

without words, connecting contexts, spaces and one another, “leading, following and making sense of the spaces in-between” (p. 45). Delving deeper and beyond sociological perspectives, Biehl also takes into consideration a wide range of topics in organizational management affairs and administration circumstances that are “in motion.”

However, the adoption of dancing as a research technique is briefly examined and set in the context of the academic study of organizations, borrowing from the disciplines of psychology and social anthropology in order to illustrate the practicalities of the methodological framework. The author also advocates for the application of dance links to phenomenological approaches and embodiment research in which the body occupies the center stage as a tool to extract data in management research. Case studies with a framework such as performance analysis and Laban Movement Analysis area provided to demonstrate how management scholars could use dance as a research tool. The author’s use of dance as a metaphor representing a research method is an indication that dance studies have much to offer in the understanding of the world of management, including the dynamics, the invisible and fleeting structures of interaction within institutions and how they are possibly changed and constantly negotiated.

---

ORTIZ, Ernesto: *La creación en danza: Un acercamiento desde la intertextualidad y la composición en tiempo real*. [Building a Dance: An Approach Based on Intertextuality and Real-time Composition]. 2018, Cuenca: Universidad de Cuenca. 90. ISBN 978-9978-14-385-8.

---

Jorge Poveda Yáñez

University Clermont-Auvergne, College of Letters, Languages, Human and Social Sciences,  
Choreomundus – International Master in Dance Knowledge,  
Practice and Heritage, Clermont-Ferrand

In the framework of the cross-disciplinary project “Aesthetic machinations, symbolic machinations” (2016), Ecuadorian artists from different fields found a common space for creativity. The performances “Alina.06” and “La Señorita Wang soy yo” were the two resulting experiences that merged the work of dancers and musicians while allowing them to become more aware of the way in which they assume their own disciplines. This contrasting collaboration is significant in a country whose crossbred heritage constantly requires creators to find new ways to position themselves regarding their own art. The reason for this is a postcolonial discernment which always remains in the background, suggesting destabilization and a certain disobedience, not to foreign knowledge itself, but to practices and methods that are not put to the test in the space and material context of practitioners. It is in this sense, and not necessarily through a geopolitical lens, that suspicion arises in the eyes of Ernesto Ortiz (dancer, choreographer and director) against the given knowledge, as long as it remains disembodied.

To parallelize with folk dance, wherein movement and its cultural context are interwoven, the author proposes a dialogue between his own ideas and those by Le Breton. The resulting conversation revolves around contemporary performing arts (dance, theatre

and performance art) and the effort to emancipate themselves from ideological alignments, but more fundamentally, from the task of producing any explanation or clear fable for the audience. Hence, the spirit of contemporary praxis in art encourages subjectivity and, at the same time, offers ambiguous discourses to an also dissimilar and diverse audience, who end up with a certain possibility to come up with their own little version of the play as curators of their own experience. This celebration of polysemy, despite being a repetitive notion in contemporary art, conveys the opportunity for creators to crystallize the decolonizing imperative hovering across Latin America. A mandate which intertwines with the aforementioned apathy for building any universally valid truth. Instead, it radicalizes the priority of ideas and meanings that are created from/through/by individuals in a self-referential fashion since they aim to account for the truth of their own selves, but more than anything, of their own *bodies*. This exercise, in turn, challenges the discursivities and symbolic values that have been previously assigned to them.

The result of this daring endeavor might somehow seem outworn or predictable in current times when postmodern and fragmentizing efforts have largely permeated into politics and academia. Nonetheless, the author's argument regains verve when he links such a re-signification process of bodies to the *embodied* practice of dance itself; not to textual arguments, not even to the content of the dance (choreographies, phrases or motifs) but to the transient nature of a discipline that should not be expected to produce stable discourses. Instead, through its ephemeral nature, dance can be the perfect medium to reveal the impossibility of solid bodies and identities. As a result, the abandonment of the "representational model" in contemporary performing arts means a shift towards a "presentational model" wherein the drama that is portrayed is not the turbulences of fictional characters, but the fungible and ever-changing presence of the dancing bodies. Bodies that behave in a way that they are not supposed to, bodies reacting, bending, shivering, stretching, melting in front of the audience are offering an exceptional moment to disobey discipline, regimes and expectations about corporealities. The interruption of such commitment to order and passivity also affects the hierarchical structures within the creative teams. If the director can no longer demand for performers to adjust themselves to the fable of an "hyper-text", then his role morphs into that of the horizontal observer and companion in an exploratory process that is not pointing towards accomplishing a pre-established notation or choreography, that rather explores the somatic script residing in the performers' bodies.

