

Always Recreating

Renato Ferracini e Antonio Flávio Alves Rabelo
PPGAC-UNICAMP

Artistic research and more specifically the aesthetic present events (intra-among bodies)¹ present many specific problems. One of them - just one is already immense! - is the blurring between the experience of this present inter-body event and conceptual thinking of a written nature:² on the one hand we have the need of an alliance between these planes and, at the same time, live with the impossibility of fusion or synthesis. The alliance between the written conceptual thought and the aesthetic event should not be in the order of **thinking about** (I will perform a thought about this scene) but should be in terms of **thinking with** (I will perform a thought with this scene). The idea of thinking about can lead us to the wrong image of written conceptual thought to be the endorsement of the aesthetic present event or, worse, its alleged conceptual translation. This thinking can operate on the level of the hierarchical relationship of these relationships, since the present aesthetic event - the act of thinking about - would not generate a thought, but only an event. We are caught here in a compartmentalized area in which concept produces thought and art produces creation. By denying this flattening and hierarchization, thinking with manifests as action that sustains the creative autonomy of both the present aesthetic event and the conceptualization of written nature.

1 We call the present aesthetic occurrences (intra-between-bodies) and theatrical occurrence, dance, the performance of all forms of hybrids and contaminated occurrences that can occur between all these manifestations.

2 We emphasize the matter of affirming the singularity of the "conceptual thought of written character" since we have already affirmed that the present corporal occurrence generates spatial, temporal and corporal concepts in the autonomy of the very aesthetic present occurrence itself. We return to this later on.

Thinking with operates an alliance between the terms without falling into a supposed hierarchy between them. By thinking with, the creative character of both planes are affirmed, and also ensures the autonomous thinking mode that each surface possesses. Both are creative, both are thoughts! This alliance found on **thinking with** blurs the borders between one form of expression and the other (conceptual and aesthetic) while keeping its boundaries in tension. It is precisely in the conflict of these creative autonomies that there coexists on the one hand the possibility of reflection and on the other the impossibility of direct translation between the terms. Thinking with territorializes itself in the borders of this conflict, in the crevices of impossibility, in the non-places of coincidence. It requires a creative action rather than a simple act of translation. It is absolute powerful coexistence - and vertically difficult! Even though set in this field of creative difficulty, I propose here an experience of thinking with.

Upon taking as focus the work of the actor, I would like to begin this essay with a simple question: where and when does one recreate in a show that has been performing for 12 years? We verticalize: Is there creation after hundreds of presentations? If yes, what is the territory in which this creation is found. To render these questions problematic, I shall think **with** the play *Café com Queijo*³ of the *Núcleo Interdisciplinar de Pesquisas Teatrais* – UNICAMP, which has been in theaters since 1999. I will also call on the actresses of this play, Ana Cristina Colla and Raquel Scotti Hirson to **think with** their answers to the following question: Where do you still create as an actress in the show *Café com Queijo*?

The woolen shoe had a hole at the big toe was sewed three times, purple thread, black thread. The dress has a brown chocolate cookie stain in the right pocket. The left one (pocket) has gone unsewed, has been sewed up quickly again in the dressing room in the last session. The red ribbon detail that embellishes the dress is blotched with the hot iron. The neckline (dress) is frayed and worn. The combination (if you still use it?), which was mother's, the strap is torn and is stuck to the body. The hair has grown. The eyes, previously myopic, now see everything (everything?). The body has gained weight and begotten two sons. Mr. Teotônio,

3 Video clip: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aTJSPPu59UQ>. One can also obtain information at www.lumeteatro.com.br/espetaculo.php?id=21. The book *Café com Queijo – Corpos em Criação* (Hucitec and FAPESP, 2006) is dedicated to its creation. It is important to note that I, Renato Ferracini, am both the author of the book and actor in the play.

