



**AFFECTIONS, EXERCISES, THEATER  
PROTOPEDAGOGIES**

**AFECCÕES, EXERCÍCIOS, PROTOPEDAGOGIAS  
TEATRAIS**

**AFECCIONES, EJERCICIOS, PROTOPEDAGOGIAS  
TEATRALES**

**André Luiz Lopes Magela<sup>1</sup>**

ORCID 0000-0002-0574-0599

**Abstract**

Reflective exposition on exercises and criteria for conducting pedagogical theater processes based on concepts from the works of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. The text discusses specificities of perspective and pedagogical approaches that such concepts propose for the body, the performer and the conductor of the processes, particularly in contemporary issues related to the imbrication between art and life - an aesthetic education concerning the theatrical scope of life.

**Keywords:** Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, Affections, Theater Education, Jerzy Grotowski.

**Resumo**

Exposição reflexiva sobre exercícios e critérios de condução de processos teatrais pedagógicos baseados em conceitos oriundos de obras de Gilles Deleuze e Félix Guattari. O texto expõe especificidades de perspectiva e de abordagens pedagógicas que tais conceitos conferem ao corpo, ao atuante e ao condutor dos processos, particularmente nas questões contemporâneas relativas a imbricamentos entre arte e vida – uma educação estética no que concerne ao âmbito teatral da vida.

**Palavras-chave:** Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, Afeções, Educação Teatral, Jerzy Grotowski.

**Resumen**

Exposición reflexiva sobre ejercicios y criterios de conducción de procesos teatrales pedagógicos basados en conceptos oriundos de obras de Gilles Deleuze y Félix Guattari. El texto expone especificidades de perspectiva y de enfoques pedagógicos que tales conceptos confieren al cuerpo, al actuante y al conductor de los procesos, particularmente en las cuestiones contemporâneas relativas a imbricaciones entre arte y vida - una educación estética en lo que concierne al ámbito teatral de la vida.

**Palabras clave:** Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, Afecciones, Educación Teatral, Jerzy Grotowski.

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor da Universidade Federal de São João Del Rei – UFSJ - na área de atuação e licenciatura em teatro. Licenciado em teatro e ator. Doutor em Artes Cênicas pela UNIRIO. E-mail: andremagela@ufsj.edu.br.

## STRATEGIES

In 2016, when the provisional Brazilian federal government, which succeeded the deposition of President Dilma Rousseff, issued the high school reform law (MP 746/2016<sup>2</sup>), the change perpetrated against arts education in the country generated several opposition reactions. Outside the country, an international institution affiliated with UNESCO, INSEA - International Society for Education through Art, in support of the social groups involved in the problem, sent an open letter to the Brazilian government (INSEA; 2016) defending the importance of this teaching modality. Its arguments visibly assumed the political tactic of attempting an explanatory dialogue with sectors of society less close to the art system and with a more productivist and neoliberal world perspective. For example, it was stated that “21st century societies need more and more creative, flexible, adaptable and innovative workers”, and that “art education or the teaching of the arts is also a means at the disposal of nations for the preparation of the human resources necessary to take advantage of their valuable cultural capital”. But perhaps the moment when the commitment to this kind of dialogue was most forthright was a list of “essential knowledge and skills for life,” eleven in all: “knowing how to communicate; persistence and attentiveness; cooperation; problem-solving; self-regulation; critical thinking; creative thinking; knowledge of cultures; knowledge of personal and community identity; awareness and respect for diversity; development of civic values/social and community values”.

I would like to make two reflections on this very significant letter. The first is how much this action by INSEA was a symptom and proof of the still glaring need to justify and clarify for society as a whole the importance of arts education for everyone. Math and Portuguese don't need this, but the arts do. And to this end, INSEA chose a strategy of resistance: fighting with the weapons available and possible in the situation. In this case, by using arguments that challenged the prevailing logic within the field of its domain, even if one did not agree with it. Another point of note is that, of the eleven topics, seven can be considered eminently cognitive: operations and ways of thinking in everyday life that are vital to everyone and which art classes address.

The implications of this letter are not fortuitous; in fact, they are an articulation of elements that may well be constitutive of a perspective of arts education (in our case, theater education) strong enough to face the political difficulties that arise in its implementation in formal education. In other words, to assume as an intrinsic need of our profession as drama

---

<sup>2</sup><https://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/medpro/2016/medidaprovisoria-746-22-setembro-2016-783654-publicacaooriginal-151123-pe.html>

teachers to **educate society** (*sic*) as to the importance and specificities of theater education and, consequently, to better investigate how theater education relates to everyone's lives, particularly in their ways of thinking.

### CONSTRUCTION OF POLICIES

If we adopt INSEA's immediate and pragmatic strategy, it seems necessary to assume that theater is embedded in reality and that, because of this, its education is essential for everyone in a more concrete and visible sense - it is a matter of survival, and not of adding color to life (which is the most current approach). As such, the theatricality of life is what these classes would address: **a theatrical stratum that forms everyday life and that the practice of theater exercises and enhances**. Initial examples of these elements could be the ability to invent other worlds of experience and the creation of ways of living, or even the ordinary planning and comprehension of events, which has already been identified as present in theater education long ago by other authors:

Dramatic imagination, the faculty of putting ourselves in the place of others or in circumstances that are not physically apparent to our senses, continues throughout life and characterizes much of our thinking when we hypothesize about the future, reconstruct the past, or plan the present." (KOUDELA, 2009, 37)

These thinking operations are as complex and multiple as the situations we experience can be, since they imply perceptions, decisions, choices and plots, which are articulated all the time in a complex and rhizomatic way<sup>3</sup>, whereby multiple layers of event are imbricated, with different weights and qualities. In this argument, it is important to point out that theater has always been related to the theatricality of life. It intensifies and deforms it, not necessarily in relation of representation. Therefore, teaching theater classes is not **exceptionally**, but rather, dare I say it, **imperatively** connected to life (MAGELA, 2022). To sensitize a student to the theater in its intensive aspects (in the operations of thought that can occur in the practice of theater, games, exercises) is to sensitize them to the theatricality of life. It is a relationship to life similar to that of mother tongue or native language classes, once we are already speakers of the language, but the classes (in theory) allow us to better enter into the flows of language already existing in the world and even to produce new ways of dealing with language.

---

<sup>3</sup> Rhizome is a philosophical concept elaborated by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari from biology. It refers to modes of relation in which elements can connect in multiple ways, dispensing with hierarchical structures, usually based on the arborescent model. For a better understanding, see "A Thousand Plateaus" (DELEUZE & GUATTARI; 1987).

Those who have experienced theater classes can confirm the extent to which cognitive operations are present in theater practice. And the moments where these forms of thought are best explored are those that we can classify as “*Pedagogia do Ator*” (Actor’s Pedagogy) (ICLE, 2009). In it, we are able to identify an *epistemology of acting*<sup>4</sup> (MAGELA, 2016, 104), which can basically be understood as the way of thinking implied in facing the challenge of being on stage and in theater exercises. This cognitive situation of performing is chosen here as a central point in theater education for a personal transformation, a greater activation of theater cognition and the potency enhancement of the student’s theatrical aesthetic experience in their daily life (better perceiving and building flows of relationships in which they live, for example). Indeed, this is a stance already investigated and adopted in theatrical processes in education: “Inherent to the formative dimension of theater is the aesthetic experience lived by the one who performs; thus, the sharpening of sensory perception and the ‘awareness of the body at play’<sup>5</sup> are brought to the fore” (PUPO, 2005, 3).

