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ABSTRACT – Academic Advising as a Space of More-Life. Aiming to pay a posthumous tribute to the work/life of Professor Sandra Mara Corazza, this paper is an investigation of her legacy as a graduate advisor. To this end, some of her manifestations on the subject are initially mobilized, followed by those about her procedures registered in the acknowledgments of the theses and dissertations of her students. The conclusion of this article presents Corazza’s advising practices as an operative ground committed not only to effect expansive movements of thinking/doing education and, particularly, educational research but also to create compositional and distributive ways of existence.
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RESUMO – A Orientação Acadêmica como Espaço de Mais-Vida. Com vistas a uma homenagem póstuma à obra/vida de Sandra Mara Corazza, o presente texto devota-se a prospectar o legado da professora no tocante à sua atuação como orientadora de trabalhos de pós-graduação. Para tanto, são mobilizadas inicialmente algumas manifestações suas sobre o assunto e, em seguida, aquelas sobre seus procedimentos registradas nos agradecimentos das teses e dissertações de seus/suas orientandos/as. As conclusões do texto apontam para as práticas de orientação de Corazza como um solo operativo obstinado não apenas com a efetuação de movimentos expansivos de pensar/fazer a educação e, particularmente, a pesquisa educacional, mas, sobretudo, com a criação de modos de existência compositivos e distributivos.

Academic Advising as a Space of More-Life

Introduction

Uhma [Muvlier] only kept a few points fixed for the convenience of the teacher language; the rest was crisis, recession, fear, panic, anguish; although I knew that I could not remain in this condition since I had to advise Scientific Initiation, Master, and Doctorate students’ research and teach undergraduate and graduate classes. How would she deal with that? Where would she turn? What turn would come from there? (Tadeu; Corazza; Zordan, 2004, p. 135-136).

In How to Write a Thesis, Umberto Eco (1992) offers, between ironic moments, an overview of the formative processes in the humanities. As a rule, they culminate in the presentation of a final piece, generically called “thesis.” In Italy, it is the result of a final course paper required by Italian universities at the time Eco authored his book. In Brazil, the same scriptural model is adopted in academic reports related to other advanced levels of university education.

The introduction to its Brazilian edition is an “[...] account of the experience of a researcher practically translated into the didactic formulas of a teacher who knows his craft” (Ferrara, 1992, p. ix). Indeed, How to Write a Thesis is committed to treading an enigmatic practice for the uninitiated, unveiling the alchemy, as Eco himself states (1992, p. xiv), contained therein.

This is how Eco – mobilizing endless information, suggestions, and warnings – unchecks the pillars of the textual genre in question via a set of beacons that includes both strict regulations and open questions: the choice of a theme, bibliographic research, disposition of the selected material, and, finally, the ipso facto writing of the final piece.

One of the final topics in the book contains a singular discussion: the acknowledgements section of works. There, one can see a sphere of the formative process that, save better judgment, is inscribed only as a determinant, at least as a strong contingency of academic activities: the relationship with the advisor.

Eco states: “However, it is bad taste to thank your advisor. If he helped you, he has simply done his job” (Eco, 1992, p. 140). Among the requirements of academic advising are joint work planning and supervision during preparation, transforming advisors into the first recipients of a work. This is their obligation. However, we can deduce that advisors could have other possible attributes, which would earn them the self-confessed gratitude of their students since fulfilling such obligation would be something only partially meritorious.

Another sign of this supplementary forum emerges when Eco, still discussing acknowledgements, considers the possibility that they include someone who the advisor “[...] hates, abhors, and despises” (Eco, 1992, p. 140). A crossroads would then emerge: the advisor is either “[...] open-minded and he accepts that his student has used resources with which he disagrees” (Eco, 1992, p. 140) or “[...] an old capricious baron,
spiteful and dogmatic, [...] probably [...] [a] wrong choice for an advisor” (Eco, 1992, p. 140-141). Eco closes with: “However, if, despite these flaws, you truly wanted this advisor because you believed that he would treat you like a protégé, then you must be coherently dishonest and ignore this other person in your acknowledgments, because you have chosen to become the same kind of person that your mentor is” (Eco, 1992, p. 141).

