



## THEATER COGNITION AND EDUCATION

### EDUCAÇÃO TEATRAL E COGNIÇÃO

### COGNICIÓN TEATRAL Y EDUCACIÓN

André Luiz Lopes Magela<sup>1</sup>

#### Abstract

A proposal for a systematic identification, in everyday life, of a type of thinking, herein called “theater cognition”, concerning the theatrical aspects of what we live. It aims to suggest criteria and manners of planning and conducting theater classes that, by touching on this cognition, can magnify more powerful relationships with this theatrical dimension of life, which relates both to more sophisticated values from each culture and to survival issues, contributing to theater education.

**Keywords:** Theater Education, Basic Education, Philosophy of Difference, Theatricality, Performativity

#### Resumo

Proposta de identificação sistemática, na vida cotidiana, de um tipo de pensamento, aqui denominado “cognição teatral”, concernente aos aspectos teatrais daquilo que vivemos. Com isto, sugerir critérios e modos de planejar e conduzir aulas de teatro nas escolas que, ao tocar esta cognição, podem fomentar relações mais potentes com esta dimensão teatral da vida, que diz respeito tanto a elementos mais sofisticados de cada cultura, quanto a questões de sobrevivência, contribuindo com a consolidação da educação teatral no ensino básico.

**Palavras-Chave:** Educação Teatral, Educação Básica, Filosofia da Diferença, Teatralidade, Performatividade

#### Resumen

Propuesta de identificación sistemática, en la vida cotidiana, de un tipo de pensamiento, aquí denominado "cognición teatral", concerniente a los aspectos teatrales de las situaciones que vivimos. Con esto, sugerir criterios y modos de concebir y conducir clases de teatro en las escuelas que, al tocar esta cognición, pueden fomentar relaciones más potentes con esta dimensión teatral de la vida, que se refiere tanto a valores más sofisticados de cada cultura, cuanto a cuestiones de supervivencia, contribuyendo con la educación teatral en la enseñanza básica.

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor of the graduate degree in theater and postgraduate in performing arts at the Federal University of São João Del Rei - UFSJ - in the area of acting and teacher training in theater. Actor. PhD in Performing Arts from UNIRIO. E-mail: andremagela@ufsj.edu.br.

**Palabras Clave:** Educación Teatral, Educación Básica, Filosofía de la Diferencia, Teatralidad, Performatividad

### **Life is theater**

A toddler tries to flick a slightly stuck electrical switch, testing where, and how, she can, and should, apply her force. Sometimes she almost hurts her finger by (inadequately?) pressing the pointy side. She seems not to have reduced the universe of her actions to the precise, delimited, and efficient touch to which we are already accustomed. And in the struggle with that hard and rough material, she experiences thoughts that enrich what for us would be the simple event of turning a light bulb on and off.

A more instructivist view might see in these faltering movements the necessary but unwanted trial and error of learning, whose purpose is to get it right while discarding what is not efficient. One could also mention the process of consolidating synapses, focusing on the developmental aspect and the utilitarian solution of objective problems. But for some time now, thanks to studies on cognition that have *Philosophy in the flesh* (LAKOFF & JOHNSON, 1999) as an important landmark, we have noticed that these actions involve the learning of intricate operations and worldviews, formed by eminently embodied experiences. Perhaps, thirty years from now, this person's resourcefulness to deal with a difficult negotiation, or the understanding that difficulties and deviations can be harnessed as new ideas and perceptions of life, may have been initiated by this tactile investigation of a pointy button.

Studies in cognition and neuroscience have contributed both to the broadening of our understanding of how we think and to building perspectives other than the conventional ones to account for our behavior, and pedagogical processes that are more interesting to us than those currently adopted: "other ways of conceiving and knowing the human being and his various behavioral patterns" (CALVERT, 2014, p.234). Moreover, by analyzing everyday actions, these investigations into cognition unpack many complex thinking operations that are necessary for quick and seemingly simple actions to occur. In recent decades, such experiments have addressed (occasionally in a critical way) the importance of "embodied bases for the construction and understanding of all forms of meaning" (GERHARDT, 2010, p.255) and of somatic processes that go beyond the visibly symbolic and rational. These studies have systematized what in previous centuries was seen intuitively: that cognitive operations are situated, embodied, and

complexly involve multiplicities of life elements: prior or “given” circumstances (STANISLAVSKI, 2008), possible implications of what is occurring, known or assumed functions (roles) of those involved, projections and planning, plots, strategies...

