

## **The body in the expanded field: perception, collective and image in Heine Avdal and Deep Blue.**

Under the ensemble named Deep Blue, which include as core members dancer and choreographer Yukiko Shinosaki and composer Christopher de Boek, Heine Avdal's stable position within the trope of a classic author (unitary, self-knowing, authoritarian) dissolves into a more fluid, expanded, multiple body. This obvious fact remains an important element to understand the kind of artistic project Avdal and Deep Blue have been pursuing for the past few years. For, in this simple undermining of the myth of the singularity and unity of the authorial voice, we can already find clues to assess the kind of work Avdal and Deep Blue have been proposing to their audiences, and the kind of body this work generates.

The death of the author was famously announced in the 1960s, particularly by French post-structuralism. Jacques Derrida's essay "La différance," Michel Foucault's essay "What is an Author," and Roland Barthes' essay "The Death of the Author" are by now well-known classics on the topic. In "The Death of the Author" Barthes wrote: "We know now that a text is not a line of words releasing a single 'theological' meaning (the 'message' of the Author-God) but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture" (Barthes, 1971). So, the author leaves its monadic shell and becomes that presence already inhabited by a multiplicity of voices, by endless collections of texts, all referring back to yet other sets of voices, quotations, lines of flight, references. The author is already a collective, a collectivity that spreads itself out across time and space. The author is a haunted body, channeling specters. The author is a body that certainly has volition, but who cannot quite locate the sources of that volition.

All this is familiar to literary theory. But, the question that Avdal and Deep Blue bring about, is of knowing what happens specifically when the author is replaced by the figure

of the collective, of the ensemble in the context of creating live performance? This is an upgrading of Barthes' notion of the "removal of the author." For what the notion of the collective proposes is an altogether different mode of understanding who can answer for the production of the artwork. At this point, the making of art stops being a solipsistic endeavor, predicated on a sort of solitary confinement of one self-contained genius expelling his ideas into the realm of the form. To make art becomes a mode of weaving all the potential multiplicities already crisscrossing each element of the collective -- including, obviously, the audience. Which means that in the particular case of art making that addresses the body directly, what is produced by this operation of multiplication, is a whole new notion of the body. I would claim that what Avdal / Deep Blue have been relentlessly working on (along with their audiences) since 2001 is on a very consistent project of re-creating pre-established notions of what a body is. Their bodies and our own.

Now, this embracing of a body that is always a pack, an ensemble, even if it appears under the guise of a singular name (like the name Heine Avdal; or Deep Blue; or Audience) creates specific difficulties for critical writing. For, the whole system of writing art criticism is predicated on the stability of the unity of the artist as singular figure, on the stability of the form of the artwork as a self-present form. Performance studies theorist Rebecca Schneider recently addressed this problem for art criticism -- of how the myth of the artist as solo figure presses hard on writings on contemporary art, as a sort of modernist dead-weight in our language and mode of apprehending and experiencing art (Schneider 2005). She proposes that against this notion, the critic takes into consideration "the broader contexts of cross-national, cross-ethnic, cross-temporal pollination, dialogic collaboration, and broadly diasporic influence" (35).

The identification of an already diasporic, cross-temporal body, being built by Avdal/Deep Blue is certainly important in critically assessing their work. It allows to directly address in their work possible lines of influences running across the temporality of dance history and the time of art history. It allows identifying the many geographies mapped out by the

steps of other dancing bodies with whom they have worked with (for instance Meg Stuart); it allows to point out the emerging in their pieces of so many citations, quotes, references coming from other art forms (consciously or not) like video art, performance art, and sculpture. Finally, the dialogic collaboration Avdal/Deep Blue propose is also one that intimately involves a conversation with the historicity of places and locations where they create their site-specific pieces. All of these “crossings” (to use Schneider’s term) and dialogues are certainly there at the dramaturgical center of their work.

