Educação em Perspectiva / *Education in Perspective*
DOI: 10.22294/eduper/ppge/ufv.v10i0.7131

DOSSIER

We are flying over a fireball: movement, multiplicity and everyday reality

Estamos voando sobre uma bola de fogo: movimento, multiplicidade e realidade cotidiana

Estamos volando sobre una bola de fuego: movimiento, multiplicidad y realidad cotidiana

Eduardo Simonini[2]

Abstract: This work intends to think on the everyday reality as a dimension in multiplicity that opens itself to the diversity and the difference. In order to develop this question, two conceptions about reality are problematized: one that argues it can be understood as a totalizable unit in its immobility, and another that considers by reality, a dynamic in movement, always in the process of new transformations. In the proposal to study these two models of reality, this work uses, as an Ariadne's thread, the action to follow some uses that have been made, in the last two millennia, of the Devil's image. Unfolding these different uses in connection with the theories of Plato, Hegel, Nietzsche, Deleuze, and Guattari, this work argues that the everyday realities are forged in uncertain encounters, mixing up in multiplicity, and not fitting into a universal project.

Keywords: Reality. Multiplicity. Everyday Life.

Resumo: O presente trabalho pretende pensar a realidade cotidiana como uma dimensão em multiplicidade que se abre ao diverso e à diferença. Para desenvolver esta questão, são problematizadas duas concepções sobre a realidade: uma que defende que esta pode ser compreendida como uma unidade totalizável em sua imobilidade, e outra que considera por realidade uma dinâmica em movimento sempre em vias de novas transformações. Na proposta de seguir esses dois modelos de realidade, este trabalho se utiliza, como um cordão de Ariadne, da ação de acompanhar alguns usos que foram feitos, nos últimos dois milênios, da imagem do Diabo. Desdobrando esses diferentes usos no conversar com as teorias de Platão, Hegel, Nietzsche, Deleuze e Guattari, este trabalho defende que as realidades cotidianas são forjadas em encontros incertos a agenciarem misturas que, devindo em multiplicidade, não se filiam a um projeto universal.

Palavras-chave: Realidade. Multiplicidade. Cotidiano.

Resumen: El presente trabajo pretende pensar la realidad cotidiana como una dimensión en multiplicidad que se abre al diverso y a la diferencia. Para desarrollar esta cuestión, son problematizadas dos concepciones sobre la realidad: una que defiende que ésta puede ser comprendida como una unidad totalizable en su inmovilidad, y otra que considera por realidad una dinámica en movimiento siempre en vías de nuevas transformaciones. En la propuesta de seguir estos dos modelos de realidad, este trabajo se utiliza, como un cordón de Ariadna, de la acción de acompañar algunos usos que se han hecho, en los últimos dos milenios, de la imagen del Diablo. Al desdoblar esos usos diferentes en la conversación con las teorías de Platón, Hegel, Nietzsche, Deleuze y Guattari, este trabajo defiende que las realidades cotidianas son forjadas en encuentros inciertos a agitar mezclas que, debiendo en multiplicidad, no se afilian a un proyecto universal.

Palabras clave: Realidad. Multiplicidad. Cotidiano.

[1] **Submitted:** 04 Dec. 2018 - **Accepted:** 11 Feb. 2019 - **Published:** 18 Feb. 2019.
[2] Federal University of Viçosa (UFV) – E-mail: simonini198@gmail.com

Raffaella Cerullo, also called Lina and one of the main characters of "My Brilliant Friend" novel (FERRANTE, 2015) listened very impatiently to Elena Greco, a childhood friend who when attending a theology course, debated herself in questionings about the true function of Holy Spirit in Holy Trinity. All of a sudden, Lina, already anguished by her friends' theological juggling, turned to Elena and said:

> We are flying over a ball of fire. The part that has cooled floats on the lava. On that part we construct the buildings, the bridges, and the streets, and every so often the lava comes out of Vesuvius or causes an earthquake that destroys everything. There are microbes everywhere that make us sick and die. There are wars. There is a poverty that makes us all cruel. Every second something might happen that will cause you such suffering that you'll never have enough tears. And what are you doing? A theology course in which you struggle to understand what the Holy Spirit is? Forget it, it was the Devil who invented the world, not the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit (FERRANTE, 2005, p. 259).

In her arguments, Lina affirmed that our world was nothing more than a risky camouflaged by stability. And that this wandering planet, among which crust we inhabit, is an instable experience settled upon a temporary solidity, likewise, our lives similar to that fragile earth upon which fire is organized, can fall apart at any time, taken by abrupt movements that have to power to drag any person, suddenly, to a world of melancholy. And, finally, Lina declares, God does not care about the world, since it is a consequence of Devil's deeds.

