

***Unnamable: Scene and Encounter as Affections' Zone*¹**

Jordana Mascarenhas de Oliveira | Alice Stefania Curi

University of Brasília | Brasília, DF, Brasil.

alicestefania@gmail.com | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5746-4362>

DOI: 10.20396/conce.v8i2.8656437.

Submitted: 29/08/2019 | Accepted: 20/11/2019 | Published: 24/12/2019.



Abstract

The article discusses the ethical dimension mobilized by the creation and sharing process of scenic work “Unnamable”. The singular and immersive proposition of characters’ (*persona~gem*) research and composition; the intimate feature in encounter~scenes’ sharing – where a single actor acts along a single spectator; and the performative, open dramaturgies - which embrace becomings in each encounter, characterize a work with a high potential of affect’s circulation.

KEYWORDS

Affections. Character (*persona~gem*). Encounter. Ethics. Scene. Touchability.

***Inominável: cena e encontro como zona de afetos*²**

Resumo

O artigo se debruça sobre a dimensão ética mobilizada pelos modos de criação e compartilhamento da obra cênica “Inominável”. A proposta imersiva e singular dos processos de pesquisa e composição de *persona~gens*; o caráter íntimo de compartilhamento em cenas~encontro - nas quais uma única atriz/ator atua com um único es-pectadora/espectador; e a natureza aberta e performativa das dramaturgias - que abraçam devires a cada encontro, conferem ao trabalho um alto potencial de circulação de afetos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Afetos. *Persona~gem*. Encontro.

¹ Translation by Francisco Carlos Costa Filho.

² The reflections presented in this text have begun in the production process of the article *O Trabalho do Ator dos Afetos à Criação* (The Actor’s Work from Affects to Creation), followed by the writing of *Corpoético – por uma Ética da Cena Construída em Afetos* (Ethicalbody – for a Scene’s Ethics Constructed in Affects), the final work of the Major in Performing Arts/ Education. Both have analyzed the scenic work “Unnamable” and were developed by Jordana Mascarenhas, with the mentorship of PhD professor Alice Stefânia Curi, at the Performance Art Department in University of Brasília. During the Scientific Initiation program, Jordana Mascarenhas had the support of FAP-DF scholarship, and received an honorable mention in 2016. The authors, aiming a co-authorship, revised both materials later.

Situating the experience in “Unnamable”

This article aims to discuss the ethical dimensions that guided the creation processes and the encounters between each actress³ and spectator, in the context of scenic work “Unnamable”. Jordana Mascarenhas and Similião Aurélio created and directed it, with production by *Companhia Dois Tempos*, between the years 2015 and 2018⁴. The composition process of each version of “Unnamable” consists in a protocol of creation in which a group of actresses and actors, immersed during some days in an uncommon place for them, develops auctorial dramaturgies. It occurs through a friction between personal latent issues that reside in their personal mythology, with fictional materials, and through the interaction with aspects from the inhabited environment.

Thus, each actress creates a character⁵ and a type of performative scene program⁶, which will be shared and updated in every performance, with a single spectator. During each creative immersion, the direction support, motivate and map the actresses’ productions, and at the same time, organize some possible circuits that the spectators will track. Space and logistics issues matter in the guidance of those circuits, as the poetic and dramaturgical connections between the scenes do. The objective is to build a structure in which a single actress interacts with a single spectator, while all scenes happen simultaneously.

³ In this research, we have chosen to replace the term “actor” for “actress”, as the subject for any gender, in order to bring into feminine grammar constructions a neutral aspect, as it happens in Portuguese Language when it comes to masculine grammar constructions. This replacement brings nouns and pronouns on the feminine form along the text because of representative reasons, once the article was written by two female authors.

⁴ The first version occurred in 2015. In the following year, the project was sponsored by *Fundo de Apoio à Cultura – FAC/SECULT* (Culture Support Fund), which provided a second season. In 2017, it was selected to join the programs of *18º Festival Internacional de Teatro Cena Contemporânea* (Contemporary Scene International Theater Festival) and in 2018, the *Mostra de Teatro do Fundão*.

⁵ Translator’s note: When referring to a *character*, we will be using the Portuguese word *personagem*, in the written form *persona~gem*, to sustain a double meaning with the word *persona*, a concept proposed by the authors that will be explained further.

⁶ See the concept proposed by Eleonora Fabião (2008).



Figure 1 – “Unnamable”, by Companhia Dois Tempos. Actor: Emmanuel Lavor;
Spectator: Thaíza Falcão. Brasília – DF, 2016. Photograph: Diego Bresani

Ethical principles have oriented the experience, identified within the creation context and in the moments of sharing, as well. In what concerns the creative processes, the ethical engagement is formed in the search of a dramaturgy that is weaved among the frictions of: the actress’s personal mythology, that is projected, expressed and/or expanded through fictional elements; the immersion’s and creation’s relation with the inhabited environments, providing spaces of strong nature contact; and in the possibility of self-investigation, favored by the displacement of daily habits, in the sense that each work’s version was created from an immersive residency in non-natural environments for the actresses. In relation to the reception process, we identified its ethical dimension especially in the scenes’ characteristic of a single actress interacting with a single spectator (one-on-one scene), each time. This condition foments the collective construction of a dramaturgy of the encounter, and almost characterizes an acting process shared by actress and spectator.



Figure 2 - “Unnamable”, by Companhia Dois Tempos. Actress: Helena Moranda and Luísa Duprat (Tuti). Brasília – DF, 2015. Photograph: Nathália Azoubel.

