

## ARTICLES

# DANCE AND CO-AUTHORING IN NETWORK: CREATION PROCESSES IN GROUP

**Lucas Valentim Rocha**

Universidade Federal da Bahia (UFBA)

## ABSTRACT

This article deals with the issue of authorship in the context of groups and collectives of Dance artists who have been working collaboratively. Intend an update of the term authorship to be always thought as co-authoring in network. This proposal suggests the dilution of the author's image as a genius creator and points to a perspective that every discourse is woven together with many other discourses that compose it. In other words, it is always about co-authoring. The bibliographic axis establishes dialogues between philosophers as Foucault (1969), Barthes (1988) and Agamben (2007) with artists researchers such as Setenta (2008), Barreto (2017), Araújo (2011) and Salles (2017).

**Key words:** Dance. Co-authoring. Collaborative Processes. Creation. Network.

## Starting points

In her most recent book, Cecília Almeida Salles<sup>1</sup> deals with creation process in group developing a conversation with Colapietro (2014) from the concept of subject as community; they put the dichotomy between processes in group and individual processes in crisis by recognizing that the human subject is not a private and isolated sphere but a communicative agent. “It is distinguishable but not separable from others: it is not only a possible member of a community, but the person as subject has it’s own form of a community” (Salles, 2017, p. 38).

Therefore, I am here this community that permeates me in body and discourse. When talking about collaboration (collab labor), I also take in consideration the readers of this work who, by confluence of trajectories, will come across the presented ideas in this text because there is no meaning in writing without a reciprocally committed attitude of those who read us. Yes, it is a committed and creative attitude, whereas it will establish meanings and counterarguments insofar your experiences enable you.

The second aspect approached by Salles (2017) proposes the reflection of artistic process as from a network of creation, based on Steven Johnson’s concept of *liquid network*. According to her, Johnson reports a research conducted by an american psychologist named Kevin Dunbar where he notes that the most important projects came up at informal meeting tables where researchers presented their ideas and everyone discussed. In other words, the solid state of tables and individual rooms turned into a liquid network of informal conversations. Salles (2017) broadens this thought by dialoguing with Complexity Theory and proposes to think the creation occurs in the midst of a tangle of interactions with many other occurrences as conversations with friends, going to the movies, reading texts etc. For the author the network is gaining complexity according as new relationships are created causing other links.

Creation as a network can be described as a continuous process of interconnections, with vague trends, generating interaction nodes whose variability obeys guiding principles. This continuous process, without beginning or ending point, is a fallible movement supported by the logic of uncertainty, encompassing the intervention of random and opening space for the introduction of new ideas (Salles, 2017, p. 117).

The perspective of creation as network, Salles (2011) exposes the procedural, unstable and relational condition of artistic creation. Procedural because it is a becoming, unstable because encompasses chance and randomness and relational be-

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor of the Postgraduate Program in Communication and Semiotics at the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC/SP).

cause “every action is related to other actions of equal relevance, thus a nonlinear path and without hierarchies” (Salles, 2017, p. 117).

By assuming this network perspective to talk about creation processes in group it is relevant to be aware that each subject constitutes its own network of relationships and interconnections. When these subjects meet each other in order to develop a collaborative project, there is an expansion in the network complexity that will encompass the specific experiences in order to coexist in collectivity.

The collective creation begins to prominence in Brazil in the XX century, between the 60's and 70's. Developed by many artists this practice evidenced a thought of cooperation and collectivity. The movement was mainly characterized by setting up common environments where all the artists involved discussed, chose and determined the directions of creation in its various aspects such as lighting, sound design, interpretation, direction, dramaturgy etc. In this case there is a dilution of the specific functions and a potentiation of collectivity in the decisions. What we nowadays call collaborative processes somewhat differs to collective creation, which is characterized by the affirmation of specific functions but causes constant alternations between the people who assume such functions. In general although there are people responsible for each function, there are also speech spaces for all and discussions that collaborate in the creations of what is composed together.

Antônio Araújo, a research artist of *Teatro da Vertigem*, observes this transition and the distinctions between those practices as well as the collective agreements between the artists in the following way:

If we think about the general model of this practice - perspective not always appropriate and true, according as there were different types of collective creation, many of them with very peculiar traits, there was a dilution desire of artistic functions or at least their relativization. That is, there was an accumulation of attributes by the same artist or a more fluid transience between different functions. So, at the limit, there was no longer a single dramaturge but a collective dramaturgy, not only one director but a collective direction and not even a costume designer or set designer or light designer but a joint creation of scenery, light and costumes by all the members of the group (Araújo, 2011, p. 132).