But what may not be too obvious is that these operations of crossing times, histories, references, bodies, geographies, nationalities, languages, are nothing more than the proposition of a type of understanding of the body. It is this very specific type of body, that I believe allows us to address the dramaturgical core of their work. Paul Schilder, in his classic book *The Image and Appearance of the Body* (first published in 1935) proposed that the body should be understood not as a closed form, not as a self-contained self that performs its solid unity for an organizing gaze, but the body should be understood as a “body-image.” The body-image is a concept that sees the body as unfolding across space and time. For Schilder one’s body-image extends itself as far as every place any of its parts has reached. Wherever one has left a particle of one’s body (feces, blood, menstruation, urine, sweat) there one finds the limits of one’s body image. Wherever one has left an imprint of one’s body (including linguistic imprints, affective imprints) there lies a limit of one’s body-image. Schilder’s notion of body-image is already rhizomatic, schizoid, in the sense that it posits a body that is always beyond its proper boundaries, beyond traditional metaphysical notions of presence: a body that is always late to its arrival and always ahead of its departure, a body that is never quite there in the context of its appearing

The body-image expands beyond the confines of the body. A stick a hat any kind of clothes, become part of the body-image. The more rigid the connection of the body with the object is, the more easily it becomes part of the body image. But objects that were once

connected with the body, always retain something from the quality of the body-image on them. I have specifically pointed out that fact that whatever originates in or emanates from out of our body will still remain a part of the body-image. The voice, the breath, the odor, feces, menstrual blood, urine, semen, are still parts of the body-image even when they are separated in space from the body. (Schilder 1970, 213)

It could be said that all of Avdal/Deep Blue's work is an exploration of this notion of the body-image, the exploration of the body as already a multiplicity, spreading across space and time.

This exploration of the body as splayed out multiplicity proposes that their work is about scrutinizing the fine distinction between phenomenologies of perception and phenomenologies of sensation. And because this exploration comes across choreographically, it falls particularly within that peculiar branch of phenomenology of perception explored by Henri Bergson, particularly in *Matter and Memory*, when he wrote that "perception as a whole has its true and final explanation in the tendency of the body to movement" (1991, 45). In this quote, Bergson could have been describing most of the dramaturgical approach to perception in Avdal's and Deep Blue's work. At the level of its dramaturgical and choreographic transcription, this rather philosophical problem becomes a rather unique exploration of the limits of the body, of the limits of subjectivity, of the limits of the very question of perception. Here, we should add the specificity of Avdal/Deep Blue concerns: that of investigating the fluid boundaries between the human and the animal, the organic and technological, the virtual and the physiological.

The perceptual and sensitive body Avdal/Deep Blue explore is an expanded, porous, dynamic body. In *Terminal* (Heine Avdal, Yukiko Shinozaki, Christopher de Boek 2002), the

main dramaturgical question could be said to be that of probing how temporality relates directly to the perceptual. *Terminal* is the name of both a mono channel video project and an evening length performance. In both versions, simple but effective image games (repetition, loops, smooth transitions) allow for a disruption of the vectorial experiencing of time passing. I would like to start my discussion of this project by first addressing the video.