The creation process of each *persona~gem*⁷ begins with the construction of individual collections, characterized by the reunion of what forms the actress’ mythical field in a personal and transpersonal way. That is, the memories located in their lives’ histories, the local and universal cultural references and the imaginary flux expanded from these memories, triggered during the livings that happen in immersion periods of three days each.

We worked from three driving-ideas: memories, living and experience built and weaved on creation and reflection fluxes. They relate respectively to the actress’ mythical, poetical and ethical fields. These driving-ideas behave in a non-stagnant way, by the friction, interaction and resizing of the actress’ creative process, and in the audience’s reception process. Each of the three mentioned fields for each subject are mobilized in time, space and in the encounter. Tripods conceded in agency, ideas that mix among themselves, in the sense of what is accessed together.

Memory	Mythical	Time
Living	Poetical	Space
Experience	Ethical	Encounter

Thus, we enter in a territory of affections, experience, creation and composition of consciousness, of personal mythologies’ rescue, of dramaturgy creation’s imaginary field, of interiority’s search, amplifying states of consciousness, presentification and accesses to friction between reality and fiction⁸.

The work has had four versions until the present moment, with twel-

⁷ The use of the tilde symbol (~) aims to emphasize the fluidity between the articulated aspects, since it sounds less stiff and sectary than the hyphen or the slash. The symbol refers to the Möbius Strip’s image and all the ambivalence and reciprocity that it represents. Every time the symbol is used between two terms, we will be referring to this perspective.

⁸ Excerpt from the article *O Trabalho do Ator dos Afetos à Criação* (The Actor’s Work from Affects to Creation), developed in the context of a Scientific Initiation program.

ve actresses⁹ participating in each. This number's choice refers to its cycle and completeness' symbology: the twelve months of the year, the twelve Knights of the Round Table, Jesus and the Twelve Apostles, the day's division in two periods of twelve hours, the twelve Zodiac Signs. The performances have taken place only during the night period, on full moons. Created through immersion processes, each of the work's versions, with its different group of actresses, took place in farms and parks in the Federal District of Brazil. Every choice was planned to function as a mobilizer to the participants' affects in the process.



Figure 3 - “Unnamable”, by Companhia Dois Tempos. Actress in the work's creation process. Brasília – DF, 2015. Photograph: Nathália Azoubel.

Throughout the research, we noticed that the proposal of a one-on-one scene, by its intimacy instauration and the confessional tone, configures an affection enhancer device – in Spinoza's perspective, and an encounter, in Bourriaud's and Dubatti's perspective. We will focus on these ideas along the text. In order to think about potentialities and ethical repercussions triggered by this scenic device, we will suggest the notion of the actress' “touchability” and extend the concept of “emancipated spectator”, by Rancière (2012). In this proposal, listening and speaking are attributes of actress and spectator, and it depends on the disposition of both,

⁹ Considering the versions of the work produced until this moment, the following artists have participated: Alice Terra, Ana Carolina Matias, Ana Quintas, Bruna Martini, Brendo Sousa, Cristhian Cantarino, Diana Poranga, Diego Bresani, Elisa Carneiro, Emanuel Lavor, Helena Miranda, Gregório Benevides, Kamala Ramers, Kim Leão, João Victor Rocha, João Quinto, Luciana Matias, Luísa Bianchetti, Luísa Duprat (Tuti), Luísa L'Abbate, Leonardo Rodrigues, Nine Ribeiro, Maria Eduarda Esteves, Maria Garcia, Matheus Dias, Pedro Mazzepas, Roustang Carrilho, Victória Carballar, Wily Oliveira, Yuri Fidelis; in different versions, since in each season only twelve artists performed.

in a literal way –, as human's listening and verbalizing aptitudes, and in a figurative way -, as porosity and speech or sense production.

Encounter: an affective body-to-body

Spinoza (2014, p. 98) understands that affects are the affections of the body through which its power of acting is increased or decreased. The affections would be the processuality of affect and would reflect on a body's potency, mobilizing it or demobilizing it. The author approaches the unity between body and mind, or soul, as an affective totality. For the philosopher, both act as a multiplicity that composes a whole.

According to Monteiro (p. 143), through the notion of *conatus*, Spinoza identifies the essence and potency of existing, acting and thinking; defining also the potency of modes as a certain power of affecting and being affected. While the essence remains the same, the potency varies negatively or positively, because it is modulated by the affections suffered by the body in the encounter with other bodies and by the consciousness of these affections in the mind, which means, by the ideas that it produces. Then, the affect would be, simultaneously, affection and idea of this affection.

The definition of *conatus*, by Spinoza, is characterized by an affect-action unity. Ferracini (2013, p.119), in his book *Ensaio de Atuação* (Acting Essays), brings the definition of Hardt, who translates *conatus* as being an effort, what gives us a notion of production, experimentation, execution endeavor and commitment in the practices. For the author (Id. Ibid, p.119), *conatus* is the essence of the being as the being is productive. It is the motor that animates the being as the world. In this sense, *conatus*, is the continuation, in Spinoza, of the naturalism's renaissance legacy: the being is spontaneity, pure activity. On the other hand, however, *conatus* is also for the mind and body's passion. This rich synthesis of spontaneity and affectivity marks the continuity between the power's ontological principle and *conatus*.