Now, all this occurs in a privileged way in the practice of theater; in a more perceptible way, in the practice of acting, through the extremely situated corporal mobilization, where the context, intentions and intersubjective implications are at stake in every little decision. And this happens both because it is capable of aggregating several modalities of actions, and because theater is the ancestral activity in which we historically dedicate ourselves to question, manipulate, criticize, and (re)invent behavior, similar to the power of music to dedicate itself to the sound dimension of existence, and of the visual arts to visuality. These languages refer to arbitrary but fundamental slices of our experience as in the meaning of the ancient Greek term *Mousiké*, cited above, which embraces not only “what emits sound, but also that which enables sound, that is, the laws of universal organization that underlie all particularity” (TOMÁS, 2002, p.38). And perhaps the same may be said when we describe theatricality, as in “theatricality is theater as an autonomous form” (SARRAZAC, 2013, p. 58) or, focusing on its intensive aspects: theatricality as “the art of theater as an act” (SARRAZAC, 2013, p. 65).

This approach to the intrinsic relationship between art and life is not original. In the field of social sciences, Erving Goffman (1956) already analyzed the theatricality of personal relationships with very concrete examples. And in its most general sense, art and aesthetics are inevitably imbricated with life and with forms of thought that act in it:

*Aisthêtikhós* is the ancient Greek word for that which is “perceptive by feeling”. *Aisthêsis* is the sensory experience of perception. The original field of aesthetics is not art but reality – corporeal, material nature. As Terry Eagleton writes: “Aesthetics is born as a discourse of the body”. It is a form of cognition, achieved through taste, touch, hearing, seeing, smell – the whole corporeal sensorium. (BUCK-MORSS, 1992, p.6)

In thinking about theater education in a more didactic way, even if still imprecise, we may say that if visual arts classes can touch the beauty (in the broadest and most contemporary sense, not the cosmetic one) of what is visual, and music of what is sonorous in life, theater classes (theatricality and performativity classes) help us perceive and produce the beauty of an action, a situation, a life story – life as a theatrical work of art:

What strikes me is the fact that, in our society, art has become something that is related only to objects and not to individuals, or to life. That art is something which is specialized or which is done by experts who are artists. But couldn't everyone's life become a work of art? Why should the lamp or the house be an art object, but not our life? (FOUCAULT, 1983, p. 236).

These theatricality classes foment, in the sense being constructed here, the social establishment of an aesthetic paradigm as an evaluator and guide for each one's actions, for the promotion of an aesthetic life, imbricated and anchored to an aesthetic of existence. If we think like this, it is necessary to approach theater not only as an institutionalized cultural phenomenon (theater spectacles, for example), but as a complex dynamic that mobilizes what is present in behavior, that which is theatrical in everyday life.

Theater has always been related to the theatricality of life. It intensifies it, deforms it, not necessarily in a relation of representation: "When people participate in theatrical activities, they engage the same kind of cognitive fundamentals that they use to drive a car, carry on a conversation, and solve a problem in mathematics" (MCCONACHIE, 2013, p.4). These are cognitive processes involved in all spheres of experience – from collaborating with a person who has only one hand free, pressing the button on top of the thermos because she has just grabbed a cup (without her having asked for it, deducing her intention from the circumstances and roles already established), to the dynamic mental emulation of several alternative scenarios or scripts in a situation, in order to make the best decision.

They are theatrical processes because they can be briefly described as imbricated modulations of time, space, and behavior, which we may call *theatrical dimensions of life*. The perspective developed here focuses on this theatricality inherent to social life: theatrical forms, forces, and perceptions that are always present, ingrained in everyday life, and that should be addressed by classes dedicated to this, if we think of education as a policy of intervention in society that fosters the enrichment of cognition, in the broadest sense, of all people. And art not as representation or as "a means to transmit notions about life, but as a form of life itself" (RANCIÈRE, 2012).

