

CHOREOGRAPHING CHANCE

Gamze Şensoy Torun

Gamze Şensoy Torun, Research Assist. Dr., Faculty of Architecture and Design, Eskişehir Technical University, Turkey. ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4368-2649

ABSTRACT

Space moves with the body in the flow of time, becomes open to new possibilities, transforms and belongs to each other. The daily life of the city provides the environment in which this relationship is most obvious and diverse. The body can create space through cause and effect, but it can also completely break the connection inbetween. The unpredictability of the body is the most important factor in this.

Merce Cunningham's dance choreographies have been identified as a valuable basis for discussing the random spaces created by the body. Integrating elements of randomness, Cunningham often used dice rolls to determine the sequence and structure of movements, decoupling dance from traditional musical and spatial constraints. In this context the research question of the study is: "Which forms of relationship between body and space can be explored in the context of randomness through Merce Cunningham's dance?". The study aims to investigate the variables within the randomly created space.

A total of 204 dances were examined on the official website of 'Merce Cunningham Trust', where Cunningham's dances were listed, of which 43 contained a random relationship. The extraction of detailed data about the space proved impossible, resulting in the elimination of 15 of them. The examination of 28 dances revealed a relationship between randomness and the spatial approach, leading to the

identification of four distinct categories: Polytemporal spatialities, disjunctive simultaneities, autonomous co-presence and relational choreoscapes. These forms of relationship are also expected to provide insight into random spatial formations in daily life.

KEYWORDS

Body, Space, Daily Life, Dance, Randomness

1. INTRODUCTION

Space is a phenomenon that is too complex to be reduced down to a geometric context. It encompasses everything it includes, as well as the relationships between them. What makes it so complex is the variability of these relationships. The body can be regarded as a medium that either receives from or transfers these variations to the space, thereby establishing integrity between its components. While the body moves through time, space opens up to new possibilities, and the two become one by transforming each other. As depicted by Sir Henry Head, the volume created by the body and its environment is not static, but constantly expanding (Morasso et al. 2015). Also, Rudolf von Laban (1966), defines the volume surrounding the body as the 'kinesphere' and states that space is an energy kept alive through movement, not a constancy. When movements are involved in the bodily schema, stimuli from the external environment trigger the sensory systems, causing a change in the volume of the body's spatial configuration (Haggard and Wolpert 2005).

The body processes surrounding objects as extensions of itself, integrating them into its own reality; through this incorporation, the primordial space of the body transforms into a hybrid form. Thus, space and the body are intertwined. The body is not inside this place, but belongs to that place (Merleau-Ponty 2005). It is the body's own discoveries that add value and depth to this mutual process. The unpredictable structure of the body, which defies conventional geometry, transforms space into a dynamic phenomenon characterised by coincidental relationships. Ka (2003) mentions that the organic body has the

potential to reveal the invisible when it encounters geometric forms. Rajchman (1998) discusses the concept of infinite differentiation in a space comprising layers in contact, where temporary situations are constantly produced. Kiesler (2014) also supports the theory that space is in constant motion. The space containing temporality does not allow for certainty; rather, it takes on meaning as an entity that can change over time and is constantly being reconfigured with each new moment. The relationship between space and body can be discussed especially in this aspect in the context of daily life.

Everyday life in the city provides countless opportunities to encounter the unpredictable potentials. Space can be created through cause and effect by the body, but the connection can also be completely broken by it. The study aims to investigate this continuous and instantaneous transforming relationship between body and space. Rather than examining daily life directly, the study has adopted a different approach: conducting research through Merce Cunningham's dances, which incorporate elements of chance into the choreography.

Drawing on the body's potential to spontaneously transform space, Cunningham's chance-based choreography, created using dice, can offer a different perspective on the relationship between the body and space. In this context the research question of the study is: "Which forms of relationship between body and space can be explored in the context of randomness through Merce Cunningham's dances?"

Cunningham's dances, which are listed on the official website of the Merce Cunningham Trust, are an important source for the scope and methodology of the study. A total of 204 dances were examined, revealing randomness in 43 of them. Fifteen choreographies were excluded from the scope because they lacked the necessary information to draw inferences about space and body. Insights into daily life were attempted to be captured by interpreting the random body-space relationships in the remaining 28 choreographies.

