

Rethinking and rewriting yourself: the possibilities of scripting research on scenic arts in academy

Repensar-se, reescrever-se: das possibilidades de escritura da pesquisa em artes da cena na academia

Luciane de Campos Olendzki¹

ABSTRACT

This article aims at considering ways of writing theses and dissertations in the academy, as being correlated with ways of thinking, conceiving and producing knowledge. Thus, it questions and searches for possibilities of forms of research writing in scene arts which may have a greater correspondence with contents, materialities, processes and ways of expression of the area, such as the play, the fabulation and the performativity. For this, we started from studies on performativity of language (Austin), literary criticism (Barthes), philosophy (Nietzsche and Deleuze), approaching the author's dissertation writing process.

Keywords: Performative writing. Play writing. Academic writing.

RESUMO

Este artigo busca refletir sobre formas de escrever teses e dissertações na academia, como sendo correlatas com formas de pensar, conceber e produzir conhecimento. Desse modo, questiona e busca possibilidades de formas de escritura da pesquisa em artes da cena que possam ter maior correspondência com conteúdos, materialidades, processos e modos de expressão da área, tais como, o jogo, a fabulação e a performatividade. Para tal, partimos de estudos sobre a performatividade da linguagem (Austin), a crítica literária (Barthes), a filosofia (Nietzsche e Deleuze), abordando o processo de escritura da dissertação da autora.

Palavras-chave: Escrita performativa. Escrita de jogo. Escrita acadêmica.

1.
PhD Student of the Graduate Program in Performing Arts, at University of Campinas.
ORCID:
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4146-4456>.
Contact:
luquerubim@hotmail.com

Submitted on: 24/03/2017

Accepted on: 27/08/2017

Scripting and literature

To develop some reflections on possible ways to script dissertations and theses in the field of arts in the academy, this article uses and analyzes some of the elements of my master's thesis "*Palhaçar: máscaras em uma patética-poética por rir*" [Clowning: masks in pathetic-poetic for laughing] (OLENDZKI, 2009). Such thesis is in a border area of production and textures between theatre, philosophy and literature, with theoretical, conceptual and methodological basis on post-structuralist perspectives, specifically in the philosophical productions of Gilles Deleuze and Friedrich Nietzsche.

The thesis is poetically and literarily scripted, which develops as a type of dramatized and performative narrative, or even a philosophical and fabled dramatization. The exercise and the production of a performative writing were focused, or a writing that is performed over the course of writing, thinking and composing. Scripting as a form of expression (non-informative or a linear and descriptive speech) that operates with a thought in action (which dramatizes) or that can only be thought about if it is put in drama (action) by writing. Scripting driven by emotions, dramas and images of thought, articulated with artistic and life experiences, studies and readings relevant to the research and to creation. A scripting developed and ran through games, experimentation and composition with theoretical and practical content of the research. Through scripting, setting in motion the fabrication and the conjunctions that provide the possibility to think and create multiple directions about a theme and problem for a research.

The progression of the thesis is rhizomatic, it does not develop a historiographic evolution of the art of being a clown and neither establishes the origin or the affiliation between types and comic masks. Beyond fixing the image and the concept of clown, it sought to move through the correlation lines and double capture among the different comical types that thrive and constitute the different series of the genealogy of clowning. Thus, passages and games through the territories of clowning are shown, with their distinguished genealogical types, tracing a topological plane, trans-historical and anachronic in information, composition and thought.

In the thesis, types and masks of the genealogy and historiography of clowning act as conceptual characters and intercessors for the movement of thought, they dramatize the philosophical concepts and the own knowledge of clowning, operating as agents

of enunciation. Clowns and comic types, in addition to their concretion and empirical and historical existence, act as undue powers while conceptual and philosophical characters, i.e., as “intrinsic presences to thought, a condition of possibility of own thought” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2000, p. 9). In this procedure of writing-thinking-creating the plans of philosophy, literature and scenic arts, they have become inseparable in the production of research.