Thus, the experience occurs through the action itself. Through the infinite potency that manifests in the body which goes towards the encounter. Spinoza considers the body an unlimited harmony of divine expression, that means, a body that carries potencies of the unlimited, that is in constant movement, balancing its action between the finite and the infinite. This body carries the potency's ethics, only known through the experience and the relations. This ethical body is an active body, because it is present; a connective body, in relation to the world. Only the connective body is able to create and open itself to encounters, and create an experience for it and for other bodies. According to Spinoza (1997),

The idea of every mode, in which the human body is affected by external bodies, must involve the nature of the human body, and also the nature of the external body. Proof-
-All the modes, in which any given body is affected, follow from the nature of the body affected, and also from the nature of the affecting body, wherefore their idea is also necessarily involves the nature of both bodies; therefore, the idea of every mode, in which the human body is affected by external bodies, involves the nature of the human body and of the external body. (Ethics II, prop. XVI).

Encounters produce affections. The experiences and crossings proposed in “Unnamable“ have proved to be a favorable condition to the appearance of the encounter, as an affects' zone.

The one-on-one structure in this work not only allows the spectator's observation and contemplation of the scene, but also puts her in the scene. Thus, we see the spectator as an interlocutor in this experience, once the process is much more associated to a form of dialogue and interaction than to observation, to viewing without participating of it. We use the term spectator because it is already consolidated, but it is worth pointing that, in this context, we consider that being a spectator goes much beyond the observation process only.



Figure 4 - “Unnamable”, by Companhia Dois Tempos. Actress: Elisa Carneiro and Victória Carballar. Brasília – DF, 2015. Photograph: Nathália Azoubel.

About such interaction aspects between spectator and actress, I bring the experience lived by one spectator, Felipe Rezende:

I believe this one-on-one structure demands a lot, from both sides; firstly, for the group, once the actor must work with improvisation. In a certain way, he/she conducts the dialects. In addition, the spectator, because one does not know the bases on which the narrative happens. It is a delicious game of knowing how to coordinate spoken word and corporality in face of nothingness, and when it works, it is precious. In this kind of scene organization, the spectator’s emancipation releases the actor’s untouchability. In consequence, the actor needs to reinvent himself/herself to sustain the scene. The spectator gets an actor patent because he/she goes from the simple position of a passive voyeur to a participative potency. In terms of aesthetics, it is democratic, and in terms of politics even more. In a more profound approach, this is still powerful once it questions the simulacrum’s potency of the spectacle and its truth regime. In this context, the spectator can create as much as the actor creates and, more or less, damage the plot prepared by the latter. It makes me remember, for example, when one of the characters asked me if I was not afraid. That is the space where the actor loses the scene’s dominance, and transfers the inventiveness, a very ethos, to the spectator¹⁰.

The four versions/seasons of “Unnamable”, with the variations of actresses, *persona~gens* and circuits, have made us understand that what remains in the processes are the encounters, the conviviality and the interaction relationship, and the proximity between spectators and actresses. That is what singles out the work. Amid everything that have transformed, the encounter remains as the main device for the theatrical event.

Nicolas Bourriaud (2009, p. 27) discusses the aesthetics’ notions of contacting the other, of the dialogues’ and potentialities’ essence which

¹⁰ Testimonial sent by spectator Felipe Rezende, shared by e-mail in August 2016.

emerge from being together (conviviality), of human interactions and lived spaces. For Bourriaud, art has been promoting more and more conviviality and human interaction. Art is a state of encounter.

We also establish a dialogue with Jorge Dubatti, who studies the notion of coexistence, articulated with *poiesis* and the “spectatorship” processes, as structures of the theatrical phenomena. For Dubatti (2016, p. 33), in the theatrical “between”, the coexisting multiplication of artist and spectator creates a subjective field that does not set the dominance of the first, but rather an equal state of mutual benefit on a third one. This is formed in – and during – the experience’s zone.

Dubatti (2016, p. 31) considers that three sub-events constitute the theatrical event coexistence, *poiesis* and spectatorship. The author circumscribes these notions in the following ways:

Coexistence or coexisting event is the reunion, bodily present, with no technological intermediation, of artists, technicians and spectators in a quotidian (a room, the street, a bar, a house etc.), *chronotopic* (space-time coordinate) territorial intersection, in the present time. Coexistence, a living culture manifestation, distinguish theater from cinema, television and radio, once it demands the auratic presence of people (Id. Ibid, p. 31-32)

Poiesis is the new being that produces and inhabits the event through body action. The poetical being constitutes a possible zone of theatricality that is present not only in it, which defines theater as such (and differs it from non-poetical theatricalities), as it symbolizes an ontological gain. It configures both an event as a between *others* in relation to daily life. [...] An ephemeral nature characterizes the theatrical *poiesis* [...] Its primary function is not communication, but an ontological instauration: making an event and an object exist in the world (Id. Ibid, p. 35)

Theater is a place to live, according to coexistence and living’s culture concept, and *poiesis* is not only seen or observed, but also lived. Spectator-

ship, thus, must be considered as a synonym of co-living, perceiving and letting be affected, in all spheres of human capacities, through the poetical being in coexistence with the others (artists, technicians, spectators) (Id. *Ibid.*, p. 37)

In “Unnamable”, the theatrical event is built by the encounter, the relationship that is established in that moment when the actress and spectator occupy the same space~time, a place of sharing, creation and updating. The notions of encounter and event, both very important to Dubatti, refer to the concept of affect, which, as we have seen, Spinoza articulates to the body’s potencies of affecting and being affected.