Devil – and the kingdom he built to himself – had at the 15th century, with Dante Alighieri, one of his most famous presentations when he described hell's concentric circles in the medieval poem "The Divine Comedy". Those circles had their origin point marked by a portal in which the souls condemned to perennial damnation could read the following inscription: "Though me the way is to the city dolente/Through me the way is to eternal dole; through me the way among the people lost. […] 'All hope abandon, ye who enter in!'" (ALIGHIERI, 1981, p. 31). Thus, suffering, agitation, teeth grinding and the total despair would be condition of the presence of and in Devil, an entity that stood in contraposition to the peace and serenity of God's presence.

By its turn, in Lina's considerations, Devils is presented equally as being a creative expression, since he conceives our world, though to affirm in it not a warranty, but uncertainty and dissimilitude, since "etymologically the dia-bolical separates, divides, parts. It is contraposed to the sym-bolical, that synthetizes, gathers, unifies" (CORAZZA, 2002, p. 17, freely translated by the author). But when we follow different expressions of Devil, we found a creative movement – announced by Lina – present in other representations. Baal, for example, was a Sumerian entity related to fertility and to vital forces when Israelites, in the 9th century BC, begun to call by the name of Baal all the divinities that they qualified as false gods. If, with the Israelites, that entity incorporated all the representations of farce and error, with the advent of Christianity, Baal began to be conceived as the Hell's ruler (SCHWARTZ, 2017). However, in its first significations, Baal was an experience of multiplication, of life producer movement. Like Azazel, an angel that in the Book of Enoch[i] is one of the names related to Devil, was seduced by the beauty of worldly women and copulated with one of them, generating monstrous children, which by their turns, were exterminated by God during

the Great Flood. But again the creative and multiplier movement appears, since Azazel was both a constructive experience – having initiated humans with the dealing of metal, adorns, precious stones, pigments – and a sexual, pregnant with desires and artifice of life creation in the act of procreation (RODRIGUES, 2004). But by having dedicated himself to the earth and to the instrumentalization of humans so that they be able to manipulate natural elements, and became themselves the constructor of their own world, upon Azazel God put the following condemnation:

> Bind Azazel hand and foot and cast him into the darkness: and make an opening in the desert - which is in Dudael - and cast him therein. And place upon him rough and jagged rocks, and cover him with darkness, and let him abide there forever, and cover his face that he may not see light […] And all the earth has been made desolate by the deeds of the teaching of Azazel, and over him ascribe all the sins! (RODRIGUES, 2004, p. 293).

The creation act had, thus, to be God's only virtue and of none else: whether human, angel and/or devil. By his turn, Ziedan (2015) presents Azazel in other manner, considering hi a symbol of the very doubt and questioning condition that torment the being. To be in the shadow of Azazel would be like exerting a methodic doubt such as made Descartes (2004), when, in his precious search for truth, began to question the certainties and constancy of everything around him. In that sense, as an Azazel property, doubt is a dia-bolical experience, since it puts the thought in movement, inserting interrogative lines (so often incommodious and disturbing) where once was fixed, triumphantly, an endpoint. As it is narrated in Matheus Gospel, when it is justified the nearly drowning of Apostle Peter by the fact that he had let himself be carried by doubt, not sustaining, thus, his walking above the waters:

> [...] Jesus came to them [the apostles], walking on the sea. When they caught sight of him walking on the sea, the disciples were troubled, saying: "It is an apparition!"* And they cried out in their fear. But at once Jesus spoke to them, saying: "Take courage! It is I; do not be afraid". Peter answered him: "Lord, if it is you, command me to come to you over the waters". He said: "Come!". So Peter got out of the boat and walked over the waters and went toward Jesus. But looking at the windstorm, he became afraid. And when he started to sink, he cried out: "Lord, save me!". Immediately stretching out his hand, Jesus caught hold of him and said to him: "You with little faith, why did you give way to doubt?" (HOLY BIBLE, 1975, MATTHEW, 14: 25-31).

One could want, to move from doubt towards the search for the Absolute – as Descartes intended -, or fall in despair for not finding more certainty in the steps one gives, as it happens to Apostle Peter. Whether in one experiment or another, the doubt refers to a split with a world granted in its project and proposal, what makes that, contrary to an experiment of integration and synthesis (symbolic dimension), the Devil be put in the field of questioning, of schism, of duality (dia-bolical dimension). What emerges as problematization and as doubt consequently is expressed by the force of one type of opposition, and it is in this sense that Corazza (2002), affirms that the figures of Devil and demon, though possessing etymological differences[ii] end up being fused in the same expression, since in order to become an opponent, there is equally the need to be astute and intelligent to convince and seduce the adversaries. Thus:

> [...] devil is a genius, spirit and intelligence. Socrates had – or Plato invented he had – his particular *daimon*, to whom he dialogued. The junction devil/demon began to occur with the Inquisition and strengthened with the invention of individual unconscious in modernity (CORAZZA, 2002, p. 17).