Philosophical concepts are played, acted, performed and made operational in the text, without being explained, in alliances and conflicted with the art modes of clowning. Deleuze demands the “pure showing,” the imitation, the rupture, the anthropophagy in relation to contents, together they move the textual production and the thought instead of the explanation based on significance and on the key “essence-example”:

Every time it interrogates us about a meaning, we respond using a designation, a pure showing. And to persuade the viewer that it is not simple “example” and the problem of Plato is misplaced, we will imitate what we designated, we will use it mimetically, or we can eat it or break what we showed. [...] And this is so much faster and so much better that there is no and there should be no similarity between what is shown and what we were asked for: only a saw teeth relation, refusing the false Platonic dualism essence-example (DELEUZE, 2003, p. 138).

Philosophical concepts and notions are put into action or dramatized in script scenes, unfolding a drama of images and fictions performed by conceptual characters in a performative writing that drives the exercise of thought and textual production in fabrication. A scripting that places the contents, the concepts and the production of knowledge in “imagin-action.” How to act, how to think, how to write in theatre and clowning? Putting in action a scripting of “*mîse-en-scène, mîse-en-page*” (SALOMÃO, 2000).

In “*Aula*” [Lecture] pronounced on January 7, 1977 at the College of France, Barthes discusses literature and scripture:

I do not understand literature as the body or the sequence of works, not even a trade or educational are, but the complex marking of the footprints of a practice: the practice of writing. Therefore, I focus on the text essentially, i.e., the tissue of the signs that constitutes the work, because the text is the exposition of the language, and because it is within the language that the language must be fought, diverted: it is not through the message that it is the instrument but the play of words that it is the theater. Therefore, I can say indifferently: literature, scripting or text (BARTHES, 1989, p. 17).

In this sense, the practice of writing focuses on the text, a scripting that is literature, the middle and the end of a combative and theatrical game inside and for the language, generating a literary object – be it a poem, a novel, an essay or a dissertation. In “The Preparation of the Novel I” (in *Aula* December 9, 1978) Barthes (2005a) claims that literary scripting opposes scientific writing since it involves a real practice of desire (to write) that includes an erotic pleasure of the text. Practicing the desire to write that holds a fantastic force that puts in motion writing itself, allowing new departures and directions.

I held the practice of writing, desiring script texts, seeking pleasure and play in the text and in the production of meanings. Through experimental procedures I allowed the fantasy and the own practice of writing to activate and point to new directions for forms of expression in scripting and literature, playing with clowning and philosophy concepts.

A scripture that tries not to be limited to the informative, to the explanatory, to the precepts and to the ordinations based on logic, on the models of structuring and organization of speech and scientific knowledge and on the linearity of reason. Which does not mean that through play, performance, dramatization and fabrication in the writing process and in the form of script, something cannot be explained or informed with clarity and scientific rigor.

According to Perrone-Moisés (2005), Barthes claims that the production of writing would allow to differentiate the writing of the writers from the writing of the scribe. The scribes (*écrivants*) perform a transitive writing, bearer with messages and directions. The writers (*écrivains*) write intransitively, i.e., without fitting to any referential, but as a process of their own organization in relation to the language. In this relation, the style is constantly transitory, not a mere formal cloak. The style of the script would be related to the merge of thought and involuntary impulse, through a conscious enunciation.

Instead of chapters, the thesis consists of script scenes that present themselves in different variations such as fragments, dialogues, poems, short stories, narratives and essays. Script scenes that were not written to be acted, they do not tell a story, but several, they have no unity of time, place and action. The scenes dramatize, but are not dramatic. Scenes that take place in non-places, undefined periods, with or without characters. Scenes that deploy a philosophical dramatization, having the ethics, the poetics and the art of clowning as problematic.

After each scene of the script there is a point book (a sort of endnotes), where other texts appear such as: a) aphorisms;

b) explanatory notes – about philosophical concepts, contexts and data on historiography and the art of clowning; c) citations of works that expand or supports what is put in the scene and d) references. The point book alludes to the point in theatre and to its informative function and as the guide to the underground of the script scenes.

On the other hand, the possibility of a literary philosophy or philosophical drama is inaugurated by Nietzsche, especially in “Thus Spoke Zarathustra” (1885), which according to Deleuze (1976), involves the assimilation of the theatre by the thought, i.e., the reformulation of thought as an experience and as a movement, which demands a reformulation of language, changes in the corresponding modes of expression.