### **Theatrical situations and elements of cognition**

Thinking about theater in an intensive way, and in its cognition, means also highlighting the theatrical quality of a fact, an action, or an environment. In order to make this perspective

more concrete, listed below are elements operated by theater in what we can identify as the cognition of theatrical character that always occurs in everyone's life in their intersubjective relations. The goal is to clarify how the practice of theater, especially in its classes (if they are geared to it), can activate and/or amplify this cognition. It is about comparisons between everyday cognitive operations and forms of thought present in theatrical activities, pedagogical or not, more specifically in the acting situation, so as to illustrate what I call "theatrical dimensions".

Notice the relationships of the body to space and in space – not just of bodies and objects, but of previous circumstances, relationships between those involved and their roles, implications, and projections. Perceive social aspects and details of actions, even if there are very intense elements that may obscure this discernment.

- Think and act collectively without the need for explicit and/or secure communication (speech, gestures, signs). Dynamically interpret and respond to the actions of others, adjusting your plans, actions and conceptions to the lived situations. Act with the understanding of others in mind, putting yourself in their place and developing greater sensitivity for empathy. Associate specific actions or facts with broader contexts, evaluating in a situated way the degree and type of importance of that which takes place.
- Withstand the anguish of not understanding events, keeping up with the unfolding events, even without the support of certainties. Deal with imperfections, unforeseen events, and partial information. Remain in risky situations without the need for excessive emotional armor that hardens the capacity to affect oneself. Accept and experience unclassifiable situations without reducing them too much to existing labels, which usually don't take into account the singularity of the event. Articulate the act of framing<sup>2</sup> and/or understand the situations involving non-classification and relative ignorance.
- Develop critical sensitivity about one's own actions. Perceive and modulate performance in "roles" in daily life and/or understand narrativities present in life. Relativize one's own identity.

---

<sup>2</sup> On the concept of framing, see LAKOFF, 2004.

- Build ethical alternatives and value systems based on the aesthetic sphere, diminishing the power or dominance of merely utilitarian values. Appreciate a situation, even if it is frustrating (e.g. laugh at yourself and what you experience), which allows for better learning by experience and existential enjoyment of life situations. Invent other world configurations; theatricalize the everyday and see the world from other angles, other than the mass or dominant ones.

- Choose the appropriate moment (*kairós*) for a speech or an action, sensing “windows” to enter the flow of events and co-produce it, in complex temporalities and functionalities (forces), responding flexibly to situations. Rank the priorities, organizing the actions to respond to the dynamic relations between the important and the urgent. Resolve situations through actions, dispensing with dependence on classificatory and comforting talk. Act in connection with the body’s impulses and at the same time in negotiation with life’s contingencies or difficulties; deal with the unwanted, sometimes merging it with desire or making it desirable. Perceive the “channels” of action already present or instituted (effective and viable modes, even if not ideal) and take advantage of them in one’s own way, inventing new ones if necessary.

### **A perspective for theater classes**

This level of detail, sometimes repetitive and perhaps too abstract, is intended to make more recognizable the cognitive elements that this proposal recommends be worked on in theater classes. Let us consider a case to demonstrate: the final topic, referring to the “channels” of action, may concern pedagogical work with frames (pictures, statue or *tableau*), in which the modes (channels) of expression are proposed (determined) by the rules of the activity. A more conventional look at theater classes might see the frames as a preparation for the stage (and they are). But, for example, if the student is acting in a frame in which he is waving to someone, and the teacher calls on him to perform this waving statically, without letting him “steal” by making movements to constitute the waving, he is contributing to this student’s ability to “channel” his expressiveness, adapting it to the viable modes so that it has potency. In other words: dealing with what you have in order to get what you want (a fundamental issue for us to live).