### **PHILOSOPHY OF PEDAGOGICAL WORK**

When we consider the epistemology of acting as a privileged resource for a pedagogical contact with theatricality - the corporal cognitive experience of theater -, what is configured is a harnessing, directed towards education, of artisanal issues already present in the most widespread practice of theater. But this craftsmanship is not limited to exercises and practices because what effectively constitutes these processes are values, principles, and ways of operating that are ingrained in those involved - basic perceptions, from which will emerge, implicitly or explicitly, the procedures and criteria for training or education. Such foundations have an intimate relation with the conceptions of what theater, art, body, and life are, and of what concerns us as living beings - the intensive of life.

Peter Brook, when commenting on the performance *The Connection*, staged in 1959 by the Living Theatre group, related it to an exhibition of paintings by Picasso that he had seen at

---

<sup>4</sup> This term, epistemology of acting, is not used or mentioned by Icle. I heard it from José Sávio Araújo, a professor at UFRN – Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (who has a position regarding theater education with which I disagree). I appropriated it and consider it central to designate what I prioritize in theater education - the way of thinking specific to the performance, which is present in life and can be addressed by classes if prepared appropriately.

<sup>5</sup> Here, Maria Lúcia Pupo uses an expression coined by Pierre Voltz, found in “Théâtre et Éducation: l’enjeu formateur”, *Cahier Théâtre / Éducation*, n°3, PP. 99-119.

the time, and his analysis exposes this search for what is effectively consistent - the intensities, the intensive, and not what is hegemonically accepted as relevant:

Why do his abstractions seem real, why do people sense that he is dealing with concrete, vital things? (...) What are the “facts” today? Are they concrete, like prices and hours of work – or abstract, like violence and loneliness? And are sure that in relation to twentieth-century living, the great abstractions – speed, strain, space, frenzy, energy, brutality – aren’t more concrete, more immediately like to affect our lives than the so-called concrete issues? Mustn’t we relate this to the actor and the ritual of acting in order to find the pattern of the theater we need? (BROOK; 1987, 30)

The conceptions, forms, and flows of both theater and life are already imbricated in theater processes. But this relationship may be considered as more intense in a theater education in which the operations of life are its priority compound. This pedagogy will therefore take place in terms of **event**, of what is intensive in life. It is in this regard that we are interested in perspectives that go toward what Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari touched on - an eminently intensive approach, which pursues life potencies; revisiting proposals previously laid out by Spinoza.

### **CONTEXT OF THE EXPOSITION**

The importance of the works of Deleuze and Guattari for theater creation and its pedagogies goes well beyond the critique of representation and dedication to the intensive character of the phenomena – an event perspective. Assuming that the teaching of theater in schools should be oriented towards the theatrical aesthetic components in social spheres and daily life - in an aesthetic life -, the philosophy of difference and its ethical-aesthetic and vitalistic proposals may already be considered as implicitly present in the thinking connected to theater education, as well as proving to be a potent field for the development of these activities. In other words, if the concepts of the philosophy composed by these two authors promote a life allied to the so called “aesthetic paradigm”, they will also connect to theater teaching if this form of education is guided by broader aesthetic parameters, and not only delimited by theater activity in the strict and conventional sense.

In this text, combining analyses of practical laboratory work with conceptual connections and inferences, I will reflexively describe pedagogical exercises created or adapted based on a dialogue with the works of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. Reflections produced from years

of research on theater education will be presented, with exercises and prototypical creation cells arising out of this dialogue. The initial considerations will be more about conceptual inferences and connections related to the exercises (shown on video and meticulously described in another article<sup>6</sup>) but, throughout the course of the text, more comprehensive questions will be addressed regarding acting, theater pedagogies and an aesthetics of existence.

The exercises, although not created for direct classroom use, are proposals for very corporal concretizations of reflections on concepts related to life, aesthetics, acting and the body. But they can be used, directly or adapted, if the situation of the theater class allows for it. Below, I highlight very concrete cognitive and existential operations that can occur in theater activities. The reader may perhaps detect a high degree of projection and even fabulation in the reflections, despite the fact that they come from a laboratory and field practice with teachers<sup>7</sup>. But the research objective is not so much to prove that the operations occur universally, but to elaborate ways of investigation and suggestions for principles and operative concepts that are fertile for the specific practice of each teacher. To propose ideas and speculations from the construction of a relatively strict discursive apparatus - a rigor internal to its procedures and its propositional character, which lends itself to be subsequently compared with practices from other studies.<sup>8</sup>

In an initial overview, we can perceive the presence of concepts that are more directly associated with the body, primarily and centrally, the affections. But in the performance situations, we were able to identify the operation of many more concepts contained in the chosen works. The practical exercises of this research were basically created in an attempt to promote affections and their derivations and developments.

## **AFFECTIONS AND THEATER EXERCISES**

The concept of affection used here comes from the work *Ethics*, by Benedict de Spinoza (2018), reread and discussed by Gilles Deleuze (1988), and implies a vision of body and individual as compositions, in a fundamental questioning of the single, nuclear subject. Everything in the universe is compositions, encounters, relationships. As living beings, the more

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC7ns9ipXlkdK7E3IEE0omQw> , on the Youtube canal “Grotowski Deleuze Educação” and the article “*Exercícios Prototípicos para uma educação teatral*”, available at <https://periodicos.ufba.br/index.php/revteatro/article/view/26519>

<sup>7</sup> The exercises and laboratories have been held for years with undergraduates, actors, people working in other activities, and teachers from various fields in the public school system.

<sup>8</sup> The research coordinated by me and funded by CNPq (National Council of Research) aimed to investigate in schools how this theater education proposal can influence the work of theater teachers in formal education.

we can affect ourselves to compose encounters, the better. The encounters (compositions) that provoke an increase in the power of affecting ourselves give joy; and these sparks of potency in being affected are the great guiding value of actions - the increase in the power of assimilation, of being affected more and more and better.

According to these conceptions, in the whole universe there is no creation, only the expression of relations, of forces that configure and reconfigure themselves into forms. It is a radical way of seeing the world only through relations, and not objects. Objects (in the widest sense) are configurations (more or less, but always, provisional) of relations. This way of seeing by relations, mentioned earlier in this text, changes all analyses of phenomena. It is what we call the “intensive approach”, since what matters are the intensities of the forces, their relations, their operations, and not the instituted configurations (often pictured, in an illusory manner, as objects). It changes the way we look at life and its situations: marriage, institutions and their principles, the theater...

These concepts outlined above were investigated as an ethical proposal primarily through exercises adapted and created for the research (which I now describe synthetically, aided by the aforementioned article and by video samples<sup>9</sup>). The most elementary exercise, the **SACHET**, is intended for students to practice a bodily capacity to receive and mold themselves to the peculiarities of what is being received. It promotes action in imbalance, which accommodates what is not planned, the dissolution of shielding and voluntarism. It is an exercise in expanding the capacity for listening.

Its complexification is the **CLOTH**, which introduces a sensitivity to a more sophisticated modulation of space and time, a more expressive aestheticization of these receptions and throws, as well as the confrontation of the performer with a grammar (the material constraints of the cloth and the collective composition of space-time, with which the performer has to contend in order to act in flow).

The individual as “a given degree of power assumed to be constant within certain limits” (DELEUZE, 1988, 27), a thicket of affectations, not tied to or limited to the conventional configuration of a subject or to that of a biological unit, is very much operated in the **CLOTH**. The dynamics of this exercise, which has almost all the elements of **SACHET** and complexifies

---

<sup>9</sup> In the videos there are explanations of each exercise, as well as a demonstration of the exercise being performed. The development of the text will require the reader to read the article and, preferably, watch the video of the exercise under analysis.

them, is initially marked by the possibilities of more than one performer being able to manipulate it at the same time, and one performer being able to touch the cloth in a *half-throw* (an intervention that does not configure a complete reception and throwing of the cloth, but it's like a semi-working with these two moments). When the exercise acquires a certain intensity and quality, what we see is that movement, relations, intensities, and interventions on the cloth are one body (“one same degree of power”), and not that previous individual-subject. Each individual can be two, three, four; and can also be half, a third, or a quarter of a subject.