Thus, if academia encompasses different strains of people, we can deduce that the ambience of graduate studies will involve experiences of different wingspans, which will find a concrete area of effect in the transactions between advisors and students.

A relatively infrequent theme in Brazilian academic production on Education, advising was the object of an extensive collection that, after two decades of its publication, in 2002, persists as a capital reference for studies interested in that issue: A bússola do escrever: desafios e estratégias na orientação de teses e dissertações (The writing compass: challenges and strategies in advising theses and dissertations). Organized by Lucídio Bianchetti and Ana Maria Netto Machado, the work brought together 19 texts from prominent professors-researchers in the Brazilian educational scenario of the time – among them, Sandra Mara Corazza (hereinafter, SMC).

It was a question of assessing the state of things under different thematic frameworks and theoretical guidelines resulting from the expansion of Brazilian graduate programs since the previous decade, whose inflections have since multiplied due to, on the one hand, the increasing installation of new courses and, consequently, the inclusion of an exponentially larger number of students and, on the other, the managerial policies enacted by the government agencies in the area.

According to Dermeval Saviani (2002), inserted in this collection, Education had, at the time, 52 programs recognized by CAPES. Currently, there are 288 courses available; in the stricto sensu modality, 138 masters’ and 95 doctorate courses and in the professional modality, 52 masters’ and three doctorate courses.

Regarding the framework of advising, another author in that collection states that: “The interpersonal process of mutual and continuous learning represented by the relationship between advisors and each of their students is probably the main novelty in Brazilian education and science in the last 30 years of the 20th century” (Zilbermann, 2002, p. 335).

If it is true that advising has become central among the attributions of higher education professors-researchers – even more so if one considers the irreducibility of the pedagogical task which, in this sphere, is their responsibility – it is also true that such practice contains events of multiple orders, proper to an unstable, complex, and often incognito modus operandi.

Thus, this text proposes to contextualize SMC’s legacy regarding her performance as an academic work advisor from some marks
left both directly – via some of her texts – and indirectly – via how her students manifested themselves about her in their theses and dissertations.

By electing such a phatic horizon, we believe it is possible to archive a fair share of the experience lived and readily bequeathed by this professor; a share of difficult systematization and, being honest, almost always forgotten when it comes observing the ways of existence of a university professor-researcher.

**The Life of a Professor-Advisor**

SMC graduated in Philosophy in 1973 from the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). Her master’s degree in Education was held at the Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), and her thesis, entitled *O período preparatório na 1ª série do 1º grau em escolas municipais de Porto Alegre: ritual de passagem* (The 1st grade preparatory period in municipal schools in Porto Alegre: a rite of passage) was defended in 1990, with Augusto Nibaldo Silva Triviños as her advisor. Her doctorate, advised by Tomaz Tadeu da Silva, was completed in 1998 in the UFRGS Education Graduate Program. She entitled her dissertation *História da infantilidade: a-vida-a-morte e mais-valia de uma infância sem fim* (History of childishness: to-life-to-death and surplus of an endless childhood).

Her engagement with that Graduate Program linked to UFRGS’s School of Education (FACED) – of which she became Assistant Professor in 1993 – took place shortly after achieving her PhD, thus working as an advisor for over two decades.

The first graduate research she advised was defended in 1999 by Andréia Todeschini Merlo: *Psicopedagogia: dispositivo de governo da subnormalidade* (Psychopedagogy: a subnormality device).

During her period linked to this Program, she was responsible for advising 21 doctoral dissertations and 21 master’s theses. Among her students, some became faculty colleagues: Luciane Uberti, Paola Basso Menna Barreto Gomes Zordan, Lisete Bampi, Nilton Mullet Pereira, Máximo Daniel Lamela Adó, and Cristiano Bedin da Costa. Others went on to teach at other public and private universities.