In the video's opening sequence, we are confronted with a paradoxical image: as the camera performs an ascending motion along the vertical lines of an elevator shaft, the image of a man (only his right hand side of the body visible to us, in perfect longitudinal cut) passes by the frame of the image, going down. By the effect of a loop, as the camera keeps ascending, smoothly, vertically, and apparently endlessly, incongruously the same man keeps descending, as if in a very controlled, yet bottomless upright falling. The upward movement of the camera generates the downward movement of the man. One does not negate the other, but create a surface tension on the image, a tension that is increased by the slow fade in of the video's soundtrack made out of unidentifiable crackling sounds, buzzes, low and high pitch sounds. What is interesting here, is that the image loop, so smoothly rendered, refuses to remain just a pure visual effect, a technological feat -- rather, the loop and its artificiality is immediately activated dramaturgically. Dramatically, its destruction begins by the obvious impossibility of the same man passing endlessly before our eyes following each of his disappearing down the bottom of the screen by another appearance at the top of it. Technologically, the image itself marks the artificiality of the loop by the insertion of a beautifully spectral brightening of the image with a bluish hue at the moment where the looping cut takes place. This brightening, this indexing of the artificial rendering of the image, is essential for the overall dramaturgical effect of *Terminal*. For, in the age of electronic reproduction, the word and the operation designated by the word "cut" is hopelessly out of touch. "Cut" relates to the specific materiality of the filmic, to the celluloid film; "cut" refers back to editing as a manual operation, involving scissors, blades, gluing agents, bits of impressed

film lying on the floor. Now, in the age of electronic reproduction, the cut is but a non-referential word, an inherited signifier emptied out of its content. With the electronic image, cutting becomes an operation of smoothing out the blurry pixilated surface of a digital matrix. This blurring of the matrix is what *Terminal* displays in its looping ascent-descent. The blurring effect is highlighted by the blueish hue only to emphasize how the conditions of production of visibility of the electronic image are no longer operating under the logic of the filmic. Which means, necessarily, that the regimes of perception of images at large, of visual perception in an expanded field, already participate of this new mode of perceiving contiguity: no longer images relate to each other under the logic of the cut. The relation between the cut and the eye as already filmic were famously rendered by Buñuel in *Chien Andalou* -- I am claiming this famous cut in the eye is no longer operating as organizer of vision. Now, visibility and the eye enter into relation by an operation developed under the logic of the blur.

The contemporary eye after the triumph of the age of electronic reproduction of images negotiates perception as a technology of blurring. No wonder then that after the apparently endless looping in *Terminal*, after the paradoxical ascent-descent of the image, the next image we are shown by the video is that of an extreme close up of a vertical eye. Now, after the vertical motions of the man descending an elevator shaft, the whole screen is occupied by a fleshy slit, by a vertical horizon, where an eyeball keeps moving without arrest. A human eye occupies the whole of the screen, tear sac at the bottom, eyelids opening and shutting like sliding doors, eyeball in incessant mobility. The close up is so extreme that we can distinctly see on the iris and pupil clear reflections of hands, moving about. The surface of the eye becomes a screen where parts of bodies appear, and make their dance. But is it really a screen? Or is it *only* a screen? Can we affirm with all certainty that those hands on the eyeball are indeed reflections? To say so would be to accept the proper understanding of the function of the eye, to treat its concave surface veiled by liquid as only a screen that captures and reflects and refracts light. Yet, *Terminal* allows for disrupting this proper understanding of the perceptual. Because the whole video so far

had been about the blurring of temporality from its linear, vectorial directionality; because the video had replaced this linear temporality by another one, where the present moment is emphatically depicted not as ephemeral, but as tightly and dynamically anchored both in the past and in the future; because the whole video had worked to establish a confusion between what has happened, what is happening, and what will come to happen; there remains the possibility that what is being proposed is that the eye may not at all be reflecting a light that has just hit its surface. It may very well be that the vertical eye is not really reflecting anything, but simply projecting something out. For isn't this operation of projecting images precisely the poetic force of the eye?

The creation in *Terminal* of a moving, fleshy, convex, humid screen confuses established notions of radical differences between surface and depth, inside and outside, what hits and what is expelled, reflection and projection. So, the question immediately erupts: are those hands moving on the surface of the vertical eye just the effect of light being reflected and refracted back by the surface of the eye? Or are those hands projections of the irrefutable animation inhabiting the hollow caves of the eye? (Bill Viola writes beautifully about the eye as a cave. Not without surprise, in a late 1980s video, Viola uses the same strategy of filming his own reflection on the pupil of an owl in order to propose the ontological question posed by the technological image: "I do not know what it is that I am like").