2. RANDOMNESS, BODY AND SPACE

The body is in constant interaction with space, which is open to many different scenarios outside the system of rules. The way the body relates to other bodies, its spatial orientation, responses to both space and others, and positioning all convey a certain depth, uncovering the range of possible states the body can assume in any given moment within space. As Tschumi (1996) states, bodies create unforeseen spatialities through the execution of fluid or unpredictable movements. The actions of bodies, whether individually or collectively, constitute a dynamic structure that produces space, deforms it, rebuilds it, and subsequently destroys it.

The choice of the body is unpredictable and uncontrollable. It is for this reason that a dichotomy exists between the given (the predefined) and the experienced. This conflict is particularly evident in the context of urban daily life. The designed space motivates a certain behavior and the body, due to its nature, stays out of the arrangement. The presence of unplanned moments in daily life stems from the subconscious resisting the forms that attempt to suppress the body by integrating themselves into the flow of everyday existence. Consequently, narratives that can be characterised as "*out of plan*" emerge within the urban space. The situation in question here is that the relationship between body and space is established randomly.

Randomness exists through the uncertain change of the relationship and interaction between the elements. Instead of clear boundaries established with certainty, there is a series of possibilities established with uncertainty. Chance, in this context, is about the possibility of elements coming together to form a random relationship. Merce Cunningham's chance in dance procedure was seen as a unique opportunity to discuss the randomness of body and space and the elements that affect this relationship.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN

Merce Cunningham was a many-sided artist as well as being recognized as the choreographer of the 20th century. He was a dance-maker, a fierce collaborator, a chance taker, a boundless innovator, a film producer, and a teacher. Over the course of his 70-year creative career, Cunningham's work transformed the landscape of dance, music, and contemporary art forever. In 1953, Cunningham founded his own dance company and went on to create hundreds of unique choreographic works. He challenged traditional ideas about dance, including the roles of dancers and audience members, the limitations of the stage and the relationship between movement and beauty. He revolutionised dance with his avant-garde approach. Cunningham applied the principle of randomness to his dance choreography, allowing the flow of the dance and the organisation of the movements to be determined by chance. Randomness was used by Cunningham as a creative tool. The structure of his choreography was often guided by flipped coins, rolled dice, or even consultations with the '*I Ching*' (an ancient Chinese book of divination, in which 64 pairs of trigrams are shown with various interpretations. Also called: *Book of Changes*) (Collins Dictionary). Cunningham saw randomness as a means to liberate his imagination from its own clichés, balancing his meticulous creative process with surprising moments of discovery (Merce Cunningham Trust). This created a new language in artistic expression, making each performance unique and unrepeatable. Each viewer experienced the performance differently, and each work became open to different interpretations. In this context, space can be considered a constantly changing entity rather than something with a fixed meaning. Boundaries become blurred and space no longer has a fixed form.

The approach of abandoning predetermined structures and strict compositional rules in the artistic production process, and allowing some or all parts of the work to be shaped by chance, creates a space open to limitless possibilities and unforeseen events. Analysing

choreographies in which randomness is used as a method can provide a basis for understanding the contexts in which space can be formed.

3.1. Methodology

On the official website of '*Merce Cunningham Trust*', all choreographies are listed by year in the '*Choreography*' section of the '*The Work*' tab. There are total of 204 dances in the list, which started in 1938 and ended in 2009. Clicking on the '*More About Dance*' section provides access to shared information about dance. The content to be analysed is limited to this information. A total of 43 dances containing randomness in their content were identified by checking the information on all dances. However, as 15 dances only included chance procedures and/or randomness in their content, and did not provide sufficient information for analysing the venue, these dances were excluded from the scope. These dances are: Suite by Chance (1953), Solo Suite in Space and Time (1953), Dime a Dance (1953), Suite for Five (1956), Changeling (1957), Second Hand (1970), Exchange (1978), 50 Looks (1979), Numbers (1982), Inlets 2 (1983), Phrases (1984), Inventions (1989), Ocean (1994), Rondo (1996) and Split Sides (2003).