The word demon comes from Latin *daemonium* that, by its turn, derives from the Greek *daimónion* or *daimon* (CUNHA, 2010). Costa (2012, p. 175) considers that, for the Greek and the gnostic Christians, "*daimon* could be thought as the very divinity, the destiny, the numen, the genius, the advisor of angels, the inner voice, the spirit, and the demon". Being the platonic *daimon* an entity full of intelligence and cleverness (for Socrates very "inner voice") he appears to commune of the same creative movement that he have pointed out in Baal and Azazel. And the *daimon*, beyond the allusion made to Socrates, has assumed in the platonic work both a creative action and a dualist action for the production of a complimentary dyad: the world of the Perfect Essences and the world of the appearances or copies. For Plato (2011), the reality that we live daily results from the work of an intelligent mind (and, therefore, a *daimon*), denominated *demiurge*; a word that designates an artifice, an artesian of reality. The *demiurge*, in order to reproduce the truth and the beauty of the Perfect Essences, has appropriated of everything in the world that moves in chaotic irregularity, and having the Essences as archetypical reference, created our world. According to Plato (2011, p. 93-94):

> [...] we must make a distinction and ask, what is that which always is and has no becoming; and what is that which is always becoming and never is? That which is apprehended by intelligence and reason is always in the same state; but that which is conceived by opinion with the help of sensation and without reason, is always in a process of becoming and perishing and never really is. Now everything that becomes or is created must of necessity be created by some cause, for without a cause nothing can be created. The work of the demiurge, whenever he looks to the unchangeable and fashions the form and nature of his work after an unchangeable pattern, must necessarily be made fair and perfect; but when he looks to the created only, and uses a created pattern, it is not fair or perfect.

In this sense, the platonic cosmogony also resonates the affirmation of Lina: our world, our universe, and consequently our daily reality, would be the result of the action of a *daimon* longing for creating for himself a world that would mimic Perfection. However, the world the demiurge instated was similar – but not identic – to the perfection model glimpsed by him; for what was created was equally marked by movement, by illusion, or worst of all, by false representations of the very copy; falsifications that Plato (1991) defined as simulacrums. For the philosopher, thus, it was need to institute in the copies the perfection of the essence, and by its turn, locate and destruct the simulacrums: those expressions qualified as maleficent, for, moving in pure difference, in nothing they imitate the Perfect Essence or their multiplied copies.

Whether in the attempt to extract a few of the indices of purity printed in the impure copies; or by denouncing the aberrant in the simulacrum, denying them legitimacy of existence; the platonic project was committed to the proposal of surpass the demonically begotten world (for being errant, instable, impermanent, falsified) in order to achieve a direct access to the perfection the demiurge have used as model for its imperfect work. What lead us to the reflection that, for Plato, Truth as such a defined and finished experience that the

exercise of thinking ended up being conceived not as a creative act, but as a faithful reproduction that one Truth that, without contractions, was immune to the illusion of the senses. What makes that all experience of daily life was apprehended as misleading, being subjected to the cacophonic torment that little or nothing could make audible the eternal sound of the pure song.

For reasons similar to the narrated in the platonic cosmogony, the members of a mystical-religious medieval movement, called Cathars[iii], negated the daily world, claiming that it had nothing valid, for it was matter; and the matter, by its turn, was a vehicle of degradation, change and death. For the Cathars, the Devil, when he was expelled from the presence of God, decided, like Plato's *demiurge*, builds a world for himself, creating his universe from the elements pre-existent and present in God (NELLI, 1980). For when, by engendering the elements of nature (air, earth, wind, water, time), Devil invented the matter, fabricated the bodies, and conceived our world: a world that was born already corrupted, for the divine elements that served as creative inspiration were perverted by diabolic intervention. God, however, as pureness and perfection, was not committed to the flows of matter; thus, for the Cathars – also like what Lina sentenced – our world if evil and the Devil is its prince. They denounced, thus, the one Jews and Christians praised as the Creator God[iv], was nothing more than the Devil himself. Therefore, for the Cathars, "it was needed to break free from Evil and from the material world, striving to stablishing the least contacts possible with them, surrendering to spiritual life: living in the invisible and not in the visible" (NELLI, 1980, p. 66).

However, the longing for inhabiting perfect world, and thus, without movement – like the Cathars and equally the Platonic did – was, for thinkers like Nietzsche, a choice between death and/or an impotent life. Denying legitimacy to what comes from the earth, of the daily life, of the mundane fights, in order to search for the paralysis of the Ideal, what results is the denying of life itself.

Trespassed by transitory forces compositions, existence, for Nietzsche, is engendered in creative-destructive potencies without marked beginning or determined end. It is not something that becomes, but something that passes, that flows (NIETZSCHE, 1966). The end of the world would not be, thus, nothing more than a new composition to announce new combinations to leave new worlds. And thus follows that Nietzsche is opposed to Plato, to the Christians, to Descartes, to Hegel: to all those who, for him, renegaded life, disqualifying the value of movement – of becoming – to search for the Absolute, the Truth, and consequently the cessation of existence, for the Absolute would be the final point of all becoming.