In a sophistication of affections, the **WITNESS** offers a delicacy for the cultivation of a refined listening to stimuli (with or without the interferences), where inner and outer are undifferentiated, and responsiveness expands in the body (not preventing oneself from acting). The **WARMING UP BY USE** expands this listening and openness to action, adding the need for a strengthening of the performer: to suffer more, to bear the “gross affections” (LAPOUJADE, 2002<sup>10</sup>) in order to live the worthwhile affections. Furthermore, this exercise proposes other forms of coexistence and production/sharing of the real. And, at the same time, it further deconstructs the individual body through its functionalization and fragmentation. In the study, the **WARMING UP BY USE** began to be proposed after the **WITNESS**, as an unfolding and even development of it.

The fragmentation of the body is radicalized by the Brownian movements of **STEP-BY-STEP** - rolling movements with virtually random direction, where only the change of surface “signifies”. The exercise constitutes a communication channel without a message (or at least an intentional one), outside the subject sphere and dehumanized, which mobilizes the whole performer’s body, inciting other experiences, physical situations and expressions.

These exercises and their varied modalities of affections aim to promote compositions of other bodies and, consequently, other frames of perception. One of their keynotes is to provide the performers with very materially concrete consistencies for the performance of movements, following the somatic approach (MAGELA, 2017) adopted here. The performer does not imagine something beforehand, does not try to express or represent emotions; their performance is composed of very precise, concrete contacts, in physical references to elements located in space, such as a sachet, a piece of cloth, or a colleague’s body. Not without reason, Spinoza-

---

<sup>10</sup> Lapoujade’s text is officially published just in Portuguese, but there is a French version (the original text) in Lapoujade’s Academia.edu site, available at: [https://www.academia.edu/15577592/Le\\_corps\\_qui\\_nen\\_peut\\_plus\\_Nietzsche\\_et\\_Deleuze](https://www.academia.edu/15577592/Le_corps_qui_nen_peut_plus_Nietzsche_et_Deleuze)



Deleuze's affection is related to **contact**, as interpreted from works by Jerzy Grotowski (which make up the artisanal system of performance that guides this proposal). Even in more elaborate processes of scene construction, contact is the vital nourishment of the work:

*Score is contact*

The concept of contact, a key concept that relates to numerous practical transformations that occurred in T.-L.<sup>11</sup>, also rewrote the structure/spontaneity binomial. The notion of score, for example, became defined in relation to contact. What was being scored were the elements of human contact, the giving and taking of relationships. Faced with the concept of contact, it was no longer possible to define the score as an organized exteriorization of inner contents, since, in contact, what is "inside" or "outside" the actor could no longer be so easily distinguished. The intentions, the associations were also reactions to the other, to the space, and were firmly tied to the corporeality, to the organism - also sensorial - of the actor; they were no longer defined only as psychic reflexes. (MOTTA-LIMA, 2012, 406)

If personal transformation (that is: education) is the focus, what the development of the work aims at is to complexify perception. To this end, in conjunction with these more specific training exercises, some improvisations, mainly **IMPROVISATION A and B**, have a direct effect on performing practice, and in different ways. It sensitizes the performer to the affectation for the here and now of the counter-play, while pointing out rhizomatic complexifications and insights regarding what happens, in terms of narrative implications of the performers' actions - and of life events.

### **OUTCOMES: EMBODIED CONCEPTS**

As already mentioned, the work that WITNESS does on impulses, particularly in the practices of **INTERFERENCES**, encourages the blurring of distinctions between internal stimuli and external interferences (similarly to what Tatiana Motta Lima mentioned above concerning contact). The blind person relates to the protector's interference, but as if it were his own impulse, as something that is part of them, a component of theirs – they are what they relate to. It involves other proposals of ways of being that the contact offers (or establishes). To listen, to be affected, is to do, is to be. Therefore, to perceive is to be composed, produced - it is a process of subjectivation. To perceive theatrical impulses, and act on them, is the production of theater subjectivity (MAGELA, 2019).

By assuming contact as the axis of the work, a capital consequence is the release of the actor from the obligation to be creative in conventional terms, to provoke interesting situations,

---

<sup>11</sup> Theater-Laboratory.

and be expressive. The creation is no longer constrained by productivity, but is assumed as investigation and openness so that ‘pertinent’ (whatever it is for those involved in the process) partnerships and contacts (lives) may occur. If relationship and partner are inseparable entities, when there is a significant partner, the relationship also becomes significant. And the same happens with a myriad of qualities, without prior moralism or aesthetic judgments, because diversity comes from the work of openness to what occurs. To create is to investigate new partnerships, accept them, and welcome them, as in SACHET, which is an exercise in body listening, and not virtuosity. The process of creation (highly pedagogical) is to foster situations that increase sensitivity to affections, to partnerships - the key to the exercises presented here, and the principle of their conduction. The diversity of life is perceived, welcomed, and embraced.

Regarding WARMING UP BY USE and its somatic consequences, one point to emphasize is that moments when the two performers are active and passive at the same time generate a microcosm of coexistence. Using and being used at the same time necessarily implies that these two things are constitutively mixed, because the use that one performer makes of the other body becomes a use that the other body makes of this first performer, and for him as well. And if this is not agreed or mediated by communication (which is fostered in all exercises: alternatives to the hegemonic and exclusionary logic of communication), the imperative of inventing and sustaining ways of welcoming external influences (the other body) amplifies the power of assimilation (LAPOUJADE, 2002). It is not only about undergoing (τὸν πάθει μάθος<sup>12</sup>) what occurs (being used), but dynamically welcoming the affections by transforming oneself and acting, while using as well. It is practicing subjectivation processes corporally, strengthening singularization and autonomy, outside of identity schemes of will:

‘Listening’ also presupposes that the actor’s action is neither voluntaristic - in the sense that it is preceded and supported by an idea or a thought that does not relate to the ‘present moment’ - nor dependent - in the sense that it performs only what is indicated or controlled from outside, by another. An ‘active’ listening presupposes a ‘passive’ action, ‘passivity’ being understood here as the permission to receive, let resonate and react to the permanent changes that occur in the actor’s own internal/external space. (MOTTA-LIMA, 2009, 30)

---

<sup>12</sup> *Agamemnon*, verse 177: a famous quote “Wisdom cometh by suffering”, by Aeschylus.

In this sense, these selective potencies of assimilation (affectation), the actions, the listening to impulses, and the experience of desire operate a theater thinking. It is a specifically theatrical form of cognition, which produces a field of invention that exceeds the creative scope more circumscribed to rational patterns. The performers are called upon to make adaptations, by coupling their impulses (desires?) to the movement-impulses of the other body, in a dynamic negotiation where there is no time or place for regrets if I am unable to do a movement I first wanted. The impulse ends up becoming what one can do, conditioning everything to the possibilities that are invented within the situation. Desire becomes action, not design. Process is already a result:

There is no need to distinguish here between producing and its product. We need merely note that the pure "thisness" of the object produced is carried over into a new act of producing. (...) The rule of continually producing production, of grafting producing onto the product, is a characteristic of desiring-machines or of primary production: the production of production. (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1983, 7).