Performative writing

The use of performative writing as a possibility of writing theses and dissertations in research on scenic arts has been increasingly discussed, but little to nothing is explained in a clear and consistent form of what such “performative writing” is. Thus, roughly, performative writing is associated with any format that does not fit to the standards of academic writing.

What do we mean when we refer to or qualify performative writing? What this term “performative” means and implies as a distinction and as a nomination of a form of writing? What are the elements, the characteristics, the specificity and differences of a performative writing? Such issues could mark the development of a study and analysis on performative writing, especially in the context of research on scenic arts in the Academy.

The academic theses and dissertations are literary objects (of writing and reading), supports that earn a physical body, existence and meaning through writing. Writing is the legitimate and conventional form of communication and sharing of academic research. Therefore, we will focus on performativity in the field of language, the performative “writing” approach is limited to an initial and partial study, there is no intention to study the theme in its completeness and complexity. We seek to provide some perspectives and conceptions that could provide support and consistency to the abovementioned questionings, serving to the possible uses and analyses regarding performative writing in academic research on scenic arts.

The notion of performative language was developed by the philosopher from the school of Oxford, John Langshaw Austin, between 1940-50; he introduced the concepts of “performative,”

“illocutionary” and “speech act” in analytic philosophy and linguistics. Ottoni (1998) proposes a “performative vision” of language through the analysis and the study of the main studies by Austin regarding performativity of speech, and these will be referenced in this study to approach the main ideas of this author.

According to Austin (1975), there are circumstances of the use of language in which the action is not described, but practiced. The performative enunciate takes an action, regardless of the properties: true or false. The performative is bound to a context, and rather than true or false, there are reporting parameters: if it was “happy” – if the desired action has been taken, or “unhappy” – if the desired action was not performed. Austin unfolds the speech act in three simultaneous and correlated acts, which schematically are: a) locutionary act (sense) – speech, articulation between syntax and semantics, place in which the meaning takes place; b) illocutionary act (strength) – the act of performing an action by an enunciate, allows the distinction between the saying and the said; c) perlocutionary act (effect) – the act that produces an effect on the person saying. The locutionary act is the act of saying something; the illocutionary act is the act of saying something (strength of enunciation); and the perlocutionary act produces an effect on the person saying. The performative takes an action through an enunciate which is the performance of an act of speech, the performative is the own act of the speech-action.

The performative is mobilized not only by performative verbs and subjects (tenses pronouns), but it is present even in statements (no verb in the active or passive voice). Considering that, the statements or affirmations “not only say about the world, they do something in the world. The action is not described, it is practiced” (OTTONI, 1998, p. 37).

Derrida (1991) addresses the issues of the performative from Austin in the essay “Signature Event Context” (1972). Among the fundamental discussions, Derrida considers that Austin removed from the analysis of language the opposition truth-falsehood, replacing it by consideration of value and difference of strength, also attacking the logocentric vision, the rationality of speech and the speech as universal.

According to Zular (2007, p. 43), “the performative character of language defines the very characteristic of literature as it constructs what it speaks, i.e., while it is constituted by making a new world that does not exist unless when enounced.”

The presence and the fabrication of fiction as a form of seeing and saying the world, re-imagining it, reshaping it and thus, constituting it too. This is supported and in line with the studies of Conquergood (apud PINEAU, 2010), which shifted paradigms of

artistic performance to the cultural performativity, and according to Pineau (2010, p. 96) allowed “the redefining of performance as a paradigm, as an exploratory metaphor, as a research method and as social justice activism.” In the educational field, this resulted in a critical production that demanded the change from an “informational pedagogy” to a “performative pedagogy.” Conquergood introduces to the ball the figure of the trickster, as an important helper for the performative writing and research:

[...] as soon as a worldview is fabricated, lines are highlighted, categories are set, hierarchies are erected, an archetypal character appears, the trickster. Moving in the breaking of the rules and on the violation of taboos, the trickster turns everything upside down. By playing with the social order, displacing certainties, he ends up increasing the awareness of the vulnerability of our institutions (CONQUERGOOD apud PINEAU, 2010, p. 101).

