

## THEATER: THE PLACE TO READ FROM

### *Teatro: o lugar de onde se lê*

GAMA, Joaquim<sup>1</sup>; & PINTO, Luisa<sup>2</sup>

---

#### **Abstract**

The purpose of this article is to look at procedures that make it possible to expand the ability to read, based on the reading of theatrical works. In a context dominated by the massification of images and models from digital social networks, thinking about a reflexive, dialogical aesthetic education, centered on the ability to read, becomes fundamental for the education of the gaze and, consequently, for a more critical view of the world around us and the process of teaching theater.

#### **Resumo**

A proposta deste artigo está voltada aos procedimentos que possibilitem ampliar a capacidade de ler, com base na leitura da obra teatral. Em um contexto dominado pela massificação de imagens e modelos das redes sociais digitais, pensar em uma educação estética reflexiva, dialógica, centrada na capacidade de leitura, torna-se fundamental para a educação do olhar e, conseqüentemente, para uma visão mais crítica sobre o mundo que nos cerca e o processo de ensino do teatro.

**Keywords:** *Aesthetic education; Education of the gaze; Theatre and education; Reading the theatrical work.*

**Palavras-chave:** *Educação estética; Educação do olhar; Teatro e educação; Leitura da obra teatral.*

**Submission date:** February 2023 | **Publication date:** September 2023.

---

<sup>1</sup> JOAQUIM CESAR MOREIRA GAMA – Centro de Estudos Arnaldo Araujo - CEEA/ESAP. PORTUGAL. Email: quimgama45@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> LUISA ISABEL DA COSTA PINTO – Centro de Estudos Arnaldo Araújo, Diretora artística da companhia de teatro Narrativensaio-AC e Professora Auxiliar na Escola Superior Artística do Porto e na Universidade de Trás os Montes. PORTUGAL: Email: luisaisabelpinto@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

*We need a type of theatre which not only releases the feelings, insights and impulses possible within the particular historical field of human relations in which the action takes place but employs and encourages those thoughts and feelings which help transform the field itself (Bertolt Brecht).*

In a society dominated by the media, it is important to have theatre as an alternative, where lively and real communication is possible. It is necessary and urgent to disturb the spectators' sensitivity, instilling in them responsibilities that make them an integral part of the show and constitute them as attentive readers of the scene. There is also a need for a theatre concerned with making each spectator a "sole spectator". This "sole spectator", an essential part of the show, needs to have their gaze provoked to read the scene. In this permanent state of reading and constructing meanings, this "sole spectator" is free to build countless relationships and associations with other performative and aesthetic experiences. The "sole spectator", who multiplies in the audience into many other "sole spectators", is invited to be a co-creator of the performance.

This "sole spectator" needs to be continuously encouraged to complete the scenic text with his / her imagination (characters' gestures, costumes, scenography, lighting, and music) so that he or she does not just remain an assistant/listener to the scene, but also adds his or her own ideas, perceptions, and views of the world to the plot (Lemann 2007).

In contemporary times, inviting the spectator to act as an active, participative reader, a receiver and co-producer of meanings, a being full of their imaginative capabilities, is accentuated, with the potential to move away from merely deciphering logically organized ideas in the scenic text and assume the attitude of a player who is interested in unravelling the puzzle. Fruition is built on the spectator's freedom to reorganize the scenes and make sense of them.

If the world of digital media makes a permanent effort to present its products as finished, self-explanatory, imprisoning its consumers, not as unique, but as a mass of spectators, the theatrical reader can become free, more independent if their action is less about deciphering and more about re-signifying the text, allowing them to understand themselves from what they see. The “sole spectator” becomes what Heiner Müller says is an element against the totalizing movement of logos (as cited in Koudela, 2003).

In this sense, thinking about theatre in the academic area means thinking about its contributions so that students not only have access to theatre by performing theatre, but also by watching other artists' productions. Attendances should entertain students and be a collective artistic act, but they can also be conceived as artistic propositions that are capable of triggering new scenic readings and making it possible to look at the world and reflect on it.

