

revista
brasileira
de estudos
em dança

Somatics and Practice as Research in Dance

Ciane Fernandes
Melina Scialom
Diego Pizarro

FERNANDES, Ciane; SCIALOM, Melina; PIZARRO, Diego. **Somática e Prática como Pesquisa em Dança**. Revista Brasileira de Estudos em Dança, Rio de Janeiro, year 01, n. 02, p. 200-223, 2022.2.

ABSTRACT

This text proposes a reflection on the crossings of the field of Somatics and the emerging methodology of Practice as Research (PaR) in the artistic-academic context of Dance Studies. Through the unfolding premises of these actions in research in/with Art today, we seek to outline general aspects of their epistemologies. This synthesis in process is an expanded action – which will continue in future publications – for a deeper development of topics that need further discussion in the field of Dance research in Brazil.

KEYWORDS Somatics as Research; field of Somatics; Practice as Research; Dance research

RESUMO

O texto traça reflexões sobre os atravessamentos do campo da Somática e da metodologia emergente da Prática como Pesquisa (PaR) no contexto artístico-acadêmico dos Estudos em Dança. Por meio de premissas em desdobramento desses fazeres na pesquisa em/com Arte na atualidade, buscamos delinear aspectos gerais de suas epistemologias. Esta síntese em processo é uma ação ampliada – que seguirá em publicações futuras – de aprofundamento em tópicos que carecem discussões mais aprofundadas na área da pesquisa em Dança no Brasil.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE Somática como Pesquisa; campo da Somática; Prática como Pesquisa; Pesquisa em Dança

Somatics and Practice as Research in Dance

Ciane Fernandes (UFBA)¹
Melina Scialom (HKAPA)²
Diego Pizarro (IFB/UFBA/UnB)³

¹ Tenured professor at the School of Theatre at Federal University of Bahia (UFBA), Brazil, one of the founders of UFBA's Graduate Program of Performing Arts, professor at UFBA's Graduate Program of Dance, researcher at the Brazilian National Council of Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq). M.A. and Ph.D. in Arts and Humanities for Performing Artists (New York University) and Movement Annalist by the Laban/Bartenieff Institute of Movement Studies.

E-mail: cianef@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2380-5034>

² Performer, dramaturge, and dance researcher. Post doctorate from the PPG Artes da Cena, UNICAMP and PPGAC/UFBA, Lecturer in Performing Arts, Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts. PhD in Dance Studies, University of Roehampton, UK, Specialist Diploma in Choreological Studies, Trinity Laban, UK, Master in Performing Arts, UFBA, Brazil, Bachelor's in Dance and Licensed in Dance Teaching, UNICAMP, Brazil.

E-mail: melinascialom@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5701-6853>

³ Dance artist, researcher, and professor at the Federal Institute of Brasilia since 2010, where he coordinates the Collective of Studies in Dance, Somatics and Improvisation (CEDA-SI). Certified teacher of Body-Mind CenteringSM and Articulation and Muscle Chains GDS. He is a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Brasília (CAPES/Brazil scholarship), he holds a PhD in Performing Arts (UFBA), a Master's degree in Contemporary Art and a Bachelor's degree in Performing Arts (UnB). Since October 2022 he has been a permanent professor at the Graduate Program in Performing Arts at Federal University of Bahia.

E-mail: diego.pizarro@ifb.edu.br

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8655-0489>

1. Introduction

This text aims to raise some issues that spans through the universe of Practice as Research (PaR) and Somatics in Dance Studies. The intention is to unpack basic assumptions that characterize these practices in the artistic-academic realm, in order to draw parallels and intersections between the epistemologies that each of these fields hold.

We seek to bring together a contemporary perspective on these two plural modalities – PaR and Somatics – based on authors with whom we have been establishing dialogues in our practices. These are part of a context of research being carried out by artists – both in Brazil and abroad – quite different and diverse in terms of approaches, methods, and applications within the academic realm. The intention is not to set parameters or determine universal rules and/or criteria for what has been called Practice as Research and Somatics. Rather, the intent of this article is to raise issues that form a field for further debate and exploration. However, in order to investigate, question and transform parameters and criteria, as well as create new ones, it is necessary to raise a few discussions that have been guiding these academic research modalities in the last twenty years.

In order to refer to Practice as Research, we will use the acronym PaR (Practice as Research) used in the English language, by which the term has been widely discussed and disseminated over the last twenty years (NELSON, 2013). As for Somatics, we follow along with Diego Pizarro (2020), who suggests the use of the term with a capital letter to refer to the field of Somatics knowledge (HANNA, 1976). The word is a neologism created by Thomas Hanna in the 1970s to refer to unconventional bodily practices that were concerned with the integration of multiple dimensions of existence: physical, mental, emotional, energetic, and spiritual. The latter was neglected by Hanna since the researcher

endeavoured to frame Somatics specifically in its biological aspect. However, as approached by Williamson et al (2014), in the 21st century, spiritualism in Somatics has been increasingly gaining space, being developed, expanded, and inseparably integrated with the other dimensions initially guided by Hanna.

Somatics is a contemporary field of knowledge that holds its own paradigm whose movements and praxis have been developed in academic research for over 50 years. Among its fundamental premises is the understanding of cellular consciousness, as developed by Bainbridge Cohen (2020), as a locus of wisdom in transformation. This means that each cell in our body and the tissues formed by a set of them, have a unique and singular type of knowledge or thought, related to their function and embryological origin. In this sense, the tacit knowledge (POLANYI, 1996) of body tissues is seen as an invitation to repattern the gestures, and the senses. This process can not only act upon the body but also transform the ways of carrying out research and the possibilities of generating knowledge, as we will discuss further.