It is important to understand that the artistic labor is not something apart from the social contexts of the subjects who compose the work. No wonder, we recognize the 60's as a social revolution mark that took place in many parts of the world and in Brazil as well. A revolution motivated by the hippie movement and the vanguards in favor of freedom of speech in contrast to years of repressive power.

Artistic movements and important groups emerged during this historical moment and traced possibilities for those who came later. Some examples below:

in theater, the *Grupo de Teatro Oficina*<sup>2</sup>; in Dance, the *UFBA Contemporary Dance Group* (GDC - Grupo de Dança Contemporânea da UFBA)<sup>3</sup> and *Dzi Croquettes*<sup>4</sup>; in Music, *Novos Baianos*<sup>5</sup>, the *Secos e Molhados*<sup>6</sup> and the whole Tropicália<sup>7</sup> movement, among many others in various arts throughout Brazil. Such examples serve to exhibit that artists' creation is the result of articulations they establish in life as a whole, not only with specific composition elements.

## Co-authoring in network

Here I am some voices. It may sound strange and confusing to talk so affirmatively so I must immediately say that this is not a joint writing. By emphasizing that "here I am some voices" I wish to provoke a thought of me-body as a subject who is in process of constant readjustments and rearrangements resulted by the crossings, intersections and negotiations with other bodies and environment. In this sense what we are is beyond the physical structure of our bodies, we are also memories and encounters. As I start this text I do it along with many other voices and writings that nourished and continue to nourish my existence, composing ways of being. But since it is not a joint writing I recognize that the organization singularity of this text was intertwined by me. Would that be enough to say that I am the author? And what does it mean to be the author of a work?

The topic of authorship has been moving many artists, philosophers and researchers from diverse knowledge areas and is not from today. Questions such as: what is an author? Whose authorship is it? How is the authentication process of the work? Among so many questions these are some that come up frequently. We add another very current question that highlights a problem that some artists have

2 Brazilian theater company, based in Sao Paulo at Bixiga neighborhood. It was founded in 1958 by Amir Haddad, José Celso Martinez Correa and Carlos Queiroz Telles. <http://teatroficina.com.br> (access in 02/19/2019).

3 Created in 1965 under direction of Prof. Rolf Gelevisky, the UFBA Contemporary Dance Group (GDC) is based at the UFBA Dance School in Salvador. <http://www.danca.ufba.br/gdc.html> (access in 02/19/2019).

4 The group composed only by men crossdressed as women was created in 1972 by Wagner Ribeiro de Souza and had as choreographer Lennie Dale. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EKjtoSzsZlo> (access in 02/19/2019).

5 Musical group of Bahia that acted between the years of 1969 and 1979, mixing several styles and were influenced by the Tropicália movement. Among the members: Moraes Moreira, Pepeu Gomes and Baby Consuelo. [https://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Novos\\_Baianos](https://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Novos_Baianos) (access in 02/19/2019).

6 Musical group of the 70's marked by the irreverence that launched Ney Matogrosso as a singer. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-zLicyzaH5A> (access in 02/19/2019).

7 Brazilian cultural movement that emerged in the late 1960's under the influence of artistic vanguards and national and foreign pop culture (such as rock'n roll and concretism); mixed traditional manifestations of Brazilian culture with radical aesthetic innovations. The movement manifested itself mainly in music with Torquato Neto, Caetano Veloso, Gal Costa, Gilberto Gil, Os Mutantes and Tom Zé but there were artistic manifestations in visual arts with Hélio Oiticica and in cinema, that influenced Glauber Rocha's movement called *New Cinema* (Cinema Novo). <https://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tropic%C3%A1lia> (access in 02/19/2019).

been struggling with: how to deal with authorship in collaborative processes? As we can see such topics represent problems of different orders: artistic, philosophical and juridical. Some clues that may represent circumstantial answers to such questions are pointed below.