In any event, the moment one starts lingering on those questions brought by *Terminal* (the question of the force of the eye, of its capacity to project as well as to receive images, a question that haunted Lacan, and that Theresa Brennan explored in a short essay on the projective eye), the video starts displaying a whole new set of its own critical moves that complicate them even further. This is a very nice break from the dangerous lure of the overly poetical. Thus, the video accelerates. Jerkingly and simply, the image picks up speed, skidding. And then slows down again. And by simply doing so, we are reminded again that the beautiful and complex vertical eye is just an image, a video image. And we

are reminded quite simply but essentially that in *Terminal* we are in the midst of representational manipulation. If we stay too long with the poetics of the image then **bang!** Here comes the cold techno-logics of the image to reveal the artificiality of it all. As if to emphasize this operation of distancing even further, right after the acceleration of the vertical eye image takes place (an acceleration that makes the hands at the surface of the eye ball skid and flutter as if they were some sort of mechanical butterfly, a beautiful image once again suggesting itself just to destroy itself right away), the hands on the iris and pupil are replaced by another image: the reflection / refraction / projection of an eye represented on a video screen. So, the image of the vertical eye reflects the image of an image of an eye reflecting. Bio and electronic feedback creating an insanely beautiful and simple virtual loop where time accelerates and decelerates, expands and contracts. All of this, it should be said, happens within a quietly noisy environment. The soundtrack of *Terminal* is reminiscent of the one used in their performance *Closer*: an odd accumulation of silences and rasping noises, creating a sensation of being listening to something between radio static, the uncanny ticking of a Geiger counter, and the buzzing rush of the Real. In *Terminal*, we find ourselves before a quiet depiction of the world as an energy field of endless waving, a vibrational field, where the status of the body as solid unit becomes porous. The body presented is not really virtual, not really present, not really human, not really technological, not really animal. It is a body already framed by the falling lines of the vertical. Here, it is not so much about morbidity but about gesturing towards the field of the spectral as already informing the field of presence. Composer Christopher de Boek writes on this effect when explaining his ideas behind the soundtrack for *Terminal*:

The sound design matches the idea of a ghostly presence, by capturing, processing and recalling signals travelling through air, through rooms, or through bodies. Sound for this performance and video is developed through multiple digital processing of recorded software or system failures. The terminal concept also implies that

bodies can be compared with processing units, which calculate input-streams to be transformed into an altered output. The relation between eye and camera lens is predominant in terminal. The input of visual data is of the greatest importance in the human way of acquiring knowledge; it is a form of reality processing. In terminal the information processing of both machine and human glide along one another, they sometimes fuse together, they also break apart.

What is really curious in the work that Avdal and Deep Blue have been developing together is not that banal fact that this work can be fashionably classified as “multi-media” or “inter-disciplinary.” What is truly interesting is how easily the work migrates from one media to the next while keeping in place the same sort of poetics of perception and dramaturgy of the image. For even when we witness or participate or attend (it is difficult to find a single term that captures the non-traditional position of the audience in their work) their live productions there is always something unusual in the way we experience the work. I guess this unusual something is precisely the work of the spectral, inevitably transforming the perceptual into a sensation that irrevocably stirs up memories. The Freudian distinction between perceiving and recollecting falls apart: all perceiving (because of the work of the ghost) becomes a remembering.

I am reminded here of Henri Bergson’s proposition in the opening of *Matter and Memory* for the insertion in his theory of memory of a mediating concept that would allow to address those entities somewhere between “a thing” and a “representation”: the image. The concept of image in Bergson complicates the relative stability of some well established dichotomies against which performance theory (but, to be fair, most aesthetic theories as well) cushions itself with perhaps too much comfort: namely the dichotomy between presence and representation. With Bergson, it is precisely the insertion of the third term -- the insertion of the image -- that disrupts the possibilities of keep grounding theories of perception on this perhaps too platonic dichotomy. The image, not quite a

thing, not quite a representation, is that third element that allows for directly addressing the temporality of perception as the materiality of memory, and the materiality of perception as the temporality of memory. No wonder then that the work of Avdal and Deep Blue relies so much on the force of images: not only video images, but even when rendered live, the duration of each choreographic sequence is predicated on a density of its visual formation. Such density comes across by a careful execution of movements within a temporality that is always already suspended by arrests, slownesses, stillnesses.

