



Intentional Artificiality: a principle to reposition the body

Rossana Della Costa¹

¹Universidade Federal de Santa Maria – UFSM, Santa Maria/RS, Brazil

ABSTRACT – Intentional Artificiality: a principle to reposition the body – The article develops a reflection on Edward Gordon Craig's principle of intentional artificiality in order to move the body in the teacher training. The Foucauldian notions of docile body, utopian body and heterotopia are put in operation in laterality with Craigian proposals of the *Über-marionnette* and the *Scene* Project, in order to think the puppet's artificial body in relation to the organic body of the Pedagogy undergraduates. It is concluded that there are two coexisting and conflicting ways that operate in the subjectivation processes, one related to the disciplinary order and another that sets the body on for creation.

Keywords: Intentional Artificiality. Edward Gordon Craig. Teacher Training. Theater of Animated Forms. Michel Foucault.

RÉSUMÉ – L'Artificialité Intentionnelle: un principe pour repositionner le corps – L'article développe un exercice de réflexion sur le principe de l'artificialité intentionnelle du travail d'Edward Gordon Craig afin de déplacer le corps dans la formation des enseignants. Les notions foucaultiennes de corps docile, de corps utopique et d'hétérotopie sont mises en œuvre en latéralité avec les propositions craiguiennes du *Über-marionnette* et du *Projet Scène* pour penser le corps artificiel de la marionnette par rapport au corps organique des étudiants en pédagogie. On en conclut qu'il existe deux manières coexistantes et contradictoires de fonctionner dans les processus de subjectivation, l'une liée à l'ordre disciplinaire et l'autre qui déclenche le corps pour la création.

Mots-clés: Artificialité Intentionnelle. Edward Gordon Craig. Formation d'Enseignants Théâtre de Formes Animées. Michel Foucault.

RESUMO – Artificialidade Intencional: um princípio para reposicionar o corpo – O artigo desenvolve um exercício de pensamento sobre o princípio da artificialidade intencional depreendido da obra de Edward Gordon Craig com o objetivo de fazer mover o corpo na formação docente. As noções foucaultianas de corpo dócil, corpo utópico e heterotopia são postas em operação em lateralidade com as propostas craiguianas da *Übermarionnette* e do *Projeto Scene*, com intuito de pensar o corpo artificial da marionete em relação ao corpo orgânico das estudantes de Pedagogia. Conclui-se que há duas vias coexistentes e conflitivas que operam nos processos de subjetivação, uma relacionada à ordem disciplinar e outra que aciona o corpo para a criação.

Palavras-chave: Artificialidade Intencional. Edward Gordon Craig. Formação Docente. Teatro de Formas Animadas. Michel Foucault.

From the Inert Body to the Movement

This paper elaborates a thought exercise that was part of the PhD study¹ intitled *O teatro de formas animadas na formação de professores: uma proposta pedagógica a partir da Über-marionnette*² and considers the principle of intentional artificiality, based on the work of the English stage-director from the early 20th century, Edward Gordon Craig, as an element to make the body to move. This exercise is developed in the context of the teacher training in Pedagogy undergraduate courses in the south of Brazil, in which the data that give substance to this study were produced.

The notion of intentional artificiality is assumed in this paper from the importance assigned to the marionette in Craig's work. This question is tied up with the fact that Craig, in order to develop his proposal of renewal of the theater in the early 20th century, draws on the concreteness of the most distinct material supports, besides theater itself, like mock-ups, marionettes, wooden figures, drawings and writings, among others. These supports are tools that Craig uses to set his thought on, being a creation procedure that considers the inert aspect of the matter in relation to the movement that has the power to animate it. The artificiality is actualized in the marionette-gesture, external to the organic body, and is constituted in the promoting force of movement. Thus, the ruse of displacing the inert matter instigates the body to move and to reposition itself. Aiming at that, Craig's theatrical laboratory establishes a two-way route from the control of the matter to the chaos of creation and vice versa, in an endless movement. Such procedure is opposite to the idea of representation and establishes a performing process, in which bodies impact other bodies. In this study, what interests us is the impact of the artificial body of the marionette in relation to the body of pedagogy students.

As an introduction, the effort made here consists of, first, presenting the possibility of an ethical-political laterality between Michel Foucault and Edward Gordon Craig; second, introducing the process from which the principle of intentional artificiality was inferred from the Craigian work; third, the operationalization of such principle in the context of teacher training; and fourth, observing the possible effects of this operationalization.

My starting point are two concerns that emerged in eight years of work (2008 to 2015) as a theater teacher, in a Pedagogy Degree course. The first one refers to the challenge of mobilizing the students' bodies for activities demanding movement or that would breach with the daily cadence of a traditional university classroom. By traditional I mean the mode in which the students are seated as the teacher explains the content. I call these bodies, almost adhered to the chairs, inert-body. This inert-body can be thought as an image of what makes it impossible the creation in result of a form of positioning the body. The second concern is related with the first one, as in the activities with theater of animated forms, it was perceivable that these bodies promoted in themselves an erecting of the back bone, adopting a posture that was more available to the creation. As a consequence, I perceived that the materiality of the marionette's body set on the students' inert-body, making them emerge from the inertia state.

I understand that, despite having been tried in the context of teacher training, the principle of intentional artificiality can be also thought within the scope of the performing arts training in the sense of promoting displacements and "[...] making strategies, mechanisms, devices from the arts, able to transform their participants" (Icle, 2012, p. 21). The focused attention that I direct to the relation of the inanimate body of the marionette with the bodies of the Pedagogy students helps to think the relation between education, corporeality and theater. This is so because the principle inferred from the Craigan work not only mobilizes the body in relation to the concreteness of the matter, which is the marionette or the object, but also implies in the setting on of the thought in this process.

