

Katja Centonze

CRITICAL/SEISMIC BODIES IN HIJIKATA
TATSUMI'S WRITING PRACTICE AND
DANCING PRACTICE

This study concerns the contiguous spaces between the writing practice and the dancing practice of Hijikata Tatsumi¹. The complex operation of dance aesthetics undertaken by Hijikata is considered here in light of his radical exploration and diversification of corporeality. In conjunction with his performative achievements his writings raise awareness of the unreadable nature of the carnal body (*nikutai*) and manifest a singular criticism about the coupling between knowledge and corporeality.

Theory and Practice, Bodies and Words

In 2009 the 15th Performance Studies International Conference (Zagreb, June 24-28) faced the complex problem of «MISperformance: Misfiring, Misfitting, Misreading». What came to the fore, were emerging agendas that radically discussed the error within theory in relation to a «mis-performativity of transmission of knowledge and of its lecture machine, of the very academic format of the conference²». One among these agendas was the urgency for a new vocabulary, while the existing one was challenged by a «provocative terminology coinage» that attempted to re-position the status of rhetoric and the notion

¹ This article is an adapted version of my paper *Fluid Corporealities: Hijikata Tatsumi's Bodies Trembling between States of Crisis* delivered at PSi#21 Fluid States Tohoku 2015, Aomori, August 28-September 1.

² Lada Čale Feldman, *Intro1: PSi Mis-Performing Papers*, «Performance Research», vol. 15, n. 2, 2010, p. 2.

of subjectivity³. The nature of illegibility which affects the body was inevitably put under examination. This challenge denounces a shared uneasiness about approaches to performance studies nowadays, and shows the strong necessity for exploring new tools that might reduce the distance between theory and practice, the body and discourse⁴.

Performance studies and dance studies are young research fields, and the most recent is the latter. Dance research, as defined by Janet Lansdale, «is very much a newcomer as a discipline»⁵ and it has given rise to continuously new challenges in analytic approaches to movement and choreography from the 1980s and, more pronouncedly since the 1990s. Many debates are still open and it is a difficult task to solve theoretical and methodological problems that arise from the encounter between scholarship and choreutic arts, the area which visibly manifests a very high degree of complexity in its survey.

The specific cluster of problems we encounter, when dealing with Hijikata's art, is of translating dance, translating corporeality, translating Japanese, translating Hijikata's hermetic texts⁶. The explosion of issues relating to corporeality, and the questions they embrace, have been envisioned by Hijikata's diagnosis. As a consequence, it is my contention that a parallel examination of Hijikata's praxis and writings may open up new perspectives on the encounter between dance and discourse, the body and words. As I elsewhere suggested⁷, the fibre and fabric of movement in *butoh* praxis, if viewed from a certain perspective, pertains to a different order from that of contemporary dance and other types of experimental performance. That is to say, *butoh* may belong to a register that necessarily requires not only a new language

³ *Ibidem*.

⁴ Problems concerning the discourse on the body are felt strongly by a large group of theorists working in completely different areas.

⁵ Janet Lansdale, *A tapestry of intertexts: dance analysis for the twenty-first century*, in *The Routledge Dancer Studies Reader*, edited by Alexandra Carter and Janet O'Shea, London/NewYork, Routledge, 2010, p. 158.

⁶ My politics of translation is trying to avoid as much as possible a contamination of the original source, even if this means sacrificing the final textual aesthetics.

⁷ See for example Katja Centonze, *I colori proibiti di Kinjiki 1959-2009: Ōno Yoshito, Hijikata Tatsumi e il corpo eretico nel butō*, in *Japan Pop: parole, immagini, suoni dal Giappone contemporaneo*, edited by Gianluca Coci, Roma, Aracne Editrice, 2013, pp. 653-684.

of criticism, but a specific thermometer of corporeal sensitivity. In particular, due to its paradoxical character, *butoh* itself calls into play a new formulation of its survey.

