

**Exploring ‘Optimal’ States of Consciousness in Michael
Chekhov’s Psychological Gesture: Towards a New
Phenomenological Paradigm**

Submitted by Effrosyni Efrosini Mastrokalou to the University of Exeter
as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
In May 2017

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature:

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank The Drama Department of the University of Exeter for awarding me a studentship and gave me the chance to be a part of a productive inspiring academic environment. During this long journey I had the chance to meet amazing people from all over the world who I will never forget. I sincerely want to thank the students of the Drama Department who took part in my practical projects: Sam-Hollis Parkes, Joe Mc Donnell, Lauren Drennan, Hannah Dunne. More specifically I want to thank my ex-student, friend and collaborator Harry Kearton. Thank you for the time, energy and seriousness of your commitment. Thank you for the hard work. Special thanks to Joe Pimrose, Gayatri Simons and Chris Mearing. A big thank to Yiannis Souris, Helena Enright, Rasha Dawood, Ali Suleiman, Jens Peters, Maria Kapsali, Eirini Nedelkopoulou, Jessica Beck, Sunhee Kim, Hanada Taihei and Katie O'Reilly. Lastly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my two supervisors Doctor Rebecca Loukes and Professor Phillip Zarrilli for their invaluable feedback, guidance, patience, support, and sincere caring.

Abstract

This thesis examines key concepts from philosophers Nishida Kitaro, Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Friedrich Nietzsche and applies them to elements of Michael Chekhov's practice of acting.

The three philosophers, in different ways, suggest an 'optimal' state, beyond a dualistic separation of the fictive from the real and the visible from the invisible, that challenges seemingly unbridgeable dualisms between inner and outer, subject and object, being and becoming and experienter and experienced.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze and understand these selected 'optimal' modes of consciousness in performance and, therefore, open up new ways of thinking about Michael Chekhov's acting processes; in particular the 'Psychological Gesture'.

The thesis asks the following questions:

1. How can the application of selected philosophical paradigms to the Psychological Gesture through theory and practice further our understanding of Michael Chekhov's work?
2. How do selected aspects of the fields of phenomenology, post-phenomenology, cognitive sciences, consciousness studies and philosophy of mind, aid in developing an articulation and understanding of an 'optimal' state of consciousness as a necessary aspect of the actor's performance in Michael Chekhov's work and theatre practice?
3. How can this project develop the way we are able to talk about Michael Chekhov's work and wider acting processes?

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Table of Contents	4
Introduction	7
Research Questions.....	9
Research Context	13
Use of philosophy as applied to acting processes	16
Use of new scientific paradigms applied to acting processes	19
Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche	25
Material on Michael Chekhov	28
Primary Sources	29
Secondary Sources	32
Research Methodology	37
Research Through Practice	39
Chapter 1: Michael Chekhov and the Psychological Gesture	44
Introduction	44
1.1 Concentration and Attention.....	50
1.2 Concentration and Imagination / Image Gesture.....	56
1.3 Objectivity	61
1.4 Consciousness Divided.....	63
1.5 Higher Ego	67
1.6 The Psychophysical	73
1.7 Psychological Gesture	87
1.7.1 Everyday (usual) gesture	90
1.7.2 Archetypal Gesture	91
1.8 Concluding Remarks.....	98
Chapter 2: Kitaro Nishida’s “Acting Intuition” and Michael Chekhov’s Psychological Gesture	101
Introduction	101
2.1. Pure Experience (Direct Experience).....	101

2.1.1 Pure Experience and Perception	107
2.1.2 Acting Intuition	114
2.1.3 Acting-Intuition, Self-identity of Absolute Contradictories (Self-Contradictory Body / Nishida's Dialectical Universal)	116
2.1.4 The Logic of Basho and Absolute Nothingness	122
2.2 Nishida and Michael Chekhov.....	130
2.2.1 The “Basho of Being” Awareness and the Psychological Gesture ..	132
2.2.2 The “Basho as Relative Being” Awareness and the Psychological Gesture	134
2.2.3 The Basho as Absolute Nothingness” Awareness and the Psychological Gesture	136
2.2.4 Acting Intuition and the Psychological Gesture.....	140
2.2.5 Breath	141
2.2.6 Rhythm	147
2.2.7 Ritual.....	151
2.3 Concluding Remarks.....	157
Chapter 3: Merleau Ponty’s Chiasmic Body and Michael Chekhov’s Psychological Gesture.....	159
Introduction	159
3.1 The Structure of Ambiguity.....	162
3.1.1 Gestalt	166
3.1.2 Horizon Structure: Glance Depth and Verticality.....	170
3.1.3 Glance and Depth.....	172
3.1.4 Transcendence or Self-extendedness	176
3.1.5 Chiasm Flesh Reversibility.....	180
3.1.6 Intercorporeality	188
3.1.7 Reflection and/or Mirror	193
3.1.8 Body Schema - Body Image	196
3.2 Merleau-Ponty and Michael Chekhov: The Psychological Gesture.....	205
3.2.1 Psychological Gesture: Sensations.....	207
3.2.2 Sensations: Proprioception - Interoception	213
3.2.3 Psychological Gesture: a Body Schema - Body Image Model of Perception.....	214
3.2.4 Psychological Gesture: Body-Schema-Image and Self-extendedness or Transcendence.....	219
3.2.5 Psychological Gesture: Mirroring and Reflection	224
3.2.6 Psychological Gesture: Reversibility Chiasm Flesh	226
3.2.7 Psychological Gesture: Passivity and Activity Functioning	228
3.2.8 Psychological Gesture: Foreground and Background Modes of Awareness (Gestalt Structure).....	231
3.2.9 Psychological Gesture: Horizontal – Vertical Awareness.....	237

Chapter 4: Nietzsche’s ‘Ecstatic’ Body and Michael Chekhov’s Psychological Gesture.....	243
Introduction	243
4.1 Nietzsche’s philosophy of the body	243
4.1.1 The Apollonian Consciousness of the Body.....	251
4.1.2 The Dionysian Consciousness of the Body.....	253
4.1.3 The Apollonian and the Dionysian Opposites	260
4.2 Nietzsche and Michael Chekhov	267
4.2.1 Apollonian-Dionysian Perception and Psychological Gesture: The Aesthetics of Multiplicity.....	267
4.2.2 Dionysian Ecstasy and Psychological Gesture	269
4.2.3 Image Thinking (Gestural Thinking) and Psychological Gesture ...	272
4.2.4 Psychological Gesture and Archetypal Structure: microcosm-macrocosm	274
4.2.5 Modes of Consciousness: “bright” and “dark” consciousness.....	278
4.3 Concluding Remarks.....	288
Conclusions.....	289
APPENDIX 1: Literature Review	301
Section 1: Material on Nishida Kitaro	302
Primary sources.....	302
Secondary sources	304
Section 2: Material on Merleau-Ponty	306
Primary Sources	306
Secondary sources	310
Section 3: Material on Nietzsche.....	314
Primary Sources	314
Secondary Sources	316
APPENDIX 2: Michael Chekhov’s Biography	319
APPENDIX 3: Kitaro Nishida’s Biography	329
APPENDIX 4: Merleau-Ponty Biography	333
APPENDIX 5: Nietzsche’s Biography	338
Bibliography	343

Introduction

Inspiration for this thesis can be traced to 2005 when, as a theatre practitioner, director and acting teacher, I decided to explore the process of actor training central to the MA in Theatre Practice at Exeter University developed by Phillip Zarrilli. Although I had previously completed postgraduate studies in Contemporary Theatre Practice (Devised Theatre and Performance) and in Directing, the strong desire to undertake this MA course was influenced by Zarrilli's publications about his approach to actor training. It seemed to me that Zarrilli was talking about problem solving issues of body-mind in acting practice that I was facing myself in my own work at the time; issues that were related to the actor's lack of awareness, focus, concentration and attention. I wanted the opportunity to experience and simultaneously begin systematic research on new perspectives that might inform my development and my own work as a director.

My first encounter with Michael Chekhov's work was unsuccessful. Many years before I started my own training with Zarrilli, I was given as a present a Greek translation of Michael Chekhov's *To The Technique of Acting*. I was immediately attracted to Michael Chekhov's work. Nevertheless, the complex principles as well as his language that seemed at first to emanate a mystical sense made me initially feel insufficient to practice. Zarrilli's training helped me to begin to understand and access Michael Chekhov's work; more specifically the actor's active engagement with images. Zarrilli writes that Michael Chekhov 'developed an approach to the creation of character based on an active use of imagination, not as an image in the head, but as an act of engagement of the entire bodymind'¹. This description might be said to reflect fundamental principles of Zarrilli's own psychophysical training as well. In that sense, Zarrilli's training built a bridge between my own practice of psychophysical disciplines and Michael Chekhov's work. Since then I began to read, research, practice and train. I took professional workshops in Great Britain and Europe with

¹ Zarrilli, P. (1995/2002), *Acting (Re)-Considered*, (London: Routledge), p. 11-12.

Michael Chekhov's practitioners from all over the world and I started to practice Michael Chekhov's work as a teacher and director.

During this period I also began to think about how we might further our understanding of psychophysical acting processes. What kind of philosophical, inter-disciplinary approaches might help us find ways to talk about the relationship between language and thinking in acting? Phenomenology and Merleau-Ponty initially were introduced to me by Zarrilli's writings and lectures. Part of my research and practice at the time was the philosophy of Eastern practices as well.

Yuasa Yasuo's cross cultural and inter-disciplinary dialogue of the body in his *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory* (1987) had a significant influence on the direction of my work since it shaped the methodology of this study. Yuasa, who points towards the vast divergences between western and eastern traditions and the complexities of the mind-body problem, offered an insightful dialogue between western sciences and eastern practices and ethics. Yuasa's main point is that the separation of mind and body, the assumptions of dualisms which are central to the western philosophy, not only fail to profoundly inquire and accurately reflect our existential situation, but also fail to consider important forms of perception. These issues became central in my research as practice and my practice as research. By reversing the western philosophical view of the body that analytically separates the mental and psychological mode from the somatic mode, Yuasa's study advances what is unique in eastern philosophical thinking: that knowledge cannot be obtained by theoretical thinking but through somatic practices of bodily realization; through "self-cultivation", which Yuasa defines, as "the performance of a practice that facilitates a somatic experience involving the totality of body and mind"². For the purpose of his argument of the "body-mind oneness", Yuasa challenges the truth and validity of what modern philosophy has claimed since Descartes. In *The Body* Yuasa blends and discusses themes from the Kyoto School, ideas

² Yuasa, Y. (1987), *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, Kasulis, T.P. (ed.), translated by Nagatomo, S. and Kasulis, T.P., (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press), p. 45.

from Heidegger, Bergson, Husserl, Freud, Jung, Merleau-Ponty and the Japanese Buddhist thinkers Dogen and Kukai. Yuasa pays particular attention to Nishida Kitaro (his “active intuition” and “historical bodily existence”) and to Merleau-Ponty’s notion of the “lived body” and *Phenomenology of Perception*. He focuses on the idea of a somatic self which through a psychophysical pathway engages the body in the practice of self-cultivation and is able to completely overcome Cartesian mind-body dualism. Yuasa uses Nishida and Merleau-Ponty to expand on a body/mind relationship which is different from the everyday normative body/mind relationship. Yuasa discusses the importance of the ability to transform from the everyday standpoint into a non-everyday, extra-ordinary standpoint by analyzing the nature and/or consciousness of this transformation. In his chapter on Nishida Kitaro, Yuasa theorizes ideas about ‘optimal’ modes of being/doing through his discussion on the existence of the “bright” and “dark consciousness” as a theory of ‘optimal’ development of consciousness. Yuasa privileges the transformation of the “bright” into the “dark consciousness” as an ‘optimal’ state that allows the development of fluid interaction between the two. In other words, Yuasa’s analysis of Nishida’s and Merleau-Ponty’s ideas was a precedent source that served as an example that extended the themes and methodological issues of the cross cultural philosophical conversation of my thesis. “Dark consciousness” as understood by Yuasa seemed to me a type of somatic intelligence that had numerous correlates with Nietzsche’s sense of transcendentalism, his ‘Dionysian consciousness’ of the body that is a sense of interconnectedness with the whole cosmos (world). In this way Nietzsche’s philosophy was introduced into this thesis.

Research Questions

Through an examination of key concepts from Nishida Kitaro (1870-1945), Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961) and Fredriche Nietzsche (1844-1900) this thesis aims to:

- a) enable a deeper understanding of the structural conditions which create and support an 'optimal' state of embodied imagination and formulate a complex paradigm of the actor's 'optimal' experience
- b) open up the possibility of a new philosophical framework for understanding elements of Michael Chekhov's practice of acting

I address these aims by asking the following questions:

- 4. How can both the theoretical and practical application of selected philosophical paradigms to the Psychological Gesture further our understanding of Michael Chekhov's work?
- 5. How do selected aspects of the fields of phenomenology, post-phenomenology, cognitive sciences, consciousness studies and philosophy of mind aid in developing an articulation and understanding of an 'optimal' state of consciousness as a necessary aspect of the actor's performance in Michael Chekhov's work and theatre practice?
- 6. How can this project develop the way we are able to talk about Michael Chekhov's work and wider acting processes?

'Optimal' could be described as a favourable state or phenomenon in which, under specific conditions, something happens. The word phenomenon comes from the Greek *phainein* meaning something is appearing to view, something is observed to exist or something has happened. Michael Chekhov implies in a sense what is an 'optimal' state of being/doing in his work in *To the Actor* (2002). He states that the 'co-operation' of three different consciousnesses and the skilful ability of the actor to recognize 'the important distinctions between them makes the actor's performance possible'³. According to Michael Chekhov these three states are a) the lower consciousness that is identified with the actor's everyday self, b) the higher consciousness identified with the creative impulses and process and c) the character's consciousness as created by the

³ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 88.

actor⁴. However, Michael Chekhov does not analyze in depth the nature of this complex perceptual phenomenon and process. His discussion of what is an 'optimal' mode of consciousness is limited to a few pages. In this thesis therefore, I want to examine the simultaneous experiencing of different consciousnesses as an aspect of the actor's 'optimal' mode of awareness in performance through the study of consciousness and direct experience proposed in the theoretical paradigms of Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche, and contemporary perspectives of their work. The purpose of this examination is to shed light and open a space of possibilities between aspects of phenomenology-ies and Michael Chekhov's acting processes in order to understand and analyze in depth 'optimal' modes of consciousness in performance. I intend the term 'optimal' to denote a heightened perceptual experience that is inextricably linked to focus, concentration and attention of the actor.

I have opted for a phenomenological exploration of Michael Chekhov's process and approach, because I was convinced of the necessity of exploring and analyzing in depth, the complex nature of the actor's experiencing. I use the work of Nishida, Nietzsche and Merleau-Ponty to conceptualize a framework that will help me theorize the embodied-embedded (living-lived) experience of the actor in Michael Chekhov's practice. Phenomenology is defined as a theory that:

can reveal alternative ways of thinking about the subjective dimension by the adoption of a different stance than the objectivistic one [...] Phenomenology does not make statements about how the world is in-itself, outside of human experiences of it. The subject matter of phenomenological studies is an examination of various human phenomena such as for example, perception, time consciousness,

⁴ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 87-88

sexuality, religious and cultural practices, the body, the experience of the Holy etc. from the point of view of meaning constitution⁵.

For Merleau-Ponty, phenomenology can be defined as a study of direct experience in the world. He writes that phenomenology deals with:

the sense which is revealed where the paths of my various experiences intersect, and also where my own and other people's interest and engage each other like gears. It is thus inseparable from subjectivity and inter-subjectivity, which find their unity when I either take up my past experiences in those of the present, or other people's in my own⁶.

Phenomenology, in other words, seemed to offer an appropriate analytical tool to examine how a specific moment in Michael Chekhov's acting techniques structures and articulates the immediate visceral experience of the actor that emerges directly from the experience of (interacting with) the Psychological Gesture and shapes distinct modes of consciousness; three distinct embodied and embedded cognitive processes that locate thinking as inseparable from the actor's actions and inseparable from the space and the environment in which these actions take place.

The underlying process of this research is also informed by my own studio-based practice on three practical projects (training, rehearsal process, performances) which took place during the period of writing. These projects included interviews with the actors and study of the actors' journals which documented their process throughout each project. The aim was to facilitate an interconnectedness between my theoretical analysis of Psychological Gesture and the actual practice undertaken in the studio. The practical work not only enhanced enormously my understanding of the research by helping me to clarify conceptually complex phenomenological terms in practice, it also forced me to more clearly articulate complex issues of situated embodiment and consciousness in acting practice.

⁵ In J. Bullington, 'The Lived Body', in *The Expression of the Psychosomatic Body from a Phenomenological Perspective*, (Dordrecht: Springer, 2013) p. 20; p. 22.

⁶ In M. Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, translated by D.A. Landes (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), p. xx.

Research Context

Within the area of theatre and performance studies, this thesis builds on previous attempts to develop theories of embodied acting and ways to articulate notions of 'optimal' states of consciousness in performance. As we know, Performance Studies is an interdisciplinary field of research that draws from the humanities, the social sciences and the arts. Ervin Goffman (*The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, 1956) and Victor Turner (his *Ritual Process Structure and Anti-Structure*, 1969) were two major figures from cultural anthropology that were essential to the formation of the discipline of performance studies⁷. The impact of their work on the body opened up the category of what constituted the actor's performance in Richard Schechner's work. Schechner's discussion approaches issues of consciousness from the perspective of performance studies. For Schechner, performance is a very broad category. Describing it as intercultural, inter-generic and an interdisciplinary phenomenon, it covers a *broad spectrum*⁸ and can be viewed as a continuum of actions that draws from a wide range of activities that includes or occurs in the following fields: everyday human activities, aesthetic activities (theatre, dance, music, high arts etc). Schechner's aesthetic tools and principles can take the performer beyond the habitual patterns and can expand and affect the field of their expressive possibilities and might be seen as closely related to the concept of 'optimal' modes of consciousness.

In terms of approaches to acting, Zarrilli in *Acting Reconsidered* proposed multiple alternatives to psychological based acting paradigms and actors' consciousness in order to discuss acting theory and practice as a personal, cultural, social, ideological, and collective dimension that is related to the study of processes that put aside acting as one coherent system of discourse or practice that is as a *truth*. Zarrilli states that acting is a 'pro-active, processual approach which cultivates a critical awareness as multiple and always

⁷ The intellectual roots of performance studies in US can be found in the 1940's-1950's when theatre was employed as a model for studying uses of language, everyday interaction and ritual. In the 1960's experimental theatre practitioners/directors moved from theatre to ritual. They started exploring the boundaries between theatre and ritual/art and life.

⁸ R. Schechner, "The Broad Spectrum Approach", in H. Bial (ed.), *Performance Studies*, (London/N.York: Routledge, 2004) pp. 7-10.

changing. Of course, in the moment of performance, the actor must embody a specific set of actions *as if these were absolute*. But every “absolute” viewed historically and processually is part of a multiplicity.⁹ Zarrilli’s acting theory contrasts the representational theories/meta-theories of acting that construct the actor’s view of action from a position as an outside observer. Zarrilli’s pedagogy and practice is an ‘enactive’ approach that views the actor from the perspective of an enactor or doer. His theory of acting is not to be understood as a representation of a role or a ‘character’, but as a dynamic lived experience where the actor ‘being-in-the-moment’ is able to psychophysically respond to the demands of a specific space-environment.

In *Psychophysical Acting: An Intercultural Approach to Stanislavsky* (2009) Zarrilli discusses the theoretical, philosophical and practical methods of psychophysical acting. A key precept in his analysis of the nature of an ‘optimal’ state of consciousness and awareness in training and performance is a structural organization of the body of the actor that Zarrilli names a ‘*chiasmatic body*’¹⁰. This structure is a dynamic process of encounters of multiple bodies that can create and engage a constant dialectic between and among four consciousness’ of the body. Zarrilli describes these four different sense of consciousness as: a) the ‘ecstatic surface’ body, b) the ‘depth visceral recessive body’, c) the ‘subtle inner bodies’, and d) the ‘fictive body of the actor’s score’.¹¹ In Zarrilli’s phenomenological enactive approach, the concept of ‘optimal’ and what constitutes this heightened mode of perceiving, is when the actor becomes acutely aware of the intersections of these four different consciousness of the body and at the same time the actor is able to experience them as a continuum and in a state of flux. He argues that this is the result of a special relationship that the body/mind of the actor assumes after a long period of training that prompts a change of awareness between breath, energy and the body in space and time. Zarrilli’s approach to discipline the body/mind is through the Asian martial arts/meditation arts and related acting exercises as a psycho-physiological basis for performance. And while Zarrilli’s approach inspired my

⁹ Zarrilli, P. (1995/2002), *Acting (Re)-Considered*, (London: Routledge), p. 3

¹⁰ Zarrilli, (2009), p. 59.

¹¹ Zarrilli, (2009), p. 59.

work and this investigation, my approach is different as it is an in-depth exploration of different philosophical paradigms that are practically applied in depth to Michael Chekhov's work.

Both Schechner and Zarrilli as directors, theorists, and educators/trainers, have played a visible and consistent role in shaping the field of performance studies. Schechner's and Zarrilli's thought of what is an 'optimal' mode of consciousness and awareness in performance are relevant to the research of this study. They both provide a framework that offers an imaginative focus on various areas of the body (physical mental emotional) which cultivates an 'optimal' experience as multiple and constant changing processes in the present moment of the actor's performance. Their performative practices address the concept of an invisible presence in the actor's performance which creates a distance between the actor and what is acted. This invisible presence and distance which is a non-physical dimension is inextricably linked to what is 'optimal' awareness and experience in the actor's work as well as is vital in the creative process. The awareness of this invisible presence and distance and how it is incorporated in the body helps the actor transcend dualities of: the body and mind, the inner and outer, the self and other, the fictive and real. The significant value of this embodied quality in the actor's performance was recognized as necessary and prerequisite by Michael Chekhov as well. As Zarrilli notes the actor "works against time", this time is intended as a space in which the participant begins to discover an alternative relationship *to time through the body*¹². Therefore, in these practices the actor inhabits different processes of the body which are historically and contextually specific relationships that shape constitute and affect 'optimal' modes of consciousness in acting experience.

Schechner and Zarrilli have examined the details of performative behaviour and have developed models of the performance training process that are seminal to issues of shaping the performer's 'optimal' states of awareness and consciousness. Their work has paved the way for other scholar-practitioners,

12 Zarrilli, 'ON THE EDGE OF BREATH, LOOKING. Cultivating the actor's bodymind through Asian martial /meditation arts', in P.Zarrilli (ed.), *Acting Re-Consider A Theoretical and Practical Guide*, (London/New York: Routledge, 1995/2002) p. 190.

such as John Lutterbie, Rick Kemp, Jerri Daboo and Rebecca Loukes, to not only question preconceptions about acting and further the discussion of how acting is embodied, but also to consider how we think and talk about acting in the twentieth first century. However, none of these scholars-practitioners, have drawn specifically on Michael Chekhov's work. While Daboo includes in her PhD a section on Michael Chekhov and Lutterbie has written an essay on cognitive sciences and "The Dynamics of Psychological Gesture" in *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov* (2015), none could be considered an in-depth analysis of Michael Chekhov's work and the Psychological Gesture. This thesis attempts therefore, to add to this body of knowledge by further developing the exploration of consciousness in relation to 'optimal' states of embodied experience in relation to elements of Michael Chekhov's practice.

Use of philosophy as applied to acting processes

The purpose of using philosophy as applied to acting is to formulate the right vocabulary to articulate and analyze the special demands that theatre and acting processes require from the actor. Philosophy, phenomenology in particular, seems to offer a process of negotiation of the human body between what is physical or natural and what is nonphysical or non-natural and possible. Ideas that are rooted in phenomenology appear to propose a place in which acting processes can engage with practices that negotiate around what the actor's body does, what the actor's body is and what the actor's body is capable of. Phenomenology then can offer the means to reflect on the nature, practice and phenomenon of acting. It can provide evidence to support how the (actor's) body inhabits the distinctions made between body and mind, subject and object as well as show how these distinctions operate.

Furthermore phenomenology and acting processes share principles of a common ground. They include: a central concern for conceptualizing the (actor's) full meaningful embodied lived experience which is related to issues of space and visual perception; space as metaphor and/or metaphor as space, the transgression of standard principles of bodily behaviour, the blurring of the outer

physical and inner phenomenal; and visual perception as inseparable from how one's whole body is affected by seeing. 'Seeing' here is always *bodied* seeing.

Two of the first and most important critical studies in relation to these issues in the field of performance theatre and phenomenology are Bert O. States' *Great Reckonings in Little Rooms On the Phenomenology of Theatre* (1985) and Stanton Garner's *Bodied Spaces Phenomenology and Performance in Contemporary Drama* (1994). States explores phenomenological perspectives of the interactions among text actor and audiences. States thinks of phenomenology as 'modes of seeing that constitute a kind of binocular vision; one eye enables us to see the world phenomenally; the other eye enables us to see it significantly'¹³. Garner's *Bodied Spaces* on the other hand is a key study in the field of performance and phenomenology that analyzes a variety of plays from different moments in the twentieth century (early 1950's-1990's). Garner demonstrates different aspects in the phenomenology of theatre. His analysis is about how characters (in Beckett, Shepard, Pinter, Brecht etc) project bodies in theatrical space. His focus on the phenomenology of Merleau-Ponty who, according to Garner, 'posited a consciousness caught up in the ambiguity of corporeality, directed toward a world of which it is inextricably and materially a part'¹⁴, had a great impact on a range of late twentieth and twenty first century acting discourses. Garner claims that the phenomenological approach,

its twin perspective on the world as it is perceived and inhabited, and the emphasis on embodied subjectivity [...] is uniquely able to illuminate the stage's experiential duality. On one hand, the field of performance is scenic space, given as spectacle to be processed and consumed by the perceiving eye, objectified as field of vision [...] On the other hand, this field is environmental space, "subjectified" (and intersubjectified) by the

¹³ B.O. States, *Great Reckonings in little Rooms On the Phenomenology of Theatre*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985) p. 8.

¹⁴ S.B Garner, Jr., *Bodied Spaces Phenomenology and Performance in Contemporary Drama*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994) p.27. Garner in this book refers basically to dramatic texts and to the character's body not to actual performances.

physical actors who body forth the space they inhabit [...] The embodied / of theatrical spectatorship is grounded in an embodied eye.¹⁵

Garner describes here the body-non body relation. The duality of the body as subject-object and the ability of the body to gaze back and to reflect. The importance of his account of the simultaneous bodied and *disembodied* spaces of the seeing eye// is that Garner analyzes the dialectics of the living body and aesthetic form. At the same time, he examines how characters / performers experience theatrical space and how this experience constructs their audiences' experiences as well. In other words, within the theatre event both performers and spectators are (bodily) affected by the way performers' bodies are placed/positioned in relation to space and time. Garner describes performance phenomenology as an excessive tangling between body/bodies, objects, and things in the world. A gathering of bodies and minds in which both performers and spectators discover that spatial conjunction is experienced as if body and space are always in mutual connection. *Bodied Spaces* is about *embodiedness* of consciousness that is about aspects of material bodiliness; a material presence that is situated with its own positionality that appropriates its spatial surroundings and foregrounds a perceptual phenomenological field which seems to be shared and felt as kinaesthetic *empathy*¹⁶ between characters and performers, between characters and spectators. In *Bodied Spaces*, theatre and acting is a way to deal with *inter-subjectivity* both from the character's/actor's perspective and from the spectator's; a co-presence of character/performer and spectator during the performance. It seems that for Gardner phenomenology is a tool to approach this 'optimal' state in theatre where both actors' and spectators' are aware of themselves as body and non-body, what constitutes, according to him, 'the ineradicable but elusive body, both I and not-I'¹⁷.

The use of philosophy in performance is a fast developing interdisciplinary field of thought, creative practice and scholarship. Monographs and essay collections address the relationship between performance and philosophy within

¹⁵ Garner, *ibid*, p.4.

¹⁶ (The ability to feel and sense the feelings, the senses of an other).

¹⁷ Garner, *ibid*, p. 230.

a broad range of philosophical traditions and performance practices in the twenty first century. For example, Arthur Lessac's *Embodied Actor Training* (2014) by Melissa Hurt, a Lessac voice, speech and movement practitioner, explores actor training in terms of embodied acting supported by the work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty. *Performance and Phenomenology: Traditions and Transformations*, (2015), edited by Maaïke Bleeker, Jon Foley Sherman and Eirini Nedelkopoulou, is a collection of thirteen essays by international researchers and practitioners (Peta Tait, Susan Kozel, Phillipa Rothfield, Mark Hansen, Phillip Zarrilli, among others) which discuss the tensions between the field of Phenomenology and Performance. The essays explore issues of embodied action and thought, new ways of thinking about experience, perception, corporeality, subjectivity and the world. The scholars-performers place phenomenology in dialogue with contemporary performance and thus expand on how one does or practices phenomenology in contemporary theory and practice; what is at stake in this process of practice-transformation. None of these authors though have applied his/her philosophical analysis directly to Michael Chekhov's work.

Use of new scientific paradigms applied to acting processes

Conceptions of the human body drawn from physiology and psychology have dominated theories of acting from antiquity to present. The nature of the body, its structure, its outer dynamics, and its relationship to the larger world that it inhabits have been the subject of diverse speculation and debate.¹⁸

In the last part of the twentieth century the "first generation" field of cognitive science (between the 1950's-80's) emerged. This dealt with how information is represented and processed in the human brain. It developed theories of mind that separated physical aspects from how the human brain works; traditional views that separated cognition from processes of perceiving and acting.

¹⁸ J.Roach, *The Players Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), p.11.

According to Encyclo.co.uk /*Medicine Net* cognitive pertains to ‘cognition, the process of knowing and, more precisely, the process of being aware, knowing thinking, learning and judging. “Cognitive” comes from the Latin root ‘*cognoscere*’ meaning to know’. The study of cognition encompasses the field of philosophy of mind, cognitive psychology, neuroscience, neuro/linguistics, cognitive anthropology, ethology, computer science, mathematics, among others. In these different and, for some, closely related disciplines similar issues and problems came into focus as the central aim was to understand the function of cognitive processes and how these processes are ‘encoded’ in the human brain.

In the late 1990’s what is referred to as “second generation” cognitive science and cognitive linguistics emerged and contradicted established principles and traditional philosophy. Questions about the structure and function of the human brain and mind brought new approaches to issues about human action. The “second generation” cognitive science laid a new emphasis on the dependence of concepts and reason on the body (embodied concepts) and on the importance of metaphorical thought and mental spaces. The emphasis was that imagination is central to meaning and metaphor central to cognition¹⁹. Cognitive science provided new definitions of emotion, feeling, and action, new ways of perceiving the inter-relationship of body and mind and new descriptions of the nature of self and other.

The most recent cognitive sciences view intellect, mind, emotion, feeling, body, as parts of a single, organic but complex process of human existence and experience. The fundamental aspects of these findings, that the brain is inextricably linked to the body and responsive to the environments and that each one of us is inextricably intertwined with each other and our environments, are useful and necessary insights in acting processes. They provide new tools and perspectives that allow actors, directors and theatre practitioners to enhance our methodologies and rethink acting terms and processes.

¹⁹ G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*, (New York: Basic Book A Member of the Perseus Books Group, 1999), p.496.

At the end of the twentieth century other disciplines were attracted to cognitive sciences. Cognitive sciences appeared in theatre and performance studies in the late 1990's. In fact, we lack a proper history of the relationship between theatre and cognitive sciences in the past century since the 'exchange between theatre cultures and research into the nervous system [...] has been as recurrent as scarcely investigated.'²⁰ Gabriele Sofia notes that the interest in cognitive sciences probably coincided with developments in pedagogies for actors. When great directors started a scientific inquiry of new learning practices, new methodical systems in acting processes²¹ emerged (Sofia refers here to Stanislavsky's writings at the end of 1920's). On the other hand, Joseph Roach discusses in his *The Players Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting* that there has always been a relationship between sciences and the theatre /performing arts. Roach, himself, explores the mutual relationship of interdependence between acting theories and the scientific understanding of the body throughout history.

Since the beginning of the twenty first century even more academics and theatre practitioners from the field of performance studies discuss notions that have attracted interest in cognitive sciences; such as consciousness, awareness, intention, inter-subjectivity and emphatic understanding. The first book on the relationship between performance and cognition is *Performance and Cognition Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn* published in 2006. Bruce McConachie, one of the editors, notes that cognitive science 'can offer empirically tested insights that are directly relevant to many of the abiding concerns of theatre and performance studies'²².

Rhonda Blair, in the same book, in her essay "Image and Action: Cognitive Neuroscience and actor training" writes that 'issues of consciousness, feeling, and action/behaviour are central to both acting and cognitive neuroscience'²³.

²⁰ G. Sofia, 'Towards a Twentieth Century History of the Relationships Between Theatre and Neuroscience,' *Brazilian Journal on Presence Studies*, 4.2, (2014), p.314.

²¹ *Ibid.* p.314.

²² McConachie and F. E. Hart Conachie, *Performance and Cognition Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*, (London: Routledge, 2006), p. x.

²³ In Conachie and Hart, *Ibid.*169.

Blair, also in her book *The Actor, Image, and Action. Acting and Cognitive Neuroscience* (2008), articulates the shifts in theory and methodology of cognitive science of the last fifteen to twenty years. She explains that what we are learning from these shifts about imagination, memory and embodiment is that they are inseparable in the structure of the brain and function and have significant implications to new ways that directors/practitioners are working with actors in acting processes. For Blair acting clearly articulates research findings in cognitive science. It is a 'transformed way of thinking about imagination and action, based in a knowledge of the neuro-cognitive ground of memory, feeling, and imagery'²⁴.

Cognitive sciences have been increasingly recognized as important to performance theory and practice. Views that everything that constitutes consciousness originates from the physical body (self), that body, mind, and feelings, is a singular dynamic thing are coincidences between cognitive sciences and significant notions in acting and actor training. Both theoretical and practical insights into the craft of acting in the twenty first century have been informed by the recent developments of cognitive science and neuroscience. Contemporary cognitive science sees that mind, that is consciousness, reason and language is embodied and tied inextricably with the body as a Dynamic System. Different sensory stimuli internal (perception), and external, those relating to position and movement of the body, (proprioception), affect one another in a circular circuit causality that leads to emotional response.

John Lutterbie, in his *Toward a General Theory of Acting: Cognitive Science and Performance* (2011), elaborates a general theory of acting from *embodied dynamicism*²⁵ or Dynamic Systems Theory (DST)²⁶. Lutterbie describes (DST)

²⁴ R. Blair, *The Actor, Image, and Action. Acting and Cognitive Neuroscience*, (New York: Routledge, 2008), p.52.

²⁵ E.Thompson, *Mind in Life: Biology, Phenomenology, and the Sciences of Mind*, (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), p.10-11. Evan Thompson writes that 'embodied dynamicism focuses on self-organizing dynamic systems rather than physical symbol systems [...] but maintains in addition that cognitive processes emerge from non linear and circular causality of continuous sensorimotor interactions involving the brain, body and environment. The central metaphor for this approach is the mind as embodied dynamic system in the world, rather than the mind as neural network in the head'.

as a “system” that is generally defined as elements that function together to create a complex whole; a “dynamic system” that exists in a constant state of equilibrium, responding to perturbations (disturbances) that further destabilize the whole²⁷. Lutterbie wants to develop a theory of acting and the reason for choosing (DST) is that it provides ‘an explanatory power commensurate with the complexity and creativity of the acting process²⁸. Lutterbie makes clear that he uses cognitive sciences not in order to ground them in empirical studies, but to challenge the way we think about things, to ask questions about common concepts, terms and metaphors in order to redefine them as new tools to understand, reframe and reflect upon contemporary acting processes²⁹. Lutterbie claims that he refers to any category or genre of theatre (realist character acting, non-realist acting and postdramatic/devised performance) and to all ‘dominant approaches to the training of acting³⁰. For understanding theatre and acting Lutterbie proposes as a framework a DST. He argues that thought, emotion, motor skills, and imagination are all integrated. They are all parts of a dynamic system which is a flexible embodied activity that is meant to develop into the actor’s score in rehearsals and performance. Lutterbie explains that the actor’s score is not a simple sequence of activities, but the activities of an embodied dynamic system ‘within a dynamic system³¹ which is the rehearsal / performance environment and everything it includes. Lutterbie mentions that an actor’s score is,

[A] series of intentional acts that interweaves creative associations discovered through analysis and improvisation with the dynamics of technique. These acts are performed through movement, language and gesture. They combine memories - those retrieved from the past as well

²⁶ Evan Thompson explains that ‘there are two main theoretical commitments to *embodied dynamicism*: one is to a dynamic systems approach to cognition and the other is an embodied approach to cognition’ [*ibid.*11]. In the first, Lutterbie’s approach to acting belongs. In the second, where one encounters the integration of cognitive science and phenomenology, Zarrilli’s (2009) account to considering acting and embodiment belongs. The focus here is on what is referred to as *enactivism*; a shift to the enactive paradigm influenced by the writings of Francisco Varela, Evan Thompson and Alva Noe, among others. An enactive approach claims that an organism is not a passive receiver of input from the environment, but an actor in the environment meaning that what one experiences is shaped by how one acts.

²⁷ J.Lutterbie, *Toward a General Theory of Acting: Cognitive Science and Performance*, (New York: Palgrave, MacMillan, 2011), p. 25.

²⁸ Lutterbie, *ibid.*, p. 9.

²⁹ Lutterbie, *ibid.* p.73.

³⁰ Lutterbie, *ibid.*, p. 27, 13.

³¹ Lutterbie, *ibid.* 209.

as those derived from working on the current production - with data from external perceptions and internal proprioceptions [...] When all works, the result is a thoughtful, precise, intelligent, and effective series of actions that sustains the performer throughout the performance.³²

Rebecca Loukes, in her chapter 'Beyond the Psychophysical? The 'Situated', 'Enactive', Bodymind in Performance'³³, also focuses on what constitutes acting and the work of the 'performer's perspective as a phenomenon and process from inside the performance score'³⁴. Loukes draws insights from the new sciences on the *situated* experience of the actor to frame an account of perspectives on acting within the wider territory of cognitive studies in order to understand the actor's bodymind and the environment as part of the actor's cognitive act. *Situated*, also includes here, both the external environment of the rehearsal / performance, and the actor's score of actions. Through the lens of selected research from contemporary *situated* perspectives, Loukes emphasizes the need to keep thinking carefully what we already know; from which perspectives might be productive to keep questioning our practices and talk about them. She also urges us to consider how new sciences develop a new frame through which we can perceive the actor, the creative process and help us better understand how we train the bodymind of the twenty first century psychophysical actor.

Samuel Grogan in his PhD thesis, 'I'm doing it, but I am so in the moment' ...: an articulation and understanding of 'absorption' for the performer towards an 'optimal' 'mode of being/doing' in dance theatre' (2014), articulates the idea of 'absorption' for the performer in dance theatre. The thesis develops a focused articulation and understanding of the actual nature of 'absorption' as a necessary aspect of an 'optimal' mode of being/doing for the performer in dance theatre. Grogan examines how we understand the work and actions of the performer through the lens of relevant aspects from the fields of cognitive

³² Lutterbie, *Ibid.* 194.

³³ P.Zarrilli, J.Daboo and R.Loukes, *Acting Psychophysical Phenomenon and Process Intercultural and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, New York: Palgrave, MacMillan, 2013), pp.224-255.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p.227.

neuroscience, phenomenology, consciousness studies, play theory, combined with Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi's theory of the notion of flow. The thesis' intention is to provide a lexicon of terminology that is possible to be used by both performer and practitioner. Grogan elaborates a useful vocabulary as a resource that can contribute to the language of discourse in the area of dance theatre.

None of the above research and practical projects have been applied the work to Michael Chekhov.

My research is an inter-cultural and inter-disciplinary analysis. It combines Eastern with Western methodologies and is employed and developed as a version of critical discourse intended to form a basis for conceptualizing the structures that constitute the complex phenomenological experiences of 'optimal' bodily experience in acting processes. This study articulates complex issues of embodiment and consciousness through which we might gain an alternative methodological understanding of the structural processes underpinning and effecting the transformation from an everyday normative mode of consciousness to a non-everyday 'optimal' mode of heightened kinaesthetic awareness.

This study is primarily based on issues of consciousness which are grounded in phenomenology, post-phenomenology, cognitive science, neuroscience, philosophy of mind, linguistics, Eastern theories and practices of the body, and selected aspects of Buddhist philosophy and practice. Apart from Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche, key figures in this theoretical approach include: Yuasa Yuaso, Nagatomo Shegenori, Drew Leder, Shaun Gallagher, Dan Zahavi, among others.

Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche

Although Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche come to my focus of concern from different directions, certain aspects of each philosopher point to a common ground. They all challenge the Cartesian *cogito* and question the propositional and resist binary logic. They all advance a non-dualistic model of self or

consciousness and assert the primacy of lived experience in the constitution of meaning that is through their projects one can realize an organic connection between the body and mind, the self and other, the body and space-world. In their philosophical projects, there is a 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' or 'affecting-affected' bodily structure of oneness between all oppositions.

A *living* bodily structure interacts with its environment and is in a constant present of here and now and operates from the perspective of doing. Shaun Gallagher explains that the living body:

senses the situation more encompassingly than cognition. It senses what is behind your back right now, without seeing, hearing, or, smelling it. You sense not just the things there, but your situation, what would happen if you suddenly turned around, or if you pounded on the wall where your neighbours live.³⁵

On the other hand, the '*lived* body' shapes the way the (actor's) self structures itself in primordial unity, in 'optimal' bodily experience³⁶. The function of the *lived* body is "being-in-the-world"³⁷, i.e. the meeting between the subject (self) and the world (object) in its primordial unity that simultaneously articulates both. In other words, the *lived* body belongs to neither subject nor object category. In terms of structure, the *lived* body is a body/mind unity without the distinction between body and world which means that it can sustain the ambiguity of the act of living perception; 'the classical subject-object dichotomy is loosened up

³⁵ See S. Gallagher, 'A Cognitive Way to the Transcendental Reduction,' in *The View From Within First Person Approaches to the Study of Consciousness* (Thorverton: Imprint Academic, 2000/2002), p. 234.

³⁶ 'A description of the lived body is a description of the body from the phenomenological perspective. On the one hand, it is the way the body appears in existence. On the other hand, it is much more than that – it is the way the body structures our experience. The body is not a screen between me and the world; rather, it shapes our primary way of being-in-the world. This is why we cannot first explore the body by itself and then subsequently examine it in its relation to the world' in S. Gallagher and D. Zahavi, *The Phenomenological Mind An Introduction to Philosophy of Mind and Cognitive Science*, (London: Routledge 2008), p. 137; The term *being-in-the-world* is further analyzed in the chapter on Merleau-Ponty.

³⁷ 'A description of the lived body is a description of the body from the phenomenological perspective. On the one hand, it is the way the body appears in existence. On the other hand, it is much more than that – it is the way the body structures our experience. The body is not a screen between me and the world; rather, it shapes our primary way of being-in-the world. This is why we cannot first explore the body by itself and then subsequently examine it in its relation to the world' in S. Gallagher and D. Zahavi, *The Phenomenological Mind An Introduction to Philosophy of Mind and Cognitive Science*, (London: Routledge 2008), p. 137; The term *being-in-the-world* is further analyzed in the chapter on Merleau-Ponty.

and we find an area “between” subject and object³⁸. Practically, this is an ‘extra-daily’³⁹ experience that is unknown in our everyday ordinary consciousness and needs to be cultivated through particular training.

In this thesis the theories of Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche offer a phenomenological practical strategy as a way to talk about the structural principles of the Psychological Gesture and to access the actor’s complex modes of awareness in experiencing the Psychological Gesture. This analysis as an approach to Michael Chekhov’s work has never be done before.

The reason I examine Michael Chekhov through Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche is because these three philosophical projects, which is a combination of western and eastern thought, translated in acting terms can be seen as an attempt to bring the actor’s body fully into the process of creating the other or the ‘character’ (body-not-me) by defining it as a psycho-physiological *Gestalt*, something that presupposes that the actor becomes skilled through cultivation, physical discipline, and control. The theories of the three philosophers suggest an ‘optimal’ state, beyond the western dualistic separation of the fictive from the real and the visible from the invisible, that seems to create an interconnection which implies a living dynamic that challenges all kinds of unbridgeable dualisms between inner and outer, subject and object, being and becoming, cause and effect, appearance and reality, and experiencer and experienced. What is considered ‘optimal’ mode of being/doing in Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche, becomes the lens to analyze a condition of hyper-awareness of the body in Michael Chekhov’s acting processes. A condition of a total psychophysical engagement of the actor’s body and mind, self and other, in the activity of gesturing (PG) in which the surrounding space becomes one with the actor’s body and creates distance between the actor and what is acted. In Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche ‘optimal’ hyperawareness is an

³⁸ The “lived body” is analyzed in detail in Chapter 3 on Merleau-Ponty. Jennifer Bullington writes about this concept: ‘The world outside ourselves is not imprinted upon us like a photograph, but taken up in an active moment of meaning constitution [...] The classical subject-object dichotomy is loosened up and we find an area “between” subject and object’. Bullington, ‘The Lived Body’, p. 24.

³⁹ Eugenio Barba in *The Paper Canoe: A Guide to Theatre Anthropology*, translated by R. Fowler (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), pp 14-15. Barba uses this term to differentiate daily context from training context experience or ‘daily technique from an extra-daily technique.

enhanced and complex state of sensory sensibility which is examined in this thesis within the context of Michael Chekhov's training of the Psychological Gesture.

Each chapter in this thesis is reflecting upon a major concept and then is analyzed within Michael Chekhov's acting context. The phenomenological theories of Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche offered a way to examine and articulate practicing / experiencing the Psychological Gesture in the following ways:

- a) The nature of the activities (the psychophysical principles) that are involved in practicing Psychological Gesture. That is "action" and "intuition" which equally engage the actor's mind (psycho) and body (physical) in a whole "total" intensive engagement in the moment. This is examined in Chapter 2 through the phenomenology of Nishida's "action-intuition".
- b) The nature of the structure of the Psychological Gesture. The Psychological Gesture is analyzed as a phenomenological structure through the philosophy of the *Chiasmic* body by Merleau-Ponty. Nishida's dialectical principles of action and intuition that are developed in Chapter 2 point in a way to the criss-crossing or *chiasmic* structure of the body offered by Merleau-Ponty in Chapter 3.
- c) The nature of consciousness involved when practicing the Psychological Gesture. Through Nietzsche's sense of transcendentalism, his Apollonian and Dionysian energies or drives, and through Yuasa's analysis of Nishida's *bashos* as *bright* and *dark* consciousness, the complex nature of the actor's different modes of consciousness that are involved when practicing Psychological Gesture is analyzed in Chapter 4 on Nietzsche.

Material on Michael Chekhov

The following section is an indication of the material I consulted on Michael Chekhov's work for this thesis. In Chapter 1 I give a full account of how Michael Chekhov conceived and described the Psychological Gesture.

Primary Sources

Michael Chekhov wrote about his approach to teaching, actor training and theatre making and articles on Stanislavsky's system. However, Andrei Kirillov, in a lecture that he gave in 2005 at the University of Exeter, said that during the time Michael Chekhov was still in his home country Russia, his work was not able to be published. However, in the twentieth century an extensive field of literature that addresses the theory and practice of Michael Chekhov started to emerge that in the twenty first century is increasingly growing.

Michael Chekhov's attempts to write a book about his acting techniques were supported by three significant women who were life time collaborators and assistants: Georgette Boner, Deirdre Hurst du Prey and Beatrice Straight. By 1928 Michael Chekhov left Russia for safety reasons and the next ten years he was wandering through Europe with sojourns in Germany, France, Latvia, Lithuania, and England. In England with the support of Beatrice Straight and the Elmihirsts family, Michael Chekhov established his first acting school in English. At the beginning of WWII, the school was moved to Ridgefield / Connecticut in 1938. In 1942, Michael Chekhov moved to Los Angeles.

Deirdre Hurst du Prey studied with Michael Chekhov and transcribed all most all of his classes and lectures from 1935-1942. Du Prey was Michael Chekhov's assistant both when the Chekhov Theatre Studio was based at Dartington / England and when it moved to U.S.A. She studied with Martha Graham and Mary Wigman. The significance of du Prey's notes is that the material, which comprises an archive that consists of approximately 500 lessons is an invaluable source of Michael Chekhov's teaching. Copies of the archive can be found in three locations: a) the Devon Records office in Exeter, Devon, England (Dartington Hall held the archive until 2010); b) New York Public Library's Library of the Performing Arts and the University of Windsor, Canada; and c) the archive in the United States / New York also houses some of Michael Chekhov's original scripts.

Georgette Boner and Beatrice Straight also helped and supported Michael Chekhov to write a book about his acting technique. Georgette Boner was

Michael Chekhov's assistant during the time he was in Europe. Boner was an anthroposophist and a doctor of philosophy, and had written on the work of the playwright Arthur Schnitzler. When Michael Chekhov was in Latvia/Riga, during a period of recovery after an illness, Boner started to note down his ideas about acting and tried to articulate them in writing. Boner's collection of documents and records is primarily in German (some material is in French and English), and this archive can be found at Zurich University. During this period Boner supported and assisted Michael Chekhov to complete his writing about his technique. With Boner as editor, the material was meant to be published in German, but finally Michael Chekhov decided not to publish the material at this stage. Michael Chekhov continued to write in order to complete a practical guide for actors; that was his desire, to publish a material for actors and for practical use. This publication process, the history of different stages and several attempts, which Franc Chamberlain⁴⁰ explains was complex, finally led to the English publication of Michael Chekhov's seminal book, *To the Actor*. *To the Actor* was an edited version of Michael Chekhov's original manuscript. It was a reduced version, edited by Charles Leonard, published in 1953. In 1991 the book was re-edited and expanded with additional exercises by Mel Gordon under the title *On the Technique of Acting*. The 1991 edition includes an "Introduction" by Mala Powers who was Michael Chekhov's former student and executrix of his estate. In 2002, a revised and expanded edition of *To the Actor* came out in English. This edition included the 1953 text material. The material is presented differently than in the previous editions and other material that had not been available before in English is included. There is a completely new section an appendix on "Psychological Gesture" translated and with a commentary by Andrei Malaev-Babel. It contains an "Introduction" by Mala Powers and a "Foreword" by Simon Callow. All editions are useful depending on the needs of the research and were used in this study.

Lessons for the Professional Actor (1985) is a collection of texts from lectures that were given by Michael Chekhov to a group of actors in the New York Studio

⁴⁰ F. Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 34.

between November and December in 1941. Du Prey took short hand notes of fourteen classes and she later edited and published this collection.

Michael Chekhov: Lessons for Teachers of His Acting Technique (2000), which was edited by du Prey, is also available in the Dartington/the Devon Records Office in Exeter, Devon, England and American archives. It consists of eighteen classes given by Michael Chekhov in the 1930's at his first teaching studio at Dartington Hall in England, to two of his most important followers, assistants, and practitioners of his work, Deirdre Hurst du Prey and Beatrice Straight. It discloses Michael Chekhov's theory of teaching and how his pedagogical approach and actor training were developed and modified alongside each other.

Michael Chekhov also wrote two autobiographies. The first *The Path of the Actor* was published in Russia in 1928 the same year he left for exile and was published in English in 2005. This autobiography documents Michael Chekhov's early years, from his childhood in St. Petersburg through to his years as actor and director at the Moscow Arts Theatre and his friendship with Vakhtangov. This edition also brings excerpts from a second autobiographical work which is titled *Life and Encounters*. It was published in North America in the 1940s and refers to the period after Michael Chekhov left Russia. It covers the discovery and subsequent influence of anthroposophy on his life and work, a subject which Michael Chekhov was not allowed to discuss or write about, because of the political circumstances in Russia at the time in the 1920s.

Mala Powers (his later student) produced a written publication that accompanied a series of recorded lectures given by Michael Chekhov in 1955. This was available on cassette in 1992 under the title *Michael Chekhov: On Theatre and the Art of Acting: The Six Hour Masterclass*. The recording is a series of lectures given by Michael Chekhov to a group of professional actors the period he was in Hollywood.

The Actor is the Theatre is an extensive collection of Michael Chekhov's unpublished notes and manuscripts on the art of acting and the theatre written by Michael Chekhov and du Prey who transcribed notes and made a valuable

record of a selection of classes given at Dartington and Ridgefield between 1936 and 1942. There are three existing copies: one at the Devon Records Office in England, one at the University of Windsor/Canada, and one in New York. The full archive comprises of three boxes divided into numerous folders.

The Training Sessions of Michael Chekhov contains an interview given by du Prey at Dartington Hall in July 1978 to Peter Hulton and 'Verbatim Transcripts' - transcriptions du Prey made of several classes which Michael Chekhov gave in 1939. Dartington Theatre Papers Third Series, 9. (Exeter Documentation Unit Exeter University 1980).

Secondary Sources

The following are secondary sources consulted during this research:

Master Classes in the Michael Chekhov Technique DVD (2007) MICHA (The Michael Chekhov Association) is a series of classes given by MICHA faculty/teachers: Joanna Merlin, Fern Sloan, Ted Pugh, Ragnar Freidank, and Lenard Petit and is an excellent source. It includes a training session on Psychological Gesture with Joanna Merlin.

Movement for Actors edited by Nicole Potter (2002) is a compilation of articles about a variety of topics, activities, and techniques that are related to the actor's movement. The volume contains the article "Michael Chekhov, Psychological Gesture, and the Thinking Heart" written by Floyd Rumohr.

Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture (DVD) is a workshop with Joanna Merlin, President of MICHA and former pupil of Michael Chekhov, which was given at the Birmingham School of Music in England in 2001. (Arts Documentation Unit, Exeter University).

The Training Sessions of Michael Chekhov (1993) is a workshop/film DVD class with Felicity Mason and one actor. Mason is an actor who studied with Michael Chekhov at Dartington Hall during the 1930's. This is by Arts Archives, Arts

Documentation Unit, Exeter (2004). This workshop also includes a section on Psychological Gesture.

Actor Training (DVD) is a workshop with David Zinder (a MICHA faculty member) which was given at the Changing Body Symposium in January 2006, at Exeter University. (Arts Documentation Unit, Exeter University). *Workshop showings of monologues based in part on Chekhov's psychological gesture* is a DVD recording that includes the participants' presentations of an intensive workshop that David Zinder gave in May 2008 at Exeter University.

In 1983, a special issue of *The Drama Review* (Vol. 27 Nr. 3) was published three years after the foundation of the Michael Studio in New York and was devoted to Michael Chekhov. Previously unpublished articles by Mel Gordon and Deirdre Hurst du Prey, among others, as well as by Michael Chekhov himself were published for the first time. The article 'Chekhov on acting: Unpublished Material' has a part on Psychological Gesture.

Michael Chekhov's to the Director and Playwright (1984) was compiled and edited by Charles Leonard. Before his death Michael Chekhov started working together with Leonard on this book mainly aimed at directors and actors. Although Michael Chekhov never finished the work, the book was 'compiled and written' by Leonard who published it posthumously in 1963. Some chapters are written versions of Michael Chekhov's lectures recorded in the 1950's (Chekhov 1992) and other are recorded conversations.

Liisa Byckling's work is based on extensive archival research, although a few of her publications are available in English mostly her work is in Russian. Her articles "Michael Chekhov as Actor, Teacher and Director in the West" in *Toronto Slavic Quarterly* (2002), in *Slavic and East European Performance* (1995), and in *Special Topics* "Michael Chekhov Teaching (Acting) in a Foreign Land" (2011), offer a historical analysis of Michael Chekhov's life and work, his career as a teacher, actor, and director. Byckling's analysis does not focus on Michael Chekhov's practice and actor training, but on his work within the perspective of broader Russian cultural studies.

In 2004, Charles Marowitz published *The Other Chekhov* which is a biography of the life of Michael Chekhov, an account of Michael Chekhov's life in Russia, Europe, U.S.A, and of his art and schools. Marowitz (had been taught by Blair Cutting who had been taught by Michael Chekhov at Dartington and Ridgefield) presents here Michael Chekhov's legacy within the theatre world since the second half of the twentieth century.

The Stanislavsky Technique: Russia – a Workbook for Actors (1987), written by Mel Gordon, is a compilation of exercises that is the result of important discoveries over decades that provide an analysis of distinctly different acting practices; not only of Stanislavsky's as the title indicates, but also of his assistant Sulerzhitsky, Vahtangov and Michael Chekhov's practice.

Michael Chekhov as Actor, Director and Teacher (1987), written by Lendley Black, explores Michael Chekhov's biography and his acting method. Black based his material on researched text, and used Michael Chekhov's books, material and interviews by du Prey, Straight and Mala Powers, among others.

Franc Chamberlain's *Michael Chekhov* (2004) provides an insightful and thorough overview of Michael Chekhov's life, his work as a director and his writings about his technique. It provides a useful section with practical exercises. Chamberlain has also written a chapter on Michael Chekhov, in *Actor Training* edited by Alison Hodge (2000/2004); in "Michael Chekhov on the Technique of Acting 'Was Don Quixote True to Life?'" Chamberlain gives a general introduction to Chekhov's life and artistic vision and includes reference to Psychological Gesture and some exercises. He also published, "Michael Chekhov: Pedagogy, Spirituality and the Occult", an article in *Toronto Slavic Quarterly* (2003) about Chekhov's pedagogy and the influence of spirituality on his work.

Rose Whyman in her *The Stanislavsky System of Acting: Legacy and Influence in Modern Performance* (2008) examines the influence of Stanislavsky system over the past century and compares it with Michael Chekhov's approaches (Vahtangov and Meyerholdare included as well). Whyman explains some of

the theories Stanislavsky's methods were based, illuminates the influences that underscored his ideas and methods and compares his work to the methods of his three principal students: Michael Chekhov, Vahtangov and Meyerhold.

The Rhythm of Space and the Sound of Time: Michael Chekhov's Acting Techniques in the Twenty-First Century (2008) by Cynthia Ashperger is a comprehensive reflection of Michael Chekhov's technique as a holistic acting approach. The book offers clear philosophical underpinnings of Michael Chekhov's technique, places the technique within a wider frame of reference and in the larger field of twenty first century acting training practice and gives an account of how the technique has developed since Michael Chekhov Association (MICHA) was established.

The Michael Chekhov Handbook For the Actor (2010) written by Lenard Petit, the Vice President of MICHA, and the director of Michael Chekhov Studio in New York, draws on the author's twenty years of teaching experience. The handbook is mainly for practitioners. It is a useful practical manual that provides explanations and exercises that cover the fundamental characteristics of Michael Chekhov's technique. In a concise manner it tries to clarify the aims, the principles, the tools, the application, and the complexities of the technique.

Bella Merlin's *Beyond Stanislavsky* approaches Michael Chekhov through his Russian lineage. In 1993, Merlin went to Russia where undertook a training on Stanislavsky's Method of Physical Actions and Active Analysis. Merlin addresses Michael Chekhov's acting technique in relation to this training. Liisa Byckling also places Michael Chekhov's technique within the Stanislavsky lineage.

Jonathan Pitches has extensively published on Michael Chekhov. His *Science and the Stanislavsky Tradition* (2006) also considers that Michael Chekhov's work is part of Stanislavsky's tradition. He also gives an in-depth account of the philosophical and practical differences between Stanislavsky's and Chekhov's work (his book contains a section on Psychological Gesture).

In 2013 a Special Issue of *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training* with Franc Chamberlain and Andrei Kirillov was dedicated to the work of Michael Chekhov. Interviews, essays, reviews, interdisciplinary perspectives, systematic descriptions in the studio, Chekhov's fascination with Steiner, anthroposophy and eurhythmy, historical investigations, offer, as Pitches writes in his editorial, 'the most important journal based-examination of Chekhov's practice, since the *TDR* special edition on Chekhov exactly 30 years ago (1983)'⁴¹. International known scholars and practitioners are among the contributors of this volume; Sarah Kane, Graham Dixon, Phelim McDermott, Sinead Rushe, Hugh O'Gorman, David Zinder, Joanna Merlin, Jonathan Pitches, Amanda Brennan, Tom Cornford, among others.

Jerri Daboo's PhD Thesis 'The Mind of a Flower: the Psychophysical Experience of Performance' (2004), "The Altering I/Eye Consciousness. 'Self' and the New Paradigm in Acting"⁴² and her article "Michael Chekhov and the Embodied Imagination: Higher Self and Non-Self" (2007), draw comparisons between Michael Chekhov's work and Buddhist thought and practice. Daboo provides an analysis of the use of non-self or the transpersonal in Chekhov's work. In her 'Michael Chekhov and the Studio in Dartington: the re-membering of a tradition'⁴³ (2012) Daboo focuses on Chekhov's time at Dartington as a historical account of Chekhov's contribution to British actor training.

David Zinder's *Body, Voice, Imagination: Image Work Training and the Chekhov Technique* (2002/2009) is a detailed actor training manual. It follows a step by step a series of exercises through the development of actor's creative expressivity, the "trajectories" of training that are the backbone of pre-Chekhov *ImageWork* training as well as seminal exercises of Michael Chekhov technique. The 2009 edition contains an entirely new chapter which is Zinder's detailed account on the seamless connections between Zinder's *ImageWork* Training and the Chekhov Technique.

⁴¹ J. Pitches, 'Editorial', *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training*, (Special Issue Michael Chekhov), vol. 4, no. 2, (2013), p. 145.

⁴² In *Consciousness, Literature and the Arts*, vol. 8, num. 3.

⁴³ In P.J. Pitches (eds) *The Russians in Britain: British Theatre and the Russian Tradition of Acting*, (London: Routledge, 2011), pp. 62-85.

Yana Meerzon's *A Path of the Character: Michael Chekhov's Inspired Acting and Theatre Semiotics* (2005) presents Michael Chekhov's understanding of the actor's stage product/mask as a psychophysical/psychological and cultural construct of the actor/character dialectical relationship. In 'Body and Space: Michael Chekhov's Notion of Atmosphere as the Means of Creating Space in Theatre' (2005) by using the example of Michael Chekhov's notion of atmosphere Meerzon examines body in space, the theatrical space that is constructed in relation to the actor.

Marie-Christine Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon have edited *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov* (2015) which presents Michael Chekhov's work in the framework of interdisciplinary and intercultural theatre practical theories. The book brings together Michael Chekhov's theatre practitioners, historians, theorists, specialists from around the world that provide a comprehensive evaluation of his life work and legacy. It reconsiders Michael Chekhov as an actor, theatre practitioner, teacher, director, pedagogue using also archival documents from U.K., Russia, Germany, U.S.A, Lithuania, Switzerland. The book contains an excellent collection of essays by Liisa Byckliin, Joanna Merlin, John Lutterbie, Andrei Kirillov, Cynthia Ashberger, Yanna Meerzon, Monica Cristini, Franc Chamberlain, Jonathan Pitches, Ian Watson, Jerri Badoo, Pose Whyman, Daniel Mroz, Lionel Walsh, Gytis Padegimas, among others.

This thesis is the first in-depth project using phenomenology to explore the Psychological Gesture.

Research Methodology

This study has drawn from both the notion of hermeneutics and practice as research as its modes of inquiry. Hermeneutics is a term derived from the Greek 'hermeneutikos' meaning to interpret, to translate, to explain (an author's language literal and figurative and of finding meanings in order to expand the possibilities of thought). In the context of this work most relevant is the

hermeneutics of Hans Goerg Gadamer outlined in his *Truth and Method* (1975/2004) and his *Philosophical Hermeneutics* (1977)⁴⁴. Gadamer's hermeneutics is not a method for understanding, but an attempt 'to clarify the conditions in which understanding takes place'⁴⁵, the nature of which, he argues, advances reflective engagement. In that sense the author and the reader do not share and/or do not search for a 'hidden' meaning of a written word to be reproduced. Understanding is always interpretation and vice versa meaning is always a creative process. The reader-interpreter needs to be aware that is a participant in a reproductive process in which everything becomes alive and meaningful.

According to Gadamer, the central problem of hermeneutic philosophy is the problem of application which is central in all understanding⁴⁶. *Understanding is to be thought less as a subjective act than as participating in an event of tradition*, a process of transmission in which past and present are constantly mediated. This is what must be validated by hermeneutic theory, which is far too dominated by the idea of a procedure, a method⁴⁷.

Gadamer argues that, understanding is possible when it involves applying the word/text to be understood to the interpreter's present situation. In other words, 'understanding proves to be an event'⁴⁸. Understanding occurs in the practice of interpreting itself, e.g., it is temporal and therefore belongs to the interpreter's situated horizon/field of praxis⁴⁹. For Gadamer, the character of every understanding is a principle of hermeneutics, a knowledge that must be applied. The meaning of exegesis is set forth as explanation. Exegesis is the actual application of hermeneutical rules. Hermeneutics is rule and exegesis application. Gadamer's dialogical approach suggests that the interpreter needs to be aware of the 'hermeneutical rule' or 'circle'; that the interpreter 'must understand the whole in terms of the detail and the detail in terms of the

⁴⁴ See also Paul Regan's article (2012) on Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics.

⁴⁵ Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, (U.S.A: Continuum I.P.G, 2004), p.295.

⁴⁶ Gadamer, *ibid.*, p. 306.

⁴⁷ Gadamer, *ibid.*, p. 296.

⁴⁸ Gadamer, *ibid.*, p. 308.

⁴⁹ Gadamer, *ibid.*, p. 308.

whole'⁵⁰. Gadamer mentions that the true locus of the dialogical relationship of 'hermeneutic circle' of part and whole is both the subjective and the objective aspects, the in-between, of a circular movement of understanding which is constantly from the part to the whole and back forth⁵¹.

Gadamer's work initiates a phenomenological description that utilizes exegesis. In this study a very close reading (exegesis) of selected key concepts within the body of work by the three philosophers Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche contributes as a framework to an in-depth discussion and analysis and further development of a model/theory for understanding the embodied work of the actor/performer. This study questions and analyzes selected aspects of three philosophical theories as to their mode of existence as practical acting tools and aesthetic principles. What they mean when they are situated and come into existence within a specific actor training practice and within the social, cultural and historical perspectives of the actor. At the same time what it means to a particular actor training practice to be situated within specific philosophical phenomenological framework.

Research Through Practice

In combination with the hermeneutic exegesis, I also drew on my own research through practice. The studio exploration consisted of three practical projects which were designed, planned and delivered in order to address specific questions related to an 'optimal' state of being and doing. All three projects followed a similar process where each day focused on specific principles and similar structures which were related to the training of Psychological Gesture in the rehearsals and performance. This process aimed to structure the actor's performance score. The application of the training mainly consisted of the following: throwing balls; breathing exercises; staccato-legato; the four qualities of movement - molding, floating, flying, radiating; Imaginary Centres; Imaginary Body; exercises and practice of the family of the Psychological Gestures.

⁵⁰ Gadamer, *ibid.*, p. 291.

⁵¹ Gadamer, *ibid.*, p. 291.

The first project was *Obituary*, a prose text by Heiner Muller. Periods of training and rehearsals were three months (February, March, April 2012) three times a week for three hours. The actor was English, an ex-student of mine from a Research and Performance module I taught on in 2010 and who as a result was familiar with Michael Chekhov's work and psychophysical practice. (Performance April 2012). The second project was *Medea Material* by Heiner Muller and extracts from *Manhattan Medea* by Dea Loher (translated from the German by Jens Peters). The participants were four English actors, three of them ex-students of mine in Exeter Drama Department also drawn from the Research and Performance module and were relatively familiar with Michael Chekhov's work. Period of training and rehearsals was during an intensive three month period (April, May, June 2013). We rehearsed four to five times each week (Performance June 2013). The third project was a second performance of *Obituary* by Heiner Muller in order to explore sameness (identity) and alterity as a monologue with two professional actors who were either in parallel action or sharing a common space or transgressing each other's space. In this project we worked on the English and Greek version of the text. Periods of training and rehearsals were three months (February, March, April 2016). The participants were a professional English actor and a professional Greek actor. The performance of this project has been scheduled to be presented in 2017-2018 in Athens.

All the participants were very committed, had a movement awareness ability and an interest and appreciation of psychophysical actor training methods. All three projects culminated in performances. In all three projects the process was documented by log books/journals, notes and video recordings. In all three projects I was a trainer and a project leader facilitator/director.

In this thesis I used the theories of the three philosophers, Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche, to provide the theoretical philosophical foundation to explore Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture as a practical form of phenomenology; "a way of seeing" as a *Gestalt* where the inner and outer dimensions of the actor's experience in practicing the Psychological Gesture are equally considered. Reflecting on the Psychological Gesture as a

phenomenological phenomenon and process helped me elaborate the creation of cognition and understanding in acting processes. The methodological aim was: How phenomenology can illuminate the practice and experience of the Psychological Gesture. Each practical project investigated how Psychological Gesture (acting) as a process of perceiving, feeling, reflecting, sensing, imagining highlighted the importance of the *situated*-ness of the actor in his/her engagement with the environment or in phenomenological terms with “being-in-the-world”. The outcomes of this process is a phenomenological study that consists of a structural description of the Psychological Gesture as a phenomenon in acting which basically describes the *how* and the *what* rather than the explanatory *why* of the actor’s experience.

The way the practical projects informed the final thesis and how I used the material of these projects is also hermeneutical. Dan Zahavi explains that ‘phenomenology has been a decisive precondition and persisting interlocutor for hermeneutics’⁵². In other words, in the practical projects the emphasis was on the central role of the actor’s experience in any attempt to reflect in the *how* of attending to *how* the actor makes sense of what happens in practicing the Psychological Gesture. The methodological tools provided by the three philosophers were examined in comparison between practical inquiry (the actors’ lived experience) and (my own) theoretical inquiry. My motivation was to bring together/reconcile through observation, interpretation, application (actors and myself included) what the actor’s experienced within the research process. This took the form of a dialogue between practical research undertaken in the form of training, rehearsals, performance production and developed gradually in the writing of this thesis. So doing phenomenology through the projects was used to ‘secure’ in a way practice within research and overcome the oppositional contrast between theory and practice; it restored/integrated the theoretical knowledge drawn from Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche to the practical knowledge gained through Michael Chekhov’s Psychological Gesture

⁵² D. Zahavi, (2008) “Phenomenology”, in *The Routledge Companion to Twentieth Century Philosophy*, Dermot Moran (ed.), London and New York, pp. 661-693.

thus revealing a deep entanglement between the two. As Gadamer explains 'in the end all practice suggests what points beyond it'⁵³.

The methodology of research through practice was to process the Psychological Gesture as stages of phenomenological development and change that is to say to move the actor's experience of the Psychological Gesture (acting) from a phenomenology of the senses to phenomenology of affect. The Psychological Gesture as a phenomenological process grew with the training and rehearsal process and developed for both actors and myself reflective practices that offered different material that questioned, enhanced and illuminated our experience and knowledge.

During the rehearsal period the actors and myself took notes, wrote journals, answered written questions (without worrying about grammar, style etc.). The documentation sometimes happened during the rehearsals, the students had always a notebook with them, or immediately after or at home as a homework. In the documentation process where memory and recollection were involved the aim was to describe what the actors experienced within a specific phenomenological context which was relative to a specific stage of my research. Phenomenology is a method based on description. At the first stages the material was relatively limited in terms of writing and articulating the complex mechanism of the Psychological Gesture. On the other hand, the actors' referred to impressions, feelings, memories, imagination, intuition, although did not easily share details of the content. The actors experienced something that conveyed a sense of absence or a sense of an invisible presence, 'something that falls between the senses and goes beyond', and reflects their experiencing the Psychological Gesture as the phenomenology of affect. All this material supported the research and extracts of this process became part of this thesis. I also filmed the training and rehearsals and conducted interviews with the actors after the performances, when the creative process was completed.

⁵³ Gadamer, *Praise of Theory*, (New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1998), pp. 35-36.

This is the first study of the Psychological Gesture that has been examined with the aim of developing an understanding of an 'optimal' mode of consciousness (being/doing) and has been analyzed with the framework of interdisciplinary lenses. It is the first study to bring together an analysis of the philosophical paradigms of Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche in relation to acting processes. It is also the first in-depth theorization of Michael Chekhov's work on Psychological Gesture using these three theoretical phenomenological lenses and provides new perspectives for a greater clarity and understanding of the language with which to encompass the interdisciplinary phenomenon of an 'optimal' mode of consciousness in performance and practice.

Chapter 1: Michael Chekhov and the Psychological Gesture

Introduction

This chapter introduces key principles in Michael Chekhov's practice including concentration, attention, imagination, objectivity, consciousness-divided, Higher Ego-Self, and Psychological Gesture. I argue that these principles are inherently phenomenological and so the aim of this chapter is to both introduce these principles themselves and identify their phenomenological nature. The chapter also points out the limitations in the way that Michael Chekhov was able to articulate his ideas, which I address through the theoretical framework of Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche in Chapters 2, 3 and 4. In other words, what seems to be *implicit* within Michael Chekhov's practice itself (and theory) will be made *explicit* through the phenomenological analysis in the following three chapters.

Michael Chekhov (Mikhail Alexandrovich formal Russian name), nicknamed Misha, was born in 1891 in St.Petersberg and died in 1955 in Los Angeles. Michael Chekhov's artistic practice went through many transformations. His personal life journey is a series of accomplishments, unhappiness, financial difficulties, psychological breakdowns, wanderings and exile (see Appendix 2 for Michael Chekhov's biography). His philosophy on the techniques for theatre acting cannot be seen separate from a life that is contextualized within the social, aesthetic, and political history of his time. His acting practices can be seen as a reaction to a mid-nineteenth century materialistic and analytical discourse of the time, which viewed the human body and human existence within the structures of scientific discoveries.

A conceptual separation of body and mind has dominated actor training in the West since Denis Diderot's *The Paradox of Acting* (1830) and his materialist analysis of acting of his time. Michael Chekhov wanted to move away from this model of acting and shatter the traditional boundaries between reason and emotion, and body and mind. His intention as a theatre practitioner was to explore and develop a more holistic approach to the body/mind for the actor. To

do this he interrogated concentration, attention, imagination, objectivity, consciousness-divided, Higher Ego, and Psychological Gesture in order to reconsider the activities engaged in the actor's creativity to approach a role or a 'character'. Although Michael Chekhov was aware of the complex processes that were at play during an actor's performance, he was also deeply concerned with the actor's body/mind dynamic, an issue that remained, throughout all his life, a source of systematic inquiry.

Sometimes his ideas seem to share the conceptual binaries or dualisms of his times. For example, in *The Path of the Actor* he writes as the actor playing Hamlet,

If an actor prepares his role correctly, the whole process of preparation can be characterized as his gradual approach to the picture of his character as he sees it in his imagination, in his fantasy. The actor first builds up his character exclusively in his fantasy life, and then tries to imitate the character's inner and outer qualities.¹

Chekhov's statement above seems to indicate a separation between an inner mental space (what the actor 'first builds up' in his mind) and an outer physical space (what the actor physically 'tries to imitate'). Chekhov here unavoidably encourages the actor to trust *first* his mind and *then* his body. The way Chekhov describes the connection between imitation (physical activity) and fantasy (thought) appears to set up a dualistic concept. His account is a separation, which reflects the split between the physical body and mind or imagination, a split, which is still part of an acting vocabulary that seems to persist in acting discourse even today. The limitations of the paradigms of his times and the lack of the right methodology and knowledge did not allow Michael Chekhov to talk about conscious and unconscious processes and demonstrate how the actor experiences multiple bodies and consciousness.

How Michael Chekhov's practices are aligned with a theory of consciousness that depends on phenomenological and unconscious cognitive processes such

¹M. Chekhov in *The Path to the Actor*, by A. Kirrilov and B. Merlin (eds.), (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), p. 108.

as proprioception, intercorporeality, body schema, *Gestalt* structure, postural states that alter the actor's sense of self, is what this thesis attempts to analyze. The argument of this thesis is that inherent in Michael Chekhov's techniques are phenomenological qualities or characteristics concerning the nature of the body and mind relationship which Michael Chekhov did not have the right language to analyze.

Michael Chekhov went through four phases that depict a constant movement, a 'geographical fluctuation', between different countries and different traditions that contributed to his contact with various different cultures and ideas about life acting methodologies and rehearsal techniques and also about understanding the way in which the body and mind and the body and imagination interrelate. This journey marked both his personal and professional work to a point that can be assumed that his acting theory is an intercultural and interdisciplinary practice.

The following description sums up the four distinct periods of development in his lifetime that indicate his intercultural journey:

- a) a celebrated acting career in Moscow (1913-1928);
 - b) a "wandering" period in Europe in Vienna, Berlin, Paris, Riga and Kaunas (1928-1934). A period during which regardless of all his personal difficulties and artistic obstacles he faced established new techniques in both acting and directing;
 - c) a period of teaching and directing at Dartington in England (1935-1942);
- and
- d) a career in Hollywood (1943-1955) where apart from film acting he was also teaching and writing².

²See M.Gordon, 'Michael Chekhov's Life and Work: A Descriptive Chronology', *The Drama Review*, 27.3 (1983), p.3; and L. Byckling, 'Michael Chekhov as Actor, Teacher and Director in the West', *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, 4 (2002).

The acting techniques of Michael Chekhov seem to be the merging together the influences of more than two cultures and philosophies that consists mainly of:

a) elements of Stanislavsky's theatrical practices;

2) Yoga training, a Hindu discipline that was introduced by Sulerzhitsky at the First Studio of the MAT;

and

3) Rudolf Steiner's Anthroposophy which came from Hinduism, Buddhism and theosophy and had a profound influence on Michael Chekhov.

Michael Chekhov was a man of vision and a practical theorist. Throughout his life he envisioned a "theatre of the future"³ and he strived to create a method of acting that would cultivate a "new" theatre that would change things and save the younger generations from the threatening and imminent spiritual poverty after the war: a theatre that would not be simply entertainment or business but a theatre that would be able to expand mentally, emotionally and spiritually human existence⁴. The priorities of this "theatre of the future", which as Jonathan Pitches notes 'was aligned with several parallel and pivotal movements in training and education philosophy, both in Europe and in the United States'⁵, were the quest for an ideal actor and the search to set up the aesthetic principles of an ideal theatre and a "new technique of acting"⁶.

³M. Chekhov writes that he wanted to 'to work upon the method in order to get the technique, so we can save ourselves and our children. Then we will leave something to them- the method which we have gone through with all the difficulties, agreements and disagreements. We have to do this work, because without it, our children will not be able to create the method, they will be so overwhelmed by things which are going on around them [...] All these difficulties, Churchill and Roosevelt know, but they hide them from us [...] Our children will meet all these phantoms, and they will not be able to create anything. This is the right moment for us, and if we do not do it, then the theatre will go down. Therefore, the method is needed for the cultivation of the theatre, not only for us, but for our children. And this is my real impulse for insisting upon the method wherever I am because I am so afraid of the vision of what the theatre will become, knowing how beautiful it can be' in M. Chekhov, *Lesson for the Professional Actor*, du Prey, D.H. (ed.) (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications 1985) pp. 115-116.

⁴ He writes: 'The theatre now is not solving any problems. It does not consider what the ethical, religious, or human problems are, or whether actors have any foresight. We are not interested in what shall happen. Everything is condensed to the present moment, and even more to certain events. It could not be more condensed, more stony that is now' in *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, du Prey, D.H. (ed.) (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1985), p. 139.

⁵J. Pitches, 'The Technique in microcosm: Michael Chekhov's work on the Fisher' scene,' *Theater Dance and Performance Training*. (Special Issue Michael Chekhov), 4.2 (2013), p. 235; Eugenio Barba also mentions that both Western and Eastern ideas and traditions have been incorporated into Chekhov's technique, into an organized system or code, although these 'traditions of codified theater, whether Asian or Euro-American, are not mentioned in his books', in *The Paper Canoe*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), p. 1.

⁶ M. Chekhov in Andrei Kirillov and Bella Merlin (eds), *The Path of the Actor* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 129.

Michael Chekhov envisioned a theatre of forms that would be based on rhythm, sound and gesture. Instead of the theatre of verbal communication, the language of the body of the actor and its expressiveness would be foundational in this 'new' theatre. Yana Meerzon mentions that the aesthetics of this ideal and international (because of its nature) theatre was a 'form of utopia'⁷ based on three fundamental principles: 'to employ a sound narrative instead of a traditional verbal text; to use the archetypal structures of the folktale; and to rely on movement and body language as the primary tools of communication in theatre'⁸.

I argue that the theory and practice of Michael Chekhov's "Theatre of the Future" is a phenomenological way of seeing, experiencing and being in the world that enables the actor to take the method with the "whole being" and to experience a "new body"⁹. The aim of Michael Chekhov's 'new theatre' and 'new techniques of acting' is for the actor to be able to move and be moved to the fullest capacity while maintaining a heightened awareness and knowledge of one's own physical body and non-physical body: to maintain a heightened awareness of the connection between inner intentions and physical gestures and actions that affect the body and mind of the actor creatively. In other words, for Michael Chekhov the actor needs to be able to recognize what is going on inside and outside the body at the same time. In order for the actor to be able to do this the actor needs to sharpen the capacity to become aware of its 'body' and 'non-body', to psychophysically know how the actor channels, controls and experiences the energetic body.

All the principles and techniques of Michael Chekhov's training need to be understood from the point of view of 'transforming the outer thing into the inner life, and changing the inner life into the outer event. To know this means to be able, to a great extent, to manage it and to do it'¹⁰. In practical terms, ideally,

⁷ It is a form utopia "which does not refer to something beyond man's reach, nor to something within his reach, but indicates the reach itself". Plattel in Yana Meerzon, 'Michael Chekhov's Theatre of the Future Pros and Cons of the Failed Experiment', *Stanislavsky Studies*, 3.1 (2015), p. 36

⁸ Y. Meerzon, 'Michael Chekhov's Theatre of the Future Pros and Cons of the Failed Experiment', *Stanislavsky Studies*, 3.1 (2015), p. 36.

⁹ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 80.

¹⁰ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, du Prey, D.H. (ed.) (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1985), p. 81.

the actor experiences a constant internal-external sequence of events, which Michael Chekhov describes as a flow of ‘visible and invisible movements’¹¹.

Michael Chekhov did not want the actor to duplicate the everyday self or the everyday personal body in the rehearsal process and on stage. For him the actor’s *techne* (τέχνη)¹² is a cultivated skill that empowers creative impulses and raises the imagination to such a level that it can balance the co-existence of two different and contradictory realities: the tangible world of the physical body, the physical self of the actor with the intangible world of the non-physical self, and the ‘invisible body’ of the actor. For Michael Chekhov ‘the invisible body must lead, entice and coax the visible body’¹³ of the actor and on the other hand the visible ‘physical body needs time to adjust to the invisible one’¹⁴.

Michael Chekhov’s theory and practice appeal to the invisible part of the body of the actor, which seems to be of a central importance in what he considers the actor’s ‘ability to transform totally’¹⁵. This is clear when he explains the important role of the ‘unseen’ in the actor’s work, that the actor ‘must always find something *under* the material in order to find the right way and be able to move the material’¹⁶. All the techniques of Michael Chekhov appeal to the ‘unseen’, to the activities of the ‘invisible body’ and the affects it has on the visible physical self.

As I have noted, it is one of the aims of my thesis to use philosophical paradigms in order to find languages and structures to unpick and perhaps further clarify what Michael Chekhov meant by the ‘unseen’, which the following three chapters will make clear.

In this study the ‘invisible body’ or the ‘unseen’ has been taken that describes the phenomenological pattern of an archetypal structure of the body of the actor that is closely related to the demanding requirements of the primordial psycho-

¹¹ M. Chekhov. M and du Prey. H, *The Actor is the Theatre*, vol. 3, MC/S1/7/C, 910.

¹² It comes from Greek and means acquired skill, mastery or knack at performing a task.

¹³ M. Chekhov. M and du Prey. H, *The Actor is the Theatre*, vol. 3, MC/S1/7/C, 1049.

¹⁴ M. Chekhov. M and du Prey. H, *The Actor is the Theatre*, vol. 3, MC/S1/7/C, 1049.

¹⁵ M. Chekhov in Andrei Kirillov and Bella Merlin (eds), *The Path of the Actor* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 183.

¹⁶ M. Chekhov a du Prey. H, *The Actor is the Theatre*, vol. 1, MC/S1/7/A, 107, pp. 174-175.

physical pattern of the 'living-lived', feeling-felt' or 'affecting-affected' body. This phenomenological approach of the actor's experience in Michael Chekhov's work will be further analyzed through the body of work of Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche in the next chapters.

1.1 Concentration and Attention

A principle idea in Michael Chekhov's training is that the conscious awareness of the actor, which eventually leads to creative imagination, is related to the powers of concentration. Concentration is one of the most vital and important qualities an actor can develop and is related to the actor's focus and attention. The more the actor is able to accomplish the 'optimal' state to physically, mentally, psychologically, and emotionally sustain a connection to the object of attention and balance the bond between the outer (visible) and the inner (invisible) movement or action, the more the actor will be able to understand the creative powers of imagination and experience concentration as an inner event.

Michael Chekhov makes a distinction between ordinary, everyday concentration which is unintentional and unconscious, and a 'special kind',¹⁷ non-everyday, well trained concentration which is conscious and directed to a specific object. The difference between these two types of concentration lies in the different way or degree to which one is involved in and engages the object of attention.

The development of the conscious, directed concentration is a 'special ability'¹⁸ that takes a long time to develop in Michael Chekhov's training. It is a willed act that helps the actor to discover and explore the endless creative abilities and possibilities in the body; to 'have a *wise* and *sensitive* body, obedient to every command of the will'¹⁹.

¹⁷ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 42.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 42

¹⁹ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for Teachers of his Acting Technique*, transcribed by D.H. du Prey (Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 2000), p. 19.

For Michael Chekhov, non-everyday concentration as a conscious willed act, means “being with something”²⁰. This ‘optimal’ form of willed concentration is the highest level of attention in the actor’s work. It is the starting point and the foundation of one’s work. To define concentration in terms of “being with the object”²¹ implies a psycho-physical power that derives from the actor’s contact with the object of attention. Without actually moving and by making use of more than the five senses, the actor engages the inner ‘invisible body’ as it moves and concentrates with the entire body/mind on the object of attention. This enables the actor to be inwardly and outwardly attentive to the object of attention. He writes: ‘Without actually moving physically, we must move our whole being toward the object [...] When you are with the object, the physical body must remain free and relaxed’²².

In the following Concentration Exercise Michael Chekhov describes this inner experience:

Concentrate again on the same objects, first visible and then imaginary. This time inwardly embrace the object. As fully as possible, grasp the object as though with “invisible hands.” Send out your whole inner being toward it. Experience your connection with the object in your arms, legs, torso. Let your whole being, as it were, participate in this embrace. This will lead you to a sense of merging with the object.[...] When you feel that the contact with the object is firmly established, when it has been “grasped” and held by you in your “invisible hands,” begin to do things that have no relation to the object of concentration²³.

In this exercise Michael Chekhov wants to demonstrate the internal process of the actor’s willed, directed concentration. Chekhov gives the account of a non-everyday process which is an inward action-movement (a gesture of embrace) through which the actor allows his/her body to receive to immediately and

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 30

²² M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 42; ‘Without actually moving physically, we must move our whole being toward the object ... When you are *with* the object, the physical body must remain free and relaxed.’

²³ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, Gordon, M. (ed.) (New York: Harper Perennial, 1991), pp. 10-11. Exercises 6 and 7.

sense, feel everything about the object of attention (the impressions, impulses, qualities). Experiencing this inward action-movement (gesture of embrace) toward the object of attention results in outer and observable action-movement that appears to be the outcome of joining together all the physical, psychological, mental and emotional forces (as physical energy) that exist within the actor's body, as Michael Chekhov describes.

In the above exercise Michael Chekhov's use of language falls again, as in the previous example, into binaries. The description involves a duality which shows a limitation in the sense of how Michael Chekhov demonstrates the imagining function of the mind and the physical activity of the body as two distinct and independent entities that can be treated separately and eventually come together to 'merge'. Michael Chekhov considers this 'merging' with the object of attention, an 'optimal' type of highly developed form of concentration and connection, and parallels it with the constant active internal connection one has to a person one loves.