Today, there is no point in a learning process based solely on technical reproductions, on pedagogical actions that fail to guarantee the development of the creative act, which is present in every human being. Just as it makes no sense to think of theatre as a mere adornment of curricular matrices.

Experiencing music, painting, photography, cinema, together with other ways of using sound and image, as well as coexisting with artificial languages, could point us towards an insertion into the symbolic universe that is not the one we have established at school. Not all these languages are alternatives. They work together. And it is this articulation that should be explored in teaching reading when we aim to work on the student's ability to understand (Orlandi, 2005, p. 40).

By understanding that coexistence with theatre and the performing arts are areas of knowledge, we corroborate the relationship between human beings and art and the meaning of making art for individuals. In this way, the indications of paths for theatrical learning are focused on the sensitive-cognitive binomial. Thus, the ideas presented in this article for reading theatrical works arise not only from a particular moment for the authors, supported by their trajectories as theatrical pedagogues, but also as part of a number of thinkers who see the act of teaching and learning theatre as a possibility for educating the eye, for training a spectator capable of reading and becoming unsettled about what is in front of them.

## CONTEXTUALIZATION

The ideas expressed in this work are contextualized in the authors' trajectories, in their experiences as artists and professors. Hence, dialoguing with various thinkers, we explicit the desire to discuss and reflect on procedures that can be established when reading theatrical works and what benefits this reading can offer students.

In fact, the ideas presented here have been nurtured for a long time. They began with research in the field of theatre and the performing arts applied to education, which sometimes covered artistic teaching and learning, and sometimes focused on the processes of reception of the theatrical work. The authors have always been interested in the artistic education of students, such as aesthetic and critical education of student spectators. Therefore, as professors and creators in the field of theatre, they have also maintained interest in the relationship between stage and audience, and fundamentally in the relationship between theatre and education.

The relationship between theatre and education has been an integral part of this art form since its origins. However, its use in a more structured and objective way for pedagogical purposes only emerged clearly in the modern era. Its ramifications extend not only to the written word of the dramaturgy but also to the spoken word of the performance with declared purposes of social, political, and ethical activism, and even having assumed a particular configuration in Brecht's theatre. This is where it is introduced, in the postmodern and post dramatic stage (...). In the Brechtian path, (...) the spectacular-dramatic creation is characterized by its work-in-progress nature as a creation, as well as its incorporation of new research proposals in theatre education and its role in the search for the democratization of art, which is so intrinsic to our time. (Guinsburg & Soares, as cited in Gama, 2015, back cover).

Modern stage directors have incorporated pedagogical perspectives into their work, aimed both at democratizing art and access to modes of theatrical production. Bertolt Brecht (1978) has several experiments that sought to broaden the relationship between the stage and the audience, turning spectators into actors and actors into spectators. In addition to his pedagogical purposes, Brecht also sought to emancipate the audience, revealing the modes of stage production and the meanings that a text could acquire when performed.

Within this artistic and pedagogical perspective, we can include the Theatrical Games system, through which it is possible to develop a method with students from drama courses that makes them capable of acting with ease on stage, in front of an audience, as well as reading theatrical signs. This method makes it possible to understand theatrical language not only as an outlet for emotional tensions and limitations (Spolin, 1984), but also as language and a fertile space for artistic expression.

In the book *Improvisation for the Theatre*, pedagogue and director Viola Spolin presents a series of games, called Theatre Games, through which students and/or future theatre professionals acquire essential knowledge that contributes to the education of "sole spectators", with the ability to read theatre. Therefore, students who try out this approach learn to read theatre by doing, by executing artistic processes and products. They also become capable of enjoying theatrical creation.

### **WHY THEATRE: THE PLACE WHERE YOU READ FROM?**

As the epigraph by Bertolt Brecht (1978) states at the beginning of the text, theatre today is not only concerned with triggering emotional and sensory sensations in the audience, nor with reproducing Aristotelian aesthetics. Since Modern Theatre, with its aesthetic ruptures and the re-signification of the various elements of theatrical language, it has increasingly become a collective artistic act that also focuses its spotlight on the audience. This is done with the aim of removing the audience from the supposed passivity of artistic reception, inviting them to participate with their ideas and thoughts, instilling a desire in the spectator to modify their relationship with the world, within the historical, political, and social contexts in which they are involved.