Hijikata's Dance of Terrorism: Naked Words, Naked Bodies

Especially during the 1960s Hijikata's *butoh* unfolds as a "ter-odansu" (dance of terrorism⁸). The corporeal matter, he works on, appears as a minefield and site of critique against the socio-political system and the pervasive commodification of existence. In his revolutionary project we see condensed the crisis of the post-war body and a critical corporeality, which enacts a resistance to the politics established by the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty (1951). He dissects the body into nuances which are multi-layered and manifest subtle and changeable spectra in a polysemous interplay. Within this extended landscape emerges the *nikutai*, which is the starting point of the adventure of *butoh*'s history. The *nikutai*, transient and anarchic, is the living and raw corporeality most exposed to deterioration and most attached to life. Its highest expression and potential is shown in processes like metamorphosis, modification and mutation. Besides the *nikutai* Hijikata fleshes out the *suijakutai* (the weakened body, the altered body, or, as I define it here, the contaminated body⁹), the *shitai* (the dead body), *jintai* (the human body), *mi* (body), *karada* (body), *shintai* (body), etc¹⁰. Hijikata writes:

⁸ Tatsumi Hijikata, *Naka no sozai/sozai* (Inner material/material), in *Hijikata Tatsumi DANCE EXPERIENCE no kai. Hijikata Tatsumishi ni okuru Hosoe Eikō shashinshū*, program notes, *Hijikata Tatsumi DANCE EXPERIENCE no kai*, Daichi Seimei Hall, Tokyo, July 23-24, 1960.

⁹ For the *suijakutai* in contrast to Körperkultur see Katja Centonze, *Butō, la danza non danzata: culture coreutiche e corporalità che si intersecano tra Giappone e Germania*, in *Butō. Prospettive europee e sguardi dal Giappone*, edited by Matteo Casari and Elena Cervellati, Bologna, Dipartimento delle Arti e ALMADL, 2015, <<http://amsacta.unibo.it/4352/>>, pp. 104-108.

¹⁰ For Hijikata's construction of disparate corporealities see Katja Centonze, *Bodies Shifting from Hijikata's Nikutai to Contemporary Shintai: New Generation Facing Corporeality*, in *Avant-Gardes in Japan. Anniversary of Futurism and Butō: Performing Arts and Cultural Practices between Contemporariness and Tradition*, edited by Katja Centonze, Venezia, Cafoscarina, 2010, pp.111-141.

The *nikutai*'s voice, inside which are buried an infinite number of chasms [*sakeme*], is something as if you would wrap in a handkerchief anew the scream from the material. This happens often in the civilisation inside the body [*karada*]. Who is the creator of the overconfidence in transforming into flesh and blood? The pure spirit and the dim soul gazed at by the *nikutai*, which is divinity of flesh [*niku no kami*] and raw dream, cry with a faltering voice, hand in hand under the collapse while still pending up in the air as ever...¹¹

Hijikata's radicalism and deep concern for the body manifested in his performative practice penetrates into verbal landscape enforcing the revolutionary act of his art, where bodies are taken in extreme situations, and threat and risk are displayed on the choreographic level by, for example, unbalance, instability and entropic forces.

His obscure literature goes beyond rhetoric. We see confirmed in it, the way the bodies, as conceived by the dancer, congeal into states of emergency turning into weapons of criticism. The body itself is radically questioned. At the same time the body questions the establishment. While dealing with bodies/corporealities in his texts, he applies distinguished terminologies in differing contexts, connoting case by case the specific materiality and matter of the body. Hijikata treats words as bodies and opens up the same word to continually new meaning. His «bodily writing¹²» confers corporeality to words and creates synaesthetic texts which are multidimensional and involve all senses.

The critical body or body of crisis is revealed in Mishima Yukio's text «Kiki to buyō» (Crisis and dance), written in 1960, when the definition *butoh* was not yet in use. Mishima's literature on the avant-garde dance is, without any doubt, among the most intuitive texts written about Hijikata's dance preannouncing the main traits of its development¹³. Mishima reflects on Hijikata's words: «He said that, an exam-

¹¹ Tatsumi Hijikata, *Nikutai ni nagamerareta nikutaigaku*, «Gendaishi techō», vol. 12, n. 10, 1969, p. 35, my translation.

¹² For the concept of «bodily writing» see Susan Leigh Foster, *Choreographing history*, in *The Routledge Dancer Studies Reader*, cit., pp. 291-302.

¹³ For Mishima's writings on Hijikata's avant-garde dance see Katja Centonze, *Encounters between Media and Body Technologies. Mishima Yukio, Hijikata Tatsumi, and Hosoe Eikō*, in *Enacting Culture-Japanese Theater in Historical and Modern Contexts*, edited by Barbara Geilhorn, Eike Grossman, Hiroko Miura, and Peter

ple that seizes this posture of crisis – and it is a very singular example – is “a man who urinates outdoors in a standing position seen from behind¹⁴”».