When trying to elaborate on the principle of intentional artificiality from Craig, intending to bring it to the context of teacher training, I became involved in one of the most complex philosophical subjects on being in the world and the human processes of assigning meaning to it. This is so because it is an issue that runs through distinct theories on the subject/object relation (Piaget, Wallon, Vigotski, Simondon, Merleau-Ponty and Gumbrecht, among others); the relation between artificial/natural (Aristotle, Hobbes and Haraway, among others); conjectures on the body as a study object and the significant metamorphoses of thought on the topic from the modernity (Descartes, Maine de Biran, Kant, Husserl, Bergson, Nietzsche, Foucault, Deleuze,

Vigarello and Le Breton, among others); also permeating the field of psychoanalysis in relation to the wholesomeness and the “[...] development of the concept of corporeal image” (Amaral, 2007, p. 11).

Amongst these possibilities, I assume as inspiration the Foucauldian thought for considering fruitful the tools that this author offers to us to think in other ways and not assuming what is given as an unequivocal truth. In this text, I try to think the body in the Pedagogy teacher training in different ways from the principle of intentional artificiality. Considering that I am interested in thinking the repositioning of the body by means of the principle of intentional artificiality, I focus the arguments around the corporeality in Foucault and in what can be considered as the thought of the body (Sforzini, 2014). The notions of docile body, utopian body and heterotopia are here highlighted and in relation with the Craigan work.

The first notion, the docile body, is from the order of discipline. Foucault (1987) calls as discipline all the techniques that make the body docile and that are a modern form of power, elaborated and spread out from the 16th century on. Amongst these techniques, it is possible to list the demarcation and an enclosure of the space (like the school’s and the hospital’s), in which what is inside or outside is established; the partitioning in which the disciplinary space tends to be divided to promote the immediate localization of its individuals; it regularizes functional localizations in the sense of addressing the need to surveil and, at the same time, creating a useful space (what promotes the ruling of the comes and goings of the subjects to/from each area); and distributes the bodies in line, individualizing them and assigning to each one a position.

Such mechanisms are regulatory of the body, that is, they are “methods, which made possible the meticulous control of the operations of the body, which assured the constant subjection of its forces and imposed upon them a relation of docility-utility” (Foucault, 1987, p. 118). These procedures evidence the body as a study object, as well as a target of power. This happens because the discipline submits the body, making it exercised at the same time that dissociates the power from it. To this divided, subjected and disciplined body, which “[...] is manipulated, shaped, trained, which obeys, responds, becomes skillful” (1987, p. 117), Foucault gave the name of docile body.

The teacher's and the student's bodies are useful bodies, constituted and constituent of the teaching machine. Such machine is organized in the school space, which, in turn, organizes time in periods; locates the subjects spatially in classrooms with the desks arranged in rows, so to promote the simultaneous work of everyone at the same time that also makes it possible the control each one (Foucault, 1987). These useful, docile, submitted and susceptible to manipulation bodies provide to us the bizarre image of a marionette in the social fabric. They are machine-bodies, targets of the power, techno-politically objectified and programmed to act in one only way in the schools in accordance with the techniques already mentioned (Sforzini, 2014).

The second notion, the utopian body, has the meaning of erasure of the body when creating a “[...] place outside all places, but it is a place where I will have a body without body [...]”; s precisely the utopia of an incorporeal body” (Foucault, 2013, p. 8). This utopia that erases the body would have two forms. The first one would be in the solid bodies of stone from the ancient Mycenaean statues keeping the idea of immobility. The second would be in the western culture configured in the great myth of the soul: the soul is pure and has perpetual brightness, while the body is muddy and will be putrid. These two initial ideas erase the body. However, Foucault understands that the body resists and does not tend to erase, as it has “[...] placeless places, and places more profound” (Foucault, 2013, p. 10). In this manner, the utopias are born from the body itself and go back to it. Ruses like masks and tattoos make the body “[...] is torn away from its proper space and projected into another space” (Foucault, 2013, p. 12).

This way, I understand that the marionette arts act in relation to the body as a ruse that establishes other possibilities of body, that relates it not with the spaces from this world, but with spaces from the imaginary. In this exercise, it takes us a long tome to perceive “[...] that we have a body, that this body has a form, that this form has an outline, that in this outline there is a thickness, a weight. In short, that the body occupies a place” (Foucault, 2013, p. 15).

The third notion, heterotopia, is conceived by Foucault (2013, p. 21) as “[...] fundamentally unreal spaces” and has an intrinsic relation with the theater and, therefore, the theater of animated forms. The heterotopia “[...]is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several

sites that are in themselves incompatible. Thus it is that the theater brings onto the rectangle of the stage, one after the other, a whole series of places (...)” (Foucault, 2013, p. 24). For the author, what the most essential of heterotopia is that it challenges all the other spaces, that is, besides carrying with it the presence of other spaces, it evidences what the spaces reverberate in each other.

The theater of animated forms, in turn, is also a heterotopia in which “[...] the manipulation of the marionette should dominate simultaneously two contiguous spaces: a real space where the manipulation is practiced, and a virtual space where the marionettes and their actions are presented” (Lefort, 2007, p. 83). The former is restrictive, subject to various laws and norms, while in the latter everything is possible, even dissolving the gravity law. The traditional space of the *castelet*³ is representative of this relation to mold in a smaller scale the same potential of the rectangle of the theater stage. The theater of animated forms by itself has “[...] the duality of the visible and the invisible, the animated and the inanimate, the effect and the cause, the confrontation of the body and the object” (Lefort, 2007, p. 83).

It is with regard to the two last notions that I perceive the existence of a laterality between the proposals from Foucault and Craig. The dots that are connected are the notion of utopian body with the *Über-marionette* and of heterotopia with the *Scene Project*.

Concerning the first proposal, Craig problematizes the work of the actor in the modern theater and explains that, in his conception, the human and everything that characterizes it as such would not be the appropriate material for the theater, as it is subject to the emotions that affect the actor’s body, face and voice, destroying the art, as everything that the human being could offer would be a “[...] series of accidental confessions” (Craig, 2016, p. 211). This way, the *Über-marionette* is a proposal that removes the actors from the scene so that they can be replaced not by a marionette, but by a “[...] higher doll” (Craig, 2017, p. 93).