Reflections on academic advising permeate a few of SMC’s texts. Two of them, in particular: *Manual infame... mas útil para escrever uma excelente proposta de tese ou dissertação* (An infamous but useful manual to write an excellent thesis or dissertation proposal) and *Um bravo (dicas para a sessão de defesa da proposta)* (A bravo (tips for the defense session of a proposal)), both contained in the 2008 book *Os cantos de Fouror* (The songs of Fouror).

It is impossible to disagree with Cristiano Bedin da Costa (2022, p. 77) when he states that, in both texts,
Instead of a writereader and her literary archive, what we find is a shrewd advisor in action. There is no doubt that one was in the other (a cunning eye, critical sharpness, and full intelligence were common and constant attributes) but it is when observation turns to the most everyday issues, when criticism turns to academic surroundings, when her eyes prove seeing more, seeing better, seeing something beyond, that Sandra offers undisputed evidence of her intellectual strength. There is poetry in these texts. As comical as they are serious, they offer a supplement of meaning to rigid spaces in the context of graduate research.

The poetic character of both texts is vectorized by blunt, sometimes biting assertions, like some constant admonitions in *Um bravo*: do not speak too much; do not thank; do not praise yourself; do not judge or disagree with arguers. Other unusual propositions, so to speak, are made present when, for example, the author suggests that:

> Before the session, wash your hair with a good shampoo, put on a clean outfit, some perfume, a nice shirt, a vernal suit, good shoes. Of course, you do not have to go into debt for six months, but... it is not worth wearing sneakers (for those who only wear sneakers: Ok, but a new pair, then!), dirty jeans (everyday ones) or ripped ones (I know they are fashionable, but not worth it). [...] It is not worth it going to your Defense session dressed like you are going to class every week. It is not worth it... (Corazza, 2008b, p. 97).

In these times, it is impossible not to share with SMC not only the gift of laughter but also a certain testimonial complicity to the idiosyncrasies of the university habitat.

Before closing the text by wishing candidates good luck, she states that:

> You will be alone. [...] Your advisor should not interfere in anything during the session, just coordinate it. They cannot be an evaluator at that moment. And if they are a sober individual, they will not interfere, defend, discuss their evaluations with Board members, talk during the arguing, or support you. On the contrary, they will let you go. They will trust you. They will let you handle it. [...] You have had all the guidance you needed (Corazza, 2008b, p. 97).

When facing the world outside peer groups, shelter is not what is offered but a certain mutual trust derived from a fulfilled common duty. And this is how the advising game will find its most perfect translation, by seeing itself install a safe space among its players, secreted from the observance–no chance of evasion–of a list of demands with which one cannot do away under penalty of the very power of playing fading away. A good academic life would thus not be lived despite such demands but precisely because of them, so that only then it is possible to overcome them. Such demands must be experienced bravely and with some inventive grace.
In an analogous effort to *Um bravo* (presumably directed to SMC's own students), *Manual infame... mas útil para escrever uma excelente proposta de tese ou dissertação* also addresses a common reader. In both cases, the author’s shrewd gaze resumes the scriptural frameworks of a qualification exam report. SMC's own impatience would have motivated the writing of *Manual* due to the incessant reappearance of a set of fundamental questions in individual or collective advising sessions. Hence the proposal of a defense which could provocatively incite a certain creative volition and never standardize or harden others' research/writing.

To unravel the intricacies not only of investigative procedures but also of their corresponding writing modes – since they will be mutually and obligingly involved – SMC reveals her point of view on education research via four topics: *Esqueleto de uma proposta* (Skeleton of a proposal); *Outras dicas preciosas* (Other precious tips); *Duas pequenas pérolas* (Two small pearls); and *Receita de uma tese foucaultiana* (Recipe for a Foucauldian thesis).

Of the countless textual passages which we could cite here, one stands out since it focuses on events related to graduate students being moved by such a rare and uncertain passion for writing—an experience that, save better judgment, no one else could describe as sharply as SMC. A beautiful moment in educational literature, in our view.

Here we reference the author’s evocation of one of the ingredients of the aforementioned recipe: “one teaspoon of salt-of-life” (Corazza, 2008a, p. 90). It is worth fully reproducing the extract.