Maria Luiza and Maroquinha have had nine-month bellies, with Manuela and Pedro inside. The body has caught the cold, lost its voice, gained thirteen years. The straw basket has broken; I patched it with nylon thread, a piece of junk, it's already ruined. The special *reco-reco*⁴ that Pedro (the musician friend) ordered in Rio de Janeiro broke the strap on the first trip (yes, this *reco-reco* has a strap, it's special), I stick new adhesive tape each presentation. The cloth stool went on opening, tearing, and when the fear of falling on the stage grew, a new one was purchased. The glass of *cachaça*⁵ was stolen and returned by mail, now it's cracked. I'm still afraid of forgetting the text, then before each performance I review the words. I do what I do and I do not think it is okay, it was not like that before, I can do better! How was that hand of Tomásia? And what about that voice? Today is kinda weird. Yeah, I'm losing Maria Luiza's walk. Maroquinha seems distant, her breathing is rapid, is that it? Today I will do everything again, without changing anything, just playing here and there. Where do I still create? At everyday chance? With the public every day and every one? With space, large or small, wood or cement? With the combination of the four, each day one? With myself, always me and every day one? With each of mimeses, always the same and never the same? With the light, Maria Emilia, Dani, Adriana, Simioni, Duda, Eduardo, very dark, very clear, much before, too fast, too slow? With the sound, low, high, bursting. Where do I create? On my body, with my body, with myself, tired, sleepless, happy, excited, wanting to be here or wanting to be there? Where else do I create? Why the else? Is it possible to not create, in this everyday making, every day one? (Colla, 2012).

We intuitively create a show with ingredients that help you have a long life. A very tied-up structure and, at the same time, elastic, with many possibilities for breathing. Each small fraction of time is subject to change, for it shares time with the time of the meeting of the gaze of the spectator, much like a conversation, even if this conversation we're talking about were to spark very clearly from a proponent who is driving actor by the structure previously established. But it is just the spark, the fire is lit in the meeting. Over the years I discovered some "tricks". One of them is forgetfulness. On purpose - after a positive first scare, even unintentionally - I stopped bothering to remember, with the same level of detail, the actions which were formerly "metered". Of course, at times that would not compromise the progress of all four actors. I permit myself places for forgetfulness and, consequently, creation in the scene. I allow myself to do what my master Luís Otávio Burnier might have abhorred in his first years of research: to breathe actions from what I bring of sensations with myself that day, that hour, of that which is constructed from more than one day of experience. I allow this to be added to the arrival of the spectators, to the temperature of the room, the volume of the music, and all this permeates the spaces between the actions (which in this particular moment of the show, its beginning, were created from observations of photographs) and allows me to know the "climate" of that combination and makes

4 Translator's note: *Reco-reco* is a Brazilian scraping instrument used especially in samba.

5 Translator's note: *Cachaça* is a Brazilian sugarcane rum.

me lose beat with the music and make me jump a few photographs and remember others that had left them stored somewhere in memory to be activated in this situation and that makes me dance that structured moment for thirteen years as a moment of life. Forgetting itself made me aware of its value. We "give line" to the spectator e allow them to fly, but the tip of the spool is with us. There are situations in which the voltage of the line is clear, for example, when we leave room for the viewer to put, say his poem, sing, tell something of himself, at the same time we know that the key is to get close and get in the tension of pre-established drama. But there are several situations where the line voltage is only noticed in a subtle space, is perceived only by the person whom it is intended. Just as each of the four actors, I have five minutes of the show when the reins are in my hands. I guide them through the path of Dona Maria Fernandes, this path which is known by me, created in 1999 and recreated and extended several hundred times. But who are these people I carry with me? We don't know each other. How can I invite them to travel with me and Dona Maria? This is the subtle space. The tension happens in breathing, in the quality with which the muscles perform so that air dance manifests this or that. There are thousands of connections, but the look quickly dialogues with breathing and finds other looks, creating a network of almost immediate frequencies that cause tension and "align" the wagons. Thus, I can calm the agitated spectators, I can ask for the attention of those dispersed or can soften the suffering of those who see only the sad Dona Maria and do not realize that she is a woman with a long life lived in pain, laughter, and music. I know, words are not enough to explain. The images of the trail, the line, of air dancing, are, after all, attempts to say that Dona Maria lives because she depends on lines of force that pass through a subtle level of unpredictability. But, that ensures that every "repetition" of its score is full of challenges and that these challenges exist in the dialogue between layers of air going through the muscles and layers of air surrounding an area of five hundred cubic meters and cause the lines to converge between a hundred people. *Café com Queijo* is always creating because it is always a journey. This ephemeral meeting, which we call *Café com Queijo* exists because there were encounters with the people that inspired this game and continue to inspire it. I am obsessed with this journey; I do not enter into a state of acting if I don't do a journey - which lasts for a period of a second - to Dona Maria, Dona Nurú, Dona Carmen, etc. In other words, I go into a dynamic in which several virtualities converge, coexist and give birth to this state of Dona Maria Fernandes, for example. The trip, the tensions of the body and consciousness of the environment I'm in, with the people that I am with form, roughly, the pieces that will fit and become a shared game. Of course, we know that this game takes place in a space of about one hundred square meters, with approximately one hundred spectators, with four actors, a lighting and sound technician, patchwork curtains all around, objects always the same; and, we know very well every step being built and lived, so that the game lasts an hour and twenty minutes and ends. But ... we do not know the qualities of tension that we have to print so that all these elements are, together, *Café com Queijo*. (Hirson, 2012).