In 1969 the philosopher Michel Foucault held the conference *What is an author?* for the members and guests of the French Society of Philosophy in order to provoke the audience to question the notion of originality linked to the idea of authorship. As he begins his speech, Foucault raises an intriguing question quoted from a Beckett text: “what matters who speaks, someone said, what matters who speaks”.

A few years later Roland Barthes again teases artists and philosophers by announcing the “death of the author.” For Barthes (1988) much more than proclaiming the author’s (proper) death what mattered was to present the distinction between the author’s life (biography) and the text he writes, since in his perspective it is the language that speaks and not the author. According to Barthes the text writing is not something original in terms of novelty because the author only imitates signs already emitted: “the writer can only imitate an always previous gesture, never original; he’s unique power resides on merge the scriptures and on doing them contradict each other, in a way he never leans on just one of them” (Barthes, 1988, p. 69).

However if we carefully observe Beckett’s phrase quoted by Foucault and the title of Barthes’ text, we will realize there are two contradictions. The first is in the enunciation quoted by Foucault: “what matters who speaks, someone said, what matters who speaks”. As Agamben notes it is noticeable that there is someone who:

even though still anonymous and faceless, he uttered the enunciation, someone without whom the thesis which denies the importance of the speaker, could not have been formulated. The same gesture that denies any relevance to the author’s identity however affirms its irreducible need (Agamben, 2007, p. 55).

Although Barthes announces the death of the author, his text carries a signature that recognizes him as responsible for the articulations of ideas presented there. That is, what appears in a certain way as a revolution (the author’s death) simultaneously reveals the inherent contradictions in the object of study itself (the authorship).

Such contradictions are not detached from the subject crisis in postmodernity and result from the transition from a modern and simplifying thought that distinguishes, classifies and bases the search for originality to another way of understanding the world and the subject - a complex reality where there is exchanges, contaminations, intersections and co-responsibilities. The contemporary subject is fragmented, diluted, surpasses the geographical boundaries of his own skin, which shows the necessity of conceptually update the identity notion by diluting the rigidity of what I am to recognize what I am being in relation to the other.

The Dance researcher Jussara Setenta notes that is about the subject built by

many others, coming from meetings, collaborations and cooperations. What is important to realize is that this paradigmatic revolution that implies on the recognition of a more fluid and porous identity causes in a certain way the need for new understandings about the notion of authorship:

It is a body that does not understand itself as constituting an isolated subject, steeped only in its creativity. This conception of subject articulates another understanding of the concept of authorship. Rather than being associated to something based on the existence of an original, a particular proposal by a sole owner, it questions the need to sustain the existence of that original to legitimize what is in fact unique - but unique in the way it organizes information which are shared with many other subjects. And if they are shared such information falls outside the "original" frame as it becomes multiple origins. Authorship, therefore, always results from shared actions (Seventy, 2008, p. 89).

Such features that point to a network authorship are recognized by Barthes himself in his 1988 text when he says that every text is a composition of utterances already uttered, that is, it deals with a creative (re)organization and not with speech originality. If we once thought the author as the holder of the original idea and the creative genius, nowadays we must understand him as an organizer of preexisting elements. The new is not built from nothing: they are contextual articulations of issues that are in the world.

Giorgio Agamben, an Italian philosopher who has been developing and broadening issues dealt by Foucault, notes that one of the main arguments presented at the conference *What is an author?* is that a distinction is needed between the author as subject and the author-function. According to Agamben the author-function is characterized by being "a trans-discursive function that constitutes the author beyond the limits of his work as 'discursiveness installer'" (Agamben, 2007, p. 56).

Thus, the authorship would be understood as a functional principle that regulates, limits and creates specific conditions for fiction free circulation, free manipulation and free composition. It is important to remember that freedom is always a relationship so this free manipulation takes place in a circuit that inevitably bumps into the issue of the copyright. The power over the work is recognized by a signature, a publication that juridically grants to the author-creator certain rights in relation to the aesthetic object and its sequent distribution. On the other hand the ideas are in the world and a signature does not give a lifetime right to the author over what can be as from his work. After all there will always be someone who can appropriate the ideas and build new webs.