We are made up of somatic wisdom, in this sense, all systems, methods and techniques that consider this type of approach promote the opening of channels for human's potential to manifest itself in all its breadth. This includes the potential for exhaustion or deep rest. In addition, 'controlled' rest is a somatic tool present in different approaches and widely used in somatic practices. With the function of enabling body self-regulation, it also motivates a reaction against the contemporary Western compulsion that follows the capitalist logic of excess. This logic's unruly schizophrenia that drives a productivist quantification is also found in Dance. It is precisely the approximation between Dance, Somatics and Practice as Research that we will touch upon in this text that unfolds just like embryological tissues do.

This text comes from the artistic-academic collaboration of three researchers that led the inauguration of the new Thematic Committee of the National Association of Dance Researchers (ANDA), in Brazil, under the title Somatics and Practice as Research in Dance. The endeavour marks a moment in time when

Somatics begins to branch out widely in the academic context, especially guiding research paths. It also marks the period in which PaR (as a methodological premise already internationally recognized and grounded) becomes articulated and integrated into the ways of researching Arts within this country.

PaR is a term that refers to a methodological umbrella that emerged at the end of the 20th century to support and justify research in which a practical activity integrates the process of generating new knowledge. The term emerged in the Anglo-Saxon academic context in the late 1990s to support research that required practical and artistic experimentation. To highlight and manage the rigor of research which key element is an artistic activity, PaR becomes an investigation guided by a practice that happens primarily through it and concomitantly associated with a conceptual reflection aiming to generate an exegesis. In this way, research in PaR as the articulation of a praxis is not exempt from written reflection, since the language articulated in the expression of academic knowledge is writing. Therefore, PaR allows the composition of dissertations/theses/articles/books (the exegesis), based on knowledge that is generated through a practice, and recognised by local and international funding agencies, stimulating the continuity of research in Arts at the university level.

2. Reflections about/with the methodology of Practice as Research

Although in recent years the term PaR is already being informally used by researchers in the academic realm in Brazil, the term was introduced in the research in Arts in the country through an article by Ciane Fernandes published in 2013. This marks a period when the author begins to associate the international praxis of research in the Arts in with Somatics and artistic performativity to achieve her approach to research and creative practice called the Somatic-Performative Research. Thus, the association of PaR and Somatics has proven to be of interest to Brazilian researchers,

in addition to being explored by international researchers (MIDDLELOW; BACON, 2014; MEEHAN, 2015). At the same time, in 2014, the term PaR was inaugurated by a Brazilian research group through the creation of the group Practice as Research: Production Processes of the Contemporary Scene, coordinated by Sílvia M. Geraldi, Ana M. R. Costas and Marisa M. Lambert, from the Arts Institute of the State University of Campinas – UNICAMP.

When the term PaR was translated from English into Portuguese and became part of Brazilian research and vocabulary, we started to consider the local academic context in relation to an international methodological umbrella, and also to consider the premises that this type of research brings to academic practice. More specifically, Artistic Practice as Research concerns creative making in the Arts as a specific and multiple way of generating knowledge, that is, as its own methodologies, ranging from Performative Research (HASEMAN, 2006) to research modalities that are guided, based, or developed from artistic practice. It is at this intersection of making and thinking that PaR not only affirms research through the Arts, but also before the scientific-university scheme of education and production of innovative knowledge. This occurs not as secondary to university education, but belongs to it, being equivalent and relevant to/in the academic context.

PaR emerges in the academic realm as a new research paradigm, not only beyond the already established quantitative and qualitative ones, but also what Stinson and Green (1999) call post-positivist research. It is even possible to consider PaR and its different developments (such as Practice-based Research, Performance as Research, Performative Research, among others) as an expansion of post-positivist research. However, there are key distinctions between PaR and post-positivist research modalities:

While for the positivists, reality (and truth) exists independently from us, for post-positivists reality is socially constructed, according to our position in the world and our subjective perspective. Furthermore, in research approaches with artistic practice, reality is dynamic and permeated by the creative experience that moves our perceptions and affections, questioning prejudices and value judgments through sensitive experience. Rather than proving the truth (positivist), the post-positivist researcher finds coherent intrinsic relationships and

meaningful qualitative connections in a multifaceted context, through more participatory, interpersonal, and subjective methods (such as limited observation, participant observation, document analysis and the interview), coming from social sciences (used in ethnographies, historiography, etc.). Research approaches with artistic practice transform the act of artistic creation into the research method itself, crossing all stages with the unpredictability and autonomy inherent in the artistic process. As in post-positivist research, the course of research with artistic practice is built during its process, however, in this last modality, during the artistic process(es). In post-positivist research, a variety of writing possibilities include autobiography, short story, artwork juxtaposition, diaries, poetry, etc., making research compatible with dance. On the other hand, research with artistic practice is not only compatible with art, but it emerges from art, from its particular and unique ways of articulating, relating differences and creating knowledge. (FERNANDES, 2013, p. 22-23)

Therefore, even if post-positivist research uses more open modes of data collection, recording and analysis, leading some of its practitioners to consider it as a type of artistic practice (STINSON; GREEN, 1999), this does not necessarily mean that this doing implies, in fact, an artistic practice, and, even more, an embodied artistic practice. Therefore, it seems to us that the central question does not revolve around the modalities in terms of being quantitative, qualitative, or post-positivist, but whether they are generated and structured with, from and through practice – in this case, artistic and, in particular, embodied. Especially because the PaR can establish dialogues with any and all modalities, without limitations, as long as it has coherence in epistemological terms.