Some important questions stand out in this brief and beautiful account of the actresses. The first one is a flyby and an appreciation of a land of subtlety and ephemerality present at the moment of presentation; we also noticed in the writings, the clear verification of a paradox between coexisting a line of structured and controlled actions in the time/space of the scene overlaid into a space of lack of control. And we verified, especially, a good dose of "suspicion" that the creative action does and territorializes itself in the performance of a present act of composition. Therefore the triad found in the writings of the actresses above: (1) a territory of subtlety, (2) the coexisting paradox of control and lack of control (3) an active receptivity of action of composing in/with this present event leads us to a complexly ephemeral, fleeting, slippery, escapable, invisible, unspeakable space in which creative action is found. It is clear that the by proclaiming here a slippery ephemerality in the field of creative action we do not say anything new. Stanislavski spoke of rays:

What name can we give this invisible current that we use to communicate with each other? Someday this phenomenon will be the subject of scientific research. For now, let us call them rays. And now let's see what we can find out about them through study and also by noting our own sensations (Stanislavski, 2010, p. 253).

Meanwhile Grotowski toasted us with transilluminations:

The actor completely donates all his bodily and mental powers, which emerge from the depths of his being and instinct, exploding into a kind of "transillumination". We do not educate an actor in our theater, teaching him something: we try to eliminate the resistance of his body to this psychic process. The result is the elimination of the time lapse between an inner impulse and an outer reaction, so that the impulse immediately becomes an outer reaction. Impulse and action are concurrent: the body fades away, burns, and the spectator watches a series of visible impulses (Grotowski, 1987, p. 14).

What we want to update and reinforce here is solely the immanence of these relationships of invisibility and the positive power in thinking creation from this virtual ground. Let us remember that virtuality is not opposed to reality. The reality is composed of the actual and virtual and if there is any opposition to the virtual it occurs in relation to the actual and never the real (Levy, 1996). Thus we can say that this immanent virtual ground - initially based on the triad of subtlety, paradox and composition - has a full reality

consisting of "rays" and "transilluminations" and can be powerful ground to trace some thought, even if composed of droplets of intelligibility (Gil, 2012), with the act of creation. The present arts (theater, dance, performance, and their potent hybridizations and contaminations) can become an artistic terrain on which this thought of in/with the invisible has its uniqueness and difference in relation to other plans of action/thought. This reflection can, very much, enhance the construction of propositions to the act of creating out of the plane of art. Of course, this ground of invisibility extends to the level of the power of life. The creation is, obviously, an act of life and is not restricted, completely, to the artistic arena. Deleuze and Guattari (2005) draw our attention to a synonymy between thinking and creating. They tell us that this thought/creativity takes place both in the sciences, arts and in conceptualization without any hierarchy between these creativities - or what would end up becoming the exact same words - between those thoughts. The relationship between art, science and concept would be, therefore, in the order of thinking with for it considers the plans of the present event as aesthetic and of the writing conceptualization as creation and thought. However, we also state in this essay an ontological autonomy of art making, not for us to close ourselves into an aesthetic solipsism, but rather permit that the creative act can be thought of in the point of view from within the realm of art. It is a thinking/creating that does not need, ever, a scientific or conceptual approval for its fulfillment. It requires no thinking about for it is thought itself. Deleuze and Guattari (2005), in the same work cited above, tell us that the uniqueness of art causes its difference by cutting out chaos, and generating, from this dry cut, beings of sensation while science cuts out from chaos and, from there, creates functions; and philosophy (and I would add the so-called human sciences) does the same but, from that action, creates concepts. Maybe it is the sensations theater - or beings of theatrical sensations - which form the autonomous realm of creation/thought that Alain Badiou (2002) calls the theater-ideas that are updated only at the event present at the theatrical act. Perhaps, also, these are dance-sensations that construct the independent ground from what this same thinker called thought-body and takes place solely in the presence of the act of dancing. "The body thinks and dancing in its act of dance

conceptualizes" are constant statements of Christine Greiner e Helena Katz (Greiner, 2005, 2010). The assertion of an ontological autonomy of the theatrical event led to the creation of the discipline of Theatrical Philosophy advocated by Dubatti (2012). Now, these authors do not claim aesthetic as a partial discipline of philosophy but speak of an autonomously "philosophizing" aesthetics. More specifically, they affirm the autonomous power of thought of present art in all its forms: dance, theater, performance and their contaminated hybrids. They yell out a simple, but powerful message: theater, dance and performance in its singular present and autonomous act theatrical occurrence, dance occurrence and performance occurrence generate the synonymy of performance=thought.