And if we pay attention more carefully to Hegel, we learn that he undertaken a "diabolic" dynamic similar to Descartes': he proposed doubt and movement as methods for thinking the Truth. This because, when refers in his dialectic to the becoming, he understands it by the point of view of what **it is not**, but that contributes to the realization of what **it is**: the becoming, thus, is presented as a negative, in the sense that it is not the Truth, but leads to it. In Hegel, the movement (becoming) is, thus, analogous to the action of lapidating a diamond in order to unveil its ultimate and more beautiful expression, being that the Absolute is already implied both in the finished diamond, and in the movement for its purification. What

turns the Absolute into the very process of life, whether it is process for knowledge, whether it be "[…] Nature, and in a very special way, the Absolute is Spirit, is Ethics, is State, it is the course of trial of the History" (CIRNE-LIMA, 2012, p. 266), since the world's history intends that:

> That the spirit reaches the knowledge of what is truly and objective that knowledge, realizing it, making out of it an existent world, and be manifest objectively in itself: the principles of the spirits of the people, in a needed and gradual succession, are nothing but the movements of a one universal spirit, which, through them, in history, is elevated and finishes a autocomprehensive totality (HEGEL, 2005, p. 15).

In this sense, if on one hand in the Hegelian dialectic reality is taken under a processual perspective, by the other hand Hegel also affirmed that there existed a final meaning to guide this movement, in the crowning of a great synthesis: the realization of the Universal Spirit. Such Spirit is the Absolute, "for it is the totality in movement, it is the living and vivifying Universe in its circular totality" (CIRNE-LIMA, 2012, p. 267). The notion of "totality in movement" or "circular totality" is worked up by Cirne-Lima also as synthesis relation between the circular movement (that does not produce history, for it return to the same point and the linear and historical movement (for, submitted to the arrow of time, is contingent, and therefore, not predictable). To exemplify his reflection, Cirne-Lima considers that a cyclist, when guiding his bicycle, produces a forward linear movement by means of a circular movement on the wheel that carries him. However, in dialectics, those two contradictory dynamics (circularity and linearity):

> [...] are overcome if and while they oppose each other. They are kept in what they have of positive. What is that? The nonextensive point – neither circular, nor linear-, that by opposing themselves in movement, traces not only the circularity of the wheel, but also the linearity of the historical trajectory. The point in movement, this is the synthesis between the thesis and the antithesis. This point has to be thought of as the eternal present moment, for thus it recovers all its past and anticipates the future. The eternal present moment, nonextensive and timeless, holds inside – *aufghehoben* – all the contingences of history that already passed and of the future that is to become. […) The Absolute […] is the point in movement, the eternal present movement (CIRNE-LIMA, 2012, p. 298).

We can, therefore, problematize that being the Absolute the nonextensive and timeless point that stands for the "eternal present moment", that holds of the past and all the future – and if we also consider that the eternity concept refers to the absence of time (and, thus, an absence of all change and/or transformation) – the movement would be, in the Hegelian dialectic, an illusion. For the Absolute, as a nonextensive point of eternal present, would also be present in the becoming, being the hidden subject of dialectic logic (thesis, antithesis and synthesis): "the Absolute is the being, the Absolute is nothing, the Absolute is the becoming" (CIRNE-LIMA, 2012, p. 273). It is in that sense that Cirne-Lima (2012) affirms that the Hegelian system is a religious thought by excellence, in which the Absolute (God) is in everything: He is the essence, appearance, identity, difference, contradiction; He is, without restriction, everywhere; He is the wheel upon which is inscribed all the trajectory of history. With the Absolute, would be indicated the construction of a totalization system to propose a unifying synthesis of all temporalities, and therefore, of all movement. He would be

"movement and yet, absence of movement. There is no space, there is no time, and therefore, nothing moves, only exists" (MOORE; CAMPBELL, 2014, p. 14).

Resonating with such affirmation, Châtelet (1985, p. 15) denounced the Universalist pretentions of the Hegelian dialectic by problematizing that:

> The dialectic as a discursive structure, is the process by which the philosopher thinks he assures the integral transparency of the Being, a dialectic that possess the magical virtue of establishing the right correspondence between the moments of thought and the systematic diversity of existence. Like in a tragedy scene, it [the dialectic] insists in the presence of contradictions. […] It, that intends to eliminate all the presuppositions, presupposes reality (that is, the possibility) of a complete revelation of the truth of the existent. God once understood that, if He wanted to survive, He should descend to earth and become Reason. With Plato, with Christianity, He spoke Greek. With Hegel, He spoke the dialectic slang.