Michael Chekhov writes that the actor can 'move inwardly toward the object of concentration in the same manner and to such an extent one concentrates on a person one loves, that one is 'continuously moving toward that person'²⁴. Michael Chekhov emphasizes that this type of psychophysical engagement is very similar to how one is attracted and *pulled in* to someone a person loves. It is the desire of the one who loves to unite with the other. It might feel that it is happening on its own in that it effortlessly occupies the attention of the entire being. The attraction is powerful and the experience very pleasing.

The person who loves is in a constant state of activity - going out of the self, sending or moving the self to the other who chooses in order to merge, to touch sense know the other and become one with the other who is the object of one's desire. What Michael Chekhov wants to emphasize is that both the actor and the person who loves do not approach their object of attention with the actual, physical body but with the non-physical 'unseen' self, the 'invisible body'; both,

²⁴ M. Chekhov, 'Chekhov on Acting: A Collection of Unpublished Materials', *TDR*, 27.3 (1983), p. 52.

actor and the person who loves, 'know it [the object of attention] and experience it when they "take it" and when they are "taken by it"'²⁵.

For Michael Chekhov, the willed strong concentration is an 'optimal' highly developed form of concentration that involves the actor to "take" the other and to be "taken" by the other²⁶. One's total engagement with the object of attention (other) is an act of doing that has nothing to do with feeling; it is an intentional action-gesture which is closely related to the doer's will that arouses feelings, moods and emotions. Michael Chekhov wants to emphasize that one's total engagement with the object of attention necessarily involves reciprocal engagement that is the mutual action and relationship between the actor and object of attention (other).

Although Chekhov implies that one's total engagement with the other is a reciprocal relation, he does not further elaborate how it operates and for this reason the above statement or quotation seem to exemplify the same dualism as the previous ones. What is not clarified in his description is that reciprocity is a multi-dimensional process and operates below the level of consciousness; that the mutual exchange between actor and object of attention is not a linear movement from one perspective to the other that simply unites the two opposite sides. This is a significant factor in the actor's living perception and experience, which is missing in Michael Chekhov's account. The unconscious cognitive processes that take place between actor and object of attention and shape the actor's performance involve a mode of perception that is shifting and a 'simultaneous and multi-perspectival form of perceiving is replacing the linear successive perspective'²⁷, as described by Hans-Thies Lehmann. In this way, concentration and attention is drawn in new ways of perceiving which Michael Chekhov was not able to examine. Michael Chekhov was not able to look attentively at that part of concentration and attention processes which is how the actor makes sense of what happens in rehearsal-training or the

²⁵ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, (1985), p. 44.

²⁶ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, (1985), p. 44.

²⁷ H-T Lehmann, *Post-dramatic Theatre*, translated by Karen-Jurs Munby, (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), p.16.

performance space. He was not able to accurately reflect how the body/mind works within these new complex modes of perceptual consciousnesses although they seem to be foundational in his acting practice and, as we shall see later on, can be analyzed through complex phenomenological and cognitive perspectives.

The training for the 'optimal' form of concentration which is conscious, willed, and highly developed is described by Michael Chekhov in three steps:

(1) to contact, to see, to touch, to sense and feel the "spirit"²⁸ of the object (either physical or non physical);

(2) to imagine the object to move inwardly or the inner 'invisible' body toward it while the physical body is open, available, still and relaxed, free or relieved from tension;

and

(3) to 'pass into the vast world of *creative imagination*'²⁹ which is to "take" the object "inside" the body, to incorporate it or to internalize its qualities and keep it until there is no need to "look at it."

According to Michael Chekhov, "creative imagination", the optimal mode of concentration, is a reciprocal relation where one 'does not know whether the object has the actor, or the actor has the object'³⁰. It can be achieved, as Michael Chekhov insinuates, when the boundaries between the actor's self and object of attention (other) are blurred. Michael Chekhov's explanation denotes the paradoxical phenomenological formula of activity-passivity structure, which is experienced by the actor as 'seeing and being seen' or 'perceiving and being perceived'. Implicit here is that, for the actor, for its body to "know" things, can experience them phenomenologically as a perceiving observing self (subject body) and as a perceived observed self (object body) at the same time.

²⁸The notion of spirit and spiritual in Michael Chekhov's work are explored in detail later on in this chapter.

²⁹ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for Teachers*, p. 47.

³⁰ M. Chekhov, 'Chekhov on Acting', p. 52.

What is left out, though, in this description is that the blurring of the boundaries between actor and object of attention (other) in practical terms involves a reciprocal relation where each is part of the other and both belong to a fabric of interactions with each other and with the world-environment. In other words, that the implicit categories of two different domain of experiences, subject-self (actor) and object-other (object of attention/character), intermingle only through movement-gesture; that both actor and the object of attention (other) exist in continuous transformations which are framed together by the fact that they are experiences of the same body (share the same body) and appear to be lived through in a succession of impressions which always involve a condition of a 'change over' that is a complete change from one perspective (actor) to the other (object of attention/character). In "creative imagination" 'not to know whether the object has the actor or the actor has the object'³¹ presupposes that the actor (self) and object of attention (other) are two opposite sides/parts that operate in a relational engagement that involves a 'change over'. This, which necessarily includes what happens "in-between", and what in phenomenological terms (as we shall see in the next chapters) is defined as a "third element" in the actor's perception, something that the actor can tangibly experience in his/her breathing, does not seem to be taken into consideration by Michael Chekhov.

The meaning of concentration in Michael Chekhov's work is "being with", that is, the actor needs to be able to 'work consciously on his/herself, perceiving the other (object of attention) in a more objective way'³². In other words, the focus in these activities is on movement-gesture as the object of perception and thought. Due to the limitations of the paradigms of his time Michael Chekhov could not fully and clearly express the phenomenological and cognitive implications of these concepts. In the following chapters concentration and attention will be explored in further detail within the phenomenological principles of embodied cognition.

³¹ M. Chekhov, 'Chekhov on Acting', p. 52.

³² Cristini, M, 'Meditation and Imagination: The Contribution of Anthroposophy to Michael Chekhov's Acting Technique', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 71.

1.2 Concentration and Imagination / Image Gesture

In Michael Chekhov's practice the highly developed concentration is inextricably linked with the imagination. Concentration accompanies imagination. 'Concentration makes imagination concrete, and imagination, if it is concrete, cannot be produced without concentration of this kind'³³. Michael Chekhov talks about a mode of concentration that does not occupy the actor's brain at all. It is influenced by one's own imagination³⁴. The moment the actor starts to move inwardly to gesture toward the object of attention whatever appears before the actor involves his/her creative imagination³⁵. The actor begins to use the imagination that arises from different parts and qualities of the actor's body gradually mean the whole body is involved.

As Michael Chekhov explains this particular process of the actor merging-imagination with the object of attention³⁶ is not exactly a visualization of a mental image in the sense of 'looking and seeing which in reality is of secondary importance'³⁷. He makes clear that it 'makes no difference whether it is a real person, a sound, a real object such as a flower, a chair, a box of matches, or if it is an imaginary object or an imaginary person/character'; the object of attention can be 1) 'seeing something in the imagination which I know exists, but which cannot see with my physical eyes'; 2) imagine things which I have never seen but which I know about; and 3) create something which is absolutely the product of pure fantasy'³⁸. A well-developed imagination in his training is a special connection of the body and mind of the actor with the object of attention (the image-gesture) that goes further than engaging simply the physical eyes and ears. The 'inner eye' of the actor, psychophysically, can feel and realize the physical qualities, feelings, sensations and movement that this creates in the whole body. It is about feeling, sensing, seeing (the object of

³³ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 45.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

³⁶ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 76.

³⁷ M. Chekhov, 'Chekhov on Acting', p. 52.

³⁸ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 76

attention-the other) 'in the mind's eyes'³⁹. By engaging the imagination the actor 'recognizes that he/she can go to new places within him/herself'⁴⁰.

For Michael Chekhov creative imagination is what makes the actor 'become aware of the physical quality/ies of the image-gesture and of his/her self'⁴¹. The sensations, (the inner movement of the gesture of embrace for example) which are the 'means to experiencing the feelings of the character'⁴² (other), inform and shape the body and mind of the actor kinaesthetically. The actor senses and feels how the movement of embrace resonates and works in the body. How the inner movement of the 'unseen' other or the 'invisible body' of the actor envelops his/her actual visible body and self. This is experienced as an 'inner event' which has such power that it becomes so immediately real and concrete as to equal in clarity and effectiveness the physical movement as if the actor is doing the physical movement of the gesture of embrace.

The gesture-movement leads the actor to the point that he/she experiences an inner resonance to the changes that occur on both physical and psychological levels that frees the body from being restricted by one's own mannerisms. The actor starts to breath, move, walk, sit, stand, look, speak and think in a completely different manner than one usually does. The engagement with the physical qualities of an image-gesture, the outer features which always follow, seem to be about awakening the actor's sense of self that touches and affects the body and are nothing other than the link between the psychology and the outer means of expression of the actor⁴³. As Michael Chekhov writes, imagination helps the actor to 'think with his/her body as being inside of it'⁴⁴.

Michael Chekhov appears to explain that the actor's perceptual engagement with the image-gesture takes place from inside the process of the actor's acting

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

⁴⁰ L. Petit, *The Michael Chekhov Handbook for the Actor* (Oxon: Routledge, 2010), p. 7.

⁴¹ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for Teachers*, p. 17.

⁴² L. Petit, *The Michael Chekhov Handbook for the Actor*, (Oxon: Routledge, 2010), p. 126.

⁴³ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 104.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

self; that in the process of incorporating the image-gesture through concentration, a movement from consciousness to instincts and unconscious takes place. This is the result of a particular psychophysical engagement with the image-gesture, which necessarily places the body of the actor into a special form or gesture that brings relationality of perception. The actor's body is structured in a way that enables the actor to recognize multiple relations between him/her body and other bodies in the world.

In Michael Chekhov's practice the actor equally experiences the physical, mental and psychological powers the imagination communicates when the actor works with techniques of the 'imaginary centre'; the 'imaginary centre is a centre because everything comes from it and returns to it-it seems to hold the organism together'⁴⁵. Working with 'imaginary centres' is an act of imagination and concentration. It is the idea of different performative centres (places) within the body, which provide a powerful energy source and can allow the 'invisible body' of the actor (the imaginary other-character) to emerge. If the actor chooses to place the 'imaginary centre' of the body high up in the chest, in practical terms the actor, in order to move, must be connected to (through intense concentration-imagination) and draw energy from that centre; once the actor is connected to this new energy centre, all the movements of the different parts of the body originate from the chest. For example, whether the image is a silver sharp blade or a black round heavy ball would alter the physical-physiological and psychological expression of the body of the actor. The 'imaginary centre' would alter the movement, the behaviour and breath of the body of the actor. The actor would feel a sense of suffocation and discomfort that would grow and swell in the chest (depending on how high or low the centre would be placed in the chest, the sense of suffocation and discomfort would be felt different). The 'chest of the actor would be felt larger and larger to the point that would be disturbing the beating of the heart and the breathing

⁴⁵ L. Petit, *The Michael Chekhov Handbook*, p. 72; See examples in Chekhov, 1996: Tape 1.

until the chest would be ready to burst. The 'invisible body' would lengthen in the legs, but would grow and swell in the chest'⁴⁶.

Michael Chekhov describes the 'imaginary body' of the other (character) as the ability to imagine and inhabit a different other body from one's own. The 'imaginary body' is an unfamiliar body with the body of the actor and his/her self-image. How the body behaves in this 'invisible body', the discoveries it makes as a result of inhabiting this new image, remain embedded in the trained imagination of the actor. The 'imaginary body' is the building material for the development of the other (character) and the creative process of transformation. For example, if the actor imagines a very tall and thin body, the neck and arms twice as long as they actually are, then the actor's inner 'invisible body' of the phenomenal other (the character) also lengthens in the legs, neck and arms of the physical visible body of the actor. The actor does not need to stretch or push the physical body parts. Instead the actor would need to imagine perceive that legs, neck, and arms are all felt and sensed twice their normal size. In that sense the actor would be able to incorporate the 'invisible body' (of the other/character) bit by bit; either starting with the head, shoulders, arms, torso or hands, or the feet, or even from the mouth or nose. In reality what the actor experiences as 'imaginary body' and incorporates is a shift in energy. What Michael Chekhov defines as the 'molding and the driving power which is within and behind the image'⁴⁷.

The image that one perceives, sees, 'shows' the actor the physical specifics; the details of the physical form that the actor has discovered and needs to implement and internalize. All the physical attributes of the image of the 'invisible body' (the phenomenal other) 'shows' the actor what is to be incorporated; thereby giving clarity and precision to the positions of the head, neck, shoulders, forehead, nose, arms, hands, legs and feet that point in turn to a series of other small changes as well. This inner process of creative imagination allows the actor to understand the psychophysical intentions of the

⁴⁶ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 103.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

image of the other (character) and contributes to the actor's total transformation. For example the position of the head in relation to a neck that draws into the shoulders and might be a little bit tilted or might have the effect of having eyes wide open that look far off, eyebrows up and knees that thrust forward⁴⁸ might delineate a person physically and psychologically uncomfortable, vulnerable, insecure or indecisive, who tries to resist to defend or push away something or someone.

At the beginning of the training the actor might concentrate on real objects such as a lamp. The actor can experience the psychophysical realization that she/he is creating the lamp as well as that the lamp would not be possible to exist without the actor⁴⁹. Michael Chekhov writes,

If you (the actor) create a strange and interesting landscape, and if you concentrate on this beautiful and strange landscape, you will notice that this landscape changes you [...] Your creation influences you, its creator, and the soul of the creator changes under the influence of his own creation. This is really the ability of an artist –to be changed because of its own creation⁵⁰.

The imaginary set of actions, gestures, or sensorimotor patterns of behaviour, that are performed by the actor's conscious choice (or the actor's creative will) can change any part of the body and in return can change the actor's entire sense of being.

The character is developed in the actor's mind/imagination rather than from previous experiences – actors imitate the internal/external qualities of the character – it is the character's experiencing that is important not the actor. According to Michael Chekhov, the image-gesture (imagining through the body) can create a direct and altering effect on the physiology and psychology of the actor. This, the actor utilises to create the object-other (the character). Through image-gesture, the actor experiences the ideal world of images, universal

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

⁴⁹ M. Chekhov and Du Prey, *The Actor is the Theatre* January 15, 1940.

⁵⁰ M. Chekhov and Du Prey, *The Actor is the Theatre* October 8, 1936.

images or archetypes, wherein both the actor's self and the other (character), as the field of the conscious and the field of the unconscious respectively, reflect small cosmos or microcosm (physical body) and big cosmos or macrocosm⁵¹ (invisible body or *qi-ki*). In this complex psychophysical condition both physical self (actor) and invisible other (character) are and are not at the same time.

It might be argued that the limitation in Michael Chekhov's description of the image-gesture is that it shows a self-sufficiency. To overcome this gap the imagination needs to be examined as the actor's ability to displace him/her self from the actual physical world, to interact with the image-gesture, the invisible absent other (character) and to embody and incorporate the image in their co-involvement (the actor's and other's) with the world and with each other. This will be examined in detail as a phenomenological embodied-embedded phenomenon characterized by discipline and cultivation to place the body into a special posture or form in the following Chapters 2, 3, 4 through the principles of dialectics, interdependent co-arising, *chiasm*, primordial unity, the "neither-nor logic", "third element", circular structure, "bright" and "dark *cogito*, Dionysian drive, non-ego body, mirroring process.

1.3 Objectivity

Michael Chekhov claims that when the actor moves inwardly toward the image/object', a change of the usual sense of self is manifested as a transformed sense of the everyday ego-self. The actor appears to perceive, touch, sense, and feel with the whole body/mind aspects of a detailed 'multiformity'⁵² of a non-ordinary "I"/self. This unusual unknown sense of self, according to Michael Chekhov, seems to be a catalyst for the actor to be able to communicate with and 'acknowledge the objectivity of the world of imagination'⁵³. The objectivity of imagination is the idea that 'the images are greater than the actor'⁵⁴. Images live an independent life, which does not reflect

⁵¹ From Greek microcosm 'mikros kosmos' little/small world and macrocosm 'megalos kosmos' big world.

⁵² M. Chekhov, 'Chekhov on Acting', p. 49.

⁵³ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 3.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

the actor's habitual physical and psychological sense of self and body or the actor's personal worries, concerns, desires, qualities and feelings. Michael Chekhov states that images reflect a life and a 'mind of their own'⁵⁵ and cannot be reduced to the everyday and the personal. Objectivity requires one to go beyond these two familiar realities and make contact with an other body and self.

Michael Chekhov makes clear the actor 'in everyday life identifies as "I". This "I" represents everything that comprises the actor's usual being, but in the moment of inspiration the "I"-self of an actor-artist undergoes a kind of metamorphosis⁵⁶. This metamorphosis or transformation is a process of depersonalization and is what the objectivity of imagination is about. The individual experience and knowledge, the infertile and intellectual thinking of the actor's ego-self, which typically dominates one's life and interferes with and hinders the actor's creative process, is enlightened and expanded.

The moment the actor experiences what Michael Chekhov considers the autonomy of imagination with the entire body/mind, the actor perceives feels and realizes a difference between the ordinary-everyday sense of self and the embodied image of a non-everyday self as an *other*. The creative impulse, the energetic body of the actor, generates imagery that in turn generates inner sensations that in turn creates an other sense of body and self. The result is the simultaneous unity and separation of the physical body and the non-physical body. In other words, objectivity involves the realization of the difference between the visible and the invisible body, which is the ability to differentiate oneself from the invisible imaginary 'unseen' other (character).

Michael Chekhov describes objectivity 'as if the actor were facing the outer world and the actor becomes objective'⁵⁷. Michael Chekhov implies that the principle of the invisible, the imaginative projection, creates verticality and horizontality in the actor's perception, which is experienced as a passive-active circuit. By embodying an invisible space, a spatial field or locus the actor

⁵⁵ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, pp. 3-5.

⁵⁶ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor: On the Technique of Acting* (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 86.

⁵⁷ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, pp. 155-6 (italics in the original).

embodies objectivity. The body is that which sees, perceives, feels and that which is seen, perceived, felt simultaneously. The image-gesture in practice displaces subjectivity and enables the actor's body to perform beyond its habitual repertoire structure.

Andrei Kirillov explains that 'by liberating an actor's imagination Michael Chekhov immediately isolates it, separating what is imagined from the actor's personality. The artist is a mediator'⁵⁸. Differently said, the actor is involved as an intermediate agency that is coming "in-between" two poles: the actor's perceiving self and the perceived other (image-gesture). The actor here operates as a "third element", a third factor the outer space/the outside world that the actor's body incorporates and establishes a distance that makes the actor's self and the other become objective.

Objectivity denotes not to stay within one's own subjective body and self. Michael Chekhov is not explicit about the non-oppositional nature of the subject (actor) object (other) relation of objectivity and this might be seen as a gap in his account. The idea of the artist-actor as being a mediator, a third element or factor implicates that objectivity is not an oppositional structural relation but rather indicates the "neither-nor" logic; that is the actor is neither subject-self nor object-other (character), neither in nor out, neither inside nor outside. It might be said that this serves to overcome dualism in this acting concept. In the following chapters, objectivity will be further examined as a dialectical unity of action-intuition, *basho* (place), as an interplay between reflective and pre-reflective, horizontal -vertical structure, and 'wild being'.

1.4 Consciousness Divided

For Michael Chekhov becoming objective is when the actor 'acquires a *divided consciousness*'⁵⁹. Michael Chekhov experienced this phenomenon when he

⁵⁸ A. Kirillov, 'The Theatrical System of Michael Chekhov', *Theatre Dance and Performance Training* (Special Issue Michael Chekhov), 4.2 (2013) p. 50.

⁵⁹ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 155; Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, pp. 101-102.

was rehearsing the role of Skid. The experience turned his body and self into a spectator of his own performance. He writes:

My consciousness had split into two – at one and the same time, I was in the auditorium and standing beside myself and in each of my fellow actors on stage and I knew what all of them were feeling, wanting and expecting ... My tiredness had disappeared and there was only lightness ... Such complex, unexpected feelings were arising within me, and the clown's body had become so agile and pliable ... The whole of mine and Skid's being were filled with awesome, almost unbearable force ... I re-entered myself.⁶⁰

Elsewhere he writes that the actor,

Must fully and completely, having laughter and tears at the same time be so objective that you can absolutely see what your sister is doing in the first row of seats ... discovered that real acting was when we could act and be filled with feelings, and yet be able to make jokes with our partners –*two consciousness*.⁶¹

In the above citations, Michael Chekhov gives a detailed account of the notion of *divided consciousness*, which seems to be described, in phenomenological terms, as being a subject body and an object body at the same time.

The Skid scene is another instant where Michael Chekhov talks about the actor's relationship to his character. In the scene, Michael Chekhov is observing himself and is experiencing a simultaneous awareness of two selves, the actor's and Skid's. It appears that Chekhov is stressing here that in nature the actor and the character are recognizably different and separate from each other. He seems to propose a correlation so distinct and direct between Michael Chekhov (actor) and Skid (character) that shows a dichotomy a separation which points to the limitations of Michael Chekhov's acting language to analyze how actor and character are interdependent opposites that come together and couple. Also, the description does not allow us to understand how the blurring

⁶⁰ M. Chekhov, *The Path of the Actor*, A. Kirillov and B. Merlin (eds), (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 145.

⁶¹ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for The Professional Actor*, p. 102.

of the boundaries between actor and character involves imagination (conceptual thought) being based on physical experience (physical body).

Divided consciousness is an 'optimal' state of consciousness that reflects the awareness of experiencing one's body objectively, that is to say it erases the boundaries between body and mind, internal and external, visible self and invisible other. *Divided consciousness* appears to be that which enables the actor to 'see', to perceive before the *mind's eye*, the phenomenal invisible other in many different psychophysical positions, all of which the actor can incorporate. The actor might see the other (character) sitting in a certain way, speaking in a new pitch, moving faster or more slowly, looking with more determination and power and/or might even feel that he/she is in different places at the same time (sitting in the audience, next to oneself, standing while sitting or standing behind oneself or between two performers or in an imaginary place).⁶²

Consciousness divided is, according to Michael Chekhov, the actor experiencing 'a feeling that he is everywhere'. This denotes the blurring of the boundaries between body and space or that the actor gets the feeling that is "neither" a subject, an "I"/me here, "nor" an object, a non-/ other self there. The sense is of being "neither" me (actor) "nor" the other (character). Michael Chekhov mentions that *consciousness divided* is the co-existence of being 'both the image and the consciousness'⁶³.

In Michael Chekhov's theory and practice the objectivity of imagination and *consciousness divided* point to two important principles that are interrelated. Michael Chekhov was concerned with the art of acting as technique, as well as with the craft of the actor, as a process that needs to involve skilful activities that sharpen the actor's abilities to recognize what is going on both inside and outside the body. Michael Chekhov refers to this 'optimal' type of *higher* level of consciousness as a *Higher Ego Self*. To attain this 'optimal' state requires, as a precondition, the actor to be able to master his/her self at once as a subject-

⁶² M. Chekhov, *The Path of the Actor*, pp. 144-145; Chekhov gives similar descriptions of Skid.

⁶³ *Ibid*, p. 58.

body and object-body as actor (self-me) and character (other/not-me). It seems that for him, the cultivation of higher consciousness or heightened awareness includes the revelation of an other *higher world* of meanings completely different from that of the everyday world. This *higher world* appears to be the source of inspiration and creativity that elevates the actor as both an artist and as a human being.

Michael Chekhov was 'preoccupied with the question of inspiration and how to gain access to it'⁶⁴. For him, the skilful actor elaborates a heightened awareness of the whole body to such an extent that 'gets inspiration from that physical body'⁶⁵. In order to be able to reach inspiration and the *Higher Self* the actor needs to use a psychophysical means of expression. That is elements that would cultivate the actor's self-development as well as cultivate an aesthetic consciousness of how to effectively use the body. To 'transform oneself totally'⁶⁶ is synonymous with achieving objectivity and a *Higher Self*, an advanced state in acting processes that can be experienced as multiple levels of consciousness or else as a *consciousness divided*.

For Michael Chekhov *divided consciousness* is the ability of the actor to perceive him/her self. The importance placed on the actor's ability to see him/herself from the outside is, according to Michael Chekhov, that the actor must develop the ability to achieve aesthetic detachment⁶⁷. In his discussion of *divided consciousness*, though, Michael Chekhov gives emphasis only on the one side of the actor-character relation, that is of the actor-observer. It is unclear whether a character (the other) is an autonomous being or one aspect a version of the actor's self. The idea that the actor can watch attentively from without and can act with 'the consciousness of the observer'⁶⁸ needs to be further developed otherwise there is a dualism and we speak of a binary concept. *Divided consciousness* needs to be further examined as the trained capacity of the actor to observe, to perceive from the outside as well as of

⁶⁴ M. Chekhov, *The Path of the Actor*, p. 145.

⁶⁵ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for Professional Actor*, p.83

⁶⁶ M. Chekhov, *The Path of the Actor*, p. 183.

⁶⁷ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 156 .

⁶⁸ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for Teachers*, p. 129.

being observed or being perceived from the inside at the same time. There is a complex relation in experiencing *divided consciousness* between actor and other (character) that potentially involves not only the ability of observing and being observed at the same time but also what this intertwinement implicates and how it operates.

In the following chapters these issues or *divided consciousness* will be developed in detail through the phenomenological analysis of a reversible *chiasmic* structure, a *Gestalt* circuit structure, where the body of the actor (the inside space) and the body of the other (the outside space) are intertwined to form what is implicitly congruent with the principles of embodied cognition.

1.5 Higher Ego

Franc Chamberlain notes that Michael Chekhov used the ability of the actor to exist or to *stand* outside of him/herself (a concept further examined later in Nietzsche's chapter) as an 'event as a further evidence for the existence of a higher ego'⁶⁹.

Cynthia Ashperger writes that the notion of 'Higher Ego' is another name Michael Chekhov gave to Rudolf Steiner's notion of "I". The 'Higher Ego' is the incorporation of Steiner's concept of the *three-fold nature of man* into Michael Chekhov's practice as the technique of the character's three centres: the *thinking, feeling* and *willing* centre⁷⁰. These three centres which are placed in the head (through or around), in the chest, and in the pelvis respectively point to the difference between a thought, a feeling and a will impulse. Working with these three centres in the training, the actor familiarizes his/her self and body with the difference between his/her own *thinking, feeling, willing* centre and those of the other (character). In this way the actor connects to the impulses that are moving through these three centres with what Steiner names the *three-fold nature of man*⁷¹.

⁶⁹ F. Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York: 2004), 22.

⁷⁰ C. Ashperger, *The Rhythm of Space and the Sound of Time, Michael Chekhov's Acting in the 21st Century* (New York: Editions Rodolpi, 2008), pp. 37-38.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38; In the studio these three centres which require the actor's imagination and intuition are explored by the actor's body through the "Stick, Ball and Veil" exercise.

The notion of 'Higher Ego' addresses that part of the self of the actor that the 'lower self', the actor's everyday consciousness, cannot enter. Michael Chekhov explains the 'lower' 'usual ego'⁷² does not move the imagination. The 'lower ego' corresponds to a 'sense of individuality and ego consciousness, the full self-consciousness, what Steiner called the "I AM"⁷³.

Michael Chekhov, as an artist and as a human being, was deeply influenced by Rudolph Steiner's philosophical work (anthroposophy). He adopted Steiner's concepts of the 'lower' and the 'higher' self to portray different dimensions of realities. The 'lower self' to portray the limited everyday personal and the 'Higher Self' the expanded, the transcendent, the spiritual; ('lower' and 'higher self' are also related to Nietzsche's "great" and "small intellect" and are further analyzed in Nietzsche's chapter). For Michael Chekhov, if the 'Higher Self' is trained the actor 'does not rely solely upon the *lower ego* and leaves the personal things behind'⁷⁴. When the 'Higher Self' is employed inspiration occurs. For example, the experience of expanding or *flowing* towards the image-gesture that unifies subject-self and object-other, the visible and the invisible body, appears to be considered by Michael Chekhov as something which is '*above*' the actor – a place at a higher level where inspiration happens. This can be recognized when the actor 'confronts the Higher Ego'⁷⁵ and the body and the mind of the actor are able to be open to other dimensions to other world(s) and the actor becomes 'objective as the artist should'⁷⁶. In other words, another kind of experience and order of things guided by 'the artist in us that stands behind all our creative processes'⁷⁷ can be realized. A psychophysical understanding of the body space and world, that has nothing to do with what physically and psychologically the actor is accustomed to doing, can be obtained.

⁷² M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 16.

⁷³ M. Carlson, *No Religion Higher Than Truth: A History of the Theosophical Movement in Russia, 1875-1922* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. 132.

⁷⁴ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 23.

⁷⁵ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 15.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

⁷⁷ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 16; p. 155.

Michael Chekhov states 'you cannot go through a chair in the ordinary world, but in art and religion we can do it'⁷⁸. For him, if the 'Higher Ego' moves the actor, inspiration re-educates the body and the mind. In that sense the 'Higher Ego' re-organizes and re-structures the body and mind of the actor to act and react to the demands of a non-ordinary psychophysical pattern and to the circumstances of a performance score and as a result the actor's 'I *can*' (what the actor can do) enables his/her *bodymind* to go through a chair.

The 'Higher Ego' is the creative spirit that 'comes to the actor outside him/herself'⁷⁹. This can be possible only if/when the actor through an embodied image, a gesture of expansion, toward the world is possible to move beyond the limits of the body and self. This is a psychophysical state that seems to be synonymous with the phenomenological form of "being-in-the-world" that can open the limited personal boundaries of a gesture of contraction within the actor. Ideally through a gesture of expansion the 'Higher Ego' inspires and moves the actor by making the body 'sensitive, flexible and receptive'⁸⁰.

For Michael Chekhov the 'Higher Ego' broadens the intellectual/mental activities of the actor and therefore sharpens the way the actor perceives and feels the body, the space and the world. It enhances the psychophysical abilities thereby the actor becomes intuitively aware of the others, the things and the environment and the actor as a result is able to *actively listen* to see and hear 'with the backs, with the legs, with the chest'⁸¹ (with the whole body).

The capacity of the 'Higher Ego' to weaken the activity of the everyday body permits the actor to 'forget his/her individual self'⁸² and step outside the usual familiar psychological and physical body into a state of self-forgetfulness. The actor in a state where there is a sense of 'no-self' consciously and actively is able to comply with 'otherworldly images'⁸³. In this creative state the actor is

⁷⁸ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for Teachers of his Acting Technique*, p. 24.

⁷⁹ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, pp. 2-3.

⁸⁰ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 87; the section on the psychological gesture goes into a deeper analysis.

⁸¹ Michael Chekhov and Du Prey, *The Actor is the Theatre*, September 28, 1937.

⁸² M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 3.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

able to stand apart or outside of the everyday self and transcend the physical 'lower ego' self.

Michael Chekhov writes 'as soon as the higher self takes possession of the building material, the actor begins to feel that he/she is *standing apart*, or rather *above*, and consequently above the everyday ego-self'⁸⁴. The actor realizes that the everyday I-self is an actuality, but not the only reality and that another expanded invisible self, which is a divine unusual world perceived by intuition a "higher-level I"⁸⁵ exists within oneself simultaneously and connects the actor to a state beyond space, time, and causation.

In Michael Chekhov's practice the gesture of expansion plunges the actor into the world of imagination where the invisible intuitively opens up thereby 'enrich[ing] and expand[ing] the actor's consciousness'⁸⁶. According to Michael Chekhov, the actor becomes aware of *three different beings* within him/her self: a) the higher self, the actor artist who creates the character, b) the usual everyday ego-self who has the control of the creative process, and c) the character as created by the actor⁸⁷. To act under the inspiration of the 'Higher Self' the actor is able to 'distinguish three different modes of consciousness within him/herself'⁸⁸ experienced with a sense of the Whole. As Chekhov explains, 'everything is one a harmonious, well-integrated physical and psychological whole'⁸⁹. The actor is 'engaged on a more spiritual or more profound level'⁹⁰.

The 'Higher Ego' appears to be the key to Michael Chekhov's approach⁹¹. The encounter of the actor with the 'Higher Ego' (or else *creative individuality*) expresses something that goes beyond and deeper. Michael Chekhov writes that the many different meanings and interpretations that have been given by

⁸⁴ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 87.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 87; I develop this point further in the last section of this chapter .

⁸⁹ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 15; Chekhov, *Lessons for Teachers*, p. 55.

⁹⁰ Sotto-Morettini, *The Philosophical Actor*, p. 53.

⁹¹ F. Chamberlain, 'Michael Chekhov on the Technique of Acting: Was Don Quixote True to Life', in A. Hodge (ed.), *Twentieth Century Actor Training* (London: Routledge, 2010), p. 65.

actors and artists throughout the centuries for classical masterpieces such as *Iphigenia* is proof that the actor's inspiration comes from the outside, from *above*. Andrei Kirillov notes that in Michael Chekhov's discussion on the "Theatre of the Future" the first impulse for any artistic creation has to come from the outside. The first appearance of Don Quixote in his inner vision had nothing to do with a mystic⁹². The 'Higher Ego' is the force that drives the actor to create and communicate reality in a unique individual way. All the actors who have either performed *Iphigenia* or staged this play and have created distinct pieces of art work have access to something *higher* which has inspired their artistic perception to 'see', feel and express *the thing differently*⁹³.

Michael Chekhov makes clear the actor needs to find the means to recognize a higher order and function within his/herself and cultivate this as a tool as well as become aware of the creative powers of its influence on the artist's-actor's body/mind⁹⁴. Michael Chekhov wanted his techniques to reinforce the ability to associate mentally and emotionally to 'something finer than one's limited personal self to inspire acting'⁹⁵.

Spirituality and inspiration contained in Michael Chekhov's idea of the 'Higher Ego' are the ability to synthesize, the power to create oneness⁹⁶. Spirituality and inspiration cannot be literally grasped. In the actor's work the practical value of their power to create a wholeness seems to portray the awakening to a higher level of consciousness where necessarily the distinctions between oppositions disappear. Spirituality is a concept that needs to be further explored and translated in Michael Chekhov's work. Ian Watson explains that Michael Chekhov's technique is characterized by a language open to interpretation that seems to be shaped by a dubious notion of the spiritual, among the technical

⁹² M. Chekhov in A. Kirillov, 'Michael Chekhov and the Search for the Ideal Theatre', *New Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 3, (2006), p. 231.

⁹³ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 17. The example of *higher self* Chekhov gives here is a quote from Goethe.

⁹⁴ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 16.

⁹⁵ R. Whyman, 'Russian Delsartism and Michael Chekhov the Search for the Eternal Type', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 280.

⁹⁶ C. Ashperger, 'Michael Chekhov's Five Guiding Principles and Theatre Practice Today. The Case of "Tender Napalm" by Phillip Ridley', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 377.

terms he refers to is the subconscious and the *Higher Ego*⁹⁷. Cynthia Ashperger writes that ‘without naming anthroposophy Michael Chekhov states that the soul is most connected to our perception and the environment.’⁹⁸

In my own practice the ‘Higher Ego’, its power to engage and unify an artistic influence on the actor’s consciousness, can be understood through the act of breath. It is through inhalation-exhalation where the union of opposites, that the actor’s self and the character, the visible body and the invisible other, is embodied and sustained. In that sense, the spirituality of the ‘Higher Ego’ indicates a double meaning, a tangible and an intangible activity in the actor’s work. To be able to reach a ‘Higher Ego’, a higher intangible knowledge, in practice is inextricably connected to the actor’s breath, to something tangible. Etymologically, the word spiritual pertains to the word spirit that comes from the Latin word *spiritus-spirare* which means breath-to breath; the word inspiration is related to the process or quality of being inspired and to inhalation. In other words, the way I understand spirituality and inspiration are associated to the non-physical part of the body (feelings, emotions, moods) to an invisible energy or an invisible dimension through which the actor can ‘attain an ideal archetypal’⁹⁹ state which cannot be extricated from the act of breath. Through the act of breath the actor’s state of body and mind alters and in that sense spirituality and ‘inspiration seem to come from relinquishing the lower ego and accessing the higher consciousness’¹⁰⁰. The ‘Higher Ego’, the actor’s inspiration and creative individuality, is an invisible dimension that can be experienced psychophysically as a rhythm, according to Michael Chekhov. He explains that ‘this invisible thing is like a high super-being who is guarding over us, who inspires us [...] Without this feeling that this rhythm is a living being, we cannot grasp it. It is a real being. We create it and it re-creates us’¹⁰¹. For

⁹⁷ I. Watson, “‘Prying behind the curtain(s) of the creative process’ Eugenio Barba’s principles and Michael Chekhov’s technique”, in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 235-236.

⁹⁸ C. Ashperger, ‘Michael Chekhov’s Five Guiding Principles and Theatre Practice Today. The Case of “Tender Napalm” by Phillip Ridley’, in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 377.

⁹⁹ R. Whyman, ‘Russian Delsartism and Michael Chekhov the Search for the Eternal Type’, in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 280.

¹⁰⁰ M. Chekhov, *The Path of the Actor*, p. 179.

¹⁰¹ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for Teachers*, p. 24.

Michael Chekhov the 'Higher Ego' creativity inspiration and rhythm are interrelated.

Michael Chekhov's account seems to give a priority to the 'Higher Ego' to its abilities to perception and the environment. The 'Higher Ego' and the 'lower ego' seem to function in a direct separate and clear way from one another. It is not clear how 'Higher Ego' and 'lower ego' correlate or how and if each depend on the other. If the 'lower ego' depends on everyday consciousness and is a conscious act, and the 'Higher Ego' is an unconscious process that goes so deep that 'moulds the body of the actor from within'¹⁰², it is unclear how they are connected to cognitive processes. How does the 'lower ego' and the 'Higher Ego' come together as one as a whole and how are they co-creating? How these two concepts actually work in practice together is a gap in Chekhov's writings.

The 'Higher Ego' will be examined in detail in the following chapters as an unusual psychophysical condition through the phenomenological concepts of self-extendedness, transcendence, *ecstasy*, self-forgetfulness, *Gestalt*, body schema, action-intuition, microcosm-macrocosm structure, vertical-horizontal being.

1.6 The Psychophysical

The objective of Michael Chekhov's techniques is to remove the actor from cold analytical thinking and psychological interpretations and to provide the right conditions, the laboratory environment, for the actor to transform 'physical exercises [in]to psycho-physical'¹⁰³. As previously discussed, in his training, imagination is the psychophysical tool that establishes the connection between outer action (the visible body) and inner action (the invisible body) instantly. Physiology and psychology, physical action and inner felt sensations, are occurring simultaneously and free the body and mind of the actor from the limited inartistic and uncreative influences of the everyday mundane part of the

¹⁰² M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 87.

¹⁰³ M. Chekhov, 1992: Tape 1; See also Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 43.

self. The physical arouses the non-physical (the psychological) and the non-physical (the psychological) arouses the physical. The 'optimal' psychophysical state ideally happens when the actor is motivated by an unceasing flow of impulses which the actor experiences as a conscious artistic and aesthetic experience. All his training techniques should be considered psychophysical: 'Everything, like the development of the imagination, or the using of the psychological gesture, all such means make physical exercises to psycho-physical'¹⁰⁴.

The psychophysical in the creative process mainly supports Michael Chekhov's ideas that feelings, emotions, and moods are fired by external or imaginary stimuli. Phillip Zarrilli explains that the 'psychophysical training works on the relationship between physical stimuli and the resulting sensory and mental states'¹⁰⁵. This relationship between internal and external states reflects Michael Chekhov's aim to eliminate the distinction between outer-visible and inner-invisible action in order to restore the balance and harmony between the outer and inner body. When the actor is in charge of this relationship, the integration of self and other is possible, meaning that the sense of body and self alters.

The actor, to be able to actualize this psychophysical integration depends upon his/her abilities to sharpen the smooth functioning between body and mind and imagination. This presupposes a refined and flexible body that 'must be moulded and re-created from *inside*'¹⁰⁶, as if the actor sculpts oneself from within all the time. In every single subtle change the actor learns through training how to become sensitive to it, listen inwardly to it and follow it, move accordingly. New physical and psychological alterations and adjustments arouse as well as new other bodies. Michael Chekhov explains how,

¹⁰⁴ M. Chekhov, 1992: Tape 1; See also M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 43.

¹⁰⁵ P. Zarrilli, 'Introduction', in P. Zarrilli (ed.), *Acting Reconsidered* (London and New York: Routledge. 1995/2002), p. 12. Zarrilli writes that: 'Stanislavsky was the first to seek to overcome the divided "mind from body", knowledge from feeling, analysis from action" through psychophysical training or the method of physical actions.'

¹⁰⁶ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 3.

The position of your head and shoulders, your arms, hands, elbows, the turn of your neck and back, the position of your legs and feet, the direction of your glance, the position of your fingers, all will call up in your creative spirit corresponding Qualities and Feelings. Go on exercising this way until you feel that even the slightest idea of a possible change makes you react to it inwardly. You will also awaken in yourself the sense of harmony between outer and inner expressiveness in your acting.¹⁰⁷

For the actor to be able to experience the harmony Michael Chekhov talks about, the actor needs to acquire the psychophysical abilities to have a body which is ready to receive, i.e, at once to be available to be affected by inner impulses and be responsive to external influences. In practical terms it requires the body to become an empty vessel 'receiving intuition and simply act as non-ego'¹⁰⁸. What I define as 'emptiness' in this thesis marks this primordial experience - the 'optimal' state where one is active inwardly and allows for whatever action performed outwardly to have an immediate inward response and vice versa. In this manner the actor:

- a) develops a psycho-physical vocabulary away from the need to use habitual movements;
- b) shapes an awareness that allows one to perceive another dimension of Michael Chekhov's techniques, the idea of creating by grasping the tangible through the intangible, the visible through the invisible and vice versa through the breath; and
- c) experiences a simultaneous subjectivity and objectivity (activity and passivity) within an action thereby actualizing and experiencing his/her body in the form of horizontal-vertical structure that is, as we shall later on, as a 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' or 'affecting-affected' structure.

¹⁰⁷ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 79.

¹⁰⁸ Y. Yuasa, *The Body Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1987), p. 199.

Fundamental Psychophysical Exercises

The fundamental psychophysical exercises that are the best practical entrance into Michael Chekhov's practice connect the body through gesture and breath to images, sensations and space. They assist the actor in integrating the visible physical body and the non-physical invisible body. They also have a reference to all Michael Chekhov's techniques. These foundational exercises include:

- a) The Four Brothers: The Feeling of Ease, Form, Beauty and the Feeling of the Whole;
- b) Staccato – Legato;
- c) The Four Qualities of Movement: Moulding, Floating, Flying, and Radiating.

a) The Four Brothers: The Feeling of Ease, Form, Beauty and the Feeling of the Whole.

According to Michael Chekhov, the actor must have these four qualities at his/her disposal all the time¹⁰⁹. The importance of the principles of these four qualities lies in the fact that their application is inextricably linked to anything the actor does as an artist in practice and performance.

They are essential as a basis for the actor to develop a means of expression in which there is a sense of ease that permeates the actor's body and ensures the effortless flow of energy that supports the detailed accuracy of action and movement. The *feeling of ease* presupposes a principle that is at the heart of the creative process: that the actor is and acts always in the present moment. The development of the *feeling of ease* depends upon the actor's second-to-second decision-making. However strenuous a movement is or heavy the content of an action, the actor must not be sloppy and needs to feel there is no tension in the body. The *feeling of ease* gives an inner strength to the body that excludes heaviness and uneasiness in an action-movement and produces all

¹⁰⁹ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 76.

action physically and psychologically with lightness and a sense of freedom. Michael Chekhov explains, 'heaviness on the stage may exist only as a *theme*, but never as a *manner* of acting'¹¹⁰. If the actor lifts the arm for example the feeling is that the arm is losing its weight. Or, if the actor skips, the actor feels the arms as wings, feels his/her body loose in the neck, shoulders, knees, toes, ankles, as if there is space in between the joints and fingers. When this happens the actor's body is informed by a *feeling of ease*. For practicing the *feeling of ease* Michael Chekhov suggests:

Make different, simple movements, repeating them several times, trying to get them easier and lighter until you gradually awaken in yourself a complete Feeling of Ease. Do not confuse ease with weakness or passivity. Inner strength must be present even in the slightest of movements. Start with small movements, then proceed to a larger and wider expansion of them so that in the end you can run and jump around the room, filled with a Feeling of Ease.¹¹¹

The *feeling of ease* might be explored by picking up an unfamiliar object for a partner such as a chair and practicing moving with it. If the actor gets the quality of being light in weight, the actor has awakened within her body the feeling of ease.

The *feeling of form* within the flow of movement means there is manifest a psycho-physical understanding of timing, clarity, accuracy and precision. The *feeling of form* comes from inside the body and from the awareness of the different parts of the body and their relation to it. Whether the actor moves or does not move the whole body the *feeling of form* is always the sensation of movement in the whole body. The actor needs to know and have a sense of the whole body as a shape, its full form all the time. Michael Chekhov in his *Technique of Acting* writes about form,

Stand still and realize that your body is a form. Then "walk," in your imagination, with your attention focused within your body, as if molding it

¹¹⁰ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 13.

¹¹¹ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 49.

from inside, and also from outside. Realize that each limb of your body is a peculiarly built form. Then start to move your fingers, hands, arms, and so on slightly, realizing that your body is a movable form. This means that motion itself prevents you from being formless at any moments while you are moving.¹¹²

The actor by experiencing the hand, the arm, etc as a form, senses the body as a form, experiences the process as a form, and realizes one creates forms with the body. To be able to experience the *feeling of form* one needs to explore the fullness of the body all the way down to the toes and feet. If the actor develops the ability to experience movements as form and to harmonize his/her body with the energy that goes through the whole body and around the body as well, this energy permeates what and how the actor is doing things. The actor might practice the feeling of form with a chair as a partner and can experience in a joint effort the feeling and creation of form. The feeling of form is the psychophysical realization that the chair has a form and the body has a form and both create form in space. In practice the *feeling of form* is the actor's full engagement with action. The actor acknowledges that his/her body is a movable form in space and time. This acknowledgement allows the body to be more sensible and obedient to the impulses that are coming from the body's inner life. Michael Chekhov mentions that consciously or subconsciously there is something which comes from feeling/experiencing the body as form that inspires the actor's creative work¹¹³.

The *feeling of beauty* is a sensation, a quality that the actor feels in whatever he/she is doing. Through the actor's conscious effort when the actor's body is full of energy and full of power and the feeling is of having a body that moves with a sense of *ease* and *form*, the actor experiences the sense of creating aesthetic forms in space, beauty in space. Michael Chekhov's *feeling of beauty* has nothing in common with the conventional or objective concepts of beauty which would mean to try to appear or make things look beautiful. For him the

¹¹² M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 51. Chekhov's exercise starts in the actor's imagination but one can start exploring the *feeling of form* from actual physical movement and the result can be an equally powerful psychophysical experience.

¹¹³ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 83.

actor can discover the *feeling of beauty* and can create beauty with the body. The actor cultivates the *feeling of beauty* by *listening attentively* within the body while moving. Beauty does not come from the outside. The actor has it within, i.e. the actor '*fathoms it deep within him/herself*'¹¹⁴. The *feeling of beauty* is a pleasurable feeling of satisfaction that arises from being fully engaged with what the actor's body is doing. In this state the actor is 'occupied exclusively with the task, without the desire to show off'¹¹⁵. Everything the actor does is a piece of art potentially imbued with the *feeling of beauty*. In order to achieve this Michael Chekhov gives the actor the following advice, 'Avoid all weakness, sweetness, and sentimentality in your movement and do not neglect the inner strength'¹¹⁶.

The *feeling of the whole* is the ability to experience an action and/or the body as a whole. Awareness of the whole body in action defines the notion of the feeling of the whole. The simple action of sitting down, standing up, or crossing the room from one end to the other needs to be grasped by the actor's body in time and in space as one whole thing. The task of sitting down and standing up will be experienced and felt differently as a whole by the actor if the actor stands to open the door or if the actor stands to rush because she/he is late for work. Moving into the sense of the *whole* means that although the actor knows what he/she is going to do and knows his/her objective, the actor acts in readiness, being present all the way and has a sense of definite beginning, middle and definite ending. The actor knows when the action begins and when it ends. At the same time, the actor can fully experience the whole process as a journey without anticipation and preconceptions although he/she already knows the destination from the very beginning. It could be said that the sense of the whole pulls each step of the action towards itself and only the actor knows when it is being completed. As we shall see in the next section, the idea of the *feeling of the whole* seems to be the unified, organized field of action that is perceived and felt by the actor's body as more than the sum of its parts, as a *Gestalt*. Michael Chekhov would say, 'What will be seen in the end needs to be present

¹¹⁴ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 17.

¹¹⁵ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, pp. 55-56.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

in the beginning, and the beginning be present in the end. Each piece is taken out reflects the whole'¹¹⁷. The *feeling of ease, beauty and form* are part of the *feeling of the whole*. All are an integral part in the actor's creative work. It takes time for the actor to be able to fully incorporate these techniques which enhance the actor's awareness of the body as a new body that can improve acting as an art.

b) Staccato –Legato

Staccato-legato is another foundational exercise in Michael Chekhov's training. Michael Chekhov himself started all his sessions with this exercise. *Staccato-legato* is considered by Michael Chekhov practitioners to include all the principles of his techniques. Lenard Petit states that 'I have come to believe that the whole Chekhov technique is in this one exercise'¹¹⁸.

Staccato-legato trains the actor's body to take on two different/opposite qualities of movement¹¹⁹. The exercise consists of six directions of right, left, up, down, forward, back. *Staccato* is a sharp, brisk, quick physical movement, and the feeling of this quality or tempo is as if you are throwing something out as far as you can. *Legato* is a more delicate, smooth, light, and seamless physical movement, and the feeling is as if you are pouring out in space. In a *legato* movement or tempo everything flows out, streams out of the body in space. The feeling is that you are going out and out in space as if there is a river in the body and streams out through the arms, fingers and keeps pouring out.

The basic principles of this technique are:

¹¹⁷ L. Petit, *The Michael Chekhov Handbook For the Actor*, p. 27.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

¹¹⁹ A detailed description of the exercise staccato-legato activity see: Petit, *The Michael Chekhov Handbook*, pp. 39-40; Ashperger, *The Rhythm of Space*, pp. 311-312; D. Zinder, *BodyVoice Imagination Image: Image Work Training and the Chekhov Technique* (Oxon: Routledge, 2009), p. 48.

a) The actor learns to stay open and to listen attentively to the inward changes inside the body when the impulse comes (from *staccato* to *legato* and vice versa). The actor pays attention to the inner aspect and/or change of the movement and to the sensation it arouses in the body and the mind. Inwardly, the actor is alert and when the movement starts or the tempo/quality changes the actor follows it. The actor learns by practicing this exercise to attune the body to let the movement through. For Michael Chekhov, the importance of staccato-legato is that the actor learns 'to be able to change immediately from one kind of existence to another both in movement and speech'¹²⁰.

b) Staccato-legato awakens the actor's body in the sense that it is opening the space. The actor's body becomes aware that it can go into the space beyond the boundaries of its physical form. The body is understood to extend further than it can possibly reach in space. The actor is assumed to be here but at the same time still out/there. According to Michael Chekhov 'not only is the physical body important in this exercise, but the imaginary things around and out of us are even more important'¹²¹.

c) With staccato-legato the actor practices working with the whole/full body. The body is unified from the top of the head all the way down to the soles of the feet, through the arms, hands, fingers and in that sense the body moves as a unit. The whole body is involved in the movement-action as is the breath sound and voice. Through staccato-legato the actor learns to pay particular attention to the lower part of the body since it supports and balances the action-movement.

d) Whenever the actor's body is directed to the right, left, up, down, forward and back, the actor learns to send out a flow of energy either in a staccato or legato quality. Every movement radiates into the outer space. By moving in any direction, the actor is not just putting the arms out but one's whole being and soul are going out. To send out energy means that energy is running all through the body and the actor is radiating that energy outward. Staccato-

¹²⁰ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 135.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

legato exercise familiarizes the actor with the principle of radiation. The actor practices radiating the sensation, i.e. how to sustain it and how this is related to inner action or movement. When the actor does the final circle of the sequence—not physically but internally-- the actor learns to practice one of the most fundamental principles in Michael Chekhov's practice, how to move (inwardly) without actually (physically) moving. The actor begins to psycho-physically understand what the body is doing when radiating.

e) When the actor practices the staccato-legato exercise after the completion of each sequence the actor's body goes back to home or neutral position. The body learns to listen to its inner experience preparing itself in a state which is not a freeze. Although the body knows what it wants to do next, it is available and open as if it is the beginning of another movement phrase and as it is the first time. David Zinder names this moment in the staccato-legato exercise and in acting practice *the zero point*. Zinder considers this as a fundamental concept in the actor's training. He writes that it is a 'potential packed moment between each stretch [...] Between moves in any direction there is a still point that is neither a remnant of the previous moment nor a preview of things to come, but a moment on its own, a gathering of energies – a "Zero Point"'¹²².

f) With staccato-legato the actor learns to work with polarities of movement and develops awareness of space. Polarity is ending the movement-gesture in the opposite direction/place that the movement started. Staccato-legato trains the actor to work with polarities of levels up/above-down/below, forward/in front-back/behind, right-left. This technique investigates the interplay of opposite dynamics principle that empowers the actor's movement.

g) Staccato-legato introduces the *ideal centre* and thus the actor gets acquainted with this principle. For Michael Chekhov the *ideal imaginary centre* 'from which flows the actual impulses for all movements'¹²³ is in the chest heart feeling centre. The actor imagines, thinks that every movement starts from there and the impulse comes from there. He mentions that the ideal centre is a

¹²² D. Zinder, *Body Voice Imagination Image*, p. 51.

¹²³ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 7; Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 44.

‘source of inner activity and *power* within the actor’s body¹²⁴ that ‘makes the actor strong, light and free’¹²⁵.

‘Staccato-legato’ movement investigates the interplay of different tempo and dynamics and might become a powerful tool to express faculties of psychophysical awareness that attunes the actor’s body to non naturalistic non everyday movement but ‘into a movement exploration that allows the actor to experience their archetypal qualities’¹²⁶.

c) The Four Qualities of Movement: Molding, Floating, Flying, Radiating

The *feeling of ease, form, beauty*, the *feeling of the whole* and the *staccato-legato* exercise prepare the actor’s body to incorporate the *Four Qualities of Movement* of *molding, floating, flying, radiating*. The four qualities of movement correspond to earth, water, air, fire/light respectively, and can stimulate and increase the dynamics of the actor’s physicality, expression and understanding.

Molding is a quality of movement appropriate to sculpting. The actor imagines that the air around the body is thick as malleable clay. This means that the substance in the air around the body offers resistance that requires more of the actor’s body to move through it. The actor moves single parts of the body, feet, heel, hips, knee, abdomen, hands, by carving/shaping forms into the space. While molding, the feet need to be rooted into the ground in order for the actor to be able to engage the lower part of the body to support the upper half and experience full-bodied movement. *Molding* requires the actor to be very active inwardly while the actor is moving and creating shapes as if the body is leaving an imprint in the space. The activity of *molding* needs awareness and attention to always open up the back space, right and left, and above the head space, so the body can be available to move randomly any direction it wants, through a

¹²⁴ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 7.

¹²⁵ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 153.

¹²⁶ D. Langman, *The Art of Acting, Body - Soul - Spirit - Word: A Practical and Spiritual Guide*, (Forest Row: Temple Lodge Publishing, 2014), p. 106; This presupposes that the actor detaches staccato-legato from the naturalistic details and expresses the archetypal quality full-bodily. Archetypal movement/gesture is further explored in the Psychological Gesture section.

very heavy and thick substance. *Molding* movement relates the body to the earth underneath and although the feeling is of being made of a steady, heavy substance, the actor needs to keep a sense of ease and lightness throughout.

Floating quality is related to water element. The actor imagines that the space around his/her body is liquid. In full-bodied *floating* the feeling is as if the lower part of the body is anchored at the bottom of the sea, as if the body is a seaweed, and the upper part of the body experiences a tremendous sense of freedom and ease. Moving with the quality of *floating* is effortless. It is as if drifting along. The actor allows the body to be carried by the power of the movement the water has and the different ways water can behave. In an exercise on *floating* (or *flowing*) Franc Chamberlain writes: 'there is a sense of the rhythm of waves swelling, breaking and subsiding'¹²⁷. In *floating* there is no resistance of the body at all. The feeling, the energy of this quality of movement, is completely the opposite of *molding*. In the activity of *floating* the actor gives him/herself over to the water. The actor experiences a sense of upward movement, a quality of calmness and a fluid feeling of buoyancy.

Flying quality is related to air. The actor imagines that the space inside and outside and around his/her body is filled with air. The actor imagines, feels that his/her bones are hollow. The tendency of the body is that it hardly touches the ground, that the body can lift itself from the ground. The body can take off and can fly into the space like a bird. *Flying* movement is dancing in the air. The actor feels senses that the body has overcome gravity and the weight of that body. Michael Chekhov explains that 'the element of air, in this exercise, must be experienced as one that stirs and urges'¹²⁸.

Radiating is related to light and/or fire. In *radiating* the actor imagines that one is flying right into the sun, has merged with the sun, and has become a body of light -- the sun itself. The actor imagines the image of the sun in the chest, that invisible rays stream out from all parts of his/her body. The space around is filled with light. *Radiating* an inner invisible movement precedes the actual

¹²⁷ F. Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov. Routledge Performance Practitioners* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 130.

¹²⁸ M. Chekhov, *To the Technique of Acting*, p.46.

visible movement of the body. The feeling is that the body goes beyond the boundaries of its physical form. Every limb of the body the actor imagines, feels is a ray of the sun - streams of light run through the chest, legs, toes, arms, palms, fingers, and pour out of the actor's body who sends them out in the direction of the chosen movement. If the actor imagines that he/she has become the rays of the sun, the burning flames, this will increase the density and intensity of the movement. Without the need to force it, the feeling is that the body is glowing out of light and is giving out energy. Radiating is the feeling of an endless source of energy that renews itself all the time. The actor can experience the body as spreading out an extraordinary energy-radiation. Michael Chekhov writes that 'if you sincerely and convincingly imagine that you are sending out rays, the imagination will gradually and faithfully lead you to the real and actual process of radiating [...] In fact, there is nothing within the sphere of our psychology which cannot thus be radiated'¹²⁹.

The importance of *molding*, *floating*, *flying* and *radiating* movements is that they introduce the elements of earth, water, air, fire/light, and bring quality into the actor's Psychological Gesture. The actor by working with the dynamics of *molding*, *floating*, *flying* and *radiating* allows his/her body to experience and incorporate archetypal elements that constitute a psychophysical 'living-lived' structure. These four elements of earth, water, air, fire/light, are archetypal, universal principles. They can establish the physical universe of the body of the actor. They are states of being that can be described as both the microcosm and macrocosm of the actor's self¹³⁰. It might be argued that this confirms, how in Michael Chekhov's practice, there is a deep and intimate connection of the body to 'cosmic forces' or energy which is absolutely connected to the ability of the actor to alter space. This interaction of body and space seems to transform the body of the actor to a 'cosmic body' that energetically can take the actor to higher levels of experience and provide his/her work with creative inspiration and knowledge. Leonard Petit writes that Michael Chekhov's technique is

¹²⁹ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 12; p. 13.

¹³⁰ D. Langman, *The Art of Acting*, p. 57.

'conceived around archetypal energies and the only way the actor can successfully engage with them is energetically'¹³¹.

Collectively *molding, floating, flying, radiating*, train the actor to become aware of the body as 'a mediator of sensation'¹³². The actor's body reflects qualities of movement which project/radiate inner states into space and energize the space through the relevant activity. When the actor practices Psychological Gesture, *molding, floating, flying, radiating*, are experienced and explored as awareness of powerful qualities of energy that thrust the actor's feelings, emotions, desires and thoughts as well. In Psychological Gesture the actor uses these four images of movement as a physical / physiological tool in order to explore and express in movement how the energy system of the other's body (character) behaves, moves physically, psychologically, emotionally.

Michael Chekhov stresses that the physical and the psychological influence each other, are in constant interplay, and the actor must strive for a well-developed body that will be able to attain a complete harmony between the two, body and mind. This certainly does not simply require only physical training or physical skills, but also a well-developed awareness that can mould and recreate the body from the *inside*, according to Michael Chekhov.

The description of the above exercises does not reflect how imagination/mind (psycho) is tied to corporeal process (physical) and can creatively transform the actor's experience of perception; it does not show how the psycho and the physical depend on unconscious cognitive processes; how mental and physical are integrated and treated as ways of thinking of the same body. These issues will be explored in the following chapters.

All the concepts and exercises in this section describe a foundational component in Michael Chekhov's technique that formed a major part of my practical research and were applied to the exploration of post dramatic texts. They were all utilized in my practical projects as a means of awakening the actor's body/mind, of appealing to the actor's creativity. These psychophysical

¹³¹ L. Petit, *The Michael Chekhov Handbook*, p.7.

¹³² D. Langman, *The Art of Acting*, p. 55.

exercises summarize the method we followed in the training-rehearsal process to help actors enter a world that would free imagination from intellect and reasoning and prepare them to work in a way that were no longer a subjective expression of the ego-self and of the everyday personal body. Through these training-exercises the actors learnt to work consciously on themselves and perceive themselves in an objective way. In this way the actors were trained to be able to invoke, acknowledge and work from the principles of objectivity, *divided consciousness*, and the 'Higher Ego', and in turn stimulate and strengthen their creativity; in other words, to be able to transcend the everyday, the mundane.

Michael Chekhov's principles and exercises, the Psychological Gesture included, became the means to lead the actors from the dramatic texts ('Obituary', *Medea-Material*, and *Manhattan Medea*) from which they drew all information regarding their gestures to the unconscious, i.e. the source of their inspiration and a way to access the archetypal world of universal images. In my practical research, Michael Chekhov's technique 'functioned as a dramaturgy of affect'¹³³ for these texts. The technique was chosen to explore the post-dramatic texts through the staging of the absence of logos to convey meaning, the rhythmical staging of the actor's visceral experience, the non-intellectual involvement that evokes the senses in creating the actor's performance score; the demanding psychophysical acting requirements of post-dramatic theatre texts that "engage with the physiology and neurology of the human body as a receiver of outside stimuli"¹³⁴ were creatively explored through Michael Chekhov's psychophysical training.

1.7 Psychological Gesture

The Psychological Gesture is considered the most important technique in Michael Chekhov's practice and one of the most creative performative tools in

¹³³ Y. Meerzon, 'Staging the Spectator', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 125.

¹³⁴ Y. Meerzon, 'Staging the Spectator', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 124-125.

actor training that explores imagination and movement in the actor's experience. Mala Powers says that 'Imaginary Centre and Psychological Gesture are two of Michael Chekhov's innovative techniques for embodying the essence of a character'¹³⁵. Franc Chamberlain writes that Psychological Gesture 'is perhaps Chekhov's single most original contribution to twentieth century actor training'¹³⁶.

The principle ideas behind Psychological Gesture were inspired by three different experiences with three different directors after which Michael Chekhov could explore and act his part(s) without difficulty and in depth. All took place before Michael Chekhov knew of the Psychological Gesture and the archetypes¹³⁷. The first was when he was working upon a part with Vakhtangov (Strindberg's *Erik XIV*). Vakhtangov in his effort to illuminate difficulties concerning Michael Chekhov's part made a gesture with his whole body: a 'strong, painfully passionate movement, as though trying to break an invisible wall before him or to pierce a magic circle'¹³⁸. The second was when Michael Chekhov was rehearsing with Stanislavsky (Gogol's *The Inspector General*). Stanislavsky wanted to depict the psychology of the character and suddenly made a 'lightning quick movement with his arms and hands, as if throwing them up and at the same time vibrating with his fingers, elbows and even his shoulders'¹³⁹. The third was when Fyodor Chaliapin, who was described by Michael Chekhov as a tall, big man, wanted to explain to him how he could become a small tiny figure. Chaliapin made a movement, a gesture with his whole body and Michael Chekhov 'saw before him for a moment a tiny little man with a small, thin body'¹⁴⁰. Michael Chekhov later discovered that these three experiences drove him to a significant acting concept when he found what these movements gestures meant in practice. These principles deeply

¹³⁵ In M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. xxv.

¹³⁶ F. Chamberlain, 'Michael Chekhov on the Technique of Acting', p. 72.

¹³⁷ M. Chekhov, 'Chekhov on Acting', p. 71.

¹³⁸ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 89.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

influenced the development of his later work and 'By 1938, the concept was fully developed and was part of the teaching classes at Dartington'¹⁴¹.

Michael Chekhov suggests that one way to approach the concept of Psychological Gesture is through language. He observes that language 'betrays all the gestures which the human soul does'¹⁴² and very often is used to describe psychological processes in our everyday life. For example, idiomatic expressions which we use in order to describe inner complicated or psychological states such as "to grasp an idea" or "to draw a conclusion" or "to touch upon a problem" or "to fall into a despair" or "to break connections", reflect physical activity and gesturing¹⁴³. Michael Chekhov states imagined gestures which are implicit in our everyday speech, but not actually produced, reveal a tendency that stirs a sense of an (inner) invisible movement similar to the act of doing physical gestures. He explains that although the area of activity is different, one is in the mind and the other is the physical action of grasping, breaking, we "grasp" the idea in our imagination in the same way as we grasp the physical object¹⁴⁴. For this reason Michael Chekhov asks us to consider the following: 'What does one do inwardly while uttering such expressions as these?'¹⁴⁵ What kind of grasping, breaking or drawing takes place when we say these expressions? He wants us to draw our attention to the fact that we physically produce these gestures. There is a desire within the body to make an invisible movement or a gesture inwardly in the same manner as the body would do it outwardly. This inner-outer relation helps us understand and experience things more efficiently about how we feel (our psychology) and/or about acting than if we tried to think things out.

Michael Chekhov also eliminates the leading role of the intellect in the actor's practice and prioritizes phenomenological modes of working by use of the technique of the Psychological Gesture. As he explains, 'by creating the gesture the actor is exploring the part deeper and deeper and does not let the

¹⁴¹ J. Pitches, *Science and the Stanislavsky Tradition of Acting* (London: Routledge, 2006), p.156.

¹⁴² M. Chekhov, 'Chekhov on Acting', p.107.

¹⁴³ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, pp. 58-59.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

intellect play the first violin'¹⁴⁶. His argument is that apart from the actual, physical gestures which the physical visible body produces, powerful imagined invisible gestures are performed by the invisible phenomenal body (other) that connects the actor to sensations, thoughts, and feelings and to a specific and analogous desire that can change the psychology of the actor.

Michael Chekhov describes Psychological Gesture as a 'combination of thoughts (or Images), feelings, and will-impulses'¹⁴⁷ that offer a means of exploring and embodying the inner state of the other (character) through the physicality of a movement. By means of Psychological Gesture the actor reacts to what is going on within in the present time right now and works with the real time *event* or with an inner event that is happening within. In that sense, by responding to the image of the gesture, the actor responds to the inner life created by the gesture and to the feeling of the physical sensation of the gesture that stimulates the thoughts, feelings, emotions, appropriate for performing the action. This connection between physicality and psychology affects and attunes the entire body/mind and awakens a sense of harmony between outer and inner gesture, outer and inner body, self and other. Through this holistic process which Michael Chekhov names 'organic', the actor gradually becomes what he considers 'the character'¹⁴⁸.

1.7.1 Everyday (usual) gesture

If we take a gesture and we do it physically then do it inwardly in our imagination without physically moving this gesture continues on, resonates, and makes changes in us. Michael Chekhov explains that when we drop the physical gesture this 'gesture becomes a certain "psychology" and this is what we want'¹⁴⁹. Simply put, when a child wants to embrace the mother who is too far away inwardly the child would perform a gesture in order to reach out to the mother. In other words, a gesture is a psychology and this is what makes a gesture a Psychological Gesture. Michael Chekhov clarifies that the definition

¹⁴⁶ M. Chekhov, 'Chekhov on Acting', p. 65.

¹⁴⁷ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 59.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

¹⁴⁹ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 133

of the term Psychological Gesture means ‘the gesture together with the feelings connected to it. This term applies to visible (actual) gestures as well as to invisible (potential) gestures’¹⁵⁰.

Joanna Merlin in the section on Psychological Gesture from the Master Class DVD begins her session with Michael Chekhov’s statement that “behind everything we do or say there is a movement, there is a gesture.” Merlin demonstrates Michael Chekhov’s statement with the following example. While talking to a group of actors, Merlin is making a small opening gesture with both hands and palms out toward the actors, and at the same time explains that her gesture suggests that she as a teacher is giving by sending them her knowledge. By directing the attention of the actors to their own response to her gesture, the actors make gestures of pulling in and say that they are receiving and are drawing in what has been offered to them. The examples of the child’s gesture, Merlin’s and the actors’ gestures, are the usual gestures we all do in our everyday life.

1.7.2 Archetypal Gesture

According to Michael Chekhov there are two kinds of gestures: a) the natural (usual) everyday gesture the actor uses in daily life and in performance space and b) the archetypal gesture that serves as the original model, typical example, after which other similar or possible gestures are patterned¹⁵¹. The Psychological Gesture belongs to the archetypal gesture. If the actor sees the gesture, the actor will be able to see the image which embraces all¹⁵².

The archetypal gesture is an actual powerful force, the prototype from which all types of gestures derive. It has a recognizable form that signifies concepts, meanings that can be identifiable by everyone because it is the crystallization of an impulse. A great source of energy, a sort of vibration that is the will force of

¹⁵⁰ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 60.

¹⁵¹ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 70.

¹⁵² M. Chekhov, ‘Chekhov on Acting’, p. 67.

an action (the character). 'The archetypal gesture is the energy behind the sum total of the actor's deeds'¹⁵³.

The archetypal gesture is complex in its structure, in the way it arranges the actor's body and mind. The archetypal gesture *takes possession* of the body. It operates as a multi-functional tool that gives inspiration whereas the everyday gesture is too limited, too personal, too specific, to be able somehow to have the whole body of the actor active and encompass his/her whole being completely.

The archetypal gesture embodies in a physical energetic 'condensed form'¹⁵⁴ each action (the objective) in a gesture which expresses the other (character) who wants to achieve the action. A relationship, a scene, a monologue, an atmosphere, a moment or the whole play, all these, can be a gesture and can be turned into the actor's language which for Michael Chekhov is always gestural. This condensation of the essence of the action of the 'invisible' other (character) into a single fully developed and performed visible gesture-movement is what makes the Psychological Gesture archetypal.

a) Psychological Gesture: Conditions and Principles

The Psychological Gesture is made and explored in the rehearsal process. The actor is not expected to have done any particular intellectual preparation and analysis or to have come to significant conclusions about psychological or social factors about the text, the other (character), or the action of a scene. This would be against what Michael Chekhov thinks about how the actor should begin to work on Psychological Gesture. For Michael Chekhov in the process of investigating the Psychological Gesture, the actor's creative *Higher Ego* self is stronger than his/her controlling mind and dry intellectual content that tries to dominate the free physical expression of the actor's body.

¹⁵³ C. Ashperger, *The Rhythm of Space*, p. 251.

¹⁵⁴ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 68.

The right image or Psychological Gesture is created from the actor's impulsive response to what the other's (character) 'main desire might be'¹⁵⁵. This might happen as soon as the actor reads the text or it might take some time to cultivate imagination by asking leading questions to the other (character). The actor's body then responds before verbalizing the answers.

The Psychological Gesture is initially external and physically represents the *what* of the other (character). This is similar to Stanislavsky's idea of the objective which expresses the action. The actor focuses on the *what* and adds the individual psychophysical characteristics, the particular quality and tempo which is the *how* of the gesture. This would be one of the four qualities of movement: molding, floating, flying, radiating, with a feeling of staccato or legato. Michael Chekhov suggests that the actor needs to 'ask ...what the main *desire* of the character might be, and when you get an answer, even if it is only a hint, start to build your PG step by step, using at first your *hand* and *arm* only'¹⁵⁶.

The actor might spend some time experimenting and investigating different gestures until the moment the actor feels that what he/she has discovered through the physicality of the gesture is the spine of the action and is realized by the body as the driving-will force of the other (character). Once the Psychological Gesture has been decided it functions as a 'scaffolding'¹⁵⁷. The actor relies on it for the overall form of the gesture, but at the same time the actor must allow his/her body to make changes and work on adjustments as one goes along with it in the process, since specific placement of the body (parts), for example open hands and palms up or clenched and turned down, will change the actor's response.

The chosen gesture must involve the whole body. The actor must 'extend and adjust the gesture to shoulders, neck, the position of the head and torso, legs and feet'¹⁵⁸. The Psychological Gesture must be repeated with the appropriate

¹⁵⁵ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 67.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

intensity and tempo until it is fully embodied and effectively stimulates the actor for every moment. When this happens the actor feels that experiences a bodymind connection with the essence of the other (character). A connection that has captured the inner action in one image and has transformed intellectual knowledge into bodily knowledge (into breath, sound and voice)¹⁵⁹. The physicality of the gesture awakens the inner life of the other (character) in the actor and aligns the feelings and thoughts of the actor to that of the other (character). Michael Chekhov explains that the 'more the actor will do the Psychological Gesture, the more the actor will see that it suggests a certain kind of acting'¹⁶⁰.

Initially, the actor performs the Psychological Gesture outwardly physically. If the actor keeps rehearsing he/she will be able to coordinate movement and breath and sound and voice. Gradually the movement of the gesture informs the quality of the sound and when the actor adds, speaks a line/text, it informs the quality of the voice. The next step is to perform the gesture inwardly in the imagination only. The remembering of the (bodily) sensations of the Psychological Gesture fills the body of the actor with its kinesthetic awareness and maintains the energy of the gesture for every performance without performing the physical visible gesture.

The actor learns the text through psychophysical incorporation of the gesture without the text disrupting the physical expression of the actor's body (a usual phenomenon in acting). The actor comes to realize that text is movement-gesture and not meaning. In this way the written text becomes spoken. It is permeated with the inner life of the bodymind and imagination of the actor through the internalization of his/her Psychological Gesture. This process not only takes away the idea that theatre is literature, but clarifies in practice that

¹⁵⁹ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 62. Chekhov writes that the actor's knowledge is 'spread over his whole being. It lives in his hands, arms, torso, feet, legs and in his voice and feels capable of expressing it as an actor, but not as a critic or an analytic scientist.'

¹⁶⁰ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 133.

behind every line of a text there is an inner gesture which is 'the internalization of a large physical movement'¹⁶¹. In other words that all text is performative.

It has already been mentioned that it is absolutely necessary the actor to have properly and sufficiently practice moving with the *Four Brothers: the Feeling of Ease, Form, Beauty*, the *Feeling of the Whole*, with the Staccato-Legato movement, and with *the Four Qualities of Molding, Floating, Flying, Radiating* movements. All must be developed by the actor. These exercises function as a pre-performative training that awakens body and mind, develops the inner-outer connection that increases the impact of the gestures on the body. These exercises are also the building principles, the structural components of the Psychological Gesture. Michael Chekhov gives the actor the following family of archetypal gestures:

expand (opening gesture), contract (closing gesture), push, pull, tear, lift, throw, smash, twist/wring, embrace. Each of these gestures-movements creates different psychophysical sensations within the body and they can be seen to reflect specific states of mind and intentions of the body. For example, to push could correspond to dominate or to destroy, to embrace to unite or to protect, to twist or wring to manipulate or to seduce, to tear to punish or to break etc. According to Michael Chekhov the process of growth and development of the Psychological Gesture is a dynamic process that must meet the following propositions for the actor's action:

- The Psychological Gesture as an archetypal gesture in principle does not draw on personal experience and cannot stand for everyday behavior. Therefore it cannot be descriptive or naturalistic movement.
- The Psychological Gesture must be a simple large movement. This helps the actor to create an image of the inner gesture and to work with it inwardly and internalize it easier later in the process. The actor must move with the whole body and must use as much space around him/her as possible. The archetypal gesture must be a wide, big gesture that can be performed with the actor's sense of whole being; 'some

¹⁶¹ C, Ashperger, *The Rhythm of Space*, p. 239.

energy must go through the whole body and not only through the body, but around the body also¹⁶².

- In practice if the actor truly engages the bodymind, uses all of his/her body, intense streams of power come from the chest to the fingers and to the rest body.
- If the Psychological Gesture is done with the whole body and in full connection energetically, the actor is being fully committed to the activity that captures the essence which awakens the inner life of an archetypal movement and the *subtle* body by 'making the actor the possessor and master of its *unchangeable core*'¹⁶³; the subtle body 'allows the practitioner to make sense of the psycho-physiological effects of practice on his bodymind as practice reshapes the experience'¹⁶⁴.

Michael Chekhov explains the Psychological Gesture must be always a strong, distinct gesture, because 'the strength of the movement stirs our will to power in general'¹⁶⁵. For this reason it must be a clear, powerful movement that must be experienced to the fullest extreme and with a sense of intensity, but without muscular tension. A body that is blocked by tension indicates that gesture, breath and sound are out of balance. When there is tension the body loses connection to the vibrations of the gesture and is not able to master the subtleties of the gesture. To be aware of the vibrations the actor needs to be able to ensure that even the smallest movements reverberate energetically throughout his/her whole body/being¹⁶⁶. Otherwise the actor has difficulty in incorporating and using the image of the gesture that can take the actor into inspiration. This process takes time. The actor cannot overcome habitual behavior immediately and experiences a phase of dualism at the first stages of the training. The actor goes through a process of realization of internal blocks

¹⁶² M. Chekhov, *Lessons for Teachers*, p. 31: 'A non creative person will move each limb separately, as if it didn't belong to the whole body. Some energy must go through your whole body and not only through your body, but around the body also; M. Chekhov and Du Prey, *The Actor is the Theatre* February 22, 1938: 'Psychological gestures are ... concrete as the floor. One of the big mistakes is that we do not do the gesture with the full being, the whole being.'

¹⁶³ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 68;

¹⁶⁴ P. Zarrilli, *Psychophysical Acting: An Intercultural Approach after Stanislavsky* (New York: Routledge, 2009), p. 70.

¹⁶⁵ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 65.

¹⁶⁶ The psychological gesture must be done without tension or stiffness as Chekhov writes this needs to be dropped and 'let it be a pure psychological state' [M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 130].

within his/her energy system and learns to practice how these blocks can be adjusted through the integration of movement-gesture imagery and kinesthetic awareness. With practice the body of the actor is released from tension, is focused and present in the moment, and is able to open to the possibilities offered by the imagination. A body without tension allows 'inspiration to flow from the top and back down to the lowest part, generating the image's (gesture's) information throughout all of the body'¹⁶⁷.

The actor must have a deep awareness of clarity, control and precision of a definite form of the Psychological Gesture. In order for the actor to be deeply affected by the qualities of the movement and the awakening of the subtle powers of the body, the physical body needs to be developed through the skillful completion of the form of the Psychological Gesture. The clearer and more detailed the form of the Psychological Gesture, the clearer and more detailed the actor's response to it. That is to say, if 'each point in the actor's body is complete [...] fully and completely alive'¹⁶⁸ he/she can break through the critical self of the actor and can create an opening for imagination and inspiration that would allow the actor's creative *Higher Ego Self* to appear.

The Psychological Gesture must be explored through different speeds and directions. In essence the Psychological Gesture is manifested as an overall behavior or intention of the body that is directed in space. When creating the Psychological Gesture the actor 'captures an overall intention and translates it into a direction in space'¹⁶⁹. The body of the actor must be psychophysically sensitive to different speeds and tempo changes of the Psychological Gesture and be able to 'distinguish between inner and outer tempos'¹⁷⁰ and how it responds to it.

¹⁶⁷ P. Brane, Beyond Michael Chekhov Technique: Continuing the Exploration through the Mask,' in Bartow, A. (ed.) *Training of the American Actor* (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 2006), p. 107.

¹⁶⁸ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, p. 108.

¹⁶⁹ C. Ashperger, *The Rhythm of Space*, p.244.

¹⁷⁰ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 84.

1.8 Concluding Remarks

For Michael Chekhov, Psychological Gesture was a means to go beyond the everyday mundane body and self that would allow the actor to encounter non-personal experiences, the invisible other, and thus be able to express the spiritual content of an archetypal state. Michael Chekhov seemed to be aware that the split between the psycho and the physical is a pitfall that blocks the actor's creativity. His intention was to develop a practice that would overcome dualism in the acting process but due to a lack of the right terminology or language he was not able to express the complexities of embodiment in the actor's work. At times his writings show an inside-outside dichotomy that tacitly encourages dualism. Joanna Merlin states that 'in her forty years of teaching she has found that Psychological Gesture constantly unlocks a deep, rich primal core in the character; that it is remarkable that in his times Michael Chekhov understood that the body's intelligence was a source of creativity that went far beyond the limited capacity of the brain'¹⁷¹. Merlin uses a language that shows a binary concept that is similar to Michael Chekhov's. By giving priority to the 'intelligence of the body' and separating it from the mind and the brain, Merlin unconsciously promotes the dichotomy of body and mind, the division between the internal and external.

Recently, scholars and practitioners of the Michael Chekhov acting technique point to the gap in what is missing in his work. Monica Cristini mentions that Michael Chekhov 'does not always clearly explain the mechanism underlying the efficacy of some exercises nor does he indicate the source of inspiration for this kind of training except in his later writings'¹⁷². Rick Kemp writes that the 'metaphor of the self as a container is a central feature of the "internal-external" dichotomy (with thought inside and expression outside) and Michael Chekhov was not immune to this although he seemed to have an imaginative conception

¹⁷¹ J. Merlin, 'The Legacy of Michael Chekhov', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 390.

¹⁷² M. Cristini, 'Meditation and Imagination: The Contribution of Anthroposophy to Michael Chekhov's Acting Technique', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 70.

of the container'¹⁷³. John Lutterbie states that 'the metaphor of containment, of inside versus outside, are typical in theories of acting and differentiate physical expression from processes associated with emotion and analytical reason'¹⁷⁴. He explains that Michael Chekhov 'tacitly reproduces this binary, but uses the PG to overcome the mind/body dichotomy by asserting the interdependent relationship between physical action and emotional and cognitive responsiveness'¹⁷⁵.

The argument in this thesis is that implicit in Michael Chekhov's technique is the oneness of body and mind, the oneness of movement and imagination that are inseparable and exist in a mutual reciprocal relationship within the actor's gesture. In *The Technique of Acting* Michael Chekhov notes that 'the actor imagines with the body and cannot avoid gesturing or moving without responding to his/her own internal images'¹⁷⁶. Michael Chekhov was pointing towards something which is ripe for a contemporary philosophical analysis to further explore the inherent phenomenological principle of the actor's body as a 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' or 'affecting-affecte' structure that seems to be characteristic in his acting process. The thesis attempts to place Michael Chekhov's technique in the frame of phenomenology and cognitive sciences in order to analyze in-depth how these disciplines can provide a bridge between the internal and the external, the personal (self) and the non-personal (other), the conscious (explicit) and the unconscious (implicit/memory) in the actor's experience and perception.

Phenomenology and cognitive science can support the analysis that Michael Chekhov was not able to offer, i.e., a detailed examination of the ambiguous status of the body of the actor which involves reciprocity and interdependence of opposites, oneness of the subject-self and object-other, the 'in-between' space or 'third' element, the actor's body as a *Gestalt* structure. As Mala

¹⁷³ R. Kemp, *Embodied Acting: What Neuroscience Tells Us About Performance*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2012), p. 125, 127.

¹⁷⁴ J. Lutterbie, 'The Dynamics of Psychological Gesture', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 101.

¹⁷⁵ J. Lutterbie, *ibid.*, p. 101.

¹⁷⁶ M. Chekhov, *The Technique of Acting*, p. 95.

Powers says Michael Chekhov's model of inspired acting can be seen as a 'double-layered circular structure'¹⁷⁷ 'representing two closed systems, one within the other'. In other words, as we shall see later on, Michael Chekhov's technique 'is a circle'¹⁷⁸, a 'circular-circuit' structure, borrowing Yuasa's term, that overcomes all dichotomies by recognizing the interdependent relationship between action/movement, feeling/emotion and cognition. There is a circular interplay that is a relational intercorporeal structure between body and mind, self and other, that can support bodily resonance which consists of proprioceptive interoceptive feedback from the actor's body that needs to be integrated with other more cognitive information and processes. As a result the structure is not oppositional but a visceral connection, a joint affective state (where the actor's body extends onto the other's/character's and the other's /character's onto the actor's) that constantly modifies the actor's perception and consciousness; this affective state or consciousness arises from the 'in-between' space in which both self and other (character) are immersed.

¹⁷⁷ Mala Powers in M. Chekhov, *The Technique of Acting*, p. xxxvi.

¹⁷⁸ M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon, 'Introduction. Michael Chekhov: actor, director, pedagogue', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London/New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 11.

Chapter 2: Kitaro Nishida's "Acting Intuition" and Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture

Introduction

This chapter examines Japanese philosopher Kitaro Nishida's concepts of "pure experience", "acting-intuition" and "*basho* as absolute nothingness" before applying this analysis to elements of Michael Chekhov's acting processes (as introduced in Chapter 1). I explore Nishida's philosophy of "pure experience" "acting-intuition" and "*basho* of absolute nothingness" as 'optimal' modes of being/doing in Michael Chekhov's work. More specifically, I take these terms as principles that can be applied in the practice of Psychological Gesture and I investigate how they might be used as practical tools that can be applied to the actor's work.

I then discuss Nishida's philosophy of the body from the perspective of what he calls "acting-intuition" through breath, rhythm and ritual in Michael Chekhov. I explore how the unity of breath and body, the unity of body and rhythm and the unity of body and ritual are principles which are inextricably linked to fully embody Psychological Gesture and can also be considered as practical tools for actualizing the 'optimal' state of "acting intuition". (See Appendix 3 for Nishida's biography)

2.1. Pure Experience (Direct Experience)

Nishida developed a systematic philosophy of "pure experience" by drawing together Western thought and Zen Buddhism. He borrowed the term "pure experience" from William James, but changed its meaning significantly because it felt "too psychologistic"¹. Nishida was interested in James' articles which were later included in *Essays Radical Empiricism* as early as 1905. In 1910 he wrote, "These days I have been reading the recently published articles of James. I find

¹G. Kopf, 'Critical Comments on Nishida's Use of Chinese Buddhism,' *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 32,2 (2005), p. 327.

them interesting. They seem to bear clear resemblance to Zen'². Nishida encountered James' philosophy under Buddhist illumination. For Nishida, James' notion of "pure experience" denotes "direct experience". The term was attractive to Nishida because of its unifying function or consciousness that seemed to be aligned with the practitioner's experience of Zen meditation. "Pure experience" featured the unity of subjectivity and objectivity. It indicates an 'optimal' mode of primordial consciousness with a unitive structure prior to the subject-object distinction and prior to cognitive reflection. "Pure experience" appears to 'signify a version of Buddhist "no-mind", a particular way of relating to experience'³.

"Pure experience" does not apply to a certain theory. Rather it is part of a form of embodiment that challenges classical substantial conceptions of disembodied self and the dualisms generated by these models. In his notes on psychology, Nishida observed that the relationship between the mind and the body, the traditional theories of materialism, spiritualism and dualism all failed to explain what is actually a living experience⁴. From Nishida's perspective "pure experience" is an unmediated and immediately realized experience⁵. The body, the self, the world and the things in it are experienced equally. The distinctions between mind and body, between the internal and external world not only are weakened but they disappear⁶. The body, the self and things and the world form one reality and are 'one world, one scene'⁷. This 'optimal' moment of being/doing the self is nothing other than the 'unity of concrete consciousness'⁸ and the self exists in a material or physical form. This is the culminating moment in the unification process⁹. To Nishida there is no consciousness of the self as such¹⁰. If the unity of the experience changes then

² In N. Kazashi, 'The World Becomes the Self's Body: James, Merleau-Ponty and Nishida', [Online], Available: <http://www.bu.edu/wcp/PaidArch.html>. www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Comp/CompKaza-htm-29-1999-0524 [25 Sep 2009].