Figure 5 - “Unnamable”, by Companhia Dois Tempos. Actress: Jordana Mascarenhas and João Quinto. Brasília – DF, 2015. Photograph: Nathália

Back to the work’s bases, recalled and mentioned in the first section of the article – memory, living and experience, weaved in the poetical, ethical and mythical fields of the actresses and the spectators, - we comprehended memory as a negotiation between the lived and the imaginary, which comes from the actress and spectator’s own stories. Both have their own cultural, quotidian and personal mythologies. In the work, the mythical field is accessed through a space of livings. In this case, the living is a poetical construct, a built space~time that aims to be an experience encourager. The experience, to recall, is something that happens when the body is ethical, touchable, that means, a spontaneous and active body, in-

creased in its potency of being and acting, affective and connective body. If a body is not porous and is not open for the proposed experience, it will be less affected, in the creation and in the fruition (or co-creation). Thus, we consider experience as something that crosses the ethical body – a body that is opened in the livings.

In order to this experience happen, it is necessary that the actress refuse what Ferracini (2013, p. 16) calls the “territory of quotidian docile body”. According to the author, it is the body’s and the subjectile-body’s art that is characterized by movement in a spiral flux of physical action differentiation. This subjectile-body produces those “physical actions” which are nothing but complex and precise territories (always in deterritorialization). Its production flux is comprehended as creating and affecting – at the same time – the very territory that it produces (Id. Ibid, p.16). However, it requires preparation and the search of this synthesis proposed by Spinoza’s *conatus*: letting yourself be affected and affect: composition (Id. Ibid., p.120).

For Eleonora Fabião (2010, p. 322), the scenic body is carefully aware of itself, of the other and the environment. It is the body of opened and connective sensoriality. The attention allows the entering and exploration of macro and micro, two greatness that usually scape in daily life. This ethical, poetical and psychophysical operation, deconstructs habits. Paying attention to the pressure and weight of the clothes while wearing them, to the other side, to the shadows and reflections, to the taste of the tongue and the smell in the air [...] Attention is a way of sensorial and perceptive connection, a psychophysical expansion path, without dispersion, a type of knowledge.

The spectator must also be ethical, that means, be open to the scenic experience. Otherwise, the scene will not happen in its encounter’s potentiality and affects’ zone. Elisa Carneiro, one of the actresses in “Unnamable”, speaks about the experience with the audience. For her,

The scene loses its brightness if someone arrives completely closed or analytical. Sometimes, people open so much to us that they seem to forget that we are people too. They forget that we will change clothes in a while, remove the makeup, have a cigaret-

te, sit down and chat. Each person is an enormous universe. What is this place where the audience feels so comfortable that they forget all judgments, taboos, and talk about everything, opening themselves so much to a character? This is so beautiful. We can only achieve that through a structure similar to this one. In the scene, there is only you and the person, nobody else, and the spectator knows there is nobody else. This is a protected structure. It is very special what happens in that singular moment, in that space. The actor must be able to deal with that persons' universe in that moment. Even when the experience is so-called bad, it is special, because it is unique. This is theater. Theater is relationship. Theater is audience (verbal information¹¹).

The experience is a human condition and crosses the creation and sharing process. Jorge Larrosa (2011), in his text *Experiência e alteridade em educação* (Experience and Alterity in Education), approaches experience not as something that happens, but as something that happens to us. Experience is something that happens to the subject as a being, and sometimes changes oneself, changes the very surrounding space~time, as Ferracini comments (2013, p. 124): The affect's time is also the affecting time. The experience, thus, does not produce automatic mechanical action, but livings that scape from the daily world of opinions and "doxas". Experience folds the common life flux and, with affect, produces a nodule, a conglomerate, a potent deviation of life that maintains the potency of life as a whole.

According to Renato Cohen (1998, p. 103), the breaking of the "forth wall" and the rupture with stage-audience aesthetics take the scene to an exacerbation of theatricalization's potencies. The author adds that, the scene's physicalization (tunnel, bathroom, woods), the search of concrete and non-symbolic signs (according to Peirce's theory), almost as in a "hyper naturalist" theatricalization, many times amplified by real, risky situations, place the spectator and the actress in a mythical, ritualistic confrontation with the work, disposing the mere aesthetical observation and distancing safeness.

For him, this reterritorialization, the theater of environment, juxtaposing "pieces of reality" with sign metaphors, chases other transpositions (in a fight with the representation paradox) and purposes other art/life proximities.

¹¹ Testimonial from actress Elisa Carneiro, on 16th July 2016.

In “Unnamable”, we have identified more than a mere refuse of the distanced relationship between stage and audience, but yet the existence of an invitation for the spectator to not only observe and inhabit, but also to act and produce sense and affects in the poetical space, engaged in a concrete, imaginary and mythical relationship.

Persona~gem: actresses in process of self-fiction

In the beginning of each immersion, the actresses are motivated to answer some questions. These instigations aim to make them access memories, subjective and mythical aspects. Then, the actresses are encouraged to choose a spot in the space, where each performative scene will be created and shared. The self-fiction process is built through the encounter of the actress with herself, in her mnemonic and imaginary fluxes, revisited and updated in creative flux.

According to Ferracini (2013, p.121), memory is duration. It virtualizes the past in a present which always passes by. However, the virtual past is not translated by accumulated files in the form of concrete remembrances, but rather precipitates into a virtualized duration that in-bodies itself, regardless our will, and create a kind of ontological memory or yet a memory of bodily duration.