While you are making this recipe, you will live but once a week—and even that will be too much, already a profit of some kind! Except that you will be so tired that you will soon get drunk, even if you are not having some ’30-year-old’. Food will give you heartburn, gastritis, even an ulcer. The anthropological sole fillet with Gambrinus capers will taste like a poor man’s stew. Movies will bring you new—and silly, always useless!—ideas to add to your thesis. The Mercosur Biennial will show you that you are not, have never been, will never be, do not have the slightest chance to be creative. The jazz at Café Majestic will be heard as if it were pagode and the songs at Bar do Nito as a pure waste of time. Conversations with friends will seem terribly trivial to you; your friends themselves, tremendously banal. Cigarettes will taste bitter, and you will be filled with ashes. Your beloved espressos will taste like cheap beer. "Peticide" impulses will have to be controlled as your three dogs and five cats ask you for food. Love-making itself will taste like a dangerous supplement, as Derrida would say, which diverts it from its current true hainamoration: the thesis. And the greatest of all misfortunes is that you will have, in that one occasion a week, an immense, non-negotiable, almost uncontrollable will to return to books, handwritten notes, keyboards; in short, to your text (Corazza, 2008a, p. 90).
Everyday habits crumbling would be the price to be paid by those who volunteered to doubt what was thought, to open up to the thoughtless, to achieve a variable quantum of emptying. Thought as an uprooting and schism occasion, thus never of assent or subscription. In doing so, one would see a fierce clash of self against self in which there will be no victory, no rest, but only small and insistent defeats, fundamental so that what existed until then is upset, displaced, and, finally, made available for use; an indeterminate and lost use, we should stress. We are discussing abandonment and, in the same turn, existential inauguration. Perhaps, another way to breathe.

In a previous text published in 1996 (republished in 2002) – *Laborintos da pesquisa, diante dos ferrolho* (Research labyrinths, before the bolts) – SMC already brought to light this point of fusion in which researching and living collide all the time, transfiguring each other.

[...] If a research practice is implicated by our own life, another will only be possible if the researcher struggles to exist in another way, to change their previous relations with knowledge and power, to lose the truth of their own identity formation so that the self is redone. That is, the whole thing of research practice is the order of creation–ethics and aesthetics–never of conversion, much less of tacky adherence to any proficiency (Corazza, 2002, p. 127).

If what is in focus here is an untimely turn toward unforeseen regions of thought/life, relying on handholding for it should be unnecessarily, thus renouncing the illusion of completeness which is unsuspectingly placed under advisors’ tutelage too often. On the contrary, their task will precisely be the refusal of any affiliation gesture, of fixing a supposed lineage, of delimiting an inert zone of reciprocal identification. On the contrary, advisors and students remain as parallel centers of force that mesh with each other at times just before detaching again. The beauty of their encounter will reside only in this temporary confluence.

It is in this vacant space–or, if you will, compulsory exile–that the act of writing is installed, bridging all kinds of demands for dependence between peers. They will cohabit in the same gesture, not the same place. Thus, each in their own way, will spend their days in favor of a writing to come and nothing else. There is beauty, too, in this joint observation of something one does not know. One hopes.

Thus, we call one last passage in our brief revisitation of SMC’s ideas. Although not specifically alluding to advising work, *Como um cão* (Like a dog), a text included in the book *Artistagens: filosofia da diferença e Educação* (Artistages: philosophy of difference and Education), is, in our opinion, a tiny masterpiece. An exquisite arrangement of formulations, now with an expressly Deleuzian bias, on the writing-artist as SMC conceived and exercised it.

We could summarize everything to the triggering proposition of the text: the act of writing in education could convert the work of thinking into a great party. Multiple sprains and different orders are claimed
to this end. Starting with the perspective of two writing modalities which ceaselessly fence each other: the representational and the artistic ones. It is, of course, a question of transferring the contrast between the two in favor of the moving power of the second when facing the inertial character of the first one.