³ A. Feenberg, 'The Problem of Modernity in the Philosophy of Nishida', in J. Heisig and J. Maraldo, (eds.) *Rude Awakenings: Zen, the Kyoto School and the Question of Nationalism*, (Hawaii, University of Hawaii, 1995), p.156.

⁴ M. Yusa, *Zen and Philosophy: An Intellectual Biography of Nishida Kitaro*, (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press 2002), p. 96.

⁵ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 9.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

⁸ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 6.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 151.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

the self changes as well. He writes, 'It is not that this unity arises because of such consciousness but that such consciousness arises because of the unity. The unity itself cannot become the object of knowledge; [the self] can become it and function but cannot know it'¹¹.

Nishida claims that meaning and judgments remain within the confines of the consciousness of past experiences which overshadow the content and the quality of the self's experiences of present consciousness because they are always lacking richness when compared to the original ones¹². For example, when one wants to form an objective opinion about a taste or a color, this decision has been influenced and limited by similar sensations of the same taste or color in the past which, has already established relationship with the present sensation¹³ and does not leave space for 'purity' in the meaning of the experience of the sensation in the present moment (this is usual in the acting process).

All distinctions are external factors that disturb the natural course of the experience and cause discontinuity that interrupts the unity of the experience¹⁴. Distinctions break apart the experience and the activity of the experience 'crumbles away'¹⁵. The self in its attempt to place the experience within a more personal sphere or scope familiarizes and explains the experience by adding what it already knows and feels comfortable with¹⁶. "Pure experience" is a concrete unifying experience in which there is no filter on the experience: no distinction between the experience as it is experienced and that which is being experienced. Nishida writes that 'what we usually mean by "experience" when we say that we have experienced something does not really refer to the state of experience as such, because in speaking of our experiences we are usually thinking in terms of a certain entity called an experiencing self'¹⁷. For Nishida, the highest form of knowing is when there is no distinction between knower and

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

¹² Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 8-9.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 8-9.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28. Nishida gives the example of the actuality of drinking tea and the moment a consciousness that tries to taste the flavour arises and becomes central.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9 and p. 16.

¹⁶ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 102.

¹⁷ Keiji Nishitani, *Nishida Kitaro*, p. 54.

the thing known. When the knower and the knowing are united. “This ‘optimal’ mode of awareness of the body (self) transcends distinctions and maintains a strict unity between knowledge and practice. Nishida states that ‘pure knowing possesses practical meaning’ as well as ‘there is neither pure knowledge nor pure feeling’¹⁸. In short, the relation between self and the world, body and the world, between subject-self and object-other is the relation between the unity of the experience of the body, the self and its content.

Matao Noda explains that “pureness” of “pure experience” means ultimately to be free from egocentricity¹⁹. The possibility of actually realizing “pure experience” is when the self finds itself in an ego-less state of openness. The self emptied of the prior usual self is devoid of content and thus meaning. Within this state of openness and readiness the body can actively engage the environment. Nishida talks about fundamentally a “trans-individual” process²⁰ where whatever the body does “it can be called the work of the “not I”²¹ perspective.

Disengaged from the ego/I²² perspective, the body moves away from ordinary daily empirical existence and ‘submerges in the thing’²³. The body of the self becomes fully absorbed in present activity which is identical to the action of the thing. As a result the self, the body and the thing (other) merge together in complete harmony and agreement²⁴. To know a thing means that the self, the body becomes the thing (other). According to Nishida, ‘When one sees a flower, the self has become the flower. To investigate a flower and elucidate its basic nature means to discard all of the self’s subjective conjectures and thereby unite with the basic nature of the flower²⁵. ‘We can know the true nature of something only when we thoroughly eliminate our own delusions and

¹⁸ *An Inquiry into the Good* p. 22 and p. 145.

¹⁹ M. Noda, ‘East-West Synthesis in Kitaro Nishida’, *Philosophy East and West*, 4.4 (1955), p. 347.

²⁰ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 160.

²¹ J.W. Heisig, *Philosophers of Nothingness: An Essay on the Kyoto School*, (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2001) p. 51

²² Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 145, p. 151, p. 160 and p. 174.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 77

conjectures - that is, idiosyncratic subjective factors - and thereby unite with the true nature; in other words, this is possible only when we unite with pure objectivity'²⁶.

“Pure experience” is an ongoing process of constant development²⁷ which allows self and body to be at all times open to infinite possibilities. It is an ‘experience of the present goings-on’²⁸. Self and body are constantly in a process of transition -- of ‘*becoming*’ and the experience is ‘knowing by becoming’²⁹. In “pure experience” notions like individual, time, and space go beyond their conventional meaning³⁰. Space and time are nothing more than empty forms that unify the experience of both self and body according to content³¹. The self functions in a particular place, space and time under a particular set of conditions in the *here* and *now* and the body is the locus, ‘the place where experience occurs’³². In other words, self and body are constituted in the flux of temporal and relational interaction that is always embedded within a particular environment and context of activity in the ‘here and now’ immersed in a mode of non-dual engagement with the environment (world).

Knowing occurs as the result of the immediacy of the experience³³. ‘Facts, the knowledge of facts, and the actual presence of the self all become immediately one in experience’³⁴. The body functions as a spontaneous dynamic unity within a constant process of transformation and emerges as an “event”³⁵. It is permanently re-writing and re-structuring itself. It is permanently under erasure and not available to representational or rational judgments and thinking.

In the ‘optimal’ mode of “pure experience” body and self are always in the actual world of the present and the decisions they make are always followed by

²⁶ *An Inquiry into the Good.*, p. 173 and p. 77.

²⁷ Nishida, *Ibid*, p.18.

²⁸ Yusa, *Zen and Philosophy*, p. 97.

²⁹ Heisig, *Philosophers of Nothingness*, p. 55.

³⁰ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p.159.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18-19.

³² Carter, *The Nothingness Beyond God*, p.14.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³⁴ Keiji Nishitani, *Nishida Kitaro*, p. 96.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good* p. 7 and p. 54.

action³⁶, i.e. self and body are always relational. Throughout his work Nishida emphasizes the ‘subject object dualism in the immediacy of action’³⁷. The unity of subjectivity and objectivity, the unity of knowledge and action. For Nishida ‘knowing is action, action is knowing’³⁸. Nishida sums up the notion of “pure experience” as follows,

To experience, means to know facts just as they are, to know in accordance with facts by completely relinquishing one’s own fabrications. What we usually refer to as experience is adulterated with some sort of thought, so by pure I am referring to the state of experience just as it is without the least addition of deliberate discrimination. The moment of seeing a color or hearing a sound, for example, is prior not only to the thought that the color or sound is the activity of an external object or that one is sensing it, but also to the judgment of what the color or sound might be. In this regard, pure experience is identical with direct experience. When one directly experiences one’s own state of consciousness, there is not yet a subject or an object, and knowing and its object are completely unified. This is the most refined type of experience....A truly pure experience has no meaning whatsoever; it is simply a present consciousness of facts just as they are.³⁹

“Pure experience” precedes the differentiation into subject-self experiencing and object-other experienced. All cognitive activities as thinking, judging, willing, intuition, are derivative forms of “pure experience” that can manifest it as long as these activities are in action, when they are going on in the present moment. According to Nishida, “pure experience” is to ‘become purely objective or selfless’⁴⁰; this is similar to Michael Chekhov’s concept of ‘objectivity’, to merge with the other the object of attention. “Pure experience” advances the

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 26 and p. 16.

³⁷ Dilworth, ‘The Initial Formations’, p. 100.

³⁸ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 161.

³⁹ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, pp. 1-2; Dilworth writes that this opening paragraph of Nishida’s *A Study of Good or An Inquiry into the Good* has probably been the most often read paragraph of modern Japanese philosophy in the past half of 20th century (Dilworth, ‘Initial Formations’, p. 96).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

dynamic process of reality that differentiates into subjective and objective phenomena to a higher consciousness of unity that involves seeing the body and self from the perspective of the world, the other. “Pure experience” is a mode of consciousness and awareness similar to what Merleau-Ponty defines the phenomenology of the *lived body*, the *flesh* of the *Gestalt*, as we shall see in Chapter 3.

2.1.1 Pure Experience and Perception

Nishida’s descriptions of the unity of “pure experience” as ‘an interdependent, self-sufficient, pure activity’⁴¹ implies a particular type of perception. Although Nishida never analyzes it to elaborate what this type of perception involves, I believe that its principles or structure can be very enlightening for the work of the actor in psychophysical acting processes in terms of focus attention and concentration. Nishida writes,

The sphere of pure experience is not limited to a single focus of attention. Without adding the least bit of thought, we can shift our attention within the state where subject and object have not yet separated.⁴²

What Nishida describes here, is an area of activity which is not limited to a single focus of attention. Nishida talks about a multi-focused attentiveness within experience - an experience that consists of interconnected parts. The self moves from one position to another, from one context to another and changes the emphasis direction or focus of attention without losing the unity of internal and external reality as a whole. Nishida talks about an experience in which the whole is perceived and actualized at once at first glance. This type of perception, according to Nishida, serves as a foundation and develops into a systematic form and ‘optimal mode of consciousness which always appears as in the following example.

⁴¹ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 47.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

When we think we have perceived at a glance the entirety of a thing, careful investigation will reveal that attention shifted automatically through eye movement, enabling us to know the whole. Such systematic development is the original form of consciousness and as long as the unity maintains itself and consciousness develops of its own accord, we do not lose our foothold in pure experience.⁴³

Nishida emphasizes the fact that the type of experience and consciousness he refers to is an 'optimal' state of primordial nature. The type of attention that is required places a special emphasis on attentiveness and concentration which have nothing to do with the limited sphere of attention of everyday conscious attention. In fact, Nishida never states clearly and precisely the demanding perceptual conditions involved in the actualization of this type of experience. I think this is clearly implied in the descriptions of the character of the actualization of the "pure experience". Nishida talks about an experience and a type of perception that 'is not necessarily limited to simple sensations'⁴⁴. It is a mode of perception established through a modal process which can be mastered through practice⁴⁵. Examples of this type of perception are those exhibited by a climber or a musician's performances both of which exhibit natural creative skills and a practical knowledge which has been mastered by a particular skilled activity through training. These performances are distinctive in their natural or intuitive ways of acting and/or thinking. Nishida explains how:

A climber's determined ascent of a cliff and a musician's performance of a piece that has been mastered through practice are examples of what G.F. Stout⁴⁶ calls a "*perceptual train*." Such a mental state may accompany the instinctual behavior of animals as well.⁴⁷

Compared to ordinary perception the nature of perception in "pure experience" maintains a particular function which is instinctual. It is an intuitive way of acting

43 *Ibid.*, p. 7.

44 *Ibid.*, p. 7.

45 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

46 Nishida refers to George Frederick Stout's book *A Manual Psychology* published in New York in 1899 by Hinds and Noble.

47 Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 6.

that guides the course of action within a complicated structure; a continuous change of focus attention and consciousness that accompanies the development of the action which is always the “present”⁴⁸.

In “pure experience” the focus of consciousness is about a particular kind of attention and connectedness that focuses at all times on a multi-layered focused experience in the present moment. The “*perceptual train*”⁴⁹ which, Nishida refers to in the above quotation, is a particularly demanding state of attentiveness and readiness for immediate action. It is a state in which the shifts of consciousness require a skilled ability to sustain the conditions of a multi-focused attention and concentration. Its duration is in a constant present without diversions. It is a skilled ability to sustain a perceptual ability that can support, link and coordinate the various activities of a living construct which consists of complex elements⁵⁰. Nishida explains that in considering the development of perception:

We find that it arises as the result of various experiences. If we listen to music, for instance, at first no feeling is imparted, but as our ear gradually becomes accustomed to the music, we arrive at a clear perception of it. One can thus assert that perception is a kind of thinking.⁵¹

To actualize this type of ‘optimal’ awareness that is “pure experience” is a structurally complex process. Nishida explains how:

Consciousness is not a simple activity but rather a synthesis of various activities...None of our phenomena of consciousness stands alone; without exception each comes forth in relation to others. A moment of consciousness is not simple – it contains complex elements that are

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 61.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁵⁰ Nevertheless Nishida explains that because this type of experience can be analyzed later into its single elements this is the reason why we consider it complex, yet no matter how complex we feel that it might be, at the moment it happens is always simple and original [Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 5]. He also writes that ‘Perception is not at all passive: it necessarily includes active – constructive - elements (This is obvious when we consider examples of spatial perception.)’ [*Ibid.*, 48].

⁵¹ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 52-53.

dependent on each other, for they have a kind of meaning in relation to others. Consciousness at a given time and also over a lifetime is organized into such a system, and the “self” is the name for the unity of this whole.⁵²

In Nishida’s terms, perception seems to be a ‘constitutive activity’⁵³. Perception is a synthesis made up of many interrelated parts that consist of all the component parts of the experience.

When consciousness moves from one thing to the next, attention is always directed toward the things perceived and each act gives rise to the next *without the slightest crack* between them for thinking ... a *perceptual train* allows for shifts of attention and temporal duration.⁵⁴

To be able to come to know immediately and comprehend fully the whole of a thing is when the body and self can express a ‘reality hidden deep within things’⁵⁵. It is when:

We see our favorite flower or pet animal, we immediately grasp a certain unifying reality in the whole. This reality is the thing’s self, its fundamental nature or noumenon. Artists are people who most excel in this kind of intuition. They discern at a glance the truth of a thing and grasp its unifying reality. What they then express is not a superficial fact but an unchanging noumenal reality hidden within things.⁵⁶

“Pure experience” points to one’s attentiveness within what one is doing. It points to the moment one perceives the direct activities of hearing, looking, feeling and thinking, to the moment one experiences and knows these activities just as they are and can grasp immediately the whole, what Merleau-Ponty calls a *Gestalt* (structure) (as we shall see in Chapter 3). Keiji Nishitani writes, that

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 127-128.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 71. The way I understand hidden is that it is not accessible to view and/or not easily discovered.

Nishida does not use it as an essentialist concept or principle.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

when the activities of looking, listening and thinking form a unity with everything else, it is as if they emerge from the “depths of the universe”⁵⁷. This is an ‘optimal’ mode of experiencing the world and the things in it where we cannot separate body from mind or external from internal. Using metaphorical language Keiji Nishitani places the “depths of the universe” as the centre of attention and perception of experience. As he explains:

[I]t only means that in our looking and listening the activities of looking and listening have emerged somewhere from the depths of the universe. Our looking and listening and all other things we do issue from a point where all things form a single living bond. This is why these activities are united with all sorts of other things and we cannot think in terms of things existing on the outside and a mind existing on the inside.⁵⁸

To experience and know something from the “depths of the universe” is to experience the inside-outside continuum which is to experience from the depths of all existing matter and space considered as a whole. To know psychophysically from the deepest part of the body and self, i.e. from the lower abdominal region, an *unconscious unifying power*⁵⁹ behind perception that originates in the lower abdomen. It functions as a physical support from below that holds a connection between body and mind, between body and space-world, between internal and external. The ‘optimal’ mode of attentiveness and connectedness required for the actualization of “pure experience” seems to be an acquired ability to perform this type of perceptual task which is a kind of ‘knack’⁶⁰. It can give one the ability to perceive the formless; what has not been split into subject and object and thus can actualize an unconscious process of becoming (a central theme in Michael Chekhov, Merleau-Ponty and Nietzsche as well). The experience is prior to the moment when the self, seeing a color or

⁵⁷ Keiji Nishitani, *Nishida Kitaro*, p. 55.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁵⁹ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 7. '[B]ehind the perceptual activity an unconscious unifying power must be functioning and it is this that guides attention.'

⁶⁰ Keiji Nishitani, *Nishida Kitaro*, p. 23.

hearing a sound⁶¹, determines the shape and the form of that experience. Nishida defines “pure experience” as pre-reflective experience. D.S Clarke explains that,

The characteristic aesthetic experience is thus the perception of the formless, the indeterminate, out of which brush strokes and sounds are like condensations or crystallizations at specific points in time and space.⁶²

This process of forming gets to the nature of things and is at work before the thing becomes the object of consciousness, even before the self can reflect that the ‘experience has a certain structure’⁶³. It is a process that gets to the heart of what the body and self are doing. When the self sees a thing by becoming the thing. The characteristic of this type of perceptual living consciousness is that it penetrates each moment and gains insight even into the most ordinary and mundane activities of the experience. Keiji Nishitani writes:

At each moment experience opens up into an infinite expanse and depth. Its infinite development urges it in that direction, or rather to it and back from it. Even if it is only a question of ordinary, everyday experiences like having a meal, looking at something, or listening to a sound, it is entirely the same ... For experiences of the self in the here and now, where facts are known as they are, the extraordinary is as normal as the ordinary and the everyday.⁶⁴

For Nishida, even the everyday perceptual consciousness, which he calls ‘instantaneous perception’⁶⁵ does not diverge in reality from the fundamental perceptual form, given in the previously mentioned example, which is the ability to perceive at first glance the entirety of a thing. Because at some point we lose the ability to follow this fundamental systematic form, this process needs to be

⁶¹ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 3.

⁶² Clarke, JR, ‘Introduction’, p. xx.

⁶³ Keiji Nishitani, *Nishida Kitaro*, p. 84.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁶⁵ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 6-7.

mastered and thus regained through cultivation, training and practice⁶⁶. “*Perceptual train*”⁶⁷ and ‘instantaneous perception’⁶⁸ are two types of perception which differ in degree and not in kind⁶⁹. Everyday or ‘instantaneous perception’⁷⁰ is usually a single focus perceptual experience which means that attention and concentration is mainly on the external. The source of attention derives only from outside. Therefore, the experience remains within the limited sphere of the physical and the subjective. Nishida calls this type of experience a ‘*representational experience*’⁷¹. The difference between a ‘*representational experience*’⁷² and “*perceptual train*”⁷³ is that the former is focused only on the external and the experience is immanent. It is always operating within the subjective and lacks the perception of the unity of internal and external of subject and object as a whole. In the “*perceptual train*”⁷⁴ there is no such distinction. The focus of the experience is on the ‘event as a whole’⁷⁵. In other words, this type of perceptual experience maintains the unity of internal and external: the unity of subject and object which is the unity of consciousness which Nishida discusses⁷⁶. No matter how complex we think “pure experience” is, the moment it happens is simple, distinct, and is original creation⁷⁷ that is always created in the present moment.

“Pure experience” is an intuitive way of acting that guides the course of action of the body and self within a complicated perceptual structure that requires a particular form of attention and concentration. Nishida defines “pure experience” as a pre-reflective action. The body is relating to and is integrated with the world in a non-dual manner. This anti-dualistic view of mind body

⁶⁶ Yuasa writes that in ‘the East one starts from the experiential assumption that the mind-body modality changes through the training of the mind and body by means of cultivation (*shugyo*) or training (*keiko*)’ in Y. Yuasa, *The Body: Toward and Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, translated by S. Nagatomo and T.P. Kasulis, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987) p. 18.

⁶⁷ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 6.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 6-7.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 6-7.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁷² *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 7.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

relationship presupposes that action, perception, environment and self-perception complement each other. Consciousness and perception are modes of bodily activity, not things that simply happen to oneself, but rather things that one's (acting) self does, according to Nishida. This complex mode of perception is analyzed by Merleau-Ponty's metaphor of the bodily *chiasm* (x) "flesh" and his notion of *Gestalt* structure. In that sense "pure experience" will be explored as the *chiasmic* texture of a bodily field where the body simultaneously is able to perceive 'see' feel and be perceived 'seen' felt. This mode of perception enables oneself to grasp fully the nature of corporeality as a relation of inside and outside, as 'intercorporeality'.

2.1.2 Acting Intuition

Nishida claims that intuition ("intellectual intuition"⁷⁸) is basically the same as having an acquired skill, a technique, the 'knack of an art'⁷⁹. All great art and great philosophy is the result of an activity that involves this unifying intuition. There is no real difference from ordinary thinking. "Intellectual intuition" differs only in degree from ordinary thinking and with respect to its process is 'richer and more profound'⁸⁰. "Intellectual intuition" is the ability of intense concentration that expands and heightens the details of each moment. It opens up into an infinite depth and penetrates into the depth and richness of ordinary experience. It is what 'deepens and enlarges'⁸¹ the content of the experience. Keiji Nishitani calls this characteristic, the 'attentiveness to the presence of the great intuition'⁸² that makes the whole thing an extra-ordinary, extra-daily experience that is incomprehensible to ordinary thinking⁸³ (similar to Nishida's "great intuition" is Michael Chekhov's "Higher Self" and Nietzsche's "great intellect"). Intuition is the fundamental basis and deep grasp of all things. For

⁷⁸ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good* pp. 30-34.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 33 and p. 32.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

⁸² Keiji Nishitani, *Nishida Kitaro*, p. 67.

⁸³ Keiji Nishitani writes that: 'For experiences of the self...where facts are known as they are, the extraordinary is as normal as the ordinary and everyday' [*Ibid.*, p. 99].

Nishida, the foundational principle on which the unity of the body and mind experience is grounded is our intuition⁸⁴.

Nishida contends that the acting self derives from a structurally dialectical experience which generates an interactive relation between body and mind, self and world, self and other. For the acting self to intuit the world means to be able to sense it through opposing forces that is in its contradictory movement and progress. The intuitive knowledge of the other serves to inform the acting self 'how to act upon [the world/other], thereby changing it, in its knowing of it and acting in it and upon it'⁸⁵. In other words, the acting self comes into being through the interrelationship of the one and the infinite many (as multiplicity in Nietzsche, Chapter 4). This reality always exhibits the following fundamental mode: it is 'one while it is many, and many while it is one. It must be self-moved and unceasing [...] Each is relative to the other and one thing goes against another'⁸⁶.

From the perspective of unifying intuition, the acting self transcends the distinction between subject (body) and object (mind) and emerges as non-self. It establishes itself through the opposing process of development of unity and contradiction and emerges from nothingness; a 'consciousness of nothingness lies behind'⁸⁷. Nothingness, in Nishida, implies an infinite opposition of both presence and absence. When the acting self is regarded as emerging from nothingness, this nothingness cannot be considered 'true nothingness', but a unique instance in the development of the acting self and its body⁸⁸. In order to be able to actualize "intellectual intuition" and emerge as a non-ego self from a state of nothingness, the self must get rid of the "small self"⁸⁹. Nishida's concept of "small self" is what is for Michael Chekhov the "lower ego" and for Nietzsche the "small intellect". They all refer to the everyday consciousness which can block and prevent the non-self (other) or nothingness (the body-not-me) as the

⁸⁴ Keiji Nishitani, *Nishida Kitaro, ibid.*, p. 26.

⁸⁵ Carter, *The Nothingness Beyond God*, p. 104.

⁸⁶ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 57; p. 170.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p.; p. 82; p. 166.

progress in a creative process. Therefore the acting self must become a “great self”⁹⁰. A “great self” is one that envelops both oneself and others and is able to encompass “objectivity”; this concept is analogous to Nietzsche’s “great intellect” and to Michael Chekhov’s “Higher Self”. In a sense, a “great self” is a larger unity of both oneself and other that envelops both⁹¹, what Merleau-Ponty names ‘flesh’ in Chapter 3. A “great self” is totally unhindered by the “small self”⁹² and is able to reach a culminating point in its development as “*basho* of absolute nothingness” that enlarges perception and awareness. The acting self then is able to become aware of the “abyss” and gain insight of the depths of the ‘unfathomable’⁹³. The unfathomable is another concept in Nishida’s philosophy that, as we shall see, shares affinities with Nietzsche’s “abyss” in Chapter 4.

2.1.3 Acting-Intuition, Self-identity of Absolute Contradictories (Self-Contradictory Body / Nishida’s Dialectical Universal)

For Nishida, the unity of intuition and acting is the lived world of actuality. The self finds itself and actualizes itself in a world of action. In Nishida’s later writings, intuition (‘intellectual intuition’) is “acting-intuition”⁹⁴ (action based on intuition). Nishida emphasizes that the self immediately experiences and gains knowledge of things only through the unity of seeing, perceiving and acting. Acting cannot be separated from intuition otherwise intuition would be an abstract concept or a mere illusion. If action/acting is separated from intuition (from seeing sensing perceiving) it would become a merely mechanical concept⁹⁵. We are acting through the form of “acting-intuition”. We are acting through seeing sensing perceiving and we see sense perceive through acting⁹⁶. Because we “see” sense perceive things, action is realized⁹⁷. Nishida introduces the term “acting-intuition” or “action-oriented intuition” to indicate

⁹⁰ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 82.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 82. ‘[A] great self that envelops both oneself and others.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 166.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

⁹⁴ In most cases the term has been translated as ‘action intuition’ but Yuasa has translated Nishida’s term as ‘acting intuition.’ In this thesis I use *acting intuition*.

⁹⁵ Nishida, ‘The Unity of Opposites’, pp. 207-8.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

⁹⁷ K. Nishida, *Fundamental Problems of Philosophy*, translated by D.A. Dilworth, (Tokyo: Sophia 1970) p. 181; Nishida, ‘The Unity of Opposites’, p. 172.

enactive intuition that suggests reciprocity between action/acting and intuition (seeing sensing perceiving).

Nishida contends that there is no action without 'seeing' and that without intuition there is no 'seeing'. Action is a form of creation which changes the structure of the body and the composition of things⁹⁸. 'Action is *poiesis*'⁹⁹. The thing that stands objectively against the self is grasped 'through poiesis and acting-intuition'¹⁰⁰. It is realized in a process from the made towards the making, 'the formed towards the forming'¹⁰¹. It is not just mere matter or a physical entity but something expressive in which the meaning of intuition or 'seeing' lies¹⁰². "Acting-intuition" is the most concrete¹⁰³ form of conscious apprehension of reality. The "acting self" is completely active¹⁰⁴ and becomes more and more distinctly defined¹⁰⁵. When the acting self is actively engaged it grasps the reality of things in their dynamic historical development as they take place here and now¹⁰⁶.

G.S Axtell explains that Nishida follows a dialectic logic which is also 'a dialectic of theory and praxis; to a "concrete" dialectical logic which relates the "concept" to metaphysics of the "Acting Self"¹⁰⁷. Nishida moves away from a conception

⁹⁸ In Nishida's vocabulary the word creation and/or making things is not what we ordinarily think. Nishida explains that creative action is not only that someone makes something, which is what we usually have in mind. He writes that 'when an architect, for example, makes a house, changes the composition and relations of things according to their qualities; i.e. he changes their form' [Nishida, 'The Unity of Opposites', p. 167].

⁹⁹ Nishida, *Fundamental Problems*, p. 181. In the Preface to 3rd ed., 1936 of *A Study of Good* Nishida himself linked the development of pure experience to his later work and affirmed that: "The notion of a world of immediate or pure experience in this work [*A Study of Good*] became what I now consider as the world of historical reality. Indeed, the world of active intuition, the world of *poiesis*, is truly the world of pure experience" [in Dilworth, 'The Initial Formations', p. 94]; *Poesis* in Ancient Greek *ποίησις* (*poiesis*, means production, creation, formation, composition) and comes from *ποιῶ* (*poieo*, 'to make' 'to form').

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

¹⁰² Nishida, *Fundamental Problems*, p. 181.

¹⁰³ Nishida had been attracted by Hegel's concept of a "concrete logic" which tries to grasp reality in its dynamic historical unfolding.' [Schinzinger, 'Introduction', p. 49] Also 'concrete concept' or 'concrete logic' in the sense of Hegel's notion is a 'subjective dynamic notion by which the objective concept or essence of things is represented' [Schinzinger, p. 244].

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

¹⁰⁶ 'In Nishida's treatise "Unity of Opposites" his thinking follows the movement of the whole "dialectical universal" which encompasses nature as well as history. In this whole the physical world has its truth as one aspect of the historical world, seen from the point of view inside the historical world' [Schinzinger, 'Introduction', p. 54].

¹⁰⁷ G.S. Axtell, 'Comparative Dialectics: Nishida Kitaro's Logic of Place and Western Dialectical Thought', *Philosophy of East and West*, 41.2 (1991), pp. 166-167.

of the self within abstract logic¹⁰⁸ that is unaffected by the passage of time, the particular physical definitions and character of space. In “acting-intuition” the “acting self” grasps reality with concrete dialectical¹⁰⁹ logic where past and future meet and oppose each other. The acting self is a unity of opposites and a movement from the ‘formed towards the forming’¹¹⁰. A movement from the past towards the future. Past and future meet and oppose each other in the present moment. This movement is a development of the self ‘from present to present’¹¹¹. Nishida emphasizes that the character of the self ‘from the formed towards the forming’ displays the creativity of the self in action. The historical character of the self is a ‘single presence in which the decided and formed constantly confront the deciding and forming. In this eternal presence past and future meet’¹¹².

Nishida’s discussion of the acting self does not follow the thesis, antithesis and synthesis dialectic process of development. It is a dialectic of thesis and antithesis which never manages to resolve itself into a synthesis. The process never reaches a final conclusion. When self and other face each other in ‘the historical present’¹¹³ of unlimited possibilities this is already a synthesis or what Nishida calls a ‘dialectical logic’¹¹⁴. A logic that is about the self that moves by itself through contradictions. It is a synthesis that is the encounter of self and

¹⁰⁸ According to Nishida ‘abstract logic’ is Aristotle’s theory of *hypokeimenon*: the word comes from Greek: *υποκειμενον* – which literally means the under/*υπο* and lying/*κειμενον* thing. Nishida writes that still Hegel is following Aristotle’s subjectivism which is his notion of *hypokeimenon*. Nishida states that ‘even the dialectic of Hegel, which is supposed to have destroyed subjectivism, still could not avoid being a self-identity of the predicate’ [Nishida, *Fundamental Problems*, p. 22]. Matao Noda explains that with Aristotle ‘what truly is is an individual substance, and he defines this as what is always a logical subject and never a predicate. But, then, the individual ... should be ultimately indefinable in logical terms. No matter how far we might pursue the individual by specifying the universal, the individual would always remain beyond our reach. Over against this difficulty, Nishida always seeks the principle of individuation in the universal itself. He wants to find a sort of “concrete universal,” as Hegel puts it. And what Nishida took as his concrete universal was his “field of nothingness.” [Noda, ‘East-West Synthesis in Kitaro Nishida’, p. 350] I am going to talk about Nishida’s “field of nothingness” later on.

¹⁰⁹ That is, acting through opposing forces.

¹¹⁰ Nishida uses ‘*from the formed towards the forming*’ throughout his treatise ‘The Unity of Opposites.’

¹¹¹ Nishida, ‘The Unity of Opposites’, p. 167.

¹¹² Schinzinger, ‘Introduction’, p. 56.

¹¹³ ‘In the historical present, past and future are facing and contradicting each other; out of this contradiction an always renewed world is born, as unity of opposites. This I call the dialectic of historical life. If the past, as something that has already been decided, and is “given,” or is taken as “thesis,” than there are innumerable possibilities of [“antithesis” of] negation, and therefore there is an unlimited future’ [Nishida, ‘The Unity of Opposites’, p. 180].

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

other (world)¹¹⁵. Self and other contradict each other as opposites but they are ultimately connected. They touch each other somewhere¹¹⁶. At the same time, they are mutually independent. The important thing here is that behind all unity there is opposition. Unity presupposes contradiction and conflict and vice versa. 'Dialectical logic' is a process of becoming aware of these oppositions and of becoming aware of the co-existence and unity of these oppositions. 'The deepest "acting-intuition" consists in having one's self in the absolute unity of the world of contradictions'¹¹⁷.

Nishida conceives the acting self or the acting body as an indivisible interrelated unity of opposites of subjective and objective elements. The acting self forms itself in the way of expression¹¹⁸ and touches, reaches something that 'has transcended time'¹¹⁹ and space. It is able to exceed the limits of its ordinary psychophysical or physiological awareness and is moving on a plane of consciousness which has a "mirroring"¹²⁰ structure. The acting self, then its body, becomes conscious of a mirror-structure, a turned inside out or reversed structure. The acting self when moving from the formed towards the forming in the creative process it is always conscious of itself¹²¹. This might be described as a form of ecstasy and transcendence wherein

the self sees the objectified self from behind, or rather, from a point directly in front of it. The subjective self assumes a form in which the seeing self becomes oblivious of itself in the self that is seen.¹²²

The dialectical process which Nishida discusses, is a process where the formed self develops by transcending its own self from within¹²³. There is mutual

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 182. '... [A] synthesis that does not deny confrontation.' By confrontation Nishida means opposition, that is, when the self and other stand opposite to each other and have a dialectical relationship.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 177. 'From the standpoint of abstract logic, it is impossible to say that things which contradict each other are connected; they contradict each other just because they can not be connected.'

¹¹⁷ Schinzinger, 'Introduction', p. 62.

¹¹⁸ According to Nishida, "the historical world has its effect on the self not as a mechanical cause, and not as a biological purpose, but through "expression". This expression moves the self to act. The actions of the self are an expression of its will, responding to the expression of the world.' [Schinzinger, 'Introduction', pp. 245-246]

¹¹⁹ Nishida, 'The Unity of Opposites', pp. 168-9.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

¹²² Nishitani, *Nishida Kitaro*, p. 118. For Nishitani this is the notion of 'true self'. This is another point of convergence between Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, Nietzsche and Michael Chekhov.

interaction between self and other, between body and space. This action can be accomplished with full awareness¹²⁴; when the acting self grasps reality in the way of the unity of opposites and is experiencing and using the body as “acting-intuition”¹²⁵. The acting self forms the environment (the space the other) and the environment, although formed by the acting self, does not simply become its part, but dynamically interacts with the acting self: it opposes and denies.

What Nishida discusses is the dialectic structure of the “living body” (“feeling body”) and “lived body” (“felt body”) wherein the acting self gives shape and form to the world (other) of the unity of opposites¹²⁶ through “acting-intuition”. The consciously acting body or active self is not static, an abstract concept lacking movement, action and change. It is ‘forming itself in a world of unity of opposites’¹²⁷. It is moved by the other and at the same time moves the other through itself and is active from itself. There is a movement from the clearly defined and fully developed self to the taking shape self and body ‘from the formed towards the forming’¹²⁸. Nishida’s concept of the dialectical world ‘is from the *created* and the *creative*, from the *formed* to the *forming*, from *being* to *becoming*, from one’s *past* to one’s *future* via the present’¹²⁹.

The fundamental creative principle here, is that the acting self or body is determined through the unity of opposites of the one and the many in a process, which is moving through inner contradictions. The dialectical universal manifests itself as the “self-identity of absolute contradictories” (“unity of opposites”) or as I define it in this thesis as a “self-contradictory body”. Self and other, body and mind, seem to establish and contradict each other and each ‘becomes an absolute other’¹³⁰ in a series of actions. For Nishida this is the

¹²³ Nishida, ‘The Unity of Opposites’, p. 207.

¹²⁴ Nishida, ‘The Unity of Opposites’, p. 171; p. 175.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 169. ‘What is given, is “formed”. Reality is where we “are” and “act”. Acting is not mere will; it is “forming”, it is the making of things.’

¹²⁹ Carter, *The Nothingness Beyond God*, p. 118.

¹³⁰ Nishida, *Fundamental Problems*, p. 134.

‘very process of the one becoming the many’¹³¹. In other words, the self should be considered without fixed form but formless and empty of content¹³².

For Nishida, the acting self always finds itself in the ephemeral position of the transitory movement from being formed to becoming forming¹³³. Nishida emphasizes the functionality¹³⁴ of this form that is a ‘form-activity’¹³⁵ that cannot be seen¹³⁶. The passing ‘from formed to the forming’ the changing from one state to the next is a transitional process which involves mediation¹³⁷. It is an ‘optimal’ mode of being/doing where the acting self is always acting by “acting-intuition”. The acting self is using its body and self as unity of opposites. The acting self through “acting-intuition” is both the formed and the formless at the same time; the ‘forming arises and forms again’¹³⁸.

Nishida emphasizes that the acting self or body cannot be a ‘simple whole but includes disjunctions’¹³⁹, discontinuities. It cannot be defined ‘as an object of cognition [though] it is the foundation of cognition and of the relationships of the various elements whose unity analysis cannot bring to light’¹⁴⁰. The ground of the acting self includes a ‘unity of mutual contradictions, i.e. a many-in-one and a one-in-many’¹⁴¹. This should not be taken as nothing or “no-thing”¹⁴², but as a formless experience characterized by the unity of body and mind, “self and non-self”, “being and non-being”, that is to say as “creative nothingness”¹⁴³. This form of action is neither merely objective nor merely subjective. It is a form that

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 134. ‘The self-determination of the dialectical universal means that the universal negates itself. That it negates itself to become an absolute other is the very process of the one becoming many. In this process the world of independent individuals is established.’

¹³² Nishida explains that: ‘By form I do not mean the figure of a static thing, but the activity of forming itself in a world of the opposites of the many and the one, from the formed towards the forming.’ [Nishida, ‘The Unity of Opposites’, p. 172].

¹³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 173-4. [Gestalt: a German origin word which literally means ‘shape or form,’ that is: an organized pattern of elements so unified as a whole which it can be described or perceived as more than the sum of its parts.] Another concept that is analyzed in detail later in the thesis.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 174. (Action intuition always serves as medium for true poiesis).’ [Ibid., p. 209].

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

¹⁴¹ Nishida, *Fundamental Problems*, p. 22.

¹⁴² Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 82.

¹⁴³ Nishida, *Intuition and Reflection*, pp. 140-141. ‘There is no fact more immediate and indubitable than the birth of being from non-being, which occurs constantly in the actuality of our experience.’

is both. It is intuitively given as what Merleau-Ponty calls a *Gestalt* (structure) and Nishida a “*basho*” or “place”¹⁴⁴.

“*Basho*” is the place where the acting self is grasped as a unity of opposites and functions as “acting-intuition”. The acting self is using the body ‘within the structure of the contradictory identity of the many and the one’¹⁴⁵. Within this structural frame the acting self is fundamentally given as self-contradictory and is able to emerge from what Nishida defines as the “*basho*” or *field of nothingness*¹⁴⁶. It depends on “nothingness”. “*Basho* of nothingness” is a self given in the form and structure of what Nishida describes “pure experience ” or “acting-intuition”.

Nishida’s “acting-intuition” refers to the dialectical fusion of self (body-me) and the other (body-not-me). The self and the space the world are inseparable and mutually determined within the dialectical world of “self-contradictory” bodies that operate as activity-passivity structure, as active-passive circuit relatedness. “Acting-intuition” denotes the nature of the body’s relatedness to the world-space which is to be understood as acting and intuiting. This term articulates the phenomenological ambiguous structure of the acting bodily self in its engagement with the world, the other. An experience that is prior to the opposition of subject and object, inner and outer. “Acting-intuition” is a kind of ‘perceiving without perceiver’.

2.1.4 The Logic of *Basho* and Absolute Nothingness

Nishida’s project of acting self is realized as a mode of “acting-intuition” or as the “place” the “*basho* of absolute nothingness”. *Basho* exhibits a complex form, a structure of ‘encompassing character’¹⁴⁷ where everyday

¹⁴⁴ Nishida, *Fundamental Problems*, p. 181.

¹⁴⁵ Nishida, *Intuition and Reflection*, p. 50.

¹⁴⁶ Matao Noda refers to Nishida’s *basho* of nothingness as “field of nothingness” [Noda, ‘East- West Synthesis’ p. 350]. Carter writes that :‘It was in 1927 that Nishida introduced what Dilworth calls “a more powerful metaphysical base” through the concept of the *topos* or *basho* of nothingness. His approach was to develop a concrete logic, a systematic approach to knowledge-as-action in the everyday world of social and historical encounter and it took him beyond a focus on self-consciousness to the dialectical world of action’ [Carter, *The Nothingness Beyond God*, p. 103].

¹⁴⁷ Tremblay, ‘The Potential of Nishida’s “Encompassing” Language’ in Wing-keung and C. Ching-yuen (ed.) *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy 4: Facing the Twentieth-First Century* (Nagoya: Nanzuan Institute for Religion and Culture, 2008) p. 131.

consciousness has been negated and emptied by a process in which all irreducible opposites, such as many and one, being and non being, break down completely. “*Basho*” is structured as a series of more and more “*bashos*”. Each “*basho*” surrounds the other and all correspond to a series of increasingly larger content¹⁴⁸ which Nishida calls “*basho* of absolute nothingness”. This “*basho*” enfolds/envelops all other “*bashos*” (or “universals”) other “selves”¹⁴⁹ which are located in and within, but because their location (spatially and temporally) is limited is finite. On the contrary the “*basho* of absolute nothingness” where everything is being located is itself beyond encompassing. It is itself the last of all contexts’¹⁵⁰. It is itself ‘an infinite horizon: absolute nothingness’¹⁵¹ that is always liable to a potential change full of possibilities.

Nishida focuses on knowing as an expansion of awareness. Michiko Yusa explains that for Nishida to “know” means for consciousness to embrace what is within it’¹⁵². Nishida applies the Japanese word “*basho*” to designate ‘a spatial metaphor for the workings of consciousness’¹⁵³. His fundamental standpoint is that the acting self exists always in some “place”¹⁵⁴ for otherwise the distinction between “I” ego-not I, self and non-self, “being” and “non-being” cannot be supported’¹⁵⁵.

By the term “*basho*” Nishida tries to define consciousness logically as a process of structuring the body and its infinite deepening of the many modalities of the self’s awareness. The acting self moves beyond the usual limits of habitually psychophysical experience and ‘arrives at a “nothingness”. It ‘embraces being,

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

¹⁴⁹ Wargo clarifies that ‘one of the major difficulties is the way Nishida uses the terms *basho*, *universal*, and *self* in such a way as to suggest that they are interchangeable even though at other times he seems to want to maintain a strong distinction among them. Roughly stated, “*basho*” is ‘a neutral term that Nishida employs when he is concerned with the logical relationships among the various elements that make up the structure he has developed. *Universal* is used when he is concerned with the structure taken primarily in an ontological and epistemological sense but to some extent objectified ... Nishida uses the term *self* when he wishes to emphasize the noetic, or subjective, aspects of *basho*’ [R. J. J. Wargo, *The Logic of Nothingness: A Study of Nishida Kitaro*, (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2005) p. 169-170]

¹⁵⁰ Heisig, *Philosophers of Nothingness*, p. 79.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p.62 and p. 75.

¹⁵² Yusa, *Zen and Philosophy*, p. 204.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 204.

¹⁵⁴ Yusa writes that Nishida turns to Plato’s *Timaeus* because it abounds in the imagery of “place”: “the becoming, that ‘wherein’ it becomes and the source ‘wherefrom’ the becoming is copied and produced” (50d); “all that exists should exist in some spot (topos) and occupying some place (chora). (52b). Nevertheless Nishida explains that what he calls “*basho*” is not identical with Plato’s ‘space’ [Yusa, *Zen and Philosophy*, pp. 203-24].

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 203.

that which purely mirrors'¹⁵⁶. According to Nishida, the various kinds of knowledge of the self are dependent on the different kinds of *topos* in which the body is situated. The acting self is developed out of different aspects of cognitive subjectivity and knowledge. This 'extends from the perception of the object to intuition'¹⁵⁷. Different modes of knowledge produce different worlds. The structure of *basho*, its logic, harbors three different "*bashos*", three selves, or 'three layers of being'¹⁵⁸ which are as follows:

a) The first "*basho*" is "the *basho* of being" ("*basho*-vis-a-vis being"). This is the 'layer of natural being'¹⁵⁹. It designates the place where physical events occur, e.g., the physical universe, the biological, "natural world". It is the outward world. This world, according to Nishida, belongs or has its "place" in the "universal of judgment".

b) The second "*basho*" is the "*basho* of relative nothingness" ("*basho* vis-à-vis (relative) nothing"). This is the 'layer of conscious being'¹⁶⁰. It is relative to the first "*basho*" and it is where the activity of the self-consciousness occurs. According to Nishida, this is the world of inner experience (the "world of consciousness"). It is the inward world. It is a deeper and higher world than the natural world. It is an "enveloping"¹⁶¹ world. It embraces and includes the earlier *basho* of the Universal of Judgment within it. As the earlier Universal of Judgment enveloped the objects of the natural world, so now the Universal of Judgment together with its objects are enveloped as *content* by the new *basho* – the Universal of Self Consciousness¹⁶². Through action the acting self makes the external world a part of itself. 'The outward world is enveloped by the ego in the same way as the inward world'¹⁶³. In this *basho*, "the world of consciousness", there is no opposition between subject and object (predicate), but opposition between self and content¹⁶⁴. The acting self contains the

¹⁵⁶ Nishida in Yusa, p. 205.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

¹⁵⁸ Schinzinger, 'Introduction', p. 33.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

¹⁶² Carter, *The Nothingness Beyond God*, p. 37.

¹⁶³ Schinzinger, 'Introduction', p. 32.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

opposition that it simultaneously affirms and negates the non-ego self, the other. This opposition, its dynamics leads the acting self beyond its usual habitual psychophysical limits. In this 'beyond' there is a new transcendence of "the world of self-consciousness". There is the transcendental world, the world of "acting-intuition" ("intellectual intuition")¹⁶⁵.

c) The third "*basho*" is the "*basho* as absolute nothingness". It is synonymous with "absolutely contradictory self-identity" ("self-contradictory body"). The logic is the structure of a self conceived as *absolute nothingness*¹⁶⁶. The "*basho* as absolute nothingness" is the deepest self (universal) and as such it enfolds the previous "*basho*" the other two¹⁶⁷. In this third "*basho*" the transcendental self which is relating to the non-ego-self is determined by and functions as "acting-intuition". Transcendence is a dimension beyond our world which is either empty or occupied by an eidetic¹⁶⁸ being (the "realm of Ideas"¹⁶⁹). In other words, the transcendental self is the self which sees itself intuitively¹⁷⁰, i.e., imagination penetrates in a way and gains insight into deeper parts of the self's bodily consciousness. Intuitively and through the imagination and intense concentration and through the act of breath, as we shall see, the acting self is able to reach the deepest part of everyday consciousness; to penetrate one's psychophysical being so completely that can reach the "lowest" part of the self in the lower abdomen. Thus one experiences and knows inward and outward realities as identical. (This process of deepening consciousness is a "self-awareness", according to Nishida).

In this deep layer there is a "negation of self"¹⁷¹, the sense of self as body-me. For Nishida a self is non-self (precisely because it is not a self at its bottomless depths)¹⁷². It is merely "place" or "*basho*" in nothingness¹⁷³ where the self

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

¹⁶⁶ A. Kozyra, 'Nishida Kitaro's Logic of Absolutely Contradictory Self-Identity and the Problem of Orthodoxy in the Zen Tradition', *Japan Review*, 20.69 (2007), p. 72.

¹⁶⁷ Carter, *The Nothingness Beyond God*, p. 45.

¹⁶⁸ Eidetic means extraordinarily detailed visual imagery or mental images that have unusual vividness and detail as if actually visible. The word eidetic comes from the Greek word εἶδος (eidos) which means form.

¹⁶⁹ B. Stevens, 'The Transcendental Path: Abhidharma Sources of Nishida's Logic of Place' in R.B. Garcia and J.W. Heisig (ed.), *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy 6: Confluences and Cross Currents*, (Nagoya: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture, 2009) p. 58.

¹⁷⁰ Schinzinger, 'Introduction', p. 33

¹⁷¹ Schinzinger, 'Introduction', p. 35.

¹⁷² Carter, *The Nothingness Beyond God*, p. 133.

transcends all contradiction and all opposites are overcome. “Nothingness” is characterized by an egoless state of non-self non “being”¹⁷⁴. The acting self able to reach awareness of a profound contradiction can be realized as a state of containing nothing or ‘no-thing’¹⁷⁵, i.e. a state ‘having no characteristics’¹⁷⁶ (“absolute nothingness”). In practical terms the acting self psychophysically experiences being both subject and object, self and other, body and mind, at the same time.

Yusa defines nothingness as the “*place*” not consciously recognized by the operation of our consciousness and in that sense it can be said it is “nothing” (*mu*). Nothingness ‘is something that lies beneath our surface everyday consciousness’¹⁷⁷. Yusa compares nothingness to an unlimited and unusual state of *unconsciousness*. Lacking ordinary awareness and sense of itself and its environment the body is able to embrace articulated self-consciousness¹⁷⁸.

Agnieszka Kozyra explains the notion of emptiness by giving the following example which is a method of a Zen master,

A Zen master asked one of his accomplished monks: “Can you take hold of emptiness? “Yes”- he replied. “Show me how you do it.” The monk stretches his arms and clutched at empty space. Master asked: “Is that the way?” But after all you have not got anything. “What then?” –asked the monk- “is your way?” The master straightaway took hold of the monk’s nose and gave it a hard pull. Which made the latter exclaim” Oh, how hard you pull at my nose! You are hurting me terribly!” That’s the way to have a good hold of emptiness” said the master.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷³ Schinzinger, ‘Introduction’, p. 37.

¹⁷⁴ Schinzinger, ‘Introduction’, p. 248.

¹⁷⁵ Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, p. 82.

¹⁷⁶ Carter, *The Nothingness Beyond God*, p. 28.

¹⁷⁷ Yusa, *Zen and Philosophy*, pp. 202-203.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 203.

¹⁷⁹ Kozyra, ‘Nishida Kitaro’s Logic’, p. 94.

To experience nothingness is to be 'both self and not self and neither'¹⁸⁰. To be able to open up into the self which belongs to the non-self other. As in the above example where the self experiences itself both as subject and object and neither at the same time.

Emptiness is prior to any dualism opposition and is not 'an object found outside of oneself'¹⁸¹. It is the place wherein both self and other, "I" and "Thou" disappear. It is an "I in not I"¹⁸². The non-self is the 'bottomless self'¹⁸³ which encounters the abyss of the *other*. "The bottomless self "in itself" is absolute nothingness"¹⁸⁴.

To be able to become aware of this bodily paradoxical unity¹⁸⁵ of simultaneous presence and absence indicates the ability to enter bottomless nothingness. For Nishida, this contradictory logic of objectivity and subjectivity is a creative process that is filled with what he calls the "demonic"¹⁸⁶ (highly developed inspiring, imaginative, creative abilities and powers). This skilful paradoxical form is "acting-intuition"¹⁸⁷. Its active expression must be '*ec-static*'¹⁸⁸. The self is able to stand outside itself, outside its everyday ego-self perspective.

The *ecstatic* in Nishida, (as well as in Nietzsche Chapter 4), is the ability to go beyond the distinction which supports the ordinary everyday experience between the subjective and the objective. The *ecstatic* is a primordial mode of being/doing. It is a mode of consciousness that is not simply about the self becoming the other or the other becoming the self. For Nishida the acting self 'must absolutely negate and thereby express itself within itself'¹⁸⁹. Self and other negotiate and work together 'through mutual interexpression'¹⁹⁰. This is

¹⁸⁰ Carter, *The Nothingness Beyond God*, p. 144.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 74.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

¹⁸⁴ Carter, *The Nothingness Beyond God*, p. 96.

¹⁸⁵ Noda, 'East-West Synthesis', p. 358.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 76. 'Demonic' means resembling or characteristic of 'demon.' 'Demon' comes from Greek daimon: δαίμων and it means 'genius, deity' that is someone with exceptionally highly developed inspiring/imaginative/creative powers and natural abilities.

¹⁸⁷ Nishida, *Last Writings*, p. 39.

¹⁸⁸ Dilworth in Nishida, *Last Writings*, p. 39. *Ecstatic* can be described as a 'leap of the self to a dimension wherein the act is the contradictory identity of transcendent and immanent planes of self-awareness.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 87; p. 103.

the result of a relational structure which offers an insightful realization of a deeper subjectivity¹⁹¹ which Nishida calls a “non-relative other”¹⁹².

According to Nishida, intuition is the ‘fact the I knows the Thou and vice versa. Intuition implies that ‘*the non-relative other* hides at the bottom of the self and that the self moves towards the other for the bottom of the self’¹⁹³; that at the bottom of the acting bodily self lies the capacity of a non ordinary psycho-physical engagement beyond habitual awareness which rejects the distinction between subject and object. This is what Nishida defines intuition. Intuition ‘necessitates a transcendent region inside the self which the self encounters’¹⁹⁴. This transcendent region which is a ‘non-relative other’¹⁹⁵ appears to be related to the creative “demonic”¹⁹⁶, to a non-self that is the centre of the bottomless contradictory bodily existence. Nishida places it in the absolute present the existential matrix of history itself’¹⁹⁷.

In “*basho* as absolute nothingness” the body being both subject and object at the same time can reach a state of *no*-thingness of an empty self and is empty of content. In this process the body can become a container of energy. An empty vessel. Yuasa Yasuo mentions that the body to become an empty vessel is an instrument that can receive creative intuition by simply acting as not-I self, non-ego-self¹⁹⁸. Intuition potentially takes hold of a targeted action. The self can move towards a certain goal and the behavior of the body guided by this intuition simply follows the path made visible¹⁹⁹. The “*basho* as absolute nothingness”²⁰⁰ is a ‘sort of material field wherein forms emerge, a physical concept of field of force, taken by Einstein as a cosmic field’²⁰¹. The capacity of the body for this kind of connectedness and relatedness of ‘cosmic field’ of

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

¹⁹² Nishida in G. Kopf, *Beyond Personal Identity: Dogen, Nishida, and a Phenomenology of No-Self*, (Surrey, UK: Curzon Press, 2001) p. 114.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.114.

¹⁹⁶ Nishida, *Last Writings*, p. 76.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

¹⁹⁸ Y. Yuasa, *The Body: Toward and Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, translated by S. Nagatomo and T.P. Kasulis, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987), p. 199.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

²⁰⁰ Noda, ‘East-West Synthesis’, p. 350. Noda writes that ‘the concept of “field” literally means *locus*, *basho* in Japanese and he as well makes clear that it was presumably suggested to Nishida by the concept of “space” in Plato’s *Timaeus*.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 350.

energy can emerge from e-motion, from movement. The body of the acting self can be used as “acting-intuition” and can actualize the unity of the subject-body (self) and the object-body (other), the unity of outward and inward²⁰² realities.

In Nishida’s philosophy “pure experience”, “*basho* as absolute nothingness”, and “acting-intuition”, are not cognitive processes, but ‘optimal’ modes of awareness, forms of ‘affective consciousness’ of ‘affective feeling’²⁰³ that can be characterized as ‘ethical and bodily practice’²⁰⁴. They are ‘purely non-dimensional awareness’²⁰⁵ in which the acting self can see objectivity not outside but inside the body. They are forms of ‘optimal’ consciousness of ‘seeing without a seer’²⁰⁶. ‘Optimal’ here is this level of awareness and consciousness where the acting self can overcome all determinations and divisions between inner and outer, self and other, body and mind. In this way the acting self can become a ‘pure undefiled mirror of reality as it is’²⁰⁷. A mirror which is neither external nor internal.

In Nishida’s philosophy the mirror does not indicate any kind of separation between inside and outside or between body and mind. The mirror is neutral²⁰⁸ (a point that will be further explored in Chapter 3 on Merleau-Ponty). Mirroring does not mean the reflection of an image that comes from elsewhere. It is an image of the acting bodily self that sees perceives and can be seen perceived in terms of the “absolute” absent “other”, from its unlimited possibilities that the network of relationships and the world of action offer. The body of the acting self can emerge as nothingness from the standpoint where the self sees perceives itself within itself through its own negation as an ego-self²⁰⁹ body.

In his later thought Nishida reformulates his notion of “pure experience” in terms of Zen Buddhist notion of “*basho*” or ‘topos’. Both terms denote the spatial field

²⁰² Schinzinger, ‘Introduction’, p. 32.

²⁰³ J. W. Krueger, ‘Nishida, Agency, and the ‘Self-Contradictory’ Body’, *Asian Philosophy*, 18.3 (2008), p. 215.

²⁰⁴ Stevens, ‘The Transcendental Path’, p. 62.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 75; p. 77.

²⁰⁸ M. Dalissier, ‘The Idea of the Mirror in Nishida and Dogen’, in J. W. Heisig (ed.), *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy* (Nagoya: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture, 2005), p. 140.

²⁰⁹ Nishida, *Last Writings*, p. 104.

of nothingness where subject-body (self) and object-body (other) are revealed; this indicates that body and mind, body and world, self and other, are allowed to perceive to 'see' and to be 'perceived' to be 'seen' at the same time. The "*basho* of absolute nothingness" is the field in which all oppositions are constituted through their mutual determination so the affirmation of one which automatically means the negation of the other is only relative.

The usefulness of Nishida's philosophy in acting analysis is the development of his dialectics. Nishida discusses that there is an absolute contradiction in opposing terms which when are found in specific place locus or "*basho*" these terms that are regarded as opposites and are mutually exclusive can be experienced and perceived as inseparable and complementary.

In this thesis it is argued that by applying Nishida's dialectics in acting analysis it is possible to say the domain that can ground and unify the connection of the contradictory properties of the actor's self and the character's (other) is the particular psychophysical circumstances the Psychological Gesture creates. These are found in the "*basho* of nothingness" that re-conditions and re-structures the actor's body (its posture) as "self-contradictory" and the actor's body can operate as "acting intuition".

Nishida's "*basho* of nothingness" and "acting intuition" which is the dialectical and mutual determination between body and the world-space, subject-self and object-other, are taken as the 'lived body', "flesh", "inter-corporeality" and "*chiasma*" in Merleau-Ponty (Chapter 3), and as Apollonian and Dionysian impulses or drives or as a process of "becoming" in Nietzsche (Chapter 4).

2.2 Nishida and Michael Chekhov

I now consider Michael Chekhov's philosophy of the actor's body through Nishida's philosophy of the body. I have already argued, in Chapter 1 that Michael Chekhov's techniques might be described as inherently phenomenological. Here, I examine how Nishida's ideas of "pure experience" as "absolute nothingness" and "acting-intuition" can deepen our understanding

of the actor's work in Michael Chekhov's technique – in particular how the actor's body operates when experiencing the Psychological Gesture. I argue that an examination of these terms can develop what we understand to be 'optimal' modes of being/doing in acting processes in relation to the Psychological Gesture. How, then, can "pure experience" "acting-intuition" and "*basho* as absolute nothingness" develop our understanding of what Michael Chekhov defines as 'objectivity' and/or 'Higher Ego Self' as introduced in Chapter 1. Michael Chekhov's 'objectivity' and 'Higher Ego Self' express a paradigm for understanding creativity in the acting process where the actor's "I"-self undergoes a metamorphosis in the moment of inspiration (in this thesis as an act of breath) which manifests as an expansion of consciousness²¹⁰.

'Objectivity' as the performative actualization of the observer (actor's self/body-me) and the observed (body-not-me/other) relation and their fusion in acting. Nishida's "pure experience", "acting-intuition", "*basho* as absolute nothingness", can be experienced when the actor reaches a level of complex reflexive awareness and the body of the actor is both an expressing subject (self) and an expression of the world (object-other) within itself. For both Nishida and Michael Chekhov the experience is performative.

The sensorimotor dimension of Psychological Gesture trains the body and mind of the actor psycho-physically to go beyond its body and itself, beyond its usual everyday structure. The actor performs an archetypal gesture, for example the action to throw or to embrace, and gradually the physical movement of throwing stops while inwardly the gesture of throwing keeps on. The actor inwardly moves while physically has stopped moving. The task to hold the inner, invisible movement of the archetypal gesture (throwing/embracing) to continue moving inwardly and to sustain the action practically requires the actor to go beyond the physical form of the body.

The performative inner gesture when internalized completely provides an intuitive, non-reflective grasp of the primal unity of subject-object, self-other

²¹⁰ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, pp. 86-87.

(character) mutual relation, which, I believe, is the basis for the 'optimal' state of consciousness in Michael Chekhov's practice. According to my own experience and understanding in practicing the Psychological Gesture the process of internalizing and incorporating the invisible gesture, the 'other' the character, has three different stages of progress and development. These stages will be analyzed by applying Nishida's philosophy of the three notions of "*basho*".

Applying Nishida's philosophy of the three notions of "*basho*" I will now analyze the Psychological Gesture.

2.2.1 The "Basho of Being" Awareness and the Psychological Gesture

We could describe the "*basho* of being", the physical outward world according to Nishida, in Michael Chekhov's training of the Psychological Gesture as the actor's empirical sense of things and before having experienced them in practice, that is apart from the actor observer. In practical matters this can be a statement such as 'this chair is brown' or it can be a statement concerning a character in a play or text which could be a preconceived idea about the character's specific characteristic such as the character is appalling or emotionally cold or "I think the character would react like this here etc'. In other words, a statement of an observation that is an objective fact that does not seem to involve or concern the observer (the actor him/herself). The structure of this level of awareness has a dualistic form (subject-predicate) that sustains the split between subject-object, self and other. It follows an Aristotelian logic which is popular in many acting practices. The actor makes generalizations, arbitrary judgments and the actor's self is treated as an abstraction of an idea. The form of this dualistic structure would fail to consider the actor as a subjective presence since it disregards that the actor becomes the enactive point for each statement for each action. It ignores the creative role the actor has in the formulation of the other (character) in the acting process. The dualistic form of "*basho* of being" in the actor's work can bring the relationship between actor and other (character), inner reality and outer world, into an

opposition with each other. It can foster the unresolved tensions of Descartes' disembodied subject. Nevertheless, this type of awareness seems to be necessary for reflection and analysis at the beginning of the rehearsal process. This level of awareness can be rather a stage of preparation at the beginning of a rehearsal process where things might be more objects of study or investigation. The "*basho* of being" stage can be necessary to understand and explain complex parts in the text, to break the text into beats for finding the action for each beat, thus the right Psychological Gesture(s) for the other (character). The "*basho* of being" is a level of awareness that can correspond to the process before practicing. In practice this stage is before adding breath to the Psychological Gesture. As one of my student actors writes in his journal referring to the first two weeks of our rehearsals,

You start by reading through the text a few times and trying to gain a sense of what exactly it is that the character 'wants' to do. Not what he is doing. The gesture then relates to this desire. I then respond physically to this want, experimenting with something that feels right though needs to be experienced in practice. (Extract from actor's journal; 'Obituary' 30/3/2014)

We could describe the Psychological Gesture through the "*basho* of being" as the first level of awareness which has the form from external focus of attention to internal. This can correspond to that level of awareness where the actor tries to find the outer form and expression of the Psychological Gesture and gradually guides the actor's inner sense of self (sensations, feelings, emotions, moods). In other words, in practicing the Psychological Gesture the "*basho* of being" can describe the awareness of the actor about the accuracy, clarity and precision of the form of the gesture, the position of the limbs, the actor's proprioceptive awareness which can train the actor's visible physical body which in turn within a period of time can train the actor's invisible body (inner self).

According to Nishida's terminology the "*basho* of being" can be the very first stages of the actor's experience in practicing Psychological Gesture. This stage can be a reflective experience that can express pure objectivity apart from the

actor observer. In this stage there is still a dualism in the actor's perception since there is a split between the actor's self (body-me) and the other (body-not-me-character) and the actor's focus of attention is mainly on the external.

2.2.2 The “Basho as Relative Being” Awareness and the Psychological Gesture

The “*basho* of being”, according to Nishida, is located in a more encompassing field of action which is the “*basho* of relative nothingness”. We could say that in practicing Psychological Gesture after intense training the actor progressively might reach the level of the “*basho* of relative nothingness” awareness. The actor can gradually move to openly recognizing the arbitrariness of empirical judgments that exclude the actor from being implicated in the creative act of observation.

After nearly a four week period of rehearsing Heiner Muller's 'Obituary' the actor reflects on his initial idea or opinion that was formed prior to having any evidence of the part as a living experience. The actor refers to the 'CHICKENFACE', a figure which is not obviously clear whether it is a real person or an invisible figure an imaginary other who seems that follows the character. The actor writes,

At the beginning of rehearsals I observed that I had the feeling that I had resigned myself to the fact that I wasn't going to be able to get rid of CHICKENFACE. However, after a period of working with the gesture and discussing it with my director I realized that this wasn't what my body or the character 'wanted to be doing' and that should be what the gesture relates to. Once I had acknowledged that the character wanted to get rid of 'CHICKENFACE' the gesture became more complete and so it opened the space and I became lighter, much less 'head heavy'. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 4/3/2012]

The actor points out that his actual experience proves to be that is not a property of his individual preconceived ideas and thoughts. He recognizes that initially his thoughts was of his individual “I”-self that seemed to pre-exist the pristine encounter with the here and now of the 'character' (the non-I-self) and

'CHICKENFACE'; The actor seems to acknowledge that is becoming aware of a subject-object, body-world (other) relation that is not external to his body. He realizes that his experience has references both to the actor's body as well as to the 'character's body. In the level of the "*basho* of relative nothingness" awareness the actor can internalize the Psychological Gesture to a point that can interrupt the presumed separation of representation between the observer (actor's body- me) and the observed other (body-not me/character). In this level the actor can reach a stage of self-awareness that can be seen in one's gaze and can be felt in one's body; the 'gaze is as if it pierces the image of the gesture the actor projects; as if it breaks the frame that divides the observer from the observed'²¹¹. There can be a sense that there is a feeling that 'something' encourages the actor as an observer to adopt a critical stance towards the process. The actor can be in the position to experience an immediate sensible ambiguous fluxing reality; that of the observer (subject-self) and the observed (object-other) and at once be able to adjust breath, body, posture, limbs, movement (if needed) in order to better support the action of the chosen Psychological Gesture. The awareness of the "*basho* of relative nothingness" is pre-reflective. What differentiates it from the "*basho* of being" is that the "*basho* of relative nothingness" is a more advanced stage in the training and that in this level one's awareness can have the form from the internal focus of attention to the external (space). The "*basho* of relative nothingness" can correspond to the stage where the actor's body can have relaxed from the technical obstacles tensions and concerns of the form of the Psychological Gesture. There can be harmony between movement, gesture and breath. The volume of the actor's breath can increase to the point of activating the *ki/qi* energy in the actor's flesh and can circulate to the actor's physical body. The form of the "*basho* of relative nothingness" awareness can be from the actor's inward space to the outward space, from the invisible body (inner self) to the physical visible body. In the training the balance and harmony between internal and external, between the observed and the observer might need further development. Because the actor's experience at times might be filled with

²¹¹ From my own journal during the rehearsal; 'Obituary' 13 April 2016.

intentionality and dualisms there might be a need to be overcome in time with more practice and training.

2.2.3 The Basho as Absolute Nothingness” Awareness and the Psychological Gesture

In Nishida’s philosophy the “*basho* of relative nothingness” is itself encompassed by the “*basho* as absolute nothingness”. The “*basho* as absolute nothingness” is the level of “pure experience”, “acting-intuition”, the “self-identity of absolute contradictories” (defined in this thesis as “self-contradictory body”). The level of awareness in this “*basho*” is also pre-reflective as well as an ‘optimal’ state of being/doing in acting. The actor can reach this ‘optimal’ mode after a long period of intense training. The actor’s awareness can have advanced to the point that the actor could not struggle, could not toil at all. The Psychological Gesture effortlessly can be incorporated in the actor’s body or can have been part of one’s self. In other words, the actor could have internalized the form and structural relations of the Psychological Gesture hundred per cent. This can indicate that the actor has physicalized the other (character) completely. This ‘optimal’ level of awareness denotes that the actor’s thinking body and acting mind can be in an uninterrupted form of activity. What can be established in the level of the “*basho* as absolute nothingness” is to experience oneness of body and mind, subject and object, the “unity of opposites”. The actor writes in relation to this in his journal,

Self’ is experienced differently when using the PG. The most accurate way for me to describe it would be to say that one experiences two selves, one within the body and one without. One which focuses on the gesture and one which notices/reacts to the space and allows for spontaneous adaption throughout. They coexist. [Extract from actor’s journal *Medea Material/Manhattan Medea* 19/5/2013]

The actor implies here that he experiences an internal-external continuum that is structuring his consciousness and action and that through the Psychological Gesture a dynamic relationship of an inward-outward bodily self is established. The internal-external continuum of the body and the space which is the actor’s

self-character continuum appears to create an open field of energy out of which the knower (actor's self-me) and the known (other-not-me) emerge and co-exist as flux. What is established through the Psychological Gesture is that the body itself (subject) and the body as other (object) fuse with each other and form a contradictory whole (Nishida's "contradictory self-identity body") which brings about the experience of "acting-intuition". Here the form of "absolute nothingness" awareness is an 'optimal' state of being/doing that belongs to the observer-observed, perceiver-perceived, body-world (space/environment) engagement in mutual interaction.

In the above extract the actor appears to realize that the self (body-me) and the acted upon *other* self (body-not-me/character) are fused in a unifying instant of spontaneous action (PG) that seems to form a single whole as a *Gestalt* structure (this is analyzed in-detail in Merleau-Ponty Chapter 3). The actor's self (body-me) and the other, the space (body-not-me), seem to have become perspectives on each other.

In the "*basho* as absolute nothingness" the actor can achieve the unification of body with space (other) and consciousness could be polar. From what the actor mentions in his journal it seems that he moves freely between bodily sensations and perceptual aspects or qualities within the structured activity of the Psychological Gesture. He does not think about what or how to do things. Things just happen. At the same time it appears that he can be equally attentive and observe notice his inner body and his outer self (other) without losing control of his body. He seems to be aware of his self as a 'perceiving-perceived body', as a 'living-lived' structure, a 'feeling-felt' experience that is taking place. The Psychological Gesture seems to have expanded his awareness and perception to the point that mental intentions and bodily tensions have disappeared. They do not block the actor's immediate and visceral response to the situation of the given action of the Psychological Gesture.

The actor appears to experience awareness as "absolute nothingness" where to know can be to perform in harmony movement, gesture, breath, sound, voice, text, sensations, action, the tasks of the performance score, in its deepest, richest sense. In this level of awareness the body itself seems to be

realized through the act of experiencing the Psychological Gesture that precedes the actor's "I" self consciousness. Since there are aspects of praxis that cannot be reduced to consciousness the actor's body-me-self, what Nishida calls the "small self", Michael Chekhov "the lower ego self" (and Nietzsche "small intellect" Chapter 4) recedes/is at the background of consciousness. In acting this is an 'optimal' mode of consciousness where the actor can reach inspiration the state of "Higher Self" understood as separate and transcendent from the small, everyday ego-self perspective.

As in the above extract, the actor's body can be experienced as a 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' structure and the actor can be able to directly encounter facts as they are; the body of the actor can incorporate them without letting the preconceptions of everyday self and consciousness to block the process. The moment can be primordial that is analogous to hear a sound or the sound of soundless or to see a color before having made presupposed meanings about the experience as in "acting intuition".

In Michael Chekhov's practice this primordial experience is to intuitively attain a consciousness of an unbroken progression of the Psychological Gesture. This is none other than an unmediated experience that transcends dualisms and can ultimately be seen as what Nishida defines the "form of the formless". An expression of Zen knowledge when experiencing "pure experience" and "acting intuition" in the acting process. In Michael Chekhov this can be the ability to attend (without thinking) the encounter of physical self and invisible other and without losing the control of the movement, the action i.e., be attentive and influenced thus affected by the impulses and sensations of the Psychological Gesture in the present moment. In this ideal moment the actor's body becomes "acting-intuition"; an 'optimal' state where the distinctions between inner and outer do not exist and can be compared to what the actor describes in the following example,

There is a feeling of absence of control and control at the same time. There is certainly the feeling that something external controls you to an extent, that the existence of some sort of other is always present and that this 'controls' you somehow. However, there is always an

awareness of this and does not mean that one follows this blindly, but more listens to the naturally incurring impulses of the gesture that affect the body. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 25/3/2016]

In this extract action and intuition seem to be inseparable. The actor implies that his experiencing of action and intuition do not operate separately, as one 'following blindly' the other. The actor through active engagement in doing the Psychological Gesture appears to experience the inner-outer body, the inner-outer space interaction and be able to actualize "acting-intuition" in acting practice. This is an advanced level of the training-rehearsal process where the actor's awareness can have developed a 'knowledge-how' that can be related to the "*basho* as absolute nothingness" and can experience oneself as "acting-intuition".

To develop awareness of a 'knowledge-how', to fully attend the active engagement in doing the Psychological Gesture is a primordial state of intentionality. It is an 'optimal' mode of primordial knowing where the actor can move un-self-consciously between bodily sensations and perceptual experience of the Psychological Gesture; (the actor could not simply move from the standpoint of the conscious self). This is an unconscious-conscious field of activity that can be analogous to the structure of "acting-intuition". The structure of "acting-intuition" reflects the ambiguity of the actor's body as an embodied-embedded existence which is the observer-observed, perceiver-perceived, presence-absence, active-passive, created-creating relations of the body to the environment and to the things in the world.

"Acting-intuition" and the "*basho* as absolute nothingness", as an advanced and 'optimal' stage of the actor's awareness in Michael Chekhov's work can be that moment the actor's sense of self (body-me) and the other (body-not-me), the form and content of the Psychological Gesture, that is all distinctions that separate actor's self and character, body and space, are totally dissolved in a singular and uninterrupted field of spontaneous performative action. The accomplished actor can achieve this advanced level of the "*basho* as absolute nothingness" when is able to manifest a heightened awareness and focused internal-external relationship to specific acts that are related to the image of the

Psychological Gesture and to its action (these finally can become tasks within the actor's performance score). Through a full-bodied psycho-physical connection to the image and action of the Psychological Gesture, the actor can be able to channel an intuitive awareness of *ki/qi* energy throughout the body. The actor can be able to control and extend (radiate) the invisible energetic body beyond the physical form of the body out from the body into the space. This link of internal and external body and space, the actor's self (body-me) and the other (body-not-me) is what encompasses in both Nishida and Michael Chekhov "objectivity". What Nishida terms a "great self" and Michael Chekhov a "Higher Ego", Merleau-Ponty calls the 'wild being' in Chapter 3 and Nietzsche "great intellect" in Chapter 4. The actor to be able to encompass "objectivity" and "Higher Ego" that can distance and detach the actor from the habitual identifications of one's everyday "small self" or "lower ego", the body movements of the Psychological Gesture need to correlate with breathing.

2.2.4 Acting Intuition and the Psychological Gesture

"Acting-intuition" in Michael Chekhov can denote the nature of the actor's body's relatedness to the character the world the space as what the term indicates as acting and intuiting. In acting analysis, in practicing the Psychological Gesture, the nature of this relatedness involves two opposites the actor and the character (other), one can imply activity and the other can imply passivity at the same time. "Acting-intuition" can help us understand how the Psychological Gesture can express the inseparability between acting (perceiving 'seeing' feeling the character the things) and intuiting (being perceived felt 'seen'), that is acting on them. In other words, "acting-intuition" can extend our understanding of the dynamism the structure of the Psychological Gesture entails: the actor through gesturing is actively engaged with the environment and is acting in the world on the things and character while is being acted and is giving things a form always within the specific circumstances of the text, the given performance score in the 'here and now'.

The argument in this thesis is that through the Psychological Gesture the actor's body can operate as "acting-intuition" and can deeply grasp the non-separation between internal and external focus of attention; between body and

mind, subject and object, self and other. When the actor is gesturing, for example is penetrating, the actor perceives feels senses his/her body the character (other) the environment the space in a certain way which is according with the act or the gesture of penetrating. The actor's body can immediately grasp a bodily penetrating that is inseparable from the physical gesture of penetrating. Through penetrating (PG) the actor acts on the character the environment the things in it while is being acted on and is being penetrated by them. Through the gesture of penetrating the actor's body is/ becomes "acting-intuition", a pre-reflective experience that can provide an active-passive relational structure that is a non-dual basis and enables the actor to overcome the actor-character, body-space dichotomy; (Yuasa refers to this creative moment of intuition as "dark consciousness" as we shall see in Nietzsche Chapter 4). The actor to be able to be connected and integrated with the world the other (character) as a fundamentally "self-contradictory" bodily structure, to be able to experience the body as "acting-intuition" the unity of breath and body, the unity of body and rhythm, the unity of body and ritual are required. This involves the aesthetics of rhythm, rituality and repetition.

2.2.5 Breath

In "objectivity", the "*basho* as absolute nothingness" awareness, the unification of inner and outer body would be experienced as the distinction between consciously attending to the body and being marginally aware of the body. The way in which attention is directed away from the body and the actor remains consciously aware of some aspects or parts of the body is through the breath. As the actor notes,

I think one has to find a balance between a focus on the gesture whilst also maintaining a focus on the action/text/movement. Of course, the two are completely interrelated but I think it is possible to become too absorbed in the gesture if one dedicates all of their focus to this. Keeping internal-external focus and a consciousness on breath and the extension of the gesture outside of the physical form helps prevent this-supports balance. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 25/3/2016]

The actor's breathing depends on concentration, focus and attention. In the level of awareness "as absolute nothingness" the actor's breathing is expected to remain in focus. To be in focus is for the actor to realize through the body and mind a complete engagement to the Psychological Gesture as well as to feel that the physical body and the inner body are involved in the same direction. In the above extract the actor while keeping peripheral awareness appears to keep simultaneous internal and external focus that strengthens the connections of the body and mind to the image (its sensations and vibrations) and action of the Psychological Gesture. The actor is able to keep the "inner eye" on the breath listening to the breath's journey through his body and beyond through the space and to the point ahead by being attentive to inhalation-exhalation.

By following the breath with an "inner eye" while still keeping his external eye focused outside on the gesture, the actor appears to develop a special kind of awareness of the body and a special kind of relationship to the body in the space. The actor's breathing and the Psychological Gesture seem to have established through the body the feeling of being in relation to space - a sense of inhabiting the space and the other; (at this point the actor has internalized the breath of the gesture that is the breath of the other the character). Through the breath the actor feels and understands inwardly and outwardly, physically and psychologically, the completion of the Psychological Gesture, the completion of the action and the sense of feeling the whole. The actor seems to be able to accomplish enhanced perception through the whole body and experience the body/mind as a *Gestalt* (structure). Without the split between inner and outer body, inner and outer space, the actor appears to be using his body as "acting-intuition".

My argument is that Michael Chekhov's training aims to train the unity of body and mind of the actor as "acting-intuition". The actor learns to trust the flow of sensations and vibrations awakened by the breath, the form of the gesture, the flow of the movement while content and meaning of the Psychological Gesture is creating and forming the actor and the Psychological Gesture is being created and formed by the actor. The attention to inner sensations has nothing

to do with the actor's personal body of feelings emotions and moods. Through the training the actor can realize how one's own sensations and vibrations of the Psychological Gesture articulate through and are being articulated by attention to the external form of the gesture, to the consistency and precision of movement to the action through the breath. In this way the actor is trained to 'weave together psychophysical tasks and actions into a set of connected sensory relationships'²¹².

In the training the role of the act of breath is fundamental for the actor to understand the body as a living organism -- to feel the gradual development and completion of the movement of the gesture (PG) from its beginning, through its middle and to the end, through the breath. As the actor explains in the following extract his breathing affects control of his body and balances internal tension and articulated bodily movement.

We have a tendency to become incredibly 'mind-heavy' being our 'everyday' selves. During the psychological gesture, this is not so --... The centre of the body moves to just below the chest. One becomes much more aware of the breath and its potential as a driving force behind the gesture. I notice that I become much more aware of each part of my body as I feel the vibrations sensations of the gesture and my breath reach every cell in my body. [Extract from actor's journal 'Manhattan Medea' 13/5/2014]

The interpenetration of vibrations, sensations, and pulsations of the body movements, when match up with breath seems to be what allows the actor's breathing to affect his body. The synchronization of the breath and the body in motion allows the actor's breathing to achieve and maintain unification of energy and balance between *ki/qi*, between inner and outer gesture that affect the body of the actor deeply²¹³. According to Yuasa in his *Body, Self-Cultivation*

²¹² P. Zarrilli, *Psychophysical Acting*, p. 104.

²¹³ To summarize the meaning of the concept and the phenomenon of *ki*-energy Yuasa Yasuo writes: 'The substance of the unknown energy, *ki*, is not yet known. It is the flow of a certain energy circulating in the living body, unique to the living organism. The flow of *ki*, when it is seen psychologically, is perceived, [...] as a self-apprehending sensation of one's own body under special circumstances. When it is viewed physiologically, it

and *Ki-energy*, the term *ki/qi* energy has been translated as a 'vital force', a 'physical energy'; *ki/qi* designates a 'holistic non-dualistic non-egological paradigm that is to be understood as 'psychophysical' or 'physiological' in nature'²¹⁴. The concept of *ki/qi* denotes a state prior to the dualistic separation of physical and psychological, subject and object, body and mind, body and space. It is rather the 'source out of which all these arise'²¹⁵. Shigenori Nagatomo, following Yuasa, explains that *ki/qi* energy indicates the "living and lived body"; "living body" refers to the life activity operating in one's physical object-body as well as in that of others, "lived body" refers to the conscious awareness of this life activity'²¹⁶. For Phillip Zarrilli, 'Asian terminologies as *ki/qi/prana-vayu* [...] is rather the actor's complete engagement of her energy, sensory awareness, and perception-in-action in the moment'²¹⁷.

As the actor claims in the above extract, the circulation of breath is what keeps his body and mind in harmony and balance. It appears that the actor's breathing and moving body are animated and articulated by spiritual power *ki/qi*; (spiritual here is from Latin *spiritus* meaning to breathe/breath; *ki/qi*, as said earlier, is the physical aspect of a life force that is connected to *dantiens*/energy centre). The actor's breathing establishes the unity of inner and outer body and the role of *ki/qi* energy within and without the body as in the 'optimal' state of being/doing of "acting-intuition" where there is no separation between the internal body and the external space. Through the Psychological Gesture and the breath the actor is trained to use the body as "acting-intuition" and establish the dynamic invisible psycho-physical energy of *ki/qi* within and without the body that marks visceral processes of the body. Experiencing Psychological Gesture as "acting-intuition" is a psychophysical skillful practice in which *ki/qi* can be cultivated and 'circulate within the interior of the body,

is detected on the skin [...] Therefore, the *ki* energy is both psychological and physiological [...] Its substance lies in the region of the psychologically unconscious and the physiologically invisible', in *Body, Self-Cultivation and Ki-energy*, (Albany, New York: The State University of New York, 1993), p. 116-117.

²¹⁴ S. Nagatomo, 'Ki-Energy: invisible psychophysical energy', *Asian Philosophy*, 12. 3, (2002), p. 173.

²¹⁵ S. Nagatomo, *ibid.*, p. 173.

²¹⁶ S. Nagatomo, *ibid.*, p. 174.

²¹⁷ P. Zarrilli, *Psychophysical Acting*, p. 21.

while at the same time intermingling with *ki*-energy pervasively present in the natural environment'²¹⁸.

In Michael Chekhov's training, as in all psychophysical practices, *ki/qi* is induced by intention the mind or attention, by an act of "attentive breathing"²¹⁹. "Attentive breathing" is an extra daily activity concealed from everyday experience and consciousness. One can accomplish "attentive breathing" through Psychological Gesture as a form of breath training which allows one 'to focus to from the visceral'²²⁰. Through "attentive breathing" the actor can gradually shift awareness to the breath in 'the here and the now' as breath traverses its way to the visceral depths of the body below the navel (*danstien*) and through the physical body beyond through the space *to* the point ahead or *through* the point ahead (*to* or *through* depends on the action of the PG). Through breathing the actor's gesture, the body of the actor feels that grows by expanding inwardly and outwardly. The body is able to move toward a sense of openness receptivity and control while there is simultaneous awareness of 'what it is doing as it is being done, i.e., the vibratory quality of its relationship to the acting task in relation to the environment it inhabits'²²¹.

Through "attentive breathing" the actor can go down at the depths of the body and reach a material energy which seems to creatively affect behavior, feelings and emotions. The process points to an unconscious body. An 'unconscious region or energy hidden from everyday consciousness'²²², a 'dark layer' (a 'dark consciousness' in Nietzsche Chapter 4) can be penetrated through a controlled willfully breathing (this region will be further explored as the Dionysian energy in Nietzsche's Chapter 4). In other words, in practicing Psychological Gesture an unconscious concentrated dynamic energy grounded in the depths of the human body is released and makes itself available through "attentive breathing". As an actor writes,

²¹⁸ S. Nagatomo, *ibid.*, p. 175.

²¹⁹ P. Zarrilli, *Psychophysical Acting*, p. 25.

²²⁰ D. Leder, 'Flesh and Blood', p. 214.

²²¹ P. Zarrilli, *Psychophysical Acting*, p. 57.

²²² Y. Yuasa, *The Body, Self-Cultivation, and Ki-Energy* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1993), p. 21.

I was breathing in and out while I was doing the gesture of throwing that allowed me to access whatever unconscious thoughts and images this unknown field of memories this landscape from my childhood evoked.²²³
[Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 20/3/2016]

This unconscious energy when experienced, one's body and self feels that 'enters more deeply into the self'²²⁴. The body of the actor 'forms one body with the universe'²²⁵, one body with nature and cosmos. The actor in the above extract appears to experience an archetypal source of creative capacity which Nishida names 'unattainable depth'²²⁶. What is really happening though is that the *ki/qi* energy of the actor's body (as microcosmos) connects with the *ki/qi* energy of space with nature and cosmos (as macrocosmos).

I feel that the top of my head connects to the sky and the soles of my feet rooted into the floor-ground connect to the earth. I have a different sense of my hands than usual. I can feel needles of energy in my fingertips and my palms are warm. The relationship to my hands and my feet has changed. I feel that my body particularly my feet and my arms and my hands are connected to the space are part of the space, part of something bigger- as if my body belongs not only to myself. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 22/4/2016]

The process the actor describes seems to rest upon an exchange of the actor's physical body with the environment, with an invisible world, characterized by viscerality that is affecting the body and mind of the actor physiologically and empowers his being. The psychophysical experience of the Psychological Gesture here seems to harmonize *ki/qi*-energy shared between inner invisible space and outer physical world-space that seems to be analogous to "acting-intuition". In other words, the actor is using his body as "acting intuition" and

²²³ Actor's journal 'Obituary' March 2016.

²²⁴ Nishida, *Art and Morality*, p. 43.

²²⁵ D. Leder, 'Flesh and Blood', p. 215.

²²⁶ Nishida, *Art and Morality*, p. 42.

“forms one body with the universe”²²⁷ because there is a ‘mutual interfusion of this *ki/qi* energy between the subject-self and the object-other (character) as a condition for the “subject-object” dialogue to take place’²²⁸. An idea, as Tu Wei-ming writes, is ‘predicated on the assumption that since all modalities of being are made of *ki/qi* all things cosmologically share the same consanguinity with us and are thus our companions’²²⁹.

2.2.6 Rhythm

The Psychological Gesture connects inner (psychic) and outer (physical) function as synchronic processes that establish the relationship between gesture and rhythm. Whether the gesture is physically (outwardly) or non-physically (inwardly) performed, through conscious control, the actor’s breathing is established when the actor’s natural breathing rhythm coincides with the rhythm of the gesture²³⁰ (the character’s). The synchronization of the Psychological Gesture with breath master the rhythm of the movement. The energetic body of the actor through Psychological Gesture by focusing on the visceral process of the breath can embody rhythm that can hold together the body to form a whole (a *Gestalt* structure). Michael Chekhov writes that rhythm is “the source of any inspiration because rhythm is the whole”²³¹. The inner impulse of the Psychological Gesture (the movement) follows the natural rhythm of the breath and patterned recurrent beat of sensations, vibrations, pulsations, that come from the gesture pervade inwardly and outwardly the body of the actor. This denotes that the body and mind of the actor has organized internal emotions, feelings and external rhythm through breath into a unified gesture into a whole. The Psychological Gesture is embodied and the body of the actor becomes rhythm. This indicates the capacity to perceive and

²²⁷ Tu Wei-ming, *Confucian Thought: Selfhood as Creative Transformation* (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1985), p. 45.

²²⁸ S. Nagatomo, ‘Ki-Energy Underpinning Religion and Ethics’, in J.Y. Park and G. Kopf (eds.) in *Merleau-Ponty and Ethics*, (U.K.: Lexington Books, 2009), p. 233.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

²³⁰ P. Zarrilli writes: ‘The wind, breath or vital energy (*vayu*, *prana* or *prana-vayu*) is conceptually and practically the link between the physical and the subtle bodies’ [2000: 130].