The philosophical attitude of quitting the model and representation paradigm occurs centrally in the work of Deleuze (1990) (1994), and engages the critique that he and Félix Guattari construct against the hegemonic conception of desire as lack:

Desire does not lack anything; it does not lack its object. It is, rather, the subject that is missing in desire, or desire that lacks a fixed subject; there is no fixed subject unless there is repression. Desire and its object are one and the same thing: the machine, as a machine of a machine. (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1983, 26)

If we swing this understanding towards the practice of acting in a pedagogical process, having as support material the exercises mentioned here, we again notice how basing the practice on affections and contact addresses these vitalist and immanentist perspectives. Hence, theater is directly life, and not an attempt to represent it; it is directly connection, and not lack. As Deleuze notes, when discussing subjectivation (which is not linked to the conventional subject, but to lines of forces and agency), “it amounts essentially to inventing new possibilities of life, as Nietzsche would say, to establishing what one may truly call styles of life: here it's a vitalism rooted in aesthetics.” (DELEUZE, 1995, 91).

We can take as another example an adaptation of the exercise “Colombian hypnotism” (BOAL, 2000, 91), in which one performer leads another by the hand (the **CONDUCTION**<sup>13</sup>). In this work, we can do a series of gradually complex variations, without interruptions, even if

---

<sup>13</sup> Please check note 4, where one can find the references for the exercises.

the teacher proposes exchanges of pairs. Initially the hand of one conducts the partner, with precision and rigor (maintaining distance and parallelism between the hand and the face). From the hand leading the face, it goes on to the hand leading the chest, the chest leading the chest, and the whole body<sup>14</sup> leading the other's whole body (always taking care not to fall into a mirror exercise). After this stage, if both lead and are led, reciprocally at the same time, the situation becomes quite complex. The rigors have to be fiercely maintained, with the obligation to preserve this complex "channel," which started out being only hand-to-face without the use of exchanging glances or gestures and speech. And if the care for the channel remains, the gaps and impossibilities of the proposal of both leading and being led at the same time imply issues of normativity, where the constitution of singular logics, adjustments without communication, etc. have to be worked out. If the two performers go immediately to a non-speech improvisation where these bodily interactions can be further explored, the IMPROVISATION A and B for example, it is very likely that the work will better address theatrical cognitive issues (how we can construct and deal with unique, dynamic, non-verbalizable normativities, etc.) (MAGELA, 2022) (MAGELA, 2020).

Similar to the metamorphosis of desire in the WARMING UP BY USE, in the IMPROVISATION A and B, in my research, over the years, the confrontation with a real (*sic*) has proven to generate transformations in the performer, more specifically in what they dynamically 'want' (the "wants" of the improvisation's enunciation). Paradoxically, because it is extremely nuclear, synthetic, minimalist, and also since it is maintained throughout the improvisation, the A's "*wants to sit*" and the B's "*wants A not to sit*" can assume any configuration - in terms of quality and level. The "*want*" is transformed according to the affections that occur, like the desire proposed in *The Anti Oedipus* (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1983). Desire becomes a multiform and dynamic coupling. And the anguish of maintaining it without solutions is an existential practice.

### **PARTIALIZATION: TOTALITY AND COEXISTENCE**

In WARMING UP BY USE, a partialization of the body ends up occurring, not only in terms of physical partitions, but also in terms of perspectivations, the perception of the intensive qualities of the partner's body. Through the type of use proposed by the exercise, the performer

---

<sup>14</sup> Here, we can assume "body" pragmatically as both performers' torsos, more than arms and legs.

begins to see the other's body as weight (by lifting them, for example, to wake up or activate their muscles more), as texture (by using the other texturally - their skin, the density of the flesh), as part or component. This is a kind of schizoid action in relation to the other performer, fostered by the proposal of the exercise, which disregards the totality of the person's identity. The performer is stimulated to use the body (the other's and their own, which eventually are one and the same) in the ways that the exercise proposes, trying to disregard their personality (without saying *good morning, how are you?* or *can I do this?* ; *how do you judge me?* ; *let's agree on something beforehand so that nothing goes wrong?*). They are also not called upon to be attentive to the "everything" of the other (the conventional totality, which is a common requirement in improvisations), here exercising their attention only in terms of the use made or emerging at each moment.

The performer fragments the attention. This is how virtually absolute fields of attention are created, **other totalities** with which they will relate. Other forms of relation are created, through the creation of this small dimension of affectation that is at the same time local and absolute. The paradox is that the partialization, the coupling in contact, is what produces this absoluteness or totality. And this operation opens the way for relations that can be becoming:

In a way, we must start at the end: all becoming are already molecular. That is because becoming is not to imitate or identify with something or someone. Nor is it to proportion formal relations. Neither of these two figures of analogy is applicable to becoming: neither the imitation of a subject nor the proportionality of a form. Starting from the forms one has, the subject one is, the organs one has, or the functions one fulfills, becoming is to extract particles between which one establishes the relations of movement and rest, speed and slowness that are closest to what one is becoming, and through which one becomes. This is the sense in which becoming is the process of desire. (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1987, 272)

Resulting from this partialization of the body, the performer does not connect with the other as a presumed person (as a subject), and what follows is that they also tend to stop being a person in these identity terms or in the instituted protocols of behavior. Conventional social procedures are extremely undesirable at certain moments in theatrical creation and in life, even if we always have to dialogue with these customary norms. The performers merge with these new relationships, intensively. They become.

A large part of this deconstruction is due to the fact that the proposals consist of tasks that are well defined by the rules of the exercise. The task is something that "pulls" the performer to this new relationship. It is a trigger, a deflagrator (MAGELA, 2017). As a resistance, which

operates in the place of already instituted forms of relation undermining them by substitution, contact makes connections that disarticulate other previous connections. A provocateur of becoming. Impulses function as small actions, tasks that engage the performer, and de-unification only occurs through partialization - through occupations, affections, couplings:

Everywhere it is machines—real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines, machines being driven by other machines, with all the necessary couplings and connections. An organ-machine is plugged into an energy-source-machine: the one produces a flow that the other interrupts. The breast is a machine that produces milk, and the mouth a machine coupled to it. The mouth of the anorexic wavers between several functions: its possessor is uncertain as to whether it is an eating-machine, an anal machine, a talking-machine, or a breathing machine (asthma attacks). Hence we are all handymen: each with his little machines. (...) And rest assured that it works. (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1983, 8)

But here the task is not a result to be achieved, but a normative delimitation (MAGELA, 2020) that intensifies attention. If an endless task is proposed, the conventional sense of task as outcome (efficacy) is also destabilized... These tasks of these theater exercises do not aim at practicing skills in order to better solve problems (efficiency). They are aesthetic situations of experiencing a more intensified and situated attention, which force the performer to open his or her established patterns of behavior in order to be affected by what arises for or by them. Once again, seeing the individual as the same degree of power is a resistance and alternative to the normal individual, the conventional subject.

In conducting these exercises, many restrictions are placed on the performers during the work, aiming to eliminate protocol and bureaucratic forms of negotiation (presume that the other will care if I do something strange, help the other, spare them, presume their desire and try to satisfy it, be kind, complement what they do). In this way, through the positive production of specific forms of relationship, one can undermine “social mechanisms which favor or permit the ordinary experience of life as a unity and a totality” (BOURDIEU, 2017, 212). A reverberation field is constituted for the invention of other theatrical modes of life, questioning the devices that collaborate so that hegemonic ways of living, and of creating theater, are perpetuated and do not allow others to emerge:

The social world, which tends to identify normality with identity understood as the constancy to oneself of a responsible being that is predictable or at least intelligible, in the way of a well-constructed history (as opposed to a history told by an idiot), has available all sorts of institutions of integration and unification of the self. (BOURDIEU, 2017, 212)

And the practice of this body as compositions in potency is the great pedagogical experience outlined here. Immediately, relating to the ways of responding to the other in improvisation; a non-supposed person constituting a virtually non-supposed ethics and aesthetics, once the performer does (and is) what affections and couplings constitute, demand, provoke; the action is done in her. The body practiced and experienced in the exercise going into improvisation, somatically influencing the performance. Something is performed: the intensive body.