In this sense, in a previous publication, Scialom and Fernandes (2022) traced a few categories for research that were distinguished by the way that practice is addressed, specifically artistic practice. This initial draft was created to identify the gradations between theory and practice in research, a relevant criterion for what we are investigating. It is not only the relation between theory and practice, but also to which extent practice is used as a methodological structuring axis (such as PaR) or if it is articulated as a data or as a reference of the research as a whole. It is important to highlight that these categories are dynamic and are constantly being elaborated. This is because as research evolves, the data is modified and some categories arise and others disappear or

merge, evolving in a complex growing system. The dynamic categories traced up until now include:

1. Research with artistic practice where this practice is the axis, but the associated methodology associates a range of approaches;
2. Research without artistic practice per se (despite the analysis of a practice);
3. Research with artistic practice, but with a frame that does not come from practice;
4. Research with artistic practice with different practical applications (pedagogic and/or social);
5. Research with artistic practice where this practice is the axis and object of the research, although not necessarily used as a methodology;
6. Research with artistic practice where the practice is the axis and main methodology used;
7. Research with artistic practice where the practice is the main methodology used but not necessarily the axis of the object of research itself.

In fact, PaR has been pointing to an ever-growing methodological multiplicity that, rather than fitting into the existing categories, it puts them into question. In this sense, Diego Pizarro (2020, p.123) refers to the Brazilian researcher Fernando Villar that, in his classes at the University of Brasília, affirms: “more than paradigms, the new methodological practices in arts produce paradoxes”. Such provocation stimulates the imminent opening to Art itself, with the intention of, instead of proposing normative paradigmatic models, it embraces diverse corporealities in research.

The fact that research in and with Arts is not restricted to the academic realm – space, recognition, and funding –, it generates a misunderstanding related to the meaning of PaR. This is due to the fact that for many centuries, research in/with Arts existed in parallel to the higher education scheme. An example is the different funding opportunities available to research in the Arts –

coming from the private sector and public municipal, state and federal – that award research. These result in artistic products belonging to a range of forms and languages and not in written reflections about the activity developed with reference to the field it belongs to.

However, when Art attempts to enter the academic context and plead an academic qualification that follows scientific parameters (accepted and recognised by the institutions), it begins to urge for an institutional recognition, that consequently reflects on the funding and financial support diverted to the area. This recognition comes from the presentation of a written paper that processes practice and knowledge articulated in a certain process, referring to the field where this practice and recognition belongs to, making clear the contribution that the research is making to its field.

To navigate over such knowledge it is necessary to consider the concept of practice, as suggested by Robin Nelson (2022). The author predicts that in a PaR context, practice is related to praxis, which means an investigation by the “imbrication of theory within practice” (NELSON, 2022, p.19). This means that, differently from artistic practice that predicts a technical or tacit development of a particular activity, including artistic creation of artwork and performances, PaR has a discourse that associates and imbricate practice in theory(ies)/thinking. For the author, praxis builds research that is foreseen in the academic realm, as practice, on its own, does not necessarily establish research.

Returning to the PaR terminology – Practice as Research – Nelson (2022) explains that the *as* intends to draw attention to the status that practice has in academic research. To reinforce the academic connection and the contribution to knowledge that PaR proposes, the author insists on differentiating this methodology/terminology from the term Artistic Practice or Arts Research. In PaR practice indicates that research has the creation, the game, the experience, the perception, and the attention as primary sources in the research process, followed by cognitive and intellectual activity, which are consequences or arise from the praxis.

In the scope of the arts, PaR has become relevant, as all artistic phenomena depend on a practice and a tacit knowledge (POLANYI, 1966) to happen and be developed. The validation of this knowledge became relevant in countries⁴ where it was necessary to justify the use of this knowledge to articulate discourse and artistic research based on these knowing (and not *about* them, as it was being done up until now).

3. PaR criteria and credibility tests

Below we present a few criteria and credibility tests developed and promoted by a number of internationally renowned academics in the field. As pointed out throughout this text, these criteria are adaptable and dynamic. The authors here cited have been used as international reference. However, this material needs a further detailed and comparative analysis of the methodologies being used by Brazilian researchers and the criteria set by international scholarship in search for how they differ from each other. That is, to what extent Brazilian research resembles or diverges from such criteria.

Two reference and international documents for PaR were developed by researchers who participated in commissions in European events about the theme. The first was The Salisbury Statement, written by the The Salisbury Forum Group in 2011. The second one was The Vienna Declaration on Artistic Research, written in 2020 by 11 European and Scandinavian associations.

⁴ The countries that broadened the discussions to support PaR in the academic realm include the group of Nordic countries and of the north of the European continent, England, Australia, South Africa, Canada, and the United States. Overall, those that have the English language as main means of communication or as reference in the construction of knowledge.

In parallel to these documents, the critique to the range of PaR terminologies continues, as already pointed out by Barret and Bolt (2007). In addition, in November 2022, lecturers/researchers from the Facultad de Artes de la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile held the *Primer Congreso Latinoamericano de Práctica Artística como Investigación*⁵, promoting an initial document and aiming the creation of a Latin American network of Practice as Research.