This closer look at the audience, considering it an integral part of the process of constructing and interpreting the theatrical work, has been researched by various theorists and artists in the field. For example, the Théâtre du Radeau, with the show *Coda*<sup>3</sup>, presents us with discussions about theatre and the performing arts that are in line with the perspective of an active audience in theatre and the performing arts. Director François Tanguy emphatically stated that what interested the group was no longer linear dramaturgy or the construction of great performances of actors and scenarios. The object of investigation that, in Tanguy's opinion, most affects and provokes postmodern artists is the audience's perception and conception of the theatrical work. According to Radeau's actors, theatre is not what is represented on stage, but rather what is established in the relationship with the place from which the scene is seen. Precisely, the theatrical phenomenon will be realized in the minds of those who watch the scene, provoking infinite possibilities of reading what is being presented to the audience. This is the same principle advocated by Western European philosophers and playwrights, more specifically from ancient Greece, which reiterates Radeau's ideas.

---

<sup>3</sup> The performance was presented in 2005, at Sesc Belenzinho, São Paulo, Brazil.

As we know, the origin of the Greek term *Theatron* is linked to the place from which the audience looks. Theorist Patrice Pavis (1999) states that, in the Greek's view, theatre is actually a standpoint on an event, a look, an angle of vision. It is in the displacement of the relationship between looking and the object looked at that the reading of the representation takes place.

The resumption of this paradigm by contemporary artists also seems to be related to studies in the field of literature, mainly the reception theories defended by Hans Jauss (1979) and Wolfgang Iser (1979). When reading the ideas defended by these authors, we realize that there are many points in common with the concern and reception of theatrical works. As theatre and literature are blood brothers, since they both deal with ideas, words, text, etc., it is possible to relate principles of reception theory to scenic and performing art.

When presenting his studies of aesthetic reception centered on social and historical factors, Jauss demonstrates his concern with the contexts of the reader by collecting data related to the contexts in which readers were (or were not) inserted at the time of the reception of the theatrical work. Iser, on the other hand, seeks to think about the relationship between the work and its history, between the past and the present.

The same concern seems to be present in the works of Heiner Müller. Müller has a very significant production based on classic texts, whose intention is to enable the spectator to critically review the present in the light of the past.

A function of drama is to evoke the dead and the part of the future that is buried with them (Müller as cited in Koudela, 20023, p.34).

Dramaturgical texts such as *Hamletmaschine*, *Medeamaterial*, *Macbeth* and others from Heiner Müller are models in their intention to deal with the past and the present, with the experience of remembrance. The analogies established by Müller, presented in a fragmentary way, with the purpose of activating the spectator's participation, thus creating a content production mechanism, which opens up to what the playwright called free fantasy spaces (Koudela, 2003, p. 55).

These so-called "fantasy spaces" advocated by Müller, present in the fragmentary way in which the actions are presented to the audience, establish the "aesthetics of fragmentation". These ideas are similar to the concept of "emptiness of meaning" that Iser advocates.

Iser claims that gaps encourage the reader to coordinate the perspectives presented in the text and open up infinite possibilities for interpretation.

(...) only when the reader makes sense of the text under unfamiliar conditions (*analogizing*), but strange, something is forming in him/her that brings out a layer of his/her personality that his/her consciousness was unaware of. However, such awareness comes about through the interaction between text and reader: that's why his/her analysis gains primacy (Iser as cited in Ângelo, 2005, p.38).

The audience's active participation is sought by Müller, as has already been said, through the aesthetics of the fragment, which creates empty spaces, making what is familiar become strange, thus creating astonishment in the spectator. In this way, like Iser, Müller also seeks this primacy of analysis, of *analogizing*.

Instability, doubt, going back on what one has said and then denied is part of the system that belongs to the reader, as they will fill the undefined blanks of the text with their imagination (Ângelo, 2005, p.40).