Conquergood points to some significant elements for the exercise of performativity in the production of a research such as: improvisation, innovation, experimentation, reflection, contextualization, agitation, irony, parody, fun, comedy and to turn things into a carnival. Conquergood defends the shift of the focus from the product to the process or to the productivity as a crucial principle to performative research.

Within a context of performative vision of literature, Zular (2007) claims that there are at least two possibilities of interrelation between the practices of writing and its formal construction: 1) a more traditional object linked to the passing to the written form and 2) another that widely opens the process itself as a form. The performativity of the process can be formally configured in the second case, in which the performative becomes a particular way of thinking about the form, at what it does. Thus, the very procedures of the writing act (performativity of the process) become ways of writing and ways of thinking.

Game Scripting

If they interrogate me; if they feel unease (as it happens, and sometimes very lively) about what I “meant,” I answer that I didn’t want to say it, but I wanted to do it and that was the intention to do what I said...
(Paul Valéry)

In the thesis “Clowning: masks in pathetic-poetic for laughing” (2009), the process of writing is done as a game, as

experimentation and ludical composition (of playing and fighting) to deal with contents and questions, to make alliances between varied and heterogeneous materials such as clowning and philosophy.

The search for a script to perform. Fantastic strength. Practice of the want-write. An actuated script. Action-word. Action-scripting. To tell a story with no ending or morals. To turn knowledge into fiction. To invent and question truths. To describe bio-graphies. To allow yourself the scripting-erasing. In drafts. Through fabling lines. Scripting as the act of creation. *Ars* writing. Scripting masked in a game space. When I do not know how to talk and something needs to talk. I learned how to talk writing with the body. Playing a mask. Therefore, the words want to play, they want to build a literary body, to be a scene, sensations, dramas of images and thoughts. Scripting machine operating in the intervals, in the blackouts, from within the script, writing thesis or dissertation.

Scripting as game – uniting game with the language and the arrangement between multiple contents. Game of thought, a polysemous game of voices, references and senses. Thought-provoking and difficult task, because the language itself is already a system of conventions and codes, that is a form of power, a conditioner of thinking, providing specific elements and cultural marks. Cunning tricksters, jugglers of language are necessary to create games of language, of scripting and of thought, which also allow and invite the reader to play along.

Ludic or playful attitudes in the act of writing was what generally conducted the scripting process of the thesis, or even, the passing of the writing to script scenes. From there, many revisions and re-scripts were performed, cuts, fittings and articulations. Informative texts, with bibliographic review and explanations ended up being cut from the script scenes, as they brought slowness, style lock, didacticism, despite containing significant information. To try and remedy these issues, I created the “point book” – a type of endnotes, below each script scene. The point book is the place of the scribe. Since, as a scribe I could exercise the scripting – copying, annotating, collecting, archiving and “reciting.” The point becomes the base and the keeper of the knowledge from the research sources, pointing to the references, safeguarding the writings of authors who experienced changes in the script scenes. The citations of authors were recited by conceptual characters and sometimes suffered partial changes or even reversals of sense – which were clarified in the point book. As part of the game, changes were made, substitutions and

inversions depending on the role of the characters and of the script scene, i.e., depending on who speaks, how it acts or how what acts. How plays Nietzsche (2005b, p. 174), with “a hunchback can perfectly speak in a twisted way!”.

The act of writing as if it was done as a game, a creative way to treat a subject or question, of making alliances and being amazed in the handling of content and practical-theoretical references that based the research. The very act of writing the thesis became performative, i.e., as a process that involved and generated the scripting form and the genres (short story, poetry, essay, drama), with different nuances of the fantastic and the surreal. The writing in game is what made such or which scripting mode, generating, driving and linking intentions and forms of expression.

Who put the thought and the script in action was not an “I,” but conceptual characters (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2000), in a game of masks. It was a performance in scripting, with the figures of the genealogy of clowning moving the thought and carrying the script forms. Sometimes, the reference authors themselves became conceptual characters in the script scenes, re-quoting themselves. Direct conversations with the reference authors of the research followed, as characters in the script scenes and even in the middle of the circus arena. Thus, a game with the works read would be developed in an anthropophagous, active, creative and playful forms, without stopping on informing and investing in performativity.