The *Über-marionette* is a proposal that was not materialized by Craig. Neither there is an academic consensus engendering an established concept for this proposal (Le Bœuf, 2010). In more objective terms, the body of the marionette and the body of the actor present distinct technical challenges. The choice between considering the “[...]actor live or a marionette –

torments the practitioners of theater” (Leabhart, 2017, p. 35) and for such question it seems to be at least two groups of arguments on the subject. The former tends to the metaphoric aspect, considering that Craig himself “[...] revised the radicality of his first essay concerning the intention to eliminate the flesh and blood actor from the theater” (Branches, 2017, p. 129) and points to the work on the control of the actor on his body and emotions. The second argument tends to favor the idea that the *Über-marionnette* had materiality, despite not fully accomplished, but pertaining to a more concrete space than an imagetic suggestion only. In his writings, like in the *Über-Marions*⁴ notebooks, there are a few clues, although dispersed and indefinite, that favor the idea that it had a certain concreteness, or even that it approaches the difficulty in materialize it. Craig does not make it explicit or resumes more clearly the concept of *Über-marionnette* or the technical procedure for its concreteness.

The uncertainty that hangs over this proposal becomes its power in the extent that it instigates the thought on what it is related. It is possible to evidence that the *Über-marionnette* is not, indeed, an isolated element, but a notion that congregates the greater whole of Craig’s work and this is markedly evidenced in the *Scene* Project. Such project idealized the kinetic scene, in which the panels aimed to the stage setting would move. But such intention did not find technical subsidies at the time, also remaining its power in instigating the imaginary.

The Craigian system articulates inseparably the actor with the scenic materiality, that is, with the scenic space itself that is presented in the *Scene* Project. When thinking the space as a matter in movement and not a fixed space for the stage setting, it happens a displacement of the place of the actor: previously located in the center of attention (as the utmost star of the spectacle) to become only another scenic element, composing with the other volumes of the space. Here lies the principle of the animation related to the materiality of the marionette. That is, the marionette is important for the Craigian thought in the most different dimensions: from the “[...] ‘noble artificiality’ [...] of the stone images from the ancient temples” (Craig, 2016, p. 226) (just like Foucault thinks as a procedure of erasure of the body related to the notion of utopian body) and of puppets from the Burattini tradition in Italy, to the most complex thought on the kinetic scene and everything that composes it.

Thus, when “wakening the screens from centuries of sleep as mere backdrops” (Ramos, 2017, p. 120), Craig thinks the human figure as re-proposed in relation to time and space, transforming them into operators of the scenic matter, or into the force that makes these screens to move. This way, Craig opens another possibility for the space, recodifying it. The *Über-marionnette*, in this case, “[...] would not be anything else than an armor to be used by human beings, what, at the same time, would increase its size and restrict its movement” (Ramos, 2017, p. 129). Wearing this exoskeleton or this armor means to reduce the superfluous movement of the actor, to erase its identitarian body and to promote the displacement from an identity to the *Über-marionnette* entity. In this sense, the intended expansion would come precisely from the restriction that condenses and at the same time expands the actor’s body.

The Craigian proposal for the actor is to become a body that is re-positioned in an opening to the emptiness, that is, it comes closer to the Foucauldian proposal of the utopian body, which “[...] I cannot only move, shift, but I also can move *it*, shift *it*, change *its* place” (Foucault, 2013, p. 7). The erasure of the body, just like the notion of utopian body, does not eliminate the initial body, but opens the possibility of creation of other bodies. I relate this Foucault’s notion of body to the notion of the *Über-marionnette*, understood as the operator of the scenic matter, that moves and removes, but that, over all, makes to move.

In the same way, I understand that it can be assumed the notion of heterotopia and Craig’s kinetic stage. To place in movement the panels previously condemned to the immobility is to open a space to the unthought. Such intent is as prolific as an image as a thought. Craig’s stage setting is set in movement in several directions: not only up or down, right and left, but also in volume and diagonality.

In this way, Foucault seems to be extremely Craigian when thinking the idea of utopia and heterotopia. Or would be Craig who anticipates the Foucauldian thought when conceiving the *Über-marionnette* as a type of utopian body of the actor and the *Scene* Project as a type of heterotopia? In any case, what interests to this study is precisely the suffix ‘topia’, which understands the body as a place in which the happenings are inscribed. Or, yet, that conceives the body itself as a place for creation. This is because, for Craig, the actor and the scene are only one: “[...] they must be kept as an

ahead of us or we will be looking at two things and, thus, losing the value of both. Their value is in being one” (Craig, 2017, p. 225).

When considering such idea, I believe that Craig knew how to look at the theater to operate in this crossing between codification and space. Craig made to collapse the very place of the actor in the theatrical art with his proposal of *Über-marionette* and the scenic space when opening space for the unthinkable with its kinetic scene or the *Scene Project*⁵. Craig makes to collapse the ordinary and static place assigned to the stage settings and place them in movement. With this proposal, he made to collapse the conservative concept of theater of his time, allowing to reverberate the power of his idea of theater until the present. In this sense, I question on which the marionette arts could collapse when thought in relation to the process of teacher training.

I perceived that all this thought positioning Foucault and Craig – each one in his context – not only collapsing the commonplace, but as founders of other ways to think, seems coherent with the goal that I propose to think the principle of intentional artificiality as operating element of the bodies’ movement.

When giving continuity to this goal in the sense of bringing it to the context of teacher training, I approach the very notion of principle that can be assumed as a “[...] starting point of a movement” or a “foundation of a certain process” (Abbagnano, 2007, p. 792). In turn, the notion of active principle seems to be more related with the question of the marionette concerning the animation of an inert material that can be defined as the “[...] Reason, Cause or God that shapes the matter [...] producing in it the individual beings [...]; Fire, in the sense of heat or encouraging spirit *cie*” (Abbagnano, 2007, p. 793). In fact, if we consider that the movement was a founding element in the Craigian work, it seems productive the idea that the intentional artificiality operates as its activator or, as previously said, that the body moves things to another place and, this way, re-positions itself. It is under this perspective that I present next the path that I covered to understand a principle of such a complex work as Craig’s.