The ethical body accesses the mnemonic field when it tangencies “real” memories and refers to a sort of “invented memories” zone, referring to Brazilian poet Manuel de Barros. According to Eleonora Fabião (2010, p. 323), memory, imagination and present time are intertwining that the body investigates. For the author, the body uninterruptedly investigates mnemonic, imaginary and perspective references. What the body explores, beyond the naïve dichotomy that opposes fiction and reality, is the indissociable among these three forces. As the scenic body experiments, imagining implies memory and both movements take place in the phenomenological present time of the scenic fact. Besides that, actor is a creature capable of making insolate psychophysical operations, such as, for example, transforming memory into present time, imagination into

present time, present time into memory. His high vibration and fluidity allow these psychophysical operations. His psychophysical intelligence opens dimensions beyond the fiction x reality dichotomy.

Due to the indiscernibility between real and fictional that the process ignites, we adopt the terminology *persona~gem*¹² in this study, so to embrace the creation of each actress in this context. Besides bringing in its term's compound the most (re)known notion, in theater, of the fictional construction which acts in the scene, each term, individually, opens interesting doors to reflect this composition specifically.



Figure 6 - “Unnamable”, by Companhia Dois Tempos. Actress: Helena Miranda. Brasília – DF, 2018. Photograph: Humberto Araújo.

The Latin origin's notion of *persona* refers to the mask, a theatrical device created to amplify and give voice to. From this premise, Suely Rolnik (2016, p. 31) reflects on the mask as an affects' conductor. She states that intensities by themselves do not exist: they are always executed through masks – composed, in composition or in decomposition. Similarly, there are no masks, which are not immediately intensities' operators. For the author, the idea of simulation implied here does not refer necessarily to falseness, pretending or unreality, if the mask works as an affect's conductor, it gains the thickness or real, it is alive. If it stops being this conductor

¹²Translator's Note: In Portuguese language, the word for character is *personagem*. As we can see, it has the word *persona* in its construction. According to Cambridge Dictionary, *persona* means “the particular type of character that a person seems to have and that is often different from their real or private character”. Thus, the authors propose a double meaning, dividing the word *personagem* with a tilde symbol (~), in order to emphasize the fluidity between the actress and the *persona* created (*persona~gem*).

(of affects) it becomes unreal, senseless, fake. In addition, the author says that behind the mask there is no face, a supposedly authentic, true, originating face, that would be hidden by trauma or repression (psychologizing version), by ideology or false consciousness (socializing version) or by ignorance (Id. *Ibid.*, p. 32).



Figure 7 - “Unnamable”, by Companhia Dois Tempos. Actress: Jordana Mascarenhas. Brasília – DF, 2017. Photograph: Diego Bresani.

In Suely Rolnik’s perspective, the mask allows us to experiment ways of being, avoiding us of crystalizing in a single persona that many times cannot handle anymore what we are and move affectively. From the perspective of Jung’s psychology, persona consists in a psychic instance responsible for putting ourselves in relation to the alterity, each persona working as a sort of social mask, which we deal with different world’s facets, and that hide some of the most intimate aspects of us, as well.

For our study, we embrace Rolnik’s perspective, persona as a mask that allows the passage of affects. The term “gem” (in Portuguese, from *personagem*) might refer to gem as a precious stone, still in the rough, what seems a potent metaphor to think about the aspects of singularity and latency worked by the artists, something that, besides very personal and subjective, is valuable, special, unique. The lapidating of these gems would relate precisely with the process of composition, with *poiesis* properly, the poetical being for whom the mask will give voice.

Thus, each *persona~gem* is arranged as a self-fiction, a mask built in a performative context, in which something very precious is shared with a single person each time. “Gem” also constitutes the word *gêmeos* (“twins” in Portuguese). We might think that this one-on-one relationship, established between actress and spectator, with no testimonies, in an intimate space, could be metaphorically associated with the living of twins in the womb, if we consider the womb (inhabited) as a space~time of singular creation, which prepares the birth of something original and unique. In the case of the experience hereby discussed, consisting in a dramaturgy that will never be repeated again.



Figure 9 - “Unnamable”, by Companhia Dois Tempos. Actress: Victória Carballar. Brasília – DF, 2017. Photograph: Diego Bresani.



Figure 8 - “Unnamable”, by Companhia Dois Tempos. Actor: João Quinto. Brasília – DF, 2017. Photograph: Diego Bresani.

According to Fayga Ostrower (1987), the creation processes occur in the intuition field, and can be expressed as they get a form. From what the author affirms, it can be understood that the creation starts from a process of letting yourself be affected by an intuitive~instinctive perception and by a truth's presentiment, which, from the contact with the actress' own experience, will carry out to the process of composition. Thus, the actresses many times create *persona-gens* (characters) before the existence of scenes or programs. In the work's versions already created, it has arisen: the past, the man who never got sleep, the astronaut, the placenta, the coyote, the silence, the "caboclinha¹³", the key, the faun, the blind woman, the butterfly, the chairs, the king, the witch, the boy who dances with machines, the warrior, the death, lilith, the bathroom, the faceless, the telephone etc.

After creating the *persona-gens* and their scenes' programs, it is possible to start thinking how will be the sewing of the whole, what will be the connecting points of the stories, the plots, the self-fictions, the processes. In this moment, we get to the dramaturgical weaving of the work, characterized by this patchwork of many stories created from these first encounters and affects.