Specific PaR events have already taken place in Brazil and have been debating issues that include the 5th *Seminário de Pesquisas em Andamento* from the Postgraduate Programme in Performing Arts of the *Escola de Comunicação e Artes of Universidade de São Paulo* in 2015, organised by Marcello Amalfi and Umberto Cerasoli Jr., and the recent *I Encontro Artes da Cena & Prática como Pesquisa: experiências e reflexões*, from the Postgraduate Programme in Performing Arts of the *Instituto de Artes of UNICAMP*, organised in 2022 by the research group Practice as Research: Production Processes of the Contemporary Scene

Below we discuss a few international criteria that have been set by renowned authors in the field.

Brad Haseman (2015) discusses a few fundamental criteria so that PaR can be considered as research in the academic realm, and not a search or personal exploration, however interesting and creative it may seem. Although he provides details of the credibility tests and the need to respect them, Haseman also reveals that, to a certain extent, PaR also deviates from these parameters and creates new variations and options, following its own purposes and contributing to the creation of a broader knowledge. In this sense it is necessary to know the limit of each of these two scopes – the existent criteria and the variations done through the research in/with Arts – once both are fundamental to the consolidation of both PaR in the academic context, as well as to establish

⁵ For more information on this event, as well as the declaration in progress, see: <https://artes.uc.cl/evento/primer-congreso-latinoamericano-de-practica-artistica-como-investigacion/>. Accessed Nov. 20th 2022.

it as a particular mode of research. After all, we do not want this type of research to continue to be marginalized and/or ignored, or receiving less financial support, even when it demands high rigor, both artistic and academic.

This dialogue between the Arts and other fields is what Biggs and Buchler (2008) name as two types of positioning of the universities: the isolationist and the situated. The isolationist positioning holds that the Arts are too special and, therefore, should and need to be separate and distinct from the rest, as well as from their criteria, which does not serve the specificities of the Arts. On the other hand, the situated positioning locates the Arts in the university context, seeking to understand how the Arts can dialogue with the existing and consolidated models of other areas, without, however, losing their needs and purposes. That is, how to be faithful to our creative methodologies and respond to the larger context of research at the university? For both Haseman (2006) and Biggs and Buchler (2008), the answer might be the credibility tests. In this sense, Haseman points to five credibility tests, briefly presented below.

Firstly, Haseman points to the fundamental role of the research problem or question, which in other areas is something that is posed right from the beginning and defines the entire process and is often quite predictable. Differently, in the Arts we seldom have a well-defined problem or question a priori, and the journey to narrow it down is made during the research process. Secondly, all research needs a methodology, that is, an articulated and disciplined process of investigation that can be revisited a posteriori in order to understand how the process occurred. Unlike other fields where methodologies have been long established, in the field of PaR, we are still building our methodologies, which also include ambiguity and unpredictability. This means that “We are at the cutting edge of research practices here” (HASEMAN, 2015).

Thirdly, all research locates itself in a particular field of inquiry, that is, one cannot postulate arguments without referencing and exchanging with other previous or contemporary perspectives to the research in process. In PaR, this includes references not only to theory, but to praxis and the medium used, including

the artistic environment as a whole (festivals, galleries, etc.) and the debates that permeate it. As Biggs and Buchler (2008) state, research is cumulative, that is, it is relational in a larger thematic context, although in PaR it emerges from subjective and personal experience. Indeed, according to McNamara (2012), PaR is not necessarily concerned with autobiographical experiences either, although these can and often do become part of the research.

According to McNamara (2012), it is sometimes not even recommended that research be self-referential or that it invalidates other methodologies. As already pointed out, it should follow well-established academic parameters, such as rigorous review of other research in the topic. The author also advocates the limiting of the use of the first-person pronoun as the centre of a research formulation; as well as avoiding the dependence on personal experience as the basis or justification of a research. Obviously, these aspects are relative, since the Arts are a field where the entire creative process – both of the artistic work and of writing, and especially of this intertwining and fusion – Includes and/or is based on sensorial, perceptual, etc. aspects, inseparable from subjective personal experience, especially from desire. Indeed, desire is a word so dear to all critical theories that aim to decolonize the domination, control, and repression of corporeality.

In fact, the issue of experience in PaR is such a fundamental and extensive aspect that Biggs and Buchler (2008) name it as a separate criterion.⁶ But the emphasis on the subjectivity of the experience of the creative process does not mean that the research should be closed in on itself and limited to the author's sense of perception. Quite the contrary, as Haseman (2015) stresses, credibility tests must be relativized and transformed to some extent.

The fourth credibility test pointed out by Haseman concerns the new arguments and postulations, which need to be shared, communicated to the field in general, and cannot be left

⁶ Unlike Haseman (2015), the authors name eight PaR criteria, four of which are common to other areas, and another four are specific to the Arts (BIGGS; BUCHLER, 2008).

only to those who research. In the case of PaR, this implies exploring means of expression consistent with the work created, as well as the validation of modes of registration, archiving, dissemination, etc. This also calls for a complete reassessment of the modes of writing and composition (including performative, imagery, tactile, auditory, etc.) of theses, dissertations etc.

Fifth, these claims or new knowledge generated need to be available for ongoing peer review, inspection, and verification. In the case of PaR, these evaluation criteria must also include the artistic process and the theoretical-critical reflection that accompanies it, and precisely the coherence between these two instances, composing, for this purpose, a plural series of instruments that go beyond a conventional evaluation of written text.