The particular temporality of memory and perception in the works of Avdal / Deep Blue, evoke Bergson's important premise regarding what constitutes the past. For Bergson, the past is that which no longer acts. This premise, of course, in order to make sense, demands an expansion of our common sense understanding of what constitutes an "action." For Bergson, the action, as long as its effects are in effect, remains in the present. Think about how Schilder opened up the body to the body-image trickling away in time and space. This is a similar operation: whatever any action remains active in its effects (no matter when that action first took place) there we have a line of present. Direct result: an unprecedented opening up of the temporal understanding of the "present" that been assigned to it to by the melancholic casting of time as an irrecoverable passing away of the instant. Think about that formula for performance studies, already articulated so well by dance manuals of the late Renaissance, that the present of performance is ephemeral, it disappears as soon as it is performed. With Bergson, through the notion of image, it is the very notion of present that can no longer be sustained within these parameters. The present is whatever still acts. Thus, we can start addressing the many images and actions that in Avdal and Deep Blue's productions index the spectral, the animal, the virtual. These are not gestures towards absences -- whether temporally remote, spatially distant, or biologically departed. The eruption of all that is not supposed to be there at the moment of its appeal, indexes precisely that particular mode of understanding the temporality of the present as that which acts upon the body, as a force, as an invisible force, as a ghostly force. This all happens without a

trace of melancholia; but certainly with traces of the uncanny, that quality that Freud tell us is also intimately associated with the eruption of animation in what should remain still. The present of Avdal and Deep Blue's performances arouses sensation, perception and memory as stirring acts of what has happened not in a "lost time" but in an intimacy to what is still happening. To understand how these acts operate temporally is to understand the necessity in their work of presenting the image as memory membrane.

In the performance version of *Terminal*, the video I have just discussed appears as a projection on the back wall of the black box theatre where the work is usually presented. The video appears strategically half way through the piece, and always in dialogue with a body on stage (either Avdal's or Shinozaki's). But the performance version of *Terminal* starts already with a video image, with an incredible video image: the first thing the audience sees after lights go down is a projection of itself on the wall before them. This becoming virtual of the audience, this becoming specular, this becoming image already points out to how *Terminal* negotiates modes of subjectification and of understanding self-presence. For the technological mirror is already a dis-organizer of bodies. It displaces the longitudinal symmetry of the mirror-image (as with any video image, it inverts the axial correspondence that the mirror images has with its object), and it adds, at the micro-perceptual level a certain delay in the perception of one's image. There we are before a past that still acts, before an image that forcefully imposes its logic. Later in the piece, the paradoxical image of the man in the elevator shaft will be projected next to Avdal's still body standing right next to it, his back to the audience. This is the moment where the performance *Terminal* clarifies Avdal/Deep Blue's embracing of the Bergsonian notion of the image as that which stands between "thing" and "representation": for it is now clear that the man in the video descends only to make a cut into the horizontal plane of the stage. This is the privilege of ghosts and of images: to transverse the boundaries of the apparently solid.

No wonder then, that Avdal and Deep Blue have framed *Terminal* within notions of force-field, a notion that casts distinctions between life and death, presence and representation, perception and memory, body and collective, sensation and affect, all become a matter of ontological conflict:

In "Terminal" we view the body as a container through which signals or "presences" can travel. They enter and leave the body. Signals are passing through the flesh. A presence charged with information. Only traces of these movements are perceptible. In this performance and video series we work with some of these traces, the effects of presences alien to the body. The terminal concept manifests itself for instance in a dying person: medical equipment will still measure a certain consciousness in the shape of electrical impulses, whereas the body itself might already appear a dead object. Sometimes an alien presence seems to take over our nerve centre and a routine action degenerates into a nervous contraction of the muscles.