We may say that the novelist was confronted with an artistic reality characterised by the potential to display concretely what its intentions and desires are, and by the actual and carnal manifestation of a discourse that goes beyond words. In fact, he often puts emphasis on the actuality (*akuchuarite*)¹⁵ of the performative act in Hijikata’s creations¹⁶.

The de-figured body seen from behind becomes a *topos* in Hijikata’s anti-dance, where the territory is predominately occupied by the rear. The rear replaces face, head and hands, which are/were the usual vehicles of expression. This implies that together with the erasure of the face and hands, expression is also erased¹⁷. As he declares in his program notes for *Kinjiki nibusaku* (Forbidden Colours II, 1959):

The execution of the action will be done all at once without bending the domesticated articulations. The expression of this body writhing in agony under the strict restriction of the bar [*bōjō*], will be reoriented from the face to the back. The promotion of the prioritised back to carry out a very important role, in consequence of this drama in which all the evil comes from the rear, the chest, which circles, the chest which moves slowly, and the chest which flies high around and must land, are equivalently used¹⁸.

Eckersall, München, Iudicium, 2012, pp. 218-237; *Letteratura invaghita del corpo: La danza di Hijikata Tatsumi riflessa nelle parole di Mishima Yukio*, in *Riflessioni sul Giappone II*, edited by Maria Chiara Migliore, Antonio Manieri and Stefano Romagnoli, Roma, Aracne, 2016 (forthcoming).

¹⁴ Mishima translated in Centonze, *Encounters between Media and Body Technologies. Mishima Yukio, Hijikata Tatsumi, and Hosoe Eikō*, cit. p. 224.

¹⁵ Mishima employs the term *akuchuarite*, which is the transliteration of the French word *actualité*.

¹⁶ Cf. Katja Centonze, *Encounters between Media and Body Technologies. Mishima Yukio, Hijikata Tatsumi, and Hosoe Eikō*, cit.

¹⁷ Katja Centonze, *Letteratura invaghita del corpo: La danza di Hijikata Tatsumi riflessa nelle parole di Mishima Yukio*, cit.

¹⁸ Tatsumi Hijikata, *Kinjiki*, «Kugatsu itsuka rokuji no kai. 6nin no abangyarudo», program notes, 650 EXPERIENCE no kai, Daiichi Seimei Hall, Tokyo, September 5, 1959, my translation.

Hijikata divests not only the body in his art, but he undresses also words (naked words, naked body) often through a mix of cruelty, apparent sarcasm and dry realism. His counter-discourse and disintegration of cultural categories goes further: he eradicates and opposes his own physicality which is conditioned, shaped, formed, informed, domesticated by the system or by dance formulas.

Nonhuman Theatre

A further important aspect in Hijikata's revolution, enucleated by Mishima ante litteram, is the relation between the body and the object, which is exemplified by the dancer as a patient affected by poliomyelitis, who tries to catch an object. Mishima envisages in this relation a process of estrangement and detects the thing (*mono*) as a dreadful thing-in-itself (*monojitai*)¹⁹.

I think that, what is described by Mishima, can be connected and extended to that specific corporeality of the *hagurete iru nikutai*, often mentioned by Hijikata. *Hagurete iru nikutai* is the carnal body which has become lost, errant/wandering/roaming, disoriented, the body of which we lose control, which has lost control, alienated from itself, detached from the bonds which govern society and the individual, divorced from subjectivity and from the person herself/himself. Such a body cannot be subjected either to choreutic methodology, or to "readable" kinetic configurations. It belongs to the non-oriented and non-directed gesture and to the de-figuration of the systemic organisation of choreography²⁰. Therefore it is strictly linked to what Hijikata defines as the *mumokutekina nikutai*, the *nikutai* without an aim, or, as I call it, the atelic²¹ *nikutai*, which operates against the society of productivity. This corporeality disobeys dynamics oriented towards a goal with an aprioristic and distinguishable point of departure and arrival. The *mumokutekina nikutai* is at the centre of his dance, as he declared

¹⁹ Cf. Katja Centonze, *Letteratura invaghita del corpo: La danza di Hijikata Tatsumi riflessa nelle parole di Mishima Yukio*, cit.