Therefore, if God was conceived as the Absolute, like Châtelet (1985) and Cirne-Lima (2012) argued about Hegel's thinking, we can think that the Devil is a co-participle of that Absolute and he can be understood as the very dialectic movement to support an opponent's fight that will only cease their contradictions by the End of Times: for the universe would find its point of non-contradiction – and consequently of non-movement – in the realization of the Universal Spirit.

On the path indicated by Châtelet's critic, we found that when Deleuze (1976) proposed himself to debate about the intensities in becoming, we did not positioned besides Plato or Hegel, but besides Nietzsche. And, like the latter philosopher, he avoided to get involved with dialectics[v] in order to follow another path, another process thought by the positivity of becoming – such becoming that would not constitute itself as a denying of the synthesis in the process of a new synthesis of higher level, but as a potency of multiplicities and experimentations. Deleuze (1976), therefore, saw the Hegelian dialectics not as an error, but as a foolishness. Such foolishness that would consist in valuing the perspective of a movement towards a condition of non-creation. And he added that:

> The Hegelian dialectic is indeed a reflection on difference, but it inverts its image. For the affirmation of difference as such it substitutes the negation of that which differs; for the affirmation of self it substitutes the negation of the other, and for the affirmation of affirmation it substitutes the famous negation of the negation. […] Opposition substituted for difference is also the triumph of the reactive forces that find their corresponding principle in the will to nothingness. Everywhere there are sad passions; the unhappy consciousness is the subject of the whole dialectic. The dialectic is, first of all, the thought of the theoretical man, reacting against life, claiming to judge life, to limit and measure it (DELEUZE, 1976, p. 163).

Abandoning Hegel, Deleuze understood becoming as an affirmation in the difference and not as a byproduct of a negation towards a greater enhancement to indicate a progress, a condition of full realization, an Absolute. In face of such argumentation, a world to become could not be taken as a predefined direction – as to become "**something**" – since it is not a term that comes from another, but each one that finds the other, in a singular becoming that happens "between" the two terms of the relation and that possesses its own direction (DELEUZE; PARNET, 1987). Thus, the becoming of a world that was not intended to fulfill a higher order; that would not organize itself as a crossword puzzle where everything fits in.

What is to become would compromise itself with encounters, blending, transitory orders and aberrant productions; and in this condition it would not exist a previous model to compose the flows; it would not exist an archetype of perfection to refer to the past, present and future movement of the world.

Therefore, for Nietzsche and Deleuze, the Universal Spirit would not synthesize all the destiny of reality. It would not be the end of all processes or the enlace of all temporalities, for would is to be found in the "end" would not accept a final point or an "eternal present moment", by the comma of wander, of continuity; the affirmation of the affirmation, the difference of the difference, multiple compositions building possibilities, inspirations, experimentations by offering an "yes" to a world unthought-of even by God[vi]. It is as narrated by Clarisse Lispector, in the beginning of her book "The hour of the star":

> Everything in the world began with a yes. One molecule said yes to another molecule and life was born. But before prehistory there was the prehistory of prehistory and there was the never and there was the yes. It was ever so. I do not know why, but I do know that the universe never began (LISPECTOR, 1998, p. 11).

Lispector's words, by their turn, seem to resonate Nietzsche's, when he declared that, if life is committed to a circularity, it is creative, for it is always open to "a new beginning, a game, a self-rolling wheel, a first movement, a holy Yea. Aye, for the game of creating, my brethren, there is needed a holy Yea" (NIETZSCHE, 2011, p. 29). In that sense, we assume here a third possible meaning of the diabolic dimension: not as a constructor of a world presented as pastiche of the Perfect Essence; not as a movement of contradictions in the process of realizing the Universal Spirit (God); but as an "yes", as a condition of difference, a non-totalizing totality (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2010), or, as affirmed by Corazza (2002, p. 17), "from there, the diabolic can be thought of as a multiplicity without unity".

The concept of "multiplicity" was elaborated by Deleuze and Guattari (1995) as a totality that, differently of the Hegelian Absolute, is not close in an integrative unity of temporalities and movements. If the Hegelian dialectics is the method to be used rise from multiplicity to unity (CIRNE-LIMA, 2012), Deleuze and Guattari (1995) propose, in contrast, that multiplicity does not refer to the plural in process to become an unifier synthesis, but the animated dimensions in agencies that, in the fostering of different and anarchic connections, does not have their destinies predefined in the eternity of the Universal Spirit. To each new arrangement, would always be the possibility of creation of an inedited perspective; of a new universe to stablish itself (or not) in singular ordinations. Under that perspective, the fact that a new connective arrangement to die in a dead end or to fix itself in an identity territorialization, would not define, by its turn, an end point or of end of the world, but would only indicate that an specific process has decreased and/or no more kept alive the connections that vitalized it. However, other process would branch, running vertically, horizontally or in parallel and/or transversally, by the activation of other lines, other movements, other worlds.