From this gradual construction of criteria in several countries, the PaR came to be seen as a research methodology and, therefore, came to have specific premises that define and characterize its existence and application. In this sense, it is important to emphasize the difference between PaR and artistic research. PaR is within an academic environment that seeks to work with knowledge, whether in teaching or in its advancement. On the other hand, artistic research carried out primarily outside the university can develop into academic research, constituting a third level of difficulty. In general, we associate academic research (especially in the humanities) purely with theoretical reflection; in opposition to artistic research, which is associated with creative processes without necessarily involving writing and/or theoretical investigation. These two levels of knowledge creation precisely constitute a third level of complexity in PaR.

Regardless, PaR is still often neglected and considered academic research that is not formal enough or not theoretical enough, or, even, research that had to become academic since it is not interesting enough to be purely artistic. Then, the PaR is often criticized by both the academic and artistic circles, and, in fact, if it is properly developed according to research excellence

criteria that have been outlined for decades,⁷ it can be even more challenging.

In Artistic Practice as Research, the investigation evolves with/through/ from artistic creations, which work as a motto to interweave and create meaning alongside theoretical studies. Therefore, PaR is constituted as an integrative modality that is not reduced to a single formal and/or methodological category – theoretical or practical – but, on the contrary, it is plural in its constitutive structure, even being able to associate itself with quantitative and qualitative methodologies (HASEMAN, 2006), besides the most compatible post-positivist methodologies. By breaking dichotomous paradigms of theory and practice inside the university, with and from artistic practice, PaR blurs the boundaries between the social group that makes art and the one that reflects on it, blending the hierarchical understanding between formal and informal education, academic and popular knowledge, etc. In other words, the PaR works horizontalizing wisdoms, valuing plural ways in which knowledge is produced, made visible, multiplied, and disseminated.

For this reason, PaR interlaces itself with the field of Somatics in a very coherent way. Both promote ways to innovate and generate relevant and current knowledge from an expansion of cognition beyond a purely rational approach, valuing multiple ways of learning, creating, and relating in/with the world

4. Somatic epistemologies for research

The field of Somatics did not hold this name and was not even considered a field when the first individual investigations began in the second half of the 19th century. It was in the blooming of the overwhelming 20th century and its numerous transformations, that the so-called somatic pioneers (EDDY, 2009, 2016)

⁷ One of its pioneers was Carol Grey, who advocated what she called Practice-led Research as early as 1969 (HASEMAN, 2015).

found inspirations and the necessary ground to transform their restlessness into continuous experimentation procedures. They were inspired by disciplines such as Dance, Theatre, Philosophy, Psychology, Biology, among others, as well as in the Asian tradition and from native people around the globe. Later, in the 1960s, the philosopher and practitioner of the Feldenkrais method, Thomas Hanna (1928-1990), ended up gathering several practices that he considered to share similar foundations, naming them Somatics. Since then, there has been plenty discussions and unfolding, between criticism and activism, moving entire communities in search of a fuller life in interpersonal and ecological relationships.

The misunderstanding of Somatics as a field of individualistic, self-centred, and self-referential journey was surpassed, going beyond the hermetic romanticism of a type of somatic activism that existed, especially in the USA, until the end of the 20th century. Fortunately, in the last decades, the field has been expanding and establishing itself worldwide by proposing and opening itself to different ways of knowing and tensioning the emerging themes of contemporaneity. Moreover, the decolonial turn (MIGNOLO; WALSH, 2018) has completed the unravel of Somatics in its opening to integrated types of knowledges that are not subject to the paradigms of modern science. By acknowledging its white and European origin, we perceive a change in the field of Somatics today to tear down closed, dualistic, homogeneous, univocal, racializing, and classist models, on a path that is diametrically opposed to any kind of colonization. See the somatic movements in the countries of the global south developing knowledge with, for and through expanded somatic perspectives.

The questionings and unfolding generated by Fernandes (2015; in press), as well as discussed in the roundtable Somatic Practices as Movements of Insurgency (FERNANDES; GERALDI; TORRALBA; VELLOZO, 2022), for example, align with the discussions brought by Critical Somatics. In this sense they reflect the provocations carried out by Johnson (1977, 1992 [1983], 1994, 1995, 2018), who develops a critique of specific somatic methods, after having experienced in depth that which he calls into question.

As a result, his critique focuses on aspects of certain methods, such as the models of the body they tend to replicate. Yet he recognises how Somatics as a field is too diverse to be limited to a generalist critique. Similarly, Fortin (2017) specifies some of Somatics' blind spots by critically examining it within five pathways: social, ecological, spiritual, educational, health and wellbeing.

In the same way that Fortin seeks to expand themes pertinent to Somatics, Batson also expands the field. In order to address the emerging critiques of the field of Somatics, Batson (BATSON; KAMPE, 2020) suggests considering, beyond the practices themselves, six points that contribute to a discourse that has been called critical Somatics. These are: a) Historical context – situating Somatics within a broad historical context of the *self*; b) Reformulated humanity – a full consideration for Somatics' multidimensionality of bodies, including the spiritual, in a movement that recognises the ecology of multiple species in coexistence; c) Political stance – Identifying what political understandings are revealed by Somatics: “How can Somatic activism become effective without minimising (weakening) its transformative potential?” (BATSON; KAMPE, 2020, p. 171); d) Mercantilisation and collusion – examining human potential and human failure to minimise the effects of contemporary hyper individualism, which in fact reduce our power for collective action; e) The tyranny of normality – undoing the coercion of conformity as a social tyranny by developing practices through interpersonal connectivity towards community interconnectivity; f) Transdisciplinarity – learning from/with a variety of disciplines, including undoing the idea of discipline, on the way to favouring the transformation of educational models impacted by the neo-liberalism.