²³¹ M. Chekhov in A. Kirillov “The Theoretical System of Michael Chekhov”, in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge,), p. 54.

respond and perform in flow and to accomplish the unity of body and mind, self and other (character) as “acting-intuition”.

Embodied rhythm is a psychophysical state of listening and responding. A state of constant flux that can be developed through a synchronic practice in space. Embodied rhythm can maintain the attention and concentration of the actor within the complex structure and environment of Psychological Gesture to the present moment. Through rhythm the actor’s movement, breath, sensations, vibrations, spatial qualities of the gesture, can attain inter-connectedness of body and mind and space on several planes simultaneously physically, mentally, spiritually. The process breaks through the barrier of rationalization and the obstacles created by tensions. ‘Rhythm is a universal language’²³² that directly affects perception, attention and emotion. It is a phenomenon rooted in the physiology of the human body that is associated to a moving and fluid body which is not fixed or static in content and form. ‘An alteration of the rhythm can fundamentally change the content of the material’²³³.

The word rhythm comes from the Greek *rhuthmos* (ρυθμός) and is related to *rhein* (ρέειν) meaning to flow. Rhythm is an organic process of the human body that can be associated directly with the experience of emotion. As one of my actors mentioned in an interview,

Being rhythmic gives you a cause, it justifies the reason how why to link and unite my emotions what is happening inside my body how I am feeling and what is manifested outside through my gesture as an external action what I am doing. I had a strange different rhythmical sense of myself I felt I was another.²³⁴

The actor describes that the body to have rhythm or become rhythm gives a coherence that can inform what is happening within and without the body. Rhythm can inform the shape and quality of the movement that arranges the

²³² A. Kirillov “The Theoretical System of Michael Chekhov”, in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge,), p. 54.

²³³ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

²³⁴ Interview 29 September 2013 ‘Medea Material’ ‘Manhattan Medea’.

kinesthetic image of the Psychological Gesture the action as well as the discovery of the internal world of the other (character) which is to see the other from the inside.

To experience a rhythmical transformation is a visceral process that re-organizes and re-structures more effectively the body of the actor to actively and creatively 'listen' and to "become all eyes"²³⁵. When practicing Psychological Gesture the actor's body becomes a rhythmic body involves the actor is able to 'see', sense, perceive an *other* within itself as in "acting-intuition". Embodied rhythm can accomplish the unity of the body and mind, and the actor's body is able to be used as "acting-intuition".

According to the actor's remark rhythm might be considered a useful tool which has the capacity to shape perception and alter the actor's state of everyday consciousness. The actor can regulate feelings emotions and action and can explore different connections between body and mind than the actor is used to. The importance of rhythm is its capacity to unite self and other (character), body and mind, body and space, and be used as a relational tool in the actor's experience and perception. 'Rhythm has the power to affect'²³⁶. Rhythm can sustain the ability of the actor through Psychological Gesture to be related to the environment, space and the character. As the actor mentions in the above extract through the gesture (PG) and by 'being rhythmic' his body and mind can transcend the limitations of his sense of everyday self. It can give rise to his other selves other bodies and can induce transcendence-ecstasy by extending his self beyond the limits of personal energies and personality beyond the physical limits of his body. The actor's 'rhythmical inner and outer progression'²³⁷ enable the actor's body to explore the possibilities of another self (character) from a transpersonal perspective.

²³⁵ P. Zarrilli, Phillip, *When the Body Becomes All Eyes: Paradigms Discourses and Practices of Power in Kalarippayattu, a South Indian Martial Art* (India: Oxford University Press India, 1998/2003) pp. 201-214.

²³⁶ A. Kirillov "The Theoretical System of Michael Chekhov", in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge.), p. 54.

²³⁷ Y. Meerzon, "Staging the Spectator", in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge.), p. 132.

The Psychological Gesture as an extension of the physical form of the body that goes beyond the physical self cannot be regarded simply as part of the body of the actor. But rather as an invented skillful tool that is created with the actor's imagination "through the rhythm"²³⁸. The body of the actor becomes rhythm by using the Psychological Gesture as a tool that becomes a part of the actor's living organism while the body of the actor becomes part of the Psychological Gesture, which is using the living body of the actor as a tool²³⁹. In practice through the Psychological Gesture the body of the actor is trained to being at once active and passive, body and non-body, self and other (character), to acquire a practical knowledge of "acting-intuition" which is a know-how of things in action. The body of the actor to become rhythm through the Psychological Gesture and to be used as "acting-intuition" is an idea closely tied with what Nishida considered the practice of Zen.

The body as rhythm operates as a tool and is the "organ of acting-intuition"²⁴⁰. Ching-yuen Cheung states that Nishida's philosophy of body as 'the organ of acting intuition is one of the most important concepts in his later philosophy and he interprets the philosophy of acting intuition as a phenomenology of rhythm'²⁴¹. In this study the aspect that through Psychological Gesture the actor's 'body is the organ of acting-intuition'²⁴² is taken from Nishida's philosophy and is a concept that focuses on the phenomenological idea that the body can become a 'thing' in "acting-intuition"; (it will be further explored through Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology of the "lived body", "flesh" "intercorporeality" and "chiasm" in Merleau-Ponty Chapter 3).

The concept that the "body is the organ of acting-intuition" is an aspect of Nishida's philosophy that is taken in this thesis that reflects foundational principles in Michael Chekhov's technique. It promotes the idea of an acting

²³⁸ M. Chekhov in G. Padegimas "Chekhov's Lithuanian Lessons", in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge), p. 347.

²³⁹ Nishida in C.Cgeung, C. Cgeung, 'Nishida Kitaro's Philosophy of the Body', *Dao*, 13 (2014), p.509.

²⁴⁰ C. Cgeung, 'Nishida Kitaro's Philosophy of the Body', *Dao*, 13 (2014), pp. 527-523.

²⁴¹ C. Cgeung, 'Nishida Kitaro's Philosophy of the Body', *Dao*, 13 (2014), pp.527-523..

²⁴² C. Cgeung, 'Nishida Kitaro's Philosophy of the Body', *Dao*, 13 (2014), p.508.

body which is not being a mechanical and a passive organ of perception that is a body without having active response or resistance. In Nishida and Michael Chekhov the idea that the body is a tool denotes that is 'an active and creative-productive organ that involves in the perception of the world'²⁴³. The 'body as a tool' does not simply mean that the body can extend itself and can go beyond the physical form, the physical limits of the body or it simply is the extension of the body which the actor experiences when performing the Psychological Gesture. The Psychological Gesture improves, invents and extends the efficiency of the body and mind to be connected with the character the other and the world by using the actor's body as an implement. The body of the actor is used as a tool to perform a particular function; to simultaneously experience the body as subject-self and object-other, as passive and active, as observer and observed; to complete the task/action of the actor to encounter the other and to feel and sense the other (character) to be part of the body, to perceive and see an *other* self within itself productively.

Being in rhythm appears to imply that the body of the actor operates as "acting-intuition", that another "I" beyond the realm of conscious ego-self arises and is felt, sensed, perceived, but cannot be grasped by conscious control and understanding. In practicing Psychological Gesture rhythm can be embodied when 'acting and intuition although are different by definition are always together because as Nishida argues there is no intuition before acting and no acting before intuition'²⁴⁴. Differently said by Michael Chekhov "any harmony" between opposites is the "result of the impact of rhythm upon something"²⁴⁵.

2.2.7 Ritual

Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture as "acting intuition" involves the aesthetics of rituality and repetition by emphasizing the importance of experiencing and perceiving space and time as non-everyday ordinary

²⁴³ C. Cgeung, 'Nishida Kitaro's Philosophy of the Body', *Dao*, 13 (2014), p. 509.

²⁴⁴ C. Cgeung, 'Nishida Kitaro's Philosophy of the Body', *Dao*, 13 (2014), p. 509.

²⁴⁵ M. Chekhov in A. Kirillov "The Theoretical System of Michael Chekhov", in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge,), p. 55.

dimensions, as “creative individuality”, that organizes the body as a continuous flow of movement, repetition and breath, that inspires the actor with multiple possibilities of other worlds and selves. Psychological Gesture as “acting intuition” experience has the characteristics of a ritual. The particular psychophysical structural conditions of the Psychological Gesture that enable “acting intuition” to happen help the actor towards an artistic creation that utilizes a rhythmical connection that can bring the actor’s body/mind ‘in time and in space to its fullest’²⁴⁶, as a Whole. This can be considered as a ritualistic experience since it makes a practical and effective use of what Cynthia Ashperger names ‘the third guiding principle in Michael Chekhov’s work that of employing the Higher Self’²⁴⁷.

Experiencing a rhythmical connection to Psychological Gesture is a ritualistic element in the actor’s work that is manifest through a series of repetitive gestures. ‘Rituals are repetitive rhythmic actions’²⁴⁸. Through a sequence of movement and actions which involve rhythmic breathing patterns and have the capacity to open ways of accessing energies and resources, the actor’s everyday energetic body can extend beyond itself. From what the actor describes in the following extract the experience might be characterized, although she does not name it as such, as a sense of ‘trance’.

I felt a suspension of personal consciousness -a sense of half-conscious state a sense of hypnotic rhythm something between sleeping and waking; my ability to function voluntarily was suspended while I was entirely aware of my breath’s journey, position of my body and what I was doing when I was twisting -- doing the gesture of twist/wring. [Extract from actor’s journal Actor’s journal ‘Medea Material’ by Heiner Muller 12/5/2014].

²⁴⁶ H. Lefebvre, *Rhythmanalysis*, p. 6; Lefebvre explains that rhythm and repetition are interrelated.

²⁴⁷ C. Ashperger, ‘Michael Chekhov’s five guiding principles and theatre practice today: the case of *Tender Napalm* by Phillip Ridley’, in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge, 2015), p. 378.

²⁴⁸ R. Schechner, ‘Living a Double Consciousness’, in Bell, C. (ed.) *Teaching Ritual*, (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), p.15.

The actor's describes a different sense of her usual sense of self and consciousness something between sleeping and waking that enables the actor's body to grasp the 'inner rhythm of the whole thing'²⁴⁹ (PG). The Psychological Gesture as "acting intuition" appears to train the actor to be able to feel to sense to perceive an inner rhythm that can produce a rhythmic tuning, a sense of unison and harmony between self and other, body and mind, body and space; this is the effect and result of the actor's repetitive act of gesturing and the actor's "inhaling-exhaling"²⁵⁰. Each time the Psychological Gesture is performed, it is to be in the 'here and now', as if it were the first time. This harnesses rhythmic actions and links the repetitive activities to the present moment in the form of ritual that it is controlled through breath in the actor's body/mind. Ashperger states that a 'ritual emphasizes the importance of both the present moment as the only important moment in an actor's body/mind, and the space in which this happens'²⁵¹.

Each Psychological Gesture might be seen as a 'self-contained, self-absorbed ritual' through which the actor is totally 'immersed in the proper execution of their complex tasks'²⁵². When doing the Psychological Gesture the actor is engaged only in performing the specific task while rhythmic stimulation of the actor's body combined with ritual body postures (specific repetitive sequence of actions related to the chosen PG) produce other bodies. As the actor states,

After a while I was doing the gesture something begun to beat in my own body until I had a physical feeling of contact with the space and the world around. I felt that energy is transmitted from my own body (me the actor) and is restored into the body of an other in space (the character?) and vice versa. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 3/3/2016]

From the above description it can be said that Psychological Gesture operates as "acting intuition" where the distinctions between inner and outer space seem

²⁴⁹ D.H. du Prey, 'Working with Chekhov,' *The Drama Review*, 27.3 (1983), p. 87.

²⁵⁰ M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 177.

²⁵¹ C. Ashperger, 'Michael Chekhov's five guiding principles and theatre practice today: the case of *Tender Napalm* by Phillip Ridley', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge, 2015), p. 379.

²⁵² R. Schechner, *ibid.*, 24.

to disappear while the actor's body follows a ritualized pattern that redirects energies in his body. The actor's physical and mental powers are applied entirely to the completion of a particular physical activity (PG) while the engagement to a specific physical activity minimalizes the intention to produce psychological meanings analytical explanations anything that would not allow a shift in the actor's everyday perceptual consciousness. Psychological Gesture is a form of specific pattern of actions as "ritual is primarily activity. It is an activity governed by explicit rules. The important thing is what you do, not what you think, believe or say"²⁵³. In other words, Psychological Gesture is a *sheer* physical action, an activity that can be lived and felt as "acting intuition", as a ritual, in the sense that requires particular rules and conditions as a form of self cultivation that detaches from habitual self-centeredness. It deeply affects perceptual experience of the body and mind of the actor.

The actor entirely absorbed merely in the physical activity of doing the Psychological Gesture functions as intuition and as reflection. Intuition as a consciousness of an unbroken progression of things just as they are (known and that which is known are one). Reflection as a consciousness which is standing outside of this progression and turns around and views it. In Michael Chekhov's training the actor can experience intuition and reflection at the same time. This function of Psychological Gesture is primordial, an "acting-intuition" experience that brings an 'optimal' mode of being/doing in the acting process. Intuition is 'the doing of the actions that draws me deeply into the actions without asking that I comprehend (at the moment of doing) what those actions signify'²⁵⁴ whereas reflection would be 'doing and watching myself doing or find a place from which to experience and observe simultaneously'²⁵⁵.

Psychological Gesture is a ritual practice that communicates what Michael Chekhov considered a "dual consciousness" in acting. Two different modes of consciousness in the actor's experience: one that helps the actor surrender the

²⁵³ R. Schechner, 'Living a Double Consciousness', in Bell, C. (ed.) *Teaching Ritual*, (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), *ibid.*, p. 18.

²⁵⁴ R. Schechner, *ibid.*, 24.

²⁵⁵ R. Schechner, *ibid.*, 24.

I-ego self and merge with other selves and/or with other worlds and one that helps the actor be 'simply the messenger'²⁵⁶ which conveys information of what is happening within and without one's body.

Richard Schechner states that,

"Ritual experience" is grounded in certain biological constants. For example, specific actions such as whirling according to known rules, generate predictable changes in electroencephalogram rates and in brain chemistry, the release of endorphins, particularly. The electroencephalogram indicates that a certain kind of experience is felt; the endorphins make people feel ... lightly, naturally opiated'²⁵⁷.

It can be said that Psychological Gesture is a *sheer* psycho-physical activity characterized by repetitive rhythmic exaggerated movements that can help boost in endorphins can help increase endorphin release and can raise the actor's levels of energy. This seems to have a vigorous change in the body and mind of the actor. If we follow Schechner's statement, it is possible to say that Psychological Gesture as ritual experience combined with full sensory engagement that comes from doing specific physical actions that belong to certain kinds of physical activity can be associated with endorphins secretion, can stimulate endorphin release that can modify the psychophysical structure of the actor. Endorphin release can be responsible for what one of my actors named in the training-studio as "a feeling of euphoria" or "euphoric feelings", a sense of "adrenaline rush", or a sense of "sudden increase and burst of energy that was felt when engaged entirely to the Psychological Gesture"²⁵⁸. The specific actor is an athlete, a boxer and a scientist, a biologist. In one of our discussions he said that the "modification he felt in his own body when practicing Psychological Gesture had similar powerful psychophysical effect in terms of exaggerated physical energy when practicing boxing"²⁵⁹. He felt that he "could perform physical and mental tasks more effortlessly more quickly

²⁵⁶ R. Schechner, *ibid.*, 24.

²⁵⁷ R. Schechner, *ibid.*, p. 18.

²⁵⁸ 'Obituary' project 3/4/2016 (from a discussion with actors after the rehearsal).

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

more lightly more accurately”; that “a change he felt in his own body was acquired from the activity of twisting (PG), from doing the gesture which he felt engaged his whole nervous system that made changes to his action of killing and was responsible for a profound transformation that created a sense of heightened awareness, an unusual sense of consciousness as if he were an other self (as he explained) that enabled him to experience different areas of alternate dimensions and realities”²⁶⁰. The following extract is the actor’s description of what his experience involved.

Doing the gesture of twisting makes me follow a specific pattern of action to achieve the killing that through repetition transforms into vibrations. This invoked a steady and continuous rhythmic movement, a state of flow that involves constant centering of attention, my merging with twisting (PG) while being aware, the experience of being in control of the twisting - the action - the space - the other who was following me, the conditions of my surroundings and a strange loss of ordinary sense of myself. [Extract from the actor’s journal ‘Obituary’ 17/3/2016]

Here Psychological Gesture operates as “acting intuition” in the sense that constantly invents and performs the actor’s body as different aspects or versions of self and a play of different states of energies and moods. In this way the unification of the self with the other, body and space, the relationship between the body, memory and imagination in the actor’s self become ‘the many-in-the one’, ‘the one-in-the-many’.

Rhythm repetition and ritual are aesthetic principles that seem to operate in practicing Psychological Gesture as a distancing strategy and device to defamiliarize the body. The actor becomes a constant witness, a constant consciousness of self that explores and encounters his/herself as the observed other. The Psychological Gesture as “acting intuition” trains the actor’s ability to shift attention and consciousness from inner to outer and vice versa from one role or self to another and to be able to handle what seems to be an ‘optimal’

²⁶⁰ From my own journal ‘Obituary’ 20/3/2016. The quotations were taken during our discussions in the studio-rehearsal process.

mode of being/doing in acting process: the overlapping of three distinct selves/bodies within the actor's self: a) the body as the self-me, b) the body as not-me/the other (character), c) the body as the technical self.

2.3 Concluding Remarks

Nishida's dialectics, the unity of opposites, that establishes the logic of the "self-contradictory" body can describe the field of action wherein there are no dualities but "acting intuition" or the "*basho* of nothingness" in acting process. Nishida offers the philosophical context to examine the nature of the basic principles of acting and intuiting that structure the actor's body and sense of self-perception in practicing the Psychological Gesture. The chapter analyzed in-depth how the Psychological Gesture conditions the actor's body as an intuitive activity. As intuition and reflection and can operate simultaneously as "acting-intuition"; as both active and passive, inner and outer, as intellectual and multi-sensory/multi-sensuous experience that can take hold of a deeper and more inclusive field of knowledge that grasps the actor's unconscious.

For Nishida and Michael Chekhov the creative process is structured with no dualities as "acting-intuition", an 'optimal' mode of being/doing that can support the aspect of cognition as embodied-embedded action. The importance of pre-reflective and reflective thought which is guiding the action in Nishida enlightens how a complex and reciprocal interplay between self and other (character), visible and invisible body, can be initiated in the actor's experience of the Psychological Gesture. Nishida help us understand the complex way in which the actor's body and mind, action and its outcomes affect each other by examining how the (actor's) acting body (experienced as a living organism) and the space stand in relation to each other through mutual co-determination, through mutually unfolded (opening gesture) and enfolded (closing gesture) bodily structure. How the actor's body in practicing the Psychological Gesture can experience the reciprocal intertwining that is not simply to receive the world the other (character) passively into oneself, but to actively encompass it, to take it in.

The above issues will be further examined in the next Chapter 3 on Merleau-Ponty through the role of the “lived body” and its creative capacities to go beyond the physical limits of the body and the self as “flesh” as “*chiasm*”, a process that generates images and reflection through imagination.

Chapter 3: Merleau Ponty's Chiasmic Body and Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture

Introduction

After having examined in Chapter 2 the nature of the psychophysical activities of action and intuition that organize the actor's body and its parts as "acting intuition" or "self-contradictory", this chapter examines the nature of this functional ambiguity of the actor's body which equally engages and structures the body (physical) and mind (psycho) as a whole.

The chapter analyzes how the Psychological Gesture structures the actor's body as both itself (body-me/actor) and simultaneously not itself (body-not-me /other) through the philosophy of the *Chiasmic* body by the French philosopher Merleau-Ponty. Nishida's dialectical principles of action and intuition that are developed in Chapter 2 point in a way to a criss-crossing structure, to the *chiasmic* body offered by the philosophy of Merleau-Ponty. Before applying Merleau-Ponty's analysis to Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture, I discuss Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of the *chiasmic* relationship of the body and the world, the self and the other, the body and the mind, the inner and the outer, the visible and the invisible.

Merleau-Ponty is classified as one of the earliest and foremost philosophers of the period during and immediately following the Second World War French movement of existential phenomenology. His close association with Jean Paul Sartre and Simon Beauvoir played a role in this. From 1948 until 1953 Merleau-Ponty was one of the first philosophers to bring Structuralism and the linguistic emphasis of thinkers such as Ferdinand de Saussure into a relationship with phenomenology and existentialism. He was strongly influenced by the work of Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger. His work remains highly influential in contemporary continental philosophy as it is practiced in Europe and beyond. (See Appendix 3 for Merleau-Ponty's biography)

Today his phenomenological analyses which always implicate the body, the subject-body, the “flesh”, continue to inspire contemporary research and have an ongoing closely connection in diverse scientific fields that are concerned with the relation between mind and body, perception, developmental psychology, the interdisciplinary disciplines of cognitive science, medical ethics, ecology, and performance among others, but no one has applied his work to Psychological Gesture in depth. The intention of Merleau-Ponty was to overcome the flaws of empiricism and intellectualism; all dualisms. His philosophy seeks to rearticulate the relationship between subject and object, body and world, in order to develop a radical re-description of embodiment, perception, and ontology. For Merleau-Ponty, embodied experience as a bodily knowledge always derives in relation to practical exigencies of the physical conditions of the body that result from being exposed in the world. In other words, embodiment is a practical capacity of the body to act.

Merleau-Ponty does not consider the body as a mere physical entity among other material entities of the world without including others, the world and the things in it. His philosophy promotes the role of the body as the intermediate agency through which the self has access to the world. The distinctive character of this existential structure is of “being-in-the-world”. The body is ‘the vehicle of being in the world that is always involved in a definite environment’¹. This idea places the body as the ‘locus for experience as it is lived in a deepening awareness’². It dissolves and transcends the body-mind dualisms and opens up a field of new and creative possibilities.

Central in the philosophy of Merleau-Ponty is the concept of the ‘lived body’. What differentiates it from the physical body is that the ‘lived body’ is a ‘system of correspondences that collectively make up a perceptual field, is a cultural identity, whereas biology treats the physical body as thematized’³.

¹ M. Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, translated by D.A. Landes (London and New York: Routledge, 1962), p. 82.

² D.M. Levin, *The Body's Recollections of Being: Phenomenological Psychology and the Deconstruction of Nihilism* (London: Routledge, 1985), p. 62.

³ C. Vasseleu, *Textures of Light: Vision and Touch in Irigaray, Levinas and Merleau-Ponty* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), p. 28.

Merleau-Ponty rejects any kind of objective, epistemological standpoint, or psychologism and emphasizes that there is not an isolated disembodied self, an 'inner man'⁴. The body, the self is not a 'pre-existing being'⁵ that can act independently. Merleau-Ponty describes and understands the experience of the body 'as the self experiences it'⁶. His starting point for understanding the notion of self and the world is their "facticity"⁷. The experience of the body is not separated from the world, from the things, cut off from space and time. The body is not what the self thinks decides or judges at an instance of deliberate thinking but what the self lives through⁸. Borrowing from Heidegger his term "being-in-the-world"⁹, Merleau-Ponty suggests that the world is the natural field and setting for the thoughts and perceptions¹⁰ of the body and only in the world does the self know itself. Bodily experience arises in the world which the self inhabits and in which it acts. The self is 'conscious of [its] body *via* the world'¹¹. The body is the means for having a world, for being in the world and in that sense the self is always 'conscious of the world through the medium of [its] body'¹².

Merleau-Ponty poses a radical challenge to the philosophy of reflection, and to Descartes' metaphysics; to his notion of self as *cogito* ("I think therefore I am") and the idea that the world is 'a completed and explicit totality'¹³. Descartes conceives both the world and the body as "thought"¹⁴. He replaces "the world"

⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. xi.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p.xx.

⁶ T. Carman, 'Merleau-Ponty and the Mystery of Perception', *Philosophy Compass*, 4.4 (2009), p. 630.

⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. vii

⁸ *Ibid.*,pp. xvi-xvii.

⁹ The notion of self in Heidegger [1889-1976], his term *Dasein* ("being-in-the-world) literally means being there or being in the present moment constitutes a "being-in-the-world" (*in-der-Welt-sein*). 'To remedy the ills of Husserl's phenomenology, Merleau-Ponty developed his approach to phenomenology under the influence of Martin Heidegger's *Dasein*.' [J.Y. Park and G. Kopf, 'Introduction: Philosophy, Nonphilosophy, and Comparative Philosophy', in J.Y. Park and G. Kopf (eds), *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism* (Maryland, Lexington Books: 2009), p. 3].

¹⁰ *Ibid.*,p. xi.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 82.

¹³ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 71.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 43. In the sections: "Reflection and Interrogation" and "Interrogation and Dialectic", Merleau-Ponty talks extensively about Cartesian subjectivism/Cartesian analytic reflection of the notion of self. [*Ibid.*, pp. 3-50; pp. 50-105].

with the “being thought” and defines the “I” *qua* “thought”¹⁵. For this reason, Merleau-Ponty claims that Cartesian philosophy constructs self and the world through thought and thus reduces them into the content of cognition. ‘Into fixed entities in a vacuum state’¹⁶ where body and the world are established in an intellectual and transparent way. Merleau-Ponty defends that the body is a primordial, pre-objective form of existence¹⁷ that belongs to immediate experience of actual things and events.

This study aims to explore Merleau-Ponty’s understanding of perception, the ontology of *chiasm* reversibility’ and ‘flesh’ as applied to Michael Chekhov’s Psychological Gesture. To understand these concepts the following terms need to be examined: ambiguity; *Gestalt*; horizon; transcendence; inter- corporeality; reflection or mirror; *ecart*; body image and body schema. All these terms interlink and reflect back to the main and key concepts in his work, that of ‘*chiasm*’ and ‘flesh’, which can offer a possible critical frame to reconsider the subject-object, body-world (space), internal-external, presence -absence, interactions in the field of acting.

3.1 The Structure of Ambiguity

Merleau-Ponty closely examined perception and in his late writing he was fascinated by how the painter Cezanne saw the world and created his paintings. In “Cezanne’s Doubt”¹⁸ Merleau-Ponty gives an account of living perception wherein ‘conception cannot precede “execution”’¹⁹ and anchors phenomenology in creative processes. The French painter’s perceptual experience is not described as a series of intellectual operations, but as happening only in the artist’s mind and/or imagination when perception and thought are not yet separated. The painter’s living perception denotes the

¹⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, 1968: 43.

¹⁶ J. Y. Park, ‘The Double: Merleau-Ponty and Chinul on Thinking and Questioning’, in J.Y. Park and G. Kopf (eds), *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism* (Maryland: Lexington Books, 2009), p. 98.

¹⁷ C. Olson, ‘The Human Body as a Boundary Symbol: A Comparison of Merleau-Ponty and Dōgen’, in J.Y. Park and G. Kopf (eds), *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism* (Maryland: Lexington Books, 2009), p. 85.

¹⁸ M. Merleau-Ponty, *Sense and Non-Sense*, translated by H. Dreyfus (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1964b), pp. 9-25. Cezanne: French Post-Impressionist painter [1839- 1906].

¹⁹ Merleau-Ponty, *Sense and Non-Sense*, p. 19.

return to that primordial state when body and mind are not separated and the 'quality, light, color, depth which are there before us, are there only because they awaken an echo in our body and because the body welcomes them ... [And] they arouse in me [the self] a carnal formula of their presence'²⁰. Merleau-Ponty states the breaking down of subject-object, body-world, inner-outer dichotomy and replaces the Cartesian *cogito* with the vital power of the primordial 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' structure of the body that 'organizes the world as it goes'²¹.

In his essay "Eye and Mind"²² living perceptual experience is formed and organized prior to any kind of preconceived knowledge the moment the perceiving self sees the tiles at the bottom of a swimming pool regardless of the reflections of the water or the misleading impressions of the distortions of sunlight or the ripples of the water. Merleau-Ponty emphasizes that because of these misleading impressions and distorted forms and shapes, the perceiving self can see the lines, the curves, the surfaces, and the spatial arrangement of the tiles at the bottom of the swimming pool. Otherwise the perceiving self 'would cease to see it as it is and where it is – which is to say, beyond any identical, specific place'²³.

Merleau-Ponty suggests that the body gets involved in and interacts with the physical environment in a way that goes beyond the limits set by the traditional preconceived boundary between self and world, body and mind, inner and outer realities. The line that marks the limits or extent between them is blurred, something that indicates, according to Merleau-Ponty, that the quality of ambiguity is 'inherent in things'²⁴; that living perception reveals a 'structure of ambiguity'²⁵. He writes:

²⁰ M. Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, J.M. Edie (ed.), (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1964a), p. 164.

²¹ L. Haas, *Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2008a), p.79

²² Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, pp. 159-190.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 182.

²⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p.172.

²⁵ Park and Kopf, 'Introduction', p. 3.

As I contemplate the blue of the sky I am not *set over against* it as an acosmic subject; I do not possess it in thought, or spread out towards it some idea of blue such as might reveal the secret of it, I abandon myself to it and plunge into this mystery, it thinks itself within me,' I am the sky itself as it is drawn together and unified, and as it begins to exist for itself; my consciousness is saturated with this limitless blue.²⁶

In the above citation from *Phenomenology of Perception*, one could not clearly and with accuracy specify the dividing line between body and the world. One would not recognize a demarcation between the two since is not definite where each begins and where the other ends. The experience of body and mind discloses an ambiguous organization, a set up that maintains the following idea: 'the sensor and the sensible do not stand in relation to each other as two mutually external terms and sensation is not an invasion of the sensor by the sensible'²⁷. The body is experiencing itself as a 'feeling-felt body or a 'living-lived' structure and can perceive its 'equivocal status'²⁸. It can embrace the ambiguity of the experience to the extent that the self apprehends itself, its body, as external-internal, as a subject-object²⁹ at the same time.

The ambiguous composition-structure of mutual interdependency of inner and outer, body and mind, body and world, is a symbiotic relationship of two opposites that exist in a dynamic process. In Merleau-Ponty's philosophy opposites should be understood not as dualistic concepts but by reference to each other, as 'polar'³⁰. The term "polarism"³¹ refers to a 'symbiosis: the unity of two organismic processes which require each other as a necessary condition'³².

²⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 214.

²⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 214.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

³⁰ R. Ames, 'Introduction to Part Three', in T. P. Kasulis, R. T. Ames and W. Dissanayake (eds), *Self as Body in Asian Theory and Practice* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press), p. 158.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 159.

In Merleau-Ponty, the principle of ambiguity involves opposites in a dialectical movement that maintain a reciprocal and complementary relationship of 'double meaning'³³ that does not allow the opposite terms to be expressed in one sole proposition. Merleau-Ponty names this dialectical movement "hyperdialectic"³⁴ and/or "ambiguity"³⁵. The nature of this activity is primordial and shares affinities with the Buddhist concept of "arising"³⁶. Opposites are making and unmaking themselves and each is being formed to becoming forming. The divide between body and world, self and other, inner and outer, is the formula "this" and "non-this"³⁷, the supposed division where 'something "is" in that it "is not"³⁸.

Gail Weiss writes that this cannot be experienced through linear trajectory. It involves a series of different backward and forward movements in which the body repetitively, reflexively, turns back upon itself, but each time it does not return to a fixed self body, but to a 'phantasmatically projected self body that is a stable site of significance'³⁹.

In Merleau-Ponty, ambiguity describes the character of his dialectical thought as a movement that is an endless succession of the ephemeral position of the body that challenges the illusion of stability and static presence and arises as a subject-body (actor's self) and object-body (the other/character). Ambiguity stratifies the body into an empty of content multi-layering of experiences and perception into a complex whole that can be defined as a *Gestalt* structure.

³³ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 91.

³⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 94.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 94. This is also what Merleau-Ponty defines as "good dialectic."

³⁶ Park, 'The Double', p. 101.

³⁷ Park, 'The Double', p. 102.

³⁸ Cipriani, 'Merleau-Ponty, Cézanne', p.142.

³⁹ G. Weiss, 'Écart: The Space of Corporeal Difference', in F. Evans and L. Lawler (eds), *Chiasms Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2000), p. 205.

3.1.1 Gestalt

A *Gestalt* is 'a whole that does not reduce itself to the sum of its parts – a negative exterior definition'⁴⁰. Merleau-Ponty writes that *Gestalt* is the psycho-physiological behavior of the body that establishes the 'optimal' phenomenon of ambiguity in living perception. He explains,

The notion of "Gestalt" is not the idea of signification but that of *structure*, the joining of an idea and an existence which are indiscernible, the contingent arrangement by which materials begin to have meaning in our presence, intelligibility in the nascent state. The study of the reflex has shown us that the nervous system is the place in which an order without anatomical guarantee is realized by means of a continuing organization. It already permitted us to establish a rigorously reciprocal relation between function and substrate; there was not an area which was not linked in its functioning to the global activity of the nervous system, but also not a function which was not profoundly altered by the subtraction of a single one of these areas; and function was nothing outside the process which is delineated at each instant and which, based on the nerve mass, organizes itself.⁴¹

The body as *Gestalt* structure operates and organizes itself in relation to a complex perception which is a field that should not be understood in terms of a fixed and immobile figure-background relationship. *Gestalt* is 'not built up like "a house out of bricks"⁴². The figure-background relationship should be conceived on the basis of embodied structure or meaningful embodiment'⁴³. Merleau-Ponty writes that perceptual *Gestalt* is:

⁴⁰ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 204.

⁴¹ Merleau-Ponty, *Structure of Behavior*, translated by L.F. Alden (London: Methuen, 1965), pp. 206-207.

⁴² L. Haas, 'Sense and Alterity: Rereading Merleau-Ponty's Reversibility Thesis', in D. Olkowski and J. Morley (eds), *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life and World* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999), p. 93.

⁴³ D. Olkowski, 'Introduction: The Continuum of Interiority and Exteriority in the Thought of Merleau-Ponty', in *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life and the World* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999), p. 12.

A “figure” on a “background”⁴⁴ contains...much more than the qualities presented at a given time. It has an “outline” which does not “belong” to the background and which “stands out” from it;... the background on the other hand having no bounds, being of indefinite coloring and “running on” under the figure. The different parts of the whole... possess, then, besides a color and qualities, a particular *significance*.⁴⁵

What is suggested here, is that there is always an important factor that although influences and contributes to the organization of the figure-background relation, at the same time is not a property of its structure. In perceptual *Gestalt* there is always an ‘internally related figure-background structure’⁴⁶. For the body to perceive a thing - a figure is to sketch it against a background, to carefully choose it out of and against a background - field from which it is clearly perceived while the self is in a constant imminent process of being transformed interacting with the environment. For this reason, perceptual *Gestalt* is of indefinite and doubtful character and has a capacity for continuing to grow. The body as *Gestalt* structure can clearly express in visible form the appearance of something where there was something else before⁴⁷. It can outline the shape of a figure on a background and give a structure to a space, to an area of the visible of the particular environment within which the body finds itself, exists and moves, and in which objects (including the body itself) are visible.

In other words, the body as *Gestalt* establishes the relations of a complex whole that consists of many parts and organizes itself according to the possible arrangements by which things begin to make sense and create a meaning the very moment all the things (including the self) are coming into existence. That is:

⁴⁴ For example a colored patch on white paper.

⁴⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 13. [Laurence Haas translates the word significance as sense [sens]. This is how I take the meaning of the word; Haas, ‘Sense and Alterity’, p. 93].

⁴⁶ Haas, ‘Sense and Alterity’, pp, 91-105. p. 93.

⁴⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 126.

The embodied being in the world is a behavioral gestalt such that human projects are internally related to specific perceptual configurations. Behavioral and perceptual gestalten together embody multiple meanings and senses, effecting not only one's own corporeality but that one that constitutes "alterity" as well, that is, the sense of other and exterior perceptual compartments with their accompanying meanings.⁴⁸

Laurence Haas, in his essay 'Sense and Alterity'⁴⁹, stresses the point that perceptual *Gestalt* should be understood in terms of an internally related figure-background structure that includes as a necessary part what Merleau-Ponty defines "third term"⁵⁰. "Third term" defines the manner the body as perceptual *Gestalt* operates and performs the necessary activities to accomplish what constitutes the organization of a whole in its parts. Haas explains that "third term" is the 'oblique meaning or "sens" that permeates the figure-background relation with a feeling and quality of the *Gestalt*⁵¹. Because perceptual *Gestalt* includes this third element which is a basic constituent part of its structure there is always a gap between figure and background⁵²; (this third element between actor (self) and character (other) which operate when experiencing the Psychological Gesture as a figure-background *Gestalt* structure has been discussed in Chapter 1 on Michael Chekhov as a 'change over'). In other words, meaning is always related to an off-frame space that is beyond the figure - background structure. Figure, background, and *sens* together retain the living quality of perceptual *Gestalt*, a structure that defies propositional analysis and cognitive judgments⁵³. In other words, perceptual *Gestalt* is the organization of the body as a 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' structure that opens itself to a possible but not certain or fixed arrangement by which the self, the world-environment and the things in it begin to have meaning. Meaning then is the

⁴⁸ Olkowski, 'Introduction: The Continuum of Interiority and Exteriority in the Thought of Merleau-Ponty', in *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life and the World* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999), p. 12. Olkowski refers to Laurence Haas essay "Sense and Alterity: Rereading Merleau-Ponty's Reversibility Thesis."

⁴⁹ Haas, 'Sense and Alterity', pp. 91-105.

⁵⁰ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 197; 'the figure-ground distinction introduces a third term between the "subject" and the "object". It is *that separation (ecart)* that is the perceptual *meaning*'.

⁵¹ Haas, 'Sense and Alterity', p. 93.

⁵² This is an early indication/version of what Merleau-Ponty later calls *ecart* and is examined later in this chapter.

⁵³ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, pp. 57-58; p. 36, p. 189; *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 265.

displacement of the figure against a ground which Merleau-Ponty calls “leakage”⁵⁴.

In order to see clearly and precisely an object, to have a more effective view of the object, and be conscious of its distinguishing features that differentiates it from other objects and at the same time the body to be able to immerse itself fully into the specific circumstances that affect the functioning or state of the object, the self needs to have its central focus and attention on the object itself. Temporarily, the self needs to suspend its full attention to the totality of the surrounding conditions around the object that is the part of a scene that lies behind the object in the foreground. In this way the body will be able to engage fully with the specific conditions of a figure pattern which is always in relation to an indeterminate background that serves to establish the distinctive characteristics and particular position of the object. In other words, the indefinite number of different perspectives that perceptual *Gestalt* can offer are related to a particular mode of concentration, attention and focus on an object. As Merleau-Ponty explains:

To see an object is either to have it on the fringe of the visual field and be able to concentrate on it, or else respond to this summons by actually concentrating upon it... it is necessary to put the surroundings in abeyance the better to see the object, and to lose in background what one gains in focal figure, because to look at the object is to plunge oneself into it, and because objects form a system in which one cannot show itself without concealing others.⁵⁵

A *Gestalt* structure is the dialectical, circular, reversible relationship between the parts and the whole that necessarily involves the *situated* self and/or the body in space. Cornelius Castoriadis provides a definition of *Gestalt* which emphasizes its relational aspect. He writes:

⁵⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 189; *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 265.

⁵⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, pp. 67-68.

A bright point on a dark background, already contains an indefinite number of relations: it implies the unending network of relations that we call “an object in space”.⁵⁶

The relational nature of how *Gestalt* organizes itself as a whole can be depicted by the well known example of the Rubin’s vase. Depending on where you focus your attention, you see two different things. If you focus on the white figure in the centre, on the foreground, you see a vase. If you focus on the black figures on the sides, on the background, you see two faces. What is a foreground in the first becomes the background in the second and vice versa. The importance of this example is that shows the relativity of the frame of reference of a *Gestalt* which can give different versions of the same thing, different content, and therefore different interpretations. *Gestalt* is the dynamic structure formed between bodily perception of the world and its response to that world, a structure always related to a specific goal placed in a particular location or context in the present moment.

3.1.2 Horizon Structure: Glance Depth and Verticality

There is a series of actions the body needs to take in order for the objects to be differentiated from each other and these objects can be allowed to be seen. For Merleau-Ponty, to see is to be involved in a sphere of activity that things *display themselves*⁵⁷ and are not concealed behind each other⁵⁸. Merleau-Ponty states that the appearance of things relative to one another is determined by their distance from the body self/viewer with the concept of the ‘object-horizon structure’⁵⁹. He explains that ‘to look at an object is to inhabit it, and from this habitation to grasp all things in terms of the aspect which they present to it’⁶⁰. He illustrates this by giving the following example: when the self looks at the lamp of the table, the self ascribes to it not only the qualities that are visible

⁵⁶ C. Castoriadis, *World in Fragments: Writings on Politics, Society, Psychoanalysis and the Imagination*, translated by Curtis, D.A., (Stanford: Stanford University Press,1997), p. 258.

⁵⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 68.

⁵⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *Ibid.*, 68; *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 180.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*,p. 68. *Horizon*: comes from the Greek word ορίζων [horizon] meaning κύκλος [kuklos] that is, limiting (circle).

⁶⁰ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 68.

from where the self is, but also those qualities which everything else in the specific environment in which the self is, that is the chimney, the walls, the table, can see⁶¹. 'The back of my lamp is nothing but the face which it "shows" to the chimney⁶². The body can see an object with an indefinite number of eyes to the extent that objects are considered as a whole and form a world and to the extent that each one of these object treats the other objects round it as spectators of its hidden parts⁶³. In that sense with the required psychophysical skills of focus and attention an object can be seen from 'everywhere'⁶⁴. The central object of focus and attention can be perceived from various angles and different aspects through a movement (between foreground and not defined background that conditions the position of an object) which would have the following characteristics: 'reciprocal concealment, mutual dependency and autonomy'⁶⁵. Each time what is becoming visible is an outward distinct appearance of a specific aspect that is invisible (inward appearance). Each time the visible and the invisible operate as a 'reflecting surface'⁶⁶ for the other. The visible mirrors the invisible and vice versa.

According to Merleau-Ponty, when an object is completed it is 'translucent'⁶⁷. It is almost transparent in the sense that it allows the glance of an infinite number of detailed examinations and different perspectives that occur in a particular time and place in the present which intersect (cut or cross each other in its depth) to pass through, leaving nothing which cannot be visible or out of sight⁶⁸. The 'object-horizon structure' is a demanding skillful psycho- physical condition that requires two performative acts: glance and depth.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁶⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 180.

⁶⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 68.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁶⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 69.

3.1.3 Glance and Depth

Glance empowers what the body looks at. It does not stabilize the strength and vitality of things, their flow of energy, constant change and development. Glance is a psychophysical creative activity of 'seeing' or 'looking' at things. It involves the use of imagination and enhances and expands the quality and power of the objects. It makes things larger, bigger, more extensive and with more individual details. Glance is the perceptual ability of the body and mind to embrace the world and things in it all-at-once (Nishida refers to this mastered ability as a "perceptual train", as I note in Chapter 1). Glance can take the self to any place in the world and put the body to the world itself.

Glance involves the performative structure of the 'here-there dialectic'⁶⁹ where the center of attention is going out or away from the body itself. Attention moves from here (the body-me) to there (space-world, the other-not me). The direction of this outward movement includes the variations of upward and sidewise as well: 'we "glance up" and we steal "sidewise looks"'⁷⁰. Glance is characteristic of the perceptual capacity of the body to perform all these directions in order to see 'something' as a whole all at once. This activity can provide enlightening information and deep awareness of what the (actor's) body is doing and experiencing in the present moment and can reveal surprising comprehensiveness and scope of a specific situation. Glance can embrace the 'now, the all-at-once, the here'⁷¹ of perception as a *Gestalt* structure. As a performative activity, glance not only goes out of the body to the world, but it also returns to the viewer, it comes (back) in. It enables the body to take in the world and the things in it, all the outward perspectives and thus can move the self from its usual position to other new places. Glance has the power to dispossess the body from its habitual state and way of seeing, from its ego-self perspective. It can take the self out of itself, its body, out of its 'customary egoic

⁶⁹ E. S. Casey, 'The World at a Glance', in F. Evans and L. Lawler (eds) *Chiasms Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2000), p. 144.

⁷⁰ E. S. Casey, 'The World at a Glance', in F. Evans and L. Lawler (eds) *Chiasms Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2000), p. 155.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 148; p. 152.

identity in its egoless ecstasis'⁷² (this points to Nietzsche's Dionysian *ecstatic* body in Chapter 4). Glance might be seen as the perceptual ability that is a psychophysical state Phillip Zarrilli names as the *actor's body becomes all eyes*⁷³; that is the actor develops an ideal state of body/mind transformation in which becomes all imagination and inspiration that alters the actor's state of everyday consciousness of the body. The actor transcends personal energy (personal body) and personality and explores the other (character) from a transpersonal perspective. In other words, glance might be seen as an 'optimal' psychophysical state for the actor to attain 'Higher Ego Self' and "being with" or become one with the object of attention' in Michael Chekhov's technique, as I explained in Chapter 1.

Depth is not a "third dimension"⁷⁴ or a measurable, objectified breadth. Depth is the place where an object is in a particular location-context and things are *situated* in it and are seen from a certain point of view that is provided by the body as "places of occupancy"⁷⁵. Depth involves the perceptual experience that 'everything exists at once and a thing is "there"⁷⁶. An object to be there before the body back or around the body is to be in depth⁷⁷. Depth is the medium, the perceiving self and the perceived other are immersed in the world, the medium, the subject-self and the object-other envelop each other⁷⁸. Merleau-Ponty defines depth as 'the thickness of a medium'⁷⁹ through which the body is able to perceive, sense, touch and move through. Depth is "lived"⁸⁰, indicating that preeminently it is a gesture of envelopment which implies the dimension of the simultaneous presence of the body, the world, and the things in it⁸¹. The function of this gesture is encompassing since depth encloses the body inside the world and the world inside the body thus implying the one in the other. Each

⁷² *Ibid.*, p.148.

⁷³ P. Zarrilli, *When the Body Becomes All Eyes: Paradigms Discourses and Practices of Power in Kalarippayattu, a South Indian Martial Art* (India: Oxford University Press India, 1998/2003) pp. 201-214.

⁷⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 180.

⁷⁵ E. S. Casey, "'The Element of Voluminousness" Depth and Place Reexamined', in M.C. Dillon (ed.), *Merleau-Ponty Vivant* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1991) p. 21.

⁷⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 180.

⁷⁷ Casey, "'The Element of Voluminousness"', p. 22.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 264-265. Merleau-Ponty explains that breadth and height are the dimensions in which things are juxtaposed.

⁷⁹ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 266.

⁸⁰ Casey, "'The Element of Voluminousness"', p. 22.

⁸¹ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 219.

is surrounded by the other. “Lived depth” discloses the connection between body and space and the things in it by articulating the spatial and temporal dimension of distance among them. How they ‘co-exist in degrees of proximity, slip into one another and integrate themselves’⁸².

Depth and glance (‘does not overcome depth but goes round it’⁸³) are the means to perform the essential activities that determine the coherence of the organization of the subject-object body, the ‘feeling-felt’ ‘living-lived’ body. Both depth and glance should be understood by reference to a pre-objective, ‘primordial’⁸⁴ moment to moment constituting-constituted structure that enables the body and self to extend in space and time. Glance and depth are perceptual activities that open consciousness and perception of the body upon the infinite possibilities of the invisible, upon what Merleau-Ponty describes as ‘some ghost thing’⁸⁵ without ‘actively assuming it’⁸⁶ as privileged. In this way, the invisible opens the body to visions other than its own by locating the body itself in the world (this presupposes what Nietzsche names *ecstatic* body or the Dionysian drive, which I discuss in Chapter 4). In this way the body is of the world and the world is and remains a horizon⁸⁷. Glance and depth are properties of an ‘object-horizon’ structure or a perceptual *Gestalt* that necessarily involve the ‘optimal’ condition of vertical perception. Merleau-Ponty considers this state primordial and defines it as a return to ‘the brute wild, non refined vertical being or perception’⁸⁸.

Merleau-Ponty contends that vision is a performative act with two aspects: the “interior” and the “exterior horizon”⁸⁹ aspect. As he explains, each horizon presupposes and envelops the other. The “exterior horizon” refers to that which everybody is aware of, can observe and see, whereas the “interior horizon” is

⁸² Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 219.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 219.

⁸⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 266-267.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

⁸⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 100.

⁸⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 212; 203.

⁸⁹ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 148.

the darkness of the invisible 'stuffed with visibility of which their surface is but the limit'⁹⁰. When a horizon opens before the body, the body is caught up and included within this horizon⁹¹. A 'new type of body'⁹² characterized by porosity arises. The body is able to grasp itself at once as interior and exterior horizon. That would be the world to appear as the horizon where the self finds itself its 'body *in* the visible'⁹³. The body would be able to see itself, to be *surrounded* by the visible,⁹⁴ to be enveloped completely with the visible. The body would be visible to itself. It could see itself seeing.

Horizon fundamentally changes the form and organization of the everyday experiential structure of the body that is mainly informed and shaped by its habitual attitudes, clichés and behavior patterns characteristic of a particular perception and surrounding culture. The structure of horizon is the encompassing-encompassed dialectical relation of the body and the space, the world that involves the visible and the invisible, the internal and the external, presence and absence all at once. This dialectical relation is a structure that necessarily involves for its actualization a vertical mode of being and perceiving⁹⁵. Françoise Dastur explains that vertical perception or 'verticality is the result of the relation of embracing that takes place between the body and the space-world, between subject-self and object-other and is a structure of a being-body that essentially stands outside of itself', in *ecstasy* (the Dionysian in Nietzsche Chapter 4). This perceptual 'dialectic' promotes an "unthematized, amorphous or polymorphous" ground and an explicit, well-defined figure, to speak in the terms of *Gestalt*⁹⁶ that requires self-extendedness or transcendence or *ecstasy* as a practical tool; transcendence is another

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 148-149. [Françoise Dastur writes that Heidegger (1889-1976) in a 1928 lecture course mentions that the word "horizon," from the Greek *horizein, opίζωv*, is not related to looking and seeing but to that which surrounds, 'encloses within limits, that which closes in, *closure*' [F. Dastur, 'World, Flesh, Vision' in F. Evans and L. Lawler (eds), *Chiasms: Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2000), p. 38].

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 149

⁹³ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 271.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 271.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 261; pp. 270-271.

⁹⁶ Madison, 'Merleau-Ponty's Destruction of Logocentrism,' in M.C. Dillon (ed.), *Merleau-Ponty Vivant* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1991), p. 123.

fundamental principle of perceptual *Gestalt* structure that is examined in detail in the next section.

3.1.4 Transcendence or Self-extendedness

Ambiguity that pervades the self as a “being-in-the-world”⁹⁷ (the body as a ‘living-lived’ ‘feeling-felt’ structure) can be ‘conceived of as *circularity*’⁹⁸. The body can operate as a project of the world and can be inseparable from a world which it projects itself⁹⁹. In this circular structure there is complementary and reciprocal action between the body as *I*-self (body-me) and the world, the other (body-not-me). Merleau-Ponty describes this exchange as a ‘movement towards the world and the world my body’s point of support’¹⁰⁰. The body can expand itself in space and be enlarged. Body and mind can expand beyond their usual physical and non-physical everyday limits and standards and are able to move in many different directions to other possible selves, bodies and worlds that can become actual¹⁰¹.

Within this circular structure the action of expanding is the articulation of the involvement of the body’s own movement of transcendence’¹⁰². Transcendence here refers to a perceptual transcendence. It is an access of the body outside itself that can be achieved as an act of ‘self-movement or subjective movement’¹⁰³. Self-movement would be the traveling of the non-physical invisible body across in space and time.

The body by moving without actually physically moving from itself to the world (a movement that returns back to the self) indicates that the body is capable of performing an act of ‘excess in relation to itself’¹⁰⁴; this act can change how the

⁹⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 430.

⁹⁸ G. B. Madison, *The Phenomenology of Merleau-Ponty* (USA: Ohio University Press, 1981), p. 169.

⁹⁹ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 430.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 350.

¹⁰¹ Merleau-Ponty, ‘Philosopher and his Shadow’, in M. Merleau-Ponty, *Signs*, translated by R. C. McCleary, (USA: Northwestern University Press, 1964c), p. 170.

¹⁰² Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 430.

¹⁰³ R. Barbaras, ‘Perception and Movement: The End of the Metaphysical Approach’, in F. Evans and L. Lawler (eds), *Chiasms Merleau-Ponty’s Notion of Flesh* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2000), p. 86 p. 255.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

body perceives its location, itself and enables it to 'become a psychophysical whole'¹⁰⁵, a *Gestalt* or a *bodymind*.

To 'say there is transcendence'¹⁰⁶ would be the ability of the body to perform an act of expansion and to be perceived. In practice transcendence is the means to become aware of being at a distance. Through expansion or self-extendedness, the physical visible body dissociates itself from the habits of its usual physical and mental everyday limiting condition and is able to become aware of a non-physical self, the invisible other (character). Merleau-Ponty defines this as the 'unrepresentable' ('*non – Urprasentierbar*'¹⁰⁷) which is 'given as a transcendence'¹⁰⁸, as self-extendedness, as that which is always "behind", beyond, far off"¹⁰⁹. In other words, transcendence is the means through which the body by perceiving itself, its own way of appearing, is able to pass from sameness and subjectivity as identity to 'not only *what it is*'¹¹⁰, but to otherness and difference.

Merleau-Ponty associates perception closely with movement. Movement, not as the necessary condition under which perception operates and affects its function, but that perception is essentially movement, that 'every perception is movement'¹¹¹. The ability of the body through movement to be aware of what one perceives in the world (including the self itself) and how the world makes itself available to one's perception (what can be perceived) establishes the body as the underlying structure into which self and the world, body and space (all objects) are woven¹¹². The presence of the self to the world is through the body and to the body through the world'¹¹³. Merleau-Ponty writes:

¹⁰⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 168; Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 123.

¹⁰⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 181.

¹⁰⁷ *Non-Urprasentierbar*: that is: originary unrepresentable.

¹⁰⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 181. Henry Maldiney explains: 'this transcendence is the originary unrepresentable and it is through its infinite resistance, through its in principle irreducibility to all representation that the being is [in H. Maldiney, 'Flesh and Verb in the Philosophy of Merleau-Ponty' in F. Evans and L. Lawlor (eds), *Chiasms Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2000) p. 61.]

¹⁰⁹ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 195.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 231. See also: pp. 254-255.

¹¹² Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 234

¹¹³ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 239.

When I walk round my flat, the various aspects in which it presents itself to me could not possibly appear as views of one and the same thing if I did not know that each of them represents the flat seen from one spot or another, and if I were unaware of my own movements, and of my body as retaining its identity through the stages of those movements.¹¹⁴

Transcendence designates the skillful ability of the body to have a practical contact with and observation of the various aspects of the events of living perception. Its style is the 'way of being of the perceived thing'¹¹⁵. It is an act of awareness of 'self-mediation'¹¹⁶. It always includes the activities of the body as an intermediate agency that distances from the everyday ego perspective. The perceptual consciousness of the body breaks up, the body opens up and is able to receive the absent other, the invisible.

To be able to achieve successfully experiencing transcendence involves the engagement of a complex arrangement or position of the body and its parts that can reach through practice a particular psychophysical form ('feeling felt' 'living-lived' structure) which can shape and determine one's capacities what is to be perceived. According to Merleau-Ponty, 'The position and movement of one's body not only allows one to see but also determines what is accessible to one's view'¹¹⁷. This psychophysical form of the body entails interiority not as something which precedes the material arrangement of one's body, its structure rather interiority occurs from what it results from it¹¹⁸. From the body and its parts as a 'living-lived' structure wherein things exist alongside, beyond each other, exterior to each other without being related to the idea of internal union of things. 'It would be necessary therefore to conceive this arrangement as *partes extra partes* without granting to the body itself'¹¹⁹. In other words, the principles

¹¹⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 203.

¹¹⁵ Barbaras, 'Perception and Movement', p. 82.

¹¹⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 92.

¹¹⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 203

¹¹⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, p. 163.

¹¹⁹ J.Taminiaux, 'The Thinker and the Painter', in M.C. Dillon (ed.), *Merleau-Ponty Vivant* (Albany, NY: State of University of New York Press, 1991), p. 200.

of this psychophysical form emphasize a corpuscular, particle based, atomistic structure of the world (and things in it) that consists of parts, however small, and each part is external and adjacent to each another (external in the sense that belongs to the form). It is because of this psychophysical structure the body is able to exceed itself and to accomplish self-extendedness. To go beyond what is usually allowed to experience as everyday self, as body-me.

Merleau-Ponty discusses the importance of two points:

- first, the connection between a particular psychophysical arrangement of the body and its powerful effects. This implies that nothing precedes the psychophysical experience of the body, that the 'body itself is without an inside and without a "self"'¹²⁰.
- and secondly, the nature of this arrangement's resulting interiority.

Merleau-Ponty points to the significance of the conditions of a complex psychophysical arrangement of the body as a whole, a *Gestalt* structure. He directs our attention to a 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' form of the body or a structure of the body that contains both physical (real) and non-physical invisible (imaginary) parts which produce its content in the here and now and can support the after-effect of the meanings of things that self and other (character), body and space-world as an inner-outer continuum experience. The continuous sequence of inner and outer experience of the body manifests that these two terms are not perceptibly different from each other.

Through transcendence, the body unaware of itself, inhabits the world and can experience itself and be 'in the world as the heart is in the organism'¹²¹. Transcendence is an 'optimal' mode of a 'perceptual opening'¹²² in which self and body are able to 'exceed themselves'¹²³, to exist outside of themselves in the world. This performative act presupposes the self to 'retire into itself, leave

¹²⁰ Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, p. 163

¹²¹ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, 1968: 53.

¹²² Merleau-Ponty, 'Philosopher and his Shadow', p. 170.

¹²³ Barbaras, 'Perception and Movement', p. 86.

itself'¹²⁴ while attentively listening and 'looking at' things in order to be able to take possession of things. In reality, this activity is more an experience of 'dispossession than a possession'¹²⁵ in the sense, as Merleau-Ponty explains, that the body 'possesses the world at a distance rather than being possessed by it'¹²⁶. For Merleau-Ponty the nature of perception is seemingly contradictory. It is paradoxical in the sense that the perceiving seeing body can exist only if someone can perceive it see it¹²⁷ from a distance. The things that are given and which the perceiving body is able to see are things for the perceiving body only under the condition that they gradually move back or further away and become unfamiliar and distant. Things always move back or further away beyond their immediately given aspects'¹²⁸ implying there is a paradox of immanence and transcendence in living perception, a simultaneous presence and absence, or yet non-presence.

3.1.5 Chiasm Flesh Reversibility

In Merleau-Ponty's project perception presupposes one's awareness of the ambiguous nature of divisions between body and the world, self and other, inner and outer, visible and invisible, and requires that one attends to one's own body in a manner that allows the body and mind to be deeply affected. Merleau-Ponty did not conceive of the above divisions as standing in contradiction. He articulated those relationships in terms of *chiasm*¹²⁹. Merleau-Ponty uses numerous words and/or images to record accurately the nature of *chiasm* such as overlapping, crossing over, binding, slipping, encroaching upon.

In his phenomenological project the binding of the interrelations between oppositions can give a structure of the body/mind as a 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt'

¹²⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 49.

¹²⁵ Merleau-Ponty, 'Philosopher and his Shadow', p. 170.

¹²⁶ M. Merleau-Ponty, *The Prose of the World*, C. Lefort (ed.), translated by J. O'Neil (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1973), p. 78.

¹²⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, p. 16.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹²⁹ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 215.

being which can operate in a form of a 'double "*chiasm*"'¹³⁰. The *chiasm* (like the *chiasm* of the eyes) can constitute a criss-crossing structure between opposite sides in the form of letter x. The word *chiasm* has its origin in biology and the natural sciences¹³¹ and in that sense it induces the idea of a universal mode of relation between body and world, body and mind, as embedded in nature.

The *chiasm* is the intersection of the experiences between body and the world, self and other, inner and outer. It can provide the sense of their intertwinement where 'a presence of me in the other and the other in me'¹³² is the union of diverse entities while they are growing and operating together and can fulfill the activities as expected to one unique particular body (or gesture, PG).

The notion of *chiasm* is the 'unique space which *separates* and *reunites*'¹³³. It is simultaneously the space a) where the binding between oppositions occurs and b) the structure that rules and controls the mode of their interaction as reversibility. The *chiasm* indicates the space, the crisscrossing, between the flesh of the body and the flesh of the world. The intertwinement at the *chiasm* refers to the relation between the two sides of a bodily being that can connect in a form of *chiasmic* structure where the 'inaccessible'¹³⁴ or hidden side of the relation 'ceases to be an inaccessible, *if* [the self the body] conceive[s] it as an encompassing, lateral investment, *flesh*'¹³⁵.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

¹³¹ Chiasm/Chiasma is an intersection or crossing in the form of the letter x. The word *chiasm* comes from Greek *chiasma*, cross-shaped mark, from *khiazein* that is mark with the letter x/chi. In Anatomy the x-shaped structure formed at the point below the brain where the two optic nerves cross over each other. Cathryn Vasseleu in her book *Textures of Light: Vision and Touch in Irigaray, Levinas and Merleau-Ponty* writes that the concept of chiasm in Merleau-Ponty's philosophy is 'metonymically related to the optic chiasma. This is an essential structuring element in the physiology of vision; in particular a means of constituting a stereoscopic image. As a physiological entity the optic chiasma is the point of cross-over of the fibres of the two optic nerves, so that the shared visual field of each eye is linked to a part of the brain on the opposite side of the body. Merleau-Ponty draws extensively upon this substantive account of visual perception in his account of the ambiguous ideality and physicality of the perceptual field. Carnal vision is stereoscopic in essence, not monocular. Monocular vision is the flattened, techicized vision of the disembodied transcendental subject or the mechanical eye' [p. 31]; [Stereoscopic: is relating to stereoscope which is an optical device for viewing stereoscopic photographs; it is a device by which two photographs of the same object taken at slightly different angles are viewed together creating an impression of depth and solidity].

¹³² Merleau-Ponty, *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 149.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 149.

¹³⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 217.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

Remy Kwant analyzes the word “lateral” in Merleau-Ponty’s writings¹³⁶. Kwant argues that there is an intrinsic connection between subject and object which is something more than simply acknowledging that subject and object are connected. The connection between opposing terms consists mainly in the fact that they are interrelated. They belong to one and the same reality. Kwant states,

The opposition is not just a kind of unity, of togetherness, but takes place within a unity which precedes and exceeds the opposition. This unity cannot be directly observed. It is not an object itself, since it involves the subject also. It is not a phenomenon, but it co-appears in all phenomena and makes phenomena possible. It is the “quasi-object” of a lateral awareness.¹³⁷

Kwant contends that the unity comes before and goes beyond the subject-object opposition and its realization requires a focus of attention of lateral awareness in the notion of *flesh*.

Flesh is a fundamental principle in Merleau-Ponty’s project that ‘has no name in any philosophy’¹³⁸ since it ‘cannot be experienced as thought, or reduced to the theoretical’¹³⁹. *Flesh* suggests a practical embodied knowledge of the blurring of the boundary between subject-body (self) and object-body (other) and as experienced even within the body itself. The impossibility to ‘put the limit between the body and the world since the world is *flesh*’¹⁴⁰ implies the impossibility to put the limit between self and other within the body itself; that is to say the perceiver, the visible body, does not exist in separation from the perceived, the invisible body. In every instance of this relation a ‘double belongingness’ defines a position which is both subjective and objective and also simultaneously a subjective which is internally divergent with itself’¹⁴¹.

¹³⁶ R. C. Kwant, *From Phenomenology to Metaphysics: An Inquiry into the Last Period of Merleau-Ponty’s Philosophical Life* (Pittsburg: Duquesne University Press, 1966), p. 221.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

¹³⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 147.

¹³⁹ Vasseleu, *Textures of Light*, p. 28.

¹⁴⁰ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 138.

¹⁴¹ Vasseleu, *Textures of Light*, p. 26.

It is in this connection with the world the encounter of the body with things can reach/take, according to Merleau-Ponty, the status of 'the archetype of the originating encounter, instituted and renewed in the encounter with the past, the imaginary, the idea'¹⁴². The word archetype signifies something ancient and primordial that precedes other forms in time. *Flesh* is the name for the archetypal, 'prototypical structure of all subject object relations'¹⁴³ that implies something elementary and fundamental from which more complex and sophisticated forms usually arise. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy claims the existence of an archetypal 'carnal principle' that conditions the immersion of the body within the corporeal tissue of the world. The body is able to perceive and to be perceivable instantly, 'because each of two beings is an archetype for the other, because the body belongs to the order of the things as the world is the universal flesh'¹⁴⁴.

Structurally *flesh* as the archetype of perception is a 'two-dimensional'¹⁴⁵ body, a body/mind being. A being of several faces, a being in latency and a presentation of certain absence which is *the body as sensible-sentient*¹⁴⁶. The intertwining at the *chiasm* refers to the relation between the two "sides" of the body as presence and absence, as sensible and sentient'¹⁴⁷, and articulates the determinants of the chiasmic structure of the body as *flesh*.

Merleau-Ponty asserts that the ability of the body to experience itself as *chiasm* signifies the exchange between the self-me and the other, but also the exchange between the self-me and the world that is an exchange between the phenomenal body and the objective body, between the perceiving and the perceived¹⁴⁸. His late writing express the fundamental homogeneity and irreducible distance of these two simultaneous moments that structure the

¹⁴² Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 158.

¹⁴³ Vasseleu, *Textures of Light*, p. 26.

¹⁴⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 137.

¹⁴⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 136.

¹⁴⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 136.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

encounter of the body-me with the body-not me (the other the world the character)¹⁴⁹.

Merleau-Ponty claims that the splitting of the body into two oppositional entities subject and object, body and mind, has assigned to the body an inferior position as an object of thought whereas instead the body should be thought as *sensible* being¹⁵⁰. He states,

the mind is the *other side*¹⁵¹ of the body, [...] the “other side” cannot be ‘described in *objective* terms, *overflows* into it (*Ueberschreiten*),¹⁵² encroaches upon it. It is hidden in it and at the same time needs it. It is *anchored* in it¹⁵³.

In an attempt to explain the *chiasmic* structure of *flesh* as the relation of the body as sensible (the body I touch, feel, perceive) with the body as sentient (the body that touches, feels, perceives) Merleau-Ponty refers to the phenomenon of “double touching” or “double sensation”¹⁵⁴. This phenomenon manifests itself when I touch one hand with the other and this action is accompanied by the awareness of the “double sensation” of both touching and being touched. Both hands of one same body can alternate the roles of touching and being touched. Both hands belong to the same body, but at the same time each hand has its own tactile experience. Merleau-Ponty describes this phenomenon as the ‘immersion of the being touched in the touching being and of the touching being in the being touched’¹⁵⁵. This relation which is *chiasmic* illustrates the capacity of the body to be at once “perceiving perceptible”¹⁵⁶ and sheds light on the relation between the perceiving subject

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 137; ‘Yes or no: do we have a body – that is, not a permanent object of thought, but a flesh that suffers when it is wounded, hands that touch? We know: hands do not suffice for touch – but to decide for this reason alone that our hands do not touch, and to relegate them to the world of objects or of instruments would be, in acquiescing to the bifurcation of subject and object, to forego in advance the understanding of the sensible and to deprive ourselves of its lights.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

¹⁵² Surpass/exceed.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

¹⁵⁴ Dillon, *Merleau-Ponty's Ontology* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988).

¹⁵⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 260.

¹⁵⁶ Kwant, *From Phenomenology to Metaphysics*, 1966. A term that is used by Kwant throughout the book.

(subjective embodiment) and the perceived object (the encounter with the other). He states,

When one of my hands touches the other, the world of each opens upon that of the other because *the operation is reversible at will*, because they both belong (as we say) to one sole space of consciousness, because one sole man touches one sole thing through both hands.¹⁵⁷

In the above phenomenon the emphasis is on the idea that the distinctive character of *flesh* is reversibility *chiasm* at will. When I touch my own hand the touched hand is not given as a mere object as it feels the touch itself, as well as I still feel it to be my own hand (part of my own body) something that indicates a respond and a volitional control over the touch. In other words, my left hand when starting to perceive my right, the touched hand does not feel like a foreign attached object (as it usually feels when the arm or leg is numb), but it becomes *flesh*, it senses, it perceives¹⁵⁸. The body becomes aware of the hand as a “physical thing”¹⁵⁹, a physical presence. This tactile experience is a palpation that is not moving or operating in a single direction of the one who perceives to what it perceives, but is always reversible and the physical thing becomes animate¹⁶⁰. Through the *flesh* of the world and the reversibility *chiasm*, the perceiving-perceived phenomenon which Merleau-Ponty calls ‘extraordinary event’¹⁶¹ ‘one can understand the lived body’¹⁶² (the potential or realized active experiential dimensions of the actor’s body in Psychological Gesture).

The paradoxical two-sidedness of the body, its ‘dual orientation inward and outward, its openness to the world’¹⁶³, when the body as *flesh* folds back on itself creates distance from itself through opening of perception. Distance and

¹⁵⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 141.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 250.

¹⁶³ E. Grosz, ‘Merleau-Ponty, Bergson, and the Question of Ontology’, in G. Weiss (ed.), *Intertwinings Interdisciplinary Encounters with Merleau-Ponty* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2008) p. 22.

reversibility is what causes to arise the phenomenon of *flesh* as “corporeal consciousness”¹⁶⁴ by allowing the body to ‘see’, hear, feel, touch, perceive itself. The consciousness of the body is opening towards the world, is connected to the world in which the body-subject along with the body-object of perception is embedded. Reversibility, which is the basis of the relation I can perceive and I am also perceived, I can touch and I am also touched, I am both subject and object, I am both self and other, denotes that the body is given both as interiority (‘a volitional structure and a dimension of sensing’) and as exteriority (a ‘visual and tactile being’)¹⁶⁵.

The totality and unity of the body is the relation of two interdependent entities that are not simply intertwining, but also allow reciprocity of position and perspectives. Merleau-Ponty states that reversibility at *chiasm* is when the seer and the seen, the touched and the touching, the perceiver and the perceived act or move mutually or in return so that both entities reciprocate one another. ‘Each is reversible to the extent that it may become, turn into, change places or shifts sides with the other’¹⁶⁶. Reciprocity and intertwinement of one in the other includes as part of the process that the body as a visible thing is part of the visual scene. The ‘seeing body subtends the visible body and all the visibles within it’¹⁶⁷. The body finds itself in the realm of the perceived and as it appears to emerge from the perceived.

The ongoing alteration between touching and being touched, perceiving and being perceived body is the reversible condition of a dual counter activity which shows that perception is an act with two faces, two aspects. The dual nature of the body as a two-fold act in opposition, that interprets things and creates meaning depending on the moment, manifests the circular interplay between touching and being touched, seeing and being-seen, perceiving and being

¹⁶⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, pp. 136, 151.

¹⁶⁵ Zahavi, *Subjectivity and Selfhood* 2005, p. 156.

¹⁶⁶ Cataldi, *Emotion Depth and Flesh*, p. 70.

¹⁶⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 138.

perceived¹⁶⁸. As Merleau-Ponty puts it selfhood and alterity formulate and structure the perception processes of the body. He writes,

The enigma is that my body simultaneously sees and is seen. That which looks at all things can also look at itself and recognize, in what it sees, the “other side” of its power of looking. It sees itself seeing; it touches itself touching; it is visible and sensitive for itself.¹⁶⁹

The circulatory and reversible structure of ‘the *I*-body chiasm’¹⁷⁰ (the self-other *chiasm*) reveals not only that the body is tangible and perceptible to itself, but also that allows access and availability to a possible viewer. The consciousness of the body opens itself upon an ‘imminent spectator’ and generates a ‘*charged field*’¹⁷¹. In this structure the body, by realizing itself by its ‘doubling up of itself’, can be felt from within but simultaneously can also be felt from without. This phenomenological phenomenon exhibits that the inside and the outside of the body are different manifestations of the same thing¹⁷² (same body).

Merleau-Ponty refers to the ‘how’¹⁷³ of the relation of the body as sensible-sentient and not to the what¹⁷⁴. The fact that my body is able to perceive and be perceivable at every instant demonstrates a carnal principle, an archetype, that conditions the psychophysical status of the body. The nature of this dual *chiasmic* reversible structure involves the body deeply in its immersion in the world and shows that the very same body can be at once passive and active. The phenomenon ‘I the seer am also visible’¹⁷⁵, the feeling of being ‘looked at

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 264-265; 263; Merleau-Ponty gives a description of the reversibility concept with the following example: the finger of a glove that is turned inside out and in which the inner side and the outer side of the glove imply the other side within it or each side is the other side of the other.

¹⁶⁹ Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, p. 162.

¹⁷⁰ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 264.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 264.

¹⁷³ M.C. Dillon, ‘Écart: Reply to Lefort’s “Flesh and Otherness”’, in G.A. Johnson and M.B. Smith (eds), *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1990), p. 25.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹⁷⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 113.

by things'¹⁷⁶, exemplifies the ontology of *flesh* as activity-passivity structure. In 'The Eye and Mind,' quoting Paul Klee, Merleau-Ponty writes,

In a forest, I have felt many times over that it was not I who looked at the forest. Some days I felt that the trees were looking at me, were speaking to me ... I was there listening ...¹⁷⁷

In this quotation there is no dichotomy between the visible and the seer. The artist's body neither passive nor active, a '(visible-seeing), mass in itself and gesture'¹⁷⁸ seems to be perceived as a corporeal consciousness that Merleau-Ponty calls the *flesh*. There is a sense here in which the body has the quality of 'double reference'¹⁷⁹. Each functions on its own, each calls for the other. As Merleau-Ponty puts it, each side is of the same Visibility, the same Tangibility, and the same *flesh*¹⁸⁰. All belong to the same kind and order of things as the world is universal *flesh*¹⁸¹. In this 'optimal' mode of perception fundamentally there is an *intercorporeality* in which the self is a part of a complex whole that resonates with others bodily experiences.

3.1.6 Intercorporeality

Merleau-Ponty parallels the experience of 'double sensation' or touching with the handshake, the embrace, the look. He asks: 'why when touching the hand of another, would I not touch in it the same power to espouse the things that I have touched in my own?'¹⁸² The argument is that when my left hand touches my right hand, I am touching a corporeal being who can touch things in the same way I can touch the touching hand of another person in the handshake, in the embrace, in the look. Merleau-Ponty argues that the paradox of a body that

¹⁷⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, p. 167.

¹⁷⁷ Swiss painter [1879-1940]; Merleau-Ponty, *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 167

¹⁷⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 271.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 137-138; 'The eyes which see, the hands that touch, can also be seen, can also be touched, because they see and touch the visible, the tangible, from within because the flesh lines and even envelops all the visible and tangible things with which nevertheless it is surrounded, the world and the self are within one another, and there is no anteriority of the *percipere* to the *percipi*, there is simultaneity or even retardation'.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 141.

is at once single and double, active and passive, is an act of perception where each side plunged into one another is deeply involved in an intercorporeal activity that conveys the 'dual relation between elements of a singular *intercorporeality*'¹⁸³.

This possible synergy of 'double sensation' (or touching) which would not exist without the structure of *chiasm* and reversibility articulating the body as *flesh* (in its sensible element) and is sustained and subtended by the pre-reflective and pre-objective unity of the body can also exist, as Merleau-Ponty claims, among different organisms¹⁸⁴. This phenomenon makes a direct engagement with *intercorporeality* as the latent connection or intertwining between the body-me (self) and the body-not me (the other). *Intercorporeality* is a mode of extending across the sensible being (the perceived), 'a carnal adherence of the sentient to the sensed and of the sensed to the sentient'.¹⁸⁵ The perceived (a spatiotemporal whole that affords us the possibility of perception) and the lived body (the subject-object body) are comparable in certain respects in the sense that can perform a similar or equivalent function. Merleau-Ponty contends that there is an internal relation between the perceived thing and a living organism as a system that can be seen analogous in structure and function to that of the perceived world. He writes,

The thing, and the world, are given to me along with the parts of my body, not by any "natural geometry," but in a living connection comparable, or rather identical, with that existing between the parts of my body itself ... The thing is correlative to my body and, in more general terms, to my existence, of which my body is merely the stabilized structure... The thing is inseparable from a person perceiving it, and can never be actually *in itself* because its articulations are those of our very existence.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸³ Vasseleu, *Textures of Light*, p. 64.

¹⁸⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, pp. 141, 142.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

¹⁸⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 205; p. 320.

The lived body as a circular system, wherein the body as subject and the body as object form moments of living perception, seems to be analogous to the system that is formed between the lived body and the perceived world. There is a dyadic interaction that is continuous and complementary which reflects instances of '*intercorporeality*'. In reality, Merleau-Ponty mentions that,

[T]here is neither me nor the other as positive subjectivities. Both belong to the same world, to the stage of Being. The body-me and the body-other incorporate one another: 'projection-introjection as well as there is that frontier surface at some distance before me, where occurs the veering I-Other Other-I.'¹⁸⁷

Both 'me' and 'not-me' bodies or selves are caught up in a circuit of conscious and unconscious, reflective and pre-reflective reversible movement where 'to see is not to see'¹⁸⁸ implying that visibility involves non-visibility, the invisible. That is to say the invisible does not contradict the visible but is part of it, and absence is a corporeal absence that is part of presence. Merleau-Ponty explains,

Meaning is *invisible*, but the invisible is not the contradictory of the visible: the visible itself has an invisible inner framework ... the visible is pregnant with the invisible, to comprehend fully the visible relations ... one must go unto the relation of the visible with the invisible ... The other's visible is my invisible; my visible is the other's invisible ... both open upon the same sensible world.¹⁸⁹

The layer upon which *intercorporeality* dwells is the reversibility *chiasmic* 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' structure of the body where the invisible is not the opposite of the visible or added to the visible, but a different layer full of meaning and

¹⁸⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 263.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 225; p. 247.

¹⁸⁹ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 215.

significance that has the same function or characteristic as the visible. This structure becomes the field within which the perceptive powers of the body, the visible and the invisible, the body and the non-body, the perceiver and the perceived, the touched and the touching, are localized¹⁹⁰. This relation of the body to itself which is an exchange that takes place at the *chiasm* makes it the bond of union; a thing that ties, as Merleau-Ponty calls it, 'the *vinculum* of the self and the things'¹⁹¹. The reversibility *chiasmic* structure of the body has a meaning of a bond within the framework of the ontology of *flesh*, but as Merleau-Ponty states in his *Working Notes*, it is also a medium of exchange (give-receive return) between subject-self and object-other and as such helps to achieve *intercorporeality*. Merleau-Ponty refers to *chiasm* with the following,

—By reason of this mediation through reversal, this chiasm, there is not simply a for-Oneself for-the-Other antithesis, there is Being as containing all that, first as sensible Being and then as Being without restriction—Chiasm, instead of the For the Other: that means that there is not only a me-other rivalry, but a co-functioning. We function as one unique body.¹⁹²

There is a co-functioning of oneself and the other and a mediation which involves the primordial experience of corporeal reflexivity that creates a certain notion of self and body. Merleau-Ponty claims that 'through the harmonious operation of the other's body and my own'¹⁹³, self and other function in agreement. His explanation can be seen as how the actor's self and the character experience each other. He writes,

What I see passes into him, this individual green of the meadow under my eyes invades his vision without quitting my own, I recognize in my green his green. I live in the facial expressions of the other, as I feel him

¹⁹⁰ Merleau-Ponty, 'The Philosopher and his Shadow', p. 166.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

¹⁹² *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 215.

¹⁹³ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 142.

living in mine. It is a manifestation of what we have called, in other terms, the system “me-and-other.”¹⁹⁴

Intercorporeality is an activity *at will*. It must be ‘found or motivated’¹⁹⁵. The mutual involvement does not overcome difference between the body-me (self) and the body-not-me-self (the other) but that the difference ‘must be watched over’¹⁹⁶ by continually rearranging and interconnecting both bodies. ‘The two bodies can therefore communicate through the different perceptions. Everything transpires as if the other person’s intuitions and motor realizations existed in a sort of relation of internal encroachment, as if my body and the body of the other person together formed a system’¹⁹⁷. In other words, each takes or borrows from the other, intersects with the other and is always in a relation of *multiple chiasms* with the other which are one. *Intercorporeality* is ‘a whole new way of relating in practice to otherness’¹⁹⁸.

Geil Weiss in her chapter ‘Ecart’ writes that *intercorporeality*,

[It] functions on both a micro and macro level. On a micro level, reversibility breaks down the (conceptual) boundaries between what have traditionally been understood as discrete bodily sensations, and on a macro level, it describes an ongoing interaction between the flesh of the body, the flesh of others, and the flesh of the world, a process in which corporeal boundaries are simultaneously erected and dismantled.¹⁹⁹

Fundamentally *intercorporeality* is the intermingling of the body with itself, of the body with the perceiving thing, and of the body with the world, in a process where the boundaries of the visible physical body and the non-physical invisible

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 142; ‘The Child’s Relations with Others,’ in *The Primacy of Perception*, 1964a: 146.

¹⁹⁵ Dillon, ‘Écart: Reply to Lefort’, p. 17.

¹⁹⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 144.

¹⁹⁷ Merleau-Ponty, ‘The Experience of Others’, Lecture Notes appearing in the *Bulletin du Groupe d’études de psychologie de l’Université de Paris*, translated by F. Evans and H. J. Silverman (1951-1952), p. 52.

¹⁹⁸ B. Young, ‘The Language of the Lips, Merleau-Ponty and Irigaray: Toward a Culture of Difference’, in G. Weiss (ed.), *Intertwinings Interdisciplinary Encounters with Merleau-Ponty* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2008), pp. 86-87.

¹⁹⁹ Weiss, ‘Écart’, p. 204.

body are simultaneously erected and dismantled. For Merleau-Ponty *intercorporeality* is a way of inhabiting the body in order to discover and become aware of its natural bond with 'wild being', a practical methodology to access the 'brute world'.

3.1.7 Reflection and/or Mirror

In Merleau-Ponty's philosophy statements such as I 'feel myself looked at by the things'²⁰⁰ or 'my body looked at and my body looking'²⁰¹ are suggestive of a psychophysical phenomenon that has the characteristics of a certain kind of reflection, as if in a mirror, that 'cannot but produce others'²⁰². In "Eye and the Mind" Merleau-Ponty writes,

The enigma is that my body simultaneously sees and is seen. That which looks at all things can also look at itself and recognize, in what it sees, the "other" side of its power of looking, it sees itself seeing.²⁰³

This experience is possible to occur when the body operates within a horizontal arrangement-structure where the perceiving and the perceptible as two 'mirrors are facing one another'²⁰⁴. The horizontal action-structure enables the body to perceive and observe itself as an object of the world in the sense that the body of oneself is perceptible to itself. In that respect reflexivity is a certain type of visual perception that refers back to the body itself. The body can/is in the position to grasp itself both as interior and exterior reality at the same time. In Merleau-Ponty words this is 'to be seen by the outside, to exist within it'²⁰⁵.

Reflexivity can be accomplished only by the ambiguous body (the neither subject-self nor object-other) and concerns 'the vision of one's body in the

²⁰⁰ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 139.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

²⁰² Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, p. 163.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

²⁰⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 139; p. 146.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

mirror'²⁰⁶. Reflexivity is the phenomenon where body and non-body, visible self and invisible other, are continually mirroring one another. Each discloses and conceals itself, each reflecting the other, and occurrently each 'does not cease to be hidden or latent'²⁰⁷. In the following extract from "Eye and Mind" Merleau-Ponty writes,

The mirror arises upon the open circuit [that goes] from seeing body to visible body. Every technique is a "technique of the body." A technique outlines and amplifies the metaphysical structure of our flesh. The mirror appears because I am seeing-visible, because there is reflexivity of the sensible; the mirror translates and reproduces that reflexivity.²⁰⁸

In the moments of mirroring the body can see itself "from somewhere"²⁰⁹. This indicates a particular position that augments visual access to otherwise invisible bodily regions. What can be viewed is the viewpoint from the perspective of the mirror²¹⁰, as the other sees it.

In reflection the world the things in it reflect back an image of itself. Galen A. Johnson explains, 'what does it mean to say that vision is similarly reversible? It does not mean the absurdity that the trees²¹¹ and things I see also see me in return. Rather, as I see objects, they reflect back to me an image of myself'²¹². The mirror appears because when the body is perceiving-perceptible, it multiplies or redoubles itself²¹³.

Merleau-Ponty clarifies the other is a mirror of the body-me-self and the body-me-self is a mirror of the other. The mirror is 'the instrument that changes and

²⁰⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 249.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 249.

²⁰⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, p. 168.

²⁰⁹ It refers to Paul Klee's citation about his experience in the forest in Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 274 (see section *Chiasm Reversibility Flesh* in this thesis).

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

²¹¹ Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, p. 167.

²¹² Johnson, 'Introduction', p. xx.

²¹³ Taminiaux, 'The Thinker and the Painter', p. 208.

transforms the self into the other and the other into the self²¹⁴. In the mirror there are not simply two images, the image of the self and the image of the other closely related associated or juxtaposed, but rather one sole image in which both self (body-me) and the other (body-not-me) are involved. We have 'one system with two terms, my bodily behavior and the other's bodily behavior, which functions as a whole'²¹⁵. In perceiving the other, the body-me and the *myth* of the other are neither inconsistent nor mutually opposed²¹⁶. The body-me and the other's body (not-me) co-exist. They are coupled. The everyday body of the self and the imaginary or invented body of the other, 'resulting in a sort of action that pairs them,'²¹⁷ are two moments of the same systematic psychophysical structure that belongs to the same world, to the same Being/Self²¹⁸.

What makes possible the perception of the other is that the body experiences reflexivity or mirroring as 'an extension of its relations with its body'²¹⁹. The phenomenon of mirroring can be conceived as self-extendedness through which 'the gestures the body makes can be the objects of another's intentions. Mirroring is this transfer of the intentions of the body-me to the other's body (not-me) and vice versa'²²⁰.

Merleau-Ponty in "Eye and Mind"²²¹ describes mirror self-experience with the following account. One while smoking a pipe before a mirror can sense/feel the sensations of the smooth, gleaming, intensely hot wood, not only where the fingers are and actually touch the pipe, but also in the invisible reflected other. In the ghostlike fingers that belong to the ghost like body image, the self sees or extends out, as its self seen inside the mirror. The ghostlike body of the other in the mirror is an image that is not limited to the physical confines of the

²¹⁴ Merleau-Ponty, 'Eye and Mind', in *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 168.

²¹⁵ Merleau-Ponty, 'The Child's Relations with Others', in *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 118.

²¹⁶ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, pp. 82-83.

²¹⁷ Merleau-Ponty, 'The Child's Relations with Others', in *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 118.

²¹⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 84.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

²²⁰ Merleau-Ponty, 'The Child's Relations with Others', in *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 118.

²²¹ Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, p. 168.

human body, but goes beyond the borderline of its physical form. The body image is seen or given to the body by the outside. In the mirroring, which is a doubling process, the body is the central point from which the action is directed and displaced at the same time. The body is moved out of its usual place, position or relationship with things, and the 'body is at the same time decentered and centralizing'²²².

3.1.8 Body Schema - Body Image

The structures of *chiasm*, reversibility and *flesh* are based on practical principles of perception that all are 'grounded in the body'²²³. In the *chiasmic* structures the body 'adopts certain forms of behavior'²²⁴ through specific actions that prepare the self for direct engagement with the phenomenon of *intercorporeality*. *Intercorporeality* indicates a latent connection between the body-me (self) and the body-not-me (other) that is enacted on a somatic level and is enabled by an underlying transfer of the *body schema*. Taylor Carman says that Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological analysis of the mirroring is 'an extension of his account of the body schema and motor intentionality'²²⁵.