The Principle of Intentional Artificiality Understood from the Craigian Work

It was challenging to understand a principle of the complex Craigian work. This is due to the fact that the elements set on by the British director are not organized in a way to close themselves in one only definition. Rather, they put into motion several lines of forces and dialogues with diverse thinkers. The choice possibilities are distinct; for instance, to assume a principle from the dialogue of ideas between Craig and Schopenhauer on the question of representation, or Craig and Nietzsche on the question of truth and so on. However, according to Bablet (1962), it becomes harmless to try to understand Craig through his influences and references: first, because they are many and second, because his work is not the direct reflex of none of these thinkers, including Nietzsche. It is interesting to observe that it is in the set of these influences that Craig finds “[...] the value of an art in which the suggestion prevails on the reproduction, in which the idea counts more than its accomplishment” (Bablet, 1962, p. 45).

Thus, I mobilized the search for a procedure that is repeated no matter the referential source with which Craig dialogues. I found such procedure in what the British director calls imagination, but I prefer to address here, from the Foucauldian inspiration, as an active exercise to search for another look to what it is preset. In fact, it is possible to think about Craig “[...] as an artist who made a principle of virtuality and a *modus operandi* of the imaginary accomplishment” (Ramos, 2014, p. 72).

Ramos (2014) is quite precise when pointing to virtuality as a principle in Craig. The imagination as procedure, however, assumes concreteness, as already said, in the material supports activated by the British stage-director: in his drawings, his marionettes, his writings and mock-ups. That is, the supports used are multiple and involve different artistic languages. From this observation, I initially turned the focus toward the idea of a negotiated coexistence (Leabarth, 2017) of these languages and that seemed to point towards the de-hierarchize of the scenic elements. Such idea seemed coherent, as the Craigian procedure, when assuming imagination as a premise, intends to displace and rearrange the elements. Thus, when rearranging, it de-hierarchizes and, therefore, opens space for the unthought.

The *Scene* Project of the British stage-director is exemplary in this sense, as it displaces the centrality of the actor and considers the scenic space in movement with its screens and punctuated volumes (Ramos, 2014). Another example of the notion of de-hierarchizing in the Craigian work is in the strategy used to think his school and that can be seen as pioneering: a school in which each one teaches what they know and have the opportunity to learn what the other knows, resulting in an exchange not only of information, but of aptitudes, techniques and knowledge.

Actually, I was inclined to assume de-hierarchizing as a principle, idealizing that, this way, it would be formed an equal system of presence between the scenic elements. However, this idea favors the horizontalization notion and such notion made me question the principle of de-hierarchizing, as it establishes a linearity. At the same time, I came across with three elements that helped me to problematize this first choice: the engraving (Image 1) made by the Californian painter and Craig's collaborator, Michael Carmichael Carr (Dircks, 2004, p. 133); Martin Puchner's notion of antitheatricity (2002) and Bernard Dort's notion of emancipated representation (1988). The two latter have complex works related to the theatrical ruptures happened from the modernism on, on which I do not intend to give account here. What interests at this moment is that they served as an alert to question the choice of the principle of de-hierarchizing of the scenic elements.

I will begin by the poetry of the drawing.



Image 1 – The workshop. Drawing by Michael Carmichael Carr, 1907. Source: Le Bœuf (2009, p. 45).

Carr was able to materialize in an image what came to my mind while I explored Craig's work: the man who seems to look through the wooden figure in his hand; the man who is concerned with the materiality of his figures while in the background (inundated by the vertical light that is so characteristic of Craig's visuality and composed of bodies in movement occupied in moving the scenic matter) seems to be an unfolding of his thought, of his vision of the construction of the theater of the future.

What is the power of a thought? How does it operate in the materiality? And vice versa? Such questions arise a closer look on the bodies, as "[...] it is always about the bodies, about a radical materiality" (Rodrigues, 2011, p. 152). In this sense, Craig's thought looks through the materiality of the marionettes that, limited in their movements, lead to the hieratic idea of life. It is about an artificial object that translates more the vision of the artist than the concrete accomplishment of his work (Innes, 1998).

The natural/artificial duality is a primary part of the constitution of the Craigian work. Craig walks between the objectification of the human and the humanization of the object; he evokes the noble artificiality of the statues of the ancient temples (Craig, 2013); he condemns the excess of

humanity of the actors; he impersonates his screens giving movement to them and restricts the possibility of movement to the human body. It is from these displacements that the British director transits between the actor and the marionette or, in other words, the movement is set on in the relation between the man and the ruse. Such procedure, that breaches

[...] with the processes of representational order makes with that the theatricality suggested by it comes close, drastically, to what we could recognize as a type of *anti-theatricality* proper to the poetics of some *symbolists* (Belloni, 2011, p. 6/7).

The prefix ‘anti’, applied to ‘theatricality’, brings a positioning with it. Puchner (2013) and Cruciani (1995) speak of the danger to be defined exactly by the thing to which we place ourselves in opposition. Thus, if Craig invented himself and his practices refusing the bizarre realism and superficiality of the theater of divas, such position is not rigid, as in the “[...] territories of art, the definition has been always personal and temporary” (Cruciani, 1995, p. 55). This way, the positioning – that requires the elaboration of a thought – also produces “[...] a form of theater in the interior of its very act of resistance. It is this complicity between rejection and production that is behind the several forms of modern drama” (Puchner, 2013, p. 44).

This means that, when taking Wagner’s ideas on the total artwork fifty years later, Craig brings them up to date when searching for the non-subordination of a scenic element to another one (Dort, 1988). In a certain way, the British director uses a procedure that Foucault (2008) would call the suspension of units. The units here are: actor, theater, scene, that Craig suspends without occupying an evolutive historical continuity of the theater but promoting himself a rupture with what was known until then as actor, theater and scene. Such movement prepared the grounds so that, approximately 100 years after Craig’s ideas had been divulged, it is possible to evidence

[...] nowadays a gradual emancipation of the elements of theatrical representation and we observe a structural change: the renunciation to the organic unit ordered a priori and the recognition of the theatrical fact as a polyphonic signifier, open to the spectator (Dort, 2013, p. 51).

