Inventory of didactic translation procedures:
theory, practice, and research method

SANDRA MARA CORAZZA
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

ABSTRACT
Since the philosophy's difference in education, the text defends the following thesis as a fact: the teacher creates the theory, the practice, and the method because when a teacher educates translating, there are no possibilities of not creating them. Or, in other words: while translating the science, the arts, and the philosophy, in a curricular and didactic way, the teacher necessarily has creative ideas. For illustrating these facts, it is necessary to appeal for the script for scheduling procedures of translation in a class, answered by scholars and researchers that are participating in the núcleo Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Toledo, PR), members of the project Escrileituras: um modo de ler-escrever em meio à vida, developed between 2011 and 2014, with the program Observatório da Educação/Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior support. By accomplishing the empirical analysis of this script, the interrelations among theory, practice, and method, that indicate directions to be followed in future classes and surveys, due to its heuristic values in the teacher-researcher formation, are discussed.

KEYWORDS
escrileituras; didatics; theory; practice; method.

INVENTÁRIO DE PROCEDIMENTOS DIDÁTICOS DE TRADUÇÃO: TEORIA, PRÁTICA E MÉTODO DE PESQUISA

RESUMO

Na filosofia da diferença em educação, o texto defende a seguinte tese como fato: o professor cria teoria, prática e método porque, ao educar, traduzindo, não tem como não criá-los. Ou, escrito de outro modo: ao traduzir a ciência, a arte e a filosofia, de modo curricular e didático, o professor tem, necessariamente, ideias criadoras. Para demonstrar essa facticidade, recorre-se ao roteiro para inventariar procedimentos de tradução em uma aula, respondidos por bolsistas e pesquisadores participantes do núcleo da Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Toledo, PR), integrantes do projeto Escrileituras: um modo de ler-escrever em meio à vida, desenvolvido de 2011 a 2014, com apoio do programa Observatório da Educação/Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior. Realizando a análise empírica desse roteiro, discutem-se as inter-relações entre teoria, prática e método, indicando direções a seguir em futuras aulas e pesquisas, por seu valor heurístico na formação do professor-pesquisador.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

escrileituras; didática; teoria; prática; método.

INVENTARIO DE PROCEDIMIENTOS DIDÁCTICOS DE TRADUCCIÓN: TEORÍA, PRÁCTICA Y MÉTODO DE INVESTIGACIÓN

RESUMEN

Desde la filosofía de la diferencia en educación, el texto defiende la siguiente tesis, como hecho: el profesor crea teoría, práctica y método porque, al educar, traduciendo, no tiene como no crearlos. O, escrito de otro modo: al traducir la ciencia, el arte y la filosofía, de modo curricular y didáctico, el profesor tiene, necesariamente, ideas creadoras. Para demostrar esa facticidad, recurre al Guion para inventariar procedimientos de traducción en un aula, respondidos por becarios e investigadores participantes del núcleo Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Toledo, PR), integrantes del proyecto Escrileituras: un modo de leer-escribir en medio a la vida, desarrollado del 2011 al 2014, con el apoyo del programa Observatório da Educação/Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior. Realizando el análisis empírico de ese Guion, discute las interrelaciones entre teoría, práctica y método, que indican direcciones a seguir en futuras clases e investigaciones, por su valor heurístico en la formación del profesor-investigador.

PALABRAS CLAVE

escrileituras; didáctica; teoría; práctica; método.

Making the articulations that connect practices creak, data collecting and correlating, assembling and dismantling forms, refining the ideas precision, using free imagination for constructing and deconstructing the truths we invent is our destiny as creatures who, being born human and finite, are bound to wish, create and recreate the world that surrounds us from perspectives and biases. This article aims to revamp and write about the consciousness of such creative desire in the educational area since the education craft practice makes many things work.