Ivana Barreto<sup>8</sup>, Dance artist-researcher, observes a problematic in the discussions

---

<sup>8</sup> Researcher, professor and artist from Rio de Janeiro, acts in the performing arts, with emphasis on dance and performance. Graduated in Letters at UERJ, Master by the Postgraduate Program in Theater of

provoked by Foucault in 1969 when he spoke about the centrality of the author's figure in the juridical context stressing that the discourse becomes the responsibility of the issuer, establishing therefore a relation of authority and property. For Ivana:

To the artistic product would be directly related the authority, in the juridical sense, and the property right in the economic sense. If the authority on the one hand authorizes a punishment, placing the author in the field of the illicit and the blasphemous, on the other hand allows participation in the social system enjoying the right of the work property. These two words "authority" and "property" are important in this discussion because they link the authorial problem to a social and institutional recognition and not exactly to an artistic question (Barreto, 2017, p. 25).

Returning to the questions brought by Foucault (2011) in his emblematic conference it is interesting to think about his proposition that the author's mark is precisely in the approach of authorship with death. Thus the author shows himself not by his presence but by the singularity of his absence. That is, there is a subject-author who attests himself in the signs of absence. For Agamben "the author is present in the text only in one gesture that enables the expression as much as installs a central void in it" (Agamben, 2007, p. 59). A gesture that causes a void, an absence. An open space - possibilities.

Could this openness resulted from the gesture of someone who performs the author-function be exercised by the work spectator as he creates relations and (dis)organizes the enunciations before his contingencies and references? In a certain way, yes. Because,

The place - nay the *taking place* - of the poem is neither in the text nor in the author (or the reader): it is in the gesture in which author and reader are playing with the text and at the same time running away from it infinitely. The author is no more than the witness, the guarantor of his own absence in the work he was playing; and the reader cannot miss spelling out the testimony, cannot miss becoming the guarantor of his own inexhaustible playing act of not being sufficient (Agamben, 2007, p. 62-63).

Ivana Barreto extends this thought of Agamben by developing the argument of author as a mediator. It would be an agent who builds relations between the world issues and organizes them in terms of aesthetic objects and establishes an openness where the spectator can create his own network of relations as a creative gesture. An author who is always coauthor.

This understanding is important because it introduces the sharing as an inherent quality in the work, the authorship as a space opened by the gesture between a body that writes and another that reads it, to experience and to install a void there again; [...] situates the author as mediator, between his particular version or his incomplete testimony - and another who experiences, recreating it (Barreto, 2017, p. 28).

However, if this notion brought by Ivana Barreto establishes an idea of authorship that is always shared, when we deal with collaborative processes this issue seems to be configured even more complexly. Before this, the researcher herself instigates us with a very relevant question for our discussion: *how to separate what was done by one or the other if the creation happens in "between"?*

When we deal with questions about authorship in Dance we also come across many ways of configuration and different meanings about what an author is. This becomes even more problematic if we are immersed in collaborative processes. Questions always arise such as: Does the authorship resides at the encounter? As the director/choreographer has the function of delimiting the rules, the time for each exercise and the procedures to be developed, will he always be the author? If in a collaborative process the singularities are evident in what is being collectively configured then how to identify who is the creator?

During my PhD<sup>9</sup> research I interviewed artists from 5 groups and colectives that articulated their artistic discourses around collaborative processes. When we approach the authorship issue during the interviews I observed some cases that allow us to observe tensions around this theme. I bring them here as examples of the articulations that Dance and Theater artists have been tracing.

In case of the interviewed artists we observed that they have been dealing with collaborative process in different ways throughout their trajectories, inside and outside the collectives they integrated. For example, in Daniel Guerra's<sup>10</sup> speech about the Alvenaria de Teatro<sup>11</sup> group, we can recognize a certain dilution of the director's figure as the main proposer, as the holder of responsibility of giving the final word and responding for the work. Simultaneously there was the consequent development of the autonomies of interpreter-creators: "In the beginning it was the director (me) who signed the direction but in the course of time everyone signed as Alvenaria (creators)" (Daniel Guerra, 2018).

The perception of the change in the role that Daniel Guerra assumed in the group did not occur in a harmonic way, it was motif for crisis. Although the members internally perceived the dilution of authorship and a more shared signature,

9 Thesis defended in January 2019 at the Postgraduate Program in Performing Arts of UFBA, entitled "Collaborative Processes in Dance and Theater: between us and the power relations".