This is only the backdrop of the show *Café com Queijo* and, also, of the writings of the actresses above. That background says the territory of a *Café-com-Queijo*-thought that only occurs in that and only in that spatio-temporal-poetic composition. In this great collective body that composes the event *Café com Queijo* there is a creative thinking that takes place in that act. However, to talk about composition and autonomous entity that is recreated while being of sensation at every *Café-com-Queijo*-event is the saying of an update and of a dynamic force that occurs between macroscopic elements of the scene, between bodies, between physical actions: a space of virtualities. This means claiming an ephemeral territory of invisibility and subtle forces that "happen" the happening but are immanent and generated by that very "happening that happens" in a present of the present (Fabião, 2010). For this reason, a plan of invisibilities that materializes and is imminent to the visible plane itself. This complex plan is formed by visibilities (effectuated bodies) and invisibility (rays and transilluminations) for they arise crossed by dynamic forces that carry the bodies in that territory. The complexity of understanding this plane is that these invisible forces do not pre-exist but are generated by these same bodies effectuated in a state of dynamic co-creation of visibility and invisibility. Bodies and forces generate bodies and forces in an increasingly complex dynamic dynamics. The singular and the collective here can only be thought if cut out in relative layers. But, even if visibility and invisibility are co-created to an extreme in this complex dynamic, we can still affirm a

certain autonomous ontology of the invisible that while crossing forces that effectuate and counter-effectuate the bodies. I believe that the complexity of thinking the body in art and the possibility of a supposed act of creation by the aforementioned celebrated actresses even after so many years of an alleged "repetition" of the show can only be thought in its complexity if we look at this ontology of the plane of unseen forces. And, of course, this complexity extends itself outside of art because each and every body has this cloud of invisibilities. The issue is trying to understand the specifics of the renewal in a state of art and what occurs in this intensification in present art.

In order to manage this complex state of bodies (in art or not) some concepts were created: Body-Media (Katz and Greiner, 2005), or Vibrating Body (Rolnik, 2006), *Body-subjetil*⁶ (Ferracini, 2006), Body-Soma (Miller, 2012) each cut out by theoretical and singular families according to their questions. They are concept-bodies which, in our view, seek to open up to a receptive and active juxtaposition (a receptivity) in this zone of turbulent forces crossing each other - or what we call here a potent plan of invisibilities. Of course we do not affirm that these concepts are saying the same, even though they inhabit the same territory - quite the contrary, each one has its own territorial space defined. We believe that some authors even criticize the existence of this plane of invisibilities - but we believe that they touch some borders that say something regarding the issue of creative dynamic flux crossing to which they are subject. If we take the conceptual theoretical framework of this particular experiment, perhaps the common edges between these concepts is the relation of hybridity, of plague, of contamination (Artaud) between what is visible and invisible as a virtual cloud, a plane of forces.

⁶ *Body-subjetil* (Corpo-subjétil): body-in-art, integrated and vectorial body in relation to the routine body. In this sense, I suggest calling this expanded integrated body-in-art, this body embedded in the Scenic State as the body-subjectil. Let us explain: in Derrida and Bergstein's *Enlouquecer o Subjétil* (1998), the image of "body-subjectil" has arisen from an extremely natural perspective. Subjetil would be, according to Derrida, and retrieving a word supposedly created by Artaud, what is in between the subject, the subjective, and the object, the objective. Not exactly in any of them, but in the space between. Another issue is that this word, *subjetil*, may by resemblance, be put close to projectile, what leads us to the image of projection, outward; a projectile that, when launched outward reaches the other and also itself. This forthcoming is possible once *subjetil* is a word supposedly created by Artaud, with no possible translation in other languages.