A commonality was determined according to the formation of space by putting together the random information of the remaining 28 dances. These are grouped into following four categories:

- *Polytemporal spatialities*: Sixteen Dances for Soloist and Company of Three (1951), Aeon (1961), Field Dances (1963) and Eleven (1988)
- *Disjunctive simultaneities*: Theater Piece No. 1 (1952), Untitled Solo (1953), Nocturnes (1956), Rune (1959), TV Rerun (1972), Chancing Steps (1973), Channels/Inserts (1981), Gallopade (1981), Doubletoss (1993) and BIPED (1999)
- *Autonomous co-presence*: Variation (1951), Fabrications (1987), Shards (1987) and Beach Birds (1991)
- *Relational choreoscapes*: Minutiae (1954), Story (1963), Paired (1964), Scramble (1967), Canfield (1969), Signals (1970), Grange Eve

(1986), August Pace (1989), Change of Address (1992) and Way Station (2001)

The spatial elements present in the dances were discussed, and then an attempt was made to gain insight into the nature of random spaces encountered in daily life.

3.2. Findings

The findings are as follows:

3.2.1. Polytemporal Spatialities

Spatiality is not constructed as a singular or linear unfolding, but as an entangled multiplicity. In these works, space is neither static nor unified; it is fractured and overlapping, continuously reorganised by bodies in motion operating under chance, variation and simultaneity.

Sixteen Dances for Soloist and Company of Three (1951)	Emotions order by chance: Nine total First seven emotions in solos Last two emotions: duet and quartet Final "Tranquility" quartet by chance Each dancer had distinct movement set
Aeon (1961)	Sequences followed, overlapped, or changed Some parts could be omitted Rauschenberg devised events Curtain rise included small explosions A "machine" crossed above stage Dancer number was flexible
Field Dances (1963)	Inspired by kids skipping, playing outside Dancers chose their own movements Each performance was uniquely different Dancers had shared small events Also had short solos assigned
Eleven (1988)	Space divided into eight equal areas Chance chose dancers and stage areas Aimed to explore spatial proportions Each phrase stayed in starting square Dancers could move to other squares after finished phrase

Figure 1. Cunningham's Choreographies that Reflects the Polytemporal Spatialities

In *'Sixteen Dances for Soloist and Company of Three'*, the layering of emotion and motion, is explored through discrete but rhythmically intercut solos, duets, and interludes. Each of these elements constitutes a temporal-spatial

state rearranged by indeterminacy. The different movements performed by each of the dancers create a spatial unity that is produced simultaneously. Each performance space, defined by the transition in emotional themes and bodily movements, metamorphoses into a phenomenon that accumulates in layers.

Within the context of *'Aeon'*, the presence of layered sequences and interchangeable components gives rise to a temporal elasticity. The occurrence of dependent or independent events within the randomly produced space serves to exacerbate this stratification.

The spaces established with the 'play' action, which is borrowed from daily life, create a dynamic spatialisation with the independent choices of each dancer in *'Field Dances'*. Despite being exhibited individually, a collective unity is created, which develops alongside the constant change of the performances.



Figure 2. A Scene From 'Field Dances'.

The division of the stage in *'Eleven'* into a grid, whereby bodies adhere to spatial boundaries determined randomly, provides a dynamic form of fragmentation. The spatial stratification is predicated on the temporal phenomenon, with each performance commencing and concluding within its designated space. This phenomenon is subject to constant transformation through the grids selected by chance on each occasion.

These dances create spaces comprising coexisting temporalities and bodily presences. They resist fixed narratives, inviting audiences into a performative field of possibilities where space and time are constantly changing.

3.2.2. Disjunctive Simultaneities

Space unfolds as a fragmented and nonlinear field. In these choreographies, multiple actions occur simultaneously or in shifting layers, sometimes in different physical or visual registers. They are not synchronized narratives, each element retains its autonomy, resisting the other's effect.