10 Ex-director of Alvenaria de Teatro group (BA).

11 Alverania de Teatro Group existed between 2008 and 2012, in the city of Salvador / BA.



for those outside the group Daniel continued to sign as director of the works. Even though the other members had autonomy to develop their ideas, having Daniel Guerra's signature as director added in their work a symbolic value, different from the other members. Raiça Bomfim<sup>12</sup> reflects about this in the interview:

It is the direction that is understood as responsible for this aesthetic. And it started to bother us because we said that it's not just the bureaucratic question of language, it's the question that who is earning the bonus of moving aesthetically all of this is still Daniel. In practice there is no conceptual, philosophical and aesthetic preponderance of this person's proposition over others. This was becoming a crisis, including many discussions. And I don't think it's a crisis, I don't blame Daniel for this crisis, I think he was also understanding (...) I don't think he was the one architecting to keep it, but I also think he was little brave to give it up, he also didn't want to give up that place from the direction that has to be with "they are saying my name" you know? (Raiça Bomfim, 2018).

In case of TeiaMUV Collective women, there was the awareness that the collective work overlapped the desires and ideas of the singularities; what mattered was to assume the collective creation as a political and aesthetic positioning to affirm the collective name as the author of the works.

Internally we knew where certain ideas "came from" between us but we always signed everything as a collective creation, which it really was as we intervened in each other's ideas when we presented something together. There was confluence of particularities and interests and from there came the TeiaMUV performances (Isaura Tupiniquim, 2018).

In case of the *Couve-flor minicomunidade artistica mundial*<sup>13</sup>, as Gustavo Bitencourt<sup>14</sup> observed in the interview we did, each member liked to see his name next to the function he had performed in fact. For him this was not only to satisfy the artist's ego but above all to understand authorship as historical data that allows other people to observe the development of a trajectory. In relation to the Couve-flor mark, there was initially a need to emphasize the name of the collective in the actions but over the years, with the emergence of other partnerships beyond the collective, this position was revised and took other forms.

---

12 Actress and professor from Bahia who was member of Alvenaria de Teatro group. She is currently PhD student in Performing Arts at the Postgraduate Program in Performing Arts (PPGAC) of UFBA.

13 Collective based in Curitiba-PR which had as a characteristic the fact that there were members who lived or were in transit in other countries. They stayed together from 2003 to 2012.

14 Actor, production director, performer, programmer, graphic designer, translator, illustrator, among other things. He was member of Couve-flor collective since its formation.

In Dimenti<sup>15</sup> Group we can perceive understanding divergences about how the authorship happened in the group's works. For Fábio Osório<sup>16</sup> the direction signed by Jorge Alencar did not make the other members less authors. There was for him a shared authorship. The collaborative and multifocal way in which the creation process took place generated a collective belonging.

goes beyond that line that said direction of Jorge Alencar. It was the way we understood that we produced things, obviously Jorge has a very strong signature, he was the works' diretor but the authorship was always collective (Fábio Osório, 2018).

On the other hand, Fábio Osório himself recognizes the works directed by Jorge Alencar outside of Dimenti, including other interpreters, as quite aesthetically close to what was being developed in Dimenti, what emphasizes in some way the strength of Jorge's signature as creator.

Paula Lice<sup>17</sup> who also integrated Dimenti compares her experience in the group with her time at NÚCLEO VAGAPARA<sup>18</sup>. In a certain way she disagrees with Fábio Osório because she recognizes that Jorge Alencar's signature as author/director was undeniable. Evidently the creation process was collaborative but it did not dilute the subject-author. To justify her argument, Paula Lice appeals to the same problem identified by Fábio Osório: in the works done by Jorge Alencar outside the group (until today) it is possible to recognize similar striking features to Dimenti's works. Which affirms, according to Paula Lice, Jorge Alencar's authorial strength in the works created by Dimenti during the period of the group.

In Dimenti I always saw how, I think Jorge doesn't like to put himself in this signature place, but for me this is very clear. It is so clear that now Jorge just made a TV show and why do people say: Wow, this looks like Dimenti in the first phase! It is not a coincidence. This is a signature, ok. Like, from an "authorality" of aesthetic thought, textual thought that is there and with our inevitably collaboration, but for me, what I understand by authorship at least, I would say that Dimenti

15 Group formed yet at school from the production of the play *O Alienista*. Always had the artistic direction of Jorge Alencar. And since Ellen Mello joined the group, the year after its formation, she signs the production direction.