But we need to give some consistency to this ontology of the invisible. Gil (2005) shows us some variations in attitudes between the See and the Look, and indicates fields of actuation that are complementary but have different natures. Distinct from the action of a macroscopic and retinal view, the look, according to the author, "digs vision, prints grooves in the landscape, differentiates it in multiple nuclei of forces, modulates the light and shadow, introduces the first selective filters of perception" (Gil, 2005: 52). What this creates in this encounter is a game of tensions between the parts that look at each other and are looked on in double capture. One allows itself to be 'trapped' by the other in a 'seduction' that is never completed. This incompleteness is the result of the inherent movement itself to this relation between looks since a look at the other will never see in the other an exact image, there will always be a new over-measure. This aspect of a distorting mirror that the look insinuates into its activity, points to the fact that it is not restricted to a visible structure involving bodies that look at each other, but that does involve, in its motion, the spaces between, the empty existing intervals, wandering beyond the mimetic image and also meeting with the invisible forces. If we enter the landscape when we look at it, it is because something in which our eye involves objects in an atmosphere that, for a certain effect of counterpart, also turns out to encompass us. This "something" is an animated emptiness that comes from the no-background of my look and I convey the things I see; it is an empty space in which we put ourselves in and that is offered us by whole of the landscape. It sends us back the space of the attitude of our look: as a topology of the spirit, an outdoor landscape of an interior (Gil, 2005: 48).

We believe in the fertility of debate on the expressiveness of the body-in-art from this particular field of the invisibilities that have been drawing themselves as a paradoxical space of the collectivities and intensive exchanges, permeated by the constant desire to reestablish the creative power itself of the encounters. The concept of invisibility interests us because it deals with events that compromise the power of the body in space/time that occurs beyond the field of the visible, both of the body(ies), as the time(s)/space(s) in question. To affirm this ontology is to enter into an "enormously vast field of study on the phenomena of borders and of a

radical invisible, unwritten, not manifested, but has an effect (because of this) on the visible" (Gil, 2005: 18-19).

An important line to be highlighted, as already hinted, is that this field of invisibility is not restricted to the limits of our retina, we are not referring to a rectilinear invisible, where our eyes cannot see objectively. "It is not a matter of a retinal invisibility nor of a sensitive invisibility nor a quasi-intelligible invisibility (such as the horizon generalities of Merleau-Ponty), both of which depend in one way or another, of the phenomenological definition of perceptual experience" (Gil, 2005: 16).

So, then, what is this invisible, and how does it manifest itself? "Through the sensory presence, thanks to a side view, the hinge of two colors or two rays of the world: in any case, it is always a kind of sensory perceptual presence that the invisible shows itself" (Gil, 2005: 26). And the path to the sensory perceptual presence of the invisible will go through another way of understanding its own perception, extending what we call perceptual experience to its reverse, its shadow. A perception called into becoming. The Invisible "is the *un-perception* of perception, which makes the latter possible" (Gil, 2005: 25). We therefore affirm a field of immanent invisibility (neither transcendent, nor essential), a material micro-perceptive invisibility, and in constant virtualization flux and updating. We verified in thinking with the actresses and the show *Café com Queijo* a concreteness and materiality of these invisible forces, located in the sensitive virtuality that crosses us. This materiality, or concrete invisibility, draws itself on the chaotic power of the encounters (intra/inter bodies).

It is in this territory that is seen the power to constantly recreate the show *Café com Queijo*. This subtle space of invisibilities has an infinite capacity to update since it works with the composition of forces in crossing this present to present (Fabião, 2010). At every marked crevice or coded mimetic action of the actors, a whole world of power opens up. The field of invisibility opens these impossible cracks in the movement of continuous duration of marked action. It is a zone of lack of control in control itself. This field opens holes in structured technique, in the measured time in the space of glances between actors and between actors and audience. And it is in these

cracks that memory is recreated pressed by its materiality: thus the new stool cited by Ana Cristina Colla contains the memory of the old stool, its combination of a torn strap consists in recreating this with the same combination of whole premiere of the show, back in 1999. All these invisible materialities and virtualities are there, hovering in a suspended immanent field and to recombine and recompose the weight of a body 13 years older with the muscle memory of an even younger body. The fiercely closed structure (control) are composed with forgetting (uncontrolled) and in these actions that this cloud of invisibility recombines - according to Raquel Scotti Hirson above- "the connections are in the thousands, but the look quickly dialogues with breathing and finds other looks, creating a network of almost immediate frequencies that provoke tension and align the wagons."