Merleau-Ponty first used the term *body schema (corporeal schema)*²²⁶ in his *Phenomenology of Perception* to underline the capacity of the body to recover its relationship with the world the things and other bodies. He also used this term in his *Nature Course Notes from the College de France*²²⁷ to state that 'the human body is a body that moves, and this also means a body that perceives'²²⁸. Merleau-Ponty connects movement and perception and clarifies

²²² Taminiaux, 'The Thinker and the Painter', pp. 199-200.

²²³ T. Carman, 'Merleau-Ponty and the Mystery of Perception', *Philosophy Compass*, 4.4 (2009), p. 634.

²²⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 354.

²²⁵ Carman, 'Mystery of Perception', p. 635.

²²⁶ In the 1962 English translation the term used is *body image* but in the 2002 English edition the term *body schema* is used instead. Carman explains that the term *body image* which was originally used by Colin Smith is wrong because Merleau-Ponty uses the term *shema corporel* which means *corporeal schema* or *body schema* [T. Carman, *Merleau-Ponty* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 239].

²²⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *Nature Course Notes from the College de France*, (ed.) by Seglard Dominique, trans. by Robert Vallier. (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2003).

²²⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *ibid.*, p. 209.

that ‘this is one of the meanings of the human “corporeal schema”²²⁹. In his “Child’s Relations with Others” Merleau-Ponty refers to the impressive capacity for mimesis of infants as conditioned by the automatic responses established of the operations of the *body schema*. Martin Dillon on the other hand states that the notion of *body schema* ‘allows one to conceive the infant as experiencing his body by *living* it; *body schema* is rather the ground of a style of interacting with the environment’²³⁰. Ultimately, the *body schema* can be considered as the primordial experience of corporeal reflexivity, the experience of the body in relation to itself and to the world²³¹.

Shaun Gallagher explains that there has been a psychological and a phenomenological conceptual confusion regarding the distinction between the notions of *body schema* and *body image*. The terminological confusion in the use of these two concepts turns on the ‘question concerning the status of the body... the manner, in which the body is experienced as an intentional object of consciousness’²³². Sometimes this confusion exists in Merleau-Ponty’s work as well. Merleau-Ponty uses these two terms, *body schema* and *body image*, interchangeably and seems that when he uses the term *body image* he means *body schema*²³³. Gallagher’s analysis [1995; 1998; 2000] proposes a phenomenological reflection of these two terms and clarifies the distinction between the terms *body image* and *body schema*. Gallagher writes,

Body image is an *intentional attitude* towards one’s body, that is having a perception of (sometimes conscious), or belief about, or emotional attitude towards one’s body.

²²⁹ *ibid.*, p. 209.

²³⁰ Dillon, *Merleau-Ponty’s Ontology*, p. 122.

²³¹ Dillon, *Merleau-Ponty’s Ontology*, p. 122.

²³² S. Gallagher, ‘Body Image and Body Schema: A Conceptual Clarification’, *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 7.4 (1986), p. 541. In this article, Gallagher gives a detailed account and a review of this problem noted in many studies. According to Gallagher, the conceptual confusion can be traced back to the early theoretical development of both terms started with Head (1920) and Schilder (1923).

²³³ Gallagher writes that Merleau-Ponty does not make an explicit distinction between *body image* and *body schema* and although he tries to be careful when he uses them, still there is ambiguity in his discussion of these terms. At times, when he uses the term *body image*, he clearly means *body schema* [S. Gallagher, ‘Body Schema and Intentionality’, in Bermúdez, J. L., Marcel, A. and Eilan, N. (eds), *The Body and the Self* (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1995/2001), p. 232].

Body schema is having a capacity to move or to exist in the action of one's own body. *Body schema* is a system of processes that constantly regulate posture and movements – *sensory –motor processes* that function without reflective awareness or the necessity of perceptual monitoring.²³⁴

The *body schema* is a postural underlying structure of the body; 'already built in the bodily structure and, is its inseparable correlative'²³⁵. The *body schema* corresponds to the how the self and the world, the things, the other bodies, are experiencing each other by enabling the body for motor differentiation within a dynamic psychophysical form that is prior to condition of possibility for perception and action²³⁶. The theory of the *body schema* is the relation of perception and action. Carman claims in Merleau-Ponty the *body schema* is 'implicitly a theory of perception'²³⁷.

For Merleau-Ponty the *body schema* is the dynamic form of *being-in-the-world*. Through the *body schema* we grasp space and acquire a corporeal knowledge that involves the ability to be aware of one's own body, aware of its mutual relations of its limbs and of its parts that are always directed towards a specific task and are always related to a certain bodily *spatial situation*²³⁸. For this reason we cannot say that 'our body is *in* space, or *in* time. The body *inhabits* space and time'²³⁹. Since the body perceives the world in praxis, the 'perceived world is a practical field'²⁴⁰. Merleau-Ponty writes,

If I stand in front of my desk and lean on it with both hands, only my hands are stressed and the whole of my body trails behind them like the tail of a comet. It is not that I am unaware of the whereabouts of my

²³⁴ Gallagher, 'Body Schema and Intentionality', p. 232.

²³⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 142.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 141-142.

²³⁷ T. Carman, *Merleau-Ponty* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 239.

²³⁸ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 100.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

²⁴⁰ A. Lingis, 'Bodies that Touch Us', *Thesis Eleven*, 36.1 (1993), p. 165.

shoulders or back, but these are simply swallowed up in the position of my hands, and my whole posture can be read so to speak in the pressure they exert on the table.²⁴¹

If I stand holding my pipe in my closed hand, the position of my hand is not determined discursively by the angle which it makes with my forearm, and my forearm with my upper arm, and my upper arm with my trunk, and my trunk with the ground. I know indubitable where my pipe is, and thereby I know where my hand and my body are, as primitive man in the desert is always able to take his bearings immediately without having to cast his mind back.²⁴²

The *body schema* makes one's body fully aware of its parts, its position that is always in relation to a directed action and its surrounding space and things. In that sense the *body schema* is a *total awareness*²⁴³ of a particular position of the body and arrangements of its parts which relates to the way in which one holds its body as a body/mind and actively organizes, controls, and modifies the aim, purpose of a course of action. If I am engaged, for example, in a conversation and at the same I am walking on a slightly steep path with many different obstacles, such as low trees with big branches and I have to go into a lower position now and then in order to avoid hitting my head, I am moving through out without having to think about what I am doing, how I am walking²⁴⁴.

Taking into consideration the descriptions of the above examples, the *body schema* operates in a holistic way since there is not a single part of the body that functions in an isolated way. Shoulders, back, feet, that is, different parts of the body adjust as a whole to the requirements of a specific task. A slight change in the posture will bring other changes as well, because the *body*

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 100.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

²⁴⁴ Gallagher, 'Body Schema and Intentionality', p. 230.

schema 'involves a global adjustment across a large number of muscle systems',²⁴⁵.

Through the notion of *body schema* we can understand *how* the body performs a series of actions in a specific space and environment. How one is moving throughout while walking, talking, lowering the head, without contemplating or reasoning the way these actions have to be performed, i.e., without being mechanical. The *body schema* is a precognitive manifestation of *how* body, lived space, the things in the world, other bodies are intermingled – how they become integrated into a unified whole through the active operations of the *body schema*. Through the body schema the body is in undivided possession of itself and knows where each of its limbs is.

The *body schema* primarily concerns spatial organization of action as well as an unconscious awareness and intentionality of one's body. Gallagher explains,

When I jump to catch a ball in the context of a game, or when I walk across the room to greet someone, my actions may be explicitly willed, and governed by my perception of objects or persons in the environment. My attention, however, and even my complete awareness in such cases are centered on the ball or on the other person ... In such cases the body moves smoothly and in a coordinated fashion ... because of the coordinated functioning of the body schema.²⁴⁶

Gallagher emphasizes that the *body schema* shows the coordination of different elements of a complex whole (body and its limbs), its particular dynamic motor behavior and attitude that is directed towards a certain possible task, and in relation to specific spatial properties. The body is always *situated* and in relation to a particular location and context of a specific action. The *body*

²⁴⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p.229.

²⁴⁶ Gallagher, 'Phenomenological and Experimental Research on Embodied Experience', Paper presented at *Atelier phénoménologie et cognition, Phénoménologie et Cognition Research Group*, CREA, Paris (December 2000), p. 2 <<http://philpapers.org/rec/GALPAE-2>> [accessed 21 April 2010].

schema is not about 'a *spatiality of position*, but a *spatiality of situation*'²⁴⁷. Through the *body schema* the body performs as undivided whole. It is able to be connected to the practical conditions of particular spatial relations in which it finds itself, that is, apprehend these relations by applying them in practice. Inseparable from space, environment, surrounding objects, present time, reality of action, the performance of a *body schema*, continually orders and ensures through this interaction the position and function of its parts in any number of possible shapes and forms.

Merleau-Ponty considers that the *body schema* is a dynamic system of sensorimotor perceptual experience that 'provides us with a way of access to the world and the object with a "praktognosia"'²⁴⁸ (knowledge in practice). The living body which is always in practical relation to the totality of its surrounding conditions and things through the *body schema* is enlarged and is developed through this interaction. In other words, the body builds up a *body schema* in order to adjust itself to the practical considerations of the intentional action. Elizabeth Grosz mentions that 'Merleau-Ponty's point is that we grasp the idea of external space only through certain relations we have to our body or corporeal schema'²⁴⁹. That 'perceptual competence', as Alphonso Lingis explains, 'is motor competence'²⁵⁰. Here perception, movement and action are inextricably interrelated.

Merleau-Ponty parallels the body's relation to space with the idea that 'the body applies itself to space like a hand to an instrument'²⁵¹. The blind man can touch, feel, sense, 'see' at the end of his stick, the driver can drive a car and get through without bumping to obstacles or other cars, a woman who wears a hat with a feather can move safely without breaking it off that is without the need to calculate the distance between her hat and things²⁵². Merleau-Ponty

²⁴⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 100.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 140. Praktognosia is a Greek word and means [*prato*] act and [*gnosi*] knowledge.

²⁴⁹ E. Grosz, *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), p. 90.

²⁵⁰ Lingis, 'Bodies that Touch Us', p. 165.

²⁵¹ Merleau-Ponty, *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 5.

²⁵² Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, p. 143.

clarifies, the stick, the car, the hat have ceased to be mere 'objects with a size and volume, they have become potentialities of volume, the demand for a certain amount of free space that has been incorporated into the bulk of one's own body'²⁵³. To get used to a stick, a car, a hat, is to be *transplanted* into them, which according to Merleau-Ponty, is a *habit* that expresses the power of *dilating* the body in the world²⁵⁴.

Habit, for Merleau-Ponty, is a corporeal knowledge to become larger, extensive, more open, that can be cultivated. The cultivation of *habit* opens up a motor space as in the case of a typewriter who can 'incorporate the key-board space into the bodily space'²⁵⁵. It is to 'experience the harmony between what we aim at and what is given, between the intention and the performance'²⁵⁶.

With reference to the *body schema* in the context of a given action, Gallagher explains that when I play a specific game and I jump to catch a ball, that action cannot be analyzed only within physiological and/or neurological structural terms. The *body schema* is much more selectively attuned to its environment than what physiology will allow²⁵⁷. There are other important factors that determine the action of playing the ball game as well; that is the 'physical environment, the effects of one's practice or lack of it, the rules of the game as they are habitually expressed in the practiced movements of the body may define how one jumps to make the catch'²⁵⁸.

The *body schema* enables the moving body to make partial changes, modifications, adjustments and readjustments in order to achieve a desirable outcome for the particular task; for example, a higher jump to catch the ball if it is needed in the ball game, or a slight movement of the foot, or of the head and/or hand can be made in order to better support the leaning body on the

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 143

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

²⁵⁷ Gallagher, 'Body Schema and Intentionality', p. 236.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 236.

desk. The decisive factor for the possible changes is the efficiency of the movements of the body, the sense of balance that determines postures and positions which as a result allow the body to perceive things properly and to adapt itself to the circumstances. The *body schema* continually arranges and rearranges the form and content of the perceiving body in order to ‘afford a “best grip” on things’²⁵⁹. Therefore the *body schema* can determine and regulate the development of action.

Gallagher explains that the distinctive characteristic of the *body schema* is *selectivity*²⁶⁰; *selectivity*, which requires skillful knowledge and practice, is how the body carefully makes choices and performs in the best possible way with the least waste of time energy and effort. *Selectivity* allows the body, the self to materialize itself in any possible number of shapes or forms. Training and the cultivation of one’s habitual psychophysical capacities is required in order for the body to avoid the ramblings allowed by physiology and be able to organize and control its perceptual field -- i.e. to structure and regulate a series of relations which are different points or viewed objects with regard to their relative position in space and distance from the body and which are of a central and peripheral perspective. The different perspectives are structured by the *body schema* and are depending on the requirements of the performing task which is ‘our horizontal and vertical anchorage in a place and in a here-and-now’²⁶¹. According to Merleau-Ponty, the perceived things are not given to the body as an assumption or explanation of *a priori* knowledge, but ‘they are open, inexhaustible systems which we recognize through a certain style of development’²⁶².

The *body schema* is the tangible or visible form of an image or gesture (PG) that is neither internal nor external, but the interplay of both which has the

²⁵⁹ Carman, *Merleau-Ponty*, p. 110.

²⁶⁰ Gallagher, ‘Body Schema and Intentionality’, p. 236; ‘Without a certain amount of selectivity, built up by practice and the cultivation of one’s habitual movements, the body might move in any one multiple ways since, the possibilities allowed by physiology are much greater than the particular movements necessary to catch the ball in the proper way.’

²⁶¹ Merleau-Ponty, *The Primacy of Perception*, p. 5.

²⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

capacity for continuing to grow. The significance Merleau-Ponty finds in the *body schema* 'is a structure of competence in the body'²⁶³. Rather than positing living perception in binary or oppositional terms Merleau-Ponty develops the middle point or position as the connector between body and space (the world), self and other, body and mind, inner and outer, in the form of a *Gestalt* structure, in the form of the *body schema*.

What makes this structure of the body possible is the *in-between*²⁶⁴ point where simultaneously the visible, physical self and the invisible, non-physical other, the perceiver and the perceived cross. Where the inner and the outer, the self and the world (the other), body and mind meet. The "in-betweenness" here is the state wherein the body exists in negotiation between polarities or oppositions. As a result the body 'rediscover[s] the being that lies before the cleavage operated by reflection, about it, on its horizon, not outside of [itself] and not in [itself], but there where the two movements cross, there where "there is something.'²⁶⁵

In this chapter so far, I have discussed Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of the *chiasmic* relationship between the body and the world, self and other, body and mind, inside and outside, presence and absence, the visible and the invisible. Merleau-Ponty claims that all oppositions are associated *chiasmatically*. The *chiasm* is a metaphorical image to describe how the intertwinement and overlapping between oppositions can take place. The *chiasmic* interrelations are not structured according to binary oppositions. This permits neither unity or fusion nor absolute separation. Merleau-Ponty defines this relational interdependence of opposites with the term *flesh*. *Flesh* denotes a 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' structure of the body that generates various embodied *chiasmic* relations which are linked together while maintaining their '*in-between*' space. The phenomenological metaphors of *chiasm* and *flesh* express a unitary field of energy, a force that brings together constituents of the same event to create an

²⁶³ Lingis, 'Bodies that Touch Us', p. 165.

²⁶⁴ Merleau-Ponty, *Signs*, p. 166. 'It is into this in-between that we must try to advance.'

²⁶⁵ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 95.

'*in-between*' space. Merleau-Ponty considers the '*in-between*' dynamics as a relational *chiasmic* structure where the invisible is a different layer of the visible and the other is the corporeal absence that is part of presence.

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology explores the disclosing of a pre-objective space in the depths of the body which serves as a primordial space that allows the body to reveal itself both as sentient and sensible, i.e., the body can perceive, sense, feel and can be perceived, sensed, felt at the same time. Exploring the nature of perception Merleau-Ponty's philosophy focuses on a conceptual frame that allows the body to transcend the dichotomies between physical and non-physical, natural and non-natural self or visible and invisible body. *Flesh* as a lived embodiment attributes both subjectivity and objectivity to the body. The concept of *flesh* reveals the '*in-between*'; the third way or element between body and mind, subject and object, self and other, inner and outer. This provides a way of thinking about a body or self somewhere *in-between* the two, in the *in-between* space, in their enacted relations. In that sense, *flesh* denotes the body not as a subject, but as an ambiguous mode of being that lies always '*in-between*' and holds a double meaning.

3.2 Merleau-Ponty and Michael Chekhov: The Psychological Gesture

In this section Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture is discussed through the lens of Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of the body which indicates the reciprocal relation of a *chiasmic* structure. The Psychological Gesture is examined as a perceptual *Gestalt* structure which suggests that there is viscerality or invisibility in the connections-relations that are enacted between the subject-body and the world, the body and the space, the self (the actor) and the other (character). Merleau-Ponty's notion of *flesh* is taken here as an underlying corporeal structure that conditions the way the actor's self in Michael Chekhov's practice experiences space and its relation between bodies. More specifically, the Psychological Gesture as *flesh* is conceived as an energetic field of action that offers a way of conceptualizing the '*in-between*' space wherein the unity of all contradictions, the immanent self (the actor) and the

transcendent other (the character), the visible and the invisible, the tangible and the intangible, presence and absence meet, but never coincide in this relational process.

In Merleau-Ponty the defining characteristic of *flesh* is perceptual reflexivity. Perceptual reflexivity is experienced as an expansion of the physical and non-physical body, as transcendence or self-extendedness of the body and mind. This phenomenological principle that is grounded in a relational engagement of the body with the space and the world (environment) holds deep affinities with Michael Chekhov's acting processes. Michael Chekhov's training aims the actor's body to be able to actively and intentionally engage with the space - world, the things in it, the other (character). Merleau-Ponty's ontology of *flesh* can offer a phenomenological frame in understanding the capacity of the actor's body to exceed the physical limits of itself through imaginative and cognitive processes when practicing/experiencing the Psychological Gesture.

My argument is that we can deepen our understanding of the Psychological Gesture by conceiving it as *flesh* or perceptual reflexivity (the ability of the actor's body to perceive, sense, feel itself and other bodies) which is a psychophysical activity that is possible when the actor's body is able to operate as a body schema-body image, as a *Gestalt* structure, where the merging of all the *chiasmic* engaged relations seem to become a whole, one "universal flesh". We can see the Psychological Gesture operating as a body schema-body image model of perception in the sense that is an organizing structure contained in the actor's body that offers a total awareness of one's postures in the inter-sensory world, an understanding of the body that is experienced as a unified whole, as a *bodymind* (*Gestalt*).

The pre-reflective aspect of the body schema-body image, the mutual dependency between practical pre-reflective engagement with the world (the other) and reflective engagement, can shed lights on the ways in which the structure of Psychological Gesture operates. The interplay between reflective and pre-reflective knowledge of movement where each is informed and fed by the world the things seems to open a space to elaborate upon the links

between perception and action around the visible and the invisible, self and other (character), immanence and transcendence, and *intercorporeality* as a *Gestalt* structure in acting.

3.2.1 Psychological Gesture: Sensations

The Psychological Gesture trains the relationship of the actor's muscular system with the nervous system and thus operates as the unifying bond between the actor's body and mind (brain). All movements of the actor's Psychological Gesture flood/permeate the actor's nervous system with sensations which are the substance of this unifying bond. The actor's mind (brain) receives sensory information from the body, an interaction that involves the actor's mind and the space, the environment.

In my practice of the Psychological Gesture the beginning method of exploration was through the process of breathing. In fact we spent several days on this process since through breathing the actor is connected to the chosen gesture which incites the body of the actor to the action. Psychological Gesture combines kinaesthetic and psychological aspects of the other (character) through uniting the actor's awareness of breath and the unifying power of the image of the gesture which the actor experiences through sensations.

The multiple possibilities of breath are explored until the actor discovers the breathing pattern of the Psychological Gesture that is the breathing pattern of the other (the character); (breath becomes a means by which the fundamental experience of the Psychological Gesture is integrated with the energy associated with the emotional behavior of the other/character). What is important to emphasize is that in Michael Chekhov's practice breath is not taken for granted in the actor's work in the sense that breath is a point of focus in the actor's training and a sensation-based process. Through breathing and gesturing the actor becomes aware of the sensations of his/her body and attunes his/her gesture and actions accordingly. In other words, when doing Psychological Gesture the actor's optimal mode of living experience of his/her own body is inextricably linked with the sensations of the movement of breath

and gesture in the actor's body. The actor is trained to learn to sense-feel the sensations of the Psychological Gesture that result from movement and breath. After establishing the bodily sensations associated with the action of the gesture these sensations become a reservoir of innate embodied reference to which the actor's attention can return repeatedly. The following is an extract from one of my student actor's journal,

Attention is always inadvertently occupied by sensations to some extent. Once the gesture had been repeated over a period of time, taking into account the qualities and sensations of that specific gesture, an attention to these things becomes almost subconscious when performing. The sensations to me are critical in the development of 'emotion' that one feels – or the sensations which evoke feelings similar to emotions previously felt. I think the attention to sensations comes from other parts of the body than the mind (where there is more focus on action, text, staging etc). The body remembers the PG and once is started internally the sensations are then again brought to life. Sensations are the source that supply the life and activities of the 'character'. [Extract from actor's journal *Manhattan Medea* 20/4/2013]

In the first place the breathing-gesturing process might be subject to preconceptions, personal inhibitions, may be to culturally and socially determined patterns, that do not allow the development of the process since they are not available to the actor's consciousness. Through bodily sensations the actor can achieve awareness of these patterns that usually operate at subliminal level and the actor is not aware of them. Gradually these patterns can be brought to conscious awareness through an orientation to the sensations of the movement of breath and gesture because both are deeply affected by such patterns.

In the following extract, one of my student actors explains that after four productive weeks of training and rehearsals he took things for granted and as a result he was not 'listening' to his bodily sensations and inner body. He became overly conscious of what he was doing and this obstructed the creative process.

Why do I feel that I reached a dead end with the 5th Section? Mostly, I was used to the 'finding of a gesture' taking a certain amount of time (usually completed in two sessions). I think I had become used to this routine and forgotten that each time gesture is different. However, as soon as I began to notice that it was taking longer, it became harder and harder for me to fully commit myself to the gesture. I became very conscious of what I was doing and found it incredibly hard to leave my 'everyday self' behind. I also, felt frustrated as I know we are working to a deadline and I want the process to be as smooth as possible ... I have noticed that most of my problems arise when I am 'thinking' too much or predetermine things and I am not 'listening' to what is happening inside my body to the impulses of the body and the associated sensations of the gesture. When I turn my attention inwardly and to my breath I have a better sense of my whole body and of how I need to go on. I think I was trying to force the gesture, simply so that we could move on to the next part ... Writing this all down I recognize to be a very helpful step in allowing me to move on from this point. Only by being aware of the problems I can deal with them. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 5/3/2012]

By means of new sensory information that looks both inwardly (to the actor's internal landscape) and outwardly (to application in the external environment), the actor made conscious what is habitually unconscious (begins to acknowledge habitual movement patterns) and this helped the actor to move on. As we see in the above extract the awareness of the breath and the ability to connect breath with gesture through sensations makes the shift from thinking to perceiving; the focus of the actor shifts from thinking to perceiving sensations.

It appears that the focus of the actor's attention to the sensory attributes of tasks/actions of the Psychological Gesture opens a dialogue between the

actor's interoceptive experience (the stimuli produced within the actor's body) and kinesthetic proprioceptive experience²⁶⁶. Sensory awareness immerses the actor in a dialogue with the space, the environment and with his/her own self and body. Through this dialogue the actor gains awareness of the internal and external respiration which expands internal awareness of kinesthetic states associated with conscious sensory experience. Internal awareness is a form of internal listening through sensations that is an attitude of exploration of the breath and the continuous investigation of the position of the body and its limbs that allows the actor to constantly note the flow of energy and its relationship to how this is felt in the actor's body. One of the actors states in his journal:

By literally focusing on my breathing and the image of the gesture I sense a gush of what seems like warm thick liquid that flows freely from my guts through my body and my limbs out in space. In this process I feel I have discovered new qualities of movement and a better understanding of my physicality and my physical habits such as that I am moving always on the same direction and level and I am focusing my kinesthetic attention only on the front part of my body. I feel aware of the powerful influence of the sensations of the images of the gesture that regulate my body. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 27/2/2016]

In the last two journal-extracts the actors seem to be able to recognize and decode sensations, to describe new images and new habits that are created through sensory awareness which appear to shape new levels of conscious experience. The actors' response to the Psychological Gesture is somatically registered through sensations and not through thought. In both extracts the actors' response might be described as an instance of "active listening" to their bodily sensations and feelings and to what is happening inside and outside the body. 'Active listening' engages the actor's whole body. It changes the way the actors experience themselves. Although the Psychological Gesture might begin as a muscular gesture, because it is a multilayered and multisensory process

²⁶⁶ The stimuli produced/perceived within an organism and are relating to position and movement of the body.

gradually it involves both the surface and the depths of the actor's body. It involves images and/or gestures of the actor's outer and inner body which after intense training the actor can experience as a sense of a whole (*Gestalt*).

In the training the actor learns to sense the movements of the Psychological Gesture with inhalation, exhalation, and pause, while attending to the sensations of breath, gesture, sound, and voice. When all these sensations synergize feed the action of the Psychological Gesture and determine meaning from these perceptions. This synergy can expand the expressive abilities of the actor beyond his/her self-image and body and can integrate internal states and external actions. The experience of this phenomenon is described by one of the actors with the following,

The PG involves being immersed in a particular sensory aspect. For me there is always a sensory awareness which alters depending on the PG used. Through the PG my sensory awareness to space becomes heightened, thus when commencing the action I find that sensory awareness allows the action to reverberate/expand more within the space relating my inner body to the environment. [Extract from actor's journal *Medea Material* 2/5/2013]

It appears that here the actor is being affected by bodily sensations and self-movement and as a result experiences the action of the Psychological Gesture as a felt sense of internal-external relation. As another actor explains,

My usual felt sense of self as a separate existence disappeared. I felt that the boundary of my skin dissolved as if replaced by a sense of being united with the character and the space and everything and everyone that was in it while feeling connected with the action of the gesture. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 12/3/2016]

In both extracts the actors' felt sense of the self indicates that they do not separate the senses individually (such as visual and haptic experience). All the senses are working together, each of the senses informs the others in virtue of

their common behavioral project or concern of the Psychological Gesture. The synthesis of the sensory awareness of the body with self-movement allows the actor to perceive a unified whole. There is a felt sense of self that extends beyond the sense organs in that the actor is able to move spatially in the world extending sensations into perception. The actors' body and the world-space overlap and transgress each other's boundaries. This inner experience that has the power to go beyond the actor's skin, and a sense of a unified body can be accomplished through pre-conscious power of bodily synthesis that involves raw un-reflected feelings and unmediated observation, is a somatic exploration that relies on the actor's ability to take in new information through sensory modalities (eyes, ears, nose, skin).

In this somatic exploration where there is a constant interaction between the nerves and the muscles and the joints structures, the actors' modes of inquiry concerning their decisions of the course of action of the Psychological Gesture include, according to their remarks,

The sense of weight, connection to the lower space (feet, legs, pelvic area), discovery of the pelvis, choices in relation to gravity, the sense of space; sensory impression from and attention drawn to hands, fingers, forearms, lower abdomen; softening of focus, peripheral gaze or awareness; alignment or release of the spine; projection, imagined directions into space and imagined vectors; a feeling of the earth-ground, a grounding of energy, and a sense of the above-the sky; these helped the actors to stay focus in the present moment. [Personal journal 22/4/2016]

In practical terms the actors' comments suggest that the actor is finally able to stay fully present to the Psychological Gesture by being able to stay fully present to their interoceptive and proprioceptive experience. In this way, the actor maintains a dual attention to the action of the Psychological Gesture and to the perceptual process of affecting and being affected by the other (character). The actor while embodying the impulses coming from the Psychological Gesture also remains responsive to the surrounding space and

the other (character). The actor's dual attention to interoceptive and proprioceptive experience denotes what Merleau-Ponty considers awareness of oneself as sensible and sentient body that expands the Psychological Gesture in *Gestalt* structure (as the background of the active listening and the action). In this way, the actor is able to inhabit, what Phillip Zarrilli names, a "dual/multiple consciousness"²⁶⁷ where one in Michael Chekhov's technique is able to maintain focus on action (PG) perception and self-awareness at the same time. In other words, through Psychological Gesture the actor can inhabit a cognitive process in action.

3.2.2 Sensations: Proprioception - Interoception

The Psychological Gesture training is a system that relies heavily on proprioception; proprioception encompasses kinesthesia [awareness of the position and movement of the parts of the body by means of sensory organs (proprioceptors) in the muscles and joints] and also includes sense position.

In practicing Psychological Gesture the actor is asked to utilize proprioception, to pay attention to the inner experience, and to differentiate body parts and be specific and precise with positioning in order to inhabit a certain psychophysical form of a certain gesture. This is asking for actors to pay attention to their proprioceptive awareness. In other words, Psychological Gesture involves the actor's awareness of his/her body in relation to space, others, things, and the changing nature of time and its dynamics. By focusing the actor's attention on how is moving and on what kind of movement and energy uses (molding, floating, flying, legato, staccato), the Psychological Gesture provides proprioceptive information that enables the actor to be aware of his/her body in relation to space others and what this includes. Proprioception enables awareness of physical connection, the actor's kinaesthetic response, and interoception enables the actor's visceral

²⁶⁷ P. Zarrilli, *Psychophysical Acting An Intercultural Approach to Stanislavski*, (New York: Routledge, 2009), p. 83; 'While attending to a specific task/action with a fully embodied primary focus and awareness, one simultaneously is able to keep an open perceptual awareness, i.e., one possesses an active dual/multiple consciousness'.

connection what in the above extract the actor refers to as a “felt sense of the self”. Interoception is the actor’s sense of the physiological condition of his/ her body that includes sensations from the visceral feelings and other internal sensations which seem to allow a sense of a ‘gut feeling’. As Phillip Zarrilli explains ‘physiologically, our experience of our internal viscera and organs is characterized by interoception’²⁶⁸. In reality sensations and bodily feelings of the Psychological Gesture appear to focus the actor’s attention on a powerful intuitive bodily response, that is on something more than the five senses, that seems to be prior to conscious reasoning or to the chance to intellectualize the consequence of the action of the Psychological Gesture.

3.2.3 Psychological Gesture: a Body Schema - Body Image Model of Perception

In practicing Psychological Gesture the actor’s attention and concentration is placed on how the actor moves, to what is happening in the actor’s body. We can understand that Psychological Gesture operates as a body schema, as the psychophysical activity that demands a form of attention that depends on the actor’s proprioceptive awareness which is about finely tuned and being sensitive to active listening, looking, feeling, sensing, perceiving. In that sense it is possible to say that the actor’s attention in practicing Psychological Gesture is engaged in a similar way one attends to one’s body as a body schema perceptual structure which can provide the actor with a pre-reflective immediate knowledge of the position of the body and its parts. The pre-reflective dimension implies that the actor can become conscious that does things which are efficient and capable of providing a reflection without knowing in a reflective sense how the actor has arrived at that consciousness. In other words, there is a suspension of judgment. Pre-reflective is a certain kind of knowledge which is a ‘tacit knowledge’, an information that is not explicit that gives rise to a bodily knowledge that comes from the actor’s whole body.

²⁶⁸ P. Zarrilli, *Psychophysical Acting An Intercultural Approach to Stanislavski*, (New York: Routledge, 2009), p. 54.

Body schema and proprioception are very closely interrelated and the idea that Psychological Gesture operates as a body schema model of perception suggests that the actor in the training learns to pay close attention to proprioceptive awareness. This enables the actor's inner psychophysical experience to go to any specific part of the body, and to sense it, feel it, and perceive it internally. In other words, we can see Psychological Gesture as a model of perception that heightens the actor's awareness of the body and the space, sharpens proprioceptive awareness, sensorimotor control, the actor's capacity to act. As one of my actors explains,

When using the Psychological Gesture I am drawn directly to the sensory qualities of the specific Psychological Gesture how I experience the position of my body the space and other things in the environment. My awareness of space in relation to my body and gesture grows and is very much heightened. A feeling of acute sensitivity to the space changes the way I sense my body my limbs while my body alters aspects of the world as this grows along with the Psychological Gesture. Changes in the space, for example the movement of other actors or changing in lighting and sound are particularly noticeable on my body. I feel I am able to control my body and adapt to the conditions of these changes through the Psychological Gesture. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 28/4/2016]

This practical example shows that the actor learns to perceive the spatiality that is created by means of the Psychological Gesture and to perceive and adjust his body and its parts that are known in their new sense of self and in their functional and practical values of a specific action/gesture. It can be said that the character of the actor's connection to the action is an 'optimal' state of a bodily "I can". Through Psychological Gesture the actor seems to be able to attain a skillful understanding of making movements in an adaptive way, in the lived understanding of the spatial structure of his body. The actor in his journal implies that Psychological Gesture places the actor's body and the actor's "I can" together in space; that the actor's body operates here not as an "I think",

but according to an “I can” that appears to replace the mechanical reaction to a stimulus.

The normal functioning of the body schema presupposes a particular attentive consciousness that allows one to be more attentive to the space, the world, the environment than to the body (the act of gesturing)²⁶⁹. In the body schema model of perception proprioceptive consciousness usually operates without necessarily one being consciously aware of it. But Psychological Gesture appears to operate as an ‘optimal’ psychophysical system where body schema and body image rely heavily on each other. There is a synergy between the two. As we can see in the above practical example the Psychological Gesture shifts the actor’s awareness to proprioceptive experience and to ‘a reflective awareness of movement which can be brought to consciousness’²⁷⁰. The conscious awareness of the body comes from the image of the actor’s body (body image) which constitutes to the actor’s bodily knowledge and action of the Psychological Gesture.

My argument is that we can see and describe Psychological Gesture as a body schema-body image model of perception that relies in their reciprocal relationship. Body schema and body image are two closely related systems, according to Gallagher, that seem to be experienced by the actor interchangeably²⁷¹. The skillful exchange between the body schema and the body image can constantly feed each other and develop and support the interaction of the actor’s body with the space, the world, and everything in it. On the other hand if the actor’s body schema and body image are incongruent, and the actor’s body image is resistant and cannot tune to the body schema, the actor cannot be able to be connected to the Psychological Gesture.

For example in the following extract the actor describes that the differences between his body schema and body image (between internal sensations and

²⁶⁹ S. Gallagher, *How the Body Shapes the Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 34

²⁷⁰ S. Gallagher, *ibid.*, p. 46.

²⁷¹ S. Gallagher, *ibid.*, p.24.

external image of himself and movement) do not allow to develop a coherent sense of his body and his Psychological Gesture. He writes that,

I became very conscious of what I was doing and found it incredibly hard to leave the sense of my 'everyday self' behind ... I have noticed that most of my problems arise when I am 'thinking' too much ... when I am not 'listening' to what is happening inside my body and the associated sensations of the gesture. When I turn my attention inwardly and to my breath while I am doing the PG I have a better sense of what is happening in my body. I have images that enhance my awareness of my whole body. I can correct my body and my postural limitations- there is a possibility of adjusted movement and the way I perceive myself, the others, everything in the space. I also have a better control of the PG with respect to its tasks although I am less conscious of what is going to happen ... I am aware of an inner and outer space that I experience as a unified whole through PG and a flowing breathing in my chest. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 18/3/2016]

What the actor explains here is that what is happening with his body and what is actually happening are in disagreement; that is body image and body schema are in disagreement. This appears to change when through breath and gesture there is an open dialogue between the actor's body schema and body image which at some point appear to come to a reciprocal relationship. We can understand that the coherent development of the body-schema and body-image functions as a unifier that holds together the structure of the actor's Psychological Gesture. When body schema and body image respond to each other the actor seems to be able to become aware of his body from the inside and from the outside simultaneously. As a result there is a constant flow of his mind, imagination, and body (both internal and external) which the actor feels through a flowing breathing in the actor's ideal centre (the chest).

Alphonso Lingis notes that ‘the “body image” is not something projected by an act of imagination when one detaches one’s perception from things’²⁷². The body image is a conscious phenomenon that brings the actor’s body to presence and always has a reference to the body schema which precedes and informs the constitution of the actor’s body as object. Understanding the Psychological Gesture as a body schema is what brings the actor’s body image to its full stage of development since the body image ‘is responsive to, but does not include the context’²⁷³.

The actor’s reference to the idea of “listening to the body”, as the actor writes in the last practical example, denotes that the Psychological Gesture can recreate the possibility of plasticity in the body schema through the ‘mobilization’ of the body image and can enable the actor to perceive the differences in movement, the qualities and alterations of the body. When body schema and body image interact and interlace, each time new information comes from the actor’s body schema that updates the data of the actor’s body image and vice versa. In this ‘optimal’ state the actor can eliminate blocks, can make changes, can initiate adjustments and can coordinate movement without thinking it or planning it beforehand. The Psychological Gesture then can be continually developed and refined throughout; (in other words internal sensations and external image remain important in this process). By incorporating the body schema of the Psychological Gesture (related to movement) into the body-image (based in perception of self), the actor seems to be able to alter his perception of the relation between himself his body and the space.

Shaun Gallagher explains that the ‘body schema and the body image and plastic changes in the body image may be generated through the operations of the body schema as it controls the interaction of body and environment’²⁷⁴. Through Merleau-Ponty’s work we can see that the Psychological Gesture trains the actor to attend to the interplay between proprioception, body schema and body image. This allows all the bodily sensations that come from the

²⁷² A. Lingis, *Sensation: Intelligibility in Sensibility* (Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1996), p. 57.

²⁷³ J. Lutterbie, *Toward a General Theory of Acting Cognitive Science and Performance* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 141.

²⁷⁴ S. Gallagher, *How the Body Shapes the Mind*, p. 37.

movement-gesture to be acknowledged and not to remain below the actor's consciousness as would normally happen in an everyday situation. Psychological Gesture is a body schema-body image model of perception that can bring all information of the actor's experience to consciousness. This extends the actor's sensory awareness, develops a greater degree of psychophysical integration and effectiveness in the actor's performance.

The Psychological Gesture involves the activities of the body schema and body image by establishing a phenomenological 'explication of the role played by the body in action and cognition'²⁷⁵. The Psychological Gesture as a body schema-body image model of perception involves the potentiality of the body schema to move within the action of the actor's own body that is to operate when 'the intentional object of perception is something other than one's own body'²⁷⁶. This also promotes the contribution of the body image to consciously monitor and control the movement or gesture by the actor's perceptual awareness of his/her own body (aspect or parts of it).

3.2.4 Psychological Gesture: Body-Schema-Image and Self-extendedness or Transcendence

The characteristic activity of Psychological Gesture is that the actor can be able to move without actually moving, can accomplish the perceptual experience to go beyond the physical form of his/her body that alters the actor's perception. As one of my student actors describes,

The actor's perception of themselves is very much affected by the PG. The use of the internal gesture often gives the impression that one is moving much more than they actually are (Physically). Physical movements that are made seem very much heightened, perhaps because I very much experience these as movements which extend out

²⁷⁵ S. Gallagher, 'Neurophenomenological Research on Embodied Experience' in C, Chan-Fai, C., Chvatik, I., Copoeru, I., Lester, E., Iribarne, J. and Rainer, H. (eds), *Essays in Celebration of the Founding of the Organization of Phenomenological Organizations*, (2003), p. 9 <www.o-p-o.net> [accessed 8 March 2013].

²⁷⁶ S. Gallagher, 'Dimensions of Embodiment: Body Image and Body Schema in Medical Contexts', in *Handbook of Phenomenology and Medicine*, S. K. Toombs (ed.), 68 (2001), p. 149.

beyond the physical form of my body. Through the PG I feel bigger as though I expand. I have a strange sense of myself. I experience the extending of my body out in space and time inhabiting places that although feel familiar they are unknown. [Extract from actor's journal *Medea Material* 19/5/2013]

I argue that the capacity of the body through the Psychological Gesture to exceed oneself, as the actor describes, can be seen as the result of the link between the actor's body schema and body image. To the extent that the Psychological Gesture operates as a body schema-body image perceptual structure, the actor can internalize into the body the external image of an extended gesture which seems that is not compatible with the actor's usual, everyday body image. In the above description of the actor's experience the synergy between body schema and body image is what makes possible the actor's extended body gradually to be incorporated into the actor's body image; (this synergy can arise through repetition of the Psychological Gesture).

In other words, experiencing Psychological Gesture involves the actor's body is working with the extended bodily other, with Merleau-Ponty's 'invisible'. The actor learns to work with the extension of the physical form of the body an act that assumes the existence of 'something' out of the actor's usual everyday sense of body and self since the actor needs to incorporate the other's body the character's into his/her body as its extension. The following practical example gives more details of this experience of self-extendedness.

I have the sense that I incorporate an extension of my body through the psychological gesture. For example when 'pushing'; There is a sensation of the body being extended, going beyond itself into the space. In this sense my arms or this 'push' becomes an extension of the body. However, this is also true for the rest of the body, in that I feel all of my body my chest my lungs expanding and pushing out into the space, it is just particularly apparent with my arms. This sense of being extended engages new meanings of how I feel my body physically and emotionally. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 5/4/2016]

In practical terms the actor's body through Psychological Gesture experiences what Merleau-Ponty names transcendence; that is the body through its extension incorporates the structure of a particular movement, i.e., a bodily consciousness that includes the consciousness of a specific gesture (push, pull, embrace, throw etc). By inclusion of a specific movement-gesture the actor's body schema is extended and the actor is able to perform an extension of the body and as an extension of itself the body can become a tool in the world-space; (in the sense that the body as tool is used to carry out a particular function to help the actor perform a specific movement). It is possible to say that the actor by going beyond the physical form of the body experiences an extended sense of the body which appears to perform the function of tool. As we can see in the last two practical examples, this sense of extension appears to be an opening up of the actor's physical, psychological and emotional world that effectively shapes the actor's consciousness of his/her body and self.

In the last stage of our rehearsals, I asked the actors to comment on the nature of their experience of self-extendedness and to compare it to the examples Merleau-Ponty gives of the carpenter's hammer extension of his hand or to the feather in a woman's hat. Although both actors agreed that these examples can delineate in a sense their experience of transcendence or self-extendedness, they explained that the difference is that the blurring of the boundaries of the actor's body and space through the Psychological Gesture is limitless, whereas with the hammer or woman's hat there is a sense that there is a 'somewhere'. As one of them explains,

I think the example of the carpenter's hammer or the woman's hat are very good comparisons of how the PG extends beyond the physical form. However, the extension of the hammer or feather for example, both still have their physical constraints. Whilst it is a similar concept, the PG allows for an extension that is in some ways infinite. That is to say, one doesn't necessarily feel as though its ends and for this reason there is very much the sensation of expanding into space beyond the constraints of the body which completely alters the usual sense one has

of his self and the space. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary'
27/4/2016]

Through what Merleau-Ponty defines sense of self-extendedness or transcendence the actor is constantly engaged between one's internal body image (the way in which the body appears to itself as an external object self) and one's external form (the body schema of the lived body in the world)²⁷⁷ while having a limitless sense of one's body in space and time. Psychological Gesture not only displaces the actor's familiar body image by making a powerful intervention into the actor's ego-self or self image, but also includes information (about time and place) that goes beyond the 'narrow boundaries defined by it'²⁷⁸.

As described in their journals, the actors appear to experience in their own body an imaginary space (created out of the gestural dimensions of the Psychological Gesture) which has the power to remove the sense of having a body or self with physical boundaries. This relies on the actor's psycho-physical *situatedness* which we can see operating as a body schema-body image perceptual structure. The actor's body in 'mobilizing into a posture situates the levels where other viewing positions lie and extends an "image" of itself as something visible, tangible, and audible in that space'²⁷⁹, according to Lingis. The following extract is one of my actor's example of psycho-physical *situatedness* in the sense of how Psychological Gesture places in a particular location and context the actor's body and self. As the actor notes,

I see my new projected self as in a mirror leaning against a door frame watching a man who was bending over a dead woman's body while I am aware of the position of my legs knees the door frame holding my back my upper body forward and down somehow. I have a sense of heaviness of holding the dead woman's head in my hands. I am standing

²⁷⁷ S. Gallagher, 'Lived Body and Environment', *Research in Phenomenology*, 16.1 (1986), pp. 139-170.

²⁷⁸ S. Gallagher, *How the Body Shapes the Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 37.

²⁷⁹ A. Lingis, *Sensation*, p. 57.

still wanted to move but felt like I couldn't. I see my reflection on the other side of the room having postures and breathing feelings of moving away from the dead woman through the image of pushing in a floating legato way. I feel my fingers and stomach tense aloof and distant as in a dream reality. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 3/3/2016]

The actor's experience seems to be reminiscent of Merleau-Ponty's example of the man who looks at himself in the mirror can feel in his fingers the burning cigarette against the mirrored image. In the actor's extract, there is the same sense of how the breath and position of the other's, the character's body, while watching another man (who is probably himself) crouched over a dead woman's body, looks from the inside and is integrated into the man's body schema, so that when a gesture or posture is performed one knows that the fact that it feels a certain way (interoceptively) means that also 'looks' a certain way from an external perspective.

Although the actor's expanded body or projected self is an extension of the body schema and not of the body image, how the actor senses, feels through his 'image' of (self)-extendedness is part of the body image, but at the same time this also includes how the actor experiences his self in the present moment (detached, tense, disconnected, according to what the actor writes). The extended image of the actor's self (the projected self who is pushing in a floating legato way) is an immediate, unthematized and practical expansion of the actor's body schema that has the power of dilating on levels and can give the actor the capacity to sense, feel, and know the movement-gesture of expansion from the inside. The actor's 'seen', perceived body is felt from within; his 'felt experience of the body helps to constitute the perceptual aspect of the body image'²⁸⁰. In other words, a 'form of reflexive, self-referential intentionality, or a body image is involved'²⁸¹ which activates the ability of the actor to sense, feel and 'see' his self and body reflected in the mirror.

²⁸⁰ S. Gallagher and J. Cole, 'Body Image and Body Schema in a Deafferented Subject,' in D. Welton (ed.) *Body and Flesh: A Philosophical Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998/2001), p. 137.

²⁸¹ S. Gallagher, 'Dimensions of Embodiment', p. 150.

3.2.5 Psychological Gesture: Mirroring and Reflection

In and through the Psychological Gesture (the gestures and postures of the other-character) the actor is able to 'see', feel, sense him/her self 'seeing', feeling, sensing and reflecting back. In this way the actor is constantly engaged between the internal body image (the way in which the body appears to itself as an external object self) and the external form of the Psychological Gesture or the body schema of the lived body in the world²⁸². I argue that, after Merleau-Ponty, through Psychological Gesture the body of the actor is always in the process of perceiving and being perceived that is of creating and being created by the interaction of the body schema and body image.

This experience is a phenomenal style of knowing and doing. It draws on the intermodal, inter-sensorial dimension of the actor's body as a body schema-body image perceptual structure which organizes the actor's body in such a way so the actor is able to 'see', feel, sense with the whole body, according to Michael Chekhov, or all at once in a "glance", according to Merleau-Ponty; (Nishida also refers to this style of perceptual structure in Chapter 1). The actor by feeling a sensation feels as if something is occurring within his/her body and is able to know the movement-gesture of the other (character) from his/her own body since the actor's bodily 'inner states are "externalized" while all the stimuli in the environment are "incorporated" meaning they are experienced within the body'²⁸³. In order to stress the importance of what "all the stimuli" can mean in the actor's work I would like to refer to the following note I read in one of my actors' notebook: "When Effrosyni disappeared behind me, I was enveloped by a wave and the sense of sadness and nostalgia I was feeling at the moment was amplified" [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 13/3/2016].

Although the perceptual experience involved in the act of gesturing might take place beyond the level of awareness, Psychological Gesture because is a

²⁸²Gallagher, 'Lived Body and Environment', *Research in Phenomenology*, 16.1 (1986), pp. 139-170.

²⁸³Legrand, Dorothee and Susanne Ravn, 'Perceiving Subjectivity in Bodily Movement The Case of Dancers,' *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 8,2009: 389.

multilayered, multisensory process that takes in information through sense and proprioception involves the actor's exploration of the act of gesturing with reflection. The actor by exploring his/her sensory system, familiarizes and constructs new neural images of each gesture and reinforces the reflective state of the actor's self which is a necessary part of the creative process.

In the following extract the actor discovers two different positions or points of view and realizes there is no lived distinction between the act of perceiving and the 'thing' perceived the moment as Medea (the character) experiences the killing of her children through the Psychological Gesture of twisting. She writes,

Through PG I experience myself looking at 'me' from the outside. When I observe from the outside the feeling is that another self observes who I don't control I perceive from the perspective of Medea. My awareness is from her perspective; the feeling is overwhelming; but when I observe from the inside I have a more explicit and direct sense of what I am doing of my body and the space. My perception and awareness is from my I self a first person perspective. [Extract from actor's journal *Medea Material* 14/5/2013]

The actor here seems to occupy the position of both perceiving object and subject of perception and is able to articulate the difference between movement that is directed by the ego-self (body-me) and the non-ego-self (body-not-me) movement that operates as an unconscious or comes from (the other), the unconscious. It appears that the actor through her projected self (PG) is being carried away by a third person perspective. Much of what occurs within the actor's self, between the actor and the other (Medea the character) is out of the actor's control. It seems to be unconscious. But because Psychological Gesture develops conscious awareness as a result the actor is able to realize the other's (the character's Medea) sensations, feelings, thoughts and intuitions, and can recognize the distinction between ordinary everyday self and non-self-other (character). Psychological Gesture cultivates conscious awareness which functions much as a mirror (reflecting position and movement providing

feedback to respond to challenges and facilitate adjustments) and operates as a powerful tool for transcending unconscious patterns.

In Michael Chekhov the term reflective implies that the actor's body (through the gesture) is established through conscious awareness of the differentiation between the actor's self (body-me) and character (body-not-me). According to Gallagher, this 'recognition of the difference between one's own gesture [the actor's] and the gesture of the other [the character's] indicates a rudimentary differentiation between self and non-self and is operative from birth'²⁸⁴. In other words, the practice of Psychological Gesture brings conscious awareness that not only enables the actor to recognize what is going on inside and outside one's body, but also fosters an expanded perspective and openness of the experiential connection between self and other (character), sameness and alterity, which according to Gallagher is archetypal.

3.2.6 Psychological Gesture: Reversibility Chiasm Flesh

It seems to me that conscious awareness through Psychological Gesture includes as a necessary activity that the actor's body is subject to reversibility and perceptual *chiasm*. Reversibility enables the actor to encounter otherness, to recognize how the actor's body is tuned in or "listen" to what is experiencing internally at that moment. In the following extract the actor implies that reversibility produces two perspectives, the one in which is penetrating and is killing an unknown other who is following him and the one in which has been penetrated without the actor losing conscious awareness of what is going on in his body (actor's self) and in the character's body (other's self) at the same time. The actor describes that,

Through PG my body reverberates the vibrations and the energies of another person. It feels that my body conveys the emotions the feelings and the mind of this other person without me losing contact with my

²⁸⁴ S. Gallagher and A. N. Meltzoff, 'The Earliest Sense of Self and Others: Merleau-Ponty and Recent Developmental Studies,' *Philosophical Psychology*, 9.2 (1996), p. 227; p. 229.

‘everyday self’. I feel both myself and this other self in a way together and separate; while I am penetrating and I ‘thrust the bayonet’ the very same gesture reverberates in me with feelings of anger, tension, lack of regret and the image of glistening blood. My body feels the effect of two different qualities my everyday self and the other; because of the PG I inhabit both. [Extract from actor’s journal ‘Obituary’ 15/4/2012]

As in the previous practical example, in this extract the actor is also able to realize the differentiation between ‘I am penetrating’ and ‘I am being penetrated’ or ‘I am perceiving’ and ‘I am being perceived’. Reversibility is happening here via the actor’s kinaesthetic embodied perceptual experience. Decentred from ego-self position via reversibility the actor can ‘actively listen’ to his body, perceive another self and learn what the world is like from a position that is not one’s own. In practice the actor while is doing the Psychological Gesture reverses position and perspectives and is able to move backwards and forwards at the same time. This relation that emerges from the actor’s Psychological Gesture and moving body and the one who begins to watch it points to the phenomenological phenomenon that one perspective merges into each other in a *chiasmic* relational structure.

In the last two practical examples from the actors’ journal we can see that through Psychological Gesture the actors realize that are caught up in Merleau-Ponty’s ‘ambiguity’ of corporeality: that is the perceived, observed perspective and the perceiving, observing perspective which overlap. Progressively the actors appear to integrate not only the imagined other, but the bodily felt other into their own intercorporeally constituted self. The actors’ bodies seem to be constituted as a double structure where both the actors’ internal states and the external actions are at the same time together. They are “co-present”. This is a phenomenological phenomenon which emphasizes the *chiasmic* junction the actor experiences between ones’ body as an observed material entity and at the same time as an expressive entity that takes on the expressivity of another self (character). Through this *chiasmic* connection the actor’s body is at once grounded in space and of the world and is also able to fold back on itself and reflect on that very condition.

The figure of the *chiasma* in the actor's experience reflects that Psychological Gesture ontologically is designed to 'encourage' or give support to the actor's body to occupy the position of perceiving object and subject of perception at the same time and to allow for what Merleau-Ponty describes 'double sensation'. The fact that the actor comes to a point to experience oneself as reversibility *chiasmic* relation, as *flesh*, that is as listening and being listened, moving and being moved, perceiving and being perceived bodies, indicates that the actor comes to comprehend oneself as bodies under observation.

3.2.7 Psychological Gesture: Passivity and Activity Functioning

When experiencing Psychological Gesture observation includes the self that is looked at is grasped by a more primitive somatic sensation (what Merleau-Ponty calls the 'brute world' or the 'wild Being') which remains hidden at the base of a passivity-activity sensory model of perception that guides the movement-gesture of the actor's body through space. It is possible to say that in Michael Chekhov's practice reversibility between the actor's body and the environment the space (other-character) might be seen as an amplification of Merleau-Ponty's 'brute world' 'wild Being' or *flesh*.

The last two practical examples from the actors' journal (pp.63, 65) exemplify the idea that conscious awareness or the felt distinction between the actors' self and the other (character), between body and space, is closely related to a dynamic relationship of opposite positions and perspectives. The actor's body is operating and behaving in opposite terms or poles: the actor's self the subjective pole and the other's (character) the objective pole. These two poles are functioning as active and passive. They are contradictory and complementary.

In the following extract the actor portrays the same inseparable relation between passivity and activity; passivity appears to be a deep immersion and attention of the actor who is focused on experiencing the Psychological Gesture that is on something other than one's body, and activity appears as awareness

of what the actor's body is doing. One of my actors writes that the moment he is either pushing or smashing (PG's), which is the moment the character in 'Obituary' is killing the 'Chickenface' the figure who follows him, he can equally experience the pushing or smashing back i.e., of being pushed or being smashed. As the actor explains,

I am at one time working with a pushing gesture and at another, that of smashing. I experience an active sense of touching in the sense that one in effect 'touches' the space through the PG. The active experience in this section for example, is that of pushing and expansion within the space, this gesture brings up feelings of anger or even disgust, these are actively felt. The passive lives again through my body but the focus is through the image of 'Chickenface' brought about by this PG. It is here that a passive sense of touching is often experienced – the projected self, within this image, the feeling of contact and pushing of another human being or a presence which has been haunting me and pushes me back. I am pushing while the other is pushing back I feel I am being pushed. This passive touching or experience can then often invoke memory and associations. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 12/3/2012]

The actor's description that "I am pushing while the other is pushing back and I feel I am being pushed" indicates that there is a creative tension that comes from two opposite psychophysical energies: passivity and activity. According to Evan Thompson's account of these two terms, 'passivity is a state of being involuntarily influenced and affected (here by Psychological Gesture) and activity is the (actor's) state of taking a cognitive position in acts of attending, judging, valuing one's own experience²⁸⁵. The creative tension that comes through Psychological Gesture and is the result of two opposite forces energies or qualities can be defined as the actor's active response and passive response

²⁸⁵ 'Activity means taking a cognitive position in acts of attending, judging, valuing, wishing and so forth. Passivity means being involuntarily influenced and affected by something' in Thompson Evan 'Sensorimotor Subjectivity and the Enactive Approach to Experience,' *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 4.4 (2005), p. 15.

which conditions the actors' consciousness of the body in the terms of inside and outside, of an 'inward and outward space'²⁸⁶.

What is also brought about in this process of passivity and activity functioning is a 'distance' and 'proximity' relationship that is linked to the principle of polarities. In the following extract, proximity and distance or the nearness and the far off in the actor's experience of the Psychological Gesture are related to the sense of how the actor is perceiving distance between oneself and the other (character) in space. Distance and proximity here is related to the oppositional dynamics principle that is inherent in the perceptual structure of the Psychological Gesture which keeps the actor connected to the actor's everyday self and to his sense of control of the experience. The actor writes that,

Through PG proximity and distance come into play in many forms. One of them is finding the right proximity to your everyday self. As this I feel, is intrinsically linked to control within the gesture. Also applicable to the polarity of the gesture, starting from an opposing point to its finish – helps to build the sense of expansion into the space and increases back awareness. Furthermore, Gives strength to the gesture and works more effectively with the breath. [Extract from actor's journal 'Manhattan Medea' 10/5/2013]

Distance and proximity indicates the relation between the actor's 'ego-self and one's body, between what constitutes and what is constituted'²⁸⁷. What Merleau-Ponty claims with the terms 'distance' and 'proximity' and helps us to understand in Michael Chekhov's practice is that there is not such a pervasive division between perceiver and perceived, knower and the thing known, between the actor's self and character, the other.

²⁸⁶ C. Petitmengin et al., 'Listening from Within,' *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 16.10-12 (2009), p. 263.

²⁸⁷ De Preester, 'Epistemological Questions', p. 223.

3.2.8 Psychological Gesture: Foreground and Background Modes of Awareness (Gestalt Structure)

Through Psychological Gesture the actor's body appears to be polarized by its tasks. The actor's body and the space the world form a practical system that structures the actor's perception into a foreground and background consciousness. One of the student-actors as Medea (the character) explains that while she is penetrating in a molding legato way (PG) in the foreground and is moving towards where the children sleep in order to murder them she can also sense and perceive the effect the feelings this gesture or movement have on her body in the background. She writes,

The experience is that my body is listening while my body is listened to what is happening in the front space where the children are. How the movement of my body of the PG affects how I feel inside and how this affects how I perceive and understand the space outside. The sense I have of myself is not just limited to what I am sensing but also my reaction to what I sense. [Extract from actor's journal 'Medea Material' 16/5/2013]

The actor's perception here does not come simply from the actor's perceiving, sensing, feeling body that is from the foreground. The experience also involves a reorganization of the actor's perceptual field whereas self-extendedness through Psychological Gesture affects the actor's body and brings spatial and temporal changes; there is a development through the actor's sense of the background and sense of being perceived. In experiencing self-extendedness (or expansion of bodily self-awareness) the body of the actor is not a marginal experience. One's bodily feelings do not disappear in the background but provide instead information that feeds and shapes the actor's perceptual experience. As the same actor notes,

The body provides a kind of centre in the space and so in experiencing the PG the 'inner self' one constantly refers back to this and this in turn

feeds the 'outer self'. [Extract from actor's journal 'Medea Material'16/5/2013]

In the following practical example another actor explains that through Psychological Gesture he experiences two consciousness of the body a front space and a back space. Two different poles where (depending on the PG) there is a sense of gap between them, but through breath and the movement, the Psychological Gesture, the actor can be connected to both bodily spaces simultaneously. He describes,

In my experience of PG I am conscious of two selves or of two different spaces of my body; one exists where my body is standing and the other is in front of me in the space. I experience them together but there is also a sense of gap between them but through breath and PG I am connected to both. The experience of this 'gap' often differs depending on the gesture. For example, with throwing or with opening gesture, the new 'projected self' feels more distant from the actor and the image is felt to be less close to the body; with embracing this feels more intimate and close the embracing PG somehow develops a closer relationship to the projected image. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 13/4/2016]

In experiencing Psychological Gesture the actor's body constantly is moving away from and towards itself at the same time and organizes itself through breath and gesture as a *Gestalt* structure that frames two mutually interdependent poles. Two different references or realities of the actor's body that is the foreground and background of the actor's experience which, according to the actor, are felt differently depending on the gesture.

Through gesturing when the actor *stands out* from the field of awareness and engrosses the imagination the actor is perceiving, sensing, feeling how the body is lived in the background. How each gesture has affected the body as it responds by making the required alterations or adjustments in relation to the action of the chosen Psychological Gesture (the objective). This is felt and grasped by the actor as observer and comes to the foreground of one's

awareness. This does not imply that the actor is reflectively aware of one's body, that reflects upon the self and objectifies oneself. Instead, the actor as the subject-self is looking at the body (object-self) and is sensing, feeling, perceiving oneself from the perspective of the other (the character). The actor's perception of the body is felt, touched, sensed *at the back as well as the front* is thematically experienced by the actor as a reflected phenomenon. As an actor notes,

There is the outward action, the stage direction, or whatever literal movement the actor is performing on stage. Alongside this, is the action of the PG. For example, in the opening section of *Obituary*, I, as in my actor self, am sat on a chair. Though my PG is an embrace, and the projected image is that of a man holding a dead body whilst kneeled on the floor. Though, perhaps surprisingly, it is the second, PG or not externally visible gesture, which is experienced as foreground action and that literal movement, experienced by the 'I' self, is lived as a background action to this. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 28/4/2012]

The actor here explains that when immersed into the activity of gesturing, into the body of the other (character) his background body is constantly connected to the foreground; i.e., to what engrosses the actor's mind or imagination or to what the other (character) is doing. This seems that can be brought to the actor's attention any time. The actor's foreground and background body and the actor's field of action are guided by touch and kinesthetic/proprioceptive sensations. Foreground and background appear to affect and shape each other all the time. From Merleau-Ponty, we can see that the actor's foreground and background sense of the body are in a dialectical relationship that is structurally established here by means of the Psychological Gesture as a *Gestalt*.

In this process, the actor can become aware of the sensations which make up the foreground and the body's overall experience creates the background or the actor's perceptual field. Each time the experience of the sensations in the foreground against its background creates what Michael Chekhov defines an

entirely new *whole*, we, after exploring Merleau-Ponty's work can call the *Gestalt*. This denotes that Psychological Gesture is not experienced as an a-historical phenomenon, but is an ongoing complex composed of the actor's perceptions of the foreground and background body that continually grows in 'the here and the now' by taking in new information that builds upon the existing *gestalts*. In this way the actor's experience of the Psychological Gesture deepens and expands and the other (the character) is experienced as sensing *flesh*.

Foreground and background modes of awareness shape the actor's perceptual experience of the temporal and spatial distance between the reflecting self (the subject-body) and the reflected other the character (the object-body). One experiences Psychological Gesture as a foreground and background bodily flow that is simultaneously involved and self-reflexive within the presently changing moment. Giovanna Colombetti explains that,

[O]ne does not forget one's body but rather one lives it through, pre-reflectively, as actively immersed in a demanding but not overpowering pursuit; This condition involves a dynamical interplay of foreground and background bodily feelings namely different degrees of self-representation of the body [...] In sum, the notions of foreground and background bodily feelings can be used to characterize the experience of being absorbed in an activity not merely as a case of bodily forgetfulness and inconspicuousness, but as a richer or better thicker experience in which one's body can be felt "at the back" as well as "the front" of awareness, without thereby losing its character of subjectively lived body.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁸ G. Colombetti, 'Varieties of Pre-Reflective Self-Awareness: Foreground and Background and Bodily Feelings in Emotion Experience,' *Inquiry*, 54.3 (2011), p. 309. Colombetti argues that 'both foreground and background bodily feelings can be understood as pre-reflective modes of bodily self awareness that nevertheless differ in degree of self-representation or self-information.' [p. 294]; In other words, both foreground and background bodily feelings can be seen as different forms of pre-reflective bodily self awareness since neither of the two objectify the body.

The *extended* body of the actor while maintaining engagement to the background (the actor's physical visible body) is brought to the foreground and the invisible movement-gesture draws the actor out of oneself into *places* situated in the far. As a result a *horizontal arc* is created by means of the Psychological Gesture. *Within this arc is contained* the actor's visible body the subject self here, in *the near*, and the actor's invisible body (the object self or the other-character) there in *the far*²⁸⁹.

By means of the *arc*²⁹⁰ that is created through the *self-extendedness* or transcendence the actor's lived and moving-gesturing body generates polarities between the here and there, the near and far, the front and back, the in and out. These polarities are embraced by the actor's physical, visible and invisible bodies as a horizontal structure. This activity, which is shaped by the extent and scope of the chosen Psychological Gesture and the given circumstances provided by the source text, induces another level of spatial awareness that is connected to the actor's body as an upright position as a vertical being.

We can see that the interrelationship between the actor's visible body and invisible body is experienced by the actor as a passive and active sense of perceiving and being perceived. This is the result of an 'alteration of the balance between focal and peripheral awareness'²⁹¹; a complex mode of attention that requires skillful technical abilities and can be described as voluntary and non-voluntary or as "panoramic," "lateral," "floating," "holistic"²⁹² engagement.

Passivity and activity functioning engages the actor's sensation of the interior space and the exterior-expanding space under the principle of 'adopting a specific attention position'²⁹³. The actor's body adjusts to specific spinal

²⁸⁹ E. Casey, *Getting Back into Place: Toward Renewed Understanding of the Place World*, (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993), p. 62.

²⁹⁰ Arc in the sense of a curve forming part of the circumference of a circle.

²⁹¹ S.Gallagher, Bodily Self-Awareness and Object Perception, *Theoria and Historia Scientiarum: International Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*, 7.1 (2003) <consc.net/mindpapers/5.1c.1> [Accessed 8 May 2009]

²⁹² C.Petitmengin, 'Towards the Source of Thoughts The Gestural and Transmodal Dimension of Lived Experience', *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 14.3 (2007), p. 61.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

alignment in relation to a chosen action that involves the actor's whole body and the movement of breath. Concentration and attention is drawn to the spatial characteristics of the Psychological Gesture which displaces preconceived content and egocentric perspective. Inherent in the archetypal structure of the Psychological Gesture are unusual and non everyday attention positions which direct and re-direct the actor's focus and attention towards the *how* and not the *what* or the *why* of the actor's action and gesture.

By adopting a specific attention position, the actor experiences an awareness of the body that seems to be sustained by reflective (conscious) and pre-reflective (not unconscious but only not yet conscious)²⁹⁴ attentive engagement. The actor can switch from one mode of consciousness to the other any time and be influenced by both at the same time. The dynamic interplay which is established between reflective and pre-reflective bodily awareness, conscious and unconscious consciousness promotes an *in-between* space of "attentive listening" to interior sensations, internal images, and kinaesthetic sensations that involve all the senses and breath. The actor plunges deep within into the body. By 'going down inside the body [the actor] shifts the interior gravity center from the head to the body'²⁹⁵ and immerses into oneself, makes contact with the pre-reflective part²⁹⁶ or unconscious levels of one's consciousness. The process can be characterized as a profound moment in the actor's work²⁹⁷. It can offer possibilities of a deep insight and understanding of the experience, the actor can access intimate but otherwise unknown and inaccessible parts of oneself. The importance and value of this in the acting processes lies in the fact that the actor becomes consciously aware of the ego-self and non-ego other

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 55; 'This part of knowledge which is not conscious is not explainable as an unconscious repression in the Freudian sense' in C. Petimengin, 'The Intuitive Experience: A First-Person Empirical Investigation', *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 6. 2-3 (1999), p.45.

²⁹⁵ Petimengin, 'The Intuitive Experience', p. 61.

²⁹⁶ Petimengin explains that: 'The pre-reflective part of experience is that which is usually hidden by the absorption of attention in the object or content of the experience, and as a result is not spontaneously described by the subject.'; in Petimengin et al., 'Listening from Within,' p. 256.

²⁹⁷ Giovanna Colombetti makes the following distinction in relation to reflective and pre-reflective: 'The distinction between the body as an intentional object of awareness and the body as the medium through which something else is experienced partly overlaps with the one between *reflective* and *pre-reflective* (sometimes also called "tacit") self-awareness, and specifically between *reflective* and *pre-reflective* bodily self-awareness.' In G. Colombetti, *The Feeling Body: Affective Science Meets the Enactive Mind* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: the MIT Press, 2014), p. 116.

(character) that is of the sameness and difference²⁹⁸ within one's own body. Eventually the actor can describe with detailed precision and clarity the explicit as well as the implicit part of one's experience.

3.2.9 Psychological Gesture: Horizontal – Vertical Awareness

The Psychological Gesture structures the actor's body and mind not only through the interaction between the near/here and the far/there, the front and the back, the in and the out, the right and the left, but also between the up and down. Edward Casey clarifies that 'horizon organizes right and left, front and back, and at the same time serves primarily to separate the "above" from "below"'²⁹⁹. The Psychological Gesture simultaneously engages the spatiality of the actor's body as Casey describes as an upright/vertical being. This spatial level of vertical awareness is a formula of being that presupposes the same *setting face to face*³⁰⁰ of the actor's physical, visible body (the subject-self) and the invisible body of the character (the object-other) that designates the thematization of the actor's body as horizontal and vertical structure.

The structure of the Psychological Gesture consists of intersecting horizontal and vertical energetic informational fields of action that simultaneously involve different directions, dimensions and orientations of the actor's spatial awareness that are related to the engagement of different bodies or different parts of the actor's body at different levels of intensity.

Through Psychological Gesture the actor's body assumes a vertical synergy, a 'chiasm of conscious and unconscious levels, a viscera-aesthesiological being'³⁰¹, between horizontal and vertical structure that postulates an unusual or extra-ordinary kinaesthetic and tactile awareness. This synergy maps how 'space has been split up into places'³⁰² or how Psychological Gesture

²⁹⁸ 'Alterity as inseparable from the sphere of an ego-self.' F. J. Varela, 'Present Time Consciousness', in F. J. Varela and J. Shear (eds), *The View From Within: First Person Approaches to the Study of Consciousness* (UK, Imprint Academic, 2000), p. 132.

²⁹⁹ E. Casey, *Getting Back into Place: Toward Renewed Understanding of the Place World*, (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993), pp. 79-80.

³⁰⁰ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, edited and translated by Colin Smith (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962/2002), p. 267.

³⁰¹ D. Leder 'Flesh and Blood A Proposed Supplement to Merleau-Ponty', *Human Studies*, 13 (1990), p. 213.

³⁰² E. Casey, *Getting Back into Place*, p. 80.

structures the actor's body and mind when doing the gesture. This split is related to and reflects the simultaneous engagement and separation of the actor's three different bodily selves: a) the physical visible body, b) the extended or transcendent body (the virtual body³⁰³) and c) the *visceral* or *in-depth* body; (according to Drew Leder, 'beneath the surface body, perceiving and perceived, acting and acted upon, lies an anonymous visceral dimension'³⁰⁴). Differently said by Helen de Preester 'underneath these bodily dimensions of body image and body schema another in-depth bodily layer can be traced - a bodily dimension often neglected or forgotten'³⁰⁵, particularly in acting practice.

It is possible to say, then, that Psychological Gesture has the ability to bring back primitive and encompassing *spatial levels* that are designed to restore archetypal structures of the actor's body in one's living perception. The actor's 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' body is being *situated*, embodied and placed 'at play'³⁰⁶. Given the archetypal properties of the sense of spatial levels which appear to be inherent in the structure of Psychological Gesture, the actor's body maintains the vital activity of establishing and re-establishing a continuous development at work in relation to emerging sensorimotor patterns of perception and action. The actor's orientation in the space-world and in relation to the *deflected vertical* image of the other (character) in the mirror is the actor's body as a thing in objective space. In that sense it could be argued that Psychological Gesture assumes the actor's body as an active agent which can be seen³⁰⁷.

The idea that the Psychological Gesture disrupts the actor's habitual sense of spatial level awareness and restores in the actor's body the interplay between

³⁰³ Virtuality is the remapping and extension of the actor's gesture into a new non-physically existing space which recasts and rearranges the actor's body schema so that it alternates between the body as a feeling affecting body and as a felt affected body.

³⁰⁴ D. Leder, 'Flesh and Blood', p. 209.

³⁰⁵ H. De Preester, 'To Perform the Layered Body-A Short Exploration of the Body in Performance,' *Janus Head*, 9.2 (2007), p. 373.

³⁰⁶ E. Casey, *Getting Back into Place*, p. 79.

³⁰⁷ Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, 'A mass of tactile, labyrinthine and kinesthetic data, the body has no more definite orientation than the other contents of experience, and it too receives this orientation from the general level of experience. Wertheimer's observation serves to show how the visual field can impose an orientation which is not that of the body. But although the body as mosaic of given sensations, has no specific direction, nevertheless, as an agent, it plays an essential part in the establishment of a level. Variations in muscular tonicity ... so modify the apparent vertical that the subject leans his head on one side in order to place it parallel to this deflected vertical', p. 249.

up and down or above and below, in and out, front and back, etc, is based on the philosophical perspective of mutual dependence of opposites. This principle reflects the dialectic between two opposing energies which are internally related. The actor experiences this dialectic by standing *in between* the two.

The principle of mutual dependence of oppositional dynamics appears to be of particular symbolic importance in Michael Chekhov's theory and practice. The equilibrium for establishing a level relation between opposing forces, such as between the upright position of the actor's body (the above) and its gravitation (the below) appears to demonstrate the co-existence of moral and metaphysical concerns and principles that, according to Erwin Strauss, 'inscribe into space world-regions to which we attach values'³⁰⁸.

The metaphysical character of the actor's dialectical experience between polarities is an inherent structural attribute of the Psychological Gesture. In the following description of the character of the Psychological Gesture (Drawing 2) in *On the Technique of Acting* Michael Chekhov states,

The character is completely opened to influences from "above," and is obsessed by the desire to receive and even to force "inspirations" from these influences. It is filled with mystical qualities but at the same time stands firmly on the ground and receives equally strong influences from the earthly world. Consequently, it is a character which is able to reconcile within itself influences both from above and below.³⁰⁹

What my reading of Merleau-Ponty's work allows us to understand is that through Psychological Gesture the actor as if standing *in between* two poles is being equally affected by two opposites places, "the above" and the "below", which are inter-related. The actor seems to be able to sense in the body inspirations that are coming from the body's upright position, from *above*, as well as influences that are emanating from what is coming from the pelvis and

³⁰⁸ E. Strauss, "The Upright Posture," *Phenomenological Psychology*, in Casey, *Getting Back into Place*, p. 78.

³⁰⁹ M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, p. 64; *To the Actor*, p. 68.

the soles of the feet, from *below*, thereby connecting the actor's moving body to gravitation and earth.

In this way Psychological Gesture advances a liminal state of corporeal existence in which the bipolarity of the actor's upper part of the body (the head) is expanding upward toward the sky, and the lower part of the body is dependent on the position of the pelvis, the actor's source of energy for movement and gesture. It might be argued that Psychological Gesture exposes and engages the actor's body in experiencing the dynamic tension between these two opposing energetic worlds (fields of action) that is manifested in the bipolarity of the actor's upright position: of the upper and lower body which can be described in terms of the dimensionality of pairs above-below, upwards-downwards.

In other words, through Merleau-Ponty we have learned that Psychological Gesture exemplifies the merging of the "inspirations" of the actor's invisible body (the mind, the mythic, the imaginary) and the influences of the actor's visible body (the physical material world) by balancing the grounding of two fundamental and archetypal elements in the actor's bodily experience: gravitation (earth) and upright or vertical posture (sky/sun/light/fire). It appears that in the Psychological Gesture the actor's body by being grounded *in between* these two archetypal elements can inconceivably extend in space and time. This seems to alter the actor's state of consciousness and perception through, what Michael Chekhov names, the 'practical tangibles with the artistic intangibles'³¹⁰.

3.3 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter I have argued that Merleau-Ponty's theory of the body that is fundamentally based upon the notion of *chiasm* of the visible and the invisible and the notion of *flesh* allows us to deepen our understanding of Michael

³¹⁰ M, Chekhov, *To the Actor*, p. 176.

Chekhov's theory and practice of the Psychological Gesture. In Michael Chekhov's acting processes there is emphasis on the dual nature of the actor's body as a two fold act in opposition, a crisscrossing of the flesh of the actor's body and the flesh of the world (other-character). In experiencing Psychological Gesture this pattern of intersecting oppositions of the visible and the invisible, the inner and the outer, self and other (character) establishes the actor's body as *chiasm* or what I define *chiasmic* body. Both in Merleau-Ponty's theory of the body and in Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture there is a dialectical relationship between the actor's body and the world-space (other-character) which manifests a circular interplay between oppositions. What binds and structures all oppositions is a circular reversibility structure that is felt from within and without. Through Psychological Gesture the phenomenon of reversibility in the actor's body and in the world/other (character) denotes that mutually reflect each other. The actor's body is given as interiority and exteriority, as passivity and activity, and is able to perceive and be perceived, to feel and be felt, to affect and being affected.

Closely related in structure to Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological analysis, Psychological Gesture is a reversibility *chiasmic* relational structure that establishes and maintains a unitary field of energy between the actor and the other (character). This structure involves that Psychological Gesture creates an "*in-between*" space which reveals the actor's body as a primordial being, as sentient-sensible body.

In Psychological Gesture the "*in-between*" space, the middle point, or "third term" "third element", is the invisible energy that comes out of the *chiasmic* encounter between the actor's body and the world the other (character) which face each other in their upright positions as 'vertical Being'. Through Psychological Gesture the actor's body demonstrates the operations of what Merleau-Ponty calls a "wild being" and as *flesh* can project itself to the space-world and can share and exchange feelings, moods and thoughts with the world the other (character). This phenomenon is performative. It denotes the

condition of a psychophysical dialogue between 'projection'³¹¹ of the actor's body to the world the other (character) and the world's or the other's (character) 'introjection'³¹² to the actor's body. In other words, as transcendence according to Merleau-Ponty, as self-extendedness or expansion according to Michael Chekhov.

³¹¹ Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 263.

³¹² Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, p. 263.

Chapter 4: Nietzsche's 'Ecstatic' Body and Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture

Introduction

The chapter examines German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy of perception in terms of the Apollonian consciousness of the body, the sphere of individuation, restraint, form, beauty, dream, illusion and imagination, and in terms of the Dionysian consciousness of the body, a state of *ecstasy* and excess and the collapse of individuation and ego-self perspective. Nietzsche considers that the transformation of the body is the performative creative act of overcoming the everyday ego-self in experiencing the relational opposition between the Apollonian bodily consciousness and the Dionysian bodily consciousness. For Nietzsche to be able to experience this relational opposition is the path toward *becoming*, creativity and insight. The chapter analyzes Nietzsche's notion of self-transformation as the art of *becoming* through which Nietzsche challenges the dualisms between being and becoming, between appearance and reality, between body and mind, between body and world.

The chapter shows that Nietzsche's Apollonian and Dionysian consciousness can offer a phenomenological methodological frame to find new ways of thinking about and describing the nature of the actor's consciousness that is involved in practicing Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture. Through Nietzsche's sense of transcendentalism, his Apollonian and Dionysian energies or drives, and through Yuasa's analysis of Nishida's *bashos* as "bright" and "dark" consciousness, which according to my reading they are related, the complex nature of the actor's multiple modes of consciousness when experiencing the Psychological Gesture are examined in this chapter. (See Appendix 5 for Nietzsche's biography)

4.1 Nietzsche's philosophy of the body

The idea that the body is the "great reason" and the intellect or spirit is the "small reason" permeates Nietzsche's philosophy and thinking; (similarly

Michael Chekhov emphasized the notions of the “higher self” and the “small self” respectively). Nietzsche assigns priority to the body over reason and suggests that reason and intellect is a tool to the service of the body. Nietzsche’s philosophy does not support any form of dualism, but instead a somatic practice over a higher developed intellect in order to give the proper attention to the role of the senses, perception and the body in human experience. The primacy of the body is central in Nietzsche as well as in Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Michael Chekhov. It is related to the critique of the idea that the activities of the ego-*I* self is petrified and corrupted in the metaphysical language of the values of the Western European civilization.

Nietzsche claimed that Europe was standing at a turning point, that the advance of scientific enlightenment, Darwin in particular, had destroyed the old religious ideas. Nietzsche declared that God is dead and unless a new grounding for values is provided human existence will be meaningless and destructive. The purpose of his philosophy of the body is an attempt to provide new forms or meanings in a meaningless world. In his philosophy self-mastery, self-assertion and self-overcoming are cultivated qualities that appear to give a unique quality in human existence. In Nietzsche, ‘self-overcoming’, “Overhuman” (“superman”) or Zarathustra is a manner or style of being. A power over body and self that seems to be a flood of creative energy capable of creating new forms of reality that can break from the forms of the past.

Nietzsche’s theory of the body reflects the idea that there is not a thinking “I”, an ego-self or being behind the activities of the body. The “doer” is merely a fiction and the deed is everything¹. Nietzsche’s philosophy maintains that all entities and activities are an ephemeral state. One phenomenon among many in a state of ‘becoming’ where the central principle is the ego-less thinking body, the non-I-self. Nietzsche’s notion of ‘becoming’ is a process of constant flux inextricably linked to the idea that everything depends on and is related to something else. In other words, Nietzsche’s theory of the body is a theory of

¹ Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1, 13)

relativity and co-dependency of all opposites that move away from the idea of “absolute truth” (God) and away from Plato’s philosophy and Christianity which despised the body and the senses. Nietzsche claims that all activities of the thinking self return and become a body, an “overhuman” self that develops a “higher body”. The concept of the “higher body” that ultimately returns to the body’s relation to great nature or cosmos, -- to what Merleau-Ponty terms “brute world”/“wild being”, Nishida “acting intuition” (“*basho* of absolute nothingness”), and Michael Chekhov “objectivity or “Higher Self”, --permeates the work of all. The “higher body” denotes an ‘optimal’ primordial condition that Nietzsche termed Dionysian bodily consciousness.

Nietzsche’s interest in somatic practice seems to have started when he used to make lengthy hikes at the vicinity of Leibnitz. In other words, the relation of Nietzsche’s philosophy of the body to somatic practice started with walking (in fact Nietzsche was an enthusiastic walker). To Nietzsche, self-creation seemed to be related to walking. It appears that for Nietzsche, to walk was to pull oneself back into nature; a means to overcome the dominance of relying on fixed concepts and identity. In the early 1880’s, Nietzsche lived for a while in Eze Bord de Mer, east along the coast from Nice, and every day he would walk up the steep mountain path. Nietzsche used to climb to the summit of the mountain every day for hours. This walking was an undertaking that involved a great deal of effort and difficulty. It was during these rigorous climbing-walking Zarathustra’s third part was composed. Nietzsche found inspiration in walking and he wandered the mountainside to write. He himself describes in *Ecce Homo* how walking inspired his writing,

On the ‘most onerous ascent from the [Nice] station to the marvelous Moorish eyrie, Eze, the suppleness of my muscles has always been greatest when my creative energies were flowing most abundantly. The *body* is inspired; let us keep the ‘soul’ out of it. –Often one could have seen me dance; in those days I could walk in the mountains for seven

eight or hours without a trace of weariness. I slept well, laughed much – my vigor and patience were perfect².

In *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, A Book for All and None (1) Nietzsche writes,

Morning I would walk in southerly direction on the splendid road to Zoagli, going up past pines with a magnificent view of the sea; in the afternoon, whenever my health permitted it, I walked around the whole bay from Santa Margherita all the way to Portofino.

Walking or the “judgment of the muscles”³ emphasized for Nietzsche the sensory and physiological aspects of inspiration and writing. Thought through walking, through movement, seemed to be a way to free Nietzsche’s mind, to feel and observe differently. In *Ecce Homo* ‘Why I am so Clever’ Nietzsche suggests:

Sit as little as possible, give credence to no thought that is not born in the open air and accompanied by free movement – in which the muscles do not also celebrate a feast. All prejudices come from the intestines – Sitting still - I have said it once already - the real *sin* against the holy spirit.

Walking was central to Nietzsche’s work. Walking appears to be intimately related to his idea of ‘becoming’ in the sense of transformation and escape from the confines of identity and the everyday ego-self. As he explains ‘all prejudices come from intestines’ suggesting that the transformative properties of walking seemed to be a somatic practice that induced a meditative state that subverted reason and logic and emancipated the body from space and time.

² Nietzsche, “Why I Write Such Good Books: Thus Spoke Zarathustra” (& 4) in *Ecce Homo*.

³ Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, 314.

For Nietzsche, ideas were not only stimulated by books. Walking was a way to organize his ideas, since for him thought and movement were absolutely interrelated. The habit to think, according to Nietzsche, indicated rhythmic movement. He writes:

[T]o think outdoors, walking, jumping, climbing, dancing, preferably on lonely mountains or right by the sea where even the paths become thoughtful. Our first question about the value of a book, a person or a piece of music is: “Can they walk?” “Can they dance?”⁴

Nietzsche was concerned to abolish dualities and to affirm ‘the nonduality of all contraries’⁵. For Nietzsche things are not independent or self-sufficient. Everything seems to be dependent on something else that leads to an absolute relativity of everything that happens. Nietzsche’s fundamental contention is that all opposing forces, remain at all times, at an incommensurable distance from one another in a relationship defined by a contradiction. He claims there is no substance, no fixed unity without change and without diversity, but many souls or many selves. According to Nietzsche, all entities are ephemeral. All activities change, pass away and disappear in constant flux. This consists of his notion of *becoming*, as the only reality that places priority and importance on natural human capabilities, the body and the senses, that leads the self to lose its usual everyday sense of self and its ordinary thinking, in order for the self to undergo the transition to ‘self-overcoming’. Nietzsche’s philosophy of the body, is a critique of the notion of a personal ego-self, which is based in his idea that consciousness and identity belongs to the self’s ‘social or herd nature’⁶. The ego-I-self that hinders creativity is a cultural form Nietzsche calls the ‘lie of culture’⁷.

⁴ Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, paragraph 366.

⁵ A. Kogaku, ‘The Problem of the Body in Nietzsche and Dogen’, in G. Parkes (ed.), *Nietzsche and Asian Thought*, (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996) p. 217.

⁶ Nietzsche, *The Gay Science* [354].

⁷ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy* 8, p. 61.

According to Nietzsche, there is no one way of seeing things. The world cannot be taken for granted as definite or absolute 'true', but as different points of view, different interpretations and perspectives. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily propose that all appearances or understandings are equally valid. Nietzsche writes:

There are only facts" – I would say: No, facts is precisely what there is not, only interpretations. We cannot establish any fact "in-itself"... "Everything is subjective," you say; but even this is interpretation. The "subject" is not something given, it is something added and invented and projected behind what there is. – Finally, is it necessary to posit an interpreter behind the interpretation? Even this is an invention, hypothesis. Insofar, as the word "knowledge" has any meaning, the world is knowable; but it is *interpretable* otherwise, it has no meaning behind it, but countless meanings.⁸

Nietzsche's philosophy acknowledges the relativity of opposites. How things appear depends on one's point of view; one's place on the continuum that tends to be a "perspectivism" and a 'philosophy of flux'⁹. In Nietzsche, the Apollonian consciousness and the Dionysian consciousness of the body are two art impulses of nature, two opposites tendencies, energies or drives, which through their intertwining, constitute, what Nietzsche names, the 'creative' self¹⁰. When the Apollonian and the Dionysian operate together they promote a particular mode of consciousness involved in the world that seems to be a necessary condition for the body to be open and available to direct immediate experience and creativity. For Nietzsche, this can be the outcome of a performative act which can embrace both consciousnesses, the Apollonian and the Dionysian, in their mutual interdependence and can attain the 'optimal'

⁸ Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, W. Kaufmann (ed.), (New York: Random House, 1968) p. 481.

⁹ "Perspectivism" is Nietzsche's term in *The Will to Power*, p. 481; G. Parkes, 'The Wandering Dance: Chuang Tzu and Zarathustra', *Philosophy East and West*, 33.3 (1983), p. 239.