In this era of the decoloniality of being, of knowledge, of corporealities and of everything that was built on solid bases from the petulant partiality of scientific modernity, Simas and Rufino (2020) invite us to move on the poetics and politics of enchantment, promoting a path that goes through the ecologies of being, otherwise we only have disenchantment.

The enchantment dribbles and bewitches the logics that want to apprehend life in a single model, more often than not linked to a productivist and utilitarian reasoning. This is the reason that enchantment is a pulsation that rips the human being to transform them into an animal, a wind, a water hole, a river rock, and a grain of sand. The enchantment pluralizes the being, decentralizes it, showing it as something that will never be absolute, but ecological and unfinished (SIMAS; RUFINO, 2020, p. 7).

The strand of PaR we have termed Somatic as Research (FERNANDES, 2019; PIZARRO, 2020) recognizes human potential within all its failure, considering that everything we experience is an intrinsic process to research that considers procedural somatic knowledge to destabilize absolute certainties: of projects, of so-called theories, of unquestionable examples. In this case, the not knowing and cellular awareness of somatic wisdom is available for processing that is not directly dependent on immediate cognitive experiences. The knowledge that is captured and somatically articulated is of another category of time, sometimes expanded enough to rearticulate the experience that research practice needs, rewriting histories from perspectives that up until now were made subaltern and invisibilised.

Dance-driven knowledge is intricately connected with Somatics. This is because Dance's performativity installs a non-representational research process from/in Art, which legitimately takes up the sensitive, the sensorial, and the somatic attunement, revaluing corporeality and reterritorializing the field of Arts, especially the bodied/corporeal one that are in the centre of academic research, amidst the increasing simulacrum and body training.

5. A few premisses with Somatics/PaR (in process)

Based on the reflections made in this article, we end the text by outlining some initial questions and premisses that emerge when we interlace Somatics and PaR in Dance:

1. PaR is neither quantitative nor qualitative research, nor is it post-positivist research, although it can be used in conjunction with these methodologies and establish dialogues more readily with post-positivist research or even become a new modality of the latter, but it is configured as another paradigm, or consists, in fact, in a paradox (PIZARRO, 2020).

2. PaR is not necessarily associated with other qualitative and post-positivist methodologies, but it establishes dialogues with them, for example ethnography, cartography, autobiography, autoethnography and action research;

3. PaR may make use of different methods for data collection, such as interviews, case studies etc.;

4. As not all practices are artistic, not all practices are research. Moreover, not everything that we call practice is necessarily characterised as corporal practice that is active in the process of knowledge creation;

5. In PaR, not all artistic practice is characterised as academic research;

6. Carrying out practice as part of academic research does not necessarily constitute a PaR;

7. To be considered a PaR, the research does not necessarily need to include staging or the creation of a work or artistic product as a final result. This means that the creative process can be integrated as a *modus operandi* of the research, which can be about other works and themes related to the Arts (SCIALOM, 2017)

8. PaR is a terminology that encompasses several types of research, such as Practice-based Research, Practice-led Research, Performative Research, Artistic Practice as Research,

Embodied Research, Somatic as Research, Merger as Research, Somatic-Performative Research, among others;

9. Practice in research is different than Practice as Research/PaR. Practice and research are two terms that are in direct relationship. However, when practice is present in research, it is not necessarily a production of knowledge agent that is articulated in current discourse;

10. Although PaR is an internationally recognised framework, it is not homogeneous. PaR has different criteria and standards in each country, related to the history of research and funding in each one of them. Although Brazil already presents some PaR methodologies created by national researchers, such as the Somatic-Performative Approach (FERNANDES, 2014), the discussion of PaR becomes important to understand about rigor in research. In PaR this means a double rigor, both in theory and in practice. An example is the academic artists who transit through both environments and overlap them in a two-way street, considering the knowledge already produced in the area and situating our enquiry in relation to the field in which we operate and the knowledge that already exists in it;

11. Although the PaR terminology was inaugurated in a specific historical context (THE SALISBURY FORUM GROUP, 2011), trends and variations were already under development in different places, and still continue to unfold and intersect nowadays. Therefore, it is important to validate different matrices without fixing a universal source;

12. As practice creates coherent principles within certain contexts, existing theories, debates, and issues emerge from it and are then articulated and connected, not the other way around (or at least this should happen simultaneously). In other words, practice is not subservient to theory; artistic practice is not a manipulable object for testing and applying theories. Art is a potent field of knowledge creation, especially Dance and corporal knowledge. Therefore, it is an autonomous and relational field, from which specific practices engender new and multiple modes of knowledge, including theoretical ones;

13. Practice determines the consistency in the use of specific terminologies, their matrices, interrelationships, and references (e.g., ecoperformance, metaphor, cognition etc.);

14. PaR is not necessarily personal and autobiographical, although it starts from the encounter with oneself, many times in creative, somatic and/or individual phenomenological processes. Nonetheless, these processes are always in dialogue with the world, with peers and with that which has already been done. It is in this transit that PaR's contribution lies;