Those who have experienced theater classes can confirm how and how much cognitive operations such as those exposed here are present in theater practice, and where such forms of thinking are best touched upon is perhaps in “Actor’s Pedagogy” (ICLE, 2009). In it, one can better identify an “epistemology of acting”, which can basically be understood as the challenge of being on stage and in more engaged theatrical exercises, and the way of thinking implied in this condition (MAGELA, 2017b, 48), which is already investigated in theatrical processes in education: “Inherent to the formative dimension of theater is the aesthetic experience lived by the one who acts; thus, the sharpening of sensory perception and the ‘awareness of the body at play’ are brought to the foreground” (PUPO, 2005, p.3).

### **Thinking and cognition of an intensive theater**

If here the term *theatricality*, and not “theater” is highlighted, it is because it constitutes an intensive, operative, functional approach to theater. In this mode of use more on the side of what is operative, this terminology could also draw on the concept of *performativity* if, rather than opposing them, we consider that the two terms can be intermingled, depending on the approach we adopt (FERNANDES, 2011, 11) to this theatricality as a “cognitive operation” (FERNANDES, 2011, 17), the theater that is performed continuously in life.

And cognition is always assumed here as an *embodied cognition*, because it favors “studying culture and experience from corporeal actions”, in “an alternative to the symbolic systems approach, which uses representation as the central mechanism” (RIBEIRO, 2012, 32). Here we focus on a conception of cognition and learning in which the most important is not to solve problems, but to invent them, in processes where the divisions between subject and object do not make sense, since the entities are co-engendered in relationships (ESCÓSSIA, KASTRUP, 2005) – to learn is not to fit in, but to assemble (KASTRUP, 2007, p.172), to build powerful arrangements with life (DELEUZE, GUATTARI, 1983).

In this way, teaching theater in schools means to prepare, propose and conduct experiences that increase the student’s willingness to be active in theatrical dimensions, be they in everyday life, in classes or in performances, so that their attention can connect with the theatrical and also produce it. It is an education that enables the student to be more attentive to the theater, to problematize, and to invent theater. But as an expanded theater, a theater in its

intensive, operative aspects, and not so much in its already configured and established forms (MAGELA, 2017a).

If we consider theater only as it is conventionally and hegemonically known, it is almost impossible to weave these analogies between it and life: “theater is only truly realized outside of itself, when it manages to free itself from itself...” (SARRAZAC, 2013, p. 70). To make a student aware of theater in its intensive aspects – in the operations of thought that can occur in the practice of scenes, games, theatrical exercises – means to sensitize him/her to the theatricality of life, which is intensive.

This accepted, when considering theater in its intensively cognitive quality, it is inevitable to adopt the philosophy of the Frenchmen, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari to guide an intensive (effectively operational) evaluation of the processes. Besides the vitalist positioning (the fostering of agency and the potency of life), the focus on the intensive composes precise criteria for each student’s pedagogical process and for the class. Indeed, the content of the class here is the theatricality present in the student – which is not the same as the teaching methodologies (which may or may not construct effective theater classes), nor the theater in its instituted forms (scenes or plays, which may or may not provoke the experience of theatricality in students). In other words, the theatrical event is what matters, and theater education dwells on the student’s arrangements with these events: “Intensity is the form of difference in so far as this is the reason of the sensible. Every intensity is differential, by itself a difference. (...) Each intensity is already a coupling (...), thereby revealing the properly qualitative content of quantity” (DELEUZE, 1994, 222).

This conception is partly in tune with the proposal of “theatrical notions”, coined by Gilberto ICLE (2011), in the sense that what matters is not information about theater, but the theater happening in the student, as for example in the notion of “being on stage” (ICLE, 2011, p.75). One difference between Icle’s proposal and that of this article is that I assume the term **content**, while resisting and trying to colonize it; but forcing a change in this concept by stating that it is the intensive, and not the information, that is the content, since intensity “creates the qualities and the extensities in which it explicates itself” (DELEUZE, 1992, p.246). In other words, the intensive is what matters – what phenomenally, experientially, takes place. In a way, Icle’s “notions” are assimilated here as theatrical contents, as intensive, experiential theatrical concepts:



The concept is an incorporeal, even though it is incarnated or effectuated in bodies. (...) It does not have spatiotemporal coordinates, only intensive ordinates. It has no energy, only intensities; it is anenergetic (energy is not intensity but rather the way in which the latter is deployed and nullified in an extensive state of affairs). The concept speaks the event, not the essence or the thing (...). (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1994, p.21)

### **A concept for multiple practices**

This theoretical or conceptual proposal of *theatrical cognition* intends to assist the ways in which theater teachers in schools can implement activities in classes that are created or adapted to broaden the means available to students to dialogue with already established theatrical components of existence, and thus create new existential components. It is a process of subjectivation that combines normativity and invention. In other words, it is about fostering ways to make students' dynamic attention more complex.

In these theater classes, the theatrical attention, or the attention to "the theatrical"<sup>3</sup>, is the core of the pedagogy, which can be implemented with improvisations, games, theatrical exercises, and pedagogical processes of scene construction and exhibition, if its conduction observes the need to mobilize this attention, as multifaceted as it is specific.

But attention is not something given or previously defined, which one simply has or doesn't have; it is learned (KASTRUP, 2004). The art of performing these forms of attention is eminently human, as recent research by Michael Tomasello, researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, has shown, but it is not self-developed or fully guaranteed by our genetic code. It becomes functional "only in actually exercising these skills in social interaction" (TOMASELLO, 2014, p.6). And these classes, if they have a qualified and specialized construction, have more chances to practice attention in these cognitive modalities, necessary for survival (yes, theatricality is necessary for survival) and the invention of ways of living.

And this is a strong argument that we can use, in our dialogue with society and decision-makers in education, for the establishment of a theater education that carefully addresses the operations of thought essential to the lives of all. As an initial example, we can highlight how

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that the noun is the same as the adjective. That is: "theatrical attention" is the same as "attention to the theatrical" (to that which is theatrical in life), since entities and relations co-engender each other ontically.

theater classes can mobilize what operates in non-verbal actions and bodily interactions. Participants can thus practice both what underlies the denser intersubjective relationships, as well as the more rapid and immediate interactions. All of these are important for our existence, in everyday life and emergencies, in the actions we take beyond ourselves, in sex and seduction (SOFIA, 2014, p.322), in the constitution of the highest values of each culture, etc.

### **Exercises in a class of theatrical intensivity**

If we assume that this cognition can be addressed educationally in theater classes, the ensuing question is how to make this wager count in practice. In a way, implicit answers have been drafted so far, if the reader has made connections between what has been stated and his/her personal experience. But what I try to make clear is that this concept and proposed approach must connect consistently and vigilantly with practices planned and conducted with this epistemological anchoring.

To begin with, a concrete recommendation is already necessary: it is in works that are performed ideally without speech, with no exchanges of glances, and without exchanges of signals – with no explicit communication – that we can best work on these forms of attention. This kind of practice is very widespread among teachers. Other frequent instructions are not to stop the work, and to absorb the conductor's instructions without interrupting the work or looking at the teacher. These exercises are performed as in a scene with a fourth wall, in a conventional "scene ethic", always practicing the aforementioned epistemology of the performer.

The fact that this proposal criticizes the current tying of theater education to the established theater system does not mean that it is not based on harnessing theater craftsmanship for the personal transformation of students in basic education.

Even if deconstructions of aesthetic conventions are pedagogically necessary (and very difficult!), the "fourth wall", as an arbitrary separation that simulates the absence of an audience for those who are performing, can be considered the most explicit element of the attempt to constitute a fictional universe in the theatrical scene. Here, it becomes an enhancer of the ability to enter the flow of events and deal with them, without "leaving the game" (of life, in the case of the educational goal of the classes). Paradoxically, this distance from everyday life practices the experience of dealing with it.

It is about ways of conducting classes so that the theatricality happens, the intensive theatricality. So that the theatricality and/or performativity occurs in the student; and that he/she notices it. The fact that a teacher uses exercises from Viola Spolin's or Augusto Boal's books, or "applies" exercises that he or she has experienced and found interesting, does not guarantee that that class is really about theater, in theater education. The content of these classes takes place eminently by the way of proposing and conducting the exercise and what the teacher does with the exercise. Above all, it is how he/she adjusts the process according to what happens with the student, in order for the experience of theatricality to be cognitively nourished in those who carry out the activities.