²⁰ *Ibidem*.

²¹ I employ here the term "atelic" (purposeless, without an ultimate end) as the antonym of "telic", (directed or moving towards a goal, an outcome or a definite end).

in *Keimusho e* (To prison²²), and may be associated also to immobility²³. Hijikata's renovation consists in conceiving dance by suffocating dance, which means, by preventing and sabotaging its commonly perceived dynamic essence. His dance launched an attack to the roots of terpsichorean art denying its harmonic and fluent dynamics, and promoting the non-dancing, non-moving body²⁴.

Mishima isolates a crucial characteristic, i.e. the non-dialectic between the body and the object and the manipulation of the *nikutai* in respect to the object. Hijikata obliterates the hierarchy among human being, animal and object, dismissing an anthropocentric vision of dance in terms of human expression. In his challenge to theatre and dance, he pushes to the extreme the nonhuman dimension in performance and investigates, intellectually and choreutically, processes for which the dancer or experiencer starts to animate the inanimate and render inanimate the animated. His terroristic act enfolds not only on a socio-political plane but invests the conception in itself of artistic creation as human domain.

Also Ichikawa Miyabi focuses on the *nikutai*/object relation and discerns in Hijikata's dance an operation, which he defines as the *nikutaika sareta mono*, the *nikutaised thing*²⁵.

The Body Observes the Study on the Body

In his essay *Nikutai ni nagamerareta nikutaigaku* (The study on the *nikutai* scrutinised by the *nikutai*, 1969) Hijikata reserves a peculiar attention also to natural crisis underlining the difference between his region, Tōhoku, and the metropolis of Tokyo. Although not explicitly

²² Tatsumi Hijikata, *Keimusho e*, cit. p. 46.

²³ Katja Centonze, *Letteratura invaghita del corpo: La danza di Hijikata Tatsumi riflessa nelle parole di Mishima Yukio*, cit.

²⁴ For a dance theory, which breaks with the isomorphism between dance and movement see André Lepecki, *Exhausting Dance: Performance and the politics of movement*, London/New York, Routledge, 2006.

²⁵ For further details see Katja Centonze, *Mutamenti del linguaggio estetico e segnico della danza: Ankoku Butō*, in *Mutamenti dei linguaggi della scena teatrale e di danza del Giappone contemporaneo*, edited by Bonaventura Rupert, Venezia, Cafoscarina, 2014, pp. 99-100.

expressed in his discourse, by addressing natural calamity, *tensai*, also natural catastrophe, plague, cataclysm, and therefore, earthquakes as well, are implied. There might be a connection between the instable bodies in *butoh* and the physical experience of earthquakes. Bodies continue to shiver also after an earthquake. The shaking corporeality displaying *keiren*, convulsive trembling, is a distinctive characteristic in Hijikata's dance, which may be affiliated to this seismic body.

In his essay he associates natural disasters with specific corporealities, in particular with the bodies of children. As far as I have observed, the infant body is denoted by Hijikata throughout his texts with the term *karada* or *shintai* and never with the term *nikutai*. Hijikata focuses on the situation of natural crisis and the infant body without rhetorical gloss. His impassive and cold-blooded words manifest an absence of desperation and lie outside the sphere to which moral judgments apply:

Natural disasters and children are connected. There are many children considered to be the appendix to natural disasters. It is a natural disaster when they are swept away by illness, as well when a *mochi*²⁶ gets stuck in their throat. Children are standing next to natural calamity. They scream, not because they have found their hat or one of their shoes has fallen, but rather because they cannot find their body [*karada*].

I have made the experience, one after the other, of being nearly thrown into the iron pot, but I was not able to have such a natural disaster in the city. Speaking about natural disasters reminds me of the flood. Together with the flood come the corpses of drowned children [*kodomo no suishitai*], and when the children's white swollen belly comes drifting, it gives a cool sensation²⁷.

With this essay Hijikata enacts a concrete movement from text towards the carnal body.

As the title highlights, Hijikata operates an inversion of the rapport between the *nikutai* and the discourse on the *nikutai*. Here it is not the study of the body that observes the body, but the body observes the cognitive practice and research. Present dance studies, as shown in discussions offered by Philipa Rothfield or Susan Leigh Foster, punctuate this very aspect, and address the body of the observer/scholar,

²⁶ Rice cake.