Encounter~scenes: from "touchability" to emancipation

To think the level of potential intervening offered to the spectators by the encounter-scene device, we refer to the concept of emancipated spectator, from Jacques Rancière. The author strongly reinforces that the scenic condition that facilitates the emancipation does not have necessarily a relation with inviting the spectator to interact, but yet with an openness, in the attribution of senses' dimension, as in reception's affective engagement level, for example. Rancière (2009, p. 13) affirms that:

Emancipation begins when we challenge the opposition between viewing and acting; when we understand that the self-evident facts that structure the relations between saying, seeing and doing themselves belong to the structure of domination and subjection. It begins when we understand that viewing is also an action that confirms or transforms this distribution of positions. The spectator also acts, like the pupil or scholar. She observes, selects, compares, interprets. She links what she sees to a host of other things that she has seen on other stages, in other kinds of place. She composes her own

¹³ Translator's Note: The word "caboclo(a)" in Portuguese represents the mix of an indigenous with a white person. In this case, the word is in the diminutive form.

poem with the elements of the poem before her. She participates in the performance by refashioning it in her own way – by drawing back, for example, from the vital energy that it is supposed to transmit in order to make it a pure image and associate this image with a story which she has read or dreamt, experienced or invented.

In the work hereby discussed, the openness is even more radical in the sense that it makes each spectator co-responsible for the encounter's instauration or non-instauration – comprehending it from its dimension of affections' zone – and the nature of this encounter. As it happens, an ethical question is posed for every person involved in each one of these encounter-scenes' experience, in their original and irreproducible configurations. Every emancipation brings responsibilities. Every freedom implies choices. Every choice reflects an ethic.

In his study, Rancière (2009, p. 8-9) refers to the pedagogical dimension of emancipation, bringing the reflections of Joseph Jacotot:

The role assigned to the schoolmaster in that relationship is to abolish the distance between his knowledge and the ignorance of the ignoramus. His lessons and the exercises he sets aim gradually to reduce the gulf separating them. Unfortunately, he can only reduce the distance on condition that he constantly re-creates it. To replace ignorance by knowledge, he must always be one step ahead, install a new form of ignorance between the pupil and himself. The reason is simple. In pedagogical logic, the ignoramus is not simply one who does not as yet know what the schoolmaster knows. She is the one who does not know what she does not know or how to know it. For this part, the schoolmaster is not only the one who possesses the knowledge unknown by the ignoramus. He is also the one who knows how to make it an object of knowledge [...] For in truth, there is no ignoramus who does not already know a mass of things, who has no learnt them by herself, by listening and looking around her, by observation and repetition [...] The ignoramus advances by comparing what she discovers with what she already knows.

Regarding to this logic, Rancière brings Jacotot's perspective on what is "stultification", which happens when the schoolmaster puts himself as the possessor and transmitter of all knowledge, considering the content's receptor as a *tabula rasa* that will only receive from the schoolmaster what is passed by him and will have to prove what has been absorbed after. This method leads to stultification, creates stultified knowledge and does not intellectually emancipate the receptor. For Jacotot, every human being have a knowledge that is inherent to his or her own livings. They have their own cultural and intellectual collection. On these aspects, we have also established a dialogue with Paulo Freire, when he brings up discussions about the Pedagogy of Freedom. According to Freire (2000, p.1),

To teach is not to transfer knowledge but to create the possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge. If, during the time of my education, which in any case should be ongoing, I begin believing that my teacher is the “subject” in relation to whom I consider myself to be the “object” (if, in other words, he/ she is the subject who forms me, and I, the object shaped by him or her), then I put myself in the passive role of one who receives quantities of accumulated knowledge, transferred to me by a “subject” who “knows.” Living and understanding my educational process in this way, I, as “object,” will become in my turn a false subject, responsible for the reproduction of further objects. It is essential therefore, from the very beginning of the process, that the following principle be clear: namely, that although the teachers or the students are not the same, the person in charge of education is being formed or re-formed as he/she teaches, and the person who is being taught forms him/herself in this process. In this sense teaching is not about transferring knowledge or contents. Nor is it an act whereby a creator subject gives shape, style, or soul to an indecisive and complacent body.

Thereby, the equality between different knowledge is not a goal to be achieved, but yet a means to learn. This equality favors intellectual emancipation. The “ignorant schoolmaster” is an apprenticeship mediator, the facilitator between sharing and the multiplication of each subject’s inherent knowledge. Still referring to Jacotot’s perspective, Rancière (2009, p. 10) reminds that, in his emancipating practice, what the ignorant schoolmaster ignores is the “stultifying distance”, and adds:

To this practice of stultification he counter-posed intellectual emancipation. Intellectual emancipation is the verification of the equality of intelligence. This does not signify the equal value of all manifestations of intelligence, but the self-equality of intelligence in all its manifestations. There are not two sorts of intelligence separated by a gulf.

From this observations, Rancière (2009, p.13-14) returns to the discussion that relates more directly to theater:

The playwright or director would like the spectators to see this and feel that understand some particular thing and draw some particular conclusion. This is the logic of the stultifying pedagogue, the logic of straight, uniform transmission: there is something – a form of knowledge, a capacity, an energy in a body or a mind – on one side, and it must pass to the other side [...] What the spectator *must see* is what the director *makes her see*. What she must feel is the energy he communicates to her. To this identity of cause and effect, which is at the heart of stultifying logic, emancipation counter-poses their dissociation. This is the meaning of the ignorant schoolmaster: from the schoolmaster the pupil learns something that the schoolmaster does not know himself. She learns it as an effect of the mastery that forces her to search and verifies this research. But she does not learn the schoolmaster’s knowledge.