It is here that it is possible to problematize the principle of the de-hierarchizing of elements. Although Dort (1988) requests a revision of

Craigian ideas for the position of the actor and the stage-director, the current possibility of dealing with a polyphonic signifier is feasible when considering the grounds prepared by Craig. Therefore, nowadays it is possible to consider that the elements not always will receive the same weight in a presence system that is intended to be de-hierarchized, as, besides the creative process, there is the reception of the spectator, which is not a guarantee of uniformity. It is the equivalences that is placed in question and the consideration that the disproportion, the juxtaposition, the alternation of places is part of the process. There is dialogue, but it does not happen necessarily in a horizontal form. It seems presently that in the theater it is possible to propose and to absorb dissonances and this becomes interesting in this field. The search for the movement continues, as, in this thought, the rigidity determines position and claims hierarchies.

Thus, I hope that I have explained well the reason why I declined the principle of de-hierarchizing. Now let me justify the choice for the principle of intentional artificiality and its relation with teacher training in Pedagogy.

For such, I resume Carr's engraving and Craig's drawing holding a figure. The procedure that considers the intention of employing artificiality searches for the construction of this bridge, in which it is established "[...] the continuity between the evidence of the matter and the life, and to make this, there are constant transferences between bodies and objects, between the bodies of men and the bodies of gods" (Borie, 2013, p. 138).

It is this way that working with the matter, having the use of an intentional artificiality that mobilizes the bodies, is set as opposed to naturalness and an attempt of representation of the real. The marionette is the ostensive principle of the artificial, it claims for an activation necessarily artificial, what lies on the work of the actor in the sense of his nature and technique, and, therefore, in his training. It is challenging to define what is natural and, in this sense, the direct opposition to artificialism can be prolific. Craig chose to walk in this complex territory when he rejected naturalism in the performance.

Assuming the principle of intentional artificiality means to launch the experimenter to the research of his own body in unthought fields. The body, in relation to the object, becomes a device for the process of experimentation and investigation of the movement and the compositions

of images in which the possibilities of gestures and corporealities that could appear are analyzed; that is, they are not given, as they do not depart from a fixed body reference.

The question of the matter is put in an intrinsic form to these analyses: the radicality of the separation between the living and the inert, as well as the relation between the raw material and the human thought. In this relation, the body becomes the space in which the symbolic operation happens, as, when put in contact with the inert matter, it reiterates and sets on the questioning of death, evidenced in the lifeless nature of the marionette. This means that thinking the matter has a straight relation with its animation (Borie, 2013). It means, also, that to animate a lifeless body leads to the force of life. By analogy, it is possible to think then that to animate the body itself means the animation of a raw material that is set in thought movement.

The exercise of this thought belongs to the domain of the symbol (so dear to Craig). That is, it is not about searching the construction of a body similar to the real, but opening possibilities of creation of another body. In other words, it is not the use of a specific technique of manipulation, but the creation of articulation systems of the body with the object in which what interests is exactly the touch point of the body with the matter and the space in which this interaction happens.

In this sense, it is important to register that Craig incorporated marionette manufacture and manipulation to the curriculum of his school in Florence. Craig justifies such proposal:

It seems more convenient that man creates, manufactures an instrument that helps him to express himself than uses himself [...] As a man, with his own body, one can only overcome obstacles, however, using his ideas, he can create inventions that overcome everything (Craig, 2013, p. 74).

The rationale presented by the British director evidences the inseparability between the concreteness of the matter (including the body itself) and the existing potentiality in the ideas. The suggestion in “overcoming everything” claims to the constant exercise in overcoming preset forms and to the game of multiplicities and decentering of the subject in relation to the object. From this, it is possible to think that the idea of artificial comes from the game between the body and what is external to it. This means that placing the body in relation to something

implies necessarily in repositioning it. However, the idea of intentionality is placed in a field of teacher training as an exercise of choice and possibility of creation. It is about opening spaces, searching for promoting possibilities for the experience.

Operationalizing the Principle of Intentional Artificiality

The proposal to work the theater of animated forms that I proposed from the study of the Craigian work takes as a principle the intentional artificiality as the activator of this process. When bringing this notion to the teacher training context, it inevitably implied the fact that there are preexisting intentional artificialities, but that are from a different nature. We deal with elements that precede us, cross us and subjectify us. Some of them were a topic of problematization by Foucault (1987), as, for instance, the spatial configuration of the school (together with the one from the prison and the hospital): its architectural structure was intentionally designed to control the bodies and make them docile according to the notion previously presented. In any way, the configuration of a classroom, either of the space of training at undergraduate level or at K-12 education, is an intentional artificiality set on, mobilizing of bodies and processes of subjectivation.

These preexisting intentional artificialities alert to the complexity implied in the processes of subjectivation or production of subjectivity. This process, however, does not always produce the same consequence. A process in which the constitution of a subject happens in a “[...] process through which a subjectivity is claimed not only negatively – [...] against the power relations whose kingdom it destroys – but positively in the world: in short, a constituent movement” (Revel, 2014, p. 64). This constituent movement refers to two types of analysis.

The first one refers to the practices of objectivation of the subject, “[...] which means that, for the power, there are only objectified subjects and that the subjectivation modes are, in this sense, practices of objectivation” (Revel, 2014, p. 65). Bodies that meet in the relation utility-docility are generated in the objectivation processes. In this sense, the bodies that experienced this capture present these marks.

The second type of analysis brings the relation with himself, “[...] by means of a certain number of techniques of the self, allows one to constitute himself as subject of his own existence” (Revel, 2014, p. 65). In this type of analysis it is possible to consider the “[...] perspective of subject as endowed with all possible conscience that he will refuse – to make, instead, to emerge a split off, dispersed subject, an effect of meaning, a place in the discourse” (Icle, 2010, p. 33).