To the writing-representational, the question is: What do you mean? To the writing-artist: How does it work? Both types of questions contain different worlds. On the one hand, there is a writing from which exegesis or justification is made, something cognitive, a logic of extra-perspective knowledge. On the other hand, a writing for which only positional functionings in the same educational complex are valid, renouncing any interpretation, exclusive option for operative use. Machination of a writing, which is only productive, neither expressive nor representative (Corazza, 2006a, p. 26).

Relying on her usual modus operandi, SMC first cares about weeding the intellectual terrain she has taken for herself. It is a question of emptying, scraping, brushing, cleaning the matter of thought in check, with a view to getting out of what is already thought, thus enabling the act of thinking to conquer a renewed vigor in which new contours of the thought thing can thrive. SMC forces us to start over from scratch, thinking for the first time, to have the redoubled wonderment of the jamais vu.

From which writing, therefore, depart? Of that territorialized, reproductive, circular, progressive, representational, narrative, emotional, figurative, imitative, illustrative, univocal, homogeneous, undifferentiated, saturating, moralist, optimistic, fusional, projective, identifying, internalistic, nostalgic, redemptive, advisory, messianic, prophetic, reactive, quiet, sensible, exegetic, justifying, cognitive, expressive, clear, objective, stratified, monist, bipolar, explainer, finalist, teleological, realistic, and true one.

And to which writing should we cast ourselves? That thought-minded, transgressive, polyvocal, intensive, energetic, heterogeneous, extrinsic, combinatorial, singular, disturbing, affirmative, cheerful, luxurious, free, foolish, rapist, tragic, impulsive, aberrant, renewed, ill-spoken, glorious, inventive, unfinished, imaginative, anarchic, indiscernible, enigmatic, passionate, impersonal, pre-individual, transcendental, plural, anonymous, depersonalized, mobile, informal, unratified, affective, dismembering, errant, violent, inexhaustible, disparate, dissymmetric, precarious, mutant, mutagenic, nomadic, schizo-analytical, micropolitical, pragmatic, diagramatic, rhizomatic, cartographic, transvaluative, innocent, perspectivist, antiteleological, anti-substantialist, anti-realistic, fictional, fragmented, partial, differentiated, countless, innumerable, dreamy, laughing, moving, becoming one.

What will be its artifices?
Those who write not because they have a writing project and try to accomplish it but because they start the act of writing to see if there is an intensity that produces some effects. Writers of the cheerful innocence of an enfant who only knows how to speak the only sensible word: – Yes! (Corazza, 2006a, p. 33).

A Life from Others

Among the texts yet unpublished by SMC is one which largely condenses what we have attempted to unfold so far. It is one of her utterances during one of her students’ – Cristiano Bedin da Costa – master’s degree defense on August 31st, 2007.

A faithful mark of SMC’s refined elaborations, the text entitled Pro seuchico (For Mr. Chico), by shuffling the different strata of the advising experience, results in a reckoning with life that was desired and realized there: the many people who passed and those to come; the labor without truce; the gestures of writing, as their risks are computed; the joy of encounters, and the pain of farewells; the power of, together, existing for a certain time interval. Here it is:

WE STILL have a lot of people to advise
reams of paper to write
forms of content to schools
expression albums to wisps
sulfurs of reading volcanoes
WHEN we do not have it anymore, we will be at the door.
WHEN we run out the paper we will write on skin
WHEN no more dancing students come
sanguine in a risk group
we will guide animals full of hair
red balloons and cicadas in heat
WHEN the pink biographical text erupts
literary games cease
only old scars are left in the bodies
no more dancing students come
thorns without two nickels to rub together
WHEN the end of the afternoon without literature
and the cold morning soil
the eyelids with words
WE WILL REMEMBER that THE SILENT AND DISCREET MR. CHICO is gone
AND WE WILL FEAR the dense sadness that, indeed,
does not even serve as WRITING MATTER
that is worth it
SINCE WITHOUT HIM our BAND OF GUIDANCE
will become musically more calcinated9 (Corazza, 2007, n. p.).