At times, the writing procedure meant acting like buffoons, unfolding ambiguity of meaning, word play, feral questionings about laughter, the presence of the different and the power. At times it was written with the mask of the *Dottore Commedia Dell’Arte* – at a banquet (a parody of “The Symposium,” by Plato), in which a group of *Dottores* break with the etymological meanings of the word “clown” using irony and absurdism, questioning any origin grounds or essence the clown. I also wrote as a child that goes to the circus for the first time, excited about the meeting with the clown, however, barely knowing how to speak. I wrote as if I were dreaming and using dreams traversed by clowns and their archetypes. I wrote as women clown, with a clumsy and unrealistic looking at making poetry and playing about what is written, how to write, live and fable a thesis.

As an example, some of the script scenes were written to be read aloud, with dyslalia games and repetition of consonants to bring the drunkenness, as a reference to the state of the clown mask that uses the red nose (the nose of a drunk), with its stumbles

and the unbridled talking. I also wrote from actions, accompanied by sensations, for example: like who falls, gets lost, dreams, progresses, judges.

Operating and writing with the “as if” theatre mindset. Having as game task: writing; having as the means of expression: the written language. Producing knowledge by fabling and creating fictions with the knowledge for the compositional construction of the text and of thinking – the script scenes were put into action and game.

Fabling, otherness and performativity in games in which conceptual characters in script scenes are woven together and compose different plans: lived and fabled experience; clowning and philosophy; absurd and logical; reason and unreason; information and imagination; facts and invention; childhood and erudition; scripting and reading; ethics and poetics. Thus, resulting in a philosophical “clowning,” a childish and absurd erudition, academic rigorousness played, a knowledge imagined, played and turned into theatre. The production of knowledge itself being creation, fiction, invention, non-Truth. The fabling, otherness and fiction of and with theoretical knowledge and artistic data were game and composition procedures for a reflection and performative writing.

A game scripting, also performative, that includes the experience and the production of otherness in the writing procedure itself. In which the author becomes a bunch, always writing as others and wearing masks. “I” becomes a space of otherness with the practice of writing. Practice driven by emotions and games from the meetings and questionings with contents of clowning and philosophy. A thesis scripting that also implies an experimentation of the “I” in the writing creation process. How to write, rethinking and rewriting yourself without experimenting yourself? Entering unknown territories, of the not known and of the unrecognizable in scripting processes. Nietzsche (2005a, p. 181) wryly wondered in his dithyrambic writings: “I – I’m not me anymore? Hand, face and step have changed? And what am I, friends – Am I not for you?”.

The scripting procedures gave the permanent experience of being adrift in the research process and production of the thesis. The result could not be previously foreseen or controlled or where written text would end, since it was in the own writing procedure that form-expression-production were configured.

Such a practice and method of research and scripting were also based on the post-structuralist perspective, which interfered directly in the form of researching-doing-writing the thesis.

Through this route of contact with the post-structuralist perspective, especially from the philosophies of difference, with Nietzsche and Deleuze, I went through changes in how I think, how I see the world and how I do research, of how I think the clown and the very act of writing a thesis researching arts in the academy. Such experiences were not only pleasant, but they were essentially destabilizing and challenging generating a series of questionings, where the certainties kept escaping and crumbling.

As previously mentioned citing Conquergood regarding the role of the trickster in performative research, it was like the playful impulse of this archetype (so similar to the clown), would not only destabilize the hardened standards of writing (and thinking) a thesis, but also unease and question the production itself as game. Thus, clashes relating to production itself surfaced, especially when judgments relating to major and legitimized design parameters of academic research entered the scene. Such clashes promoted radical self-questionings, involving the review of established paradigms on academic research production and of common sense opinions relating to the art of the clown. As said by Conquergood (apud PINEAU, 2010, p. 101), “the playful impulse of the trickster promotes critic and radical self-questioning that leads to a deeper knowledge of the self, the first step to the transformation.” In this situation, the production of research and knowledge at the University became evident and how it is done, regarding the ways of thinking, implying not only conceptions of the world, but actions in the world and, particularly, constructions of this world.