### AS IN THEATER

In the theater tradition, the seminal and fundamental action of the performer to come out of themselves is materialized in the Greek term *enthousiasmós*, which configures a detachment of the self in favor of a divine potency (PINHEIRO, 2006, 81). Taking this into account, the concept of becoming and its implications and consequences (conceptual, practical and existential) is not only pertinent, but also enriches the theorization about acting, even if it takes place in aesthetically conventional forms. Suddenly and bluntly, at least in the performance desired here, we can assume that **the performer becomes on stage. That performing is becoming.**

There are visions that maintain that life outside the theater (the so-called real world) is that which is to be represented on the stage. But if we leave aside the tendency to subsume the performance to a form of the supposed real (the scheme of representation), what the performer does is situated in this unidentifiable place between being something, not being, imitating, being part of, functioning. All this has a conceptual approximation to becoming. The lending of oneself in favor of potencies, intensities, and forces to bring forth the theatrical on stage executes the same vital operations of becoming, as conceived by Deleuze and Guattari:

Take the case of the local folk hero, Alexis the Trotter, who ran “like” a horse at extraordinary speed, whipped himself with a short switch, whinnied, reared, kicked, knelt, lay down on the ground in the manner of a horse, competed against them in races, and against bicycles and trains. He imitated a horse to make people laugh. But he had a deeper zone of proximity or indiscernibility. Sources tell us that he was never as much of a horse as when he played the harmonica: precisely because he no longer needed a regulating or secondary imitation. It is said that he called his harmonica his “chops-destroyer” and played the instrument twice as fast as anyone else, doubled the beat, imposed a nonhuman tempo. Alexis became all the more horse when the horse’s bit became a harmonica, and the horse’s trot went into double time. (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1987, 305)

Perhaps the **alliance**, defended by Deleuze and Guattari<sup>15</sup> as being of the nature of becoming, has a proximity with the affections prioritized here. Because the performer in affections, less than imitating or wanting to express or represent (even less trying to communicate something), weaves alliances with forces that arise in the process of investigation, and these alliances are what provoke these becomings, which the performer modulates, getting intimate with them. Becoming is something that happens in life as a whole, “becoming is a reality: becomings, far from being the province of dreams or the imaginary, are the very consistency of the real” (ZOURABICHVILLI, 2012, 149); and, in fact, it is part of the preservation of life – or rather, of its effectivation, in its most intense processes:

(...) as someone becomes, what he is becoming changes as much as he does himself. Becomings are not phenomena of imitation or assimilation, but of a double capture, of non-parallel evolution, of nuptials between two reigns. Nuptials are always against nature. Nuptials are the opposite of a couple. There are no longer binary machines: question-answer, masculine-feminine, man-animal, etc. This could be what a conversation is – simply the outline of a becoming. The wasp and the orchid provide the example. The orchid seems to form a wasp image, but in fact there is a wasp-becoming of the orchid, an orchid-becoming of the wasp, a double capture since ‘what’ each becomes changes no less than ‘that which’ becomes. The wasp becomes part of the orchid’s reproductive apparatus at the same time as the orchid becomes the sexual organ of the wasp. One and the same becoming, a single bloc of becoming (...). (DELEUZE & PARNET, 1987, 2)

As far as the performer is concerned, it is important to emphasize this character of encounter and contact in becoming, which only occurs when there is a surrender, a departure from the territory and the existing arrangements<sup>16</sup>: “there are animal-becomings of man which do not consist in playing the dog or the cat, since man and the animal only meet on the trajectory of a common but asymmetrical deterritorialization” (DELEUZE & PARNET, 1987, 3). As mentioned earlier, a detachment from the self is a fundamental process in art, and also a fundamental process in life. Acting, even if it simulates rather than actually is life, comes about as becoming, which “operates a dismantling of forms, relaunching them on the plane of shapeless forces. To this extent, the becoming corresponds to a moment of desubjectivation, which is a condition for the process of producing subjectivity to remain on course” (KASTRUP,

---

<sup>15</sup> Finally, becoming is not an evolution, at least not an evolution by descent and filiation. Becoming produces nothing by filiation; all filiation is imaginary. Becoming is always of a different order than filiation. It concerns alliance. (DELEUZE & GUATTARI; 1987, 238)

<sup>16</sup> “Arrangement” or “assemblage” refers to the French *Agencement*, maybe the most consequential concept in Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophy. In Portuguese (*agenciamento*), the proximity with “agency” (*agência*) makes an interesting political ambiguity, once agency is a term used in the world economic agenda educational writings.



2005, 1276). In pedagogical processes in theater, the fostering of this capacity of dismantling and sustaining deterritorialization and becoming are fundamental for the compositions of territories in an autonomous and inventive way, towards a production of theater subjectivity (MAGELA, 2019).

### **ANGUISH: BEWILDERMENT FACED WITH THE VIRTUAL**

In **IMPROVISATION A and B**, the minimalism of the instructions (no initial storyline) and the restrictions placed by the exercise conductor (eliminating acting resources such as mime, gags, and the simulation of objects, characters, and situations, for example) create many challenges and difficulties for the performers. It is common for them to become very fixated on an attitude of always quickly solving any situation in which they may find themselves not knowing what to do, and some even avoid these situations beforehand. In this proposal (and I dare say in every performance) it is essential that the participants welcome doubts, that there is an openness to situations that are new problems. In short, that the anguish of the unknown is sustained. These situations are pearls for the performer.

The perception/awareness of fragmentation, participation, instability and dynamism of subjectivity can be, at first, terrifying for a subject too attached to stability and too attached to what he/she has called his/her individual contours; on the other hand, it can also be 'healing' and freedom from this figure that requires disproportionate - and perhaps unnecessary - efforts to block the traversing, porosity, affectation and perception of the shards. (MOTTA-LIMA, 2009, 35)

Because to prioritize affections in the performance implies a specific ethics, which does not occur in terms of control of already experienced objects. It emerges precisely at the moment of exhaustion of the known, when, through the force of becoming, "another way of living and sensing haunts or is enveloped within our own and 'puts it to flight' [*fait fuir*]" (ZOURABICHVILI, 2012, 149).

In this aspect, when practicing the CLOTH, a thinking *from within* becomes very active, not *a posteriori*, not at a distance, nor theoretical. Thinking is already doing, analogously to the relation between production/product and the desire in Deleuze and Guattari's *The Anti-Oedipus* (1983): "Becoming is the content proper to desire (desiring machines or assemblages<sup>17</sup>): to desire is to pass through becomings" (ZOURABICHVILLI, 2012, 148). When a performer occasionally

---

<sup>17</sup> Here, rather arrangements.

puts himself or herself outside the process, it is probably because they recoil at the possibility of ‘falling apart’<sup>18</sup>, and this is immediately noticed. The cloth invokes and leads to a thinking in action, a thinking that is action. By calling for this, it makes the performers practice a bodily thinking, which has no guarantees or security - anchors that commonly refer to cognitive processes tied more to rationality and consciousness.