¹⁰ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, translated by W. Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Press) pp. 38, 33. In *The Birth of Tragedy* Nietzsche names creative self the lyricist.

mode of 'self-overcoming', the 'will to power', the source of self creativity and aesthetic insight that exceed the capacity for representation.

For Nietzsche, the body is realized as an effect of being immersed in two separate 'physiological phenomena'¹¹; two states known to the body through the two oppositional forces of nature. The first force is the Apollonian impulse stated as dreaming and the second force is the Dionysian impulse stated as *ecstasy*, a state of forgetting oneself or of being outside oneself. The Nietzschean notion of the body is modeled on the Apollonian dream image and on the Dionysian *ecstasy* or intoxication. The Apollonian loses the ego-self and emerges through a half conscious state as a dream image that affirms illusion as illusion¹². The Dionysian, through complete loss of the ego-self, emerges as other, as transgression and dispossession of the habitual 'I'. In this interplay, in which the Apollonian and the Dionysian bodies move beyond the everyday consciousness, the emphasis is on the productive encounter between the Apollonian and the Dionysian bodies, which is the encounter between presence and absence, the present self and the absent other.

The Apollonian dreaming body refers to an expressive of a dream reality or mere illusion. The Dionysian body refers to an intoxication of 'self-oblivion'¹³ and is expressive of an extreme intense and dark reality in the sense that it articulates an irrational and chaotic energy. Both bodies or energies are manifested as natural creative drives and 'states of nature'¹⁴ herself only secondarily; that is to say they can become expressed without the conscious mediation of the body. They are performative. They are acting only through the intervening but creative efforts of the artist's (actor's) body.

The fundamental structure of Nietzsche's philosophical question concerning the notion of artistic transformation, that subverts dualisms and the hypocrisy of

¹¹ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 33.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 45.

¹³ 'everything subjective vanishes into complete self-forgetfulness' *Ibid.*, p. 36; 'succumbed to the self-oblivion of the Dionysian state' *Ibid.*, p. 46.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

Western culture, is an experience based on the interplay of opposites that depends upon the possibilities created by the style of 'being contained and containing'¹⁵ in a manner modeled where the Apollonian drive meets the Dionysian drive and the self experiences *abyss*. One gazing into the *abyss* indicates one gazing into multiple layers of interpretation or into multiple consciousness. This active creative process is a highly complex interweaving of the Apollonian and Dionysian bodily consciousnesses where familiar principles, usual standards or behavior are displaced and new modes of values, new modes of perception and new modes of consciousness can be realized.

In this thesis, the Apollonian consciousness and the Dionysian consciousness are taken as two energies or impulses that are employed in the creative process of the Psychological Gesture, as expressive of the actor's everyday physical self and the character's self (the invisible other) respectively, while they are acting upon one another. In the creative process of the Psychological Gesture, while the actor is attending to a specific task/action or gesture, the Apollonian and the Dionysian manifest the relational and temporal encounter between bodies, the actor's (body-me) and the character's (body-not-me) in the acting process. This process necessarily involves affective consciousness, that is, affect happens against the actor's will.

In the next sections I examine the following issues:

- The Apollonian body: the analysis of the dream image reality, imagination and knowledge in the Apollonian mode of consciousness.
- The Dionysian body: the embodiment of the *ecstatic* Dionysian consciousness. The displacement of the ego-self in which the body forgets itself and actualizes a non-*I* state of consciousness as a purely body or self in *excess*.
- The intertwining of the Apollonian-Dionysian consciousness as a bodily structure that is based on the interplay and codependence of opposites. A tension that involves the use of imagination, perception and movement and

¹⁵ G. Parkes, 'The Wandering Dance', p. 238.

generates dynamic creativity. The focus is on how each is dependent on the other and on the dynamic synthesis of the two through the mediation of a symbolic/archetypal language. This idea can take forward our understanding of how the Psychological Gesture and Michael Chekhov's technique, as an example of archetypal psychic structures, can structure the actor's body and self as the invisible other, the character.

4.1.1 The Apollonian Consciousness of the Body

The Apollonian consciousness of the body is a dream state where one is deeply engaged in 'the beauty of the illusion of the unrestricted inner world of phantasy'¹⁶. At the same time, it is limited and restrained by a complete absorption. Inspired by Apollo, the "shining god"¹⁷, "the deity of light"¹⁸, it is a dream state which is in complete contrast to the world of the intelligible everyday reality. The Apollonian dreaming body, having lost contact with the waking reality and its 'ominous obtrusiveness'¹⁹, experiences a delight in images.

Apollo is 'the ruler of the world of phantasy'²⁰ which imposes limitation and exercises control over the excessive desires and needs of the body, according to Nietzsche. The effect of this consciousness is that the Apollonian body does not take the dream image as if it were actual reality. In the Apollonian dream image all the things and concerns of the everyday reality take a different significance and shape. Even the smallest mundane detail cannot be considered unimportant or unnecessary. Everything is serving a specific function, a practical purpose²¹. The dream image always appears as a perfect embodiment of an idea or concept that expresses a state of reality which provides a different perspective. Information or certain version(s) of 'truth', that cannot be available or have been understood in the context of everyday reality

¹⁶ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 35.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p.35

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 35.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*,p. 44.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 35.

²¹ 'All forms speak to us, there is nothing unimportant or superfluous.' *Ibid.*, p. 34.

and thus unknown and unexplored, can be available to the body through the dream images. Something previously hidden and invisible is directly revealed through the dream image and makes itself visible to one's body and becomes known to the self.

The Apollonian image is the outward appearance of something that 'is also mere appearance and another quite different reality lies beneath it'²². This reality is pure fiction. It is imagination. For Nietzsche, when the Apollonian body becomes aware of the illusion of the image and the image is understood as image or illusion, a process which describes a 'deep consciousness of nature'²³, only then the realization of the creative act happens since it casts and mirrors reflection back upon the body therefore transforming it. The imagination, which is the faculty that represents things, not as they are in themselves, seems to have the capacity to mold the body by feelings, emotions, moods and thoughts, unknown to the self, into an infinite variety of combinations and shapes that can open up deeper and broader perspectives.

In the Apollonian mode of consciousness, the body is actively engaged in a creative process of making and remaking itself. This is of a similar character to the fundamental principles of the natural dreaming process. In other words, it is as if the Apollonian mode of consciousness imitates the fluidity and relativity of the dreaming process. Everything seems to have significance always in relation to something else.

Nietzsche was concerned with the role of creative imagination in the body's constitution of itself and the world (the other). The fluidity and flexibility of a dream image to its changeable quality, permits a multiplicity of possible points of views, emphasizing that experience is always of a relative perspective and importance. The Apollonian consciousness, like a dream, is an illusion, is a deceptive appearance that makes available the form, the frame within which

²² Nietzsche claims that the dream reality is a mere appearance and the reality in which we live is also mere appearance. (Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 34).

²³ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 35.

undifferentiated impulses and drives are systematically organized into a whole (*Gestalt*). This is a perceptual structure that appears to permit the experience of the Dionysian consciousness to be realized²⁴.

4.1.2 The Dionysian Consciousness of the Body

According to Nietzsche, the Apollonian consciousness of the body, which is a restrained and suggestive perception in the illuminating and liberating power of a dream state of illusion, needs to be complemented by the *ecstatic* and poetic inspiration of 'the rapturous²⁵ and 'intoxicated'²⁶ vision of the Dionysian consciousness of the body. The Dionysian challenges and threatens the limits and the integrity of the Apollonian. The Apollonian gradually loses subjectivity and surrenders in a more intense and dark fusion with the other(s) and the natural world; (dark here is used in a sense of being inaccessible to the rules of logical understanding or explanations and is difficult to identify). The principle feature of the Apollonian perception of the body, as a drive to structure itself and the world into a coherent whole here, is lacking.

The Dionysian operates beneath the individual "I" ego-self (body-me). Its effect has the power to destroy, to 'nullify the principle of individuation'. The Dionysian can break down the barriers that separate the body of the artist from the world so that it is the collective "I" at the ground of all things that speaks through the artist's body²⁷.

The Dionysian consciousness has the power to blur the boundaries between the artist's (actor's) body and the world so they can become indistinct. The effect of this phenomenon is unitive. It forms a whole. The Dionysian can unite the body of the artist with the world (other), with the cosmos. Nietzsche claims that the Dionysian perception can establish the body as a collective *I*. The body

²⁴ L. Spinks, *Friedrich Nietzsche*, (London: Routledge, 2003) p. 21.

²⁵ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 45.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

²⁷ G. Parkes, *Composing the Soul: Reaches of Nietzsche's Psychology*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 276.

can grasp a collective / that is 'oneness of self with nature'²⁸. It is the highest form of perception or expression of nature that comes from the heart of the world²⁹. Nietzsche describes a fusion of the Dionysian body with the world-cosmos (nature) as the tendency of the artist's body to rupture, to break and disturb the harmony of the experience.

Nietzsche draws a phenomenological condition of the artist's body which does not come into being naturally as if inevitably³⁰. The Dionysian perception operates under the influence of the 'narcotic draught'³¹ of intoxication which has the ability for the body to forget the usual sense of itself completely. The body in a state of 'complete self-oblivion'³² that is produced by a poison or other toxic substance dissolves itself and can break its connection to the artist's individual personal "I" (body-me). It can surrender its individuality³³.

Nietzsche indicates artistry as intoxication, as a form of artistic creativity that is not a natural process and can cause one to lose control of one's individual physical and mental powers. It appears that for Nietzsche, intoxication is a skillful activity that springs from the greatest possible extreme and intensity. Intoxication is a feeling of abundance³⁴ and increased energy through which the body of the artist loses control of its usual faculties and reveals itself in 'excess'³⁵.

In Nietzsche's own words the Dionysian body is 'overfull'³⁶. The artist's body in excess denotes that it can be separated into its constituent parts into a body and non-body, into self and other. In a state of expansion, transcendence or sense of self-extendedness and enlarged self, the Dionysian body can forget

²⁸ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 43.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 36.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

³⁴ Nietzsche, *The Gay of Science* (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), p. 370.

³⁵ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 46.

³⁶ In this speech Zarathustra talks about the Overhuman: 'I love him whose soul is overfull, so that he forgets himself, and all things are in him: thus all things become his going under.' There is a correlation between Overhuman and Dionysus: each one's attributes can be assigned to the other'. Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* [1st Part, 4: 14, 'Zarathustra's Prologue']; Also in *The Gay Science*, p. 370.

itself. It can enter the consciousness of a non-*I*, non-self without the perceptions of the Apollonian consciousness. Subjectivity, personal and social experiences, and characteristics, under the uncontrollable paroxysms of intoxication are abandoned. They prove to be a “fiction”³⁷. In this psychophysical condition the Dionysian body is depersonalized. According to Nietzsche, it can live in the world of imagination and can constantly be surrounded by hosts of spirits’³⁸ and be haunted by otherness.

Nietzsche seems to suggest, that the Dionysian body is moved by a consciousness, which stands in direct contact with the natural world and has the ability to become a ‘purely somatic “subject”³⁹ moved by a consciousness of a wider context⁴⁰. Zarathustra’s Overhuman and the Dionysian *ecstatic* body is connected to earth. Both share with nature realities beyond the personal and the everyday and develop a “natural” body which Nietzsche calls the “higher body”⁴¹ (reminiscent of Michael Chekhov’s creative individuality of “Higher Self”). In other words, the Dionysian is the formation of a “natural” “higher body” which shows abilities and powers beyond the ordinary human body. The “higher body” is an “overhuman” body moved by higher states of consciousness. It is the realization of the sense of the earth, the nature that can reverse everyday awareness and understanding. Zarathustra says,

I love him who is overfull, so that he forgets himself, and all things are in him: thus all things become his going-under. I love him who is a free spirit and a free heart: then his head is simply the entrails of his heart, yet his heart drives him to his going-under.⁴²

Nietzsche through Zarathustra seems to talk about the creative process in the formation of the Dionysian (Overhuman) body that involves head, entrails, and

³⁷ *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 49.

³⁸ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, (8: 64). p. 64.

³⁹ Kogaku, ‘The Problem of the Body’, p. 217.

⁴⁰ ‘The equivalent of the greater self and the whole earth means that the self’s authentic activity takes place with awareness of the greater context.’ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

⁴¹ ‘May they become convalescents and overcomers and create for themselves a higher body.’ Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* [Zarathustra’s Prologue, First Part, 3: ‘On Believers in a World Behind’].

⁴² *Ibid.*, [Zarathustra’s Prologue, First Part, p. 4].

heart. In his notebooks Nietzsche writes that ‘the heart belongs to the entrails’⁴³ and that one must ‘learn to hear with the eyes’⁴⁴. Nietzsche discusses a non-dualistic ‘optimal’ mode of somatic consciousness that originates and is placed upon psycho-physiological movement awareness⁴⁵ that can enable one to alternate between ordinary and non-ordinary states of perception.

Nietzsche emphasizes the superiority of the Dionysian “higher body” with unconscious intentions suggesting an intuitive, visceral awareness that can grip and move the body of the artist from the lower abdomen. Nietzsche indicates a body/mind awareness that is urged by the guts (a ‘going over and a going under’⁴⁶ consciousness), it can take hold of and move the whole body ‘from the guts’ arousing ecstasy or ‘exaltation of all the symbolic faculties’⁴⁷, i.e. it can be expressed symbolically involving the use of archetypes. For Nietzsche, the Dionysian “higher body” is moving rhythmically and can perform or dance in a manner that goes beyond representation. He writes:

The entire symbolism of the body is called into play, not the mere symbolism of the lips, face, and speech but the whole pantomime of dancing, forcing every member into rhythmic movement. Then the other symbolic powers suddenly press forward, particularly those of music, in rhythmic, dynamics, and harmony. To grasp this collective release of all the symbolic powers, man must have already attained that height of self-abnegation which seeks to express itself symbolically through all these powers – and so the dithyrambic votary of Dionysus understood only by his peers.⁴⁸

⁴³ *Ibid.*, [Explanatory Notes, p. 290].

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, [Zarathustra’s Prologue, First Part, p. 5].

⁴⁵ Nietzsche writes that we tend to interpret all bodily feelings that we do not understand intellectually. We try to find reasons in persons and experiences in order to justify why one feels this way or that way. For example frequent rushes of blood to the brain accompanied by a choking sensation is interpreted as “anger.” Consequently we tend to associate certain physiological incidents with certain general feelings or even to arouse the corresponding feeling through closeness of association. In other words: a rush of blood to the head and a change in pulse and breathing might be interpreted as “anger” but is a physiological movement that arises in an unconscious physiological process and has nothing to do with conscious intention. [Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, p. 670].

⁴⁶ Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* [Zarathustra’s Prologue, First Part, p. 4].

⁴⁷ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 40.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 40-41 [The dithyramb was a wildly ecstatic choral hymn of ancient Greece especially dedicated to honor the god of Dionysus].

Here, Nietzsche describes the overwhelming power of the Dionysian self-abnegation that sets free symbolic archetypal psycho-physiological powers and enables the body of the artist to grasp the energy of a collective body. The denial of ego-self seems to be a form of consciousness of freedom, harmony and unity, between body and mind, body and world, body and nature or cosmos, self and other. Through rhythmic movement and sound, through the symbolic or archetypal powers of the Dionysian “higher” body, a unified flow of dynamics and harmony can produce the total liberation of the whole body (lips, face, limbs, etc). Nietzsche, in the above quotation, pictures the Dionysian “higher” body as the energy of a non-body that, when incorporated, can produce a new artistry of rhythm and movement and can create a new resourcefulness of body language⁴⁹.

Nietzsche discusses the capacities of the creative powers of the “higher body” throughout his work⁵⁰. Zarathustra suggests that the natural “higher body” is consciousness⁵¹ itself; that consciousness is the body itself which he identifies with the notion of *Self*. Nietzsche states:

Body am I through and through and nothing besides; and soul is merely a word for something about the body. The body is a great reason, a manifold with one sense, a war and a peace, a herd and a herdsman. A tool of your body is your small reason too, which you call “spirit,” a small tool and toy of your great reason. “I” you say, and are proud of this word. But the great thing – in which you do not want to believe – is your body and its great reason: it does not say I, but does I. What the senses feel, what the spirit knows, that never has its end in itself. But senses and spirit would like to persuade you that they are the end of all things: that is how vain they are. Tools and toys are senses and spirit: behind them

⁴⁹ Nietzsche searched for a new body language. He believed that song and dance expresses a consciousness of a higher community and that ‘man has forgotten how to walk and speak and is on the way toward flying into the air, dancing.’ [Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 37].

⁵⁰ Particularly in *The Gay Science*, *The Twilight of the Idols* and above all in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.

⁵¹ *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* [Part I, Ch: 3, ‘On Believers in a World Behind’]; Zarathustra refers to one’s own “body as-the-thing-in-itself”.

there yet lies the Self. The Self seeks with the eyes of the senses too; it listens with the ears of the spirit too. Always the Self listens and seeks: it compares, compels, conquers, destroys. It rules and is also the I's ruler. Behind your thoughts and feelings stands a mighty commander, an unknown wise man – his name is Self. In your body he dwells, he is your body.⁵²

For Nietzsche, the emphasis here seems to be entirely on a bodily knowledge which can be attained only when the artist can give up the “small reason” or “spirit”. The “small reason” or “spirit” is an instrument in the service of the “Self's great reason” which is the body.

The ability of the Dionysian body is to substitute a self-conscious, self-reflective unity for the intuitive, unconscious knowledge⁵³; to translate instinctive unconscious knowledge into the language of images⁵⁴ expressing knowledge in the multiple language of symbols⁵⁵ and archetypes. The Dionysian has the power to generate myth, in the sense that it is a concentrated image of the world, a condensation of phenomena⁵⁶ (unconscious images or ideas combine into a single symbol, into an archetype or into a gesture).

The Apollonian in contact with the Dionysian intoxicated energy is invigorated otherwise the body would just be a rigid set of patterns or forms deprived of vitality. Unless the Apollonian body ‘incorporates the transfiguring power of Dionysian energy, the Apollonian threatens to petrify life within dead forms’⁵⁷. The Dionysian *ecstatic* body prevents the Apollonian body from being lost in aimless traveling without clear destination⁵⁸. But if the influence of the Apollonian consciousness is broken, the Dionysian as a raw and irrational

⁵² *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* [Part I, Ch: 4, ‘On the Despisers of the Body’].

⁵³ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 86; it can create ‘until it becomes unconscious and bereft of understanding’.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 104.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p.103 and p. 40.

⁵⁶ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 135.

⁵⁷ Spinks, *Nietzsche*, p. 21.

⁵⁸ *Ibid* 23, p. 135.

energy articulates that chaotic energy that 'glances into the inside and terrors of nature'⁵⁹. It is the capacity of the Apollonian consciousness to concentrate amorphous or shapeless energy into coherent and distinct images that hides /conceals something which seems incapable of being fully explored or understood through illusion and only *ecstasy* and frenzy can allow to be seen.

The principles that guide the Dionysian consciousness of *ecstasy* (reunion and separation/dismemberment) that violates and disrupts the limits of the body generates an unending process of displacement and discontinuity whereby each moment needs to be redefined, needs to be re-inscribed in terms of its own new context, its own new 'truth.' Nietzsche states that 'Dionysus cut to pieces is a *promise* of life: it will be eternally reborn and return again from destruction'⁶⁰.

The contradictory character of the dialectics of body and cosmos (world nature), self and other, presence and absence, erasure and re-inscription of the Dionysian body consequently defines the character of its opposition, the Apollonian⁶¹. Since behind the body's experiencing of the Dionysian consciousness lies an *abyss*⁶² (a profound gap or chasm that impregnates multiple layers of meanings), it might be said that the Dionysian is not grounded on any notion of metaphysical presence. In that sense, Nietzsche assumes a phenomenological and not a metaphysical criterion for evaluating meaning, evidence or 'truth'⁶³. In Nietzsche, the Dionysian consciousness of the artist's body is marked by the dialectics of its *double writing* of self and non-self, body and non-body, presence and absence. The performative presence of the artist's body, as being at once what Nietzsche writes as, 'he (the self) is at once: subject and object, at once poet, actor and spectator'⁶⁴, body and cosmos

⁵⁹ *Ibid* 9, p. 67.

⁶⁰ *Will to Power* [1052]; *Beyond Good and Evil* [56].

⁶¹ Sallis in a note relating to the relation of the Apollonian and Dionysian opposites says that when the Apollonian and the Dionysian are taken as simple opposites, the opposition is presented as the relation of Apollo only to one side of the god, not to Dionysus in his dual nature. (p.57).

⁶² See note 63.

⁶³ *Beyond Good and Evil* [289] Nietzsche writes that 'behind every one of a philosopher's caves lies another, deeper cave – a stranger, more comprehensive world beyond the surface, an abyss behind every ground, beneath every foundation.'

⁶⁴ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy*, p. 52.

(world), is the result of a 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' mode of awareness that is a of "being-in-the-world". Nietzsche's project suggests a 'mode of involved yet *reflective* participation in the world rather than of detached *observation* of the cosmos'⁶⁵.

4.1.3 The Apollonian and the Dionysian Opposites

The Apollonian and the Dionysian opposition is not a simple binary opposition. Everything that comes in the surface in the Apollonian body looks simple, coherent, precise and transparent. But when we penetrate into the Dionysian myth which the Apollonian reflection projects, one feels intense disgust and fear⁶⁶. As Nietzsche says, it is as if the body looks at a 'bright image on a dark wall'⁶⁷ or as it were 'luminous spots to cure eyes damaged by gruesome night'⁶⁸.

The Apollonian character of measure and moderation and the Dionysian *ecstasy* and excess are opposites that are held in their opposition throughout. The opposition between these two bodies is a force that appears to strengthen, support and increase the intensity in one another 'in mutually renewed births'⁶⁹. Nietzsche describes the intricate relation of the Apollonian and the Dionysian as a tremendous opposition of two contrary tendencies that run parallel, separate to each other, and for 'the most part openly at variance'⁷⁰. The Apollonian and the Dionysian consciousness continually instigate each other. Their active opposition is what always prevails indefinitely. The opposition between the Apollonian and the Dionysian is a necessary obstacle for encroaching unities⁷¹ which always threatens the coherence and the consistency of the creative act, according to Nietzsche. Even when it seems that the opposition is overcome or has come to a point of reconciliation under

⁶⁵ Parkes, 'The Wandering Dance', p. 237.

⁶⁶ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy* 9, p. 67.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 9, p. 67. Nietzsche seems to characterize the Apollonian consciousness as bright and the Dionysian as dark.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 9, p. 67.

⁶⁹ 'The perpetuum vestigium of the union of the Apollonian and the Dionysian ... further reinforced by ever-new births, is testimony to the power of this artistic dual impulse of nature.' *Ibid.* 6, p. 53.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 1, p. 33.

⁷¹ Nietzsche, *The Will to Power* [693].

the 'term art, this happens only superficially'⁷². When they finally appear joined together into a relation which can be symbolized by a 'fraternal union'⁷³ and the Apollonian speaks the language of the Dionysian and the Dionysian finally the language of the Apollonian,⁷⁴ this is when both consciousnesses, in the creative process of a highly complex interweaving of the two, are in relation of harmonious arrangement. Each functions as a complement that enhances each other's qualities. The Apollonian body protects the Dionysian body from orgiastic self-annihilation and the Dionysian body heightens the intensity and enlivens the Apollonian body. The mode of their opposition is their interdependence. They are completely linked with each other. Each is dependent on the other in order to exist and be what it is since each carries the seed of the other and can be only relationally defined.

For Nietzsche, the opposition between the Apollonian and the Dionysian body lies in 'a curious internal bifurcation'⁷⁵. The Apollonian pulls the body in one direction and the Dionysian in another. The character though, of these oppositional forces or dynamics, is different. The Apollonian exerts force toward the contemplation of beautiful images, toward illusion, and the Dionysian toward a dark and disturbing state in a manner that puts things out of order and dismantles the existing and familiar structure of things.

Duality is the characteristic of the oppositional relation of the Apollonian bright world of beauty, illusion and dream, and the terrible and dark wisdom of the Dionysian. This duality exemplifies Nietzsche's conceptual formula that the body is Apollonian and Dionysian consciousness at the same time. Nietzsche defines the dual nature of the Apollonian and the Dionysian body as a "neither nor" structure. In other words, the body is and is not at the same time.

⁷² Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy* 1, p. 33.

⁷³ *Ibid.* 22, p. 131.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 22, p. 131.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 22, p. 131.

Nietzsche refers to their dual nature as: 'all that exists is just and unjust and equally justified in both'⁷⁶.

The interface, between the Apollonian moderation and the Dionysian ecstasy and excess, functions as a point where oppositional dynamics stimulate development and change and is a process inherent in all living beings⁷⁷, according to Nietzsche. Zarathustra also talks about the principle of oppositional dynamics in the relational interdependence between the upper and lower realms and between the powers of light and darkness. The more one desires to move towards the height and light, the more strongly one's roots are established deeply and firmly toward the earth; 'strive earthward, into the dark, into the depths'⁷⁸; (the relational oppositional dynamics between upward and earthward, sky and ground/earth is a point that we meet in Michael Chekhov as well).

The mutual interdependence of opposites is fundamental in a procedure for entering the threshold of an extra-ordinary mode of consciousness that would permit self-overcoming. The interdependence of opposites allows the body to 'go over' and to 'go under'⁷⁹ at the same time in order for the body to overcome itself and attain the egoless, self-less state of the Dionysian (Overhuman) consciousness⁸⁰. For Nietzsche, self-overcoming presupposes the subjugation of oppositional dynamics to be constitutive of a heightened self-less awareness, beyond the ego-centric *I* self, through which the body is becoming *other* bodies. Through the principle of oppositional dynamics the body structures itself always in relation to an *other*. It is part of a fluid process that depends on what has been going on and where the process is heading.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 9, p. 72.

⁷⁷ 'THE HABIT OF CONTRASTS - Superficial, inexact observation sees contrasts everywhere in nature (for instance "hot and gold"), where there are no contrasts only differences of degree. This bad habit has induced us to try understand and interpret even the inner nature, the intellectual and moral world, in accordance with such contrasts. An infinite amount of cruelty, arrogance, harshness, estrangement and coldness has entered into human emotion, because men imagined they saw contrasts where there were only transitions.' Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human* ['The Wanderer and his Shadow,' Section: 67].

⁷⁸ Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* [First Part: 8, 'On the Tree on the Mountainside,' p. 37].

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* [First Part: 4, 'Zarathustra's Prologue,' p. 13].

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* [First Part: 6, 'On the Pale Criminal,' p. 33]: 'My I is something that is to be overcome: my I is for me the great despising of the human: thus it speaks from this eye.'

Nietzsche claims that the body encounters and explores itself only in one's otherness. Otherness transforms and heightens the body's awareness of being engaged in the world, in the things and creates meaning. Nishida writes on this point:

[C]onsciousness derives meaning from its relations to other consciousnesses – meaning is determined by the system to which consciousness belongs ... For example, when a mental image that is a consciousness of a certain meaning is viewed simply as it is with no relation to anything else, it is merely a fact of pure experience with no meaning whatsoever.⁸¹

Otherness is the transformation of the body which is closed off from the world and through an excess of energy becomes 'the overflowing of libido or psychic energy'⁸². Otherness is an act of interpretation that affirms "will to power"⁸³ and creates lived meaning. The body, having the creative power and the skills to affirm that inherent⁸⁴ archetypal interpretive energy which defines all organic processes, is necessarily engaged in a performative act of creation; (this performative act in Michael Chekhov's work is the Psychological Gesture) .

According to Nietzsche, the mutual opposition and synergy between the Apollonian and the Dionysian body is apparently rooted in nature and is bound up with multiplicity and the continuous development of the self's creativity⁸⁵. The merging of the dynamic opposing Apollonian body and Dionysian body designates the connection of conscious and unconscious processes in the creative process. The realization of the self (Overhuman/Übermensch) in the affirmation of the creative act through the mediation of the archetypal

⁸¹ K. Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, (California: Yale University Press,1992) p. 15.

⁸² Parkes, 'The Wandering Dance', p 238.

⁸³ 'The will to power interprets (... – in fact, interpretation is itself a means of becoming master of something. (The organic process constantly presupposes interpretations.) Nietzsche, *The Will to Power* [643].

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* [693].

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* [707].

(symbolic) language (in this thesis through the Psychological Gesture) is the means through which the Apollonian and the Dionysian interweave and express the body's irrational unconscious energies; its sources of creativity of imagination and intuition. The opposition between the Apollonian and the Dionysian body generates an impulsion, a mutual energy toward something that creates an intensity, a forceful movement that promotes the growth and development of the creative process (this movement in Michael Chekhov is the act of gesturing). Through the mediation of the archetypal (symbolic) language (or archetypal gesture as in Michael Chekhov) this tension is channeled and extended and thus harnessed toward the creative act. The archetypal (symbolic) language metaphorically structures the perception of the body and the sense of one's self and expands their capacity for development while it balances differences between the Apollonian and the Dionysian drive in a creative synthesis of the two⁸⁶. This process seems to start with an image:

With an "individualized original experience" (*Urerlebnis*) which has the character of an image. This image is then transferred to a new sphere, sound (word), and then to yet another sphere, the concept. Thus, the function of metaphor is not simply ornamental, it points to the true nature of language. Nietzsche calls this movement *uberspringen*, *ubertragen* or *Ubertragung*. We can translate this as "transfer" or "transposition," or if we want to use an image "to carry over" (which is actually the literal translation)⁸⁷.

The archetype (symbol) is experienced as a movement that is inherent within the Apollonian and the Dionysian opposites themselves. In other words, creativity is within the body and is the result of a primordial process that involves the use of imagination and intuition and brings together a synergy of

⁸⁶ ... man has cultivated an abundance of contrary drives and impulses within himself: thanks to this synthesis, he is the master of the earth. - ... Thus a drive as master, its opposite weakened, refined, as the impulse that provides the stimulus for the activity of the chief drive... where the plant "man" shows himself strongest one finds instincts that conflict powerfully (e.g. in Shakespeare), but are controlled.' *Ibid.* [966].

⁸⁷ L.P.S. Torjussen, "Is Nietzsche a Phenomenologist? Towards a Nietzschean Phenomenology of the Body," in A-T Tymieniecka(ed.), *Analecta husserliana: The yearbook of phenomenological research*, 1:103, (2009), p. 181

the two opposing bodies or energies. This primordial process generates the 'optimal' formation of what Nietzsche calls the 'synthetic'⁸⁸ body. The term 'synthetic' suggests that the Apollonian and the Dionysian energies are never totally experienced as independent bodies. They never exist in a totally arbitrary manner. Nietzsche says that these two art drives are always in a mutual interplay defined by an efficacious interaction⁸⁹.

The blurring of their boundaries and the link between the Dionysian latent awareness to the Apollonian half conscious awareness denotes that essential unconscious material that happen to the body and determine thinking, feeling, experiencing and its actions⁹⁰ come to be realized as conscious knowledge. It is possible to say that Nietzsche treats the unconscious as an autonomous entity that can function in dialectical opposition to consciousness; this relation that the body seems to experience in an overwhelming and involuntarily manner seems to mark what Nietzsche considers the body's creative moment of insight and its *becoming*.

I have introduced Nietzsche's philosophy of perception in terms of the Apollonian consciousness of the body, the sphere of individuation, restraint, form, beauty, dream, illusion and imagination, and in terms of the Dionysian consciousness of the body, a state of *ecstasy* and excess and the collapse of ego-self and individuation. The Dionysian perception is an intense self-forgetfulness experience and an ego-less state, a sense of non-self. The Apollonian and the Dionysian are two artistic proclivities, two energies which seem to be inherent in human psycho-physiology. According to Nietzsche, the Apollonian and the Dionysian drives are deeply rooted in the human body. Nietzsche claims that the unconscious manifests itself in a physiological

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* [881].

⁸⁹ Nietzsche, *Birth of Tragedy* 25, p. 143.

⁹⁰ : 'Ultimately, we understand the conscious ego itself only as a tool in the service of a higher, comprehensive intellect; and then we are able to ask whether all conscious willing, all conscious purposes, all evaluations are not perhaps only means through which something essentially different from what appears in consciousness is to be achieved. We think: it is a question of our pleasure and displeasure –but pleasure and displeasure could be means through which we have to achieve something that lies outside our consciousness... could *our* positing of purposes, our willing, etc. not perhaps be also only a language of signs for something altogether different, namely something that does not will and is unconscious?' Nietzsche, *The Will to Power* [676].

language and that any mode of behavior that is performed is more or less unconscious. The entire body thinks⁹¹ without an explicit or conscious awareness of the self which is involved. The activity of what Nietzsche calls the “higher body” or “higher intellect” is always unconscious⁹². In other words, consciousness is never self-consciousness, but the consciousness of an ego-self in relation to a non-self or no-body which is not itself conscious.

Nietzsche’s metaphor of the Apollonian and the Dionysian consciousness shows a distancing of the artist’s (actor’s) ego-perspective from the creative process. It shows that the artist’s perception is always in a constant motion, that the artist’s body is always caught *in-between* inner and outer mobility and that the creative act which is a performative gesture (PG) is deeply rooted in the artist’s body where a complex unity of opposites, the body and the mind or imagination, self and other, are inseparable.

The metaphor of the Apollonian and the Dionysian consciousness of the body can be seen crucial to understanding the aesthetic style of the different modes of consciousness that are developed and that the actor embodies when experiencing Psychological Gesture. Nietzsche’s Apollonian consciousness espouses controlled form and simultaneously allows the freedom of the Dionysian consciousness to express the primordial state of the ambiguity of the artist’s body, its *ecstatic* state and excess, only within a given system of rules and principles. In Psychological Gesture these traits can be taken that reflect the fusion between the Apollonian form and the Dionysian content of the actor’s creative work, the slippage between different modes of consciousness (the actor’s self and the character’s) which includes a blurring of opposites.

⁹¹ ‘For we could think, feel, will, and remember, and we could also “act” in every sense of that word, and yet none of all this would have to “enter our consciousness” (as one says metaphorically).’ Nietzsche, *The Gay Science* [354].

⁹² ‘In short, we discover an activity that would have to be ascribed to a far higher and more comprehensive intellect that we know of. We learn to think less highly of all that is conscious, purposive creatures, are only the smallest part of us... Ultimately, we understand the conscious ego itself only as a tool in the service of a higher, comprehensive intellect; and then we are able to ask whether all conscious willing, all conscious purposes, all evaluations are no perhaps only means through which something essentially different from what appears in consciousness is to be achieved... we have to achieve something that lies outside our consciousness.’ Nietzsche, *The Will to Power* [676].

4.2 Nietzsche and Michael Chekhov

Nietzsche proposes a phenomenological structure in which, although there is an apparent unity on the surface of the body (a *Gestalt* structure) that encloses both the Apollonian (the ego-self perspective illusion) and the Dionysian (the non-ego *ecstatic* other) (as well as everything a *Gestalt* like a horizon structure includes), the artist's body is able to embrace a complete perception via a visceral cognition that is characterized by multiplicity.

4.2.1 Apollonian-Dionysian Perception and Psychological Gesture: The Aesthetics of Multiplicity

Michael Chekhov's theory and practice and Nietzsche's philosophy of embodiment can be understood or examined in the terms of the Apollonian-Dionysian aesthetics of the body where the artist's-actor's ego-self in a state of *becoming* subverts all logic and dualisms and the unconscious appears to be the dominant organizing principle of perception and experience. In Nietzsche, multiplicity implies an aesthetic phenomenological phenomenon of the body, where in Michael Chekhov's work this phenomenon implies the ambiguous status of the actor's-artist's body as a dual structure; as Apollonian-Dionysian modes of consciousness that can reveal the actor's multiple modes of awareness in experiencing Psychological Gesture.

Nietzsche's aesthetics of the Apollonian and the Dionysian can describe the dual nature of the actor's perception of the body when by means of the Psychological Gesture is caught up in the structural reversibility of two opposing energies or drives (the actor's and the other's-character's). In this corporeal phenomenon, the actor's Apollonian body and the Dionysian body are open to being influenced and changed by the difference they bring to their interaction. As a result, this reciprocal action reformulates the everyday limited perspective of the artist's-actor's perception of one's body and a new phenomenological relation to the cosmos (world), to the other (character) arises.

The body of the actor, regarded as Apollonian and Dionysian perceptual consciousness, suggests that it is involved in a relation of mutual dependence of body and non-body, presence and absence, visible and invisible, i.e. in oppositions which co-exist within the phenomenological structure of the Psychological Gesture where one senses, feels, perceives the body as it is sensing, feeling, perceiving and meaning. This artistic activity of the Apollonian and Dionysian perception of the body de-centers everyday consciousness and the actor is able to acknowledge otherness and recognize one's own body as multiplicity.

In Michael Chekhov multiplicity can be grasped in a single Psychological Gesture. In the Psychological Gesture, by placing the actor's body into a special form, a special posture, multiplicity is manifested through self-extendedness, as *ecstatic* Dionysian transcendent body. In this very moment the Apollonian (body-me) and the Dionysian (body-not-me-character) can crossover. The actor appears to become one who can 'see', feel, perceive and reach the deep wisdom of the body and can experience what Michael Chekhov calls "objectivity", what Merleau-Ponty calls the "inexhaustible" character of the pre-objective being or 'wild being' or what Nishida and Nietzsche call an "abyss". It is by virtue of the existence of an "abyss" that the Apollonian and the Dionysian can meet and unite but do not coincide. "Abyss" is the '*in-between*' spatiality (the *chiasm*) that joins and separates the artist's-actor's Apollonian body (the outside) to the Dionysian world/other (the inside), and impregnates multiple possibilities (meanings).

The Psychological Gesture uses the body as a metaphor of mirror (phenomenon of reflection) and this enables the actor to convey and reflect the image of the other (character) through one's own body. The actor's body moves between perception and imagination and is being directed toward the invisible. In other words, the Psychological Gesture is a movement-gesture that makes possible for the actor to perceive 'something' that is invisible. It can be said that Nietzsche appears to describe this style of movement in his *Birth of Tragedy* as a "glance into the abyss": as a perspective that disrupts the structure of the

artist's-actor's everyday self, the Apollonian individuation and the world of images, and causes Dionysian, the drive towards the expanded reproduction of bodies, to open the artist's-actor's body to the other (character) to the cosmos (world).

4.2.2 Dionysian Ecstasy and Psychological Gesture

Multiplicity necessarily seems to involve the phenomenological circular structure of reversibility that initiates what Shigenori Nagatomo, a Yuasa scholar, names the neither/nor logic. This logic rejects the dualistic either/or logic. Nagatomo explains that the structure of the neither-nor logic when established leads to an elimination of the self's ego-consciousness. There is a shift from 'the egological stance to a non-egological stance'⁹³. This form 'transcends ordinary ways of experiencing'⁹⁴. It frees the everyday ego-self from its fundamental dualistic either or principle⁹⁵. In the experience of the Psychological Gesture there is no Apollonian or Dionysian at all. There is no one at all. 'Neither an ego standing behind drives and affects nor a particular drive that dominates the others and directs the self (since drives are not distinct entities but relational impulses). The "one" who acts and who might be held responsible is therefore neither a (reflexive) subject behind the drives nor a (blind) individual drive. "One" is simply a shorthand for multiplicity'⁹⁶.

The "neither nor logic" is a relational structure that does not separate the two different bodies or energies; the Apollonian (the actor's self) here faces the other (character) or the Dionysian there. There is no distinction between here and there in that there is no distinction between actor's self and character. In that sense the same is true of space and time. The Apollonian and the Dionysian, the here and there, each embrace the other in their

⁹³ S. Nagatomo, 'The Logic of the Diamond Sutra: A is not A, therefore it is A', *Asian Philosophy*, 10.3 (2000), pp. 221-222.

⁹⁴ Van der Braak, *Nietzsche and Zen*, p. 93.

⁹⁵ Nagatomo, 'The Logic of the Diamond Sutra', pp. 221-22

⁹⁶ Widder, 'A Semblance of Identity', p. 834.

interdependence. Interdependence requires as a precondition of its possibility a form of *ecstasy* and transcendence.

I argue that *ecstasy* in acting is a transitional state. It is a form of liminality which is perceived as the threshold between two oppositions, between the actor and the character. Victor Turner writes that 'liminal entities are neither here nor there; they are betwixt and between the positions assigned and arrayed by law, custom and convention [...] frequently linked to invisibility and darkness'⁹⁷. By being taken out of the everyday ordinary context, the Apollonian body of the artist-actor is taken out of itself and experiences the Dionysian consciousness, the phenomenon of *ecstasy* as a liminal space, a threshold between immanence and transcendence.

Graham Parkes illuminates the notion of *ecstasy* and transcendence by emphasizing the archetypal aspect of this experience. He writes that 'ecstasy or the 'Dionysian Rausch'⁹⁸ (intoxication) ... causes all subjectivity to fall into forgetfulness, resulting in a reunion of the previously encapsulated self with the whole of humanity and nature'⁹⁹. The Dionysian intoxication therefore reaches beyond human nature per se. It extends to the world (the other), 'to a cosmic dimension'¹⁰⁰ which takes the form of "'immanent transcendence'"¹⁰¹. Dionysian intoxication in Psychological Gesture is the moment the actor psychophysically grasps the ambiguity of its body, its self-extendedness. We could say that the actor's body is lifted out of its everyday conventions and context and enters a kind of an imaginary state. It becomes creative. In practical psychophysical terms, the actor's body is able to 'depict energy as a transcendent force'¹⁰² through breath and radiation and can manifest itself as *ecstatic* Dionysian body. Andrei Bely, who collaborated with Michael Chekhov, asserts 'Chekhov's acting

⁹⁷ V. Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (New Jersey: Aldine, 1969), p. 95.

⁹⁸ *Rausch* is a German word and means a state of drugness, intoxication, joy.

⁹⁹ Nietzsche in G. Parkes, *Composing the Soul Reaches of Nietzsche's Psychology* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 68.

¹⁰⁰ Van der Braak, *Nietzsche and Zen*, p. 86.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87.

¹⁰² R.A. White, 'Radiation and the Transmission of Energy: From Stanislavsky to Michael Chekhov', *Performance and Spirituality*, 1 (2009), p. 24.

is derived from pause not from word”, observing that, for Chekhov, the “body is like lightning”; the word is born from the tip of the lightning, like from a burst of energy – the word is the aftermath of everything’¹⁰³.

Michael Chekhov and Nietzsche converge on the idea that actually the moment the artist’s-actor’s body is going out of itself, of its usual familiar sense of self, can reach deeper parts of oneself¹⁰⁴ and can express a wholeness of body and mind/imagination and the world; wholeness in the sense of potential sense of harmony and oneness with oneself and with something larger than oneself, the cosmos. It might be said that the moment the actor is gesturing (PG), he/she experiences a Dionysian *ecstatic* energy and the actor’s body operating as an immanent transcendent or cosmic body in the sense of communicating with extra-ordinary experiences, ‘with other worlds’¹⁰⁵, seems to take the artist-actor to higher forms of consciousness and to a deeper knowledge of self.

Ecstasy and transcendence in acting depends on the artist’s-actor’s body to become aware of a form of imminent absence. Presence and absence are in a state of mutual dependence in practicing Psychological Gesture. Drew Leder suggests that, in etymological terms absence, coming from Latin, means being away and in that sense ‘an absence is the being away of something’¹⁰⁶. Yet this absence ‘is not equivalent to a simple void, a mere lack of being’¹⁰⁷. Absence is a form of presence, the other’s (character’s) presence. ‘The notion of being is after all present in the very word absence’¹⁰⁸. Leder explains that ‘this presence is not a simple positivity. It is born from the reversal, from the absence of an absence’¹⁰⁹.

¹⁰³ R.A. White, ‘Chekhov’s notion of radiating: from concept to concrete’ in Marie-Christine Autant Mathieu, Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 117.

¹⁰⁴ M. Chekhov, *Lessons for the professional Actor*, p. 42; ‘can go into oneself so deeply’.

¹⁰⁵ Whyman, *The Stanislavsky System of Acting*, p. 192.

¹⁰⁶ Leder, *The Absent Body*, p. 22. ‘The word *absence* comes from the Latin *esse*, or “being,” and *ab*, meaning “away.”’

¹⁰⁷ Leder, *The Absent Body*, p. 22.

¹⁰⁸ Merleau-Ponty defines it as *ecart*.

¹⁰⁹ Leder, *The Absent Body*, pp. 90-91.

In Psychological Gesture, after Nietzsche, we could say that ecstasy or transcendence is experienced as corporeal ecstasy that takes on the notion of another mode of absence. Within Nietzsche's and Michael Chekhov's context, the idea of absence lies in the disappearance of the actor's everyday physical self, the Apollonian body, and the appearance of an *other* invisible self, the Dionysian body. The Psychological Gesture structures the actor's body in a way that the actor consciously develops spatial awareness which involves the ability of the body to incorporate an external space that is the appearance of an imaginary other, the character. In this way the Dionysian body of the artist-actor can give spatial reality to the invisible. The actor can be oneself and at the same time can become/be the person who can 'see' perceive, feel an invisible presence, the other (character). The actor can become 'the I and the You, the one being addressed and the one replying'¹¹⁰. In other words, the Dionysian consciousness necessarily presupposes the phenomenological condition of 'intercorporeality'.

4.2.3 Image Thinking (Gestural Thinking) and Psychological Gesture

In practicing the Psychological Gesture, the activities of the Apollonian, the moving acting self (the actor's everyday body) and the Dionysian, the moved acted upon self (the character's body) resonate the activities of 'intercorporeality'. 'Intercorporeality' here is a condition that indicates that image thinking or gestural thinking (PG) permeates the actor's body and possesses the actor's self. Yuasa Yasuo uses the term "image thinking"²⁴¹ to describe a state where a distinct quality that arises within the actor's body denotes practice and training. Yuasa points to a skillful ability which seems to have much in common with the use of sensory experience that is driven by imagination and the creative powers of the actor's body when practicing Psychological Gesture as a means of cultivation.

¹¹⁰ C Mittlesteiner, 'Georgette Boner and Michael Chekhov: collaboration(s) and dialogue(s) in search of a method, in Marie-Christine Autant Mathieu, Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 59.

According to Yuasa, “image thinking” goes beyond everyday language since it incorporates within its mode of thinking both the body and the unconscious¹¹¹. “Image thinking” has the power to disengage one’s body from the bounded everyday ego-/I-self thinking and to connect one with a deeper dimension of a corporeal experience which is transpersonal; it is an ‘optimal’ state that denotes modes of consciousness beyond the limits of personal body and identity. Nevertheless, the actor’s personal sense of self, the Apollonian body, is always part of the process. One of my actors defines this experience with the following comment:

The director asked us whether the experience of PG felt as being my own experience whether it feels personal. The experience is felt to be personal, that is to say that as the ‘character’ being played, the PG is most certainly personal to ‘them’. So of course there is an element of this feeling personal to the performer as well, one can’t help but observe similarities in sensations brought about by the gesture and those felt at certain points in one’s life. I think the PG allows us to bring the personal element of the text to life and share this with the audience. It is shared personal experience both with myself and the ‘character’ I am experiencing. This is a generous ‘personal’ as one feels that this is very much shared with the space with the audience via the inherent nature of the gesture pushing out beyond the physical form. The sense of sending out and giving out energy as something part of yourself feels very personal but at the same time feels that serves as something non personal at all - you can observe but you cannot control. [Extract from actor’s journal ‘Obituary’ 18/4/2016]

The actor through Psychological Gesture, through *ecstasy* and transcendence and by going beyond the physical form of the body, is able to experience “image thinking” (“gestural thinking”) that engages both his personal and non-personal self, the Apollonian and the Dionysian drives at the same time. In other words,

¹¹¹ Yuasa, *Overcoming Modernity*, p. 11; See also Yuasa, ‘Image-Thinking and the Understanding of “Being”’, pp. 179-208.

it can be argued that Nietzsche, Yuasa and Michael Chekhov speak about a cultivation of the artist's-actor's body and self in terms of the education of the bodily drives.

4.2.4 Psychological Gesture and Archetypal Structure: microcosm-macrocosm

So, after my reading of Nietzsche, we could say that first the Psychological Gesture appears as an image, as an Apollonian energy or drive, and this immediately connects the actor's body to the Dionysian drive, to an 'unconscious energy that functions independently of consciousness'¹¹²; (as the actor in the above journal-extract mentions he experiences 'something non personal at all which he can observe but cannot control'). At the same time the actor explains that 'by pushing out' (PG), he can experience this image by going beyond the physical form of his body. In other words, the image (PG) is spatial. The actor through ecstasy and transcendence experiences his body in space. The image (PG) is directly a reflection of how the world, the character (other), is sensed and felt by and appears to the actor. In this way the Apollonian energy or drive, the actor's imagination, is liberated, separating what the actor imagines from the personality of the actor. The actor is given the ability to penetrate the Apollonian ideal world of images by rejecting one's own personal ego and personality. It is possible to say that the Psychological Gesture connects the actor's body and mind to archetypal energies and images while separating and maintaining at the same time a connection to or sense of the actor's individual self. Andrei Kirillov explains that the actor 'to transmit images into the real world is the accomplishing of a lofty spiritual and aesthetic mission. The artist-actor becomes a mediator'¹¹³.

¹¹² Y. Yuasa, *The Body, Self-Cultivation and Ki-Energy* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1993), p. 21.

¹¹³ A. Kirillov, 'The Theatrical System of Michael Chekhov', in Marie-Christine Autant Mathieu, Yana Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), p. 50.

Yuasa mentions that ‘which can be gained through images is deep’¹¹⁴; (deep in the sense of extending the body and mind in space and time and thus discover unknown parts of the actor’s body and self). Yuasa writes “a deeper region of the mind is found to be universal which goes beyond the differences of language and which is prior to the utterance of words”¹¹⁵. One who is able to be connected with images (archetypal gestures), which are found to be both a universal and unconscious layer of being, seems to have the power or the capacity to associate one’s body with the ability to overcome the natural physical powers of one’s body and be open to the non-naturalistic powers of the human body that is to an invisible field of energy; a world-space that is limitless and full of possibilities. This universal and unconscious layer of being is probably associated, as Nagatomo notes, with Carl Jung’s archetypal images connected by way of “memory” to the unconscious which is a reservoir of images¹¹⁶.

It is possible to argue that the basic principles of the Psychological Gesture, the ‘Four Qualities of Movement: Molding, Floating, Flying, Radiating’ that structure the actor’s body are rooted in the notion of the universal or cosmic dimension Yuasa discusses. Psychological Gesture by positing as a source of action, ‘*arche*’, archetypal elements such as ‘earth, water, air, and fire ,[...] *archai* that carry a symbolic meaning involves a projection from the psyche’¹¹⁷. This projection is a psychophysical self-extendedness or expansion of the body that involves non-naturalistic physical powers. An invisible level of psychic energy that through breath and radiation extends beyond the physical dimensions of the actor’s body in terms of space and time (and can be actualized in terms of horizontal-vertical structure, as we have seen in Merleau-Ponty Chapter 3). In this way the actor is able to experience one’s body in space. There is a sense of ‘cosmic’ or universal dimension here that is an experiential activity which is the

¹¹⁴ “That which can be gained through words is shallow; that which can be gained through images is deep” in Yuasa, ‘Image-Thinking and the Understanding of “Being”’, p. 192.

¹¹⁵ Yuasa, ‘Image-Thinking and the Understanding of “Being”’, p. 192; p. 190; In a note Shigenori Nagatomo mentions that the universality Yuasa has in mind is probably related to Jung’s archetypal images connected by way of “memory” to the unconscious which is a reservoir of images [S. Nagatomo, ‘Translator’s Introduction’, in Yuasa, *Overcoming Modernity*, p. 204].

¹¹⁶ Nagatomo, *ibid.*, p. 204.

¹¹⁷ Nagatomo, ‘Translator’s Introduction’, p. 10.

projecting of an image, gesture, breath and sound that involves the invisible, the actor's imagination, reflection (mirroring), and memory.

In creating and practicing the Psychological Gesture the actor's mode of engagement and what develops in the process can be felt, as the actor mentions in the last practical example as personal as well as non-personal or symbolic. Symbolic appears to be the non-personal element that contains the physiological possibility for both imagination and memory¹¹⁸ through archetypal images or archetypal gestures to grasp the whole of the Psychological Gesture (the character) with a level of 'spiritual' clarity. The actual application of spiritual in my training is related to spirit (coming from Latin spiritus-spirare meaning breath-to breathe), i.e. to a non-everyday activity that transcends the ego-self body (body-me) and contains the ritualistic elements of repetition and breath which appear to alter one's state of mind and consciousness. Therefore the Psychological Gesture can be carried out directly without preconceived ideas and 'without the intervention of an arbitrary constructed system of meanings'¹¹⁹.

I align with the idea that "image thinking" or gestural thinking (PG) engages the actor's conscious (personal) and unconscious (non-personal) thinking at the same time. This seems to advance the union of the actor's individual world as microcosm with the other's world (character's) as macrocosm. Yuasa explains that "image thinking" is a mode of being that connects these two worlds, the microcosm with macrocosm¹²⁰. In the following journal-extract we can see that the actor's personal self, the physical body and sensations, are associated with microcosm whereas the non-personal extended invisible body is associated with macrocosm. According to the actor, the Psychological Gesture relies on the interdependency between the physical self (body-me) and the invisible other

¹¹⁸ Shigenori Nagatomo explains that an image must be connected by way of "memory" to the unconscious in Yuasa, 'Image-Thinking and the Understanding of "Being"', p. 204.

¹¹⁹ Nagatomo makes a distinction here between auditory languages in which meaning is arbitrarily assigned to a string of sounds for the purpose of inter-personal communication and Chinese language as a mode of engagement with the world or nature that is carried out directly without the intervention of an arbitrarily constructed system of meanings; in Yuasa, 'Image-Thinking and the Understanding of "Being"', p. 204.

¹²⁰ Nagatomo, 'Translator's Introduction', p. 9.

(body-not-me) which appear to operate as microcosm and macrocosm respectively. The actor writes:

I think the PG is formed from multiple sources, and at times it can feel that one source is more prominent than another. The original source always seems to be breath and this then feeds into the other sources. These other sources are the external projected image or 'self' - which accompanies the sense of expansion in space- the non personal self. There is also the personal self, that remains more attached to the 'physical', the sensations, or the actual physical movements of the body rather than the perceived PG. There is an interdependency that exists. I think it's this dependency which feeds and continues the PG. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 21/4/2016]

It is possible to say that through the Psychological Gesture "image thinking" moves the actor's body between an Apollonian private space as microcosm (the actor's personal physical world) and a Dionysian public space as macrocosm (the non-personal invisible world). As another actor explains:

There is a detachment from the 'personal' inside body that seems to be experienced as non personal outside of the body – connections to memories and recalled images. The non-personal seems more immediate. However, being that two 'selves' are experienced I find that there are 'personal' and 'non-personal' experiences processes occurring at once which seems perhaps overwhelming as a concept, yet so much of this is experienced sub-consciously, or in a secondary manner. [Extract from actor's journal 'Obituary' 29/4/2016]

In other words, in the last two journal-extracts both actors explain that through the Psychological Gesture, the union of conscious with unconscious thinking, personal with non-personal self, that is microcosm with macrocosm is creatively expressed within a specific structural style of "being-in-the-world". This structural style seems to be based on the affective interchange of the visceral relationship between the actor's personal inner body (the Apollonian drive) and

the non-personal outside or *ecstatic* body (the Dionysian drive) which appears to involve the actor's 'unconscious intuition'¹²¹. The union of the two bodies, which is a union of the actor's visible body and the character's invisible body, is a cognitive experience that does not follow the principles of reason and logic. It functions in terms of "form is emptiness". Emptiness corresponds to *ecstasy* and transcendence and form corresponds to immanence"¹²², to the Dionysian and Apollonian body respectively.

The Psychological Gesture is a movement of an invisible energy that seems to condition an intuitive mode of 'cognition [that] is of a higher dimension'¹²³. The actor's body might be said to exist most fundamentally in space and time as an Apollonian-Dionysian structure that can transcend the sensible world and the ordinary everyday thinking. Yuasa names the world of everyday thinking "bright consciousness"¹²⁴. This mode of awareness though can assume the engagement of a non-everyday thinking which Yuasa names "dark consciousness"¹²⁵. According to Yuasa, "dark consciousness" which is the overcoming of the everyday thinking, but cannot exist independently or self-sufficiently from it, can move the actor away from the ego-self perspective toward primordial archetypal psychic structure. This thesis relates the Apollonian consciousness to "bright consciousness" and the Dionysian consciousness to "dark consciousness" in order to examine in detail the actor's multiple modes of awareness in practicing the Psychological Gesture.

4.2.5 Modes of Consciousness: "bright" and "dark" consciousness

In this section, in order to examine the role of action and intuition in the different stages of the actor's experience of the Psychological Gesture, I relate the two major themes in Nietzsche, the Apollonian dream body

¹²¹ Yuasa, 'Image-Thinking and the Understanding of "Being"', p. 189.

¹²² Yuasa, 'Image-Thinking and the Understanding of "Being"', p. 193; 'Emptiness corresponds to transcendence and form corresponds to immanence'.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 196.

¹²⁴ Yuasa, *The Body: Toward and Eastern Body Mind Theory* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1987), pp. 4-6; pp. 60-63.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6; pp. 60-63.

and the Dionysian *ecstatic* body, to Yuasa's "bright" and "dark consciousness". Yuasa's two forms of cognition, the "bright" and the "dark" consciousness and Nietzsche's Apollonian and Dionysian consciousness of the artist's body, are used as a metaphorical lens through which I examine the tensions that shape the multiple layers of consciousness that structure the structuring of the actor's body and self and help the actor overcome all forms of dualisms in the creative process. Yuasa's "bright" and "dark" consciousness and Nietzsche's Apollonian and Dionysian consciousness appear to resemble each other conceptually and practically. They are examined together because these two theories of the body seem to possess the same ontological implications.

The implications of the Apollonian and the Dionysian, the "bright" and the "dark" consciousnesses, are taken as two modes of energies/ drives that seem to reflect the actor's task of incorporating or implementing the interplay between two opposing modes of awareness as instinctive knowledge when practicing the Psychological Gesture. After my reading of Nietzsche, we can understand that in the practice of the Psychological Gesture the aesthetic effects of two essentially separate art-energies or drives, the Apollonian or "bright" and the Dionysian or "dark" consciousnesses of the body, can enter into a simultaneous activity that seems to be the outcome of practices which are the expression of non-natural forces the body of the actor does not control in advance, but embodies.

The many tensions in the interplay between the two opposing consciousnesses, the "bright" and the "dark", the Apollonian and the Dionysian, self and other (character), seem to operate as complementary. Neither the "bright", the Apollonian consciousness (actor's self), nor the "dark", the Dionysian consciousness (other/ character), stand on their own. The boundary between them is fluid. Both Yuasa and Nietzsche appear to claim that the "bright" Apollonian consciousness is an intrinsic moment of the "dark" Dionysian

consciousness. To state there is no clear ontological distinction between them promotes the standpoint that there is no ontological distinction between body and mind, body and space (the world), self and other (character). Yuasa and Nietzsche seem to suggest that there is a 'primal' 'primordial' unity between these entities that is not a natural state that comes into being without preparation or mediation, but a state that needs to be accomplished through practice and training. The primal or primordial unity¹²⁶ Nietzsche illustrates by examining the Ancient Greek Tragedy or the 'oneness of body-mind'¹²⁷ claimed by Yuasa through the Japanese religious practices (meditation) is the goal, the ideal 'optimal' state the actor needs to achieve in Michael Chekhov's acting.

Yuasa developed the terms "bright" and "dark" consciousness in his book *The Body* (1987). Yuasa uses the terms "bright" and "dark" consciousnesses in order to analyze and differentiate Nishida's "*basho vis-à-vis-being*" ("*basho* of being") from "*basho vis-à-vis-nothing*" ("*basho* as absolute nothingness") respectively. Yuasa makes a similar suggestion to that made by Nietzsche and Michael Chekhov, namely that consciousness is not a consistent, undifferentiated entity. Consciousness seems to be a whole that shows variations, differentiations, inconsistencies and interdependency of all contradictions. In that sense, Yuasa's "bright" and "dark" consciousnesses as well as Nietzsche's Apollonian and Dionysian consciousnesses, can shed light on the inseparability of the body and mind, self and other (character), body and world-space in acting practice, indicating that the actor's consciousness is *double layered*. As Yuasa clarifies:

The surface and the base structures of the mind-body relationship are psychologically distinguished into the bright and dark consciousness; physiologically, as the functions of the cerebral and the autonomic nerves. Nor completely separate from each

¹²⁶ Nietzsche, *BT*, 6/55; 3/37, 43.

¹²⁷ Yuasa, *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, p. 40.

other, the poles in each pair are connected through the emotions. Accordingly, we should be able to enter deeply into the base structure, controlling the emotional or sentimental capacity through training.¹²⁸

The “bright consciousness” related with the everyday body is capable of self-conscious awareness and is reminiscent of the Apollonian body. On the other hand, the “bright consciousness” seems to be merely the surface of the “dark consciousness”, the surface body of a deeper visceral layer which is reminiscent of the Dionysian body.

The “bright’ consciousness” is related to the bright *cogito*, to Descartes’ *cogito* ‘I think’ and to the *surface* body. Drew Leder defines surface as ‘where self meets what is other than self’ and focuses upon the sensorimotor surface of the body¹²⁹. The “bright consciousness” like the Apollonian appears to be the layer of thought. It is ‘reflective and takes time to deliberate’¹³⁰. Both “bright” and Apollonian consciousness seem to be related to the sensory world and to the ‘surface structure of the mind-body relation’¹³¹. In other words, both “bright” and Apollonian consciousness are connected with controlled form. They indicate clarity, lucidity and reason within specific given rules and aesthetic principles. It appears that the field of the “bright” Apollonian consciousness is an ordinary situation in which ‘we know what is, why it is, and how we want to act toward it’¹³².

The nature of the “bright” Apollonian consciousness is characterized by the illusory world of the body and the senses that is the world of appearances. Nishida identifies the ego with the body. He writes ‘there is

¹²⁸ Yuasa, *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, p. 209.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 193; Leder defines surface as ‘where self meets what is other than self’ and focuses upon the sensorimotor surface of the body, in D. Leder, *The Absent Body* (USA: The University of Chicago Press, 1990, p. 11.

¹³⁰ T. P. Kasulis, ‘Editor’s Introduction’, in Y. Yuasa *The Body: Toward and Eastern Mind Body Theory* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1987), p. 5.

¹³¹ Yuasa, *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, p. 193.

¹³² Kasulis, ‘Editor’s Introduction’, p. 32.

no ego without a body'¹³³. According to Nishida's statement the layer of the "bright consciousness" operates within the domain of the ego-consciousness. Within the phenomenal reality of the physical body that is related to the 'everyday life-space'¹³⁴ where intuition is still passive and action is active. This mode of consciousness is confined within the subjective (meaning) of the everyday experience which in Nishida is the "*basho-vis-à-vis-being*" and in Nietzsche the Apollonian energy or drive.

Yuasa states that 'ego-consciousness essentially means a consciousness of the *object* as well as of the *self*'¹³⁵. In the layer of the "bright" Apollonian consciousness the body is experienced phenomenologically and in reflective terms. The body is aware of itself within itself. The distinctive feature of the "bright" Apollonian consciousness is that the body is conscious of itself, can see perceive itself within its self. The body is 'capable of self-conscious awareness'¹³⁶. It is capable of experiencing the subject-object relation, the 'self-object consciousness'¹³⁷. In practicing the Psychological Gesture, the foundation of the layer of the "bright" Apollonian consciousness might be seen as the actor's awareness of the relationship between the self (body-me) and the world-space, the character (body-not-me), but still the awareness of the body is enclosed within the bounds of its own interiority (this in Nishida is the "*Basho as Relative Being Awareness*" in Chapter 2).

The awareness of the illusory nature of the layer of the "bright" or Apollonian is a conscious/semi-conscious state that manifests itself in images while the body is maintaining awareness and a distance from the

¹³³ Nishida in S. Nagatomo 'Part Three, The Japanese Concept of Self: Another Analysis of a Culturally Reinforced Attitude', in D. E. Shaner et al. *Science and Comparative Philosophy: Introducing Yuasa Yasuo* (The Netherlands, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989), p. 147.

¹³⁴ Yuasa, *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, p. 61.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 61; 'For example, when looking at a tree, accompanying the perceptual function of looking at a tree (that is, being conscious of the tree) is the function of being conscious of the self as looking at the tree (the thinking, emotion, desire, and so forth).

¹³⁶ Kasulis, 'Editor's Introduction', p. 4.

¹³⁷ Yuasa, *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, p. 61.

image. Michael Chekhov describes this conscious/semi-conscious state in the following passage from his book *On the Technique of Acting*:

At night when we are alone in our bedrooms, sharp images often emerge from the darkness. Before our mind's eye the events of the day mysteriously appear. The faces of people we have seen, their conversations and mannerisms, the streets of a city or the fields of the countryside suddenly reveal themselves. Mostly, we look passively at these familiar pictures, but among them appear strange visions, unknown to us. Scenes, moods, events, and people with which we have no connection intermingle with our everyday mental images and branch out in all directions. The new images seem to develop and transform themselves independent of our control or wishes. And when this occurs, we are drawn into another realm [...] Artists in every field affirm that such images surround them not only after the day is over, when solitude and night come, but also during the day, when the sun shines, in the noisy city or in a small room - everywhere. Artists live with their images. They and their images belong to each other, depend upon each other¹³⁸.

However, the reflective attitude of the “bright” Apollonian consciousness is ‘divorced actionally and disengaged from the world’¹³⁹. When this mode of consciousness initiates an action what generates as a result remains within the subjective body (meaning). The self through the body exists as a “being-in-the world” still experiencing the ambiguity of subjectivity-objectivity. That is to say, the body-mind relation, or the actor’s self and the character relation, is experienced as not being completely one as a whole.

The layer of the “bright” Apollonian consciousness points to the separate function of the body from the mind in ordinary experience and shows the

¹³⁸ *On the Technique of Acting*, pp. 1-2.

¹³⁹ Nagatomo, ‘The Japanese Concept of Self’, p. 147.

role intuition has in the field of everyday ego-consciousness. This can be that the 'bodily (sense) intuition is the passive relation to the world, and bodily action is the active relation'¹⁴⁰. Intuition is still passive and bodily action is active.

I discovered through my practical experiments that, from the very beginning in the training, the actor's body is conscious of the world of images and the world of appearances as something that is necessarily employed in the creative process of an artist's work. In the first stages the actor still experiences the ego-/consciousness that is related to this layer of consciousness. In other words, initially the actor goes through a phase of dualism but gradually develops and achieves a bodymind integration. Integration occurs when the Apollonian or 'bright glance of Descartes' cogito disappears'¹⁴¹ and an invisible concealed bottom layer, the Dionysian, is revealed.

Yuasa claims that at the bottom of the sphere of activity of the surface layer of the "bright" consciousness another hidden layer lies: the *dark cogito* which is tightly bound by corporeality'¹⁴². The "dark" cogito is 'the base structure of the mind-body relation. It is associated with primitive consciousness'¹⁴³ and to what Yuasa names the "dark consciousness". The "dark consciousness" is 'spontaneous and impulsive'¹⁴⁴ and seems to resemble the Dionysian, unconscious body; 'the word 'unconscious' does not mean some Freudian part of suppressed desires but simply a state which there is (almost certainly) no subjective sensation –no 'what it is like to be'¹⁴⁵.

Thomas Kasulis writes that "dark consciousness":

¹⁴⁰ Yuasa, *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, p. 56.

¹⁴¹ Kasulis, 'Editor's Introduction', p. 33.

¹⁴² Yuasa, *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, p. 61; pp. 122.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

¹⁴⁴ Kasulis, 'Editor's Introduction', pp. 4-5.

¹⁴⁵ Carter In *Exploring Consciousness* (California, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), p. 9.

[P]sychoanalytically resembles the unconscious in some ways. Neurophysiologically, it parallels, in part, the functions of the automatic nervous system. Phenomenologically, it appropriates the lived body examined by Merleau-Ponty and Bergson in their discussions of the sensory-motor circuits. In Buddhist terms, it is related to what is called “no mind”. In a more precise sense, however, it is none of these. It is rather their common ground, a single aspect of consciousness viewed from various perspectives’¹⁴⁶.

The affinities between the layer of the “dark consciousness” and the Dionysian consciousness is striking in the sense that both are primitive modes of consciousness that appear to indicate direct experience, excess, expansion, ecstasy, transcendence and the irrational. The layer of the “dark” and the Dionysian consciousness seem to be related to what is going beyond the bounds of the physical and the subjective (self/meaning) and to what is regarded as customary.

Yuasa and Nietzsche contend that the physical body grounds the layer of the “dark” Dionysian consciousness. Yuasa and Nietzsche seem to claim that the ‘dark’ and the Dionysian are modes of consciousnesses that can be accomplished only through practice and psychophysical processes. In Michael Chekhov this way of knowing can be experienced practically through the Psychological Gesture. When the body, through the gesture and breath goes *under* (reaching the lower abdomen) and goes beyond (through self-extendedness and radiation) the self to a point of immersion deep within the body, the actor’s self is able to reach deeper regions and to achieve a deep sense of the body. In this condition, the body is immersed in a layer of consciousness found within the “dark” or Dionysian consciousness¹⁴⁷. The actor’s body immersed deeply in the expanded transcendent body is involved deeply in the

¹⁴⁶ Kasulis, ‘Editor’s Introduction’, pp. 4-5.

¹⁴⁷ Nagatomo, ‘The Japanese Concept of Self’, 150; By ‘immersing consciousness at the bottom of consciousness’.

cosmos, the world-space. In this moment the artist's-actor's self is transformed. Through this act of submerging and transcendence of the everyday-ego-*I* consciousness, the body is present in the world-space naturally, socially, historically. Yuasa writes that 'to immerse oneself in the world is not to lose the body, but rather the self is deepened and is thoroughly at the base of the body'¹⁴⁸.

Through Psychological Gesture, the actor can reach this layer of the "dark" or Dionysian consciousness where the *I* seems to rise from 'the innermost depths of the self's being'¹⁴⁹. The *I* here, seems to be an expression of an unconscious cosmic body that is "an expression of the deep self that lies at the base of everyday consciousness"¹⁵⁰. The "dark" or Dionysian mode of consciousness is a self-less state in which all opposition and ambiguity disappear. The body without being an ego *I* body is the non-self. It experiences an *ecstatic* state where objectivity, body and mind, self and other, body and cosmos (world-space), which were still distinguishable in the layer of the "bright" Apollonian consciousness are perceived and experienced in the layer of the "dark" Dionysian consciousness as inseparable. All conscious acts of the actor's body, thinking, feeling, willing, come together (an 'optimal' mode of being/doing for Michael Chekhov). They are unified by the creative powers of intuition which alter and reverse the structural dynamics between action and intuition. In this *ecstatic* Dionysian state 'intuition becomes active and action passive'¹⁵¹. Intuition in the layer of "dark" or Dionysian consciousness is an underlying force that is more like a creative intuition. As Yuasa explains it is more like what Nishida calls an "action intuition" or "*basho* of absolute nothingness"¹⁵².

¹⁴⁸ Yuasa, *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, p. 71.

¹⁴⁹ Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, translated by W. Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Press,

¹⁵⁰ Nishida in Nagatomo, 'The Japanese Concept of Self', 1989: 148.

¹⁵¹ Yuasa, *The Body: Toward and Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, p. 68.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, pp 68-69.

The Psychological Gesture is a practice that establishes the actor's body to become the ground that can condition these two layers of cognition, the totality of the subject-object, body-mind relationship, suggested by Yuasa, Nishida and Nietzsche. In order for the actor's body to enter into the layer of the "dark" Dionysian consciousness the conscious body needs not to be actively engaged. The Psychological Gesture through repetition, breath and radiation can be the direct route by which the layer of the "bright" Apollonian consciousness, the ego-everyday consciousness, can 'submerge itself'¹⁵³ and establish contact with the layer of the "dark" Dionysian consciousness. Conscious and unconscious body, self and other (character), body and cosmos (world-space), are blurred and the distinction between subjectivity and objectivity is overcome completely.

In Psychological Gesture the self-conscious state of the "bright" Apollonian consciousness, the actor's thinking mind and imagination, shapes the body into a particular form. This can be an awkward position or posture. Gradually through practice, the posture and movement of the Psychological Gesture grows impulsively and spontaneously to a point where it can be described as 'natural' or second nature. Thomas Kasulis explains that the reason it becomes 'second nature is because the mind has entered into the *dark* [Dionysian] consciousness and given it a form; it is an acquired naturalness [...] the bright consciousness has put the dark consciousness into a form or posture, preparing it to respond in an approved, yet autonomous, manner'¹⁵⁴. In other words, the "bright" Apollonian consciousness gives form to the abstract and chaotic "dark" Dionysian consciousness.

¹⁵³ Nagatomo, 'The Japanese Concept of Self', p. 148.

¹⁵⁴ Kasulis, 'Editor's Introduction', p. 6.

4.3 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter I examined the relational dynamics the Psychological Gesture creates between the actor's self and the other (character), the complex nature of the actor's multiple modes of consciousness, through Nietzsche's sense of transcendentalism, his Apollonian and Dionysian energies or drives, and through Yuasa's analysis of Nishida's *bashos* as "bright" and "dark" consciousness. These modes of consciousnesses which can be achieved in Michael Chekhov's work through the cultivation of the actor's body in practicing the Psychological Gesture can create affectivity as relational and temporal encounter between opposite bodies, the actor's physical natural body and the actor's non-physical non-natural body (the character's body). The ability to incorporate the Psychological Gesture involves the free movement between the "bright" Apollonian consciousness and the "dark" Dionysian consciousness that is constituted as a system of circular movement between these two modes of cognition which integrates the actor's body as a whole. Yuasa names this system of circular movement the 'active-passive circuit'¹⁵⁵. The actor is caught "in-between" the many tensions of the structural relationship of the surface layer of the "bright" Apollonian consciousness and the bottom layer of the "dark" Dionysian consciousness. Nevertheless, the trained actor learns to be able to oscillate between these two consciousnesses effortlessly without breaking one's body apart. The Psychological Gesture is a cultivation of the body that can establish the relational connection between the surface layer of the "bright" Apollonian consciousness (which indicates perception thinking imagination) and the deeper layer of the "dark" Dionysian consciousness (which indicates intuition inspiration and creativity) that is located in the "in-betweenness" of the actor's self (body-me) and the character (body-not-me).

¹⁵⁵ Yuasa, *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, p. 122.

Conclusions

This study has articulated the phenomenological processes by which the Psychological Gesture shapes the body of the actor as a *dynamic platform* involving multiple bodies or multiple *bashos*, *chiasms*, and *ecstatic* modes of consciousnesses.

The analysis of the actor's body through the "action-intuition", "*chiasmic*", and "ecstatic" theoretical perspectives of Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche respectively, has brought into the foreground what was implicit in Michael Chekhov's theatrical practice: a non-dualistic understanding of the actor's consciousness and perception when experiencing the Psychological Gesture. The phenomenological principles in Michael Chekhov's work are viewed from the angle of the phenomenology of Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche in order to gain an in depth analysis, a better understanding of how the Psychological Gesture structures the actor's body and sense of self-perception.

This study has explored: (a) the complex nature of the Psychological Gesture as the site of exchange between the body and the space; (b) its relational connections to the invisible (other selves or worlds); and (c) how Psychological Gesture shapes the actor's self as multiple bodies therefore one's consciousness and perception to create what we call a 'character'.

The phenomenological theories of Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche offered a way to examine and articulate experiencing the Psychological Gesture in the following ways:

Each chapter in this thesis is reflecting upon a major concept and then is analyzed within Michael Chekhov's acting context (Chapter 1). Chapter 2 examines the nature of the activities of action and intuition that are involved in practicing Psychological Gesture. Chapter 3 examines the nature of the structure of the Psychological Gesture and Chapter 4 examines the nature of consciousness involved when practicing the Psychological Gesture.

Avoiding the pitfalls of a facile reductionism that would fail to examine the merits of each theorist independently, the thesis explores perception in the acting process through the lens of phenomenology. Instead of succumbing to the typical dualisms between natural and non-natural, body and non-body, self and non-self, visible and invisible, inner-outer, imagination (imaging) and reflection, it treats the structure of the actor's body as part of a 'living-lived' 'feeling-felt' or 'affecting-affected psychophysical whole, a *Gestalt*.

The research questions that have been addressed in this thesis are:

1. How can the application of selected philosophical paradigms to the Psychological Gesture through theory and practice further our understanding of Michael Chekhov's work?
2. How do particular aspects of the fields of phenomenology, post-phenomenology, cognitive sciences, consciousness studies, philosophy of mind, aid in developing an articulation and understanding of an 'optimal' state of consciousness as a necessary aspect of the actor's performance in Michael Chekhov's work and theatre practice?
3. How can this project develop the way we are able to talk about Michael Chekhov's work and wider acting processes?

In the following paragraphs I discuss the key findings of my research on the interaction between phenomenology cognitive sciences and acting processes in Michael Chekhov's work.

The focus on imagination has been a means to explore the interconnection and 'oneness' of body and mind, breath, and subtle energies. This opens up an immediate connection with the actor's own body, other bodies and the world which might be seen as a potential source of transcendence (self-extendedness). As the ability of the body and self when experiencing Psychological Gesture to constantly overflow (go beyond physical self) and blur the boundaries between body and space, self and other (character), visible and invisible. In that sense, in Michael Chekhov's work the conceptualization of the

actor's body opens up a space which is a cognitive field of action and is an extension of the capacity of the actor's body to sense, to feel, to perceive itself.

Psychological Gesture is a task-focused activity, a gestural self-extendedness (*ecstasy*) which suggests immanence of the body. The actor having a focus on the here and now in ever shifting patterns is involved in a heightened form of awareness. Transcendence must be seen as an inhabited space that must be understood as something *in-between* the physical and the mental, the body and the non-body (the world-space), the visible and the invisible, the self and other.

The actor can experience transcendence as a "lived" "felt" "perceived" inhabited space where all distinctions disappear and subject-body and object-body co-exist simultaneously. Transcendence shapes the actor's body as an interior space (inside the actor's body) and exterior space (outside and separate from it) that opens up a field of possibilities wherein the boundaries between conscious and unconscious, between reflective and pre-reflective, between presence and absence might be seen to be blurred. In psychophysical terms the actor's body coupling (that can be accomplished through PG) to an external world (other) is always in excess of itself.

The gestural extension of the actor's body potentially removes the ego-self perspective and seems to prompt a change to a non-everyday consciousness that contains other bodies as well. The body develops 'multiplicity' and can be defined as multiple or non-self.

Through Psychological Gesture the actor's body is *situated*. It is conditioned to operate as a skilled psychophysical body that is grounded in one's relational engagement with the other and the things in the world. One is immediately related to space and the surrounding environment. The actor can experience space time and movement as a relational dynamic process thereby affecting a switch from everyday language to a different kind of language that brings about the body's attunement into a way of perceiving, feeling, sensing and knowing as a system of affects. In other words, through Psychological Gesture, *situatedness* in imagination implies taking the actor's tactile body image along and inhabiting it in the imagined scene of the other, the character. This can be

understood as an interactive process in which the actor intercorporeally joins in with the other, the character, and is him/herself simultaneously displaced. So both actor and character get involved in a process of shared displacement of tactile body images. As a result, the creation of the condition of harmony and agreement between the actor perceiving and the character being perceived emerges.

The state of being a *situated* self is an 'optimal' state of affecting and being affected that is a primordial condition where the actor's body is always already engaged with otherness. The Psychological Gesture engages this state of relationality suggesting that is an acting process deeply rooted to the ability of the human body to self-relatedness, i.e. to being in touch with one's body and with the world-space (other). This not only shows that the Psychological Gesture is an acting process that includes the invisible, but also that it has its roots in archetypal psychic structures. The Psychological Gesture involves the actor's intuitive awareness of being in contact with some larger, 'higher self' or higher body, as Michael Chekhov claimed, where there is a felt sense of being part of a 'cosmic' body or energy. In other words, the Psychological Gesture enables the actor to become aware of interdependency: the ability to connect to other bodies and selves that can be defined in terms of an affective capacity directed beyond the physical limits of the body. Interdependency denotes relationality. It refers to the idea that affect and consciousness cannot be separated. The Psychological Gesture involves relationality i.e., relational or affective consciousness.

The thesis examines Psychological Gesture as a phenomenological relational or affective structure. It proposes a re-thinking of it inspired by Nishida's "action-intuition", Merleau-Ponty's *chiasm* and "flesh", and Nietzsche's Dionysian *ecstasy* or "self-overcoming", as phenomenological forms that indicate affective relations. The actor's body is being affected by the relations that are articulated in the perceptual field of living experience while at the same time the actor's perceptual field and the things in the world are being modified through this affection. The Psychological Gesture can be described as a body schema body

image *Gestalt* structure that makes possible and advances this affection through the act of reflection (mirroring process).

Reflection here is not just reflecting on experience. It is felt as an immersive experience. Reflection itself is experienced as an 'auto-affection effect that once attests and occludes hetero-affection'¹. In that sense Psychological Gesture establishes a fundamental relational ontology: the actor's affective consciousness. In this way the actor's body seems to "resonate with the energies"² of the self, the other bodies and the things in the world. Affective consciousness enables the actor to 'see', to feel, to perceive, to know "from the viewpoint point of many and with purely personal eyes"³. In this way the actor can become consciously aware of the sameness and difference within one's own body and self. To be aware of the differences between experiencing an ego (body-me) and a non-ego (body-not-me) body is to realize 'alterity as inseparable from the sphere of an ego-self'⁴. The actor by being at once a subject-body and an object-body indicates that is consciously aware of alterity and eventually can describe with detailed precision and clarity the explicit as well as the implicit part of this experience.

We can say that, after my analysis the Psychological Gesture advances affective consciousness. It activates multiple levels of awareness that are employed in the archetypal form of the "bright" and "dark consciousness" or in the Apollonian dreaming and Dionysian ecstasy. These modes of awareness are expressed in movement-gesture (PG), breath, sound and rhythm and involve the 'invisible', the 'unseen'. In this thesis the 'invisible' has been taken that describes the phenomenological primordial pattern of an archetypal structure: the 'living-lived', feeling-felt' or 'affecting-affected' body.

¹ Marratto, L. Scott, *The Intercorporeal Self Merleau-Ponty on Subjectivity*, 2012: 147; State University of New York Press, Albany.

² Graham Parkes, 'Nietzsche, Panpsychism and Pure Experience: An East-Asian Contemplative Perspective' in *Nietzsche and Phenomenology* (ed) Andrea Rehberg 2011:92.

³ Nietzsche in Graham Parkes 'Nietzsche, Panpsychism and Pure Experience: An East-Asian Contemplative Perspective' in *Nietzsche and Phenomenology* (ed) Andrea Rehberg 2011: 91.

⁴ F. J. Varela, 'Present Time Consciousness', in F. J. Varela and J. Shear (eds), *The View From Within: First Person Approaches to the Study of Consciousness* (UK, Imprint Academic, 2000), p. 132.

The concept of the invisible (body or presence) in the actor's performance is a non-physical dimension that seems to be closely linked to what is 'optimal' awareness in the creative process. What is considered 'optimal' mode of being/doing in Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche, becomes the lens to analyze a condition of hyper-awareness of the body in Michael Chekhov's acting processes. This condition of hyper-awareness presupposes a total psychophysical engagement of the actor's self and the other (character), body and mind, in the activity of gesturing (PG) where the surrounding space becomes one with the actor's body. This creates distance between the actor and what is acted. This distance and how it is incorporated in the body helps the actor transcend dualities of: the body and mind, the inner and outer, the self and other (character), the fictive and real.

This phenomenological approach is an 'optimal' mode of awareness in acting in the sense that can transport the actor's body and self into the state of an "abyss" (after Nishida Chapter 2 and Nietzsche Chapter 4) and/or "wild being" of the "brute world" (after Merleau-Ponty Chapter 3). Unconscious processes seem to penetrate in the depths of the actor's everyday consciousness and enable the actor's body and mind to engage with symbolic and archetypal structures. The actor's actions seem to 'stem not from the narrow confines of [Nietzsche's] the 'small self' [or Michael Chekhov's] 'low self', but from the forces of heaven and earth as they operate through the well trained body'⁵.

The thesis explores the creative effect of the Psychological Gesture as a multisensory mechanism on the actor's body and mind. This mechanism allows the actor to engage with a sensory interface with the environment and enables the actor to enter a new imaginary virtual space of performative knowledge that has experiential, phenomenological and affective characteristics. As a result, the body of the actor is fully immersive in an invisible virtual field of activity and is re-contextualized. The actor exists in a fluid realm of three dimensional space that embraces three overlapping consciousnesses:

⁵ Graham Parkes, 'Nietzsche, Panpsychism and Pure Experience: An East-Asian Contemplative Perspective' in *Nietzsche and Phenomenology* (ed) Andrea Rehberg 2011: 97.

- a) the actor's self (body-me), the everyday self (the "bright" Apollonian consciousness)
- b) the actor's body as not me, the other the 'character' (body-not-me), (the "dark" Dionysian consciousness)
- c) the technical self (technical denotes the skillful actor that corrects, adjusts and re-adjusts oneself always in relation to the needs of the moment and the circumstances of the performance score)

This overlapping of three different modes of consciousness is the affirmation of the actor's creative act in Michael Chekhov's work. It is characterized by the skillful ability to place the body into a special form or posture. The term 'optimal' denotes a heightened perceptual experience that is inextricably linked to focus, concentration and attention, and appears to occur always in relation to the actor's intertwining of these three modes of consciousness. The actor's body through Psychological Gesture becomes a fluid flowing activity in which forms and bodies appear and disappear. Yuasa explains that this is 'essentially the realization and destruction of form'⁶. The actor's body engaged in a relational association with the invisible in practical terms is operating in the form of activity-passivity.

Through Psychological Gesture to enter a state of passivity (the action of receiving) would be the inner gestures of the actor liberate an interior space wherein intuition entails acting and acting entails intuition. This interior space, that is located '*in-between*' two opposing bodies energies or drives (me and the *other*, the actor and the character), involves experiencing the body by conscious and unconscious knowledge, reflective and pre-reflective awareness at the same time. The 'optimal' state of this activity is an oscillation between multiple layers of consciousness that conditions the body of the actor as "acting-intuition"/"*basho*" (Nishida Chapter 2), as "flesh"/"chiasm" (Merleau-Ponty Chapter 3) and as "Dionysian body"/"ecstasy" (Nietzsche Chapter 4).

The fundamental structure of Psychological Gesture is the *in-betweenness* of an indivisible whole, a *Gestalt*, where the distinction between foreground and background disappears. This distinction refers to the knower and the thing known, to the doer and what is done. What the actor's body perceives and feels

cannot be distinguished from perceiving and feeling itself. *In-betweenness* can make possible the actor's intuitive mode of cognition.

In practicing Psychological Gesture, the experience is being *in-between* two opposing relations, two opposing gestures, that of expansion and contraction, which are structured in cyclical patterns. Expansion and contraction fundamentally integrate what Yuasa refers to 'the latent harmony between microcosm and macrocosm'⁶. *In-betweenness* is the 'middle term' or space. The third element between two opposing forces, impulses or drives, that structure the actor's inner and outer body and space and facilitate the awareness of inter-connectedness and attunement to a dynamic interplay of multiple levels of consciousnesses. *In-betweenness* is an 'optimal' state where the actor can 'take in' something *other* than oneself. This might be conceived as an expression of a 'cosmic energy' or body that is a connection which is of a 'spiritual' (non-everyday) dimension and is inextricable linked to the ability to perceive the act of breath.

In this study 'spirituality' is rather a psychophysical condition where the actor is aware of or is present to one's breath. In other words, the actor is able to perceive and attend to the unconscious breath of the Psychological Gesture (the character) and is brought to awareness without the actor interfering with it. The actor's breath of the Psychological Gesture can come and go on its own while the actor is able to respond every moment to all internal and external stimulus of the action of the performance score. The balancing function of the breath of the Psychological Gesture is what makes possible '*in-betweenness*', what connects the actor's self, the internal space, with the outer world, the other (character).