The content of these classes is the theatrical event in the student, in his or her attention; not what the teacher has planned and thinks is being "transmitted". There is no "transmission", because there is nothing to transmit, since the logic is not that of objects, but of relations. The teacher proposes a theatrical relationship along with the student, and it will happen or not. The teacher plans and dynamically assesses the contents accordingly. The established forms of theater and the experiences of professional performers (the craftsmanship of theater) are resources for the theatrical to take place in the student. The class comes from theater but owes it nothing; just as mathematics classes are not engineering classes.

Thus, theatrical games, Boal, IMPRO or theatresports (Keith Johnstone), Ryngaert, English drama, scene construction, viewpoints, the consecrated techniques of making plays, even the most diverse singular and contextualized strategies, are all pedagogical resources, methodologies that will serve or not to make the theatrical happen intensively in class. They may be the content of a teacher's training, but they are not the content itself of a theater class. The content of these classes is a theatrical thinking of the student that we try to touch, just as mathematics classes aim to touch a mathematical thinking, present in our lives in minimal actions, not only in solving equations.

### **Policy (ies)**

This examination of the theatrical modes of thought in everyday life attempts to address intersubjective relations (cooperation, primarily) and education in their operational aspect, rather than their "edifying" side. Even if we attempt to examine issues concerning morality

(TOMASELLO, 2016), the investigation dwells on what is functional, and quite practical, in these spheres.

In the same way, in the craft of theater we know that commonly idealized behavioral elements, openness to otherness for example, are necessary technical requisites for performance to occur. In a certain way, the transposition of technical issues from acting to life can lead to a shift in judging, in which the question is no longer about good or evil, but about what serves us or not, if we assume the importance of collectively inventing more powerful ways of living.

The same process of *technicalization* is desired by us, art people, when we protest that aesthetic issues are treated in an opinionated way, and we argue that there are criteria to judge art (OSÓRIO, 2005), thus making it something serious and worthy of a policy or policies. Many think that art is anything whatsoever – a “subjective” matter, a matter of taste. This technicalization, instead of leading us to surrender to the more “exact” epistemologies, allows us to face the hegemony of relations with the truth that reject and dismiss personal transformation, not questioning the being of the subject (FOUCAULT, 2005), attached to utilitarianism and accumulation processes.

What is desired here is to enrich, in the long run, the inventiveness of social relations through the expansion of theatrical ways of thinking (aesthetic values and worldviews and more inventive ways of living) provoked by theater classes benefitted by the conception of theatrical cognition. The cognitive detailing of our actions, coupled with the intensive perspective, adds to the struggle in the field of educational policies regarding the clarity of what these classes can activate and amplify. For example, to clarify that it is not the case that theater classes, among other skills, work on collaboration in a vague way (as any other discipline can do), or make life more exhilarating (as any entertainment can do).

It is important in the struggle in the field of education (especially nowadays) to accurately expose that these classes can activate and amplify the cognitive elements present in the most vital actions of everyday life, which are theatrical, if carried out in a directed and rigorous manner. Let us set out for society that without theatrical thinking, we simply cannot exist. If we realize that theatrical elements are ingrained in the real, then their education is necessary for everyone in a very concrete and visible sense. This is a matter of survival, as advocated in this article and others by the same author (MAGELA, 2020, 2021).