The established is destabilized when the performer opens up to what may arise, in the work, in the improvisations. These moments of *not knowing* are analogous to perceptions of new problems - confronting the question, the doubt, without resolving it, with this field of indeterminacy and indiscernibility being welcomed and upheld:

However, this virtual time itself determines a time of differentiation, or rather rhythms or different times of actualisation which correspond to the relations and singularities of the structure and, for their part, measure the passage from virtual to actual. In this regard, four terms are synonymous: actualise, differentiate, integrate and solve. For the nature of the virtual is such that, for it, to be actualised is to be differentiated. (DELEUZE, 1994, 211)

Thus, the perception of the performer is allied to the **virtual**, where unpredictability promotes invention and experimentation. And it is necessary to point out the prominence, in the thinking, of the posing of questions, the invention of problems, and not their solution, since “the virtual is the insistence of what is not given” (ZOURABICHVILI, 2012, 215). If a pertinent framework for the action of the performer is that of becoming, what occurs on stage can be seen as inhabiting the sphere of the virtual and the actual.

In this sense, in IMPROVISATION A and B, the restrictions on the performer’s actions mentioned before try to avoid killing intermediaries. These are all the unspecified situations that are located in an intermediate, virtual and interesting range, that occur between not abandoning the “*want*” of the utterance and not giving in to the temptation of the solution (which kills the ongoing situation):

In this sense, actualisation or differentiation is always a genuine creation. It does not result from any limitation of a pre-existing possibility. (...) For a potential or virtual object, to be actualised is to create divergent lines which correspond to - without resembling - a virtual multiplicity. (DELEUZE, 1994, 212)

If the intermediary is upheld, small actualizations coexist with virtualities, in an (often unnerving) multiplicity of sense production. On the contrary, if the filling of the void and the

---

<sup>18</sup> Or being “outside” the work itself, for some other reason. But what matters now are the hardest difficulties in the **surrender** required for one to affect oneself.

solution of anguish occur, marked almost always by an early intervention on the part of the performers in improvisational situations (which does not let the affection occur), this eliminates the chance for the appearance of these many intermediary actions and contacts. These are a myriad of subtle and almost imperceptible elements that do not configure themselves as significant plot points, but that act at the level of a microperception of the performer: “*virtual differentiates itself in the active creation of something new, an actual that does not resemble the virtual from which it emerged*” (TADEU SILVA, 2001-2002, 77).

In IMPROVISATION A and B, as in other more minimalist improvisations, the fear of the present often shows itself in the performers. And previous theatrical resources quickly fail and are exhausted. In these very special moments of failure, either the performer faces/accepts the small event that begins to arise, or he/she kills it with a solution or way out of the situation (usually by doing something known and already approved - escaping from the void by inventing a trick, for example). One kills the experience by realizing (and fearing) what it might bring about:

...in other words, the “thing itself” is the experience as it is made; it is becoming, always singular, rather than the Being in general. The “thing itself” is thus its property without meaning: we reach it at the moment when meanings remain in suspension, when we know how to bring the enunciation<sup>19</sup> into one of its disconcerting relationships, deeper than any theory, which stubbornly assert themselves in the thinking and force her to envisage new possibilities of thinking and living. (ZOURABICHVILI, 2005, 1319)

An important methodological aspect of these practices is the fact that these opt-outs from contact become very clear, very blatant. What might happen if the performer faces these small gaps? What threatens to emerge in improvisation is in the realm of the virtual, so we know only in the experience of the performance, which is irreducible to rational description and planning:

In reality, duration divides up and does so constantly: That is why it is a *multiplicity*. But it does not divide up without changing in kind, it changes in kind in the process of dividing up: This is why it is a nonnumerical multiplicity, where we can speak of “indivisibles” at each stage of the division. There is *other* without there being *several*; number exists only potentially. In other words, the subjective, or duration, is the *virtual*. To be more precise, it is the virtual insofar as it is actualized, in the course of being actualized, it is inseparable from the movement of its actualization. For actualization comes about through differentiation, through divergent lines, and creates so many differences in kind by virtue of its own movement. (DELEUZE;

---

<sup>19</sup> It should be noted that, although Zourabichvili refers here to the literary enunciation of philosophy, in fact, in his article and generally in Deleuze and Foucault, to enunciate is to do, to act - something related to the event. In the same sense, we have, for example, “collective assemblage [arrangement] of enunciation”.

1991: 42-43)

And this is a big question, regarding the promotion of embodied theater cognition for theatrical (and life) invention: the event in improvisation takes place within a body-theater process of thinking. But for this, we need to welcome the affections, without anticipating solutions, embracing, with our attention, the actuality in movement:

Our attention to the present does not go, in principle, in search of new stratifications, but rather a certain drift of subjectivity. Actuality does not reveal a stable domain and instituted forms, nor is it the result of a linear succession of events, but an unstable field, of which transformations are part. (KASTRUP, 2008, 94).

In the relations between virtual and actual within these improvisations, the present can become intimidating: “it is in the present that continuities are broken and identities dissipated” (KASTRUP, 2008, 97). To be in the present, in effective, affective contact, is to face this destabilization, an invitation to deterritorialize oneself: “It is also in the present that such regularities are destabilized and novelties are outlined” (KASTRUP, 2008, 94).

We are conformed by our mind structures, cultural, social and religious structures that produce us as subjects - produce our ways of thinking, feeling, acting, that is, our ways of perceiving (ourselves) (Grotowski talked about the production of our "world images" or our "thought structures"), and, therefore also our identity, the place/places where we say "I". To be able to 'think' about what we think, 'feel' what we feel, 'act' on what we do mechanically, another kind of attention is necessary, a work on perception that frees us - even if momentarily - from our identity prison. (MOTTA-LIMA, 2013, 225)

In many cases the present cries out for the event, when layered, known, recognized actions are exhausted, especially when they are not fueled (as in the restrictions operated in the conduction of the exercises). In any case, in life<sup>20</sup> territories don't last; this is the question...

In fact, it is part of the common sense that performers, professionals or not, in classrooms or laboratories, have to be open to the perception of what happens in the activity. The perception demands deterritorialization, even if, many times, the performers are not really territorialized; even if they haven't assembled, arranged, inhabited territory, or composed anything. The moment when the conventional or safe fails, if the performers allow for a rupture, is a moment when an affection affords the possibility of new couplings, arrangements: “*the present is able to promote cracks in the historical strata, in the old mental habits, the established structural couplings, and produce novelty*” (KASTRUP, 2008, 100). This place of virtualities that we may consider as

---

<sup>20</sup> And here performance is life.

intermediary keeps the possible active. The initial situation of improvisation, its deflagrating proposal (the instructions) can always be active (and indeed should be), but in multiple ways and intensities.

## **LURKING**

Abiding unpredictability is an imperative in improvisation. This implies in not avoiding it beforehand, in not excessively situating the performance, and in not suffocating it with solutions that are known to be successful. The necessary listening to perceive these problem-moments, question-moments, demands intense vigilance, in an attitude of hunting, foregoing planning and armored security:

It is expected that the correctly applied planning will fulfill the planned objectives, and thus close the cycle it started. (...) As such, planning ceases to be a phase of teaching/learning and becomes, practically, its final quest: the better the planning, the more detailed it is, the more assurance it offers of being able to fulfill the planned objectives. (MOTTA-LIMA, 2017, 35)

In the attitude of planning primacy, which is the dominant one, if something goes wrong, it is the model adopted that is revised (and not the fact of clinging to models), as if the perfect project had not yet been found. This attitude is distinct from that of hunting, where one gives up control of results, so that instability can be accommodated. In hunting there are methods and procedures, but with adaptations and adjustments, and the greatest technique is to remain attentive and on the lookout.

The cultivation, design, plan, and preparation are not a problem in themselves. Note that most of the measures presented here (as well as hunting procedures, be they adopted by wild-animals hunters or by those who hunt sparks of life power) are constituted by rules, instructions, norms even. A strong issue in performance, worked out in this pedagogy of theater studied here, is the articulation between cultivation and hunting, between maintaining and changing, closing and opening. Even in the restrictions that are being explored, what is sought is to close so that more and other openings may emerge. In fact, reprising the idea of theater education here, life is this game of openings and closings...