²⁷ Tatsumi Hijikata, *Nikutai ni nagamerareta nikutaigaku*, cit. p. 33, my translation.

which is epistemologically included in the analysis²⁸. We may say that Hijikata accomplished what dance studies and performance studies recently claim: to bring back corporeality to its corporeal sense.

Nikutai ni nagamerareta nikutaigaku embraces stratified observations, perceptions and cognizance concerning bodies. It is an important key to access Hijikata's conception of diverse corporealities, as well as their intriguing rapport with language, with the verbal and rational universe. It may be considered an investigation ante litteram of several issues posed by recent dance theory. This text came out in the October special number *Nikutai to gengo* (Nikutai and language) of *Gendaishi techō* (Contemporary art handbook, 1969), after the September number (1969), which included Kasai Akira's critique and other essays on language and the carnal body. In my opinion, both issues epitomise the intricate debate on the *nikutai* in the 1960s and Hijikata's analysis is an outstanding example.

I dare to say that Hijikata's texts are bodily texts, which melt orality and writing, performance and literacy, bodies and words, and this is clearly displayed in this essay.

A fundamental aspect of Hijikata's dance politics and artistic strategy introduced explicitly in this essay, is the shattered visual rapport, the debunking of "optocentrism". He blows up the monopoly of sight in perceiving and producing performance, and as a criterion in philosophical phenomenology. This aspect is crystalised in the reign of *ankoku* (utter darkness), in the subtraction of light, in confusing the audience's visual perception and empowering the other senses. The performing body is deferred from the production of visual forms and the spectator's and the performer's gaze is disoriented. As articulated in Sally Banes and André Lepecki's collection of essays, recently dance and performance studies have concentrated on reorienting the optomonopolism and turned to the analysis of performances involving our organs beyond our eyes²⁹.

In respect to the gaze in Hijikata's dance Gunji Masakatsu highlights:

²⁸ Philipa Rothfield, *Differentiating phenomenology and dance*, in *The Routledge Dancer Studies Reader*, cit. pp. 303-318; Susan Leigh Foster, *Choreographing history*, cit.

²⁹ *The Senses in Performance*, edited by Sally Banes and André Lepecki, London/New York, Routledge, 2007.

[...] Hijikata Tatsumi peeps constantly into the *nikutai*'s inside/inner part as if he would go beyond the inside of a cavern, and as if he would look at something which is his own *nikutai*, but is not his own *nikutai*. There the relation of showing and seeing seemed not to have been established. While the spectator sees Hijikata's dancing *nikutai*, and also Hijikata is seeing that *nikutai*, it seems as he would render this *nikutai* and its condition different from the usual scenic arts in the world³⁰.

The extraordinary condition created in Hijikata's performances, according to Gunji, can be paralleled only by the folk tradition based on the sympathetic magic, *jujutsu*. This situation happens, for example, during the Hanamatsuri and Yukimatsuri, performed in Winter in the area between the mountains of the upper course of Tenryūgawa. In these rituals the relation between seeing and show/ing, between who dances and who is watching is erased. As Gunji explains, spectators (*kenbutsu*) are excluded, because a fundamental condition of partaking in the event is of blood relations³¹.

In *Nikutai ni nagamerareta nikutaigaku* Hijikata discusses also *nikutaigaku* (study on the carnal body) and *nikutaishi* (history of the carnal body). Both are not common designations. In my opinion, these neologisms are emphasised in respect to the *shintai* (body), the corporeality prevalingly considered in a philosophical survey. As a consequence, *nikutaigaku* and *nikutaishi* can be viewed in contrast to the common designation of *shintairon*, the theory on the body³². In respect to *nikutai*, *shintai* is further a sort of normativised body inserted into a social context.

Hijikata envisages *nikutaishi* and *nikutaigaku* as mythology, shared by a large number of people, living on the surface of the car-

³⁰ Gunji Masakatsu, *Shi to iu kotenbutō*, «Bijutsu techō», n. 2, 1973, p. 121, my translation.

³¹ *Ibidem*. See also Katja Centonze, *Finis terrae: butō e tarantismo salentino. Due culture coreutiche a confronto nell'era intermediale*, in *Atti del XXX Convegno di Studi sul Giappone*, edited by Maria Chiara Migliore, Galatina (Lecce), Congedo Editore, 2008, pp. 121-137.