Some very concrete objectives to confront educational problems are in line with the proposal of this article. The following layout of topics is an attempt to establish a dialogue with the most institutionalized viewpoints, linked to the most hegemonic epistemologies and fields of knowledge (the natural sciences or management tools, for example):

- Reinforce the undergraduate teacher training system in Brazil, by improving and strengthening the principles and methodologies that underpin licentiate degrees in theater and arts in Brazil, and the study of theatricality in schools.
- Increase more technical, consistent, systematic and detailed approaches, and with more specific content (in the sense of being scientifically and philosophically grounded). Direct the focus of the discourse on arts education towards this more recognizable technicalization by other fields of knowledge, legitimizing theater classes more for other social players and academic sectors, and equating the importance of the discipline of theater with that of other disciplines.
- Enhance and disseminate the technical component of our work, the epistemological rigor of its approaches, in dialogue with other epistemologies and social fields of activity.
- Improve teacher training in theater education by systematizing and better clarifying the contents of university classes in the area, developing training methodologies and conducting theater classes in schools in tune with this approach.
- Contribute to the definition of parameters, criteria, notions and research devices for the critical and philosophically mature use of the most current neuroscience and cognition studies as a resource for the improvement of theater classes in schools, and also for the training of theater teachers.

The hypothesis is that the construction of an educational perspective that connects with this theatrical thinking is a consistent and at the same time politically pragmatic position to weave understandings that improve the policies for implementing theater education in mainstream schools. Based on the assumption that theater classes are justified because they are dedicated to something that only they address (namely, the forms of theatrical thinking) and that

this epistemology is fundamental in the lives of all students, it is of utmost importance to prioritize, when reflecting on these classes, this theatrical cognition, which can be preferentially addressed in the experience of the body on stage or in theatrical exercise.

Taking all these proposals into account, the teaching of theater in schools should aim to contemplate the development of a field of aesthetic thought, as fundamental in everyone's life as are, for example, the fields of mathematical, linguistic, geographic thought. It is a field that is constitutive of cognition, since theater does not help us to think or to be creative; it *is* thought – because it is connected to the most vital of our existences. And this view is also pertinent if we consider all the students who will not be actors or theater professionals and who are obliged to participate in theater classes, because the theatricality addressed is not that of the production and circulation of shows, but of their life.

Strengthening the argument that there are theatrical dimensions to everyday existence, and that theater classes (if conducted in this sense) expand the ability to relate to the forces and codes of these dimensions, and finally that this education contributes to the lives of students, is of paramount importance not only to the field of theater education, but also to the whole of society.

## Referências

BUCK-MORSS, Susan. Aesthetics and Anaesthetics: Walter Benjamin's Artwork Essay Reconsidered. In: **October**, Vol. 62. (Autumn, 1992), pp. 3-41. Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1992. Stable URL: <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0162-2870%28199223%2962%3C3%3AAAABWA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8>

CALVERT, Dorys. **Teatro e Neurociência: o despertar de um novo diálogo entre arte e ciência**. In: Revista Brasileira de Estudos da presença. V.4, n.2. mai/ago 2014. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, 2014. (available also in French)

DELEUZE, Gilles. **Difference and repetition**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

DELEUZE, Gilles & GUATTARI, Félix. **Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and schizophrenia**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

DELEUZE, Gilles & GUATTARI, Félix. **What is philosophy?**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

FERNANDES, Sílvia. Teatralidade e performatividade na cena contemporânea. In: **Revista Eletrônica Repertório – Teatro e dança, nº 16, p.11-23**. Salvador: PPGAC UFBA, 2011.

FOUCAULT, Michel. On the Genealogy of Ethics: an overview of work in progress. In: DREYFUS, Hubert L.; RABINOW, Paul. **Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics**. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **The hermeneutics of the subject – Lectures at the Collège de France (1981-1982)**. New York: Macmillan, 2005.

GERHARDT, Ana Flávia L. M.. **Integração conceitual, formação de conceitos e aprendizado**. In: **Revista Brasileira de educação**. V.15, nº 44. Mai/ago. ANPED: 2010. Available in : <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbedu/v15n44/v15n44a04.pdf> Acesso em: 20, abr, 2018.

GOFFMAN, Erving. **The presentation of self in everyday life**. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre. 1956.

ICLE, Gilberto. **Da pedagogia do ator à pedagogia teatral: verdade, urgência, movimento**. In: **O Percevejo online – Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Artes Cênicas da UNIRIO**. Volume 01- Fascículo 02 – julho-dezembro/2009.