Thus, in Deleuze and Guattari (1995) the multiplicity does not refer to a collective of elements in causal relationship, but to the circulation of states, processes, of forces of expansion of constriction, in which plural significations dance. That multiplicity, that was considered by Corazza (2002) as being diabolic – for it is not reducible to a centralizing unity

– and by us as an experimental "yes", is equally an experiment of opportunization of worlds. Worlds not yet defined, for being invented among uncertain arrangements, so often distressing, but that can offer access to different sensibilities.

Maybe was under that perspective that Rober Musil (2018) intuited that for each "sense of reality", for each concrete world in which a subject or group refers his steps, attitudes and perspectives, there must exist a "sense of possibility". According to him, the one who possesses a sense of possibility:

> […] Anyone possessing it does not say, for instance: Here this or that has happened, will happen, must happen. He uses his imagination and says: Here such and such might, should or ought to happen. And if he is told that something is the way it is, then he thinks: Well, it could probably just as easily be some other way. So, the sense of possibility might be defined outright as the capacity to think how everything could 'just as easily' be, and to attach no more importance to what is than to what is not (MUSIL, 2018, p. 24).

That is to say, if the validation of a reality tends to be affirmed by the seemingly infinite repetition of rules, patterns, references and destinies, it does not suppress the opportunity to "[…] comes along to whom something real means no more than something imagined. It is he who first gives the new possibilities their meaning and their destiny; he awakens them" (MUSIL, 2018, p. 25). Provoke, for the production of "para-logics" that, even without being considered legitimate along the path of a kind of rationality that intends to be the only one possible, insist in produce themselves as viable.

However, it is important to emphasize that those new possibilities would not be predefined in their trajectories, as a whole tree would already be asleep inside the seed even before it germinates. To the contrary, new possibilities must, to follow Musil's arguments, be provoked, invented, and agitated. And agencies only exist in movement, in the composition in multiplicity of a new arrangement; in the fecundation of a "sense of possibility". But in the same way multiplicity is not translatable to a specific place, the agencies that trespass have more to do with a complex spatialisation than to the description of a definable place. Therefore we have associated to Massey (2008), when she considers the space as a product of interrelationships both macro and microscopic; being similarly a dimension in multiplicity, in which distinct trajectories co-exist. For the mentioned author, multiplicity and space are co-constituted processes and are always in construction; they are always in the process of making, being open in a becoming without Final Judgement. In that sense:

> In this open interactional space there are always connections to be made, juxtapositions yet to flower into interaction (or not, for not all potential connections have to be established), relations which may or may not be accomplished. […] A space, then, which is not neither a container for ever-existing identities nor a completely closed holism. It is a space of unpredictable results and missing links. For the future to be open, space must be open too (MASSEY, 2008, p. 11).

The space is understood here as an existential dimension whose potency affirms itself in the flexible force of its agencies: those agencies that are assumed, especially in the work of Félix Guattari (1992), as an intensive space in which diverse elements get in contact that, often, does not have a priori no connection between one another; a space that, as well defined

by Massey (2008), is of "missing links". Under this perspective, the agencies activate (and are activated by) a vibrant relation that produces a frequency, a rhythm, but that not necessarily constitute a place in which specificity the elements would present themselves bound in a casual, temporal or geographic logic. However, the intense frequency activated in an agency produces potential sensibilities and cognitions that make possible to existential expressions to move other senses of reality and other fields of possibility. Some of the latter can inclusively come to stablish itself and even to become chronic, turning themselves into places of safe redundancy (of values, practices, desires, dreams), configuring a daily life that presents itself supported by the ritualist mimic of one day-to-day seemingly always the same. However, we consider that one place is always the stablishing of a (provisory) territory in the space in a "diabolic" multiplicity, for being moving, not wholly totalizing and without defined end or marked beginning. Life, flowing in a process of continuous displacement ignoring absolute teleologies, would be animated by dynamics in different accelerations or paralysis; what makes the daily existence an experiment beyond the repetition without creation, for being involved in risky of sudden movements.

Illustrating that problematization, we found that in the end of 20th century the musical group Green Day (1997) released a videoclip of the song *Redundant*[vii]. It begins with a newspaper being thrown in a living room for, in the sequence, a woman enters the room, take it and walk away. All along the videoclip, the same scene of the woman with the newspaper is repeated. By the end of the song, however, the singer of the band takes the newspaper of the ground before the woman can do it, and when she comes to the room, and sees that it is not there "like always", she cries out mixing paralysis and fear. The repetition of the act of taken the newspaper has stablished for her the place of truth in a world wherein she found herself safe in the constancy he inhabited. But, suddenly, her identity territoriality has been shake when a subtle displacement installed a "sense of possibility", giving her a glimpse of the risky of the unusual in her daily life.