From the experience of my own practice I understand that the Psychological Gesture methodologically encapsulates the body of the actor as a microcosm which reflects internally the external macrocosm. This phenomenological structure relies on the archetypal principles of microcosm and macrocosm that

⁶ Yuasa, Yasuo, (1993) *The Body, Self-Cultivation, and Ki-Energy*, trans. by Nagatomo Shigenori and Hull, Monte, Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, p. 186

are actualized through Michael Chekhov's archetypal gestures of contraction and expansion. This creates a particular kind of engagement within the actor. The Psychological Gesture is a pre-performative psychophysical methodology that does not begin with the actor's psychology, but with the actor's gestures, position of the body and its parts, and the 'enlivening quality of the actor's breath as energy (*prana-vayu, qi/ki*),⁷ that engages the senses, body memory, mind, and nervous system, reflection, and thus create affective states.

In this study I have examined from the perspective of a director the complexities of the Psychological Gesture as an embodied-embedded psycho physical tool that is a form of corporeal reflection.

The thesis has articulated at length how the effective application of this technique (PG) can facilitate the actor's transcendence of the limitations of perceptive consciousness thereby helping 'solve' the complex and difficult problems in the relationship between the "psycho" and the "physical," the "internal" and the "external", the "invisible" and the "actual" in the acting processes. The ability to overcome these obstacles enhances the ability to perceive the source of creative action something which is beyond conscious awareness. To be able to go beyond the range of the physical senses implies the actor is able to overcome dualisms. The Psychological Gesture, by being deeply established in the 'immediate, pre-representational and pre-discursive experience of the world' where the actor's 'cognitive activity seems to be rooted'⁸ help the actor become aware of a line of communication between the reflective and pre-reflective, the visible and invisible, the conscious and unconscious body. The actor as a creative artist is able to know, feel, and understand the world and the other (character) intuitively. Intuition appears to transform and enact the actor's self and the world, the other (character) in one single unfolding gesture (PG) that contains both. In this manner both the actor's self its body and the things in the world, the environment, the other (character) are formed mutually and are reflected in one another. This perspective can help

⁷ Zarrilli, *Psychophysical Acting*, 2009: 21.

⁸ Petitmengin, 'The Intuitive Experience', p. 77.

one see how intuition is being formed. How intuition may grow in one's own inner awareness. By being fully engaged and present in the moment, in the action whereby one's energy focus and awareness are fully deployed, the actor is able to build the link between technique inspiration and creativity.

The outcomes of this phenomenological analysis have informed and enriched my understanding of the enormous value of the role of imagination. How imagination enables the actor to delve into one's own corporeality and discover the intangible means of expression in the creative process.

From my findings the implications of the Psychological Gesture have seeded the potential for a practical and critical understanding of Post-dramatic performance techniques and have offered an articulation of the actor's work beyond representation. In order to approach and stage a Post-dramatic performance wherein character, plot and dialogue are called into question the use of Michael Chekhov's acting processes wherein the body is the centre of attention not as a carrier of meaning, but through psychophysicality and gesture, appears practical and effective. As Yana Meerzon points out, Michael Chekhov's work can create the 'basis of a theatrical composition that can find echo in Post-dramatic productions'⁹. The discoveries that have been made within my practice as research context will be further examined and developed in the future. More specifically, I intend to further explore Michael Chekhov's practices as a tool for solving particular problems dealing with the demands of specific dramaturgies and the requirements of acting in Post-dramatic theatre/texts.

I also expect to explore ancient Greek Tragedy as an art form that shares affinities with Post-dramatic theatre. Both genres can be examined as paradigms of theatre practice in which the actor enters a non-naturalistic space in the sense that the form of the actor's work is not subjugated to the expectation of conventional narrative. Post-dramatic and ancient Greek

⁹ Meerzon, 'Staging the spectator in Michael Chekhov's acting theory', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge, 2015b.), pp. 125.

Tragedy texts require from the actor to work on very long monologues which consist of several pages of column of words or fragments as autonomous entities of matter and time. These texts can be creatively explored through Michael Chekhov's acting processes so that the actor him/herself can enter in an act of reflection as part of the process of playing. Here 'play', as Zarrilli explains, is 'the potential space in-between that engages the actor dialectically and prevents the ego-I self from having a controlling effect'¹⁰.

My research has explored why and how the actor's attention is directed to the physicality and the images of the text, whereas ideas, interpretation and meaning can come later from having experienced the image-gesture (PG). What can be further explored is why the embodied-embedded acting processes, where the body is perceived, related and re-invented as the primary site of being and knowing, is possible to breathe new possibilities into Post-dramatic and non-Post dramatic texts in performance. The emphasis here is that the creative process supports the body of experience as it is lived in a deepening awareness without reinforcing the a-historical, rationalized experience of disembodied subjectivism of the conventional notions of what it means to be a 'character'.

The deep interconnectedness between textual form and performative form and the convergence regarding the hidden corporeality of language and thought can be further explored. Michael Chekhov's methodologies can also be utilized to investigate the mythic resonances and associations, the archetypal psychic structures in Post-dramatic and ancient Greek Tragedy genres.

Other areas for further research could be language as a conceptual system that is metaphorically structured and grounded in bodily experience. The exploration of the openness of the metaphorical language can shed light in the application of the 'physiological thinking'¹¹ and the studio-based metaphors in the embodiment of consciousness in psychophysical actor trainings and

¹⁰ P. Zarrilli, *Psychophysical Acting*, 2009, p.99.

¹¹ A. Rehberg, 'Nietzsche and Merleau-Ponty: Body, Physiology, Flesh', in *Nietzsche and Phenomenology*, 2011, p.142.

performance. To concentrate on the language and set of metaphors practitioners, particularly from Post-dramatic theatre, intentionally employ to assist the actor in developing the ability to inhabit an 'attentive awareness' in and through the body/mind, as well as, track similarities and see how context changes what those metaphors appear to mean to actors.

This study represents a moment in my on-going process and development as a director and acting teacher and has opened up a new space that lies in-between philosophy (theory) and acting processes. The research has allowed me to develop and explore new ideas, connections and perspectives in actor training and performance that a different methodological approach would not have facilitated to the same extent and depth. I hope the conversation between Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, Nietzsche and Michael Chekhov will contribute to the ongoing developments in acting processes that furthers a phenomenologically complex view of the body/mind in the context of psychophysical training and performance; a conversation and view which has shed light in how meaning(s) and experience(s) arise in the creative process. In that sense, the ideas and the findings of this thesis add to a body knowledge that is an on-going dialogue between performance studies, practice and cognitive sciences and could also be used or applied to another psychophysical acting context .

The phenomenological arguments in this study might be seen as participating in ongoing embodied-embedded acting processes which are always in progress. As Merleau-Ponty writes 'the meaning of what the (actor) artist is going to say *does not exist* anywhere - not in things ... nor in the artist herself'¹².

¹² Merleau-Ponty, *Sense and Non Sense*, 1968: 19.

APPENDIX 1: Literature Review

In the following Appendix section I present briefly the philosophical material I have consulted for the project 'optimal' consciousness. I have divided it up into three sections: section one) Nishida Kitaro section two) Merleau-Ponty, and section three) Nietzsche.

Each section briefly describes the content of the most important primary and secondary material I used for my research in order to create a specific vocabulary that would help me frame the different stages in structuring the concept primordial unity as a manifestation of 'optimal' awareness in performance. What actually constitutes 'optimal' consciousness for the actor in action and how it is manifested.

In the three philosophers I examine primordial unity can be defined as the primary relation that enfolds the human body. The primary relation here is that of bodies of the senses and extends to the world. The body as the centre of perception and the medium of consciousness. In this study the implication of 'optimal' awareness as the manifestation of three modes of consciousness means being attentive to the primordial unity of the human body. To the primary relation that takes care of or attends in detail to the sensory relation between body and world and suggests that the body is an open entity in which the interiority of the body (the inner space/the organs, bones, psyche, flesh) is connected with the exterior world (outer space/things in the world). The three philosophical projects of Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Nietzsche, develop theories of the body that place the primordial unity structure within a worldly body. They develop a dialectic which is a reciprocal exchange within a body, and that of the world, between the sensing and the sensed. The dialectic is a movement which never in reality transcends the bodied world. Transcendence is a depth of the world into which sensing self or being is drawn.

The project of each philosopher holds the potential for dealing with a relational and deeply sensual account of a body/mind connection in and with the world. The relevance of Nishida's "pure experience" "acting-intuition" "*basho* of absolute nothingness", Merleau-Ponty's "*chiasm*" "intercorporeality" "flesh", and

Nietzsche's "Apollonian and Dionysian" body, to 'optimal' awareness is that all appeal to a consciousness of oneself as subject that is conscious of oneself as a body behaving in a world which transcends the self. In other words, they all appeal to the potential for placing the body of the (actor's) self in relation with other worlds. Therefore the work of each philosopher can enable the development of a relational consciousness beyond the dichotomies of mind and body, self and other, reason and emotion, subject and body, inner and outer, appearance and reality, visible and invisible.

Section 1: Material on Nishida Kitaro

Primary sources

An Inquiry into the Good or A Study of Good (1911/1990). Nishida's first philosophical essay introduces "pure experience" as 'optimal' consciousness. "Pure experience" is that which underlies the subject-object relation, that there is no differentiation between subject and object. It is described as the sense of knowing the "facts as they are".

Intelligibility and the Philosophy of Nothingness Three Philosophical Essays (1958/1966) consists of three essays. In the first essay, "The Intelligible World", Nishida discusses why Kant, Fichte, Hegel, among others, fail to reach the standard of Zen, to transcend knowledge and arrive at absolute nothingness. The second essay, "Goethe's Metaphysical Background", is more about ideas and/or aesthetics that can be found in Goethe who Nishida greatly admired. The reason for Nishida's admiration was that Goethe's writing manifests an 'optimal' state of being and doing. In his work "there is no inward and outward; everything is as it is; it comes from where there is nothing, and goes where there is nothing"¹. The third essay, "The Unity of Opposites", discusses the relationship of God and human beings as the relationship of absolute unity and of the opposites of the one and the many. For Nishida, the principle of unity of the one and the many demonstrates a mode of 'optimal' consciousness.

¹Nishida "The Intelligible World", in *Intelligibility and the Philosophy of Nothingness Three Philosophical Essays*, (Honolulu: East-West Centre Press, 1958/1966), p. 157.

Fundamental Problems of Philosophy (1934/1970) consists of two volumes that form one piece of work. *The World of Action* (1933) and *The Dialectical World* (1934). Here Nishida clarifies the fundamental structure of his thought. The standpoint of personal action presupposes the socio-historical world in which the I-Thou relation takes place. Nishida's argues that the Cartesian "I think therefore I am" should be reassessed by "I act, therefore I am" with the implied dimensions of the socio-historical world in which action takes place (*basho*). Nishida exhibits a distinctive characteristic of his thought which is his sustained dialogue with Western philosophy especially with contemporary phenomenology to support his argument for 'optimal' consciousness.

In *Art and Morality* (1923/1973) Nishida tackles the connection between art and its moral character and the relevance of aesthetics for his idea of active intuition. Nishida establishes a correlation of the truth, the beautiful and the good. He sees art and morality as the self-expression of the *absolute will*. *Absolute will* here is of the same indispensable force at work in the foundations of consciousness. The will is a metaphysical principle and a unifier of consciousness characteristic of an 'optimal' state of being and doing. The *absolute will* is the unifier of subject and object and the I/self finds itself in the context of action.

In *Intuition and Reflection in Self-Consciousness* (1987) Nishida explicates self-awareness as an 'optimal' form of being and doing in which reflection and immediate experience or intuition are unified; it is the form that reflects itself within itself and gives rise to differently experienced systems such as body/mind and spirit and to worlds such as religion and art. The book is the translation of the second volume of the *Collected Works of Nishida*. It provides a glimpse into Nishida's effort to reassess Western philosophical concerns in terms of his Japanese/eastern intellectual heritage.

Last Writings: Nothingness and the Religious Worldview (1987) contains Nishida's last essay "The Logic of the Place of Nothingness and the Religious Worldview" which was completed a few months before his death. This essay is a summary of his philosophy of religion and is regarded as the foundational text

of the Kyoto School. It is one of few places in his writings where Nishida draws openly on East Asian Buddhist sources. It also includes a translation of Nishida's seminal "Last Writing" which was written literally two days before his death.

Place and Dialectic: Two Essays by Nishida Kitaro (2012) presents two essays by Nishida that are translated into English for the first time by John Krummel and Shigenori Nagatomo. The two essays included are: "Basho" from 1926/27 and "Logic and Life" from 1936/37. The first essay represents the first methodical articulation of Nishida's philosophical system of *basho* (place) that apparently has been indispensable to understanding Nishida's philosophy. In the second essay Nishida inquires after the pre-logical origin of what we call logic. The second essay provides the development of Nishida's thinking after the initial articulation of his theory of "basho" and shows how Nishida applied his understanding of "basho" to the outer historical world.

Secondary sources

Nishida Kitaro (1991) written by Keiji Nishitani who was a Japanese philosopher of the Kyoto school and a disciple of Nishida Kitaro. Keiji Nishitani studied under Martin Heidegger in Freiburg from 1937-39. The book consists of a series of essays Nishitani wrote about the life and thought of his teacher Nishida. In this book Nishitani examines in depth one of the most important of Nishida's work *An Inquiry into the Good* and the 'optimal' state of "pure experience".

The *Sourcebook for Modern Japanese Philosophy: Selected Documents* (1998) includes a selection of writings from seven philosophers who are associated with the Kyoto School approach to comparative philosophical analysis. The book contains an important lecture that Nishida gave in 1937 and was named "The Historical Body". In this lecture, Nishida mentions that the importance of the body has not been sufficiently considered in philosophy since the 'body is very much involved even when a poet composes a poem'. The idea of the historical world emphasizes an earlier claim of Nishida that consciousness is inseparable from all the things in the world. Consciousness is inseparable from the concrete everyday space in which we leave as embodied, encultured beings

immersed in the histories that we make and makes us. The book also includes two important writings, Nishida's "The World as Identity of Absolute Contradiction", and, his "Fundamental Principles of New World Order".

Philosophers of Nothingness: An Essay on the Kyoto School (2001) is a comprehensive comparative in-depth examination that addresses the philosophy of three scholars (one of which is Nishida Kitaro) who constitute what has come to be known as the Kyoto school. The book analyses and develops the complicated cross-cultural interface between European continental philosophy, particularly phenomenology, and the works of the three Kyoto school philosophers whose unifying element is Buddhism. The "Kyoto School" term is presented as a consistent school of thought in its own right that engages with the distinctly Zen Buddhist emphasis on the experiential components of philosophical practice and its subsequent moral behaviour/consequent.

Beyond Personal Identity: Dogen, Nishida, and a Phenomenology of No Self (2002). In this book, Gereon Kopf undertakes a phenomenological journey on a comparative study of the philosophy of Dogen and Nishida. The book is an analytical, hermeneutical exploration of the term "the self". As the title indicates the intention of the author is to elucidate a new paradigm of personal identity based on a Buddhist notion of no-self. The main theme of this comparative study is the paradox that one by going beyond personal identity is returning to the personal identity. Kopf's approach is a phenomenology of no-self. Kopf's focus centres on the question: how it is possible to talk about the notion of self in the face of a theory of selflessness.

Zen and Philosophy: An Intellectual Biography of Nishida Kitaro (2002). This is an illuminating study of the life and work of Nishida. Michiko Yusa arranges the account of Nishida's intellectual biography chronologically. The very interesting about this book is that Yusa locates Nishida's key concepts and developments of his philosophy in the narrative of Nishida's life. The prevailing character, the thread that combines the material throughout into a whole is the role of Zen in Nishida's life. Nevertheless Yusa is very careful with the idea of mixing Nishida's philosophical ideas and his personal life. There is an original

investigating work by Yusa that corrects numerous errors that have been written about Nishida's writing, political ideas and philosophy. Scattered throughout Yusa's thorough narrative of Nishida's life and thought is a selection of Nishida's own essays, letters, diaries, and short presentations newly translated in English. The book has been a treasure house of information for my research, for someone who is interested in Nishida's life and ideas.

The Logic of Nothingness: A Study of Nishida Kitaro (2005) by Robert J. Wargo describes the middle period of Nishida's work (1913-30) which is a key transition in his philosophy. During this period Nishida's focus shifts. He moves from 'pure experience' to the 'basho' or place of absolute nothingness. Wargo analyzes in-depth Nishida's period of "basho". The book also includes an appendix with Wargo's translation of Nishida's 'General Summary' (The System of Self-consciousness of the Universal).

Overcoming Modernity: Synchronicity and Image Thinking (2008) contains the last writings of the prominent Japanese scholar Yuasa Yasuo. Yuasa explores a wide range of East Asian and Western thought including the relationships between language, being, logic and psychology, Yung's concept of synchronicity, mind and body, among others. The book examines the engagement of an alternative to the seventeenth and eighteenth scientific worldview. As a result Yuasa offers a new mode of thinking, a new paradigm which he calls "image thinking" which incorporates image experience that involves space-and-time and body-and-mind integration.

Section 2: Material on Merleau-Ponty

Primary Sources

In *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945) Merleau-Ponty discusses the essence of perception and consciousness. Merleau-Ponty investigates consciousness as a process that includes sensing as well as reasoning. As a conception of the human subject which is opposed to the problematic and too abstract conceptions of the human being in the philosophy of his time. Merleau-Ponty attacks the two opposite theories of perception (empiricism and intellectualism)

as incapable of explaining how the nature of consciousness determines our perceptions. He introduces a theory of phenomenology as a method of describing the nature of our perceptual contact with the world that consists in *relearning* to look at the world. The argument is that perception can not be distinguished from awareness of one's own body and the purposes for which one uses the world by means of their bodies. *Phenomenology of Perception* determines the concepts of objects, of space and time by what one wants and is able to do and perform certain tasks in the world. The idea is that one's body cannot be separated from the experience of one's own body. *Phenomenology of Perception* analyses the body according to embodied intentionality or motor intentionality in which the body's fundamental form operates in a manner corresponding to an "I can" that replaces the mechanical reaction to stimulus and Descartes' "I think, therefore I am".

Sense and Non-Sense (written between 1945-47) is a collection of essays that summarize Merleau-Ponty's previous insights and provide an introduction to his philosophical thought. The collection of essays manifest Merleau-Ponty's ideas in aesthetics, ethics, politics, and human sciences. One of the most important essays in this collection is "Cezanne's Doubt". The fullness and density of Cezanne's painting, the structure and balance of a picture where sight was also touch is an attempt to get a lived perspective which presupposes that the work of art requires embodiment. Cezanne describes an 'optimal' state of being and doing in which the artist embodies in sensations that organize the work of art in a way that 'the landscape thinks itself in the artist, and the artist is its consciousness.'²

Signs (1964) includes the following essays that are closely related to my research. These are: "Indirect Language and the Voices of Silence", "Everywhere and Nowhere", "Husserl and the Phenomenology of Language», and the "The Philosopher and his Shadow". In *Signs* the main theme is the problem of expression, e.g., the relation of thought to its expression. The

²Merleau-Ponty, *Sense and Non Sense*, translated by H. Dreyfus, (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1964b), p.17.

contingency of expression as a future event which is possible but cannot be predicted. When thought does not exist before the expression is born is a moment of 'optimal' consciousness. When expression and speech is a way of designing meaning(s) from an undivided whole in which 'mind and man never are; they show through in the movement by which the body becomes gesture, language, *oeuvre*, and co-existence truth'³; when activity and thought are made of certain articulations between things said'⁴.

The Primacy of Perception contains three essays relevant to my research of 'optimal' consciousness. "The Primacy of Perception", "The Child's Relations with Others", and "Eye and Mind". The "primacy of perception" is defined by Merleau-Ponty as 'the experience of perception that is our presence at the moment when things, truth, values, are constituted for us, [that] perception is a nascent logos [...] that it summons us to the tasks of knowledge and action'.⁵ In "The Child's Relation to Others" Merleau-Ponty focuses on the idea that knowledge of ourselves and others is given through inter-connectedness or "intercorporeality". The relation between one's own body and that of the other in which 'perceiving the other my body and his are coupled, resulting in a sort of action that pairs them.'⁶ "Eye and Mind" describes 'optimal awareness' as the intertwining of body and world in the creative process. The idea that space and world is not an entity outside of and separate from the artist's body or indeterminable by perception. The artist's body is born out of space/its environment and operates as the centre around which all space expands. An 'optimal' state of awareness as a kind of "mutual visibility" between the artist's body and the world/ space.

In *The Structure of Behaviour* (1965) Merleau-Ponty goes beyond the dualism of mind and nature. The argument is that the behaviour of animals and human beings is a harmonious relationship between the two. Behaviour is not an

³Merleau-Ponty, *Signs*, translated by R.C McCleary,(Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1964c), p.240.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 160.

⁵Merleau-Ponty, *Primacy of Perception*, J.M.Edie (ed.), (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1964a), p. xv.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 118.

account which is a partial connection between stimuli and responses. The idea that behaviour is a global reaction of the body/mind and nature describes an 'optimal' state of being and doing. Merleau-Ponty argues that the principle of this unity which embraces the body/mind and nature as a whole is not attributed to mind. The main issue which is settled in *The Structure of Behaviour* is the notion of the gestalt structure. The movements of the body or each part of the body that seem to take account of all the other parts of the body describes an 'optimal' state of being and doing. The body is always aware of its environment and adapts its behaviour accordingly in playing a specific role in the whole reaction/response for fulfilling a specific task.

The Visible and the Invisible (1968) introduces a radical turn into Merleau-Ponty's ontology. Merleau-Ponty explores here the concept of *reversibility* as a means to overcome dualism. In *The Phenomenology of Perception* "reversibility" is just coming into existence and begins to display signs of its future potential with Merleau-Ponty's characteristic illustration of the alternation of the touch of two hands, of one person, touching one another. In *The Visible and the Invisible* Merleau-Ponty mentions this concept by the name "reversibility" and explores the notion further. Merleau-Ponty reveals vision as reversible so that when I see I know myself not only as a seer (subject), but also as visible, as seen (object). In *The Visible and the Invisible*, the reversibility of perception implies that the world itself is *flesh*. Merleau-Ponty thinks embodied perception as *flesh* and that the world is flesh. *Flesh*, which is the intertwining, the crossing over, is a phenomenon that reveals the presence of a depth and reflection, the "mirroring phenomenon", that is enacted between the two reversible sides. *Flesh* which is the term Merleau-Ponty uses for his new conception of the body is central in *The Visible and the Invisible*. Perception is taken as primary meaning. Its characteristic is that is founded on "reversibility" and/or a *chiasm*. An 'optimal' state of being and doing which combines subjective experience and objective existence.

Secondary sources

M.C. Dillon's *Merleau-Ponty's Ontology* (1988), as well as his three essays, 'Gestalt Theory and Merleau-Ponty's Concept of Intentionality' (1971), 'Merleau-Ponty and the Reversibility Thesis' (1983), 'Merleau-Ponty and the Transcendence of Immanence: Overcoming the Ontology of Consciousness' (1986), are considered classic as far as Merleau-Ponty's thinking is concerned. Dillon's thesis is that Merleau-Ponty's early work to his later philosophy of the "flesh" offers a non-traditional, alternative ontology to dualism in Western philosophy. Dillon claims that the dualisms of body and mind, subject and object, immanence and transcendence, can be overcome when placed within the framework of the worldly embodiment of thought.

In *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty* (1990), by G.A. Johnson and M.B. Smith (editors), the collection of essays explain the meaning of Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of "flesh" and reversibility, some criticising some defending, its relation to alterity and difference. The book contains Claude Lefort's seminal essay 'Flesh and Otherness', Patrick Burke's 'Listening at the Abyss', M.C. Dillon's 'Ecart: Reply to Claude Lefort's Flesh and Otherness', G.B. Madison's 'Flesh as Otherness', among others. The contributors are in a dialogue, each in a way responds to the other.

The Absent Body (1990) by Drew Leder belongs to the post-Merleau-Ponty, post-phenomenological conceptual framework of this study that describe different views on embodiment modes of absence in examining the (actor's) 'optimal' consciousness in performance. Leder was heavily influenced by Merleau-Ponty's ideas on the 'lived body', as presented in his unfinished *The Visible and the Invisible*. Leder's further exploration of bodily absence in our everyday life enhances the presence-absence relation in understanding 'optimal' consciousness.

Merleau-Ponty Vivant (1991) edited by M.C. Dillon consists of eight essays that situate Merleau-Ponty's thought in the last decade of the twentieth century. Edward Casey's "The Element of Voluminousness": Depth and Place Re-examined' touches on theoretical aspects of the body subject in a world of

density and space; Duane Davis' 'Reversible Subjectivity, the Problem of Transcendence and Language' touches on reversible subjectivity that opens up in transcendent language; David Levin's 'Visions of Narcissism: Intersubjectivity and the Reversals of Reflection' discusses intersubjectivity as a means to overcome narcissism and solipsism; G.B Madison's 'Merleau-Ponty's Destruction of Logocentrism' explores ambiguity as a means to define consciousness; Joseph Margolis's 'Phenomenology and Metaphysics: Husserl, Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty' touches on consciousness that is immersed in the world; Jacques Taminiaux's 'Thinker and the Painter' is an analysis of artistic painting as an intertwining of vision and motion.

Emotion, Depth and Flesh: A Study of Sensitive Space. Reflections on Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of Embodiment (1993) focuses on emotional depth. S.L. Cataldi argues that the emotional and perceptual depth involve one within another. Cataldi explores the nature of perceived depth and extends it to the dynamics of emotional experience.

In *Body Images: Embodiment as Intercorporeality* (1999) Gail Weiss claims that the perceiving self/subject is in a constant imminent process of being transformed when interacting with other world(s); that 'the experience of being embodied is never a private affair, but is always already mediated by our continual interaction with other human and non human bodies'⁷.

Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority: Psychic Life and World (1999) edited by Dorothea Olkowski and James Morley explores what its title indicates. That is, the implications of Merleau-Ponty's non dualistic theory of the psychological/interior life and material/exterior world continuum when applied to psychoanalysis, philosophy, the human sciences, health studies. The book is divided into three parts: a) "Interiority" which delineates aspects of interiority as originally connected to exteriority, b) "Gestalt Connections and Disconnections" which focuses on gestalt phenomena and on the idea that interiority - exteriority are inherently mutually suggestive, c) "Exteriority, Life in the World" which

⁷G, Weiss, *Body Images: Embodiment as Intercorporeality*, (New York: Routledge, 1999) p.5.

emphasizes from the perspective of exteriority the way it forms and structures interiority. The collection includes: Laurence Haas' 'Sense and Alterity: Rereading Merleau-Ponty's Reversibility Thesis', Elizabeth Grosz's 'Merleau-Ponty and Irigaray in the Flesh', Nobuo Kazashi's 'James, Merleau-Ponty and Nishida' among others.

Chiasms: Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh (2000) is a collection of essays by Fred Evans and Leonard Lawlor (editors) that contributes to various versions of Merleau-Ponty's "chiasm" and "flesh" by different scholars that has been very useful for my research. The main idea is that because Merleau-Ponty left the book unfinished when he died seems that the notion of "flesh"/"chiasm" needs to be more analysed and developed in different ways. The collection is organized around the central notion of "flesh" and "chiasm" and is divided into three sections: a) "explications of the flesh", "extensions of the flesh", and "limitations of the flesh". Some helpful and related to my research essays are: Françoise Dastur's "World, Flesh, Vision" which claims that the foundational in relation to "flesh"/"chiasm" is that Merleau-Ponty's questions the presuppositions of consciousness and presence from the inside. Renaud Barbaras' "Perception and Movement: The End of the Metaphysical Approach" who claims that Merleau-Ponty conceives subjectivity as self-movement and that perception is movement and movement grounds the transcendence of the world. As well as Edward Casey's "The World at a Glance" that proposes a phenomenology of the glance, that glance engages "glancing off" surfaces.

Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism (2009) is a strong encounter and a highly provoking source of intercultural philosophy that of Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and Buddhist philosophy (such as Dogen and Nishida Kitaro among others). The book consists of thirteen diverse essays that investigate the "third" space in Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of the "flesh" of the world, the "intentional arc", the "chiasm" of visibility, in relation to Buddhist philosophy and practice. Merleau-Ponty's thinking of ambiguous interpenetration and dependent becoming of the self and the world and the Buddhist doctrine of no-self/"dependent co-arising", as well as Nishida's concept of "*basho*", are brought into a dialogue. A link between two seemingly unrelated traditions is explored.

The book is divided into three parts: I) “Body: Self in the Flesh of the World”, II) “Space: Thinking and Being in the Chiasm of Visibility”, III) “The World: Ethics of Emptiness, Ethics of the Flesh”. Gerald Cipriani’s “Merleau-Ponty, Cezanne and the Basho of the Visible”, Shigenori Nagatomo’s “Ki-Energy Underpinning Religion and Ethics”, Bernard Stevens’ “Self in Space Nishida’s Philosophy and Phenomenology of Maurice Merleau-Ponty”, Kim Hyong-hyo’s “Merleau-Pontyan Flesh and its Buddhist Interpretation”, Carl Olson’s “The Human Body as a Boundary Symbol A Comparison of Merleau-Ponty and Dogen”, Yusuo Yuasa’s “Merleau-Ponty’s Theory of the Body and the Doctrine of the Five Skandhas”, David Brubaker’s “Place of Nothingness and the Dimension of Visibility: Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and Huineng”, are just a few among several strong and excellent essays that present Merleau-Ponty’s theory of the body and Buddhist thinking/practice as mutually complementary.

The Being of the Phenomenon: Merleau-Ponty’s Ontology (1991/2004) by Renault Barbara’s is an in-depth analysis of the history and development of Merleau-Ponty’s thinking from *Phenomenology of Perception* to *The Visible and the Invisible* which has been another insightful source in my research.

Intertwinings: Interdisciplinary Encounters with Merleau-Ponty (2008) by Gail Weiss (editor) is an interdisciplinary collection of essays on Merleau-Ponty’s early and late thought on corporeal differences as a source that enriches and inspires one’s encounter with human and non-human other. The collection of essays focuses on the implications of Merleau-Ponty’s thinking on the constitutive intertwinings of inside and outside, self and other, identity and difference. Elizabeth Grosz, Laurence Haas, Gail Weiss, Talia Welsh, are among the collection’s important contributors.

Merleau-Ponty’s Philosophy by Laurence Haas (2008) readdresses phenomenological issues concerning the body, self, other, perception, *ecart*, reversibility, flesh, language, expression, in Merleau-Ponty’s thought. Haas’ analysis claims that to achieve an understanding in living experience the nature of language that reasoning uses in phenomenology is metaphorical, gestural, descriptive. Haas’ discusses ontology in Merleau-Ponty’s *The Visible and the*

Invisible and presents *ecart*, reversibility, and “flesh” as an “artful term” that illustrates the idea or the paradox of “separation in relation”. Haas’ argument that Merleau-Ponty designates ‘the third sense of flesh to be beyond fire, water, air and earth, that flesh is the fifth element and that we might think of it as the “element of experience”, an experience that is at play wherever there are creatures that perceive’⁸ is an illuminating moment in the process of my research which finds seminal connection to Michael Chekhov’s practice of Psychological Gesture as an archetypal structure of an ‘optimal’ consciousness in performance.

The Intercorporeal Self Merleau-Ponty on Subjectivity (2012) by Scott Marrato is a sophisticated study that engages with contemporary research in cognitive science in order to clarify Merleau-Ponty’s philosophy of subjectivity and sensibility. Marrato places Merleau-Ponty’s intercorporeal character of subjectivity within recent studies of embodied, enactive, situated approaches to cognitive discourse. An insightful source for my research on Merleau-Ponty’s accounts of sensation and space, perception as movement, depth in terms of temporality of experience and sensorimotor subjectivity as proposed by Dan Zahavi, Alva Noe, Evan Thompson.

Section 3: Material on Nietzsche

Primary Sources

The Birth of Tragedy is about Nietzsche’s assertion of the function of the Apollonian and the Dionysian impulses/drives in the creative process. For Nietzsche the Apollonian self/artist is supposed to perform the shift from the empirical/everyday standpoint to its non-ordinary transcendental counterpart. The Apollonian and the Dionysian duality are two complementary forces which are bound up and in a continuous development in the creative process. The Apollonian and the Dionysian energies foreshadows a central theme in Nietzsche’s later work that of ‘Will to Power’. I examine ‘Will to Power’ in order

⁸L.Haas, *Merleau-Ponty’s Philosophy*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2008). p. 139-140.

to enrich my analysis of the Apollonian and the Dionysian consciousness. Although Nietzsche's philosophical thought is not systematically organized, and the themes are fragmented throughout, there is a continuity between the activities of each concept in his work.

The Will to Power (1872). The 'Will to Power', the doctrine of 'overcoming', expansion as 'overcoming', the drive of the 'overhuman' is a keystone to Nietzsche's whole philosophy. As a theme is related to the Dionysian consciousness and to the self-assertive creative drive. 'Will to Power' underpins chaos, anarchism, re-evaluation and plurality which can be found in all Nietzsche's writings. The Apollonian and the Dionysian, and the 'Will to Power', which is about perfecting and transcending the self through the possession and exercise of creative power in a sense is a return of the self into a primordial unity/oneness of an 'optimal' mode of consciousness. The 'Will to Power' is to be thought as a plurality and multiplicity of overcomings. It is referred to as a power that is connected with explosive energy and in relation to creativity in the following books: In *Human, All Too Human* (1878), in *Daybreak* (1881), the concept of drive and drives are presented as constituting the bodily self in a productive process of each drive incorporating the other. In *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (1883) the notion of 'will to power' is characterized by overcoming. All other references of this concept in other works is further elaborated. Zarathustra reveals the action of 'Will to Power' as an activity that is dynamic, not static, and in flux. In *Beyond Good and Evil* (1886) Nietzsche deals with how physiological drives achieve to master other drives, e.g., that action is a matter of strong and weak wills. Nietzsche deals here with 'psycho-physiological' themes and/or 'naturalistic psychology'. He focuses on 'Will to Power' which is present in the natural world and in primal consciousness. It is present in drives, affects, and emotions. In *The Gay Science* (1882) Nietzsche mentions that the only reality is the reality of our drives and that thinking is merely the relation of the drives to each other. In *The Genealogy of Morals* the metaphors indicate the self's inner struggle. The power of will one applies to one's self to transcend and live beyond conventional old morality. The book is dedicated to Dionysus, the god of all natural processes. In *Ecce Homo* the references to the 'overhuman' bear on aesthetic experience of beauty, which is of reflective character, and to

the material aspect of creating meanings in the creative process in which 'all laws of phrasing are art of gesture' ("Books" 4).

Secondary Sources

In *The Self-Overcoming of Nihilism* (1990) Nishitani Keiji investigates the problem of the self, the underlying theme to overcome Nihilism on the ground of 'absolute nothingness' is examined here as a trans-cultural phenomenon. In chapters three, four and five Nietzsche is examined.

Crossing: Nietzsche and the Space of Tragedy (1991) by John Sallis is a close reading of Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy*, of the complexities of the Apollonian and the Dionysian duality and of the crossing of these two art impulses/drives in tragedy. Sallis describes the nature of the union of the Apollonian and the Dionysian in tragedy as a kind of dance over an abyss that represents the double bind of individuation and nothingness.

Nietzsche and Asian Thought (1991) edited by Graham Parkes is a volume of thirteen comparative essays which address for the first time analogies to Asian thought in Nietzsche's philosophy. It is a discussion on the connection of Nietzsche's ideas to Indian, Chinese, and Japanese philosophy.

In *Composing the Soul: Reaches of Nietzsche's Psychology* (1994) Graham Parkes gives an account of Nietzsche's life and ideas. Of the influences of Goethe, Byron, and Emerson on Nietzsche's life and thought. Parkes also examines the development of Nietzsche's psychological ideas in terms of imagery that were inspired by the dialogues of Plato and Nietzsche's own spiritual/mystical experience of nature and that of the soul as composed of multiple "drives" or "persons" within the psyche. There is a section on the Apollonian and the Dionysian drives.

Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle (1969/1997) Pierre Klossowski explores the Nietzsche's notion of "eternal return" in order to analyze self-denial, self-refutation, self-consumption, in his thought.

In *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (2002) Deleuze's reading of the "Will to Power" that it is both active and reactive, therefore it instigates a plurality of perspectives and values.

In *Corporeal Generosity: On Giving with Nietzsche, Merleau-Ponty and Levinas* (2002) Rosalyn Diprose explores the social dynamics of affect, power, and giving and elaborates alternative structures of female subjectivity through the 'affective field of the other' [143]. Drawing on the philosophies of Nietzsche, Merleau-Ponty, and Levinas, Diprose's theory challenges the concept of generosity in terms of intercorporeal relations as an openness to others, where the self is given to others.

In *Nietzsche on Language Consciousness and the Body* (2005) Christian Emden discusses Nietzsche's reflections on language, consciousness and the body. Emden traces the development of Nietzsche's ideas and places his writings within a wider historical context. He evaluates the contribution of Nietzsche's ideas within a frame of what he calls "anthropology of knowledge" and/or within the works on the same subjects by writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Emden's research does not rely only on Nietzsche's writings, but also on his sources, reading habits, things that shaped Nietzsche's intellectual environment or 'intellectual history'.

In *Nietzsche and Embodiment: Discerning Bodies and Non-Dualism* (2006), Kristen Brown draws from Nietzsche's philosophy for challenging traditional dualisms in the West thought and for describing the interdependence of body and mind, e.g., the dynamic relation between the two that seems to open new possibilities, new understandings for the self. There is a whole chapter on Nietzsche, metaphor, and body.

Nietzsche and Zen: Self Overcoming Without a Self by Andre van der Braak (2011) is a study on Nietzsche and Zen that is situated within the field of comparative studies and cross-cultural hermeneutical approach. Among the Buddhist Zen tradition thinkers are Nishitani, Dogen, Linji, Nagarjuna. Deer Braak discusses Nietzsche's thought as a philosophy of continuous self-

overcoming by analyzing Nietzsche's relationship to Buddhism. Nietzsche's methods of self-overcoming are compared to Dogen's sitting meditation practice (zazen) and Dogen's notion of forgetting the self.

In *Nietzsche and Phenomenology* (2011) edited by Andrea Rehberg, the ten papers in this collection discuss the practice of philosophical investigation associated with Nietzsche and phenomenology. The method of investigation is toward the ways in which Nietzsche's thought and phenomenology come together, although from different directions, and whether they are separate depending on the perspective, from which point of view it has been taken. The volume contains two parts: a) "Thematic Approaches" and b) "Nietzsche among the Philosophers", (this includes Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty and Derrida). It contains a chapter on "Nietzsche and Merleau-Ponty, Body, Physiology and Flesh".

Nietzsche and Phenomenology: Power, Life, Subjectivity, (2013), edited by Elodie Bloubil and Christine Daigle, is a collection of fifteen essays written by international group of scholars. Consciousness, intentionality, and the body in the light of phenomenological methods in Nietzsche, as well as, the inter-connections between Nietzsche and phenomenology/ies is examined. Three main parts consist this volume: a) "Life and Intentionality", b) "Power and Expression", c) "Subjectivity in the World". The volume contains a chapter on Nietzsche and Merleau-Ponty "Art, Sacred Life and Phenomenology of Flesh" by Galen A. Johnson.

APPENDIX 2: Michael Chekhov's Biography

Michael Chekhov (Mikhail Alexandrovich formal Russian name), nicknamed Misha, was born in 1891 in St.Petersberg and died in 1955 in Los Angeles. Michael Chekhov grew up in a middle class home. He was a nephew of Anton Chekhov. His father Alexander was the oldest brother of the famed Russian playwright. Michael Chekhov's father was a broadly educated man a journalist and a sort of unconventional philosopher who was hopelessly addicted to alcohol throughout his life. His father was a very powerful and influential figure who pervaded Michael Chekhov's life with fear admiration and respect. When he was thirty six he wrote in his autobiography *The Path of the Actor*.

I was afraid of my father and I didn't dare contradict him ... What terrified me was the power of his eyes and his loud voice ... But it wasn't only fear that I felt for my father; I also respected and even revered him ... he would expound all manner of philosophical doctrines to me in a remarkably engaging and accessible way to me ...I would sit for hours beside my father, listening to what he was saying ... He inculcated in me a love of knowledge¹.

Michael Chekhov's mother Natalya on the other hand was his best friend. Mother and son shared a powerful inner connection and love, a very special relationship and communication, which was beyond words and lasted until her death when Michael Chekhov was twenty eight. He writes,

From very early childhood ... I had one friend who never failed me- my mother ... I had her undivided love. I had no secrets from my mother. I brought her all my sorrows, joys, successes and failures ... Not one of my roles was prepared without my mother's involvement ... My inner life was so strongly connected with my mother that I had absolutely no need for her to give me any oral

¹M. Chekhov in Andrei Kirillov and Bella Merlin (eds), *The Path of the Actor* (London: Routledge, 2005), pp. 16, 20; The book consists of two parts *The Path of the Actor* and *Life and Encounters*. Both cover Michael Chekhov's earliest career 1925 and 1934 respectively.

exhortations or rules of conduct ... we hardly ever wasted any words on discussing everyday occurrences.²

Michael Chekhov as a child was of a wild and passionate temperament. He frequently engaged himself in a variety of theatre games. In an autobiographical note he writes that as a child he just 'took the first piece of clothing he came across, put it on and felt: *who I am*'³. When he was sixteen (1907) entered the Alexei Suvorin Drama School in St. Petersburg where although the youngest student he did outstandingly well in comic roles. At the age of nineteen (1910) Michael Chekhov reads Darwin, Freud and Kant. His thinking was overtaken by tendencies of pessimism⁴.

At twenty-one (1911) Michael Chekhov auditions for Stanislavsky who takes an interest in him and immediately invites him to join the most 'prestigious Moscow Art Theatre which was then at the peak of its international renown'⁵. When Michael Chekhov joined MAT fell under the direct instruction and guidance of Yevgeny Vakhtangov with whom he became close friends. The 'MAT Studio was established by Stanislavsky in 1912 as a laboratory where he intended to examine new principles of acting with the young actors and to develop his "system"⁶. Michael Chekhov studies at this experimental Studio under Leopold Sulerzhitsky⁷ (Stanislavsky's personal assistant) and was taught by Stanislavsky, Sulerzhitsky, Vakhtangov⁸, Bolaslavsky, and Ouspenskaya⁹.

²M. Chekhov in Andrei Kirillov and Bella Merlin (eds), *The Path of the Actor* (London: Routledge, 2005), pp. 28-30; The book consists of two parts *The Path of the Actor* and *Life and Encounters* and both cover Michael Chekhov's earliest career (1925 and 1934 respectively).

³M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, Gordon, M. (ed.) (New York: Harper Perennial, 1991), p.x.

⁴M. Gordon, 'Michael Chekhov's Life and Work: A Descriptive Chronology', *The Drama Review*, 27.3 (1983), pp. 3-21. Chekhov writes about himself: 'My mysterious and complex inner life became more difficult. Externally, I became coarser and coarser. I begun to drink more and frequently acted when drunk. My relation with women became more coarse and primitive. The worse my behavior became, the more I loved my mother and pitied my father.'

⁵M. Gordon in M. Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, Gordon, M. (ed.) (New York: Harper Perennial, 1991), p.xi.

⁶Kirillov in Andrei Kirillov and Bella Merlin (eds), *The Path of the Actor* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 205.

⁷Leopold Sulerzhitsky (1872-1916) tried many professions in his life; writer, painter, director, and sailor. He was close friend of Lev Tolstoy. He was imprisoned in 1896 for refusing military service, he was a pacifist. 'He had great faith in Stanislavsky's system and helped to teach its principles. He believed in the ideal, moral purity which lay at the heart of human nature, and as the 'system' was concerned with the actor's subconscious, he supposed that acting might provide an opportunity for the ethical improvement of society. For the participants of the First Studio, he was not only teacher, but also a sort of 'spiritual father'. He cultivated a quality of collectivism and a sense of a family.' He became Chekhov's close friend; Kirillov in Andrei Kirillov and Bella Merlin (eds), *The Path of the Actor* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 206.

⁸Evgeny Vakhtangov (1883-1923): Armenian origin and one of the most important members of the MAT. Vakhtangov attempted to combine Stanislavsky's and Meyerhold's work in what was called 'fantastic realism'.

What Michael Chekhov learned at the MAT Studio was discipline, the 'general ethical spirit of the school' and the 'religious devotion to acting and commitment to art'¹⁰. He played significant roles in all the productions of the MAT Studio that established its reputation but he was 'plagued by inner conflict and was unable to engage with as many of the Studio's activities as he wished'¹¹.

Stanislavsky criticized Michael Chekhov for either "having too much fun with the part"¹² or for not following the intentions of the playwright. His usual response to that kind of criticism was that he wanted to go beyond the playwright and the play and to find the true character¹³. Gradually Michael Chekhov's reputation as a talented actor increased immensely and became one of the most popular actors of MAT. Between 1913-1918 he appeared in twelve productions of MAT mostly having a leading role. He was established as an exceptionally talented actor when he was cast as Caleb a toymaker in Charles Dickens *The Cricket on the Heath* (1914) a performance which was highly praised by Stanislavsky as "absolutely brilliant"¹⁴. Between the period 1913-1918 Michael Chekhov became one of the most popular actors of MAT despite the problems with Stanislavsky and other members of the company. Although Stanislavsky's method had been his basic training and developed his skills Michael Chekhov seems that 'turned Stanislavsky's acting training on its head'¹⁵. Polemics with Stanislavsky centred on the expression of artistic creativity and on the concept of "experiencing" the role¹⁶. Michael Chekhov on the other hand was interested in theatrical form. He advocated "dual consciousness" and the concept of the actor observer. Even later Michael Chekhov scarcely mentioned Stanislavsky's

⁹Boleslavsky (1889-1937), Ouspenskaya (1876-1949) immigrated to Europe in 1920 and then on to USA in 1922. They became the main teachers of the Stanislavsky's system at the American Laboratory which played a significant role in the way Stanislavsky was developed in USA.

¹⁰L. Byckling, 'Michael Chekhov as Actor, Teacher and Director in the West', *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, 4 (2002).

¹¹F. Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 9.

¹²M.Gordon in M.Chekhov, *On the Technique of Acting*, Gordon, M. (ed.) (New York: Harper Perennial, 1991), p. xi.

¹³M.Gordon, *ibid.*, p. xii.

¹⁴M.Gordon, 'Michael Chekhov's Life and Work: A Descriptive Chronology', *The Drama Review*, 27.3 (1983), p. 7.

¹⁵M.Gordon, *ibid.*, p. xii.

¹⁶L. Byckling, 'Michael Chekhov as Actor, Teacher and Director in the West', *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, 4 (2002).

name and did not ask his students to read his books either. Overall this controversy between Stanislavsky and Michael Chekhov had a strong influence on the opinion that others had of him during the period he was at the MAT. The prevalent impression was that of 'an imaginary talented actor who is always taking things to extremes'¹⁷.

The Russian Revolution of October 1917 the Bolshevik victory depressed Michael Chekhov¹⁸. His personal difficulties became more intense after this. Russian Revolution had an immense impact not only on Michael Chekhov's life but also on life in Russia and in Europe. It led Michael Chekhov out of his homeland for life and was the reason of his life-exile. Nevertheless Michael Chekhov never refers to the period of revolution although it was one of the most significant moments in world history and had such a strong impact on his own personal life as well. Concerning this matter Franc Chamberlain says that 'we know that he was opposed to violent revolution on the grounds that violence only led to more violence and suffering'¹⁹.

Throughout 1912-1918 things went steadily worst for Michael Chekhov. 'Family deaths, war, fever, revolution, and civil war often undermined his mental equilibrium and ability to act. Even so, the first years after the Bolshevik victory (1918-1919) were especially crucial to Chekhov's spiritual and artistic breakthroughs'²⁰. He suffered from various personal, artistic, spiritual problems and social events. He was susceptible to alcoholism and paranoia. A serious psychiatric disorder that involved delusions and a fear of persecution which he later defined as a period of 'nervous tension'²¹.

¹⁷F. Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 12.

¹⁸The Russian Revolution of October 1917, which had an immense impact not only on life in Russia but also on life in Europe and also led Chekhov out of his homeland for life, that was the reason of his life-exile, is never mentioned anywhere in the things that I have read, in Chekhov's writings. Chamberlain says that 'we know that he was opposed to violent revolution on the grounds that violence only led to more violence and suffering' (2004: 13); but still it is strange that Chekhov nowhere mentions anything concerning the revolution, one of the most significant moments in world history, which after all had such a strong impact on his own personal life.

¹⁹F. Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 13.

²⁰M. Gordon, 'Michael Chekhov's Life and Work: A Descriptive Chronology', *The Drama Review*, 27.3 (1983), p. 8.

²¹M. Chekhov in Andrei Kirillov and Bella Merlin (eds), *The Path of the Actor* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 71.

Michael Chekhov was drinking heavily and unable to give up drinking moved into a deep psychological and personal crisis that had severe effects on his life and work. The death of his father intensified the difficult conditions of his situation. It created obsessive thoughts of suicide and an obsessive fear that he will lose his mother. He also “heard” and “saw” “faraway conversations”²². He could not even go out of his house. He was moving ‘toward a physical and psychological collapse. He was in a vicious circle of oppressive and destructive fantasies and behaviors, especially his excessive drinking’²³. His wife Olga divorced him taken their newborn daughter away. A team of psychiatrists sent by Stanislavsky took care of him with a series of hypnotic treatment. In 1919 Michael Chekhov’s condition improved but begun to have uncontrollable fits of laughter. He begins to read books on Hindu philosophy and yoga to comfort his psychic and mental condition his unhappiness and distress.

Although Stanislavsky had forbidden to provide information or discuss what they did at the First Studio Michael Chekhov wrote “On the Stanislavsky System” an account of their work. It was published in 1919 in a journal and included many ideas and exercises of Michael Chekhov which were ascribed to Stanislavski²⁴. Michael Chekhov taught in a left-wing theatre school and then opened his private ‘Chekhov Studio’ for teaching his own work in his Moscow loft (1918-1922). He taught improvisation and atmosphere that aimed at teaching the sense of creating ‘truth’ and the arousal of the actor’s fantasy. He ‘used exercises based on yoga, techniques of observation, concentration and communication, and applied these to “awaken the life energy” of the actor. In his exercises of communication actors send and receive energy rays, not words’²⁵.

Michael Chekhov’s mother died in 1920 and his personal life collapsed. He was unable to act and ‘on one occasion left the stage in the middle of the

²²M.Gordon, ‘Michael Chekhov’s Life and Work: A Descriptive Chronology’, *The Drama Review*, 27.3 (1983), p. 8.

²³F.Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 13.

²⁴See “Chekhov on Acting” sections on “Concentration” and “Imagination” in M.Gordon, ‘Michael Chekhov’s Life and Work: A Descriptive Chronology’, *The Drama Review*, 27.3 (1983), pp. 46-86.

²⁵L. Byckling, ‘Michael Chekhov as Actor, Teacher and Director in the West’, *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, 4 (2002).

performance'²⁶. After a serious psychological, emotional and spiritual crisis he returned to the theatre. When Vakhtangov died in 1922 Michael Chekhov replaced him as head of the First Studio which became the Second MAT.

In winter 1922 he reads Rudolf Steiner. He finds in a bookshop Steiner's *Knowledge and Its Attainment of the Higher Worlds*. The discovery of Steiner's Spiritual Science and Anthroposophy facilitated to recover from his mental illness and helped him to understand and reconsider things in spiritual terms. Steiner's eurhythmy had a huge influence and gave new impulses on Michael Chekhov's emphasis on creative imagination. The 'unification of science, art, and spiritual knowledge [and] ... how to refine non-verbal acting and develop the harmony of the actor's body'²⁷ were closely related to Michael Chekhov's vision: that the actor should be able to grow both physically and spiritually and acquire an inner life of images that would enrich the creation of their character intuitively. Michael Chekhov met Steiner in Stuttgart and saw him lecture on eurhythmy "the science of visible speech". He followed Steiner to the Netherlands and wanted to become a priest in his Christian Community. A year later (1923) Michael Chekhov begun rehearsing for a "modern" Hamlet with a new technique of acting'²⁸. Michael Chekhov was influenced by Steiner's anthroposophy and begun to explore with the First Studio actors acting exercises that use sound and movement in a new way. He writes: "We silently threw balls to each other while the text of the play was read slowly and loudly to us [...] We learned to achieve in a practical manner the deep connection of movement with words on one hand, and with emotions on the other"²⁹.

When he directed *Hamlet* (1924) his performance of the lead role was seen as 'a parable about Chekhov himself in the world of Soviet society'³⁰. Michael Chekhov's mental and physical improvement was striking. It seemed that he

²⁶F. Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 13.

²⁷L. Byckling, 'Michael Chekhov as Actor, Teacher and Director in the West', *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, 4 (2002).

²⁸M. Gordon, 'Michael Chekhov's Life and Work: A Descriptive Chronology', *The Drama Review*, 27.3 (1983), p.11.

²⁹M. Gordon, *ibid.*, p. 11.

³⁰M. Gordon, *ibid.*, p.11.

changed from “youthful and indifferent” to “dignified, mature and ambitious”³¹. During 1925-1926 he experimented with Steiner’s exercises on movement and speech and begun to experience the incorporation of images technique. He went and met several times the last Russian Elder Monk at the Optina Monastery and discussed with him Steiner and theatre. These meetings brought great spiritual relief to Michael Chekhov.

Because of his different approach to rehearsal methods sixteen actors left the MAT in 1927 and publicly declared that Michael Chekhov was an “idealist”³² and “mystic”³³ artist. Immediately after this the leading Moscow newspaper characterized Michael Chekhov “a sick artist” whose productions were “alien and reactionary”³⁴. He was also accused of mysticism³⁵ by the Soviet and a “sick” actor who would spread corruption³⁶ and was told to eliminate all reference to Steiner’s work. In 1928 Michael Chekhov found himself under threat of imminent arrest because of its anti-Soviet attitude. He abandoned his activities in the second MAT and left Russia.

In 1928 Max Reinhardt³⁷ offered Michael Chekhov a contract to work together. He went to Berlin/Germany with his wife Xenia. His collaboration with Max Reinhardt was not a happy one. Michael Chekhov was displeased because he worked more with his assistant than Reinhardt himself. It was during the rehearsal process of his collaboration with Max Reinhardt that Michael Chekhov started experiencing the separation of actor-character.

After Germany Michael Chekhov went to Paris set up another studio (1931) and hoped he would form his ‘ideal theatre’ but encountered many difficulties on a number of levels. In Paris he had a new collaborator Georgette Boner (Reinhardt’s former student) and did experimental work. They established

³¹M. Gordon, *ibid.*, p. 11.

³²A believer in philosophical idealism holds that material objects do not exist independently of the mind; that the object of external perception in itself or as perceived consists of ideas.

³³Either yoga or Anthroposophy were considered esoteric practices and were seen as obscure and spiritual.

³⁴M. Gordon, ‘Michael Chekhov’s Life and Work: A Descriptive Chronology’, *The Drama Review*, 27.3 (1983), p.11.

³⁵Mysticism is the belief that personal communication or union with the divine is achieved through intuition faith or sudden insight rather than through rational thought.

³⁶F. Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 20.

³⁷Max Reinhart (1873-1943) was Austrian director who was famous for huge theatrical spectacles.

together the Theatre of Chekhov, Boner & Co but their project on Tolstoy's fairytales was not successful and after a few public performances was closed.

Then he went to independent Latvia and Lithuania (1933) where he worked at the state theatres but there was a fascist revolution and he had to leave. He left and went to Italy and France. Boner followed him. In other words, from 1928 till 1935 Michael Chekhov worked in Germany, Paris, Latvia and Lithuania and meanwhile in 1933 when he was around his forties had his first heart attack. At the time he suffered from his heart attack he was in Riga directing *Parsifal* which was meant to perform on Broadway. Michael Chekhov had to stop acting and with Boner's editorial support begun writing a German book about his acting technique.

In 1934 Michael Chekhov and Boner organized a group of other exiled MAT Russian actors formed a company The Moscow Art Players and toured later in USA. In 1935 Michael Chekhov left Europe/Paris and went in USA. In New York he met Beatrice Straight and Deirdre Hurst du Prey. Both were greatly impressed by Michael Chekhov³⁸. L.C. Black writes that Boner contacted Beatrice Straight (1914-2001)³⁹ and Deirdre Hurts du Prey (1906-2007) who were looking for a director of the Theatre School at Dartington and suggested Michael Chekhov⁴⁰. Beatrice Straight a young actress invited him to create and run a studio for the experimental community in Dartington Hall in Devon England. He accepted the offer and moved to England (October 1935). At this time Michael Chekhov's English were very poor and limited to simple everyday phrases but within a year he could speak the language fluently although it was always obvious that he spoke like a foreigner.

The Dartington Studio opened in 1936. Michael Chekhov begun a series of classes with Beatrice Straight and Deirdre Hurst du Prey in order to train them as his assistants who remained his seminal collaborators until his death.

³⁸L.C. Black, *Mikhail Chekhov as Actor, Director and Teacher*, (Michigan: Ann Arbor UMI Research Press, 1987), p.27.

³⁹Beatrice Straight's mother Dorothy Elmhirst and her step father were the founders of Dartington community school which was devoted to the cultivation of experimental agriculture and small-craft industry as well as to performing arts.

⁴⁰L.C. Black, *Mikhail Chekhov as Actor, Director and Teacher*, (Michigan: Ann Arbor UMI Research Press, 1987), p.27.

Michael Chekhov designed a three year course which included 'the development of concentration and imagination, eurhythmy, voice and speech (drawing on Steiner) and musical composition'⁴¹. The Chekhov Theatre Studio opened with twenty students who were between twenty two- twenty six and came from many different countries all over the world. The Dartington period was one of the happiest periods in Michael Chekhov's life. He was free to develop his ambition to form a group of creative actors and a system of training where students would also 'have some knowledge of scene designing, costume making, production, music, and even writing and they would be experts in theatre'⁴². Dartington was a utopian and stimulating place at this time. The environment and artistic circumstances of the School offered Michael Chekhov the opportunity to be a part of an ideal creative community. Except Michael Chekhov part of this community were: the German choreographer Kurt Jooss (1901-1979), Jooss' former teacher Rudolf Laban exiled from Germany (1879-1958) and the Indian modern choreographer Uday Shankar (1900-1977). The meeting of all these significant artists was very promising. Unfortunately this ideal community of performing arts hardly lasted three years. In 1938 the Dartington School had to close. The political situation in Europe⁴³ was threatening because of imminent war. Michael Chekhov moved to USA. His collaborators and students who could leave followed him.

At Ridgefield in Connecticut Michael Chekhov opened his new studio (1939). By this time his acting system had nearly taken its shape. His training the 'aims of his original programme were more systematic and tangible than those at Dartington Hall'⁴⁴. Most of the components of the Michael Chekhov acting technique were formed and as Chamberlain notes 'it was during this period at Ridgefield that Chekhov begun to formulate his ideas on the "psychological gesture" which had been in the process of gestation since the 1920s'⁴⁵. Michael

⁴¹F.Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 29.

⁴²L. Byckling, 'Michael Chekhov as Actor, Teacher and Director in the West', *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, 4 (2002).

⁴³The Second World War did not start before 1939 but the Germans had occupied Austria, Czechoslovakia and in Spain there was a civil war. The Europe at this time was burning.

⁴⁴L.C. Black, *Mikhail Chekhov as Actor, Director and Teacher*, (Michigan: Ann Arbor UMI Research Press, 1987), p.34.

⁴⁵F.Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 20.

Chekhov's desire was to make work to show it and have it recognized. His productions toured successfully and the studio created a sensation and attracted new students. Michael Chekhov began teaching professional classes in New York in 1941 but in 1942 the studio because of the war draft⁴⁶ had to close. Most of his students and actors were called up for military service. An increase in the financial problems of the school made Michael Chekhov close the Studio. He moved to Los Angeles in 1943.

Michael Chekhov went to Hollywood where he finally settled. Within a year he begun a film career and made nine films. After Ridgefield he did not organize another school or company and he did not direct any production either. He continued to lecture and teach acting classes but never in a studio context again. Many well known Hollywood stars were his students⁴⁷. In 1945 he was nominated for an Oscar for his part in Hitchcock's *Spellbound*⁴⁸. Gordon argues that Michael Chekhov was in a way the 'strongest intellectual counterweight to Lee Strasberg's much criticized method'⁴⁹.

In 1948 Michael Chekhov had his first heart attack an event that interrupted his career in Hollywood. A few years later by 1955 Michael Chekhov's health deteriorated. His condition was very weak and was unable to attend his regular master classes. He recorded his lessons on tape which were later published as *Michael Chekhov on Theatre and the Art of Acting*. In September 1955 Michael Chekhov died of a second heart attack in his home in Beverly Hills/L.A at the age of sixty-four.

⁴⁶The Japanese had attacked the American naval base Pearl Harbor which meant the sudden and rapid entry of the US into the Second World War.

⁴⁷Chamberlain writes something important in relation to this matter: 'We must be careful, however, not to attribute the success of these actors to their encounters with Chekhov. It is too easy to see a list of big names and then make assumptions about the effectiveness of his teaching. Chekhov's aim was art, not fame, and he was very aware that, in Hollywood and the commercial theatre, the two don't always go together' in *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 33.

⁴⁸He gives a finely detailed performance as the old professor, which, although far from the great experimental performances of the 1920s as Erik XIV, Khlestakov and Hamlet, demonstrates his humor and a precise control of physical actions' in F.Chamberlain, *Michael Chekhov*, (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 33.

⁴⁹M. Gordon, 'Introduction' in Chekhov, M., *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, du Prey, D.H. (ed.), (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1985),p. 17.

APPENDIX 3: Kitaro Nishida's Biography

Nishida Kitaro was born in 1870 and was, arguably, the most significant and influential Japanese philosopher of the twentieth century. He grew up in the early years of Meiji era (1868-1912) when Japan was still undergoing the North American and European period and adopted Western ideas and natural sciences and technology were changing in a short time the political, cultural, religious and educational institutions, in other words the traditional Japanese way of life. During this period Nishida was a young boy who experienced the pervading tone of modernization that promoted heavy industry and building up military force as rigid and oppressive. Japanese traditional values and the excess of western modernization was the ideological environment that drove Nishida to be critical of many changes and to search for redefining his national identity as well as reconciling his Japanese heritage with western modern progress. Nishida 'was an idealistic humanist and pushed the horizon of his world beyond the tiny archipelago of Japan'¹. The clash between two different cultures is the unique characteristic of Nishida's thought in his attempt to creatively integrate these two traditions and to synthesize the best of both East and West. For Nishida this was an 'occasion to reflect on such questions as the relationship between cognition and volition, between tradition and globalization, and the nature of history and science'².

Nishida was the founder of what has become known as the Kyoto School. Kyoto School was a creative intellectual movement that tried to develop a synthesis between a neo-Buddhist thought and adherence to the notion of "absolute nothingness" and Hegel's ideas and methods that shaped the school's thinking. When he was sixteen and still in high school, Nishida had an early training in classical Chinese, was familiarized with the Confucian and Daoist literatures, developed writing skills in compositions and poetry in Chinese, learned to read English and German, and was also trained in mathematics that cultivated his analytic and synthesizing ability. At the age of

¹M. Yusa, *Zen and Philosophy: An Intellectual Biography of Nishida Kitaro*, (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002), p. xvii.

²M. Yusa, *ibid.*, p. xvii.

twenty one he was admitted at Tokyo Imperial University and studied Kant, Hegel and Schopenhauer and wrote a thesis on Hume. After graduating in 1894 he married and held teaching positions at several provincial high schools and universities.

A particular intellectual influence was the world famous Daisetz T. Suzuki who was Nishida's childhood friend and encouraged him to embrace the practice of Zen Buddhism when Nishida was still a very young man; Nishida and D.T. Suzuki were classmates at school and remained lifelong friends until Nishida's death. D.T. Suzuki shaped Nishida's understanding of Buddhism. In 1895 urged by him, Nishida's relationship to Buddhism and his practice of Zen meditation began. Nishida continued to train in Zen practice from his late twenties through his thirties. He spent some time training in Zen in Kamakura where D.T. Suzuki was studying. In 1903 Nishida, in his early thirties, undertook *koan* training and passed the Zen *koan* of *mu* (nothing). The practice of *koan*, as Mitchiko Yusa explains, is a "kind of "Zen homework" designed to release the mind from the conventional opposition between subject and object that shattered his arid intellectual desire for secular fame and success [...] and rendered his thinking flexible"³. Nishida was deeply engaged in Buddhism and the intense practice of *zazen* under a Zen master from 1897 to about 1905. Nishida's relation to the somatic practices of Zen was not an easy path for him. It involved the tensions between his intellectuality, the life as a scholar, and the practice of Zen meditation. Nevertheless Yuasa mentions that 'the coming together of Zen Buddhism and philosophy, or Oriental *prajna* and Western *sophia*⁴, may constitute some the essence of the "Nishida mystique"⁵. Zen opened up Nishida spiritually and liberated him as a human being and from the ordinary confines of the ego. Even when Nishida stopped practicing regularly sitting meditation (*zazen*) and his private interviews with a Zen master (*sanzen*) the "Zen seed"⁶, the quest for enlightenment, was always alive. The Zen spirit continued to grow and determined the nature of the style and content of his

³Yusa, *ibid.*, xvii.

⁴*Sophia* is a Greek word and means wisdom.

⁵Yusa, *ibid.*, p. xvii.

⁶Yusa, *ibid.*, p.xvii.

philosophical thought and research. After the appearance of *Inquiry Into the Good* (1911) and as his own philosophy 'came to take shape Nishida gave up Zen meditation, but it still fused into his philosophy and it became a "kind of recourse in the midst of activity" for everyday life'⁷. In his writings he never engages in any kind of textual analysis or exegesis of the Buddhist references he cites. Nishida hardly ever explicitly referred to Zen Buddhism, because he did not want his philosophy to be reduced to a philosophy of "*satori*" that only a few enlightened would be able to understand⁸. Nevertheless Zen Buddhism shaped his thought and was always a point of reference throughout his life⁹.

Nishida was guided by the tension between Zen inspiring thinking and western intellectual thought. This creative antagonism between an impulsive energy and the laws of the universe, that Nishida wanted to follow, tempered his will and culminated in a deeper awareness of a body-mind engagement that united him(self) with the principles of a 'cosmic energy' that shaped his philosophical stance and achievements¹⁰. Nishida died of uremia on June 7th 1945. Four months later the two atomic bombs were dropped on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki bringing the World War Two to an end.

Nishida's work consists of twenty volumes of essays that establish a unique Japanese philosophy involving the fusion of ancient Asian sources (including Zen Buddhism and the thinking of Lao Tsu) with Anglo-European philosophy, something that begun to be introduced to his country with Nishida's writings. He drew from Plato, Aristotle, Leibniz, Kant, Hegel, Fichte, Schiller, Husserl, and many others, as well as from William James and Henry Bergson. In fact, what distinguishes Nishida from his contemporary thinkers and philosophers is not his Zen practice and Buddhism, but his serious engagement with Western thought and thinkers that sharpen his thinking¹¹. Yusa, quoting D.T. Suzuki and Thomas Merton respectively, agrees that to understand Nishida "some

⁷K. Nishitani, *Nishida Kitaro: The Man and his Thought*, translated by Yamamoto Seisaku and James W. Heising, (Berkeley/Oxford: University California Press, 1991), p. 25.

⁸Yusa, *ibid.*, p. xix.

⁹See Feenberg 1999; Krueger, 2006.

¹⁰Nishitani, *ibid.*, 26-27.

¹¹Yusa, *ibid.*, p. xx.

knowledge of Zen might be necessary and some knowledge of existential phenomenology may serve as a preparation as well”¹².

Nishida’s central philosophical concern was the idea of an ultimate context that would encompass the body the self the world itself and the things in the world. The idea of this ultimate context is related to an ‘optimal’ mode of being/doing and consciousness that goes beyond the terms we usually conceptualize the world and everything in it. Nishida’s philosophical work begun with his *An Inquiry into the Good* (1911)¹³. The basic theme is the notion of “pure experience” which is the moment prior to any distinction between experiencing self and experienced object. “Pure experience” is a ‘leading and generative idea’¹⁴ which was developed into a central notion of the body and the self and became a foundation a ‘central thread’¹⁵ of Nishida’s later philosophical system of thought of “acting-intuition” and “absolute nothingness”.

After retiring in 1928 from Kyoto University where Nishida had served as professor of philosophy since 1913, he begun to write more and published many books. During these years Nishida advanced unique concepts¹⁶. Within the context of Nishida’s technical vocabulary, the philosophy of the body as “pure experience” includes the development and replacement of this term to the notions of “acting intuition,” the “dialectical universal,” the “self-identity of absolute contradictories”. This terminology reached its culmination in a system of logic called the “*basho* of absolute nothingness”.

¹² Yusa, *ibid.*, p.xx.

¹³ There are two editions of this book. The first one, *A Study of Good*, was translated by V. H. Viglielmo and was published in Tokyo in 1960, and the second one, *An Inquiry into the Good*, was translated by Masao Abe and Christopher Ives and was published in USA/Yale in 1990. In this study I have used the second edition.

¹⁴ D. Dilworth, ‘The Initial Formations of ‘Pure Experience’ in Nishida Kitaro and William James’, *Monumenta Nipponica*, 24.1/2 (1969), p. 93.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

¹⁶ M. Abe, ‘Introduction’, in K. Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1990), p. xxiii.

APPENDIX 4: Merleau-Ponty Biography

The French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty was born on the west coast of France in the province Rochefort-sur-Mer, Charente-Maritime in 1908. When he was five years old his father was killed in the First World War. After the death of his father which had affected him greatly he became extremely attached to his mother (many years later it was revealed to him that his father was not his biological father, that his father was an adulterous professor). The family moved from the countryside to Paris where he and his sister were raised by his mother. Merleau-Ponty had an unusually happy childhood. His very close and affectionate relation to his mother was a powerful bond that remained until her death in 1953. His mother was a devout Catholic and Merleau-Ponty was raised as a Catholic. Nevertheless during the 1930's, early in his adult life, he became dissatisfied with the established Church, broke with Catholicism and stopped to practice his faith. During his last years he seemed rather an open agnostic but at his funeral a Catholic Mass was said. It has been suggested that probably there had been some kind of reconciliation with the Church prior to his death in May of 1961.

When he was at school he won the "Award of Outstanding Achievement" in philosophy (1923-24) and he was awarded "First Prize in Philosophy" at Louis-Le-Grand (1924-25). In 1930 Merleau-Ponty studied philosophy at the Ecole Normale Supérieure in Paris, where he completed his postgraduate work on the nature of perception and met Jean Paul Sartre, Simone De Beauvoir, Simone Weil and Claude Levi-Strauss. During the period of his student years (1924 - 1930) he attended Husserl's Sorbonne lectures (1929) and George's Gurvitch's courses on German philosophy (1928-1930). The following decade after his graduation and after a year of mandatory military service Merleau-Ponty taught at lycées/French secondary school funded by the state (Beauvais and Chartres and the Ecole Normal). From 1935 until 1940 he was a tutor at the Ecole Normale Supérieure. During this period he attended lectures on Hegel by Alexandre Kojève and lectures on Gestalt psychology by Aron Gurwitsch. His first publications appeared during these years as a series of review essays.

During the Second World War after the Nazi invasion of Poland (1939) Merleau-Ponty joined the army and served as a lieutenant in the infantry for a year. Days before the truce between France and Germany (June 1940) he was wounded in battle. He was discharged from his military service and was awarded for bravery in combat. After several months of convalescence he returned to his teaching in Paris where he remained from 1940 until 1944. In November 1940 Merleau-Ponty married to a woman of a considerable prominence who was a physician and a psychiatrist. The couple was happily married and had one child - a daughter. The relation was not monogamous. For a time Merleau-Ponty had an affair with Sonia Brownell soon to be Sonia Orwell.

During the Nazi occupation Merleau-Ponty was active in the Resistance. In the winter of 1940-1941 through his involvement in the resistance group called Socialisme et Liberte Merleau-Ponty met again his friend from his school days Jean Paul Sartre and the relationship was renewed (the first time was when he was a student at the Ecole Normale). The group published a few issues, but when two of its members were arrested in 1942 it was dissolved. With the completion of his docteur de lettres which was based on two dissertations *The Structure of Behavior* (1942) and *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945) Merleau-Ponty became one of the foremost French philosophers of the period immediately following the Second World War. In 1944-1945 he replaced Sartre who left his position at the Lycee Condorset in Paris. He also became co-editor with Sartre and Beauvoir of a new influential political, literary, and philosophical journal called Les Temps Modernes. Merleau-Ponty served as political editor until 1953. He continuously criticized what he saw Sartre's dualist and Cartesian philosophy as well as Sartre's hard-line Marxism. This eventually played a major factor in the ending of his friendship with Sartre. Merleau-Ponty initially was more Marxist than Sartre, but Sartre's continuing support of the Soviet Union and the political disagreements between Merleau-Ponty and Sartre that came up because of the Korean war was the cause of the break in their relationship in December 1952. Merleau-Ponty distanced himself from Sartre and criticized him for "ultrabolshevism". Beauvoir criticized Merleau-Ponty for misrepresenting Sartre's position. The split between the two men was emotionally painful for both and the relationship of the three former friends was

never healed. Merleau-Ponty resigned his role as a political editor and finally withdrew.

The fall of 1945 when the war was over and Liberation came Merleau-Ponty was appointed to a post in Psychology at the University of Lyon. In 1948 he was promoted to the rank of Professor in the Chair of Psychology. From 1947 to 1949 Merleau-Ponty taught supplementary courses at the Ecole Normale Supérieure. His students included the young Michel Foucault. In early 1949 he received a leave from the University of Lyon for the year and went to Mexico to present a series of lectures at the University of Mexico. Later in 1949 Merleau-Ponty was appointed Professor of Child Psychology and Pedagogy at Sorbonne, the University of Paris. He lectured on child development, phenomenology, psychoanalysis, Gestalt psychology, and anthropology. He remained in this position for three years until 1952 when he was elected for the position of Chair of Philosophy at the Collège de France. The post was considered the most prestigious for a philosopher in France and it was previously filled by Henri Bergson. His intellectual circle during the period at the Collège de France included Lévi-Strauss and Jacques Lacan. Merleau-Ponty was the youngest philosopher ever to hold that position which he retained until his death.

In 1955 on a commission Merleau-Ponty visited several African countries (Tunisia, French Equatorial Africa, the Belgian Congo and Kenya) where he delivered a series of lectures on racism, colonialism, and development. In 1957 he refused to accept induction into the France's Order of the Legion of Honor as a gesture of protest over the inhuman actions of the Fourth Republic including the use of torture during the battle of Algiers. In 1957 on a second commission and motivated by his desire to see the effects of reforms in French policies governing overseas territories he gave a series of lectures in Madagascar, Reunion Island, and Mauritius. In 1960, a collection of essays on art, language, the history of philosophy and politics that covered more than a decade, Merleau-Ponty's last book *The Signs* was published. In 1964 his last essay "Eye and Mind" where Merleau-Ponty discusses the ontological implications of painting was published in the inaugural issue of *Art de France*. In May 1961 Merleau-Ponty collapsed at his desk while he was preparing a lecture on

Descartes' *Optics*. He died of a heart attack in Paris at the age of 53. Many of his courses from the College de France have subsequently been published.

Two unfinished manuscripts of Merleau-Ponty, *The Prose of the World* (1969/1973) and *The Visible and the Invisible* (1968), and numerous working notes (1959-1961) on his late developed ontology, were posthumously published by his former student and friend Claude Lefort. Manuscripts and unpublished notes and papers of Merleau-Ponty were donated to the Bibliotheque Nationale de France by Suzanne Merleau Ponty in 1992 and is available for scholars.

In general a little has been written about the life of Merleau-Ponty. There is no autobiographical material or autobiographical reflections. Merleau-Ponty led a quiet and discreet life. He was a timid person, extremely gentle and polite, with a small circle of few intimate friends. He was an impressive lecturer, a very good teacher, with a genuine interest in his students and in younger people in general.

Merleau-Ponty had a very secure and happy family life with his mother and sister. He 'confided to Sartre that he never got over the incomparable contentment of his childhood, something that Sartre later vividly recounted in "Merleau-Ponty Vivant" in the process of implying that Merleau-Ponty theoretical work was always nostalgically desiring a return to such a pre-reflective state of happiness and innocence'¹. Merleau-Ponty owed his infant happiness to his mother. 'She was the lucid witness of his childhood and because of that, when exile came, she remained its guardian'². Merleau-Ponty described his childhood as incomparably happy and unable to be compared to his adult years which he felt never quite provided the sense of fulfillment he experienced when he was living with his mother and sister in the countryside and outdoors. It appears that his childhood in the countryside was an idyllic period where everything was felt or being with the body. Sensations and corporeal relations underlay all his experiences. It is possible to say that the sense of being surrounded by fields and meadows and also being in relationship with a sensuous extended the

¹R. Diprose, *Merleau-Ponty: Key Concepts*, (London: Routledge, 2014), p. 4.

²J. Steward, (ed.), *The Debate Between Sartre and Merleau-Ponty*, (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1998), p, 609.

boundaries between his body and things and constituted an ambiguous expansive horizon of his world. His bodily engagement was intertwined directly with the life of the sentient body, to inter-corporeal relations with the delights and the challenges of the natural world. In that sense Merleau-Ponty although did not have personal experience of somatic practices this early insight, the engagement and responding to the cycles of the natural seems to have enforced a conceptual refinement that illuminated and shaped his philosophical work on the body. Merleau-Ponty's account of the bodily basis of perception seems to be a craving that meets the fulfilling condition of fully achieving one's potential in the pre-reflective, primordial relationship we have with our bodies which possibly have its roots in his childhood.

APPENDIX 5: Nietzsche's Biography

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche was born on 15 October 1844 in Rocken Germany where his father as a follower of the German protestant theologian Martin Luther (1483-1546) served as a pastor. When Nietzsche was four years old his father died and soon after this painful distressful loss to which Nietzsche refers in his later writings his youngest brother died. Nietzsche spent most of his early life in a household consisting of five women, his mother, his younger sister, his grandmother, and two aunts.

In 1850 the family moved to Naumburg. After attending local schools there, in 1858 Nietzsche at the age of fourteen won a scholarship to Pforta (near Naumberg-Saxony), an elite and one of the leading Protestant boarding schools in Germany. At Pforta Nietzsche received one of the best trainings in the classics. Here Nietzsche had to adjust to a very demanding traditional almost monasterial life regime. He had to rise early, pray, start, studying, break classes for prayer and reading, additional classes, homework, meal, prayer, bed. Within the strictest conditions of daily rhythms Nietzsche received a thorough training in the classics and acquired several life-time friends. Nietzsche had shown already an interest for unknown romantic poets instead for established Prussian poets. In 1861 Nietzsche discovered Holderlin wrote an essay on him¹ and called him his "favorite poet". Nietzsche found with a few friends the literally club Germania. While still at Pforta he attends lectures by Friedrich Ritschl.

In 1864 Nietzsche graduated and went to the University of Bonn to study theology and classical philology. Nietzsche made efforts to take part in the social life of the university, but because as he explains he had to 'accommodate himself to rules and forms he didn't understand'², and there was a quarrel atmosphere between his leading professors, he stayed in Bonn only two semesters. Nietzsche turned to music. Influenced by the German Romantic composer Robert Schumann he wrote compositions.

¹R. Sufranski, *Nietzsche A Philosophical Biography*, translated by S. Frisch (London: Granta Publications 2002), p. 354.

²Nietzsche in Julian Young *Friedrich Nietzsche a Philosophical Biography*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2010), p. 64.

After a while in 1864 Nietzsche moved to Leipzig (Germany) where he pursued classical studies with Friedrich Ritschl. A brilliant and eccentric professor who was obsessed with his subject and was caring for his students. Ritschl was a kind of substitute father. Nietzsche first met Ritschl in the University of Bonn and when Ritschl moved to Leipzig Nietzsche followed him. Ritschl was what Nietzsche considered a dream professor, the opposite of God-professor. As soon as Nietzsche arrived at Leipzig his most important philosophical encounter occurred. Nietzsche discovered in a local bookstore a second hand copy of Arthur Schopenhauer's *The World as Will and Representation*. The incident was of a great importance to Nietzsche. Immediately he was greatly influenced by Schopenhauer's atheistic and turbulent vision of the world and considered himself a "Schopenhauerian". Nietzsche's student years in Leipzig were the happiest in his life. It was also a period of excellent health. Leipzig was a splendid place for culture especially for music. During the Leipzig years Nietzsche had a group of intimate friends and prospered under the tutelage of Ritschl. Nietzsche was the only student who ever published in his journal.

During the Leipzig years Nietzsche attempted to begin to be involved in the social life of the students, but soon realized that his own interests and pursuits in life was a sense of mission that made him an outsider. He felt distanced from what most other students shared. During the Leipzig period his friendship with the composer Richard Wagner begun as well as his lifelong friendship with the classicist Ervin Rohde. Nietzsche read Ralph Emerson. In 1867-1868 Nietzsche did a one year military service in the Naumberg artillery where he learnt to ride and fire cannons. In 1868 Nietzsche had a serious riding accident injured seriously his sternum and took morphine.

Ritschl deeply respected and admired Nietzsche as a person with limitless talents. Nietzsche's early publications in classical philology had hugely impressed his professor. In 1869 Ritschl recommended Nietzsche for a professorship in classical philology in Basel, Switzerland. Nietzsche at the time was only twenty four years old and without a degree. He had not completed his doctoral thesis yet something which was required for the German degree. The University of Leipzig gave Nietzsche his doctoral degree without requiring an

examination on the strength of his published writings. Nietzsche then entered upon a teaching career. He was appointed a professor of classical philology in Basel. During the years in Basel Nietzsche's friendship with Wagner grew, but gradually deteriorated due to Wagner's anti-Semitism, chauvinism, and his increasing exploitation of Christian motifs (*Parsifa*). By 1878 their friendship came to an end.

During his professorship in Basel Nietzsche published *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872) and *Human, All Too Human* (1878). Gradually Nietzsche distanced himself from classical philology and the teachings of Schopenhauer and his interest turned more to the underlying values and ethics of modern Western civilization. Nietzsche's teaching at Basel was interrupted frequently by long periods of sickness and by a period of service as a medical orderly during the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871) where he gathered corpses and wounded soldiers on a battlefield. Nietzsche fell ill. He had contracted diphtheria and dysentery. In 1873 Nietzsche suffered from eye disease and his friend Carl von Gersdorff assisted him in his writings. Nietzsche writes that only when he produces something he feels healthy and well. In 1877 he requested and received a sick leave. The same year the medical examinations showed that his eyes were most certainly the cause of his sufferings and his awful headaches. It was forbidden to him to read and write for several years. Nietzsche's health deteriorated steadily. He suffered from insomnia, physical breakdown, nervous disorder. In 1879 his lectures were cancelled because of his illness. He submitted a letter of resignation. Nietzsche resigned from his post in Basel in 1879 and was granted an annual pension of 3.000 Swiss francs for six years.

In 1878 Nietzsche's nomadic period begun. The following years was a decade (1880-1890) of isolation and creativity. Seriously ill, half blind, and in pain, when he did not stay at his mother in Naumburg, Nietzsche lived a ten year period wandering searching for a friendly climate. He lived in boarding houses in Switzerland, the French Riviera and Italy. During this period Nietzsche lived in seclusion without human contact and with increasing pain from the ruthless progress of his disease which gradually damaged his strong body. In his middle life he suffered almost constantly from head migraines, eyesight problems and

stomach upsets vomiting. Although loneliness and physical pain was the background of his life Nietzsche was very productive. In 1880 Nietzsche wrote that “the pleasure I take in my thirst for knowledge brings me to heights from which I triumph over all torment and despondency³”. In 1881 Nietzsche made his first visit to Sils Maria and his *Daybreak* was published. In 1883 quite ill Nietzsche wrote that he did not know what to do with himself anymore. In the same year Nietzsche breaks away from his family and writes: “I do not like my mother, and hearing my sister’s voice annoys me. I always fell ill when I was with them⁴”.

Nietzsche succeeded in writing one hundred books before his final collapse. He wrote *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* in four volumes (1883-1885), *Beyond Good and Evil* (1886), *The Genealogy of Morals* (1887), *Twilight of the Idols* (1889). In 1887 Nietzsche worked on the fifth book of *Gay Science* and on *The Will to Power*. He read Dostoyevsky. This year Nietzsche became quite ill and wrote that ‘I now have forty-three years behind me and I am just as alone as when I was a child⁵’. In 1888 August Strindberg read *The Case of Wagner* and sent an enthusiastic letter to Nietzsche. Nietzsche wrote that felt that people in public places (theatres, cafes, on the street) treated him with great respect. In 1888 *Ecce Homo* was written but was published in 1903.

In January 1889 Nietzsche collapsed on a street in Turin Italy. He had a mental break down which although when he regained consciousness his sanity had gone it appears that left him an invalid for the rest of his life. Nietzsche begun to send off wild letters to friends and strangers which he signed with the name “Dionysus-the Crucified”. In the last years of his life Nietzsche was in a state of incapacitation that deprived him from normal functioning. Nietzsche lived with his mother till her death in 1897. He was in a semi conscious state sinking even further from the real world until his death. On August 25, 1900 Nietzsche died in a villa as he approached the age of 56. He died apparently of pneumonia in

³R. Sufranski, *Nietzsche A Philosophical Biography*, translated by S. Frisch (London: Granta Publications 2002), p. 364.

⁴R. Sufranski, *Nietzsche A Philosophical Biography*, translated by S. Frisch (London: Granta Publications 2002), p. 354.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 368.

combination with a stroke. The reason of his insanity is still unknown. Overall Nietzsche was afflicted with numerous physical pains, near blindness, feelings of general paralysis and complete blackouts. At the time Nietzsche was at Leipzig the original diagnosis from the doctors in Basel was that he contracted syphilis. In 1865 Nietzsche made an involuntary visit to a brothel so either he contracted the disease while he was a student in a brothel or while he was serving as a hospital attendant during the Franco-Prussian War. Historians attributed the causes of Nietzsche's illness as varied to as syphilis, an inherited brain disease, a tumor and overuse of sedative drugs that undermined his already weakened nervous system. Nietzsche was a regular abuser of drugs including hashish, opium etc.

Bibliography

Abe, M. (1985) *Zen and Western Thought*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Abram, D. (1996) *The Spell of the Sensuous Perception and Language in a More- Than-Human-World*, New York: Vintage Books.

Ames, R. (1993) 'Introduction to Part Three', in Kasulis, T. P., Ames, R. T., and Dissanayake, W. (ed.) *Self as Body in Asian Theory and Practice*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Anderson, M. O'D. (ed.) (1996) *The Incorporated Self Interdisciplinary Perspectives of Embodiment*, USA: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Anderson, N. (2011) 'On Rudolf Steiner's Impact on the Training of the Actor', *Literature and Aesthetics*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 158-174.

Angeles, P. (1981) *Dictionary of Philosophy*, New York: Barnes & Noble Books.

Arisaka, Y. (2001) 'The Ontological Co-Emergence of 'Self' and 'Other' in Japanese Philosophy', *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 8, no. 5-7, pp. 197-208.

Artaud, A. (1993) *The Theatre and its Double*, translated by Corti, V., London: Calder.

Ashperger, C. (2006) 'East and West Meet in the Body: the Intercultural Aspects of Michael Chekhov's Technique'. Symposium paper for The Changing Body Conference, Exeter University. Unpublished.

----- (2008) *The Rhythm of Space and the Sound of Time: Michael Chekhov's Acting Technique in the 21st Century*, New York: Editions Rodolphi.