ICLE, Gilberto. **Problemas teatrais na educação escolarizada: existem conteúdos em teatro?**. In: **Urdimento – Revista de Estudos em Artes Cênicas**. V.2, nº17. Florianópolis: Programa de Pós-Graduação em Teatro – UDESC, 2011.

KASTRUP, Virginia. **A aprendizagem da atenção na cognição inventiva**. In: *Psicologia &*

Sociedade 16(3): p.7-16; set/dez. 2004. Available in [www.scielo.br/pdf/psoc/v16n3/a02v16n3](http://www.scielo.br/pdf/psoc/v16n3/a02v16n3)

KASTRUP, Virginia. **A invenção de si e do mundo – uma introdução do tempo e do coletivo no estudo da cognição**. Belo Horizonte: Editora Autêntica. 2007.

LAKOFF, G. & M. JOHNSON. **Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought**. New York: Basic Books, 1999.

LAKOFF, George. **Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate**. White River Junction, Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing Company, 2004.

MAGELA, André Luiz Lopes. **Abordagem somática na educação teatral**. In: Moringa – Artes do Espetáculo v8n1p23-28. 2017a. Available in <http://periodicos.ufpb.br/ojs2/index.php/moringa/article/view/34856> (Also available in english)

MAGELA, André Luiz Lopes. **Afecções, exercícios, protopedagogias teatrais**. In: **Rascunhos – caminhos da pesquisa em artes cênicas**. V4.n2. p.46-71. 2017b. Available in <http://www.seer.ufu.br/index.php/rascunhos/article/view/38729>

MAGELA, André Luiz Lopes. **Refusal and Adhesion: resistance between studies of cognition and theater education**. Rev. Bras. Estud. Presença, Porto Alegre, v. 11, n. 1, e102372, 2021. Available at: <https://seer.ufrgs.br/presenca/article/view/108794>

MAGELA, André Luiz Lopes. **Normativity of cooperation in theater classes** (2020 English version of the 2019 article). Urdimento, Florianópolis, v. 3, n. 39, nov./dez. 2020a. Available at: <https://periodicos.udesc.br/index.php/urdimento/article/view/18948/12533>

MCCONACHIE, Bruce. **Theatre & Mind**. New York, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

OSÓRIO, Luiz Camillo. **Razões da Crítica**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2005.



PUPO, Maria Lúcia de S. B.. **Entre o Mediterrâneo e o Atlântico – uma aventura teatral**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2005.

RANCIÈRE, Jacques. **Formas de vida: Jacques Rancière fala sobre estética e política. Entrevista realizada por Guilherme Freitas**. Rio de Janeiro: O Globo, dezembro de 2012. Available in <https://blogs.oglobo.globo.com/prosa/post/formas-de-vida-jacques-ranciere-fala-sobre-estetica-politica-478094.html>

RIBEIRO, Mônica Medeiros. **CORPO, AFETO E COGNIÇÃO na Rítmica Corporal de Ione De Medeiros - entrelaçamento entre ensino de arte e ciências cognitivas**. Tese apresentada ao programa de Pós-Graduação em Artes da Escola de Belas da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Belo Horizonte: Escola de Belas Artes/UFMG, 2012.

SARRAZAC, Jean-Pierre. **A invenção da teatralidade**. In: **Sala Preta**. PPGAC – USP. vol. 13, n. 1, jun., 2013. Available in <https://www.revistas.usp.br/salapreta/issue/view/4706/showToc>

SOFIA, Gabriele. **Por uma história das relações entre teatro e neurociência no Século XX**. In: Revista Brasileira de Estudos da Presença. Porto Alegre, v. 4, n. 2, p. 313-332, maio/ago. 2014. Available in <http://www.seer.ufrgs.br/presenca>

STANISLAVSKI, Konstantin. **An actor's work**. New York: Routledge, 2008.

TOMÁS, Lia. **Ouvir o logos: música e filosofia**. São Paulomousik. Editora UNESP: 2002

TOMASELLO, Michael. **A natural history of human thinking**. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2014.

TOMASELLO, Michael. **A natural history of human morality**. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2016.