In that production of daily constancies demarking safety places, we found that a given familiar and/or social value is equally a place that repeats itself, traversing generations and producing truths that offer consistency to the historical territoriality of a group and/or a subject. They are places that, fearing the amplitude of the spaces in multiplicity, close themselves often in rigid discourses of essences and exclusion of what, in the state of becoming, threatens some specific stability conquered. However, such daily redundancies, by organizing truths of a world, were not eternally grant, but built. To those repetitions that build provisory constancies Deleuze and Guattari (1997) have designed ritornellos.

They captured that concept of the music universe where, in its strictly melodic aspect, ritornello means a refrain or a prelude that repeats along a composition, therefore being a concept that refers to the return of a theme, to a refrain. However, by putting its concept "in work" in other dimensions other than music, them afore mentioned authors have meant the ritornello as working in a dimension of multiplicity, being then understood as a chaining of heterogeneous components that produce an existential territory. Since, "we call a refrain [ritornello] any aggregate of matters of expression that draws a territory and develops into territorial motifs and landscapes" (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1997, p. 132) the ritornellos

emerge from stabilizations in moving spaces and have committed themselves to territorializations that can be related to, according to Guattari and Rolnik (2005, p. 388):

> […] [both as] an experienced space, [and] a system perceived within which a subject feels 'at home'. Synonym of appropriation of subjectivation closed about itself. A set of projects and representations in which a whole series of behaviors, of investments, in times and in social, cultural, aesthetic, and cognitive spaces will result.

Composed in multiplicity, the concept of territory in the work of Deleuze and Guattari is broad, being much more than the description of a physical place, extending also to the dynamics of agency and consequently to the multiplicity, in the universe of relationships, to the becoming, to the production of rhythms that repeat and like untie. At the moment, thus, in which each territory is not exterior to the multiplicity and rhythms that constitute it, a safe home can suddenly intensify in a foreigner land in face of the vibrant composition of new agencies. Thus, if different emerging arrangements in the ritornellos promote constancies that rate, in an intensive field, politics, sexualities, economies, aesthetics, among other; those, by their turn, do not cooperate with the production of a state of immutable truth that would annihilate the legitimacy of the composition of new rhythms, of other existential experimentations and landscapes.

Therefore, it is important to emphasize that, as a moving dynamics, the ritornello is not a defined place, but agencies that settle, unsettle and resettle a place. It is a dimension of encounters and not of a rigid fixity, since in "the ritornello, what returns is neither the element, nor the form, nor the sonority […], what returns is the potency to make music; the potency to make and unmake places" (FERRAZ, 2005, p. 39). In the same act in which it settles an expressive novelty, a new ritornello can put in risky the consistence and the legitimacy of territorialities already stablished, fostering "[…] turbulence zones; terrains that very often can be the intersection of two or more terrains […]: wandering harmony" (FERRAZ, 2005, p. 40). By understanding "harmony" not as a dimension free of conflicts, but an agency that, settling as a territory, creates a possible existential coordinate; we believe, therefore, that the term "wandering harmony" becomes here a beautiful expression to describe daily life. A life engendered in moving worlds that, nonetheless, should not be considered as mere points of view or as representational variations of a static predefined reality, but as an invention of new announcements:

> [...] a production of new coordinates, an autocoordination, an autoreferentiation, […] These entities obviously produce a vision of the world, they produce a world, they produce universes of reference that have their own logic in the same way a musician like Debussy, at one point, invented a new type of relationship of musical writing, a new type of scale, a new type of melodic and harmonic line, and suddenly, produced new universes and fertilized an entire series of machinic phyla for the future of music. It is a universe production, an ennunciation production (GUATTARI, 1998, p. 220).

What makes that, for Guattari (1986) each existential rhythm that comes to animate a daily production of reality also constitutes a trajectory with its intensities, its compasses and agencies to privilege different ways of existence to plurify life. Thus, if the processes, in agency, give rhythm to different existential ritornellos, they stabilize worlds that do not exist

separately from the agencies that design their wefts. And if a reality is not independent of the multiplicities that engender it (in its social, economic, political, educational, emotional, psychic rhythms…), they also ceases to be conceived as an experiment solely grounded in some generator principle that intends to be a totalizing synthesis of the existence movements.

Thought of as becoming in multiplicity, the daily realities would not emerge, therefore, by parthenogenesis, but among living dynamics of shock, conflicts, nuptials, doubts, (un)encounters, questionings and fecundations…, all that agitated in a diabolic "yes" not affiliated to a "eternal present moment", but to an universal destiny, to some redemptory morality or tributary of an end point.

References

ALIGHIERI, Dante. **A Divina Comédia**. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1981.

BÍBLIA SAGRADA. Rio de Janeiro: Barsa, 1975.

CHÂTELET, François. **O pensamento de Hegel**. Lisboa: Editorial Presença, 1985.

CIRNE-LIMA, Carlos. O absoluto e o sistema. *In*: LUFT, Eduardo; CIRNE-LIMA, Carlos. **Ideia e movimento**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2012.