In both Iser and Müller, the idea of “empty spaces” or “fantasy spaces” suggests the idea of an implicit reader. Unlike the real reader, the implied reader materializes in the set of pre-orientations given in the fictional literary text, or by conceptual association, in the scenic text. To put it in another way, it can be said that the text presents mechanisms that characterize the implied reader, anticipating the presence of a receptor, a real reader.

Therefore, the implicit reader plays a fundamental role in the articulation of reading, being delegated countless connections between the work and their previous experiences. Without this openness, only denotative reading would take place, and there would be no suitable space for reading artistic objects from a historical and individual point of view (Ângelo, 2005).

According to both German authors, the connections proposed for the reading process, left to the reader, whether from the “empty spaces” or the “fantasy spaces”, both indicated in the literary, dramaturgical, and scenic text, are far from being characterized as an explanatory reading of the contents, as if it were a mechanized, school exercise of completing the sentence. It is a space reserved for the receptor audience, the space for contemplating the work.

### **FOR AN EDUCATION FOCUSED ON “FANTASY SPACES”**

In proposals that involve teaching and learning, reading the work of art must be part of the process of artistic fruition: the spectator's gaze at the work, the construction of a meticulous and critical eye. This is a concern with the reception of the work of art by the ordinary spectator. Such concern for the spectator is also present in current discussions about the following principle: there is a need for educational systems to add content to their curricula equipping students to take a more attentive and reflective look at the bombardment of images to which they are subjected.

In contemporary times, everyday life has been managed by artificial intelligence (AI), and is no longer the narrative world of words, but the narrative world of images. People spend the day in front of their computer screens and/or cell phones, consuming *didactic* contents and, when they get into university, they find it difficult to accept the idea that they are there to think (Bloom, 2001).

When students are invited to immerse themselves in the living stream of theatrical language, based on what they read on stage, have the opportunity to

(...) take an interpretative look at life, exercising the ability to understand it in one's own way. Thus, we can conceive that awareness is achieved through reading the world. Appropriation of language means gaining the conditions for this reading (Desgranges, 2006, p. 23).

The proposal for reading of the theatrical work presented here is not based on the action of reading the letters, words, sentences, phrases of the dramaturgical texts. Reading is not restricted to the explanatory action of the work, often mistakenly assumed by mediation processes.

Reading "(...) can be disconcerting, difficult, obscure, ambiguous, but the problem lies with the reader" (Compagnon, 2001, p. 142).

Many of the mediation processes disseminated in cultural spaces or in the classroom are pragmatic transpositions of reception theory, aimed to facilitate the "real reader's" access to the work. In general, this turns the mediation process into explanatory actions that make it impossible for the reader to deal with what is most important in the work of art: symbolic thought. Mediation thought of in this way disqualifies the abilities of the "real reader", transforming them into a caricature of an "ideal reader".

By making mediation too easy, we don't deal with the process and ideation, with what can be disconcertingly difficult, with ambiguity, with obscurity. On the contrary, these elements are transformed into degradation of the knowledge offered or incited in the work of art (Iser, 1979).

The process of reading the work, within the scope of theatre and performing arts pedagogy, should be more directed towards the following idea:

(...) on the one hand, clarify the current process in which the effect and meaning of the text for the contemporary reader take place and, on the other hand, to reconstruct the historical process by which the text is always received and interpreted differently by readers of different times (Jauss, 1979, p. 47).



This takes us back at the forefront of Heiner Müller's aesthetic proposals, with the idea of historicization, the aesthetics of fragmentation and spaces for fantasy. Academia is often too fulfilled! It's fulfilled with *connectivity* (Iser, 1979). It lacks empty spaces, to fantasize about.

Reading theatre means describing, analyzing, coding and decoding, interpreting and judging the scenic text, which refers to the relationship of all the signifier systems used in the performance, whose arrangement and interaction form the staging. Thus, the integral parts of the scenic text are the scenery, costumes, props, make-up, sound (voice, music and sound design), gestures, lighting and all the other elements that make up the scene (Pavis, 1999). Therefore, reading means focusing your gaze on the materiality of the scenic space, it is the development of methods that make it possible to deconstruct the network of signifiers that structure the staging and reconstruct it based on multiple possibilities and interpretations of meanings for the reader (Ryngaert, 1998).