The exercises discussed here, especially those that work on specific channels (SACHET, STEP-BY-STEP), are very delimiting. They strongly direct the initial universe of action and, beyond the pedagogical intentions regarding restriction, perhaps one of their ambitions paradoxically is this training of unpretentious attention, which doesn't aim for something special,

and is content to be in contact with something immediate or specific. In this somatic approach (an intensification of a specific body, and its frames of perception, through exercises), it is important that there is a gradation, a cumulative or constructivist dynamic in the conduction and chaining of the exercises and other activities. And it is desirable to depart from these more directed practices, which supposedly activate specific perceptions in the performers because they are training specific channels, and go directly to improvisation, where the experience is much more complex, imbricated, articulated. In improvisation, which is the locus of confluence of this theater education proposal's elements, everything is at stake: depth and surface; various tempos; compositions of different types; more elaborate layers of perception with immediate and demarcated hunts.

## **RHIZOME**

Mostly, this initial work with the students, even in improvisation, excels in terms of specifics and reduction of elements, in an attempt (perhaps cliché) to tap into the *here and now*<sup>21</sup>, to dwell on couplings, direct affections, through a didactic simplification of scope. It involves working on a more immediate attention, of contact, which is never surpassed, since this perception is the basis for everything that is studied here. The other elements accumulate from this work.

But some imbrications and articulations quickly emerge, complexities in the sense-production of what the performers do. **Plot** cells, perhaps: narrations, suggested or implicit given circumstances, projections... In certain exercises this may already happen a little, but it is in improvisations that these plots and dramaturgies are most noticeable. A large part of this complexification concerns other forms of relationship beyond the simple and immediate, where what the performer does becomes denser, is connected to more implications of meaning and a production of more complex temporalities, where the micro and the macro are related, the constructed and what is meant to emerge.<sup>22</sup>: “*the relation between the constituted forms and the present is not one of rupture or discontinuity, but of coexistence*” (KASTRUP, 2008, 99).

Improvisation goes beyond the immediate, beyond naivety about the implications (to avoid the word meaning) of the performers' actions. They are complexifications of attention -

---

<sup>21</sup> What Grotowski will refer to in Latin - *hic et nunc*, when speaking of the need to be in the face of the Act, not to postpone it.

<sup>22</sup> The actual and the virtual, not exactly, but at least close.

which are not deterministically constituted by what precedes it, but depend on historical conditions to occur:

Actuality appears as an instance in which regularity and instability coexist. They are like its two faces. Without the historical strata, actuality would be pure movement, incessant agitation, total dispersion. Therefore, it would be unfeasible. On the other hand, without its untimely face, without the force of becoming, all actuality would be explained by the past, that is, historically. In this sense, it would be predictable, nothing truly new ever occurring. (KASTRUP, 2008, 96)

In some improvisations, less immediate densifications and consequences take place, implying something about the past, the future, and other relations to the actions - “*novelty is not subject to any kind of historical determinism, but neither does it arise from nothing, ‘ex-nihilo’*” (KASTRUP, 2008, 97). The word *layer* may seem like a way to illustrate this, but it is insufficient, and it is inadequate, because of the suggestion of hierarchy and excessive topological simplicity that it entails. What seems to be more pertinent is to attribute a **rhizome** character to these connections, densifications, and implications in what occurs at times in the work. Because in improvisation, one of the aspects that becomes very active is the connectivity between all the elements and moments, and their diversity as to nature<sup>23</sup>, level, and intensity. A given moment involves multiple aspects, and any connection can take place at any moment, as a rhizome, “agglomerating very diverse acts, not only linguistic, but also perceptive, mimetic, gestural, and cognitive” (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1987, 7):

semiotic chains of every nature are connected to very diverse modes of coding (biological, political, economic, etc.) that bring into play not only different regimes of signs but also states of things of differing status. (IDEM, 7)

A multiplicity has neither subject nor object, only determinations, magnitudes, and dimensions that cannot increase in number without the multiplicity changing in nature (the laws of combination therefore increase in number as the multiplicity grows). (IDEM, 8)

These articulations between elements, intensities, and implications of improvisation are also an engine for thinking about the **dimensional** character of improvisation and some other activities, when they are able to constitute a broader theatrical environment that is perhaps not always well enough defined by terms commonly used for improvisation, such as game, for example. A character of environment or dimension perhaps better defines what sometimes occurs

---

<sup>23</sup> In the coexistence of virtual and actual, for example, or when more immediate and intuitive perceptions are articulated with more identitarian or stratified and conventional information.

in the theater work, and this refers to the theatrical cognition overflowing into everyday life, since the theatrical components in life compose strata, dimensions:

Here, as elsewhere, the units of measure are what is essential (...). All we talk about are multiplicities, lines, strata and segmentarities, lines of flight and intensities, machinic assemblages and their various types, bodies without organs and their construction and selection, the plane of consistency, **and in each case the units of measure.** (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1987, 4)

The word dimension refers more conventionally to ways of measuring something (space, for example). But taking the Nietzschean concept of *interpretation* (WOTLING, 2001), we may consider dimension not strictly in the conventional sense of measurement, but in the sense of meaningful perception, which evaluates, distinguishes, discerns; in that which does not necessarily determine, but rather conditions and provides the conditions.

We do not have units [*unités*] of measure, only multiplicities or varieties of measurement. (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1987, 8)  
All multiplicities are flat, in the sense that they fill or occupy all of their dimensions: we will therefore speak of a plane of consistency of multiplicities, even though the dimensions of this “plane” increase with the number of connections that are made on it. (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 2004, 17)

This dimension is, above all, one of arrangements<sup>24</sup>. Assemblages produced by the affections, which occur in becoming, demanding deterritorializations and forming a field of experience that is perhaps a plane of immanence, constituted by relations (ZOURABICHVILI, 2005, 1519). But from these deterritorializations, through these same relations, new compositions of new territories can arise, which demand courage and work to take place. And to sustain the anguish provoked by the affection that arises in improvisation at certain moments (those of emptiness, for example, or those when the mask falls) is to deterritorialize oneself and be summoned to inhabit another territory, a territory outside security. When it no longer lasts, the process cries out to occur again, but in another way (like the party, which is repeated, but in another way).

These territories are theatrical densifications that articulate a more immediate *here and now*, which is the most encouraged in the exercises (being affective to what occurs in the moment and in a more corporally concrete way), with other natures of expression and constituent forms. The rules of progress, trajectory, logic, etc, can eventually compose a consistency - mini

---

<sup>24</sup> As noted before, *Agencements*, in French.



plots or seminal dramaturgies that give more intensity and consequence to what occurs. But they are not what effectively brings out what matters in improvisation. Taking the fact that the expressive elements sediment themselves quickly and can constitute arrangements (in this case, forms that constitute themselves, that compose what we can call *history* or *plots* in improvisation), they end up providing possibilities for denser articulations in what takes place in the work. In other words, everything that is done in the improvisation generates, at each moment, several possibilities of complexifications and consequences. The dimension is the composition / inhabitation of this theatrical territory. It is existential.

These densifications are confronted with becomings, at moments in which the present and its unpredictability are accepted. And these articulations also occur at each improvisation in the development of creation, not just at each instant, because we are talking about something that densifies in the succession of different instants and between moments. The immediate, the remembered, the superficial, the various qualities of behavior, the sketches of stratified behavior (sketches of characters even), down to the clichés, all of this and everything else that may emerge has no previously defined place, value, volume, intensity, or position. But dimensions are formed in each improvisation and between them. This is also why these plots are what most gives a rhizome character to improvisation. To see improvisation as rhizome opens up exceptional fields of perception and theorization in this important theatrical activity.