³² Cf. Katja Centonze, *Bodies Shifting from Hijikata's Nikutai to Contemporary Shintai: New Generation Facing Corporeality*, cit.; Katja Centonze, *Topoi of Performativity: Italian Bodies in Japanese Spaces/Japanese Bodies in Italian Spaces*, in *Japanese Theatre in a Transcultural Context. German and Italian Intertwinings*, edited by Stanca Scholz-Cionca and Andreas Regelsberger, München, Iudicium, 2011, pp. 211-230.

nal body, and compares them to bacteria. He ironically observes, that these discourses are meant for maintaining the «hygiene of the body [karada]»³³.

According to the dancer, this condition of the discursified *nikutai* is transitional, then, he adds, «real extinction» makes its entrance. The dead body, *shitai*, does not take part in the «real extinction», and therefore also the corpse is affected by the mythological bacteria.

Our *nikutai* is shattered, disintegrated even in the very moment of birth; it is not intact or integral. This is reflected also in Hijikata's choreographies since the beginning, and will be fixed as a method in his dance practice defined as that of *butoh-fu* (*butoh* notation). The *nikutai* concerns a condition of corporeal fragmentation, a split corporeality, a straying and alienating/alienated (*hagurete iru*) corporeality, characterised by chasms, tears, cracks, rips (*sakeme*), and not graspable in a unity. Therefore, «the hand chases the hand»³⁴. They are seen as independent entities, alienated from the subject. Subjective identity is obliterated and the *nikutai* melts, congeals, coagulates like a sugar candy (*bekkoame*) in a physiochemical process reproduced in dance. The body's structure is radically disturbed in its normal and normative organisation, its parts and senses are dissociated from their original physiological position and function, dismembered, mixed up and then dislocated, as for example in the case of a seeing foot or a seeing rear³⁵. The dancer's hand does not belong to the dancer. The *nikutai* is an object independent from the dancer, and is aligned with the external objects. This deferred and distantiated body, the distance between the dancer and him or herself, is the peculiar *Verfremdung* achieved in *butoh* dance, where the attention is shifted from the centre to the periphery, and the focus is distributed everywhere. The decentring process points at the anti-modern aspect of Hijikata's dance strategy. But, as I often have discussed elsewhere, the condition of *Verfremdung* is not a

³³ Tatsumi Hijikata, *Nikutai ni nagamerareta nikutaigaku*, cit. p. 31. Hijikata expresses here his critique against the sanitised and prosperous post-war society.

³⁴ Tatsumi Hijikata, *Nikutai ni nagamerareta nikutaigaku*, cit. p. 31.

³⁵ This was put into practice, for example, during Kobayashi Saga's workshop (POHRC event, Tokyo, May 13, 2014), where the topics were: eyes under the feet, eyes on the rear; corporeal situations linked to Francis Bacon's art, and to articulations with spherical junctions in Hans Bellmer's art.

prerogative of *butoh*, although it has been accentuated and made explicit, and recurs historically and technically in Japanese performing arts dating back to premodern theatricality³⁶.

Hijikata's words reveal that the *nikutai* is bound to loneliness and is approachable cognitively only through physiology – and not through *nikutaigaku* or *nikutaishi*.

We may say, that the discursive disciplines embracing *nikutai* are fallible and misfiring, because the *nikutai* is not circumscribable, confinable, containable.

Hijikata's words convey that we can dominate history as a cultural construction, but we cannot dominate the *nikutai*. I suppose that herein lies the anarchic nature of the *nikutai*.

Nevertheless there are also contrasting and paradoxical aspects of the *nikutai* or different nuances or states of the *nikutai*. Therefore, it is a fluid entity. It is fluid, because these corporealities maintain paradoxes and contradictions inside (such as «the dead body standing straight at the risk of its own life»).

In Hijikata's texts we are not confronted with the idea of the body, but the body in itself. Through this perspective, the word does not entrap (corpo)reality in a fixed category, but flows together with it.

³⁶ I discussed the «diachronic polymorphism of *wazaogi*», for example, in Katja Centonze, *Finis terrae: butō e tarantismo salentino. Due culture coreutiche a confronto nell'era intermediale*, cit. pp. 130-133.