Theater Piece No. 1 (1952)	Audience seated in center area Chairs arranged along diagonals Spectators couldn't see everything directly Dog chased dancer during performance Spectators interpreted events individually Cage used chance-based time brackets	Channels/Inserts (1981)	Chance decided space usage order Action could occur simultaneously Chance determined dancer numbers involved Piece divided into sixteen sections Sections varied in length Notable section: male solos filmed Following section: Women laughing in small studio
Untitled Solo (1953)	Large gamut of movements devised Included arms, legs, head, torso Movements were separate and tensile Movements were off the normal or tranquil body-balance Arranged in continuity by randomness Movements overlapped with own rhythm, time	Gallopade (1981)	A series of non-sequitur situations The use of chance operations
Nocturnes (1956)	Used chance to relate to music Separate movement lines for each dancer Chance decided duets and groupings Stage split into two areas Main space: open, brightly lit The second space: Dim dancer figures on rear scrim Costumes: white tights and leotards/shirts	Doubletoss (1993)	Two dances merged into one piece Coin toss determined choreography Duality was dance's basic concept Dancers inhabited two different worlds Black scrim hung before backcloth Dancers seen behind and in front
Rune (1959)	Dance changed each performance by chance Space explored in layers Independent events in stage foreground Simultaneous events in middle and rear Audience viewed all layers together	BIPED (1999)	Motion capture animation is explored for the décor Choreographed 70 phrases transposed into digital images Animated images and abstract patterns projected Projection on scrim at stage front Live dancers visible behind scrim Stage floor randomly divided into lit squares Curtained booths let dancers appear/disappear
TV Rerun (1972)	Everyone learned same dance material Dancers chose parts during performance Spontaneous selection created unique versions Cunningham explored shifting stage focus Photographers moved around during performance Dancers responded with non-fixed focus		
Chancing Steps (1973)	Performed in any order or space Any combination of dances allowed Includes ten solos, five duets Also three trios, two quartets and two quintets Dances performed sequentially or overlapped Multiple dances could occur simultaneously		

Figure 3. Cunningham's Choreographies that Reflects the Disjunctive Simultaneities.

Space is no longer the backdrop to cohesive action. Instead, it becomes an area of multiplicity, inhabited by independent temporalities and embodied decisions.

In *'Theater Piece No.1'*, the fragmentation of space occurs in a way that the audience cannot see everything. At the same time, different perspectives perceived by different observers reveal many spatial possibilities.

'Untitled Solo' is a choreography of simultaneous yet independent flows, each body performing a different movement. These randomly arranged movements, with its own rhythm, become part of a fragmented space.

In *'Nocturnes'*, the simultaneous space is created by the physical division of the stage into two. The blurred bodies appearing behind the curtain embody this simultaneity, acting as shadows of the bodies in the primary space. *'Rune'* explore layers of presence -foreground, middle, and background- filled with coexisting

events. The audience's ability to see all the events unites the space formed by independent elements.



Figure 4. A Scene From 'Rune'.

Dancers improvise selections from shared material, generating unpredictable intersections. In 'TV Rerun'. Here, the space is formed not only by the audience's eyes, but also by the photographers' perspectives. Events that appear whole on stage become fragmented as photographers focus in on them.

'Changing Steps' is a series of spaces that are endlessly produced by the existence of variables such as the ways the body comes together, the order, and whether the dance is performed individually or with more bodies.

As in 'Nocturnes', 'Channels/Inserts' physically divide the space, enabling different events to occur simultaneously in each area. This time, sound also creates a simultaneous layer.

Randomness is considered a key element in the construction of space in 'Gallopade'. There is an emphasis on the meaningless nature of movements, flows, and the way things come together.

Simultaneous spatialities are established by the duality created through two different atmospheres, as well as by the reflections of the bodies themselves in 'Doubletoss'. Thus, in fact, duality is doubled. In 'BIPED', this synchronous events are presented through digitalization. The space creates a sense of simultaneity with the digital layers on the ground and in the background. The appearance and disappearance of bodies, and the way they blur,

makes this layering more multidimensional. In this context, time is not linear, but splintered. Dancers move through their own isolated timelines, unaware of or unaffected by those of others. The body becomes a vector of its own temporality, forming brief alignments or contradictions with others.