Reading is, first of all, the construction of a dialogical and reflective attitude towards the reality of the work of art and, consequently, towards the spectator's perceptions and conceptions of the world. In other words, we seek to read what is most provisional and fleeting in theatre and the performing arts: the moment of representation. Probably, it is also the most temporary and ephemeral thing in human existence: life.

It is the games of charades, hide-and-peek, the search for meaning, the pleasure of discovery, the restlessness of questions that should guide and determine the reading actions of the theatrical work.

How do you teach yourself to look at a work divergently, dialectically? How do you build a dialogic relationship with the artistic object? What do I need to learn to read a work of art?

Knowing how to read, understanding that reading presupposes dialogue with the world of sensations and ideas are precious actions that constitute "fantasy spaces". Spaces that are not only a challenge for faculty related to the area of written language, neither for playwrights as it seems to be an issue for the whole of today's contemporary excessively imagistic society.

Reading today takes on a somewhat literal meaning, in which case it is as much a school problem as a metaphorical one, involving society (or at least its more enlightened sectors) that seeks to find its identity by researching the manifestations of culture. Under this dual focus, a theory that reflects on the reader, the aesthetic experience, the possibilities of interpretation and, in parallel, its repercussions on teaching and the environment, may have something to pass on to the scholar, broadening the scope of his/her investigations (Zilberman, 1989, p. 6).

It is therefore necessary not to deny the configurations of contemporaneity, but to take a vigilant and critical stance. The deviance of globalization, such as the manifestation and reductive homogeneity, must be replaced by the effort of distinction and its clear perception to unite and relate parts that are unequal. Contemporary presenteeism must not dismiss the historical significance of the actions of time and must not erase the importance of the contemplative attitude for the construction of thought (Rios, 2003).

In a society still dictated by *Homo faber*, by the idea of functionality, we tend to confuse the manufacturer with the creator of a work of art. Thus, the idea that the arts must be functional, that a painting serves as much for contemplation as it does for filling a hole in the wall, or decorating the dentist's office, cannot be treated by academia with disregard.

Hannah Arendt (2000) states that the idea that is spread is that mass society doesn't need culture, but entertainment. Entertainment becomes a product to be produced by industry and consumed by society like any other good. Thus, art, as a cultural good par excellence, is expropriated by the industry and sold as a consumer good to be digested quickly. Works of art understood as processes of fruition and aesthetic experience, as a "fantasy space", in dialogue with symbolic thought, in mass society, come to be understood as pastimes, leisure activities, moving away from the idea of knowledge.

Academic curricula need to be aware of this marketing trend towards the objectification of art. Faculty must establish a state of judgment in themselves and in their students. "Judgment is one if not the most important activity in which this sharing of the world takes place" (Arendt, 2000, p. 276).

There are procedures that make it possible to read a work and develop critical and imaginative ways of reading the world, expanding the "fantasy spaces".

### **PROCEDURES THAT CAN SUBSTANTIATE "FANTASY SPACES" OR PROMOTE ENCOUNTERS WITH "EMPTY SPACES"**

What are the possibilities for reading theatre and what pedagogical contributions can they offer to incite "fantasy spaces" or promote encounters with "empty spaces"?

We will find it possible to develop some methodological procedures for reading works of art based on distinct and interconnected processes proposed by Edmund Feldman (1981)<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> Edmund Burke Feldman is an American author who, in the 1970s, publishes *Becoming Human Through Art*, in New Jersey, by Prentice Hall, where he presents, for the first time, the idea of art as knowledge and art as performance in art education. For Feldman, learning the language of art means technical, critical and creative development, where the social, cultural, psychological, anthropological and historical dimensions of individuals are at play. The critical development of art is the central core of his theories. According to

For Feldman, the act of reading is linked to expanding the ability to see. Therefore, he proposes four stages for reading the work of art: Describing, which involves paying attention to the materiality of the work, its ways of describing what the eye sees; Analyzing, which consists of relating the formal parts of the observed object to each other, seeking to understand their meaning within the artistic production itself; Interpreting, which follows the path of the meaning of the work for the beholder and its meanings, relating it to the space of discussing the expressive, formal or instrumental qualities of the work. These proposals bring with them the effort to build the idea that reading the meanings of a work must be accompanied by a formal reading of the elements that make up the artistic production. Reading meanings and formal reading are distinct, complementary, and inseparable procedures for building skills such as knowing how to describe, compare, relate, code, decode, judge, decide and choose. Hence, Feldman seeks to demonstrate how it is possible to understand the world by understanding a work of art.