Actually, it is possible to observe that the body is always implied in these processes. If for the power there are only objectified subjects, it interests then to look for, in the interior of these relations of power, forms of refusal of the objectification. In this aspect, it is appropriate to ask: “[...] which processes the individual puts in action in order to appropriate from his relation with himself” (Revel, 2014, p. 65)? I understand these processes as artificial and intentional, in which men are produced and transform themselves. For Foucault (2008), there is a historical character in the subjectivation processes. However, the subject is not only the inexorable result of the historical determinations, “[...] but it is also the unknown space of a work on himself whose modalities are sometimes historical, but that make to appear the dimension of the outside (the creation, the invention, the unprecedented)” (Revel, 2014, p. 66).

From such ideas, I understand that the proposal for the theater of animated forms in this study is much more modest than Foucault’s. Even though we could assume as inspiration Craig’s conception of scenic space and imagine the walls, the desks, the (white or black) board, the windows, the doors, and everything else that is characteristic of the traditional space of a classroom disengaging and assuming a life of their own; becoming volumes moving forward, backwards, up, down, in diagonal line, wavy etc.; we already know that its concretion is impossible.

However, it interests to think Craig’s notion of scenic space as a creation space, a poetical space that can become a classroom. That is, a space in which teachers and students can open places for creation and the unthought. It is worth remembering that Craig had the idea of the construction of a “[...] scene with mutant nature” (Craig, 2017, p. 220), involved in a modern spirit, that is “[...] the spirit of the incessant change” (Craig, 2017, p. 220). Actually, Craig thought in another way the static stage settings and assigned to them an unthought movement at his time. A

possible bias is to think about the puppeteer and the possibility that he has to create a poetics of the space. This is so because the materiality of the marionette animates in time and space in relation to other bodies. The body of the marionette is not subject to the laws of gravity nor to the biological and anatomical logic. It can move in other ways, increase and reduce, break and be reassembled. The marionette-gesture brings in itself the power to erase the body at the same time that it opens the possibility of creation of other bodies. This process does not search for the return to the unit, but the creation of other possibilities by means of the recombination of these fragments. Thus, it is possible to consider that the “[...] transgression of the logic of the space is a privilege of the marionette” (Valantin apud Le Bœuf, 2009, p. 67). In this aspect, the chisel of Craig’s wooden figures means the yearning for the incessant movement of the space. Its exercise takes form in the materiality of the bodies and the setting on of the scenic matter, of which the actor is its operator (Ramos, 2017).

From these concerns and relations, eleven courses were conducted in 2015 and 2016 with future early childhood education and 1st to 5th grade teachers, having provided the data comprised in this paper. In this process, the study of the Craigian work and the elements previously mentioned form a type of guide in the structuring of the activities with theater of animated forms, and the principle of intentional artificiality was assumed as an activator of the body and the thought.

Having these questions in mind, I elaborated the structure of the course of theater of animated forms with future teachers. My inspiration for the order of the selected exercises was Craig’s work. This means that the work begins having as a reference the actor’s body, that is, the shape of the human body and then “[...] moving itself to abstraction” (Innes, 1998, p. 193). Based on these considerations, I planned the course in three stages, each one with a sequence of exercises.

The first stage was focused on the anthropomorphic body. Thus, my starting point was the exploration from the reference of the body itself, that is, of the anthropomorphic form, its possibilities and movements. The choice for working with the inhabitable hybrid technique, in which the body of the puppeteer mixes with the body of the marionette, brought the possibility of the experimentation to create an external body, but from the organic body. Such relation demands a game of presences, in which the

body that is animated is erased and gives place and evidence to the marionette's body.

The second stage provided possibilities for the body, in the sense of playing with the anthropomorphic form, opening space also to deconstruct it from the construction of other forms. Different materials were used, besides the marionette's body, ; for instance a 4-meter-long red fabric developed by a group of five people. It was aimed at exploring other corporal logics, as one only body could have several heads or arms, for instance.

The third stage considered experiencing the body and the form, with the animation of geometric forms, privileging the movement, the pause, the volume in space and the possibility of different abstract compositions, as it can be observed in the following image. I understand that this stage is the one that is closer to Craig's kinetic scene proposal, in the sense of making the body as the space. The body itself moves away from the drafting of the initial configuration, remaining only geometric figures and the possibilities of composition offered by these forms.

These experimentations aimed, over all, to make possible to the future teachers the expansion of the body perception. What was evident, from the data produced, is that the inert materials of the marionette and the object become an invitation to be willing to move the body, to put in movement its very organic-matter-body. Amongst the various registers of the courses with Pedagogy students, I present here the claim of one of them when saying that she would never again look at a fabric or a doll in the same way (Dossiê São Judas Tadeu, 2016). Such register evidences that, more than an invitation to the movement, one of the effects of the operationalization of the principle of intentional artificiality consists in opening space for a procedure able to invert the logic of a discourse briefly established in the educational field “[...] replacing the formula of ‘knowing to transform’ by ‘transforming to know’” (Dias, 2012, p. 30). The fabric was extracted from its known utilitarian context to become an object carrying several possibilities of transformation and creation. But such possibility of opening to the unthought was only possible because the previous reference of fabric collapsed. In this process, there is a juxtaposition, that is, the fabric as such does not cease to exist, but at the same time that its primary function is extinguished, other possibilities are created for this materiality. Thus, the

theater of animated forms also seems to be able to animate pedagogical formulas, as the inert material calls first for transformation – from inertia to movement – and later for its possibilities of composition of the movement in space.

This way, distinct spheres are configured in which it is possible to operationalize the principle of intentional artificiality.