We realize that this process of emancipating the spectator requires from the actress a process of “touchability”. The “touchable actress”, as we see, would be the actress who is available to the crossings that come from this relationship. As authors Fernanda Eugénio and João Fiadeiro suggest

(2012, p.4), from the fittingness that is situated between “compossible”, “co-inciding” possibilities. Touchability in the ethical sense, of being receptive and open to the event.

In the case of the work “Unnamable”, we propose that the spectator feels invited to fall directly upon the dramaturgical creation, giving new outlines to the dramaturgy being weaved. Thus, the work’s structure takes the spectator to a potential process of acting with the actress. It is potential once the spectator needs to want and engage herself in order to the acting together may happen. In the posed game, the actress may seem to have certain advantage over the spectator in the scene, due to what has been previously programmed. However, if we analyze it through Freire’s and Jacotot’s pedagogical logic, there is in the spectator the advantage and potency of not knowing. Thus, it is set a game in which the actress must put herself as an ignorant schoolmaster.



Figure 10 - “Unnamable”, by Companhia Dois Tempos. Actress: Diana Poranga. Brasília – DF, 2017. Photograph: Diego Bresani.

If the actress puts herself in the position of the one who possesses the entire scene’s knowledge and does not open to touchability, this will interfere on the experience’s process of fruition/co-creation proposed in this work. On the other hand, by putting herself in an emancipating place, in the sense of wanting to create or cause the spectator’s emancipation, instead of creating possibilities for this process to happen, she might just create

the non-emancipation – by not putting herself as the mediator actress of this encounter's relationship, but as a transmitter of something.

We cannot think about the spectator's emancipation as something to be applied, because it is not about simply putting the spectator in interactive activity inside the scene. What is being discussed, besides the relation of activity/passivity, is the place of the invisible, the between, the encounter, the affection, the performativity and the "actress' touchability", since those gaps and hiatus of sense created during this process of (almost) acting together, in certain moments, propose or put the spectator in a place of more critical/affective activity.

For Dubatti (2016, p. 33), in the theatrical "between", the coexisting multiplication of the artist and the spectator creates a subjective field that does not set a dominance of the first or the second, but yet an equal state of common benefit on a third one. The latter is constituted in – and during – the experience's zone.

According to him (Id. Ibid, p. 35) there are theatrical poetics in which the *spectatorial* work assumes completely the conscious exercise of ontological distance: the fourth wall of Italian stage; the metatheater of Brecht's distancing; the classical ballet. However, there are other theatrical poetics in which the viewing event might get partially or completely dissolved, might be provisionally interrupted and restarted or, yet, combine to acting tasks or to techniques inside the specific game of each theater poetic. Nevertheless, in order to make all these variations possible at some point, it must be established the spectatorial space from the consciousness of ontological distance. Centuries of activity and spectatorial competence in the acknowledging of *poiesis* allow setting this event space with very few elements. The spectator might run away from his or her space and be taken by the coexistence regime or by *poiésis*.

João Fiadeiro and Fernanda Eugênio (2013, p. 68) approach similar matters in an excerpt from the performance-conference *Secalharidade*, bringing a perspective on the encounter created from these relations: It

can only be done if we revoke the protective shields from the subject or the object and let go the pre-defined outlines of the I and the other. It can only be done if we do not immediately move with the vertigo of *unveiling* or with the spontaneity's tyranny, finding time inside the own time of things. A time that is already there, between stimulus and answer, but that is wasted on the veracity with what we give in to fear and fall again into habit, in the ready-made answers or in any impulsive reaction, just to satiate the despair of not knowing. It can only be done if we give up the protagonism, transferring it to this precarious place, which is set in the middle of the way, in the crossing of common inclinations: the event.

For an Ethics of Looking (after)

In the work, actress and spectator share the poetical space. Both throw themselves together into the same game and the creation of dramaturgies, only differentiating by the fact that the actress starts from a *persona~gem* previously lapidated, while the spectator elects on the way, in real time, the personas and singular preciousities with which she will fall upon the encounter.

We bring the concept of the dramaturgy of conviviality, approached by Jorge Dubatti (2014, p. 253) as a dramaturgy of the actor in coexistence: those dramaturgies which, by the actors' freedom to interact with the spectator or by the imposition of conviviality upon the scene's material, would produce a particular case. Let us say the actor is no longer a simple technology of the director and is transformed in a creator of co-lived knowledge, who implies dramaturgy production. In this sense, I think the dramaturgy of conviviality is lived all the time, including in the works where the actor is determined to fulfill a protocol of text representation or follow the instructions of a director, because conviviality produces modifications. If someone measures the duration of a work in each section, he or she will see that it is never the same.

On the other hand, there are changes in the dramaturgy order not only by the conviviality dynamics, but also by the dynamics of producing

poiesis as well – the productive *poiesis*, according to the Philosophy of Theater’s terminology. In this sense, two types of conviviality dramaturgies must be distinguished: one that is natural in the conviviality event and will always happen, even if the actor works with the fourth wall and is isolated from the world, this dramaturgy will be functioning. Another type are very particular cases of different poetics that work with what we may call a “dramaturgy of the actor in conviviality”, in which the actor interacts permanently or seizes the stimulus.

The dramaturgy of the actress in conviviality is built through these between-spaces, through the relationship between actress and spectator. The spectator gets in touch with the *persona~gem* and composes the scene with her, differing by not having a pre-established construction, though. Each spectator participates of three of four encounter-scenes, which constitute one of the work’s circuit. In each one of these scenes, she participates in the construction and updating of a different dramaturgy.