In this way, "Building a dance" can raise enthusiasm in the reader, but it still owes further explanation on how to pragmatically match this tremendous shift of paradigm. Both in dance composition at the level of training processes; let alone the innovative somatic ways of attention that performers are expected to develop so that they can dig into themselves, being no longer expected to obey an external stream that would tell them how to act or move.

The remainder of the book somehow addresses these concerns by using the notion of "intertextuality" as a resource to trigger dancers into interacting with other materials/texts – movies, music, aesthetics, objects – that do not necessarily need to be translated with fidelity into the dance but can still trigger movements and gestures. Along with this, and in order to attain lively and ever-present performers, Ernesto Ortiz unfolds some thoughts around the value of "real-time composition" as the optimal dynamic for performers to become aware of the requirements of the instant and avoid interrupting the

stage until strictly necessary. This attitude of what could be described as a “scenic *laissez-fair*” requires dancers to begin inhabiting a “real time”, not the time given in a written play or that of the director, but the time perceived with a phenomenological acuteness directed to the space, the other performers, the situation and, more than anything, their inner impulses.

The value of this book transcends the aesthetical or social resonance of the plays referred (“Alina.06” and “La Señorita Wang soy yo”) and it becomes interesting for specialists of dance anthropology to grasp the kind of creative processes conducted by South American directors who resonate with the so-called post-dramatic perspective. The application of which proves to require an eclectic exercise of composition that is always performed *in situ* and *ad hoc*. This topic might be of relevance following the somatic trend in dance studies since the author clarifies that the results obtained are not only materials with aesthetical connotations, but expressions of embodied knowledge. Nevertheless, Ortiz avoids touching upon how this type of knowledge can glint as substantial for other people beyond the few involved in such creative processes or how it can become significant from a larger scope, which is precisely the quality that knowledge has to have in order to surpass the level of plain anecdote.

---

PÓCS, Éva: *Népi vallás és mágia Közép-Kelet-Európában. Válogatott tanulmányok II.* [Popular Religion and Magic in East-Central Europe. Selected Studies II]. 2018, Budapest: L'Harmattan – PTE Néprajz – Kulturális antropológia tanszék. 768. ISBN 978-963-4144-31-1

---

Gábor Klaniczay

Central European University, Department of Medieval Studies, Budapest

On picking up the second volume of the selected studies of Éva Pócs, the first thing that strikes you is the sheer weight of the book. The first volume, published 17 years ago, contained 11 studies that filled 297 pages; the second volume comprises 24 studies and runs to 764 pages. Both volumes are structured according to similar principles, the first into three thematic clusters, and the second into five. In both volumes, the first cluster, which establishes the logical and theoretical framework of the inquiry, has the title “Belief system, belief beings.” The titles of the other clusters, in both volumes, indicate the phenomena and the imaginary beings explored by Éva Pócs over the past decades. In the 2002 volume, these are assumed under the headings “Seers, sorcerers, *táltoses*” and “On the borderline of religion and magic.” In the present volume, the titles are “Archaic religious techniques,” “Magic, sorcery,” “Witchcraft” and “Samples from the history of the discipline.”

Alongside the similarities, however, there are some slight but nevertheless important differences. While the title of the first volume is “Hungarian folk belief on the border of Central and Eastern Europe” (*A magyar néphit Közép- és Kelet-Európa határán*), the title of the present volume is “Popular religion and magic,” since, as Éva Pócs mentions in the preface, the traditional notion of ‘folk belief’ as a “separate entity, independent from