Feldman doesn't just focus his system on reading paintings; it's possible to apply the same method to reading various texts, including scenic texts. The scenic text is made up of sound and gestural texts that will contribute to the shape and structure of the visual text of the scene. What we have in theatre, as in cinema, is a succession of moving frames, which facilitates the immediate relationship with the scenes experienced or observed by the spectator in everyday life.

For reading to take place with greater intensity, Feldman proposes that the act of reading should also be accompanied by practical experimentation activities. These practical, creative activities should lead student spectators to the act of producing works based on aesthetic experiences, seeking to establish the same challenges that artists probably experience at the time of birth of their works. Complementing Feldman's proposals, specifically in theatre and the performing arts, it is possible to relate Feldman's approach to theatrical fruition processes. Both show us a way towards building a more active spectator, capable of obtaining a more precise, curious and critical look at the theatrical product. This makes it possible to build an epic spectator, as advocated by modern German playwright Bertolt Brecht. In other words, the creation of a spectator who doesn't get caught up in the Hollywood novelistic, cathartic style relationships contained in many artistic productions. But rather the construction of a spectator who reflects on what they see, who questions the fate of the characters, who seeks to find historical meaning for the actions presented in the scene, who dissects the narrative into various fragments in order to interpret them separately and then, understand the whole meaning.

---

the author, critical capacity is developed through the act of seeing. This publication demonstrates how much you can understand about the world by reading a work of art (as cited in Barbosa, 1994, p. 43).

Supported by Feldman's proposals and the epic conception of an active spectator, it is possible to understand the idea that reading is not just a cognitive, solitary, verbal narrative act, but that it also involves *productive plans*, related to artistic production; *conceptual plans*, related to the order of ideas as well as artistic and world conceptions; *perceptual plans*, towards the education of a sensitive gaze, attentive to sensory sensations (Machado, 1988).

The gaze has now become immobilized or demobilized. Adopt television and whatever points of view you like, they will only evoke the absence of the gaze. The eye, in fact, is only a current instrument because of its ability to read schematic, synthesized, hyper significant images, and to read them quickly, at the risk of "death" – as in video games and other simulations (Aumont, 2004, p.77).

The challenge in establishing the procedures presented here is focused on reading the scenic text. In addition to this didactic challenge, it includes the opening up of "fantasy spaces" or the encounter with "empty spaces" that allow us to find effective ways of educating the eye, as a way of learning to read.

#### **FINAL CONSIDERATIONS TO START THE WORK THE PLACE WHERE YOU READ FROM**

As already explained, the motivation for the proposal presented here is linked to the academic trajectories of the authors of this article, within the scope of theatre teaching and the performing arts. Along with the academic trajectories, the awareness that proposals aimed at reading the work can reshape theatrical and performing arts reception processes, as well as educating the gaze.

In this way, the strategies proposed here are directed towards the Pedagogy of the Spectator, in other words, based on procedures that create a taste for aesthetic debate, which stimulate in the student-spectator the desire to take a unique look at theatrical productions and performing arts, that develop the pleasure of investigating contents that arise in the relationship with the work of art and the constitution of its language. To this end, reading methods are proposed, specifically presented by Edmund Feldman, aimed at the Pedagogy of the Spectator, in other words, the education of a "unique spectator", an active spectator who expands their fantasy spaces, significant to the fruition and meaning that art assumes in the lives of human beings. Such pedagogy may comprise the following steps:

- **Warm-up** – choosing the work to be analyzed, explaining the reasons for the choice, previous readings about the performance (reviews, dramaturgical text, interviews...) and questions to be addressed by the spectators.
- **Fruition** – aesthetically enjoying the work chosen for shared reading with the group of student-spectators.
- **Reading the Work of Art** – *productive plans* (related to the description of the materiality of the work – scenic space, gestures, voice, costumes, lighting ...); *conceptual plans* (the order of analysis; formal parts of the work and their meaning in artistic production); *perceptual plans* (towards Interpretation, the sense of the work for the beholder and its meanings).
- **Criticism** – related to the space for discussing the expressive, formal, or instrumental qualities of the work.