These dances generate spatial phenomena characterised by concurrent, yet dissociated, actions, devoid of a prevailing authoritative structure that would typically direct the body. Spaces are characterised by their complexity, wherein fragments coexist, collide, are plural, mobile and open-ended.

3.2.3. Autonomous Co-presence

The fundamental components of the spaces; body, sound, light, rhythm, and scenography, exist in deliberate disjunction.

Variation (1951)	Ballet steps arranged by chance order Difficulty from awkward transitions Cunningham didn't take musical cues Needed to track timing independently
Fabrications (1987)	Inspired by I Ching's sixty-four Used chance process with phrases Décor not period-accurate to dance
Shards (1987)	Created short phrases passed between dancers Chance determined phrase passing order One dancer moves, others remain immobile
Beach Birds (1991)	Based on individual physical phrasing Dancers don't have to be exactly together Dancers move like flock of birds Rhythm more fluid than usual Light color and intensity varied on white scrim backcloth Lighting plot devised by chance Timings unrelated to dance structure

Figure 5. Cunningham's Choreographies that Reflects the Autonomous Co-presence.

The dances under consideration do not conform to the notion of a unified sensory experience; rather, each constituent element is governed by its own distinct logic, which has been developed through the process of chance operations. The outcome of this process is a multidimensional space in which the audience is required to navigate multiple aesthetic scenes which coexist

yet are autonomous.

In *'Variation'*, the dancer contends with an impossibly awkward sequence of ballet movements, ignoring the musical phrasing; thus displacing temporal harmony between body and sound. In this sense, sound and movement are elements that exist independently of each other and create the spatial atmosphere together in temporal parallelism.

The performance piece *'Fabrications'* is notable for its complete separation of the dynamic space created by dance from the physical space. The décor constitutes a physical entity that exists independently of the dance.



Figure 6. A Scene From 'Fabrications'.

Bodies never intersect through movement; therefore, the spaces they dynamically produce are also separate from each other in *'Shards'*. The only connection between them is the signal for one to stop and the other to start moving.

It is possible to say that for the *'Beach Birds'*, movement is characterised by fluidity and independence, reminiscent of birds in flight, while lighting, determined by chance, evokes a distinct temporal landscape, unrelated to bodily action.

Space cultivates a form of autonomous co-presence, in which each component coexists but refuses to synchronise. The concept of time is understood as plural, with bodies operating independently and space becoming an intersection of asynchronous sensory parts.

3.2.4. Relational Choreoscapes

The concept of spatial experience is redefined as inherently relational, encompassing not only the

interaction among bodies but also the relationships between dancers and objects, sound cues, props, lighting mechanisms, and chance-induced triggers. These dances are characterised as interaction spaces, wherein meaning emanates from the dynamic negotiations between performers and external elements.

Minutiae (1954)	Free-standing object is created Dancers moved through, around, under the object Choreography used complex chance process
Story (1963)	Indeterminate structure Eighteen changeable sections (solos, duets etc.) Dancers could cue movement changes Clothes packed in two duffel bags Dancers could wear garments anytime
Paired (1964)	Dance had nine color-cued events Event sequence decided during performance Between events, paint cans used Dancers ran off, dipped in paint Paint color indicated next event
Scramble (1967)	Eighteen sections, order changeable Sections could be omitted Orchestra performs scrambled cued sequences Moveable canvas set that dancers can move Canvas strips in spectrum colors
Canfield (1969)	Chance process determined movement sequence Each card assigned a motion word Red suits fast, black slow Light shone on backcloth Light intensified as dancer passed Light: Vertical stage column Travels cross-stage continuously during dance
Signals (1970)	Dancers signalled next movements Chairs used as stage props Movements influenced by chair direction Cue types varied each performance
Grange Eve (1986)	Men danced with canes Chance determined weight shift sequences Shifts on right, left foot, cane
August Pace (1989)	Consisted of seven duets Chance decided dancer pairings Duets sometimes separated or together

<p>Change of Address (1992)</p>	<p>32 phrases combined using chance operations Many phrases featured unbalances Unbalances by single or multiple dancers The motif of "unbalances" recurred often Men leaned against each other until two of them fell to the floor</p>
<p>Way Station (2001)</p>	<p>Décor: Five freestanding sculptures Dancers move through and inside the sculptures Movement both swift and slow Costumes by James Hall, dark colors Costumes contrast pastel-colored sculptures</p>

Figure 7. Cunningham's Choreographies that Reflects the Relational Choreoscapes.