In one sphere it is evidenced the direct reaction of the bodies in contact with the objects considered. The material available for the exercises is nothing more than inert substance, that will remain as such, and, unless a force gives movement to it, it will remain inanimate. This force comes from the repositioning of the bodies that were instigated to be placed in the most diverse postures – but the traditional posture of the student who remains seated to listen to the teacher. From this repositioning, there is something that happens in the thickness of this space with approximately 30 centimeters of distance between the body of the puppeteer and the object that offers possibilities and impossibilities of movement. There is something that happens in the thickness of the body, as Foucault referred (2013). There is also an exercise that does not concern to the techniques referring to the theater of animated forms only⁶, but to the relational space created between the bodies. What interests, therefore, is the contact with the brutality of the matter, in order to explore the body itself as such, until making it plastic and pliable and, in this way, susceptible to modification.

In another sphere, processes that not only promote the exercise of the body, but of the look at this body and at the place that its body occupies in the world are set on. It is the exercise of a poetical body, that implies in “[...] placing the body” (Sanchez, 2017, p. 131) and creating its own movement. This procedure is the opposite of the understanding of the body as a docile, individual gear partitioned, classified and ordered. It relates more with the conscious processes of action in which the individual searches for the appropriation of himself. It is in this sphere that it is possible to think that the docile body and teachers and students do not cease being necessarily a marionette – in the sense of having the marks of capture by objectification processes –, but that can use the intentional artificiality to set on intentional methods of force that allow to overcome the primary form of subjection and making the bodies docile and to juxtapose other ways of being in the world.

And why limit us to exercises with marionettes in teacher training? If we consider, resuming Foucault (1987), that the more useful and docile the body, more reduced is its political force, the opposite also is part of this game: the live body that re-positions and recreates itself resists with more power to be led and become marionette-like. In this sense, the intentional artificiality seems to offer, amongst several, a possibility of refusal to the body-machine, of erasure of the body objectified by the power. The antidote that is presented is in the relation with the intentional artificialities – those that already precede us and those that the individual can operate to set in action.

Considerations in Movement

In this paper, I tried to promote an approximation between Foucault's and Craig's notions; respectively, the utopian body, with *Über-marionette*, and heterotopia, with the *Scene* Project. I evidenced the process from which I inferred the principle of intentional artificiality, as well as I made an effort to present its effects in the two ways where such principle manifests itself.

The first way is related to the docile body – understood by Foucault (1987) as a body dismembered by the power machine. That is, he understands the body in the thickness “[...] of a relation that in the same mechanism becomes more obedient as it is more useful, and inversely” (Foucault, 1987, p. 119). Such idea in this text was set in relation with the bizarre notion of marionette: teachers and students becoming marionette-like by subtle mechanisms of control from the order of the disciplinary power. This way would be of a devitalized marionette, that only reproduces, set on by artificialities that engender a battle that tires and exhausts the body. Thus, the inert-body is even more devitalized and depleted.

The second way understands, through the heterotopia notion, the body as a place, therefore a utopian body, in other words: a heterotopic body. This way has its major reference in Craig's work, in the principle of intentional artificiality responsible for setting in motion the movement to the things of the world and, therefore, giving movement to the thought. Giving movement to the things of the world is not in the order of the repetition, of control and of ordering to which the body is submitted. Rather, it is a procedure that draws other forms, but that is not fixed in

them, as it is artificially and intentionally promoting its own movement. In the very core of the notion of utopian body, Foucault (2013) places two conceptions that seem irreconcilable: of the body as place to which it is condemned by the incapacity to go beyond it, of its finitude, the daily configurations of work, the biological condition of sleep, that is, as a place from which it is impossible to escape. And the heterotopic body, able to look at its different forms and to transfigure its worlds (Sforzini, 2014). Thus, by analogy, it would be possible to think the overcoming of the forms (im)posed to the teachers in training, and to exercise in the core of the power relation an opening: the search for strategies to avoid the coercive movement imposed and to engender the movement itself.

Both ways are asset on by an intentional artificiality, but their effects point in opposing directions. And both coexist, generating friction and conflicts. We oscillate between these movements and these directions. This way, it is possible to think the intentional artificiality from a double process: it still is a marionette in the bizarre sense, that is, an objectified body, but a space opens as possibility when we consider being in relation with the body-marionette: when we make of the ruse the power to leave oneself. It is a force line that pushes towards the object. A line, among many. A possibility of displacing oneself by means of the work with the arts of the marionette⁷.

Notes

- ¹ Dissertation developed in the Graduation Program in Education of the Education School of Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul in a joint degree agreement with Université Paris Nanterre (Della Costa, 2018).
- ² In this work, it is made the option to join the German prefix *Über* with the word *marionette* in French. The spellings found are as diverse as *Über-marionette* or *Sur-marionette*. Considering that I refer the PhD dissertation from which the idea of this text originates (Della Costa, 2018), I use the same form presented in the title of the dissertation used in the first paragraph. Most of the students in this course are females.
- ³ A structure usually called *castello* in Italian and *castelet* in French, in which the puppeteer is hidden. But “[...] they also receive other denominations like, for

instance, *biombo*, *castelete*, *retablo*, *toldo*, *tendinha*, *barraca*, *tapadeira*” (Balardim, 2004, p. 71), *totem* and *empanada*.”

- ⁴ Collection of the Bibliothèque National de France.
- ⁵ Besides the dossier on Craig published in the *Revista Brasileira de Estudos da Presença* in 2014, there is the translation of the text *Scene* into Portuguese by Luis Fernando Ramos.
- ⁶ Beltrame (2003) elaborates on the techniques used in the theater of animated forms in a detailed way. Also *Móin-Móin: Revista de Estudos sobre Teatro de Formas Animadas* provide an excellent referential in Portuguese.
- ⁷ This work was carried out with the collaboration of the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Código de Financiamento 001.