16 Actor, dancer and producer. Currently based between Salvador/BA and Rio de Janeiro/RJ. He is Dimenti's member since the initial formation of the group.

17 Professor at the Federal University of Recôncavo da Bahia (UFRB). Graduated in Vernacular Letters and Foreign Language – English at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA) where she completed her specialization in Linguistic and Literary Studies and her Master's degree in Theory and Criticism of Literature and Culture through the Postgraduate Program in Letters and Linguistics. She was founding member of both Dimenti Group and NÚCLEO VAGAPARA.

18 Collective of artists based in Salvador/BA. They worked collaboratively between 2007 and 2013.

has a stronger signature than VAGAPARA. VAGAPARA was never interested in collective signature or having this consistency (Paula Lice, 2018).

Still diverging to Fábio Osório in terms of collaboration in the group, Paula Lice realizes that the processes have not always been collaborative. In the beginning the works were directed by Jorge Alencar who also created the choreographies and defined the texts to be spoken. Over the years, it has changed before other assumptions that were composing the artistic and academic trajectory of Jorge himself and of the other group members:

From *Alienista* to the last show I did in Dimenti with Jorge directing *Chuá*, not *Batata*, changed Jorge's way of thinking that, I think. At the beginning it had a much more choreographic wave. So Jorge used to bring the texts ready and assembled the scenes, so we had a mark very... O *Alienista* is absolutely choreographed. So there was a very precise mark that we followed and we, of course, gave our opinion and so on but we didn't create the scenes of the play, we followed his direction. [...] So in *Chuá* we had demands for the scenes, for creation, that we thought of at home, created and brought and Jorge was setting. There are texts in *Chuá* that are mine, my authorship. It was the first time I felt comfortable doing this, and from *Chuá* onwards it happened more like this, we proposed things and in dialogue with Jorge was transforming. But for me it happens in *Chuá* (Paula Lice, 2018).

In observing the reported processes above we recognize that in many cases happened a certain dilution in the author's image as creative genius and the consciousness of a collaborative network in creation; this led to the necessity of updating the idea of authorship to better match the reality of artists in their contexts. Thus,

the authorship is complex, networked but singularly organizes itself in relation to the means of its production, in circumstantial political agreements. This means that authorship is built on the political devices in which it is immersed, in a context generated by the artist's articulation process (BARRETO, 2017, p. 11).

In this sense there is an ideological aspect in the way authorship relations are configured in each community. The choices represent positions and points of view. When artists choose to put on the crew description creator-interpreter ou interpreter, shared creation or "someone's" creation, they assume a position that is not only artistic but also ideological. When a choreographer although recognizes his role as a situational leadership in front of the group and opens space for an emancipatory and democratic process. This is not just a choice in terms of creation. It is a political position loaded with discourses that can increase hegemonic paradigms or counteract these ideas and present other possibilities.

As we are talking about positions that increase ideas, it is important to say that even in face of the paradigmatic changes that are taking place in contemporarity there is still some *modern extract* on authorship, centered on the figure of a supposed holder of the original idea. This permanence is reflected by Lia Lordelo<sup>19</sup> in our interview when she goes back to her experience with group Dimenti. The conception's permanence emerges in a subtle way because in the group cohabited the perspective of a fixed director with the notion of collaboration and collective creation.

We are facing a big challenge. We know that the emergence of a thought does not cancel what existed before, both can be considered cohabiting paradigms. However it is necessary to tense ideas in order to provoke other understandings: the collaborative authorship guarantees the authoral subject's dilution as oneness from sharing and cooperation in a way it is not objectively recognizable who created what? Jussara Setenta reflects about that:

As the subject is a sharer of other subjects, he is no longer isolated because he carries many of them in himself as well as he is in many of them. Sharing, however, does not stop authorship's action but changes it to a kind of co-authorship. The subject starts to understand his actions as of a reorganizer. The reorganization's result is authoral but not in the original sense. It is authoral as from sharing, from contamination processes (SETENTA, 2008, p. 92).

## Final considerations

Nowadays with the great impact of new technological media and hypertext it is necessary to rethink the author's place and what his role is in a work's composition. We talk and write in network, simultaneously. We built an online reality that connected speeches and intensified the flow of information (texts, images, audios). This movement in the constitution of society inevitably provokes different understandings about authorship. Let's not lose sight for example of websites like Wikipedia – a kind of collaborative virtual encyclopedia where anyone can edit information already available or insert new ones.