(Avdal, de Boek)

The effects of presences alien to the body are precisely the activation of an expanded notion of body, of presence, of temporality. The body becomes a transducer of not only information, but of forces that are not inert across time. Thus, the choreographic importance of the spasm, or the tick in their work. Yukiko Shinozaki is particularly impressive in her renderings of these spasms, of these velocities, tremors, ghosts, electric discharges that crisscross our bodies. She displays them in incredible ways in *Closer*.

Here, once again, the whole performance is framed between the tensions drawn out of the force of a screenal presence and of a physical presence of bodies in space. These bodies moving in space, by the way, are no longer just that of the performers, but also and in extremely important way, those of the spectators. *Closer*, performs its title, or allows

the audience to perform the title, by drawing them to an extremely close proximity to the performers Yukiko Shinozaki and Heine Avdal. This proximity is not easily gained. The piece opens with the audience gathering in a narrow space before a long rectangular structure made out of several small rectangular screens, where projected images of Shinozaki appear and disappear, as a projector moves along slowly from one screen to the next. Without shoes, and wearing high quality headsets that isolate any outside sounds, the audience is confronted with a series of tensions in the organization of perception: we gaze at an image that comes and goes on the flat screen; we are in a collective; we feel the ground under our feet (its texture, its temperature); yet our experience remains highly solitary, since the subtle sound track, composed out of similar electric noises as in *Terminal*, as it presses against our ears, isolates us from the world, and from each other. In a striking way, what *Closer* displays, is that the closing of oneself inside a solipsistic sonic chamber is the sensorial premise for the transformation of our experience of the world into a flattening of the world. The solipsistic experience offered by the headsets and the soundtrack is the aesthetic condition for the creation of a virtual mode of perceiving the world. Within the sonic shell, everything, including ourselves, becomes flat. In *Closer*, we relate only to images.

After a while, the long screen opens up and we enter into a void of total and absolute darkness. Since we cannot hear each other, not even ourselves, not even the sounds of our steps, not even the vibration of our bones as we walk (we are all in socks!) this is a disturbing experience. Stepping into the dark void is already to experience a kind of falling. Soon we hit something, something that dangles in the air. And, after a while, we start to discern in the space -- as our eyes start to laboriously turn figments of light into perceptions -- thin white bamboos suspended from the high ceiling. Those suspended bamboos create moving curtains, suggest pathways, spirals and turns. We realize that the space we are in is a moving, wavering, tranquil labyrinth. We go about, Geiger counter ticking in our head, ticking away our nervous system, indexing a sort of radioactive field, a space for mutations, sounds scratching the surface of our bones, making our bones quiver

slightly, making us involute into a proprioception of the skeletal, imaging our bones as white and limb and structuring as those white bamboos filling up dark space.

After a few moments of exploration a few sources of light appear here and there. They reveal Yukiko Shinozaki, standing. This first apparition in the space performs a gesture that by now will no longer be a surprise in Havdal and Deep Blue's perceptual investigation: Shinozaki attacks her eyes. This is a very harsh, very beautiful, very uncanny moment, of a woman trying to open up her eyes that insist in remaining shut. Shinozaki is relentless, harsh. Her fingers are rigid as they pull and scratch skin, her hands contorted with too much energy, a blocked energy, hands that cannot grasp but only scratch and graze. And as she grazes, she reveals her eyes' fleshy quality, making them red, two red balls of flesh. With the powerful literality Gaston Bachelard once assigned to those critical acts of "super-imagination," Shinozaki reveals the truth behind Merleau-Ponty's notion of the flesh of the gaze as the flesh of the world. Again, as in *Terminal*, the eye appears as a mediating organ between inside and outside, between body and world, between animal and human, between a thing and its representation.