15. The intertwining of PaR with Somatics grants autonomy to the field of Dance, which relates to other fields and areas of knowledge based on its own premises as an Art form. In such context, "movement" can be understood as gradations between stir and stillness (LABAN, 1984, p. 68), in an infinity of variations and combinations that respect singularities and differences, as well as artistic multimodalities that emerge with and from Dance;

16. PaR processes in Dance are guided by embodied modes of creation such as the identification of the research's axis-elements (terminology used in the Art of Movement), selecting what is fundamental (through movement) and around which the remaining elements are organised. Dynamic categories are also consistent with such modes, making more flexible methodologies, parameters and criteria that are given a priori;

17. Methodology is a way of creating something repeatable, but we precisely seek to transform through PaR. This process can be identified as repatterning, a Somatic terminology that refers to the action of revisiting patterns – more specifically, in the case of Body-Mind CenteringSM, Basic Neurocellular Patterns (BAINBRIDGE COHEN, 2018) – in a process of constant development and growth;

18. PaR in Dance through Somatics happens through co-moving modes, that is, moving and being moved with and by the research(es), in an interdependent and integrated way on all levels (physical, mental, affective, spiritual, social, cultural, political, environmental, ancestral etc.)

19. The incorporation of Somatics and practice in Dance research methodologies is a decolonial process of resonance in

an expanded field, contributing, fundamentally, to a change in the current normative and hegemonic paradigms (rationalist, anthropocentric, individualist, ableist etc.), building embodied affective paths of recognition, validation and visibility of plural collective knowledge;

20. The association of Somatics and PaR in Dance research stimulates the establishment of an expanded decolonial field of multiple creative modalities, from more egalitarian modes (less verticalized in terms of a single power that imposes itself from the top, as in the case of the cognitive mind separated from corporeality), respecting differences at all levels and promoting mutual support and unrestricted accessibility to be/live/relate/learn in/with a world in constant change.

Acknowledgment

To Prof. Dr. Silvia Maria Geraldi, for the conversations and exchanges held during the event 1st Performing Arts & Practice as Research Meeting: experiences and reflections, held at Oficina Cultural Oswald Andrade, São Paulo-SP, in October 2022.

References

BAINBRIDGE COHEN, Bonnie. *Basic Neurocellular Patterns: Exploring Developmental Movement*. El Sobrante: Burchfield Rose, 2018.

BAINBRIDGE COHEN, Bonnie. Self and Other, SelfOther: Bonnie Bainbridge Cohen in conversation with Nancy Stark Smith for CQ. *Contact Quarterly*, Northampton, v. 45, n. 1, p. 51-56, 2020.

BARRETT, E.; BOLT, B. (Eds.) *Practice as research: approaches to creative arts inquiry*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2007.

BATSON, Glenna; KAMPE, Thomas. Dancing Critical Somatics – An emancipatory education for the future? In: DAVID, Ann R.; HUXLEY, Michael; WHATLEY, Sarah (Eds.). *Dance Fields: staking a claim for dance studies in the twenty-first century*. Binsted: Dance Books, 2020. p. 154-184.

BIGGS, Michael; BUCHLER, Daniela. Eight criteria for practice-based research in the creative and cultural industries. *Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education*, v. 7, n. 1, 2008.

EDDY, Martha. A brief history of somatic practices and dance: historical development of the field of somatic education and its relationship to dance. *Journal of Dance and Somatic Practices*, Coventry, v. 1, n.1, p. 05-27, 2009. Available at: <https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/intellect/jdsp>. Accessed July 2nd, 2018.

EDDY, Martha. *Mindful Movement: the evolution of the somatic arts and conscious action*. E-book. Bristol, UK and Chicago, USA: Intellect, 2016.

FERNANDES, Ciane. Em Busca da Escrita com Dança: Algumas Abordagens Metodológicas de Pesquisa com Prática Artística. *Dança*, Salvador, v.2, n.2, p. 18-36, julho/dezembro 2013.

FERNANDES, Ciane. Somatic-Performative Research: Attunement, Sensitivity, Integration. *Art Research Journal/Revista de Pesquisa em Arte*, Natal, v. 1/2, n. 2, p. 72–91, July/Dec., 2014.

FERNANDES, Ciane. When whole(ness) is more than the sum of parts: Somatics as contemporary epistemological field. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos da Presença*, Porto Alegre, v. 5, n. 1, p. 9-38, Jan/Apr. 2015.

FERNANDES, Ciane. Somática como Pesquisa: Autonomias criativas em movimento como fonte de processos acadêmicos vivos. In: CUNHA, Carla Sabrina; PIZARRO, Diego; VELLOZO, Marila Annibelli (Eds.). *Práticas Somáticas em Dança: Body-Mind Centering™ em Criação, Pesquisa e Performance*. Brasília: Instituto Federal de Brasília, 2019. p. 121-137.

FERNANDES, Ciane. Somática em campo expandido e a prática artística como pesquisa. In: PIZARRO, Diego; CUNHA, Carla Sabrina; MARTINELLI, Suselaine Serejo (Eds.). *Epistemologias Somáticas em Movimento*. Brasília: IFB. (In press)

FERNANDES, Ciane; GERALDI, Silvia; TORRALBA, Ruth; VELLOZO, Marila Annibelli. Mesa temática Práticas Somáticas como Movimentos de Insurgência. Mediação de Diego Pizarro. VII Encontro Científico Nacional de Pesquisadores em Dança, 2022. Available at: <https://youtu.be/rnVr1Ax6wsY>. Accessed Aug. 2nd, 2022.