### **THE THEATRICAL INTENSIVE: FORCES, THEATER, LIFE**

But what do these connections come for? Why weave these parallels and analogies between facts observed in performance exercises and interpretations obtained from Deleuze and Guattari's concepts? What's the point, here?

In a way, these questions have already been answered from the beginning of this text. But a specific interest needs to be pointed out: the increase of epistemological consistency, for pedagogies and theatrical creations, which comes from connections with these philosophical perspectives. These influences enrich theater education, mainly in the fragmentations and questionings of the subject and in the blurring between fiction and reality, art and life.

Because the fact that in the cited theatrical activities there are these vital operations inspired by the concepts characterizes these activities in theatrical affect as concrete processes of

life production, and subjectification. The performer in affect goes beyond the subject and the representation. They produce and are produced in the theatrical activity:

Foucault doesn't use the word subject as though he's talking about a person or a form of identity, but talks about "subjectification" as a process, and "Self" as a relation (a relation to oneself). And what's he talking about? About a relation of force to itself (whereas power was a relation of a force to other forces), about a "fold" of force. About establishing different ways of existing, depending on how you fold the line of forces, or inventing possibilities of life that depend on death too, on our relations to death: existing not as a subject but as a work of art. (DELEUZE, 1995, 92).

If what occurs in the classes are relations of theatrical forces, of mutual influences that construct what happens and who the performers are, this theater is inseparable from a series of elements identified by Gilles Deleuze and Michel Foucault as present and constitutive in the production of subjectivity. In the classroom, the pedagogical theatrical experience produced by this body as compositions of potency establishes dimensions that are totally imbricated with life. It is education because it is life.

## REFERENCES

BOAL, Augusto. **Jogos para atores e não-atores**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2000.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. The biographical illusion. In HEMECKER, Wilhelm & SAUNDERS, Edward (eds.). **Biography in Theory - Key Texts with Commentaries**. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2017.

BROOK, Peter. **The shifting point – 1946-1987**. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

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

DELEUZE, Gilles & GUATTARI, Félix. **A thousand plateaus - capitalism and schizophrenia**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

DELEUZE, Gilles & PARNET, Claire. **Dialogues**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.

Deleuze, Gilles. **The logic of sense**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

DELEUZE, Gilles. **Bergsonism**. New York: Zone Books, 1991.

Deleuze, Gilles. **Difference and repetition**. London: Continuum, 1994.

DELEUZE, Gilles. **Negotiations, 1972-1990**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Deleuze, Gilles. **Spinoza – practical philosophy**. San Francisco: City Light Books, 1988.

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.

INSEA – International Society for education through art. **Carta para o governo do Brasil**.

INSEA: Portugal, 2016. Disponível em <https://insearesearchshare.files.wordpress.com/2016/11/cartadainseaparaogovernodobrasil.pdf>

KASTRUP, Virginia. A cognição contemporânea e a aprendizagem inventiva. In: KASTRUP, Virginia & TEDESCO, Silvia & PASSOS, Eduardo. **Políticas da cognição**. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2008.

KASTRUP, Virginia. **Políticas cognitivas na formação do professor e o problema do devirmestre**. In: Educação e Sociedade, Campinas, vol. 26, n. 93, p. 1273-1288, Set./Dez. 2005.

KOUDELA, Ingrid Dormien. **Jogos Teatrais**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2009.

LAPOUJADE, David. O corpo que não agüenta mais. In LINS, Daniel & GADELHA, Sylvio (orgs.). **Nietzsche e Deleuze – Que pode o corpo**. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará, 2002.

MAGELA, André Luiz Lopes. Docência de teatro em escolas: argumentos para uma consistência. In: CARVALHO, Levindo Diniz & SANTOS, Larissa Medeiros Marinho dos. **Educação (em tempo) integral: diálogos entre a universidade e a educação básica**. Belo Horizonte: Fino Traço Editora. 2016. Disponível em [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317385993\\_Educacao\\_em\\_tempo\\_integral\\_dialogos\\_entre\\_a\\_universidade\\_e\\_a\\_educacao\\_basica](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317385993_Educacao_em_tempo_integral_dialogos_entre_a_universidade_e_a_educacao_basica)

MAGELA, André L. L. **Normativity of cooperation in theater classes**. Urdimento - Revista de Estudos em Artes Cênicas, Florianópolis, v. 3, n. 39, p. 1-26, 2020. DOI: 10.5965/14145731033920200201. Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.udesc.br/index.php/urdimento/article/view/18948>.

MAGELA, André L. L.. **Somatic approach to theater education**. Revista Moringa -Artes do Espetáculo, João Pessoa, UFPB, v. 8 n. 1, jan/jun 2017, p. 23 a 38. Available at <https://periodicos.ufpb.br/ojs2/index.php/moringa/article/view/34856/17709>

MAGELA, André L. L.. **Theater education as subjectivity production**. Conceição | Conception, Campinas, SP, V.8, n.2, p.50 - 74, jul. - dez. 2019. DOI: 10.20396/conce.v8i2.8656489. Available at <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/conce/article/view/8656489/25629>

Magela, André L. L. (2022). **THEATER COGNITION AND EDUCATION**. Revista Rascunhos - Caminhos Da Pesquisa Em Artes Cênicas, 9(2), 27–43. <https://doi.org/10.14393/issn2358-3703.v10n1a2022-03>. Available at <https://seer.ufu.br/index.php/rascunhos/article/view/63722/34785>

MOTTA-LIMA, Tatiana. **Em busca (e à espreita) de uma pedagogia para o ator**. CADERNO DE REGISTRO MACU, v. 10, p. 32, 2017.

Motta-LIMA, Tatiana. **Palavras Praticadas - O Percurso Artístico de Jerzy Grotowski, 1959-1974**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2012.

Motta-LIMA, Tatiana. **Atenção, porosidade e vetorização: Por onde anda o ator contemporâneo?**. Belo Horizonte: SUBTEXTO – Revista de Teatro do Galpão Cine Horto. Ano VI. Número 6. 2009.

MOTTA- LIMA, Tatiana. **“Cantem pode acontecer alguma coisa”**: em torno dos cantos e do cantar nas investigações do Workcenter of Jerzy Grotowski and Thomas Richards. In: Revista Brasileira de Estudos da Presença. v. 3, n1, jan./abr. 2013. Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 2013. Disponível em: <http://seer.ufrgs.br/presenca/article/view/38593> .

PINHEIRO, Paulo. Nietzsche, Platão e o entusiasmo poético. In: FEITOSA, Charles; BARRENECHEA, Miguel Angel & PINHEIRO, Paulo (Orgs.). **Nietzsche e os Gregos: Arte, Memória e Educação – Assim Falou Nietzsche V**. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A : UNIRIO : Faperj ; Brasília: Capes, 2006.

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

SPINOZA, Benedict de. *Ethics - Proved in Geometrical Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

TADEU SILVA, Tomaz. **Guia de leitura – Gilles Deleuze Diferença e Repetição**. . Elaborado para uso exclusivo no Seminário Avançado Pensamento da Diferença e Educação II. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da UFRGS. 2001-2002.

WOTLING, Patrick. **Le vocabulaire de Nietzsche**. Paris: Éditions Ellipses, 2001.

ZOURABICHVILI, François. Deleuze e a questão da literaridade . In: **Revista Educação e Sociedade** vol. 26, n. 93, p. 1309-1321, Set./Dez. 2005. Campinas: UNICAMP: 2005.

ZOURABICHVILI, François. **Deleuze: A Philosophy of the Event - together with The**

**Vocabulary of Deleuze.** Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2012.