CORAZZA, Sandra Mara. **Para uma filosofia do Inferno na Educação:** Nietzsche, Deleuze e outros malditos afins. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica: 2002.

COSTA, Alexandre. **Heráclito:** fragmentos contextualizados. São Paulo: Odysseus, 2012.

CUNHA, Antônio Geraldo da. **Dicionário etimológico da língua portuguesa**. Rio de Janeiro: Lexikon, 4. ed., 2010.

DELEUZE, Gilles. **Nietzsche e a filosofia**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Rio, 1976.

DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **Mil Platôs**. São Paulo: Ed. 34, v. 1, 1995.

DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **Mil Platôs**. São Paulo: Ed. 34, v. 4, 1997.

DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **O Anti-Édipo**. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2010.

DELEUZE, Gilles; PARNET, Claire. **Dialogues**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.

DESCARTES, René. **O discurso do Método**. São Paulo: Nova Cultura, 2004.

FERRANTE, Elena. **A amiga genial**. São Paulo: Biblioteca Azul, 2015.

FERRAZ, Silvio. **Livro das sonoridades:** notas dispersas sobre composição. Rio de Janeiro: 7 Letras, 2005.

GREEN DAY. Redundant. **Nimrod**. Warner, 1997. 1CD, Faixa 4.

GUATTARI, Félix. As novas alianças: movimentos sociais & movimentos alternativos – um debate com Félix Guattari. **Desvios**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, n. 5, mar. 1986.

GUATTARI, Félix. **Caosmose:** um novo paradigma estético. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1992.

GUATTARI, Félix. Pragmatic/Machinic: discussion with Felix Guattari (19 March 1985). *In*: STIVALE, Charles J. **The two-fold thought of Deleuze and Guattari**. New York: Guilford, 1998.

GUATTARI, Félix; ROLNIK, Suely. **Micropolítica:** cartografias do desejo. Petrópolis: Vozes, 7. ed., 2005.

HEGEL, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. **Hegel**. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 2015.

LAWRENCE, David Herbert. O trabalho da criação. *In*: BLAKE, William; LAWRENCE, David Herbert. **Tudo que vive é sagrado**. Belo Horizonte: Crisálida, 2001.

LISPECTOR, Clarice. **A hora da estrela**. Rio de Janeiro: Rocco, 1998.

MASSEY, Doreen. **Pelo espaço:** uma nova política da espacialidade. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2008.

MOORE, Alan; CAMPBELL, Eddie. **Do Inferno**. São Paulo: Veneta, 2014.

MUSIL, Robert. **O homem sem qualidades**. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira (Biblioteca Áurea), 2018.

NELLI, René. **Os Cátaros**. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1980.

NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. **Assim falou Zaratustra**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2011.

NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. **Vontade de potência**. Rio de Janeiro: Ediouro, 1966.

PLATÃO. **Sofista**. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1991.

PLATÃO**. Timeu-Crítias**. Coimbra/Portugal: Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos, 2011.

RODRIGUES, Cláudio J. A. **Apócrifos da Bíblia e Pseudoepígrafos**. São Paulo: Novo Século, 2004.

SCHWARTZ, Jorge (org.). **Borges babilônico:** uma enciclopédia. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2017.

ZIEDAN, Youssef. **Azazel**. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2015.

Notes

[i] Apocryphal book supposedly written around 200 BC attributed to Enoch, an ancestral of Noah. There are indicated prophecies, besides descriptions on the destiny of the angels (denominated Vigilant) who have abandoned their celestial dwelling to live among human beings.

[ii] The concept of Devil speaks of an opponent entity that cultivates an opposition movement, while de concept of demon refers to an intelligent, clever entity.

[iii] The word Cathar (that means pure) begun to be used in Italy around 1030 A.D., being that the Cathar Church would firm itself in a significant way in south France, coming to disappear completely (by a violent action of the Catholic Church and of its hunters of heretics) in the 15th century (NELLI, 1980).

[iv] For everything that creates, only creates in the production of movement, and that the movement cannot support in itself Perfection.

[v] According to Deleuze (1976, p. 162) "three ideas define dialectics: the idea of a power of negative as a theoretical principle that is manifest in opposition and contradiction; the idea of a value of suffer and sadness, the appreciation of the 'sad passions', as a pragmatic principle that is manifest in the split, in tear apart; the idea of positivity as a theoretical and practical product of denial itself".

[vi] "God is a great urge, wonderful, mysterious, magnificent, but he know nothing before-hand. His urge takes shape in the flesh, and lo! it is creation! God looks himself on it in wonder, for the first time. Lo! There is a creature, formed! How strange! Let me think about it! Let me form an idea!" (LAWRENCE, 2001, p. 229).

[vii] The videoclip can be watched in http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wRE4zP826yA. Access in: 01 Dec. 2018.