References

- ABBAGNANO, Nicola. **Dicionário de Filosofia**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2007.
- AMARAL, Ana Maria. **Teatro de animação**. Cotia: Ateliê Editorial, 2007.
- BABLET, Denis. **Edward Gordon Craig**. Paris: L’Arche, 1962.
- BALARDIM, Paulo. **Relações de Vida e Morte no Teatro de Formas Animadas**. Porto Alegre: Edição do Autor, 2004.
- BELLONI, Arthur Eduardo Araújo. Automatismo Divino: Teatralidade e anti-teatralidade na poética cênica de Edward Gordon Craig. **Revista Cena**, Porto Alegre, n. 10, 2011.
- BELTRAME, Valmor Níni. O trabalho do ator-bonequeiro. **Revista NUPEART**, Núcleo Pedagógico de Educação e Arte, Florianópolis, v. 2, n. 2, p. 33-52, set. 2003.
- BORIE, Monique. Corps vivant et corps objet: une approche anthropologique. In: GUIDICELLI, Carole (Org.). **Surmarionnettes et mannequins – Craig, Kantor et leurs heritage contemporains**. Lavérune: L’Entretemps, 2013. P. 137-145.
- CRAIG, Edward Gordon. **De l’Art du Théâtre**. Belval: Circé, 2013.
- CRAIG, Edward Gordon. O ator e o Über-marionette. In: RIBEIRO, Almir. **Gordon Craig, a pedagogia do Über-marionette**. São Paulo: Giostri, 2016. P. 209-234.

CRAIG, Edward Gordon. **Rumo a um novo teatro & Cena**. Tradução: Luiz Fernando Ramos. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2017.

CRUCIANI, Fabrizio. **Registi Pedagoghi e comunita'teatriali nel novecento**: e scritti inediti. Roma: Editori & Associati, 1995.

DELLA COSTA, Rossana. **O Teatro de Formas Animadas na Formação de Professores**: uma proposta pedagógica a partir da Übermarionnette. 2018, 336 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2018.

DIAS, Rosimeri de Oliveira (Org.). **Formação Inventiva de Professores**. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, 2012.

DIRCKS, Phillys T. **American Puppetry**: collections, history and performance. North Carolina: Theatre Library Association, 2004.

DORT, Bernard. **La Représentation Émancipée**. Paris: Actes Sud, 1988.

DORT, Bernard. A representação emancipada. **Revista Sala Preta**, São Paulo, v. 13, n. 1, p. 47-55, 2013.

DOSSIÊ São Judas tadeu. Relato das aulas e da conversa final. Arquivo confidencial não publicado. 36f. 2016.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Vigiar e Punir**: nascimento e prisão. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1987.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **A Arqueologia do Saber**. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2008.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **O Corpo Utópico, As Heterotopias**. São Paulo: n-1 Edições, 2013.

ICLE, Gilberto. **Pedagogia Teatral como Cuidado de Si**. São Paulo: Aderaldo & Rothschild, 2010.

ICLE, Gilberto. O que é Pedagogia da Arte? In: ICLE, Gilberto (Org.). **Pedagogia da Arte Entre-Lugares da Escola**. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS, 2012. P. 11-22.

INNES, Christopher. **Edward Gordon Craig, a vision of a theatre**. London: Routledge, 1998.

LE BCEUF, Patrick et al. (Ed.). **Craig et la Marionnette**. Avignon: Actes Sud et Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2009.

LE BOEUF, Patrick. On the Nature of Edward Gordon Craig's Übermarionette. **New Theatre Quarterly**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 102-114, 2010.

LEABHART, Thomas. Edward Gordon Craig's übermarionette and Étienne Decroux's 'Actor made of wood'. **Mime Journal**, Claremont, v. 26, p. 34-42, Feb. 2017. Disponível em: <<http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1048&context=mimejournal>>. Acesso em: 15 set. 2017.

LEFORT, Stéphanie. **Marionnettes: le corps à l'ouvrage**. Bernin: À La Croisée, 2007.

PUCHNER, Martin. **Stage Fright: Modernism, Anti-Theatricality & Drama**. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

PUCHNER, Martin; YOSHITAKE, José. Pânico de Palco: Modernismo, Antiteatralidade e Drama. **Sala Preta**, São Paulo, v. 13, n. 1, p. 13-46, jun. 2013. Disponível em: <<http://www.revistas.usp.br/salapreta/article/view/57529/68219>>. Acesso em: 13 maio 2018.

RAMOS, Luiz Fernando. O indizível e as obras imaginárias de Klein e Craig. **ARJ - Art Research Journal**, [S.l.], ABRACE, ANPAP, ANPPOM, v. 1, n. 1, p. 35-47, maio 2014. Disponível em: <<http://www.periodicos.ufrn.br/artresearchjournal/article/view/5260>>. Acesso em: 01 jan. 2016.

RAMOS, Luiz Fernando. A relação entre atores e screens no teatro de Gordon Craig: um legado à contemporaneidade. In: TAVARES, Enéias Farias; BIANCALANA, Gisela Reis; MAGNO, Mariane (Org.). **Discursos do Corpo na Arte**, v. II. 1. ed. Santa Maria: Editora UFSM, 2017. P. 115-142.

REVEL, Judith. O nascimento literário da biopolítica. In: ARTIERES, Philippe (Org.). **Michel Foucault, A Literatura e as Artes**. São Paulo: Rafael Copetti Editor, 2014. P. 49-69.

RODRIGUES, Heliana de Barros Conde. Cartografias Minoritárias do Enclausuramento: sobre Michel Foucault e Charles Fourier In: ALBUQUERQUE JR., Durval Muniz de; VEIGA-NETO, Alfredo; SOUZA FILHO, Alípio (Org.). **Cartografias de Foucault**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2011. P. 149-164.

SANCHEZ, José. **Cuerpos Ajenos**. Segovia: Ediciones La una Rota, 2017.

SFORZINI, Ariana. **Michel Foucault, une pensée du corps**. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2014.



Rossana Della Costa is an associate professor of the Theater degree course of the Center of Arts and Letters of Universidade Federal de Santa Maria. She holds a PhD from the Graduate Course in Education of Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul in a joint degree agreement with Université Paris Nanterre.

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4469-6447>

Email: rocacor@gmail.com

This unpublished text, translated by Ananyr Porto Fajardo, is also published in Portuguese in this issue.

Received on 23 July 2018

Accepted on 2 September 2018

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International. Available at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>.