When discussing *Terminal*, I mentioned that the eye there reveals its phenomenological function as membrane of memory, as a mediating surface for the projection and the reception of "what still acts" in the expanded field of the present. In *Closer* the function of the eye becomes multiple. The eye unfolds in unimaginable becomings. I mentioned how the headsets and their muffled and muffling sounds create a sense of solitude that distances oneself from the world, and renders the world as a flat image. Due to the darkness and to the wavering motions of the bamboo, this distancing experience is further enhanced by an impending sense of disequilibrium. Thus, our eyes and visibility at large become overwhelmingly charged. The environment that *Closer* creates, demands that our eyes start operating not only as visual organs but re-organize their function as vestibular organs as well, guaranteeing equilibrium. The most interior centers organizing motion and perception, the vestibular apparatus, the proprioceptual apparatus, are pushed out of

their core to resurface on the globular flesh of the eye. This is a very odd experience of becoming, that *Closer* brings about. In this sense, the whole piece could be seen as an experiment in that generative disorganization of the organism Deleuze and Guattari so famously articulated in their recuperation of Artaud's notion of Body without Organs.

It is perhaps due to this long preparation of our bodies and our perception in the darkness, a preparation to which uncanny sensations and emotional sensations necessarily emerge as well, that the final section of *Closer* becomes particularly successful. *Closer* is an odd piece, since it is not quite an installation (it is emphatically theatrical in the sense it has a clear beginning and a clear ending); it is not quite a site-specific dance piece (the theatre may be used in its entirety, but only to create an illusion of another space); and it is also not quite your average dance performance. If it allows the audience to freely roam about, it also organizes the audience and directs it towards certain parts of the space where clearly choreographed sequences will be performed flawlessly by Shinozaki and Avdal.

Two thirds within the piece, we are lead to an open area between the curtains of dangling bamboos, a space where Avdal and Shinozaki will dance for a while. It is at this moment, that what could have been just another dance sequence becomes charged with unexpected hues. For, by then, the previous experience of having been in that space, semi-lost, semi-blind, semi-falling, semi-solitary, semi-collective, semi-listening, semi-tired, semi-directed, semi-alert allows for a seeing that could not have been anticipated. We just remain there, while Avdal and Shinozaki perform their uncanny becomings:

Le point de départ de cette production est inscrit dans notre propre microcosme : le corps génétique. Un plongeon au cœur de la chair organique, aussi artificiel et inconfortable que cela puisse paraître. Comme si c'était une construction d'un langage conçu par les autres. Dans *Closer*, le corps des danseurs se développe comme des

formes vivantes expérimentales dans un laboratoire, un monde à mi chemin de l'organique et du mécanique, de l'humain et du non humain, du perceptible et de l'imperceptible. Reste à la fin cette impression de s'être immiscé dans un monde en présence d'une corpo-réalité mais qui n'a jusqu'à présent jamais été expérimentée.

A corporeal reality that has never been experienced before. This is what Avdal /Deep Blue in their reorganization of the body have to offer as most radical gift.

**André Lepecki**

**New York, April 2005.**

This text was first published: "Dans i samtiden", Camilla Eeg (ed.) Spartacus, Norway 2006.

**References:**

Barthes, Roland: "The Death of the Autor" in Image, Music, Text (New York, Hill and Wang) 1977.

Bergson, Henri: Matter and Memory, (New York, Zone Books) 1991.

Schilder, Paul: The Image and Appearance of the Human Body (New York, International Universities Press) 1970.

Schneider, Rebecca: "Solo, Solo, Solo" in After Criticism, Gavin Butt, ed. (Malden, MA, Oxford, England, Blackwell Publishing) 2005.