Based on what has been said so far, this proposal aims to achieve the following objectives:

- **Contribute** to training spectators who can decode scenic signs.
- **Elaborate** adequate routes to read the staging in the act of fruition and reception of the work.
- **Create** fields conducive to debate, reflection on subjectivity, point of view, previous experiences and the place occupied in society, both in the context of those who enjoy the work and the artist who produces it.
- **Invest** in the education of the gaze as opposed to the massified and *didacticized* gaze of digital media.
- **Foster** “fantasy spaces” and encounters with “empty spaces” with the aim of broadening the capabilities of symbolic thought.

Therefore, through pedagogical processes suitable to the construction of an attentive and in-depth reading of theatrical works and the performing arts, it will be possible to contribute to a critical attitude towards the world and, consequently, towards human life.

In general, theatre and the performing arts in academic spaces are focused on workshops to produce shows, which are usually presented to the institution's community at the end of a work module. There is also the dissemination of these arts as a consumer good, for entertainment or as a complement to school contents. With very few exceptions, theatre and the performing arts are present at the various levels of education, as a starting point for discussions on the most varied topics about life, as an integral part of interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects, as part of a cultural agenda, or as a foundation in students' academic training process.

Furthermore, the principle that education will only be education when it emancipates individuals. Such intent can be achieved through processes involving reading of works of art, with the possibility of investigating pedagogical, methodological and didactic paths, both for the education of the eye, identified here as the basic principle for reading, as well as for the optimization of effective educational processes.

## REFERENCES

- Ângelo, D. M. P. A. (2005). *Leitores implícitos e vazios de sentido em resenhas críticas de quatro grandes brasileiros no começo do século XXI*. (Tese de doutoramento). Faculdade de Educação da Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.
- Arendt, H. (2000). *Entre o passado e o futuro*. São Paulo.
- Amount, J. (2004). *O olho interminável – cinema e pintura*. Cosac&Naify.
- Barbosa, A. M. (1994). *A imagem no ensino da arte*. Perspectiva.
- Brecht, B. (1978). *Estudos sobre teatro*. Nova Fronteira.
- Compagnon, A. (2001). *O demônio da teoria*. UFMG.
- Desgranges, F. (2003). *A pedagogia do espectador*. Hucitec.
- Feldman, E. B (1981). *Varieties of visual experience*. Prentice.
- Gama, J. C. M (2016). *Alegoria em jogo: a encenação como prática pedagógica*. Perspectiva.
- Iser, W. (1996). *O ato da leitura* (vol. 1 e 2). Editora 34.
- Jauss, H. R. (1979). *A leitura e o leitor*. Paz e Terra.
- Koudela, I. D. (2003). *Heiner Müller – o espanto no teatro*. Perspectiva.
- Lehmann, H-T. (2007). *Teatro pós-dramático*. COSACNAIF.
- Machado, R. (1988). Para pintar o retrato de um pássaro. In: A Compreensão e o prazer da arte: além da tecnologia. *4º Encontro: Leituras de obras de arte e discussão acerca do lugar da apreciação na sala de aula de acordo com os Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais*, São Paulo: SESC.
- Orlandi, E. (1993). *Discurso e leitura*. Cortez.
- Pavis, P. (1999). *Dicionário de teatro*. Perspectiva.

Rios, T. A. (2003). *Compreender e ensinar*. Cortez.

Ryngaert, J-P. (1998). *Ler o teatro contemporâneo*. Martins Fontes.

Spolin, V. (1984). *Improvisação para o teatro*. Perspectiva.

Zilberman, R. (1989). *Estética da recepção e história da literatura*. Ática.