We must say that one of MCS’ achievements as an advisor was creating the Group of Guidance and Research (hereinafter GGR) related to research on Philosophy of difference and education and to the DIF Research Group: artstations, fabulations, variations at UFRGS FACED.
In her Memorial, presented in 2014, at her promotion to Full Professor, SMC recovered one of her interviews from 2013, in which she unveiled the GGR support lines: an aggregate of students from different backgrounds and levels of training that would join “[...] via the anthropophagy: of texts, authors, ideas, moods, laughter, parties. Philosophically, literarily, and educationally (at least), GGRians constitute a neighborhood of intellectual friendship” (Corazza, 2014, p. 220).

Note that GGRians could not be reputed as a qualifier but as a style, a way of conducting oneself, a willingness to move through life.

GGRians are darters, dashing against everything that does not walk. Gentiles, they revolutionize multiplicities, without unification. Makers of the unborn, they do not welcome cadaverized ideas since thinking is dynamic. [...] Their texts, theses, and dissertations express uncreated universes; therefore, they have no speculation, containing only divination, fabulation, and beauty, the major science of distribution (Corazza, 2014, p. 220-221).

On another occasion, SMC pointed out the reasons why they would remain together: “For camaraderie, worldliness, mannerism, multiple loves, giddy happiness” (Corazza, 2010a, p. 8).

We thus assume that GGR was, in addition to a substantive part of SMC’s academic life, a continent of valuable experiences, a spot where expansive events took shape and place.

What about the other GGR members? What did those present witness? And, more specifically, what has been said about what happened there?

Concerned with these issues, we pursue—in a circumscribed way, of course—the echoes of SMC’s advising practice in the acknowledgments of theses and dissertations she advised.

Among the 42 dissertations and theses, some do not contain acknowledgements (Zordan, 2004; Pereira, 2004; Dalarosa, 2011; Frichmann, 2012; and Kings, 2019). Others convey them in a summary way, without further justification (Costa, L.B., 2006; Coast, C.B. 2007; Adó, 2013; Matos, 2014; Abdalah, 2018; and Dinarte, 2018).

In total, four works include Hugo Corazza, SMC’s husband, among the people to be thanked (Costa, C.B., 2007; Nodari, 2007; Heuser, 2008; Oliveira, 2014).

As pieces of proof of SMC’s impact on those lives, the most recurrent evocation refers to her intellectual rigor, a type of signal immediately recognizable by those who lived with her in GGR. As Roos (2005) claimed, SMC was a thinking machine or, according to Acom (2015), a motor power.

To my advisor for the rigor, the remaking of my thoughts, the precious teachings (Cardoso, 2001);
To Sandra, for her sophisticated advisory work, as well as for the dedicated and rigorous reading, which left me no other way out but to write (Rodrigues, 2002);
To my advisor, Sandra Mara Corazza, for her rigor and suitability in her advising practice (Uberti, 2002);

To my advisor, Prof. Sandra Mara Corazza, tireless rower, great broadcaster of signs. Event engenderer (Roos, 2005);

To Sandra Mara Corazza […] for the philosophical joy that proved to be much more than possible but effective: in writing, classes, conceptual rigor, and thought (Heuser, 2008);

I thank Sandra Corazza, […] an example of rigor and passion for research (Costa, L.B., 2010);

To Sandra Corazza, […] for the rigor and care during all these years (Costa, C.B., 2012);

I thank Sandra Mara Corazza, […] for the examples of life and rigor with which she conducted this shared research (Campos, 2013);

To Sandra Corazza, for her cheerful and non-negotiable rigor; for her affection and dedication without which the text would not be text (Oliveira, 2014);

I thank Sandra Mara Corazza, […] for the passion and rigor in research (Campos, 2017);

To Sandra Mara Corazza […] with her exaction I was able to accomplish what I wish not to have been otherwise (Olini, 2017);

To Sandra Mara Corazza, […] for not easily assenting, for showing the importance of intellectual rigor (Olegário, 2018);

To Sandra Mara Corazza […]. Necessary exaction, minimal affections at the right moments; shared trust (Martins, 2019);

To the arch-sorceress Sandra Mara Corazza […] for her intense and rigorous presence in research (Pinto, 2019).