In *'Minutiae'* and *'Way Station'* dancers move seamlessly through the medium of a sculptural object, transforming spatial navigation into choreography. The object, in virtue of its static nature, exerts a gravitational force on the body, causing a distortion in its spatial dimensions.

'Story' is a performance in which the choreography is changed by the use of objects by the body. A costume that changes according to the body's desires at any given moment alters the integrity of the space.

The difference between *'Paired'* and other performances is that the object of interaction is fluid. This fluidity, however, acts like a garment worn by the body. The flow of the space is changed by the uncertain series of movements that change according to the colour of the paint.

In *'Scramble'*, the choreography is created through the differentiation of colours and the movement of the colour source itself. Consequently, the body and the object influence each other. As a similar but different representation, the moving light column intensifies when it interacts with the body, temporarily changing its atmosphere in *'Canfield'*.

In *'Signals'*, the positioning and orientation of the chairs influence movement, incorporating spatial decision-making into scenography. This interaction is even more intertwined in the performance *'Grange Eve'*. The body moves in unison with the object. The object is an extension of the body and is controlled by it; they construct the space together.



Figure 8. A Scene From 'Signals'.

Bodies interact with each other in *'August Pace'* and *'Change of Address'*. While this interaction is evident in all types of collective dance, it is particularly pronounced in *'Change of Address'*, where one body significantly changes the trajectory of another.

These works blur the distinction between the body and its environment. Space is no longer a neutral stage, but rather an evolving interplay of responsive elements. Time becomes reactive, unfolding through cues, imbalances and gestures that alter the course of the dance. Objects, structures and even garments act as participants in this choreography. Spaces are sites of mutual influence, where movement is generated through contact, resistance and response between diverse bodies and materials, rather than in isolation.

3.3. Discussion

No matter how much daily life is formalised by forms and structures, it remains inherently informal due to its unpredictability. Just as in Cunningham's choreographies that are randomness-based, space emerges in different forms. The chaotic unity of daily life is actually made up of these multitudes. In this sense, an attempt was made to identify similarities with everyday spaces through the four categories discovered in the choreographies, thereby interpreting the nature of daily embodiments.

- *Polytemporal Spatialities:*

Spaces mirror the unpredictable, layered nature of daily life, much like an urban area where

conversations, gestures and movements unfold in parallel yet uncoordinated rhythms. Chance encounters and temporal overlaps are embodied in both Cunningham's choreography and daily life.

These spaces are not shaped by design, but by co-presence, decision and divergence. As Blanchot and Hanson (1987) put it, everyday life is accessible yet inaccessible. It is also paradoxical, as it contains both rules and rule-breaking. It is everyday experiences that reveal this hidden extraordinariness. Such randomness reveals the choreography embedded in everyday spatial experience.

- *Disjunctive Simultaneities:*

Spaces reflect the fragmented and overlapping experiences of everyday life. These experiences are characterised by a combination of different sensory perceptions and events occurring in more than one place at a time. As in public spaces, bodies perform without shared awareness.

Events occur alongside one another, not together. These isolated narratives are not unified, but in collision. The concept of meaning does not emerge from the principle of coherence; rather, it is derived from the navigation of disconnection, contingency, and spontaneous intersections. Cunningham's choreographic works are characterised by this phenomenon, where bodies act in an independent manner, forming transient relationships that dissipate as swiftly as they materialise.

In both cases, the spatial meaning is not derived from order, but rather from the coexistence of differences which are spontaneous, ephemeral, and constantly reconfiguring. Each body's desire creates its own difference. As Sheringham (2006) asserts, desire represents the sole element that escapes the forms in daily life.