Post-structuralism derives from the philosophy and discusses the safe knowledge of things, the common sense (*Doxa*) established and taken as given, so there are no facts or truths within, but interpretations. Thus, leading to a critical attitude and production, for conducting evaluations and perspectives that expose the moral foundations that ground current values, emphasizing the ways of life and the sign regimen as historical, social and cultural constructs. Subjectivity is understood as social production. Notions and values involved in the modes of existence and current power relations that are given as originating and universal truths are questioned, such as: The Reason, The Being, The Truth, The Ideal, The Origin. Using this, we can say that the performative effect of post-structuralist ideas is felt and interpreted as deconstruction. The future of history and man are prominent, replacing the “is” gives visibility to “becomes,” the becoming, the cracks and the interstices what-that-was and what-is-being for a coming, here and now.

The exercise of questioning and of criticism (productive and propositional), the irony and the paradox are resources used by post-structuralists on the form of thinking and use of language. In this context, the language forms the world, not merely reproducing it. Through scripting, procedures are taken and qualities become present, such as: contrast, emotionality, urgency, euphoria, extravagance, variation, contradiction, subversion, instability, holes, cracks, breaks, discontinuities, use of allusions and puns, offsets, omissions, aporia, language games, fragmentation, non-unit, use of metaphor, work with the materiality of language, unfolding of the etymology of words and their meanings, use and variation of the first (I) and second person (he), coexistence and change of tenses in past and present etc.

According to Barry (2002), the production of a textuality where the signs fluctuate is searched, there is dissemination, dispersion, aporia and sliding signs regardless of what these are called, with the absence of sources or references, unique and identity – what causes uncertainty, decentering and plurality of meanings.

Academic writing?

We can destroy only as creators!
(Nietzsche)

Why often the academic writing can be so boring, aseptic, out of life, with no color, pulse, style, variation, humor or game? Why theses and dissertations can do without the eroticism of the text, the pleasure of scripting and especially the pleasure of reading, often limited to “scribing”? Who wants tasteless knowledge?

Want-write a script that invites to feel-think, to feel pleasure, to challenge, to the non-knowledge, to imagination, to *sapientia*. “*Sapientia*: no power, a bit of knowledge, some wisdom, and as much flavor as possible” (BARTHES, 1989, p. 45). Investing in scripting theses and dissertations – literary objects, with compositional, conceptual, procedural rigor, without losing the aesthetic and eroticism of the text-thought.

Because after all, what is at stake? They are not simply forms of writing or scripting (poetic, academic, scientific, performative), neither possible typified speeches (of an artist, academic, theoretical etc.). The main question is what operates, what you do, what do you think when you adhere, play or experiment a determined form of acting, writing and thinking? Which mask, in which game? In which dialogue, with and to which world? With what action and world construct? As Barthes observes:

We know that writing differently depends on thinking differently. Because writing is already organizing the world, is already thinking (learning a language is learning how to think in that language). Therefore, asking the other to rewrite himself is useless, unless he is decided to rethink himself (BARTHES, 2003, p. 202).

The production and writing patterns taken as academic and scientific entail values, judgments and forms of power, affecting ways of thinking and acting. They cannot be sustained simply “like” that is or that is how it has always been. It is not a mere fortuitous denial of the given and established forms of organization and writing of dissertations and theses, but the critical and creative exercise for new procedures and other formats that allow making the language – the script – in line and affected by the content that deals with non-linguistic forms of expression such as topics, processes and artistic results. How to move sensations, emotions, sensory and body senses from art, also in the language in a format that can use such expressions? For Deleuze and Guattari, the Art (2000, p. 253) – one of the three major forms of thought (along science and philosophy), “composes a plan of composition that bears composed monuments or sensations, under the action of aesthetic figures.”