There are moments that uncover a horizon of forceful dislodging effects that circulated in the formative conviviality with the advisor. This is how some of them vocalized it:

And especially Sandra, for having welcomed, encouraged, expressed, pushed, excited a philosophy teacher and, at this painful forceful moment, compelled such a creature to create (Cunha, 2006);

To Sandra Mara Corazza […] for the violence which swept the I Ester through cursed men and women I got to know and learned to love (Heuser, 2008);

I thank Sandra Mara Corazza, my favorite executioner (Feil, 2009);

To the “belligelicious” acquaintance with Sandra (Oliveira, 2010);

To Sandra Mara Corazza, for having challenged and encouraged my thoughts in this dissertation […] (Olini, 2017);

Sandra: from signal-artistic hell-paradise (Sperb, 2017).
In what has been asserted about SMC’s advising performance, there seems to be a kind of power cord that covers from the events cited above to a kind of inverse power, in which an event stands out among others: friendship.

To Sandra Mara Corazza, for her multiple presence— as an intellectual, advisor, friend, woman, and colleague and the spaces once occupied and remade by this line of affection (Merlo, 1999);

For my advisor, Sandra Corazza, [...] friend with whom I had the privilege of living: my eternal thanks (Bilibio, 2002);

My advisor, Sandra Corazza, for all her support and intellectual friendship (Kroef, 2003);

To Sandra Mara Corazza, for the Yes, trust, friendship, and affection (Heuser, 2008);

I thank Sandra Corazza, my friend and advisor in six years of academic and life adventures [...] (Costa, L.B., 2010);

To Sandra Corazza, for the friendship [...] (Costa, C.B., 2012);

I thank Sandra Corazza, [...] for years of coexistence and affection (Nicolay, 2012);

I thank Sandra Mara Corazza, my advisor, journey companion [...] (Campos, 2013);

I thank Sandra Mara Corazza my advisor, friend, and companion (Campos, 2017).

Added to the dexterity of being available to others without reservation, to offer continence to their “[...] comings and goings” (Nodari, 2007). To Cardoso (2001), her advisor deserved her gratitude due to her “[...] fraternity and the loving welcome.” Uberti (2002) stressed the “[...] investment and trust spent on me in this production,” whereas Santos (2002) saw in her advisor “[...] seriousness, competence, dedication, persistence, and that was made available helping me to overcome the ‘limits’ of this production.” Bampi (2003), in turn, thanked SMC for her “[...] professionalism and constant availability.” Ramos (2004) also highlighted: “Thank you very much, Professor Sandra Corazza, because I learned things of generosity in your company.” Roos (2005) thanked her for having “[...] welcomed, inspired, and challenged” her. Costa, R. P. (2007) assured readers that “[...] without her accompaniment, patience, affection, and generosity, the completion of this work would not be possible.” Finally, Olegário (2018) states: “To Sandra Mara Corazza, for her welcome, generosity, and trust in my work,” and Martins (2019), “To Sandra Mara Corazza, for all the encouragement of reading and writing in her seminars prior to her advising practice and especially for the hard journey with this student.”

In the eyes of her students, SMC taught:

[...] vocative and provocative writing (Rodrigues, 2002);
[...] courage and joy (Ramos, 2004);
Aquino

 […] respect and admiration (Nicolay, 2006);
 […] the strength of divergence of thinking about thought (Heuser, 2008);
 […] living together in academia (Feil, 2009);
 […] strength and passion for curiosity (Pacheco, 2011);
 […] teachcraft the art of research in education (Nicolay, 2012);
 […] vigorous, attentive, and intense education (Bandeira, 2014);
 […] challenges of an adventurously shared academic-life (Campos, 2017).

One Life, Many Lives

In the intricate intellectual mosaic SMC carved, several problems unfolded over time, from the germinal discussions around a post-critical education through debates about childhood, didactics, and curricula, proposals around writingreading and transcreating translation to the final topic: dreams. In the midst of such a plethora of ideas, we cannot deny that the means to practice educational research occupied the author’s thought, especially in a frontal way.