Dubatti attributes to productive *poiesis*, which concerns to the actress, an individual and irreplaceable character, and to spectatorial *poiesis*, a transindividual and transitory dimension. For the author (2014, p.48), there is a productive *poiesis*, that corresponds to the artists’ action, indispensable in its micropoetic individuality, and a spectatorial or receptive *poiesis*, not linked only to semiotics processes. The multiplication of both into a third one that impedes differentiating them is the conviviality *poiesis*, in the space of the reunion’s event. Unlike the productive *poiesis*, the receptive is not individual, but transindividual: the spectator is indispensable in his or her generic role, but not as an individual; the individual (actor) cannot fail the commitment established with each spectacle; the spectators, on the contrary, “replace” themselves, they circulate. For a *poiesis*, “this” particular actor is expected; the audience, nevertheless, is constituted by “any” spectator, each one of them will give his or her contribution, but from the indispensable productive *poiesis*.

In the experience discussed in this text, even though the scenic event might happen to *any* spectator, we also know that the level of singularity

and differentiation that each spectator might print on the encounter with the actress who crosses her way will make each scene's updating original and unrepeatable.

From the context of each encounter-scene between actress and spectator, where both are in the position of looking and being looked, we refer to the polysemy of the verb look, which brings the meanings of seeing, watching, and also the meaning of assisting, when *we look after*. Looking after in the sense of being responsible for, among other acceptions that could enrich this perspective, but will not be discussed now. This double notion of looking displaces the spectator who has come to look – as just observe – to a looking-after spectator, that one who effectively assist¹⁴ the scene.

To conclude, it matters saying that in the experience of creating the work “Unnamable”, both spectators and actresses are required to engage in the field of assisting in favor of the scenic event, with the disposition of looking (after) and supporting each other, operating towards the construction of an affective-scenic zone to be lived and witnessed by both. Here, to look means throwing yourself in the abyss of an encounter.

¹⁴ Translator's Note: In Portuguese, this word construction is clearer since the verb “assistir” can have different meanings, and in this case, could refer to “see” and “assist” at the same time, hereby translated as look/look after.

References

BONDÍA, Jorge Larrosa. Experiência e Alteridade em Educação. *Revista Reflexão e Ação*, Santa Cruz do Sul, v. 19, n.2, p. 04-27, junho./dez.2011.

BORRIAUD, Nicolas. *Estética Relacional*. São Paulo: Martins, 2009.

DUBATTI, Jorge. *O Teatro dos Mortos*, São Paulo: Edições Sesc São Paulo, 2016.

DUBATTI, Jorge. Teatro como acontecimento convival: uma entrevista com Jorge Dubatti. nas dependências Centro Cultural de la Cooperación, Buenos Aires, Argentina, fev. 2014. *Urdimento*. v.2, n.23, p 251-261, dezembro 2014. Entrevista cedida a Entrevista concedida à Luciana Eastwood Romagnolli e Mariana de Lima Muniz.

COHEN, Renato, *Work in Progress na Cena Contemporânea*, São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1998.

FABIÃO, Eleonora. Corpo Cênico, Estado Cênico. *Revista Contrapontos*, v.10, n.3, p. 321 – 326, set/dez 2010.

FABIÃO, Eleonora. Performance e Teatro: poéticas e políticas da cena contemporânea. *Sala Preta*, v.8, p. 1- 19, 2008.

FERRACINI, Renato, *Ensaio de Atuação*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2013.

FIADEIRO, João e EUGÊNIO, Fernanda. Secalharidade como Ética e como modo de Vida: O Projeto AND_Lab' e a Investigação das Práticas de Encontro e de Manuseamento Coletivo do Viver Juntos. *Urdimento*, Excerto da Conferência-Performance Secalharidade. p.61- 69, novembro de 2012.

FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogia da Autonomia: Saberes Necessários à Prática Educativa*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

PAULO FREIRE: <http://abahlali.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Paulo-Freire-Pedagogy-of-Freedom-Ethics-Democracy-and-Civic-Courage-2000.pdf>

MONTEIRO, Adriana Belmonte. Nietzsche e Espinosa: fundamentos para uma terapêutica dos afeto. *Cadernos Espinosanos XXIV*. p. 141-165.

OLIVEIRA, Jordana Mascarenhas. **O Trabalho do Ator dos Afetos à Criação**. Escrito em contexto de pesquisa de iniciação científica na UnB, sob orientação da Professora Doutora Alice Stefânia Curi. 2016.

OLIVEIRA, Jordana Mascarenhas. **Corpoético – por uma Ética da Cena Construída em Afetos**. 2019. 54f. Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso (Graduação). Departamento de Artes Cênicas da Universidade de Brasília – UnB, Brasília, 2019.

OSTROWER, Fayga. **Criatividade e Processos de Criação**. Petrópolis, Vozes, 1987.

RANCIÈRE, Jacques. **O Espectador Emancipado**. São Paulo: Editora WMF Martins Fontes, 2012.

RANCIERE: London, New York: Verso. 2009. 134 p. ISBN-10: 184467343X; ISBN-13: 978-1844673438. Translated by Gregory Elliott.

ROLNIK, Suely. **Cartografia sentimental**. Transformações contemporâneas do desejo. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 1989.

SARTRE, Jean-Paul. **O Ser e o Nada**. 12ª ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1997.

SPINOZA, Benedictus de. **Ética**. 2ª Ed. Belo Horizonte: Autentica, 2014.

SPINOZA: <http://www.dominiopublico.gov.br/download/texto/gu000920.pdf>