FORTIN, Sylvie. Looking for blind spots in somatics' evolving pathways. *Journal of Dance and Somatic Practices*, Coventry, v. 9, n. 2, p. 145-157. Available at: <https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/intellect/jdsp>. Accessed March 5th, 2018.

HANNA, Thomas. The field of somatics. *Somatics: magazine journal of the bodily arts and sciences*, Novato, CA, v. 1, n. 1, p. 30-34, 1976. Available at: <https://somatics.org/library/html-fieldofsomatics>. Accessed Dec. 16th, 2019.

HASEMAN, Brad C. A necessidade da pesquisa performativa ou "A melhor definição do amor não vale um beijo de moça namorada". Conferência de abertura do Seminário de Pesquisas em Andamento 2015, ECA/USP (Universidade de São Paulo). Available at: <http://iptv.usp.br/portal/transmission/video.action;jsessionid=872536638CEFDD94C832F686EC0BCDEE?itemId=31203>. Accessed Sep. 10th, 2022.

HASEMAN, Brad C. Manifesto for Performative Research. *Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy*, Santa Lucia-AU, n. 118, p. 98-106, 2006. Available at: <https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=010497030622521;res=IELLCC>. Accessed Oct. 5th, 2010.

JOHNSON, Don Hanlon. Introduction: Borderlands. In: JOHNSON, Don Hanlon (Ed.). *Diverse bodies, diverse practices: toward an inclusive somatics*. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books, 2018. p. 1-19.

JOHNSON, Don Hanlon. Introduction. In: JOHNSON, Don Hanlon (Ed.). *Bone, Breath and Gesture: practices of embodiment*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1995. p. ix-xviii.

JOHNSON, Don Hanlon. *Body, Spirit and Democracy*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1994.

JOHNSON, Don Hanlon. *Body: recovering our sensual wisdom*. 2^a. edition. Berkeley, California: North Atlantic Books, 1992 [1983].

JOHNSON, Don Hanlon. *The Protean Body: a rolfer's view of human flexibility*. New York: Harper & How, 1977.

LABAN, Rudolf. *A vision of dynamic space*. London: Laban Archives & The Falmer Press, 1984.

MEEHAN, Emma. Speak: Authentic movement, "embodied text" and performance as research. *Journal of Dance & Somatic Practices*, Coventry, v. 7, n. 2, p. 313-329, 2015.

McNAMARA, Andrew E. Six rules for practice-led research. *TEXT*, Australasia, special issue, n. 14, p. 1-15, 2012. Available at: <http://www.textjournal.com.au/speciss/issue14/content.htm>. Accessed July 5th, 2018.

MIDGELOW, Vida; BACON, Jane. Creative Articulations Process. *Choreographic Practices*, London, v. 5, n. 1, p. 7-31, 2014. Available at: <https://www.intellectbooks.com/choreographic-practices>. Accessed April 10th, 2015.

MIGNOLO; Walter D.; WALSH, Catherine E. *On Decoloniality: concepts, analytics, praxis*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2018.

NELSON, Robin. *Practice as research in the arts: principles, protocols, pedagogies, resistances*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

PIZARRO, Diego. *Anatomia Corpoética em (de)composições: três corpos de práxis somática em dança*. 446 f. il. 2020. Doctoral Dissertation (Ph.D. in Performing Arts) – Escola de Teatro/Escola de Dança, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Artes Cênicas, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, 2020.

POLANYI, Michael. *The Tacit Dimension*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, INC., 1966.

SCIALOM, Melina. *Laban Plural: Arte do Movimento, pesquisa e genealogia da práxis de Rudolf Laban no Brasil*. São Paulo: Summus, 2017.

SCIALOM, Melina; FERNANDES, Ciane. Prática artística como pesquisa no Brasil: Algumas reflexões iniciais. *Revista de Ciências Humanas*, Viçosa, v. 2, n. 22, p. 1-23, 2022. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufv.br/RCH/issue/view/506>. Accessed Nov. 27th, 2022.

SIMAS, Luiz Antonio; RUFINO, Luiz. *Encantamento: sobre política de vida*. Rio de Janeiro: Mórula, 2020.

STINSON, Susan; GREEN, Jill. Postpositivist research in dance. In: FRALEIGH, Sondra Horton; HANSTEIN, Penelope (Eds.) *Researching Dance: Evolving modes of inquiry*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1999. p. 91-123.

THE SALISBURY Forum Group. The Salisbury Statement. *Social Work and Society International*, Wuppertal, v. 9, n. 1, p. 4-9, 2011. Available at: <https://ejournals.bib.uni-wuppertal.de/index.php/sws/article/view/2/10>. Accessed March 1st, 2012.

VIENNA DECLARATION on Artistic Research. June 26, 2020. Available at: <https://cultureactioneurope.org/news/vienna-declaration-on-artistic-research/>. Accessed Nov. 20th, 2022.

WILLIAMSON, Amanda; WHATLEY, Sarah; BATSON, Glenna; WEBER, Rebecca (Eds.). *Dance, Somatics and Spiritualities: contemporary sacred narratives*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 2014.

Received on October 3th, 2022

Aproved on november 06th, 2022

REALIZAÇÃO



UFRJ

PPGDAN
UFRJ

Anda
associação nacional de
pesquisadores em dança