Proof of this are the productions in which different address keys are collected to the act of researching education operating in GGR and beyond; thus, in addition to SMC’s students, the members of the Research Network Difference Writereadings in Philosophy-Education (Escrileituras, 2022). This is, in addition to the 10 different versions of Cadernos de Notas (Notebooks), of the collections Docência-pesquisa da diferença: poética de arquivo-mar (Teaching-researching difference: poetics of the archive-sea) (Corazza, 2007); Fantasias de escritura: filosofia, educação, literatura (Writing fantasies: philosophy, education, literature) (Corazza, 2010b); Métodos de transcriação: pesquisa em educação da diferença (Transcreation methods: research on education of difference) (Corazza, 2020); and Notas de Tradutores [N. T.]: escritureaduras de um projeto de pesquisa do CNPq (Translators’ Notes [T.N.]: writingreadings of a CNPq research project) (Corazza; Carvalho; Nodari; Monteiro, 2021).

SMC was, of course, a researcher attentive to the circulation of her ideas and those plotted with her partners. Again, proof of this was her commitment to fostering collective publications—always with the presence of GGR members. Thus, the following stand out: Abecedário: educação da diferença (ABC: education of difference) (Aquino; Corazza, 2009); Dicionário das ideias feitas em educação (Dictionary of ideas in education) (Corazza; Aquino, 2011); Aula com… em vias de uma didática da invenção (A lecture with… toward an invention didactics) (Heuser; Aquino; Corazza, 2018); and Breviário dos sonhos em educação (Breviary of dreams of education) (Corazza, 2019).

It is true that the agglutinating content of her performance – whether as a mentor, a professor, and a colleague – did not take place without an austere counterpart; now rough, now mocking, always un-
usual. In the tribute published on the UFRGS’s FACED website one week after her death, the traces of a life that crossed those of so many others are well expressed.

[SMC] leaves an immense sense of gratitude in everyone, be it those she helped, those she provoked with scathing questions, those she articulated, those she inspired, those she bothered and made think. [...] Whoever knew her and lived with her remarkable presence had the privilege to earn her mark, some say, that of a beast; others received the strike of a caterpillar tail; some were left with the trill of a flying bird. (FACED, 2021, n.p.).

In fact, SMC left unequivocal signs wherever she went, with whom she made contact, in the time she was given to live. A free spirit of Nietzschean proportions, a mixture of lion and child. A little lioness, perhaps.

It is, therefore, correct to admit that SMC’s actions, especially those related to the practice of advising, constituted a laboratory of continuous experimentation that became a more-life space, that is: an obstinate operative soil not only with the effect of expansive movements of thinking/doing education—particularly, educational research—but, above all, with the creation of compositive and distributive modes of existence, since nourished by and nourisher of lives to come. SMC was/is legion.

As Fabiano Neu Pinto (2019) stated in his acknowledgements, SMC “[…] lives in the flame texts of the archive.” Indeed, an unquenchable, profuse, flourishing presence. A mycelium.
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Notes
1 The Portuguese edition of the book translates the same passage as “Or else the advisor is an irascible, envious, and dogmatic old mandarin and students should not do their theses with such an individual” (Eco, 2007, p. 197).
2 According to data from the Sucupira Platform, CAPES, referring to 2022.
3 Entitled Infamous… but useful manual to write a good thesis or dissertation proposal, the same text was previously published as a chapter in Bianchetti and Machado (2006b), and then as an article (Corazza, 2016). Note the change from good to the excellent qualifier in the 2008 title.
4 Proposal defense is equivalent to a qualification exam.
5 Gabriel Sausen Feil (2022) wrote an interesting dialogue-homage with the Manual infame.
6 Portuguese restaurant, active since 1889, located in the Porto Alegre Municipal Market.
7 In the Majestic Hotel, which nowadays houses the Casa de Cultura Mário Quintana.
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8 Bar in Porto Alegre, with live Brazilian music, especially samba.
9 The formatting of the text shown reproduces its original form.
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