This field of invisibility is born of the thinking with of the actresses and in the experience of constant recreation of the show *Café com Queijo*. It is a necessary empirical field for understanding the aesthetic experience of this event. This space of subtlety, paradox and composition sung in the voices of the actresses in the beautiful sayings above. The event *Café com Queijo* is a great collective body of updates and virtualities, and for that reason, a cloud of constantly recreated present physical perceptions made up of memories and updated and forgotten memories. This virtual atmosphere generates forces in crossing and pressure onto renewal the action in the singular body of each actor to each event. At the same time, this singular act of renewal of the actors' bodies - in itself a necessary act of creation - and refers back to the cloud itself recreating it and enlarging it at each materialization of the spectacular encounter. Here we have an ontogeny of action in act of encounter, that is, an action that creates itself in the act of composing the present of the present (Fabião, 2010) of the event. It is an ontogeny that blurs the borders of what would be a collective body and a unique body, as both are matters of expression for the act of creation itself. It is here that the physical action meets politics. Moreover, this ontogeny of action in act is absolutely positive, did not deny either the invisibility or visibility, nor the technical, nor control or lack of control, nor chance, nor the collective and not even the singular but composes with all of them. For this ontogeny to occur this diving in the present of the present in opening

from/to experience is necessary. This "listening" would be necessary to the actor, this receptivity to the cloud of invisibility, not only to feel it passively, but to act with it. It is necessary to the actor, therefore, an entire reception+action, a receptivity to this plane of forces, including there the receptivity of the action itself generated. In other words, the body must be receptive to itself in this ontogeny because the actor does not perform a simple and fixed synthesis in this turbulent area but creates a large territory in which any action is always on the run, in escape and therefore always being created in flux with the field of experience of the scene. It is in this plane of escape that one always recreates. And, upon throwing ourselves out of the territory of the arts: would not be the **receptivity** of creative composition in relation to that surface of invisibility precisely the field of ontogeny of action in act that subtends an entire aesthetics of existence? (Foucault). Maybe...

References

- ARTAUD, Antonin. *O Teatro e Seu Duplo*. Trad. Teixeira Coelho. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1999.
- BADIOU, Alain. *Pequeno Dicionário de Inestética*. Trad. Marina Appenzeller. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2002.
- DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Felix. *O que é Filosofia*. Trad. Bento Prado Jr e Alberto Alonso Muñoz. Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34, 1992.
- DUBATTI, Jorge. *Arte, Convívio e Tecnívio*. In: CARREIRA, André L. A. N.; BIÃO, Armindo. J. C; TORRES, Walter. L. (Orgs.). *Da Cena Contemporânea*. Porto Alegre: ABRACE, 2012.
- FABIÃO, Eleonora. *Corpo Cênico, Estado Cênico*. *Revista Contraponto*, Univali, Santa Catarina, V. 10, 2010. Disponível em: <http://siaiweb06.univali.br/seer/index.php/rc/article/view/2256>. Acesso em: 15 out. 2012.
- FERRACINI, Renato. *Café com Queijo: corpos em criação*. São Paulo: Aderaldo & Rothschild Editores/Fapesp, 2006.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. *Ditos e Escritos V. Ética, Sexualidade, Política*. Rio de Janeiro : Forense Universitária, 2006.
- GIL, José. *A Imagem-Nua e as pequenas percepções. Estética e Metafenomenologia*. Trad. Miguel Serras Pereira. 2ª ed. Lisboa: Relógio d'água, 2005.
- GIL, JOSÉ. Transcrição Palestra José Gil. *Revista Ilinx*. Campinas, n.1, 2012. Disponível em: <http://www.cocen.rei.unicamp.br/revistadigital/index.php/lume/article/view/116>. Acesso em 15 out. 2012.
- GREINER, Christine. *O Corpo em Crise. Novas Pistas e o curto-circuito das representações*. São Paulo: Annablume, 2010.
- GREINER, Christine. *O Corpo. Pistas para Estudos Indisciplinares*. São Paulo: Annablume, 2005.
- GROTOWSKI, Jerzy. *Em busca de um teatro pobre*. Trad. Aldomar Conrado. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1987.
- LÉVY, Pierre. *O que é o virtual?* Trad. Paulo Neves. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1996.
- MILLER, Jussara. Qual é o corpo que dança? In: *Dança e Educação Somática para adultos*. São Paulo: Summus, 2012.
- STANISLAVSKI, Constantin. *A Preparação do Ator*. Tradução de Pontes de Paula Lima. São Paulo: Editora Civilização Brasileira, 2010.