Which forms of composition of academic productions (dissertation, thesis, article) can be related with the think-do art, beyond the legitimacy and standardized shapes? Can we disentangle ourselves from the formats and types of scientific research to develop and enhance forms of research in art, without a conciliating and legitimate relation grounded in science or in other non-artistic areas of Humanities? Why the research form of arts in the academy, especially the production of dissertations and theses, often sustains and perpetuates a servile and submissive relationship to the scientific methods and assumptions, related to the production of science and not arts? Does the research in arts in the academy needs to find its own justification, reason, defense, legitimacy and validity outside the field of arts? From where the devaluation and bastardy of art as a field of knowledge comes? Are we still reproducing the Socratic-Platonic thought of valuation of the Idea, in which art is considered a paltry and twisted copy of nature, being false, illogical, too carnal and material, pathetic (of low passions), useless, misleading?

As artists-researchers we must heed on which forms of value and power we are (re)producing through the methods of (re)production of theses and dissertations in arts based on scientific methodologies and assumptions. And with that, question ourselves

about which conceptions of world we project or perpetuate? What place, shape and voice we give to art in this world (academic)? It is necessary to (re)think the epistemology and methodologies used in research on scenic arts, but fundamentally rethink how artists-researchers ourselves, implying on what and how we are doing research in arts. With responsibility for what we are being and what we want while artists-researchers within and outside of the academy – a task of research and creation, of ethics and poetics, involving form of production of knowledge and incessant (re)creations of ways to connect, view and constitute worlds. It is up to us to do and redo, to write and rewrite the modes of research and academic work. Especially, involving rethinking and rewriting ourselves as artists-researchers in dialogue with the world, adhering to other possibilities and constitutions of worlds in art and research.

REFERENCES

- AUSTIN, John Langshaw. **How to do things with words**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- BARRY, Peter. **Begging Theory: an introduction to literary and cultural theory**. New York, NY: Manchester University Press: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- BARTHES, Roland. **A Preparação do Romance I: da vida à obra: notas de cursos e seminários no Collège de France, 1978-1979**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2005a.
- BARTHES, Roland. **A Preparação do Romance II: a obra como vontade: notas de curso no Collège de France 1979-1980**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2005b.
- BARTHES, Roland. **Aula** (pronunciada dia 7 de janeiro de 1977). São Paulo: Cultrix, 1989.
- BARTHES, Roland. **Crítica e verdade**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2003.
- DELEUZE, Gilles. **Lógica do Sentido**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2003.
- DELEUZE, Gilles. **Nietzsche e a Filosofia**. Rio de Janeiro: Rio, 1976.
- DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **O que é a Filosofia?** São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2000.
- DERRIDA, Jacques. **Assinatura, acontecimento, contexto**. In: Derrida, J. *Margens da filosofia*. São Paulo: Papyrus, 1991, p. 349-373.
- NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. **A Gaia Ciência**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2001.
- NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. **Além do Bem e do Mal: prelúdio a uma filosofia do futuro**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2005a.
- NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. **Assim Falou Zaratustra**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2005b.
- OLENDZKI, Luciane. **Palhaçar: máscaras em uma patética-poética por rir**. 2009. Sss f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2009.
- OTTONI, Paulo Roberto. **Visão Performativa da Linguagem**. Campinas, SP: Editora da UNICAMP, 1998.
- PERRONE-MOISÉS, Leyla. **Texto, Crítica, Escritura**. São Paulo, Martins Fontes, 2005.
- PINEAU, Elyse Lamm. **Nos Cruzamentos Entre a Performance e a Pedagogia: uma revisão prospectiva**. In: *EDUCAÇÃO & REALIDADE*. Porto Alegre: UFRGS/ FAGED 35(2): 89-113 maio/ago 2010.
- RIBEIRO, Delfim Paulo. **Investigação Baseada nas Artes: caminhos de metáfora e escrita performativa**. In: *Performa '11 – Encontros de Investigação em Performance* Universidade de Aveiro, maio de 2011.

SALOMÃO, Waly. **Tarifa de Embarque**. Rio de Janeiro: Rocco, 2000.

ZULAR, Roberto. **Uma Visão Performativa da Crítica Genética**. In: Revista de Letras, São Paulo, 47 (2): 39-56, jul./dez. 2007.