In a collaborative creation process the author-function can be exercised by different subjects. And even if is exercised only by one member of the collective it is still the result of collaborative processes and sharings with all the members of the

---

<sup>19</sup> She has a degree in Psychology, master's degree in Teaching, Philosophy and History of Sciences from UFBA/UEFS (2007) and a PhD in Social Psychology (Postgraduate Program in Psychology of UFBA). She has experience and professional qualification in performing arts mainly through Dimenti group. Lia has been working for over 15 years as an actress, dancer and singer in performing arts shows. Professor at CECULT - Center for Culture, Languages and Applied Technologies at the Federal University of Recôncavo da Bahia (UFRB).

process and with the spectators who may access the artist's work.

By broaching authorship always as co-authoring in network we are dealing with a complex perspective that dialogues with SALLES (2017). We are understanding an environment of interactions, ties, connectivities, exchanges and contaminations, an opposite perspective to segmentation and disjunctive proposal.

So we have an old paradigm that taught us to separate, simplify and reduce. This assumption does not allow us to understand relations' complexity, so we seek and explore other paradigm able to gather, contextualize and connect. A paradigm that allows us to recognize the singular and the plural, the part and the whole. Complexity does not deny simplification, on the contrary it seeks to go further integrating it, but not restricting it. We recognize individual authorial gestures integrated into what is build between:

I propose a concept of authorship exactly in this interaction between the subject and the others. It is a distinguishable authorship but not separable from dialogue with others; it is not a closed authorship in a subject but there is still space for distinction. From this point of view the authorship is established within relations, that is, in the interactions that support the network which is being built along the creation process (SALLES, 2017, p. 39-40).

Among researchers and artists who work in collaboration, other formulations about authorship have also been considered dialoguing with the perspective of postmodern subject. That is, a subject constituted by transitory and fluid identities in contrast to the idea that delimits the subject as an individual closed in himself and as owner of an immutable essence. In authorship this question arises from the dilution of the authorial subject - considered the creative genius - towards to an author who is the organizer of pre-existing speeches. In authorial terms the *new* is in the singular way in which information that already exists in the world is organized. An author who is plural in his singularity, made up by encounters and exchanges with others.

Therefore, there is a transference of the notion of authorship from the subject to the action. An authorial gesture that only completes itself in the encounter with the other, a spectator who captures ideas, creates meanings and his own relations when accesses the work. The artist proposes an opening space for the meeting when he is creating and sharing his work, all creation being also co-creation and all authorship also co-authoring. Thus, it constitutes a complex network of speeches that contaminate each other, provoking others and others and others relations. A movement that does not stop. A co-authoring that is build together in network.

## References

AGANBEM, Giorgio. *Profanações*. Tradução Selvino J. Assman. 2. ed. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2007.

ARAÚJO, Antônio. *A gênese da Vertigem: o processo de criação de o paraíso perdido*. São Paulo: Perspectiva: Fapesp, 2011.

BARRETO, Ivana. *Criar Possíveis: entre o um e os muitos*. in Anais II Congresso Nacional de Pesquisadores em Dança. Salvador: ANDA, p. 01-11, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Autoria em rede: modos de produção e implicações políticas*. São Paulo: 7 Letras, 2017.

BARTHES, Roland. *O rumor da língua*. Tradução Mário Laranjeira. São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense, 1988.

FOUCAULT, Michel. O que é um autor? in *Ditos e Escritos III: Estética, literatura e pintura, música e cinema*. Tradução Inês Barbosa. Rio de Janeiro: Forense, 2011.

ROCHA, Lucas Valentim. *Processos Colaborativos em Dança e Teatro: entre nós e as relações de poder*. 2019. 294 páginas. Tese (Doutorado em Artes Cênicas). Escola de Teatro e Escola de Dança. Universidade Federal da Bahia. Salvador, 2019.

SALLES, Cecília. *Processos de criação em grupo: diálogos*. São Paulo: Estação das Letras e Cores. 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Redes da Criação: Construção da obra de arte*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora Horizonte, 2006.

SETENTA, Jussara. *O Fazer-dizer do corpo: dança e performatividade*. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2008.