----- (2015) 'Michael Chekhov's five guiding principles and theatre practice today: the case of *Tender Napalm* by Phillip Ridley', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 372-389.

Auslander, P. (1993) *From Acting to Performance: Essays in Modernism and Postmodernism*, London: Routledge.

Autant-Mathieu, M.C. and Meerzon, Y. (2015) "Introduction" in Autant-Mathieu, M.C. and Meerzon, Y. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1-19.

Axtell, G.S. (1991) 'Comparative Dialectics: Nishida Kitaro's Logic of Place and Western Dialectical Thought', *Philosophy of East and West*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 163-184.

Bablet, D. (1966) *The Theatre of Edward Cordon Craig*, London: Eyre Methuen.

Bachelard, G. (1969/1994) *The Poetics of Space*, translated by Jolas, M., Boston: Beacon Press.

Bannon, B. (2011) 'Flesh and Nature: Understanding Merleau-Ponty's Relational Ontology', *Research in Phenomenology*, vol. 41, pp. 327–357. Available Online :

https://www.academia.edu/859005/Flesh_and_Nature_Understanding_Merleau-Pontys_Relational_Ontology

[Accessed 21 Dec 2014]

Baranova, J. (2005) *Contemporary Philosophical Discourse in Lithuania: Lithuanian Philosophical Studies IV*, USA: Publisher Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

Barba, E. & Savarese, N. (1991) *A Dictionary of Theatre Anthropology*, London and New York: Routledge.

----- (1995) *The Paper Canoe: A Guide to Theatre Anthropology*, London and New York: Routledge.

Barbaras, R. (2000) 'Perception and Movement: The End of the Metaphysical Approach', in Evans, F. and Lawler, L. (ed.) *Chiasms Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

----- (2004) *The Being of the Phenomenon: Merleau-Ponty's Ontology*, translated by Toadvine, T. and Lawlor, L., USA: Indiana University Press.

Barnett, D. (2003) 'Text as Material? The Category of 'Performativity' in Three Postdramatic German Theatre-Texts', in Duttlinger, C., Ruprecht, L. and Webber, A. (eds.) *Performance and Performativity in German Cultural Studies*, Bern: Peter Lang, European Academic Publishers.

----- (2008) "When is a Play not a Drama? Two Examples of Postdramatic Theatre Texts, *NTQ*, vol. 24, no 1, pp. 14-23.

Bartow, A. (ed.) (2006) *Training of the American Actor*, New York: Theatre Communications Group.

Bataille, G. (1992) *On Nietzsche*, London: Athlone Press.

- Bell, C. (2007) (ed.) *Teaching Ritual*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Benedetti, J. (1982) *Stanislavsky: An Introduction*, London: Methuen.
- (1998) *Stanislavsky and the Actor*, London: Methuen.
- (2005) *The Art of the Actor*, London: Methuen.
- Bennett, S. (2013) 'The Dancer of the Future: Michael Chekhov in Cross-Training Practice,' *Theater Dance and Performance Training*. (Special Issue Michael Chekhov), vol. 4, no. 2, pp.162-175.
- Beringer, E. (ed.) (2010) *Embodied Wisdom*, Berkeley, California: North Atlantic Books.
- Bermúdez, J. L., Marcel, A. and Eilan, N. (eds) (1995/2001) *The Body and the Self*, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Bial, H (ed.) (2004) *Performance Studies*, London and N.York: Routledge.
- Biggs, M. and Karlsson H. (eds.) (2011) *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*, London New York: Routledge.
- Black, L.C. (1987) *Mikhail Chekhov as Actor, Director, and Teacher*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press.
- Blackburn, S. (1996) *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*, Oxford University Press. *Oxford Reference Online*.
- Blackman, L. (2010) 'Embodying Affect', *Body and Society*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 163-192.
- Blair, R. (2006) "Image and Action: Cognitive Neuroscience and actor training" in Bruce McConachie and F.E. Hart (eds.) *Performance and Cognition Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 167-187.
- (2008) *The Actor Image and Action. Acting and Cognitive Neuroscience*, London New York: Routledge.
- (2009) 'Cognitive Neuroscience and Acting: Imagination, Conceptual Blending, and Empathy', *TDR The Drama Review*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 93-103.
- and Lutterbie, J. (2011) 'Introduction: *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism's* Special Section on Cognitive Studies, Theatre and Performance', *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism*, Spring, pp. 61-70.

Bleeker, M., Sherman F.J., and Nedelkopoulou E. (eds.) (2005) *Performance and Phenomenology Traditions and Transformations*, London and New York: Routledge.

Boublil, E. and Daigle, C. (ed.) (2013) *Nietzsche and Phenomenology: Power, Life, Subjectivity*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Booth, D. (1985) 'Nietzsche on the "Subject as Multiplicity"', *Man and World*, Vol. 18, no. 2, pp.121-146.

Brahe, P. (2006) 'Beyond Michael Chekhov Technique: Continuing the Exploration Through the Mask,' in Bartow, A. (ed.) *Training of the American Actor*, New York: Theatre Communications Group, pp. 155-206.

Brennan, A., (2013) 'Working with the Intangible: Radiation, a twenty first century interpretation.' *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 176-188

----- (2016) *The Energetic Performer: An Integrated Approach in Acting for Stage and Screen*, (London and Philadelphia: Singing Dragon).

Brown, K. (2006) *Nietzsche and Embodiment: Discerning Bodies and Non-Dualism*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Brubaker, D. (2003) 'Merleau-Ponty's Eye and Mind: Re-Thinking the Visible', *Journal of Contemporary Thought*, vol. 17, Summer, pp. 27-38.

----- (2008) 'Aesthetic Self-Creation and the Betweenness of the Visible: Nishida, Watsuji and Merleau-Ponty', *JTLA*, vol. 33, pp. 27-44

----- (2009) "'Place of Nothingness" and the Dimension of Visibility: Nishida, Merleau-Ponty, and Huineng", in Kopf, G. and Park, J. Y. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Bullington, J. (2013) "Lived Body", in *The Expression of the Psychosomatic Body from a Phenomenological Perspective*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Burke, P. (1990) 'Listening at the Abyss' in Johnson, G.A. and Smith, M.B. (eds.) *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Byckling, L. (2002) 'Michael Chekhov as Actor Teacher and Director in the West,' *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, 4. Available at:

<http://sites.utoronto.ca/tsq/01/chekhovwest.shtml>

[Accessed 20/9/2009]

----- (2010) 'Michael Chekhov's Production of *Twelfth Night* at the Habinam Theatre', *Assaph: Studies in the Theatre*, No. 24, pp. 53-74.

----- (2011) 'Michael Chekhov (Teaching) Acting in a Foreign Land,' *Critical Stages* The IATC web journal, No. 5 (December). Available Online: <http://www.critical-stages.org/5/michael-chekhov-teaching-acting-in-a-foreign-land/>

[Accessed 15/8/2014]

----- (2015) 'Michael Chekhov's work as a director', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 21-40.

Caldwell, L. (2009) 'Genesis and Order in the Chaosmos: Will to Power as Creative Cosmology', *Intersections*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 495-505.

Callow, S. (2002) "Foreword" in M. Chekhov, *To the Actor*, London: Routledge, pp. xi-xxiv.

Calvo-Merino, B. *et al.* (2005) "Action Observation and Acquired Motor Skills: An fMRI Study with Expert Dancers," *Cerebral Cortex*, vol. 15, pp. 1243-1249.

Carlson, M., (1993) *No Religion Higher Than Truth: A History of the Theosophical Movement in Russia, 1875-1922*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Carman, T., Hansen, M. B.N. (eds.) (2005) *The Cambridge Companion to Merleau-Ponty*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

----- (2008) *Merleau-Ponty*, London and New York: Routledge.

----- (2009) 'Merleau-Ponty and the Mystery of Perception', *Philosophy Compass*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 630-638.

Carnicke, M. S. (2003) *Stanislavsky in Focus*. London: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Carter, R. (1997) *The Nothingness Beyond God: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Nishida Kitaro*, Minnesota: Paragon House Publishers.

----- (2001) 'The Form of the Formless: The Healing Journey from Self to Nothingness', *Journal of Inquiry and Research*, vol. 73, no. 2, pp. 63-71.

----- (2002) *Exploring Consciousness*, California, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Casey, E. S. (1991) "The Element of Voluminousness" Depth and Place Reexamined', in Dillon, M.C. (ed.) *Merleau-Ponty Vivant*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- (1993) *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World*, Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

----- (1999) 'The Unconscious Mind and the Prereflective Body' in Olkowski, D. and Morley, J. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life, and the World*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- (2000) 'The World at a Glance', in Evans, F. and Lawler, L. (eds.) *Chiasms: Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Castoriadis, C. (1997) *World in Fragments: Writings on Politics, Society, Psychoanalysis and the Imagination*, translated by Curtis, D.A., Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Cataldi, S. L. (1993) *Emotion, Depth and Flesh: A Study of Sensitive Space, Reflections on Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of Embodiment*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

----- (2000) 'Embodying Perceptions of Death: Emotional Apprehension and Reversibilities of Flesh', in Evans, F. and Lawlor, L. (eds.) *Chiasms Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cestari, M. (1998) 'The Knowing Body: Nishida's Philosophy of Active Intuition (Kōiteki chokkan)', *The Eastern Buddhist*, vol. XXXI, no. 2, pp. 179-208, Available Online:

https://www.academia.edu/860464/The_Knowing_Body_Nishidas_Philosophy_of_Active_Intuition_K%C5%8Diteki_chokkan_

[Accessed 18 Dec 2014].

----- (2009) 'From Seeing to Acting', in Bouso, R. G. and James W. Heisig, J. H. (eds.) *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy 6: Confluences and Cross Currents*, Nagoya: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture.

----- (Date unknown) Between Emptiness and Absolute Nothingness Reflections on Negation in Nishida and Buddhism, Available Online: <https://nirc.nanzan-u.ac.jp/nfile/2138>.

Cgeung, C. (2014) 'Nishida Kitaro's Philosophy of the Body', *Dao*, 13, pp. 507-523.

Chamberlain, F. (2010) 'Michael Chekhov on the Technique of Acting: Was Don Quixote True to Life', in Alison Hodge (ed.) *Actor Training*, London: Routledge, pp. 63-81.

----- (2003) 'Michael Chekhov: Pedagogy, Spirituality, and the Occult,' *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, no. 4, Spring. Available Online:

<http://sites.utoronto.ca/tsq/04/chamberlain04.shtml>.

[Accessed 10 August 2006]

----- (2004) *Michael Chekhov: Routledge Performance Practitioners*, London: Routledge.

----- (2007) 'Gesturing Towards Post-Physical Performance', in J. Keffe and S. Murray *Physical Theatres: A Critical Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 117-122.

----- (2015) 'Michael Chekhov in England: outside the magic circle', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 207-219.

Chanter, T. (2000) 'Wild Meaning: Luce Irigaray's Reading of Merleau-Ponty', in Evans, F. and Lawler, L. (eds.) *Chiasms Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Chan, Wing-Tsit. (1963) *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Chaulet, E. (2008) *A Balancing Act*, Maine: Starlight Acting Books.

Chekhov, M. and du Prey, D.H., (1937) *The Actor is the Theatre*, September 28, 1937.

Chekhov, M. and Hurst du Prey, *The Actor is the Theatre*, vol. 1, MC/S1/7/A.

Chekhov, M. and Hurst du Prey, *The Actor is the Theatre*, vol. 2, MC/S1/7/B.

Chekhov, M. and Hurst du Prey, *The Actor is the Theatre*, vol. 3, MC/S1/7/C.

Chekhov, M. and Hurst du Prey, *The Actor is the Theatre*, vol. 4, MC/S1/7/D.

Chekhov, M. (1983) 'Chekhov's Academy of Arts Questionnaire,' *The Drama Review, TDR* vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 22-33.

----- (1953) *To the Actor*, Evanston, New York: Harper&Row, Publishers.

----- (1983) 'Chekhov on Acting: A Collection of Unpublished Materials', *The Drama Review*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 46-83.

----- (1983) 'Chekhov's Academy of Arts Questionnaire,' *The Drama Review*, *TDR* vol. 27, no, 3, pp. 22-33.

----- (1983) 'Michael Chekhov's Career and Legacy', *The Drama Review*, *TDR* vol. 27, no, 3, whole issue.

----- (1984) *To the Director and Playwright*, compiled and written by Leonard, C., New York: Harper and Row.

----- (1985) *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, du Prey, D.H. (ed.), New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

----- (1991) *On the Technique of Acting*, Gordon, M. (ed.) New York: Harper Perennial.

----- (1992) *Michael Chekhov: On Theatre and the Art of Acting: The Six Hour Masterclass: A Guide to Discovery with Exercises*. Cassette recordings. New York: Applause.

----- (2000) *Lessons for Teachers of his Acting Technique*, transcribed by du Prey, D.H., Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions.

----- (2002) *To the Actor: On the Technique of Acting*, London: Routledge.

----- (2005) *The Path of the Actor*, Kirillov, A. and Merlin, B. (ed.), London: Routledge.

Cipriani, G. (2000) 'Merleau-Ponty, Cézanne, and the *Basho* of the Visible', in Kopf, G. and Park, J. Y. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Citron, A. (1983) 'The Chekhov Technique Today,' *TDR The Drama Review*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 91-96.

Clarke, Jr., D.S. (1991) "Introduction", in Nishitani, K. *Nishida Kitarō*, California, Berkley: University of California Press.

Climenhaga, R. (2013) *The Pina Bausch Sourcebook: The Making of Tanztheater*, London and New York: Routledge.

Cole, T. and Chinoy, H. K. (eds.) (1970/1949) *Actors on Acting*, New York: Crown Trade Paperbacks.

Colombetti, G. (2011) 'Varieties of Pre-Reflective Self-Awareness: Foreground and Background and Bodily Feelings in Emotion Experience', *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 293-313.

----- (2014) *The Feeling Body: Affective Science Meets the Enactive Mind*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Conway, D. W., (1999) 'The Birth of the Soul: Toward a Psychology of Decadence', in Golomb, J., Santaniello, W. and Lehrer, R. (eds.), *Nietzsche and Depth Psychology*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cornford, T. (2013) 'A New Kind of Conversation': Michael Chekhov's 'turn to the crafts', *Theater Dance and Performance Training*. (Special Issue Michael Chekhov), vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 189-203.

----- (2014) "Michael Chekhov: The Spiritual Realm and the Invisible Body," in Luckhurst, M. and Morin, E. (eds.) *Theatre and Ghosts Materiality, Performance and Modernity*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 178-196.

-----, Fleming, C. and Rushe, S. (eds.) (2013) 'Interview: The MCCUK past, present and future. Interviews with Graham Dixon, Sarah Kane and Martin Sharp,' *Theater Dance and Performance Training*. (Special Issue Michael Chekhov), vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 316-324.

Cristini, M. (2015) "Meditation and Imagination: The Contribution of Anthroposophy to Michael Chekhov's Acting Technique", in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Y. Meerzon (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London/New York: Routledge, pp. 69-82.

Crossley, N. (2012) 'Phenomenology of the Body', in Turner, B. S., (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of the Body Studies*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990/2008) *Flow The Psychology of Optimal Experience*, New York: Harper Perennial modern Classics.

Csordas J. T. (1993) 'Somatic Modes of Attention', *Cultural Anthropology*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 135-156.

----- (2008), 'Intersubjectivity and Intercorporeality', *Subjectivity*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 110-121.

Daboo, J. (2004) 'The Mind of a Flower: the Psychophysical Experience of Performance'. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Faculty of Humanities, Department of Theatre Studies, University of Exeter.

----- (2007a) 'Michael Chekhov and the Embodied Imagination: Higher self and Non-Self', *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 261-273.

----- (2007b) "The Altering I/Eye: Consciousness, 'Self', and the New Paradigm in Acting," *Consciousness, Literature and the Arts*, vol. 8, no. 3.

----- (2012) "Michael Chekhov and the Studio at Dartington: The Remembering of a Tradition," in J. Pitches (ed) *The Russians In Britain: British Theatre and the Russian Tradition of Actor-Training*, London: Routledge, pp. 62-85.

----- (2015) "As the shadow follows the body: examining Chekhov's creation of character through "Eastern" practices", in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 282-297.

Dalissier, M. (2006) 'The Idea of the Mirror in Nishida and Dogen', in Heisig, J. W. (ed.) *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy*, Nagoya: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture.

Dalton, L. (2017) 'The Art of Michael Chekhov's Chart: A Training Sequence for Contemporary Practice in Professional Studios and Academia'. Available Online:

critical-stages.org/15/the-art-of-michael-chekhovs-chart-a-training-sequence-for-contemporary-practice-in-professional-studios-and-academia/

[Accessed 19 April 2017]

Danto, A. C. (2005) *Nietzsche as Philosopher*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Dastur, F. 'World, Flesh, Vision' (2000), in Evans, F. and Lawler, L. (eds.) *Chiasms: Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Deleuze, G. (2002) *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, translated by Tomlison, H., New York: Continuum.

De Preester, H. (2002a) 'On the Differentiation Between Self and Non-Self' *Communication & Cognition*, vol. 35, no. 3 & 4, pp. 211-224.

----- (2002b) 'Intentionality and the Inside/Outside Distinction in Sensitive Systems', *Consciousness and Emotion*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 65-79.

----- and Knockaert, V. (eds.) (2005) *Body Image and Body Schema Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the Body*, Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

----- (2007a) 'To Perform the Layered Body-A Short Exploration of the Body in Performance', *Janus Head*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 349-383.

----- (2007b) 'Epistemological Questions Concerning the In Depth Body and the Coming About of the Ego', in Tymieniecka, A. T. (ed.) *Analecta Husserliana XCIV*, pp. 201-225.

----- (2008) 'From ego to alter ego: Husserl, Merleau-Ponty and a layered approach to intersubjectivity', *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 133-142.

----- and Tsakiris, M. (2009) 'Body-Extension Versus Body-Incorporation: Is There a Need for a Body-Model?', *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 307-319.

Dewsbury, J-D. (2000) 'Performativity and the Event: Enacting a Philosophy of Difference,' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 473 – 496.

Diedrich, A. (2002) 'Talent is the Ability to Be in the Present: Gestalt Therapy and George Tabori's Early Theatre Practice', *New Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 72, no. 4, pp. 375-391

Diderot, D. (2007) *The Paradox of Acting*, translated by W.H. Pollock, "Preface" by H. Irving, Whitefish: MT Kessinger.

Dillon, M.C. (1971) 'Gestalt Theory and Merleau-Ponty's Concept of Intentionality', *Continental Philosophy Review*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 436-459.

----- (1983) 'Merleau-Ponty and the Reversibility Thesis', *Man and World*, vol. 16, pp. 365-388.

----- (1986) 'Merleau-Ponty and the Transcendence of Immanence: Overcoming the Ontology of Consciousness', *Man and the World*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 395-412.

----- (1988) *Merleau-Ponty's Ontology*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

----- (1990) 'Écart: Reply to Lefort's "Flesh and Otherness"', in Johnson, G.A. and Smith, M.B. (ed.) *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (ed.) (1991) *Merleau-Ponty Vivant*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Dilworth, D. (1969) 'The Initial Formations of 'Pure Experience' in Nishida Kitaro and William James', *Monumenta Nipponica*, vol. 24, no. 1/2, pp. 93-111.

----- (1970) 'Nishida's Final Essay: The Logic of Place and a Religious World View', *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 355-367.

----- (1987b) 'Introduction: Nishida's Critique of the Religious Consciousness', in *Last Writings Nothingness and the Religious Worldview*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Diprose, R. (2002) *Corporeal Generosity: On Giving with Nietzsche, Merleau-Ponty and Levinas*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- and Reynolds, J. (ed.) (2008) *Merleau-Ponty Key Concepts*, Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing Limited.

Drama Review (1983) 'Michael Chekhov's Career and Legacy', vol. 27, no. 3, whole issue.

Du Prey, D. H. (1979-80) 'The Training Sessions of Michael Chekhov', *Theatre Papers*, The Third Series, no. 3. Devon, Department of Theatre, Dartington College of Arts.

----- (1983) 'Working with Chekhov', *The Drama Review*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 84-90.

----- (1985) 'Preface' in M. Chekhov *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, New York: PAJ Books, pp. 7-10.

Emden, C. J. (2005) *Nietzsche on Language, Consciousness and the Body*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

English Encyclopedia www.encyclo.co.uk/

Elman, B. A. (1983) 'Nietzsche and Buddhism', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 671-686.

Eldredge, S.A. (1996) *Mask Improvisation for Actor Training and Performance: The Compelling Image*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Evans, F. and Lawler, L. (eds.) (2000) *Chiasms Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Featherstone, M. (2010) 'Body, Image And Affect in Consumer Culture', *Body and Society*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 193-221.

Feenberg, A. (1995) 'The Problem of Modernity in the Philosophy of Nishida', in J. Heisig and J. Maraldo, (eds.) *Rude Awakenings: Zen, the Kyoto School and the Question of Nationalism*, Hawaii: University of Hawaii, pp.151-174.

----- (1999) 'Experience and Culture: Nishida's Path "To the Things Themselves"', *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 28-44.

Feldenkrais, M. (1972/1985) *Awareness through Movement*, New York: Harper Collins.

Fitzpatrick, C. (2013) 'Where the butterfly meets the moth: An interview with Graham Parkes', *Postgraduate Journal Of Aesthetics*, 10 (3), 2-12. Retrieved from <http://www.pjaesthetics.org/index.php/pjaesthetics/article/view/150/168>

Fleming, C. (2013) 'A genealogy of the embodied theatre practices of Suzanne Bing and Michael Chekhov the use of play in actor training. Unpublished PhD Thesis De Montfort University, Faculty of Humanities Department of Performing Arts.

Franck, D. (2013) 'Beyond Phenomenology', in Boubilil, É. and Daigle, C. (eds.) *Nietzsche and Phenomenology: Power, Life, Subjectivity*, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Feenberg, A. (1995) 'The Problem of Modernity in the Philosophy of Nishida', in J. Heisig and J. Maraldo, (eds.) *Rude Awakenings: Zen, the Kyoto School and the Question of Nationalism*, Hawaii: University of Hawaii, , pp.151-174.

Freedberg, D. and Gallese, V. (2007) "Motion, Emotion and Empathy in Esthetic Experience," *Trends in Cognitive Science*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 197-203.

Fuchs, T. and Koch, S. (2014) 'Embodied affectivity: on moving and being moved', *Hypothesis and Theory Practice*, vol. 5, Article 508, pp. 1-11.

Gadamer, G.H. (1977) *Philosophical Hermeneutics*, translated and edited by D. E. Linge, Berkley: University of California Press.

----- (1992/2004) *Truth and Method*, translated by J. Weinsheimer and D. G Marshall, London New York: Continuum I.P.G.

Gallagher, S. (1986a) 'Lived Body and Environment', *Research in Phenomenology*, vol. 16, pp. 139-170.

----- (1986b) 'Body Image and Body Schema: A Conceptual Clarification', *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 541-554.

----- and A. N. Meltzoff (1996) 'The Earliest Sense of Self and Others: Merleau-Ponty and Recent Developmental Studies', *Philosophical Psychology*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 211-233.

----- and Jonathan C. (1998) 'Body Image and Body Schema in a Deafferented Subject' in Welton, D. (ed.) *Body and Flesh: A Philosophical Reader*, Malden: Blackwell, pp: 131-48.

----- (2000) 'Phenomenological and Experiential Research on Embodied Experience', Paper presented at *Atelier phénoménologie et cognition, Phénoménologie et Cognition Research Group*, CREA, Paris (December 2000), pp. 1-8, Available Online: <http://philpapers.org/rec/GALPAE-2>

[Accessed 21 April 2010]

----- (1995/2001a) 'Body Schema and Intentionality', in Bermúdez, J. L., Marcel, A. and Eilan, N. (ed.) *The Body and the Self*, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

----- (2001b) 'Dimensions of Embodiment: Body Image and Body Schema in Medical Contexts', in Toombs, S. Kay. (ed.) *Handbook of Phenomenology and Medicine*, vol. 68, pp. 147-175.

----- (2000/2002) 'A Cognitive Way to the Transcendental Reduction,' in Varela, F. and Shear, J. (eds.) *The View From Within: First Person Approaches to the Study of Consciousness*, Thorverton: Imprint Academic.

----- (2003a) 'Neurophenomenological Research on Embodied Experience' in C, Chan-Fai, C., Chvatik, I., Copoeru, I., Lester, E., Iribarne, J. and Rainer, H. (ed.) *Essays in Celebration of the Founding of the Organization of Phenomenological Organizations*. Available Online: www.o-p-o.net.

[Accessed 8 March 2013]

----- (2003b) 'Bodily Self-Awareness and Object Perception', *Theoria et Historia Scientiarum: International Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*, vol. 7, no. 1. Available Online: consc.net/mindpapers/5.1c.1

[Accessed 8 May 2009].

----- (2005) *How the Body Shapes the Mind*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

----- and Zahavi, D. (2008/2010) (eds.) *The Phenomenological Mind: An Introduction to Philosophy of Mind and Cognitive Science*, Oxon: Routledge.

Garner, S. (1994) *Bodied Species: Phenomenology and Performance in Contemporary Drama*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Garre-Rubio, S., (2012) 'Shifting paradigms of practice in 'Interpretación Gestual' : integrating bodymind training in Michael Chekhov's acting techniques within the context of training professional actors in Spain'. Unpublished PhD thesis. Faculty of Humanities: Department of Theatre Studies, University of Exeter.

Gaskel, I. and Conway, D.W. (eds.) (1998) *Nietzsche, Philosophy and the Arts*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gemes, K. and Richardson, J. (ed.) (2013) *The Oxford Handbook of Nietzsche*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

George, D. (2000) *Buddhism as/in Performance*, New Delhi: D K Printworld (P) Lit.

Gendlin, E.T. (1992) 'The primacy of the body, not the primacy of perception', *Man and World*, vol. 25, no. (3-4), pp. 341-353.

Gilmer, J. M. (2013) 'Michael Chekhov's Imagination of the Creative World and The Question of Its Integration into His Future Theatre', *Theatre Dance and Performance Training*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 204-218.

Ginburg, C. (1999) 'Body-Image, Movement and Consciousness: Examples from a Somatic Practice in the Feldenkrais Method,' *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2-3, pp. 79-91.

Goffman, E. (1956) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, Social Sciences Research Centre.

Golomb, J., Santaniello, W. and Lehrer, R. (ed.) (1999) *Nietzsche and Depth Psychology*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Goldie, P. (2002) 'Emotions, Feelings and Intentionality', *Phenomenology of the Cognitive Sciences*, vol. 1, pp. 235-254.

Gordon, M. (1983) 'Michael Chekhov's Life and Work: A Descriptive Chronology', *TDR The Drama Review*, vol 27, no.3, pp.3-21.

----- (1985) "Introduction" in M. Chekhov *Lessons for the Professional Actor*, Du Prey, D.H. (ed.), New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

----- (1987) *The Stanislavsky Technique: Russia: A Workbook for Actors*, New York: Applause Theatre Books Publishers.

Goulding, J. (2009) 'Merleau-Ponty and Asian Philosophy: The Double Walk of Buddhism and Daoism', in Park, J.Y. and Kopf, G. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Gregg, M. and Seigworth, G.J., (eds.) (2010) *The Affect Theory Reader*, Durham&London: Duke University Press.

Grogan, S. (2014) 'I'm doing it, but I am so in the moment' ...: an articulation and understanding of 'absorption' for the performer towards an 'optimal' 'mode of being/doing' in dance theatre'. Unpublished PhD thesis, Faculty of Humanities, Department of Theatre Studies, University of Exeter.

Grosz, E. (1994) *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

----- (1999) 'Merleau-Ponty and Irigaray in the Flesh', in Olkowski, D. and Morley, J., (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty: Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life, and the World*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- (2008) 'Merleau-Ponty, Bergson, and the Question of Ontology', in Weiss, G. (ed.) *Intertwinings Interdisciplinary Encounters with Merleau-Ponty*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Haas, B (2003) *Modern German Political Drama 1980-2000*, NY, USA: Camden House.

Haas, L. (1999) 'Sense and Alterity: Rereading Merleau-Ponty's Reversibility Thesis', in Olkowski, D. and Morley, J. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life and World*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- (2008a) *Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

----- (2008b) 'Elemental Alterity: Levinas and Merleau-Ponty' in Weiss, G. (ed.) *Intertwinings: Interdisciplinary Encounters with Merleau-Ponty*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hanaoka, E. (2004) 'The Problem of Self-Awareness and Feeling through Nishida and A. N. Whitehead', *Bulletin of Nara Sangyo University*, vol. 22, pp. 1-14.

Hansen, M.B.N. (2006) *Bodies in Code: Interfaces with Digital Media*, New York: Routledge.

Hart, F. E. (2006) "Performance, phenomenology and the cognitive turn," in McConachie, B. and Hart, F. E. (eds.) *Performance and Cognition Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 29-52.

Heisig, J. W. (2000) 'Nishida, Buber and the Moral Consequences of Self-Actualization', *Philosophy of East and West*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 179-207.

----- (2001) *Philosophers of Nothingness: An Essay on the Kyoto School*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

----- (2005) (ed.) *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy*, Nagoya: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture.

----- Kasulis, P.T. and J.C. Maraldo (eds.). (2011) *Japanese Philosophy A Sourcebook*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Henriques, J. (2010) 'The Vibrations of Affect and their Propagation on a Night Out on Kingston's Dancehall Scene,' *Body and Society*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 57-89.

Hodge, A. (ed.) (2000) *Twentieth Century Actor Training*, London: Routledge. [Revised 2nd edition retitled *Actor Training*, 2010].

Hornby, R. (1992) *The End of Acting: A Radical View*, New York: Applause.

Hurt, M. (2014) Arthur Lessac's *Embodied Actor Training*, London: Routledge.

Huskinson, L. (2004) *Nietzsche and Jung: The Whole Self in the Union of Opposites*, England: Brunner-Routledge.

Hyomg-hyo, K. (2009) "Merleau-Pontean "Flesh" and its Buddhist Interpretation", in Park J.Y., and Kopf, G. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books, pp. 19-44.

Innes, C. (1998) *Edward Gordon Craig: A Vision of the Theatre*, Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Irigaray, L., (1981) 'One Does not Stir Without the Other,' in *Signs*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp.56-67.

----- (2004) 'To Paint the Invisible', *Continental Philosophy Review*, vol. 37, pp. 389-405.

Iwakuma, M. (2002/2006) 'The Body as Embodiment: An Investigation of the Body by Merleau-Ponty' in Corker, M. and Shakespeare, T. (eds.) *Disability/ Postmodernity Embodying Disability Theory*, New York: Continuum.

Jenkins, F. (1998) 'Performative Identity: Nietzsche on the Force of Art and Language', in *Nietzsche, Philosophy and the Arts*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, G. A. and Smith, M.B. (eds.) (1990) *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (1990) 'Introduction: Alterity as Reversibility', in Johnson, G.A. and Smith, M.B. (ed.) *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (ed.) (1993) *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (1999) 'Inside and Outside: Ontological Considerations', in Olkowski, D. and Morley, J. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life, and the World*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Johnstone, K. (1994) *Improvisation and the Theatre*, London: Methuen.

Jurs-Munby, K. (2006) "Introduction" in Lehmann. H.T. *The Post-dramatic Theatre*, London and New York, Routledge.

-----, Carroll. J, and S.Giles (eds.). (2013) *Postdramatic Theatre and the Political*, London and New York: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Kalb, J. (1998) *The Theater of Heiner Müller*, Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kasulis, T.P. (1987) 'Editor's Introduction', in Yuasa, Y., *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, New York: State University of New York Press.

----- (1981/1986) *Zen Action/Zen Person*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

----- Ames, R.T. and Dissanayake W. (ed.) (1993a) *Self as Body in Asian Theory and Practice*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kazashi, N. 'The World Becomes the Self's Body: James, Merleau-Ponty and Nishida', [Online], Available Online:

<http://www.bu.edu/wcp/PaidArch.html>.www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Comp/CompKaza-hm-29-1999-05-24

[Accessed 25 Sep 2009]

----- (1999) 'Bodily Logos: James, Merleau-Ponty and Nishida', in Olkowski, D. and Morley, J. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty, Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life and the World*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Keefe, J. and Murray, S. (eds.) (2007) *Physical Theatres: A Critical Reader*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Kelly, S. D. (2002) 'Merleau-Ponty on the Body', *Ratio*, vol. XV, pp. 376-391.

Kemp, (2012) *Embodied Acting What Neuroscience Tells Us About Performance*, London New York: Routledge.

Keiji, N. (1990) *The Self-Overcoming of Nihilism*, translated Parkes, G. with Setsuko, A., Albany State: University of New York Press.

Kim, H. T. (1955/56) 'The Logic of the Illogical: Zen and Hegel', *Philosophy East and West*, vol. V, pp. 19-29.

Kindelan, N. (1977) *The Theatre of Inspiration: An Analysis of the Acting Theories of Michael Chekhov*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Wisconsin - Madison.

Kirillov, A. (2005) [DVD] *Concerning Michael Chekhov*, Exeter: Arts Documentation Unit.

----- (2006) 'Michael Chekhov and the Search for the Ideal Theatre', *New Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 22-23, no. 3, pp. 227-234.

Kirillov, A. and Chamberlain, F. (2013) "Rehearsal protocols for Hamlet by William Shakespeare at the Second Moscow Art Theatre," *Theater Dance and Performance Training*. (Special Issue Michael Chekhov), vol. 4, no. 2, pp.237-242.

----- (2015) "The Theoretical System of Michael Chekhov", in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 40-57.

Klossowski, P. (1969/2005) *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle*, translated by Smith, D.W., London: Continuum.

Kofman, S. (1972/1993) *Nietzsche and Metaphor*, translated by Large, D., London: The Athlone Press.

Kogaku, A. (1991/1996) 'The Problem of the Body in Nietzsche and Dogen.', in Parkes, G. (ed.) *Nietzsche and Asian Thought*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Konijn, E. (1999) *Acting Emotions*, translated by Leach, B. with Chambers, D. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Kopf, G. (2001) *Beyond Personal Identity: Dogen, Nishida, and a Phenomenology of No-Self*, Surrey, UK: Curzon Press.

----- and Park, J. Y. (eds.) (2009) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books.

----- (2002) 'Temporality and Personal Identity in the Thought of Nishida Kitaro', *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 224-245.

----- (2004) 'Between Identity and Difference: Three Ways of Reading Nishida's Non-Dualism', *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 73-103.

----- (2005) 'Critical Comments on Nishida's Use of Chinese Buddhism,' *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, vol. 32, no.2, pp. 313-329.

Kozel, S. (1996) 'The Diabolical Strategy of Mimesis: Luce Irigaray's Reading of Merleau-Ponty', *Hypatia*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp: 114-129.

----- (2007) *Closer: Performance, Technologies, Phenomenology*, Spain: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

----- (2011) 'The Virtual and the Physical: A Phenomenological Approach to Performance Research', in Biggs, M. and Karlsson H. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*, London New York: Routledge, pp: 204-223.

----- (2012) 'Affexity: Performing Affect with Augmented Reality', *The Fibrecultural Journal*, vol. 21 (Exploring Affective Interactions), pp. 72-96.

----- (2013) 'Bausch and Phenomenology' in Climenhaga, R. (ed.) *The Pina Bausch Sourcebook: The Making of Tanztheater*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 300-306.

----- (2015) "Process Phenomenologies", in J.F. Sherman, M. Bleeker and E. Nedelkopoulou (eds.) *Theatre and Phenomenology*, Abington and New York: Routledge, pp. 54-75.

Kozyra, A. (2007) 'Nishida Kitaro's Logic of Absolutely Contradictory Self-Identity and the Problem of Orthodoxy in the Zen Tradition', *Japan Review*, vol. 20, no. 69, pp. 69-110.

Krueger, J. W. (2006) 'The Varieties of Pure Experience: William James and Kitaro Nishida on Consciousness and Embodiment'. Available Online: <http://www.bu.edu/wcp/PaidArch.html>

[Accessed 14 Sep 2009]

----- (2008) 'Nishida, Agency, and the 'Self-Contradictory' Body', *Asian Philosophy*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 213-229.

Kwant, R. C. (1966) *From Phenomenology to Metaphysics: An Inquiry into the Last Period of Merleau-Ponty's Philosophical Life*, Pittsburg: Duquesne University Press.

Lacey, A.R. (1986) *A Dictionary of Philosophy*, London: Routledge.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, G. (1999) *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*, New York: Basic Books.

Langman, D. (2014) *The Art of Acting: Body - Soul - Spirit - Word: A Practical and Spiritual Guide*, Forest Row: Temple Lodge Publishing.

Law, L. H. (1983) 'Chekhov's Russian *Hamlet* (1924),' *The Drama Review, TDR* vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 34-45.

Leach, R. (1997) 'When He Touches Your Heart ...- The Revolutionary Theatre of Vsevolod Meyerhold and the Development of Mikhail Chekhov', *Contemporary Theatre Review*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 67-83.

----- (2004) *Makers of Modern Drama*, London: Routledge.

Leder, D. (1985) 'Troubles with Token Identity,' *Philosophical Studies*, vol. 47, pp. 79-94.

-----, (1990a) *The Absent Body*, USA: The University of Chicago Press.

----- (1990b) 'Flesh and Blood: A Proposed Supplement to Merleau-Ponty', *Human Studies*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 209-219.

----- (1998) 'A Tale of Two Bodies: the Cartesian Corpse and the Lived Body' in Welton, D. (ed.) *Body and Flesh: A Philosophical Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Lefebvre, H. (1992/2004) *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life*, translated by Elden, S. and Moore, G., London-New York: Continuum.

Lefort, C. (1990) 'Flesh and Otherness', in Johnson, G.A. and Smith, M.B. (eds.) *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Legrand, D. and Ravn, S. (2009) 'Perceiving Subjectivity in Bodily Movement: The Case of Dancers', *Phenomenology of the Cognitive Sciences*, vol. 8, pp. 389-408.

----- (2005) 'Transparently Oneself', *Psyche*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 1-19.

----- (2006) 'The Bodily Self: The Sensori-Motor Roots of Pre-Reflective Self-Consciousness', *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, vol. 5, pp. 89-118.

----- (2007) 'Pre-Reflective Self-Consciousness: On Being Bodily in the World', *Janus Head, Special Issue: The Situated Body*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 493–519.

----- (2011) 'Phenomenological Dimensions of Bodily Self-Consciousness', in Gallagher, S. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Self*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lehmann. H.T. (2006) *The Post-dramatic Theatre*, London and New York, Routledge.

Leonard, C. (1984) *Michael Chekhov's To the Director and Playwright*. New York: Limelight Editions.

Levin, D. M. (1985) *The Body's Recollection of Being: Phenomenological Psychology and the Deconstruction of Nihilism*, London: Routledge.

----- (1990) 'Justice in the Flesh', in Johnson, G.A. and Smith, M.B. (ed.) *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Lingis, A. (1993) 'Bodies that Touch Us', *Thesis Eleven*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 159-167.

----- (1996) *Sensation: Intelligibility in Sensibility*, Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books.

----- (1999) 'Segmented Organisms' in Olkowski, D. and Morley, J. (ed.) *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life, and the World*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- (2005) 'Impulsive Forces In and Against Words,' *Diacritics*, Summer, pp. 60-70.

Listengarden, J. (2015) 'Michael Chekhov and the visual arts: influences, synergies and collaborations', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.)

The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 253-267.

Loukes, R.M. (2006) 'Concentration' and Awareness in Psychophysical Training: The Practice of Elsa Gindler, *New Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 4, 387-400.

----- (2007) 'How to be "deadly: The "natural" body in contemporary training and performance?', *Contemporary Theatre Review*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp: 50-58.

----- (2013) 'Beyond the Psychophysical? The 'Situated', 'Enactive', Bodymind in Performance', in P. Zarrilli, J. Daboo and R. Loukes *Acting: Psychophysical Phenomenon and Process*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Low, D. (2012) *Merleau-Ponty in Contemporary Context: Philosophy and Politics in the Twentieth First Century*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

----- (2013) 'Merleau-Ponty and Transcendental Philosophy', *Philosophy Today*, Vol. 57, Summer, pp. 279-294, Available Online: <http://www.douglaslow.net/> [Accessed 12 Dec 2014]

Liotard, J-F, (1977) "The Tooth, the Palm," in Murray, T. (ed.) *Mimesis, Masochism, and Mime: Politics of Theatricality in Contemporary Thought*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan press, pp. 282-288.

-----, (1977) "The Unconscious as Mise-en-Scene," in Murray, T. (ed.) *Mimesis, Masochism, and Mime: Politics of Theatricality in Contemporary Thought*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan press, pp. 162-174.

Lutterbie, J. (2001) 'Phenomenology and the Dramaturgy of Space and Place', Available Online:

<https://journals.ku.edu/jdtd/article/download/3384/3313>

[Accessed 12 November 2014]

----- (2006) "Neuroscience and Creativity in the Rehearsal Process", in McConachie, B. and Hart, F. E. (eds.) *Performance and Cognition Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 149-167.

----- (2011) *Toward a General Theory of Acting Cognitive Science and Performance*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

----- (2012) "Resisting Binaries: Theory and Acting", in Alrutz, M. Listengarten J. and Wood V. D. (eds.) *Playing with Theory in Acting Practice*, U.K and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 139-148.

----- (2013) "Wayfaring in Everyday Life: The Unraveling of Intricacy", in N. Shaughnessy (ed.) *Affective Performance and Cognitive Science: Body, Brain, Being*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 103-115,

----- (2015) "The Dynamics of Psychological Gestures", in Autant-Mathieu, M.C. and Meerzon, Y. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 96-109.

Madison, G. B. (1981) *The Phenomenology of Merleau-Ponty*, USA: Ohio University Press.

----- (1990) 'Flesh as Otherness', in Johnson, G.A. and Smith, M.B. (ed.) *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (1991) 'Merleau-Ponty's Destruction of Logocentrism', in Dillon, M.C. (ed.) *Merleau-Ponty Vivant*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Magnus, B. and Higgins, K. M. (1996) *The Cambridge Companion to Nietzsche*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Machon, J., (2011) *(Syn)aesthetics Redefining Visceral Performance*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

McCaw, D. (2011) 'Answer the question', *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 262-269.

McConachie and F. E. Hart, (2006) *Performance and Cognition Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*, London: Routledge.

Malaev-Babel. A. (2002) "Appendix-A Practical Guide to the Application of Psychological Gesture," in M. Chekhov and M. Powers (eds.). Fwd. Simon Callow. *To the Actor On the Technique of Acting*, London: Routledge. 183-217.

Maldiney, H. (2000) 'Flesh and Verb in the Philosophy of Merleau-Ponty', in Evans, F. and Lawlor, L. (ed.) *Chiasms Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Marietti, A. K. (2000) 'Nietzsche's Philosophical Interpretation of Metaphor: A Metaphorical Genealogy' Nietzsche's Use of Language, Nijmegen University, 21-23 September 2000. Available Online:

dogma.free.fr/txt/AKM-Nietzsche02.htm

[Accessed 10 Dec 2007].

Marratto, S. L. (2012) *The Intercorporeal Self: Merleau-Ponty on Subjectivity*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Marowitz, C. (2004) *The Other Chekhov: A Biography of Michael Chekhov, the Legendary Actor, Director, and Theorist*, New York: Applause Theatre & Cinema Books.

Mason, F. (1993) [DVD] *The Training Sessions of Michael Chekhov*, Exeter: Arts Documentation Unit.

Massumi, B. (2002) *Parables for the Virtual Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

MICHA, *Master Classes in the Michael Chekhov Technique* (2007) [DVD Routledge]

Matthews, E. (2006) *Merleau-Ponty: A Guide for the Perplexed*, London, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Mazis, G. A. (2009) 'The Flesh of the World Is Emptiness and Emptiness Is the Flesh of the World, and Their Ethical Implications', in Park, J.Y. and Kopf, G. (ed.) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books.

----- (2012) 'Merleau-Ponty's Artist of Depth' *PhaenEx* 7, no. 1, pp. 244-274., Available Online:

https://www.academia.edu/8380871/Merleau-Pontys_Artist_of_Depth_Exploring_Eye_and_Mind_and_the_Works_of_Art_Chosen_by_Merleau-Ponty_as_Preface

[Accessed 12 December 2014]

McConachie, B. and Hart, F.E. (eds.) (2006) *Performance and Cognition: Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*, Oxon: Routledge.

Meerzon, Y. (2004) 'Forgotten Hollywood: Michael Chekhov's Hollywood Film Practice viewed through Prague School Aesthetics', *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*. Available Online:

<http://www.utoronto.ca/tsq/04/meerzon04.shtml>

[Accessed 17 November 2009]

----- (2005a) *The Path of a Character: Michael Chekhov's Inspired Acting and Theatre Semiotics*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang GmbH.

----- (2005b) 'Body Space: Michael Chekhov's Notion of Atmosphere as the Means of Creating Space in Theatre,' *Semiotica*, vol. 155, no. ¼, pp. 259-279.

----- (2014) 'Between Intentionality and Affect on Jan Mukarovsky's Theory of Reception', *Theatralia*, no. 2, pp. 24-40.

----- . (2015a) 'Staging the spectator in Michael Chekhov's acting theory', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 123-139.

----- . (2015b) 'Michael Chekhov's Theatre of the Future pros and Cons of the Failed Experiment', *Stanislavsky Studies*, vol. 3.no. 1, pp. 35-52.

----- . (2015c) 'Michael Chekhov's Theatre Theory and Pedagogy of Theatre Adaptation', *Critical-Stages/Scenes Critiques*. The IATC webjournal /Revue web de l' AICT –December 2015: Issue No 12. Available Online:

<http://www.critical-stages.org/12/michael-chekhovs-theatre-theory-and-pedagogy-of-theatre-adaptation/>

[Accessed 20 June 2016]

----- . (2017) 'Michael Chekhov's Theatre in the Age of Cosmopolitanism', [critical-stages.org /15/michael-chekhov-pedagogy-today/](http://critical-stages.org/15/michael-chekhov-pedagogy-today/)

[Accessed 9 April 2017]

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1951-1952) 'The Experience of Others', translated by Evans, F. and Silverman, H.J., *Lecture Notes in the Bulletin du Groupe d'etudes de psychologie de l'Universite de Paris*.

----- . (1962/2002) *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. by Smith, C., London and New York: Routledge.

----- . (2012) *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. by Landes, D.A., London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

----- . (1964a) *The Primacy of Perception*, M.Edie, J. (ed.), Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- . (1964a) "Eye and Mind", in *The Primacy of Perception*, M.Edie, J. (ed.), trans. by C. Dallery, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, pp. 159-193.

----- . (1964a) "The Child's Relations with Others", in *The Primacy of Perception*, M.Edie, J. (ed.), trans. by W. Cobb, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, pp. 96-159.

----- . (1964b) *Sense and Non-Sense*, trans. by Dreyfus, H., Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- . (1964b) "Cezanne's Doubt", in *Sense and Non-Sense*, trans.by Dreyfus, H., Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, pp. 9-25.

----- (1964c) *Signs*, trans. by McCleary, R.C., Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (1964c) "The Philosopher and his Shadow", in *Signs*, trans. by R. C. McCleary, USA: Northwestern University Press, pp: 159-182.

----- (1965) *The Structure of Behavior*, translated by Alden, L. F., London: Methuen.

----- (1968) *The Visible and the Invisible*, translated by Lingis, A. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (1973) *The Prose of the World*, Lefort, C. (ed.), translated by O'Neil, J., Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (2003) *Nature Course Notes from the College de France*, (ed.) by Seglard Dominique, trans. by Robert Vallier, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Merlin, B. (1999) 'Albert Filozov and the Method of Physical Actions', *New Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 228-235.

----- (2001) *Beyond Stanislavski: The Psychophysical Approach to Actor Training*, New York: Routledge.

----- (2003) *Konstantin Stanislavski*, London: Routledge.

Merlin, J. (2000) [DVD] *Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture*, Exeter: Arts Documentation Unit.

Merlin, J. (2015) 'The legacy of Michael Chekhov then and now', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 389-399.

Meyer-Horsch, U. (2017) 'Critical Stages/Scenes Critiques', critical-stages.org/15/gestures-of-listening/

[Accessed 24 April 2017]

Miklashevsky, T. A. (1983) 'Chekhov's Academy of Arts Questionnaire', *The Drama Review*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 22-33.

Mistry, F. (1981) *Nietzsche and Buddhism: Prolegomenon to a Comprehensive Study*, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Mittelsteiner, C. (2015) 'Georgette Boner and Michael Chekhov: collaboration(s) and dialogue(s) in search of a method', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 57-69.

Mitter, S. (1992) *Systems of Rehearsal: Stanislavsky, Brecht, Grotowski and Brook*. London. Routledge.

Moeller, H-G. (2004) 'The "Exotic" Nietzsche: East and West', *Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, vol. 28, pp. 57-69.

Montero, B. (2010) 'Does Bodily Awareness Interfere with Highly Skilled Movement?' *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 105-122.

Mooney, B. and Norris, D., (2007) 'Merleau-Ponty on Human Motility and Libet's Paradox', *Indo-Pacific journal of Phenomenology*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1-9., Available Online:

http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CCYQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fink.library.smu.edu.sg%2Fcgi%2Fviewcontent.cgi%3Farticle%3D1180%26context%3Dsoss_research&ei=1amdVOvGCoP8aL7NgOgO&usq=AFQjCNGX9zQc_DVqU9EekE1832OLtm9JwA&sig2=fqcbHdz4BAaqSQqTYBonkw

[Accessed at 26 Dec 2014]

Moore, G. (2002) *Nietzsche, Biology and Metaphor*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Motoyama, H. *Toward a Superconsciousness: Meditational Theory and Practice*, translated by Nagatomo, S. and Ames, C., Berkeley, California: Asian Humanities Press.

Morley, J. (2001) 'Inspiration and Expiration: Yoga Practice through Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology of the Body', *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 73-82.

Morrison, R. (1997) *Nietzsche and Buddhism: A Study in Nihilism and Ironic Affinities*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Morris, D. (1999) 'The Fold and the Body Schema in Merleau-Ponty and Dynamic Systems Theory', *Chiasmi International: Trilingual Studies Concerning Merleau-Ponty's Thought 1*, Available Online:

<http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/6444/>

[Accessed at 7 Dec 2014]

----- (2004) *The Sense of Space*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mroz, D. (2015) 'Cycles of Creation: Michael Chekhov and *Yinyang Wuxing* cosmology', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge*

Companion to Michael Chekhov, (London and New York, Routledge,), pp. 297-311.

Müller, H. (1984) *Hamletmaschine: and Other Texts for the Stage*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

----- (1995) *Contexts and History: A Collection of Essays from the Sydney German Studies Symposium (Sydney, Australien)*, Tübingen : Stauffenburg Verlag.

----- (2001) *A Heiner Müller Reader: Plays, Poetry, Prose*. Ed. Carl Wieber. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Myss, C. (2001) *Sacred Continents: Awakening Divine Potential*, London: Bantam Books.

Nagatomo, S. (1989) 'Part Three: The Japanese Concept of Self, Another Analysis of a Culturally Reinforced Attitude', in Shaner, D.E., Nagatomo, S., Yuasa, Y. *Science and Comparative Philosophy: Introducing Yuasa Yasuo*, The Netherlands, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

----- (1992a) *Attunement through the Body*, New York: State University of New York Press

----- (1992b) 'An Eastern Concept of the Body: Yuasa's Body Scheme', in Sheets-Johnstone, M. (ed.) *Giving the Body its Due*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

----- (1992c) "Two Contemporary Japanese Views of the Body: ICHIKAWA Hiroshi and YUASA Yasuo," in Kasulis T.P. (ed.) *Self as Body in Asian Theory and Practice*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp.321-346.

----- (2000) 'The Logic of the Diamond Sutra: A is not A, therefore it is A', *Asian Philosophy*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 213-244.

----- (2002) 'Ki-energy: invisible psychophysical energy', *Asian Philosophy*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 173-181.

----- (2006a) 'In Praise of Non-Performance in the Performing Arts', unpublished keynote address, "The Changing Body" Symposium, Department of Drama , University of Exeter, January 6-8.

----- (2006b) 'Yuasa Yasuo's Theory of the Body, a keynote speech delivered, "Contemporary Japanese Concept of the Body" Symposium, School of Oriental and African studies, June 5-6.

----- (2008) 'Translator's Introduction', in Yuasa, Y., *Overcoming Modernity: Synchronicity and Image Thinking*, translated by Nagatomo, S., Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- (2009) 'Ki-Energy: Underpinning Religion and Ethics', in Park, J.Y. and Kopf, G. (ed.) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books.

----- (2012) 'The *Diamondsūtra*'s Logic of Not: Toward a Holistic Mode of Thinking'. Available Online:
<https://astro.temple.edu/~snagatom/SketchLogicofNot>.

[Accessed 7 February 2013]

----- (2014) 'Yuasa Yasuo's Philosophy of Self-Cultivation: A Theory of Embodiment', in Bred W. Davis (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Philosophy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nancy, J.L. (2007) *Listening*, USA: Fordham University Press.

Nietzsche, F. (1911) *Human All-Too-Human*, translated by Cohn, P.V., Edinburgh and London: Morrison and Gibb Limited.

----- (1911) 'The Wanderer and his Shadow', in *Human All-Too-Human*, translated by Cohn, P.V., Edinburgh and London: Morrison and Gibb Limited.

----- (1963) *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (1883-1885), in Kaufmann, W., (ed.) *The Portable Nietzsche*. New York: Random House.

----- (1967) *The Birth of Tragedy*, translated by Kaufmann, W., New York: Vintage Press.

----- (1968) *The Will to Power*, Kaufmann, W. (ed.), translated by Kaufmann, W. and Hollingdale, R.J., New York: Vintage Books.

----- (1974) *The Gay Science*, translated by Kaufmann, W., New York: Vintage Books.

----- (1973/1978) *Beyond Good and Evil*, translated by Hollingdale, R.J., London: Penguin Books.

----- (1979) 'The Philosopher', 'Philosophy and Truth', 'On the Truth and Lies in A Nonmoral Sense', in Breazeale, D. (ed.) *Nietzsche, Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870's*. New Jersey: Humanities Press.

----- (1991) *Beyond Good and Evil*, Kaufmann, W. (ed.), New York: Vintage Books.

----- (1999) *Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870s*, Breazeale, D. (ed.), Amherst, New York: Humanity Books.

----- (2005) *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for Everyone and Nobody*, translated by Parkes, G., New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

----- (2008a) *Twilight of the Idols*, translated by Large, D., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

----- (2008b) *Human, All Too Human, Beyond Good and Evil*, translated by Zimmern, H. and Cohn P.V., Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.

----- (2008c), *On the Genealogy of Morals*, Douglas S. (ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

----- (2009) *Ecce Homo*, translated by Large, D., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nishida, K. (1958/1966) *Intelligibility and the Philosophy of Nothingness. Three Philosophical Essays*, translated by Schinziger, R., Honolulu: East-West Center Press.

----- (1958/1966) 'The Intelligible World', translated by Schinzinger, R. in *Intelligibility and the Philosophy of Nothingness: Three Philosophical Essays*, Honolulu: East-West Center Press, pp. 69-145.

----- (1958/1966) 'Goethe's Metaphysical Background', translated by Schinzinger, R., in *Intelligibility and the Philosophy of Nothingness. Three Philosophical Essays*, Honolulu: East-West Center Press, pp. 145-163.

----- (1958/1966) 'The Unity of Opposites', translated by Schinzinger, R. in *Intelligibility and the Philosophy of Nothingness. Three Philosophical Essays*, Honolulu: East-West Center Press, pp. 163-243.

----- (1970) *Fundamental Problems of Philosophy*, translated by Dillworth, D.A., Tokyo: Sophia University.

----- (1923/1973) *Art and Morality*, translated by Dilworth, D. A. and Viglielmo, V.H., Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press.

----- (1978) 'Affective Feeling', translated by Dilworth, D.A. and Viglielmo, V.H., in Nitta, Y. and Hirotaka, T. (eds.), *Japanese Phenomenology*, Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Co, pp. 223-247.

----- (1987) *Intuition and Reflection in Self-Consciousness*, translated by Viglielmo, V. H. with Yoshinori, T. and O'Leary, J. S., Albany: State University of New York Press.

----- (1987b) *Last Writings: Nothingness and the Religious Worldview*, translated by Dilworth, D.A., Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

----- (1990) *An Inquiry into the Good*, translated by Abe, M. and Ives, C., Princeton: Princeton University Press.

----- (1998) 'The Historical Body', translated by Dilworth, D. A. and Valdo H. V., with Zavala, A. J. (eds.), in *Sourcebook for Modern Japanese Philosophy: Selected Documents*, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, pp. 37-54.

----- (1998) 'The World as Identity of Absolute Contradiction', translated by Dilworth, D.A. and Viglielmo, V.H. with Zavala, A. J. (ed.) in *Sourcebook for Modern Japanese Philosophy: Selected Documents*, Connecticut: Greenwood Press) pp. 54-73.

----- (1998) 'Fundamental Principles of a New World Order', translated by Dilworth, D.A. and Viglielmo, V.H. with Zavala, A.J. (ed.), in *Sourcebook for Modern Japanese Philosophy: Selected Documents*, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, pp. 73-78.

----- (2012) *Place and Dialectic: Two Essays by Nishida Kitaro*, translated by Krummel, J.W.M. and Nagatomo, S., New York : Oxford University Press.

Nishitani, K. (1990) *The Self-Overcoming of Nihilism*, translated by Parkes, G. and Aihara, S., Albany: State University of New York Press.

----- (1991) *Nishida Kitaro*, translated by Seisaku, Y. and James W. Heisig, J.W. with introduction by Clarke, JR., California: University of California

Nobuhara, T. (Date unknown) 'Hartshorne and Nishida: Re-Envisioning the Absolute. Two Types of Pantheism vs. Spinoza's Pantheism', [Online], Available: <https://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Cont/ContNobu.htm> [18 Dec 2014]

Noda, M. (1955) 'East-West Synthesis in Kitaro Nishida', *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 345-359.

Noë, A. (2004) *Action in Perception*, Cambridge Massachusetts: M. I. T. Press.

Noland, C. (2007). *Motor Intentionality: Gestural Meaning in Bill Viola and Merleau-Ponty*. Available Online:

<http://pmc.iath.virginia.edu/text-only/issue.507/17.3noland.txt>

[Accessed 8 December 2011]

Oida, Y. (1979-80) 'Shinto Training of the Actor.' *Theatre Papers*, The Third Series, no. 3.

----- with Marshall, L. (1997) *The Invisible Actor*, London: Methuen.

Olkowski, D. and Morley, J. (ed.) (1999) *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life and World*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Olkowski, D. (1999) 'Introduction: The Continuum of Interiority Exteriority in the Thought of Merleau-Ponty', in Olkowski, D. and Morley, J. (ed.) *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life, and the World*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Olson, C. (1986) 'The Human Body as a Boundary Symbol: A Comparison of Merleau-Ponty and Dogen', *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 107-120.

----- (2009) 'The Human Body as a Boundary Symbol: A Comparison of Merleau-Ponty and Dōgen' in J.Y. Park and G. Kopf (eds). *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books, pp. 83-95.

Ortolani, B. and Leiter, S., (1998) *Zeami and the No Theatre of the World*, New York: Martin E. Segal Theatre Center Publications.

Padegimas, G. (2015) 'Chekhov's Luthianian lessons', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge,), pp. 343-357.

Park, J. Y. (2009) 'The Double: Merleau-Ponty and Chinul on Thinking and Questioning', in G.Kopf and J.Y. Park (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books, pp. 97-113.

Parkes, G. (1983) 'The Wandering Dance: Chuang Tzu and Zarathustra,' *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 235-250.

----- (1989) 'A Cast of many: Nietzsche and depth-psychological pluralism,' *Man and World*, vol. 53, pp. 453-470.

----- (ed.) (1991) *Nietzsche and Asian Thought*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

-----, (1991a) 'The Early Reception of Nietzsche's Philosophy in Japan,' in *Nietzsche and Asian Thought*, 177-199.

----- (1994) *Composing the Soul: Reaches of Nietzsche's Psychology*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

----- (1996) 'Nietzsche and East Asian Thought: Influences, Impacts and Resonances,' in K. Higgins and B. Magnus (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Nietzsche*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). Pp. 356-383.

----- (2005) 'Introduction', in Nietzsche, F. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book For Everyone and Nobody*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

----- (2011) "Nietzsche, Panpsychism and Pure Experience: An East-Asian Contemplative Perspective" in A.Rehberg (ed.) *Nietzsche and Phenomenology*, (London and New York: Routledge), pp. 87-103.

Petit, L. (2010) *The Michael Chekhov Handbook For the Actor*, Oxon: Routledge.

Petitmengin-Peugeot, C. (1999) 'The Intuitive Experience: A First-Person Empirical Investigation', *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2-3, pp. 43-77.

----- (2006) 'Describing one's subjective experience in the second person: An interview method for the science of consciousness,' *Phenomenology and Cognitive Sciences*, vol. 5, pp. 229-269.

----- (2007) 'Towards the Source of Thoughts The Gestural and Transmodal Dimension of Lived Experience,' *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 54-82.

----- Michel Bitbol, Jean-Michel Nissou, Bernard Bachoud, Helene Curalluci, Michel Cermolacce, and Jean Vion-Dury, (2009) 'Listening from Within' *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 16, no. 10-12, pp. 252–284.

Pettigrew, D. E. (1999) 'Merleau-Ponty and the Unconscious: A Poetic Vision', in Olkowski, D. and Morley, J. (ed.) *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life, and the World*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Phillips, J. (1999) 'From the Unseen to the Invisible: Merleau-Ponty's Sorbonne Lectures as Preparation for his Later Thought', in D. Olkowski and J. Morley (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life, and the World*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Pitches, J. (2005) 'Is it all going soft? The turning point in Russian Actor training', *New Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 21, issue 2, pp. 108-117.

----- (2006) *Science and the Stanislavski Tradition of Acting*, London: Routledge.

----- (2007) 'Towards a Platonic Paradigm of Performer Training: Michael Chekhov and Anatoly Vasiliev,' *Contemporary Theatre Review*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 28-40.

----- (2009) 'Spinal Snaps: Tracing a Back-story of European Actor Training', *Performance Research*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 85-95.

----- (ed.) (2012) *The Russians in Britain: British Theatre and the Russian Tradition of Actor Training*, London and New York: Routledge.

----- (2013) 'The Technique in microcosm: Michael Chekhov's work on the Fisher' scene,' *Theater Dance and Performance Training*. (Special Issue Michael Chekhov), vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 219-236.

----- (2015) 'Contrasting modernities: the rural and the urban in Michael Chekhov's Psychological Gesture and Meyerhold's biomechanical etudes', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, (London and New York, Routledge,), pp. 218-235.

Poellner, P. (1995) *Nietzsche and Metaphysics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Polanyi, M. (1973) *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Potter, N. (ed.) (2002) *Movement for Actors*, Allworth Press: New York.

Powers, M. (1992) (ed.) [Audio Programme] *Michael Chekhov: On Theatre and the Art of Acting: A Guide to Discovery with Exercises*, tape series, New York: Applause.

----- (2002) 'The Past, Present and Future of Michael Chekhov', in Michael Chekhov, *To the Actor*, London: Routledge, pp. xxv-xlvi.

Priest, S. (1998) *Merleau-Ponty*, London and New York: Routledge.

----- (2009) 'The Structure of Emptiness', *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 467-480.

Pulido, M. (2010) 'An Entirely Different Kind of Synthesis: Reflections on Merleau-Ponty's Analysis of Space in The Phenomenology of Perception', *Aporia*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 27-44.

Purser, A. (2011) 'The Dancing Body-Subject: Merleau-Ponty's Mirror Stage in the Dance Studio', *Subjectivity*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 183-203.

Quadri, F. (1998) *Robert Wilson*, New York: Rizzoli.

Quick, A. (2006) "'The Gift of Play: *Ubung* and the Secret Signal of Gesture,'" in Kelleher, J. and Ridout, N. (eds.) *Contemporary Theatres in Europe*, London: Routledge, pp. 149-162.

Ravn, S. (2009) *Sensing Movement, Living Spaces: An Investigation of Movement Based on the Lived Experience of 13 Professional Dancers*, Saarbrücken: Verlag Dr Müller.

Regan, P. (2012) 'Philosophical Hermeneutics: Concepts of Reading, Understanding and Interpretation' in *Meta: Research in Hermeneutics, Phenomenology and Practical Philosophy*, Volume IV, No2, December 2012, pp. 286-303.

Rehberg, A. (ed.) (2011) *Nietzsche and Phenomenology*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

----- (2011) 'Nietzsche and Merleau-Ponty: Body, Physiology, Flesh', in A. Rehberg (ed.) *Nietzsche and Phenomenology*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 141-163.

Rizzolatti, G., L. Fadiga, V. Gallese, L. Fogassi (1996) 'Premotor Cortex and the Recognition of Motor Actions', *Cognitive Brain Research*, vol. 3, pp. 131-141.

Rizzolatti, G. and Craighero L. (2005) "Mirror Neuron: a Neurological Approach to Empathy", in J.P. Changeux, A. Damasio, W. Singer, and Y. Christen (eds.) *Neurobiology of Human Values* (Berlin: Springer Press), pp. 107-123.

Rehberg, A. (2002) 'The Overcoming of Physiology', *Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, vol. 23, pp. 39-50.

----- (ed.) (2011) *Nietzsche and Phenomenology*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

----- (2011) 'Nietzsche and Merleau-Ponty: Body, Physiology, Flesh', in A. Rehberg (ed.) *Nietzsche and Phenomenology*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Reynolds, J. (2004) *Merleau-Ponty and Derrida: Intertwining Embodiment and Alterity*, Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press.

Reuter, M. (1999) 'Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Pre-Reflective Intentionality', *Synthese*, vol. 118, pp. 69-88.

Richard, T. (1995) *At Work with Grotowski on Physical Actions*, London: Routledge.

Ridley, A. (2007) *Nietzsche on Art*, London: Routledge.

Ruhmor, F. (2002) 'Michael Chekhov, Psychological Gesture and the Thinking Heart', in Nicole Potter (ed.) *Movement for Actors*, New York: Allworth Press, pp. 27-36.

Russell, H. T., Heavy, C. L. and Bensaheb, A. (2009) 'Sensory Awareness', *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 16, no. 10-12, pp. 231-251.

Roach, J. (1993) *The Player's Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting*, United States: Michigan Press.

Robbins, P. and Aydele, M., (ed.) (2009) *Situated Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sallis, J. (1991) *Crossings: Nietzsche and the Space of Tragedy*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

----- (2011) "Shining in Perspective: Nietzsche and Beyond", in A. Renberg (ed.) *Nietzsche and Phenomenology*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 19-33.

Sanchez-Colberg, A. (2007) "Altered states and subliminal spaces: Charting the road towards a physical theatre", in Keefe, J. and Murray, S. (eds.) *Physical Theatres: A critical reader*, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 21-25.

Sarukkai, S. (2002) 'Inside/Outside: Merleau-Ponty/Yoga', *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 459-478.

Schacht, R. (1983) *Nietzsche*, London: Routledge.

Schechner, R. (1969) *Public Domain: Essays on the Theatre*. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

----- (1985) *Between Theatre and Anthropology*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

----- (1993) "Anna Deavere-Smith: Acting as Incorporation," *Drama Review*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 63-64.

----- (2003) *Performance Theory*, London: Routledge.

----- (2004) 'The Broad Spectrum Approach', in H. Bial (ed.), *Performance Studies*, London and N.York: Routledge, pp. 7-10.

----- (2007) "Living a Double Consciousness", in Bell, C. (ed.) *Teaching Ritual*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-21.

Schenck, D. (1985) 'Merleau-Ponty on Perspectivism with References to Nietzsche', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 307-314.

Schinzinger, R. (1966) "Introduction", in Nishida, K., *Intelligibility and the Philosophy of Nothingness: Three Philosophical Essays*, Honolulu: East-West Center Press.

Schrift, A. D. (ed.) (2000) *Why Nietzsche Still? Reflections on Drama, Culture, and Politics*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Seddon, R. (ed.) (1988/2004) *Rudolf Steiner*, Berkeley, California: North Atlantic Books.

Sellers-Young, B. (1999) 'Technique of the Embodied Actor', *Theatre Research International*, vol 24, no. 1, pp. 89-97.

----- (2001) *Breathing, Movement, Exploration*, New York: Hal Leonard Corporation.

Senelick, L. (2009) 'Embodying Emptiness: the Irreality of Mikhail Chekhov's Khlestakov', *New Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 25, pp. 224-232.

Shaner, D. E. (1985) 'The Bodymind Experience in Dogen's "Shobogenzo": A Phenomenological Perspective,' *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 17-35.

----- Nagamoto, S. and Yuasa, Y. (1989) *Science and Comparative Philosophy: Introducing Yuasa*, Netherlands: E. J. Brill.

----- (2002) 'Temporality and Personal Identity in the Thought of Nishida Kitaro', *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 224-245.

Sharp, M. (2002) *Michael Chekhov The Dartington Years*, VHS, Palomino Films.

Sheets-Johnstone, M. (2009) *The Corporeal Turn: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, Exeter: Imprint Academic.

Shevtsova, M. (2007) *Robert Wilson*, London : Routledge.

Shriver, R. (2010) *From the Depths of Aesthetic Expression: Nishida, Merleau-Ponty and the Body*. Available Online:

[https://www.academia.edu/405818/From the Depths of Aesthetic Expression Nishida Merleau-Ponty and the Body](https://www.academia.edu/405818/From_the_Depths_of_Aesthetic_Expression_Nishida_Merleau-Ponty_and_the_Body)

[Accessed 12 Dec 2014]

Shusterman, R. (2008) *Body Consciousness: A Philosophy of Mindfulness and Somaesthetics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silverman, H. J. (1990) 'Merleau-Ponty and Derrida: Writing on Writing' in Johnson, G.A. and Smith, M.B. (ed.) *Ontology and Alterity in Merleau-Ponty*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (1993) 'Cézanne Mirror Stage', in Johnson, G.A. and Smith, M.B. (ed.) *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (2000) 'Is Merleau-Ponty Inside or Outside the History of Philosophy?', in Evans, F. and Lawlor, L. (ed.) *Chiasms: Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Silk, M. S. and Stern, J. P. (1981), *Nietzsche on Tragedy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sinigaglia, C. and Rizzolatti, G. (2011) "Through the Looking Glass: Self and Others", *Consciousness and Cognition*, vol. 20, pp. 64-74.
- Slaby, J. (2008) 'Affective Intentionality and the Feeling Body', *Phenomenology of Cognitive Sciences*, vol. 7, pp. 429–444
- Slatmann, J. (2009) 'A Strange Hand: On self-recognition and recognition of another', *Phenomenological Cognitive Science*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 321-342.
- Smith, D. W. (2005) 'Klossowski's Reading of Nietzsche's Impulses, Phantasms, Simulacra, Stereotypes', *Diacritics*, Summer, pp. 8-21.
- Smith, D. (2004) 'Nietzsche's India, Another Look', *Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, vol. 28, pp. 57-69.
- Smith, M.B. (1999) 'Transcendence in Merleau-Ponty', in Olkowski, D. and Morley, J. (ed.) *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life, and the World*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Soares, T. (2009) "An Introduction to Influences on Michael Chekhov's Technique," <https://tomsoares22.wordpress.com/2009/10/27/an-introduction-to-influences-on-michael-chekhov%E2%80%99s-technique-3/>.
- Sobchack, V. (2004) *Carnal Thoughts: Embodiment and Moving Image Culture*, Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- (2004) "A Leg to Stand On: Prosthetics, Metaphor and Materiality" in *Carnal Thoughts: Embodiment and Moving Image Culture*, California: University of California Press.
- (2010) 'Living a Phantom Limb on the Phenomenology of Bodily Integrity', *Body and Society*, vol.16, no. 3, pp. 51-67.
- Sofia, G. (2014) 'Towards the Twentieth Century History of the Relationship Between Theatre and Neuroscience', *Brazilian Journal on Presence Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2.
- Sotto-Morettini, D. (2010) *The Philosophical Actor: A Practical Meditation for Practicing Theatre Artists*, Chicago: Intellect.
- Spiegelberg, H. (1960/1984) *The Phenomenological Movement: A Historical Introduction*, Dordrecht, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Springgay, S. (2005) 'Thinking Through Bodies: Bodies Encounters and the Process of Meaning Making in an e-mail Generated Art Project', *Studies in Art Education*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 34-50.

Stadelmann-Boutry, B. (2006) 'Yuasa Yasuo's Theory of the Body', in Heisig, J. W. (ed.) *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy*, Nagoya: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture.

Stadelmann-Boutry, B. (2006) 'Yuasa Yasuo's Theory of the Body'. Available Online:

<https://nirc.nanzan-u.ac.jp/nfile/2050>

[Accessed August 4 2012]

Spinks, L. (2003) *Friedrich Nietzsche*, London: Routledge.

Stanislavsky, K. (1981) *Building a Character*, translated by Hapgood, E. R., London: Methuen.

----- (1994a) *Creating a Role*, translated by Hapgood, E.R., London: Methuen.

----- (1994b) *An Actor Prepares*, translated by Hapgood, E. R., London: Methuen.

Standal, F. Ø. and Moe, V. F., (2011) 'Merleau-Ponty Meets Kretchmar: Sweet Tensions of Embodied Learning', *Sports, Ethics and Philosophy*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 256-269.

States, O.B. (1985) *Great Reckonings in little Rooms: On the Phenomenology of Theatre*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Steeves, J. B. (2004) *Imagining Bodies: Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of Imagination*, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania: Duquesne University Press.

Stern, D. N. (2010) *Forms of Vitality: Exploring Dynamic Experience in Psychology, the Arts, Psychotherapy, and Development*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Stevens, B. (2009a) 'The Transcendental Path: Abhidharma Sources of Nishida's Logic of Place', in Bouso, G. R. and Heisig, J. W. (eds.) *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy 6: Confluences and Cross Currents*, Nagoya: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture.

----- (2009b) 'Self in Space: Nishida Philosophy and Phenomenology of Maurice Merleau-Ponty', in Kopf, G. and Park, J. Y. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books, pp. 133-141.

Stewart, J., Gapenne, E. and Di Paolo, E. A. (2010) *Enaction: Toward a New Paradigm for Cognitive Science*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Sufranski, R. (2002) *Nietzsche A Philosophical Biography*, translated by S. Frisch, London: Granta Publications.

Taminiaux, J. (1993) 'The Thinker and the Painter', in Johnson, G.A., (ed.), *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Taylor, George and Whyman, Rose (2005) "Francois Delsarte, Prince Sergei Volkonsky and Mikhail Chekhov," *Mime Journal: Vol. 23 Essays on Francois Delsarte*, Article 7, pp. 97-111.

Thompson, E. (1999) *Human Consciousness: From Intersubjectivity to Interbeing*. [Online] Available:

www.ummoos.org/pes/pesfetz1.html

[Accessed 20 February 2011]

----- (2005) 'Sensorimotor Subjectivity and the Enactive Approach to Experience', *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Science*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 407-427.

----- (2007) *Mind in Life: Biology, Phenomenology and the Sciences of Mind*, Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Toadvine, T. and Lawlor, L (ed.) (2007) *The Merleau-Ponty Reader*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (2009) *Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of Nature*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Toporkov, V. (1998) *Stanislavski in Rehearsal: The Final Years*, translated by Edwards, C., London: Routledge.

Torjussen, L.P.S (2009) 'Is Nietzsche a Phenomenologist? Towards a Nietzschean Phenomenology of the Body', *Analecta husserliana. The Yearbook of phenomenological research*, vol. 103, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 179-190.

Tremblay, J. (2008) 'The Potential of Nishida's "Encompassing" Language,' in Wing-keung and Cheung Ching-yuen. (eds.) *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy 4: Facing the Twentieth-First Century*, Nagoya: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture.

Turner, B.S. (1984) *The Body and Society: Explorations in Social Theory*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Turner, V. (1969) *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, New Jersey: Aldine Publishing Company.

Ueda, S. (1993) 'Pure Experience, Self-Awareness, 'Basho,' in *L' Ecole de Kyoto*. Bruxelles: Ousia.

Uehara, M. (2008) 'Japanese Aspects of Nishida's Basho: Seeing the "Form without Form",', in Wing-keung and Cheung Ching-yuen. (eds.) *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy 4: Facing the Twentieth-First Century*, Nagoya: (Nanzan) Institute for Religion and Culture.

Van der Braak, A. (2011) *Nietzsche and Zen: Self Overcoming Without a Self*, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Vallega-Neu D. (2005) *The Bodily Dimension in Thinking*, Albany, N.Y: State University of New York Press.

Varela, F., and Thompson, J. E., and Rosch, E. (1991) *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

----- and Shear, J. (ed.) (1999/2002) *The View From Within First Person Approached to the Study of Consciousness*, UK: Imprint Academic.

----- 'Present Time Consciousness' (2002) in Varela, F. and Shear, J. (eds.) *The View From Within First Person Approached to the Study of Consciousness*, 2nd Edition, UK: Imprint Academic.

Varela, C. (2002) *Reaching for a Paradigm: Dynamic Embodiment*, Available at: https://www.google.co.uk/?qws_rd=ssl#q=varela+reaching+for+a+paradigm

[Accessed 10 Dec 2012]

Vasseleu, C. (1998) *Textures of Light Vision and Touch in Irigaray, Levinas and Merleau-Ponty*, London and New York: Routledge.

Waldenfels, H. (1966) 'Absolute Nothingness Preliminary Considerations on a Central Notion in the Philosophy of Nishida Kitaro and the Kyoto School', *Monumenta Nipponica*, vol. 21, no. 3/4, pp. 354-391.

Walsh, L. (2015) 'Developing the imagination: Michael Chekhov in actor training', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 357-372.

Wang, Y. (1963) 'Inquiry on the Great Learning', in Chan, W. (ed.), *A Sourcebook in Chinese Philosophy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wargo, R. J. J. (2005) *The Logic of Nothingness: A Study of Nishida Kitaro*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Watson, I. (2015) "Prying behind the curtain(s) of the creative process" Eugenio Barba's principles and Michael Chekhov's technique', in M.C. Autant-Mathieu

and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 235-251.

Welton, D. (ed.) (1998) *Body and Flesh: A Philosophical Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Weiss, G. (1999a) *Body Images: Embodiment as Intercorporeality*, New York: Routledge.

----- (1999b) "Body Image Intercourse: A Corporeal Dialogue between Merleau-Ponty and Schilder" in Olkowski, D. and Morley, J. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty Interiority and Exteriority, Psychic Life, and the World*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- (2000) "Écart: The Space of Corporeal Difference" in Evans, F. and Lawlor, L. (eds.) *Chiasms: Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- (ed.) (2008) *Intertwinings: Interdisciplinary Encounters with Merleau-Ponty*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wei-ming, Tu (1985) *Confucian Thought: Selfhood as Creative Transformation*, Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

White, A. R. (2009) 'Radiation and the Transmission of Energy: From Stanislavsky to Michael Chekhov', *Performance and Spirituality*, no. 1, pp. 23-46, Available Online:

<http://www.utdl.edu/ojs/index.php/pas/article/view/9/10>

[Accessed 12 Dec 2014]

----- (2015) "Chekhov's notion of radiating: from concept to concrete" in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Michael Chekhov*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 110-123.

Whitmire, J. (2009) 'The Many and the Ontological Multiplicity and Functional Unity of the Person in the Later Nietzsche', *The Pluralist*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 4.

Whitney, S. (2012) "'Overwhelming proximity": Affective Orientation and Difference in Merleau-Ponty's Account of Pure Depth', [Online], Available: https://www.academia.edu/1403833/_Overwhelming_proximity_Affective_Orientation_and_Difference_in_Merleau-Pontys_Account_of_Pure_Depth

Whyman, R. (2008) *The Stanislavsky System of Acting*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

----- (2015) "Russian Delsartism and Michael Chekhov: the search for the eternal type", in M.C. Autant-Mathieu and Yana Meerzon (eds.) *The Routledge*

Companion to Michael Chekhov, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 267-282.

----- (2016), 'Explanations and Implications of 'psychophysical' acting', *New Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 157-168.

Widder, N. (2012) 'A Semblance of Identity: Nietzsche on the Agency of Drives and their Relation to the Ego', *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 821-842

Wiles, T. J. (1980) *The Theatre Event: Modern Theories of Performance*, Chicago: University Chicago Press.

William, J. (1979-80) 'What is an Emotion', *Theatre Papers*, The Third Series, n. 3.

Wing-keung and Cheung Ching-yuen. (eds.) (2008) *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy 4: Facing the Twentieth-First Century*. Nagoya: (Nanzan) Institute for Religion and Culture.

Wintsch-Heinsen, B. (2016) *A Report of my Experience at The Michael Chekhov School in Hudson, New York*, New York Hudson: Michael Chekhov School.

www.michaelchekhov.eu/

www.michaelchekhov.net

www.michaelchekhov.org.uk

Yuasa, Y. (1987) *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-Body Theory*, Kasulis, T.P. (ed.), translated by Nagatomo, S. and Kasulis, T.P., Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- (1992) "A Contemporary Scientific Paradigm and the Discovery of the Inner Cosmos" Kasulis T. P. (ed.), translated by Shigenori Nagatomo and William Allen, in *Self as Body in Asian Theory and Practice*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp.347-361.

----- (1993) *The Body, Self-Cultivation, and Ki-Energy*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

----- (2005) 'Image-Thinking and the Understanding of "Being": The Psychological Basis of Linguistic Expression', translated by Nagatomo, S. and Fasan, J., *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 179-208.

----- (2008) *Overcoming Modernity: Synchronicity and Image Thinking*, translated by Nagatomo, S., Albany: State University of New York Press.

----- (2009) "Merleau-Ponty's Theory of the Body and the Doctrine of the Five Skandhas", translated by Kopf, G., in Park, J.Y. and Kopf, G. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Yusa, M. (2002) *Zen and Philosophy: An Intellectual Biography of Nishida Kitaro*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Yoo, J. (2007) 'Moving ki in Inner and Outer Space- A Korean Perspective on Acting Process in The Water Station;', *Contemporary Theatre Review*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 81-96.

Young, B. (2008) 'The Language of the Lips, Merleau-Ponty and Irigaray: Toward a Culture of Difference', in Weiss, G. (ed.) *Intertwinings Interdisciplinary Encounters with Merleau-Ponty*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Young, J. (2010) *Friedrich Nietzsche a Philosophical Biography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zahavi, D. (1999) *Self-awareness and Alterity: A Phenomenological Investigation*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

----- (2008) *Subjectivity and Selfhood: Investigating the First Person Perspective*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

----- (ed.) (2012) *The Oxford Handbook of Contemporary Phenomenology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zarrilli, P. B. (1990) 'What Does It Mean "To Become the Character": Power, Presence, and Transcendence in Asian In-Body Disciplines of Practice.' in Schechner, R. and Appel, W. (eds.) *By Means of Performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 132-148.

----- (ed.) (1993) *Asian Martial Arts in Actor Training*, Wisconsin-Madison: Center for South Asian Studies Publications Series.

----- (ed.) (1995/2002) *Acting (Re) Considered*, London and New York: Routledge.

----- (1995) 'Between Theories and Practices: Dichotomies or Dialogue?' *Theatre Topics*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 111-122.

----- (1997) 'Acting "at the nerve ends": Beckett, Blau, and the Necessary', *Theatre Topics*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 103-16.

----- (1998) 'From Kalarippayattu to Beckett,' video by Peter Hulton. Exeter: Arts Archives, the Fourth Archive 1998/99.

- . (2000a) *When the Body Becomes All Eyes: Paradigms, Discourses and Practices of Power in Kalarippayattu, a South Indian Martial Art*, India: Oxford University Press India.
- , (2000b) 'Embodying the Lion's 'fury.' Ambivalent Animals, Activation, Representation,' *Performance Research*, vol. 5, no.2, pp. 41-54.
- . (2001) 'Negotiating Performance Epistemologies: Knowledge About, For, and In,' *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 31-46.
- . (2002) 'ON THE EDGE OF BREATH, LOOKING. Cultivating the actor's bodymind through Asian martial /meditation arts', in P.Zarrilli (ed.), *Acting Re-Consider A Theoretical and Practical Guide*, London/New York: Routledge, pp. 181-200.
- . (2002) (ed.) *Acting Re-Consider A Theoretical and Practical Guide*, London and New York: Routledge.
- . (2002a) 'Action, Structure, Task and Emotion and Performer Training from a Performance Studies Perspective,' in Stucky, N. and Winner, C. (eds.) *Teaching Performance Studies*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 145-160.
- . (2002b). 'The Metaphysical Studio', *The Drama Review*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 157-169.
- . (2004) 'Toward a Phenomenological Model of the Actor's Embodied Modes of Experience,' *Theatre Journal*, vol. 56, pp. 653-666.
- . (2007) 'Senses and Silence in Actor Training and Performance' in Banes, S. and Lepecki, A. (eds.) *The Senses in Performance*, London Routledge, 47-70.
- . (2008) 'An Enactive Approach to Understanding Acting,' *Theater Journal*, 59, 5: 635-647.
- . (2009) *Psychophysical Acting: An Intercultural Approach after Stanislavsky*, New York: Routledge.
- . (2011a) "Altered Consciousness in Performance: West and East" in Cardeña, E. and Winkelman, M. (eds.) *Altering Consciousness: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, California: Praeger Publishers and ABC-Clio, pp. 301-327.
- . (2011b) "'...presence..." as a question and emergent possibility: A case-study from the performer's perspective', in Giannachi, G., Kaye, N., and Shanks, M. (eds.) *Archaeologies of presence: Acting, performance, being*, London: Routledge, pp.119-152.

-----, Daboo, J., and Loukes, R. (2013) *Acting: Psychophysical Phenomenon and Process*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

----- (2015a) "The actor's work on attention, awareness and active imagination: Between phenomenology, cognitive sciences and practices of acting", in J.F. Sherman, M. Bleeker and E. Nedelkopoulou (eds.) *Theatre and Phenomenology*, Abington and New York: Routledge, pp. 95-116.

----- (2015b) "'Inner Movement" between practices of meditation, martial arts and acting. A focused examination of affect, feeling, sensing, and sensory attunement", in M. Bull and J.P. Pitchell (eds.) *Ritual, Performance and the Senses*, London: Bloomsbury, pp. 121-136.

Zahavi, D. (1999) *Self-awareness and Alterity: A Phenomenological Investigation*, US: Northwestern University Press.

----- (2008) *Subjectivity and Selfhood: Investigating the First Person Perspective*, US: MIT Press.

----- (2010) "Phenomenology", in Dermot Moran (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to Twentieth Century Philosophy*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 661-693.

----- (2015) *The Oxford Handbook of Contemporary Phenomenology*, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press

----- (2017) *Self and Other*, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Zinder, D. (2002) *Body Voice Imagination: A Training for the Actor*, London: Routledge.

-----, (2006) *David Zinder* (DVD recording), Exeter: Arts Documentation Unit.

-----, (2007) 'The Actor Imagines with His Body-Michael Chekhov: An examination of the phenomenon', *Contemporary Theatre Review*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp: 7-14.

-----, (2008) 'Workshop showings of monologues based in part on Chekhov's psychological gesture' (DVD recording), Exeter: Arts Documentation Unit.

----- (2009) *Body Voice Imagination Image: Image Work Training and the Chekhov Technique*, Oxon: Routledge.

----- (2017) 'ImageWork Training and the Chekhov Technique'. Available Online:

critical-stages.org/15/imagework-training-and-the-chekhov-technique/

[Accessed 19/4/2017]

Zeami, Motoyiko, (1984) *On the Art of the No Drama,: The Major Treatises of Zeami*, translated and introduction by Rimer, J. T and Masakazu, Y., Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ziporyn, B. (2009) 'How the Tree Sees Me: Sentience and Insentience in Tiantai and Merleau-Ponty,' in Kopf, G. and Park, J. Y. (eds.) *Merleau-Ponty and Buddhism*, Maryland: Lexington Books.