- *Autonomous Co-presence:*

These spaces are characterised by their reflection of the layered, asynchronous and non-interactive nature of everyday life. It is evident that a multitude of events may transpire either concurrently or at disparate intervals. However, it is crucial to note that these events do not exert

a reciprocal influence on one another. These ruptures have the capacity to occur in a variety of phenomena, bodies, and temporal and spatial contexts.

The elements within the space are not harmonised, but instead coexist according to their own rhythms. In a manner analogous to Cunningham's choreographic works, no singular element exerts dominion; rather, multiple components coexist in parallel yet autonomous manifestations. The concept of meaning emerges from the interplay of these elements, where bodies, sounds and images coexist in the same or different spatial dimensions, yet maintain a sense of separation. Such daily spatialities are not composed, but encountered, and offer a choreography of disjunction, where connection is possible, but not guaranteed. This fragmented simultaneity reflects the disjointed realities of contemporary life, in which meaning emerges not from unity, but from coexistence without cohesion.

- *Relational Choreoscapes:*

Spaces are characterised by the establishment of the randomness of everyday life through interaction. It is conceivable for the encountered body, object or space to modify the flow and produce a new one. Just as Cunningham's dancers respond to chairs, sculptures, or one another, bodies respond to a tree in their path, a sudden sound, or any body. As Tschumi (1996) asserts, the bodies traversing a narrow corridor adapting to its width is indicative of the violent relationship between space and body. These interactions form temporary spatial compositions shaped by negotiation and adaptation.

The concept of space is not static; it is produced through relational acts, including collisions, pauses and redirections. In both life and dance, the meaning of a performance emerges not from pre-planned pathways but from shared, ever-shifting environments. In this context, the spatialities that bodies discover through their newly produced experiences transform the space into a permeable and fluid structure by making various encounters and confrontations possible.

REFERENCES

Blanchot, Maurice and Susan Hanson, "Everyday Speech". In *Yale French Studies: Everyday Life*, Yale University Press, 1987.

Collins Dictionary. "I Ching." Accessed October 5, 2025. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com>

Haggard, Patrick and Daniel Mark Wolpert, "Disorders of Body Scheme". In *Higher-Order Motor Disorders: From Neuroanatomy and Neurobiology to Clinical Neurology*, edited by H.-J. Freund, M. Jeannerod, M. Hallett and R. Leiguarda, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Ka, Wolf. "From Text to Interface: Theatre and Digital Media," *3rd Conference on Computational Semiotics for Games and New Media*, Middlesbrough: University of Teesside, (2003): 42-47.

Kiesler, Frederick. "Sonsuz Ev: İnsan Yapımı Bir Kosmos" [Endless House: A Man-Built Cosmos]. In *Sürrealizm / Mimarlık, Mekan Sanatı [Surrealism / Architecture, The Art of Space]*, edited by N. A. Artun, İletişim Publications, 2014.

Laban, Rudolf. *Choreutics*. Macdonald & Evans, 1966.

Merce Cunningham Trust. "The Six Sides of Merce Cunningham." Accessed June 26, 2025. <https://www.mercecunningham.org/about/merce-cunningham/#about-merce>.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Routledge, 2005.

Morasso, Pietro., Casadio, Maura., Mohan, V Vishwanathan, Rea, Francesco and Zenzeri, Jacopo. "Revisiting the Body-Schema Concept in the Context of Whole-Body Postural-Focal Dynamics," *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, no. 9, (2015).

Rajchman, John. *Constructions*. The MIT Press, 1998.

Sheringham, Michael. *Everyday Life: Theories and Practices from Surrealism to the Present*. Oxford University Press, 2006.

Tschumi, Bernard. *Architecture and Disjunction*. The MIT Press, 1996.

Figure 1, 3, 5 and 7 are produced by the author

with information from the official website of 'Merce Cunningham Trust', <https://www.mercecunningham.org>

Figure 2, 4, 6 and 8 are derived from 'Dance Capsules' section in the official website of 'Merce Cunningham Trust', <https://www.mercecunningham.org>

Figure 9 is produced by the author.

2025