Because many things work, our research problem when educating is whether knowing why something worked or, as its effects are produced, how they came about. This because we consider that identifying the effects and signalizing the causes of educating is a responsibility of educational research so that education is never regarded as some kind of thaumaturgy or magical belief. We do not agree with the view that educating is so difficult (or even impossible) that it cannot have its workings described, conceptualized, understood, and explained — even considering the limitations and camouflages of our understanding on internal cohesion and communicability capacities and the empirical verifiability of such knowledge.

Along such research line, we may outline a methodical doubt or establish another rigor, different from that produced by the obscurantism or the (usually inspired) charm of mute opacity; the rigor of a method captured by the idea that the (trans)creation act specificity in education occurs par excellence in a translational fashion, both in curriculum and didactics (Corazza, 2013b). In this case, the effort, not without ancestors or predecessors — who have often gone through the same problem, albeit at different levels of verticality —, removes ignorance about our profession functioning, erected in principle or even in ideal, so that we can dynamically operate with what is left in the penumbra of effectiveness and we have become used to saying that we do not know what it is.

In doing research this way, we formulate the following questions: is creating didactics and curriculum through translation procedures a result from imagining, achieving, seeing, anticipating the teaching? For researchers such as ourselves, who stand in the field of philosophy of difference in education (Corazza, 1996; Tadeu, Corazza and Zordan, 2004), is the fundamental materialist principle of practice as the most important aspect or the idealist principle of the theory supremacy that counts? Are we able to produce checking devices and procedures such as those of the formal empirical sciences (which we consider to be more experimental than exact) to prove the scientificity of this thesis (or idea) of translational transcreation? Or do we need to predict effects without being able to check their truth (*aletheia*) according to teaching facts? Are we exclusively territorialized in the operability and epistemological organization of human sciences, for which the scientificity criterion is the criticism? Even if the translational thesis is not arbitrary, considering what each teacher perceives or believes to perceive from their teaching practice — distinguishing or opposing it to other existing theses or ideas —, how can one anticipate research initiatives without submitting such thesis to the criterion of common sense, consensus or a gentlemen's (and ladies') agreement?

On the other hand, how not to make this thesis an equation or a theorem — understood in the same sense by anyone, anytime and anywhere —, opening its uni-

vocity to the polysemy of the observed and described teaching situations? How can we reflect on the drama of teachers (shared by the students) in the classes, keeping in mind the audacity of thinking about teaching in a different way than we have already thought or still think? How risky is our subjective responsibility as researchers in face of teaching acts, in their effects and unpredictable experiments? Also for us this is a question of, as Marx (2001, p. 103, author's translation) asserted in his "XI thesis on Feuerbach", no longer "interpreting the world differently […] but modifying it"?

In researching the reality of teaching, are we dealing, as asserted by Althusser (1992, p. 165, author's translation), with "the theory of theoretical practice, that is, the practice of sciences, in an almost positivist view"? If so, would it make sense to select a set of problems and seek to solve them, through what is admitted as scientific research: hypotheses, controls, comparative tactics, laboratory techniques, and statistical treatments? How can one carry out a research on difference within an empirical scope without treating it in a formal way, operating on educational subjects — considered as imprecise, non-codified but amorphous data — that have been produced in a certain time and space (from 2011 to 2014) to be then gathered in a file (Corazza, 2014; Derrida, 2001; Farge, 2009; Foucault, 1972)? And how can one, from this file — which "originates from invention" (Olegário, 2016, p. 19) since "every invention depends on a file" (Adó, 2013, p. 102, author's translation) — , produce self-knowledge and wisdom of life, without paradigmatic quantification, mechanistic determinism, totalitarian model of rationality, mirage of absolute knowledge, or ineffable intuition?

Although we have a file, comprising educational subjects (= data) produced during the development of the project Escrileituras: um modo de ler-escrever em meio à vida (Corazza *et al*., 2014), we chose not to abandon the literary, poetic, and romanesque sources of our research. For this reason, we prefer that the given data (which are not given at all) within the file, which traditionally would be suitable to an empirical order, are offered to researchers, without criticism or determined intention, so that we continue to capture them in their plurality, transgression, and mutations; even if they are presented in a pre-theoretical or larval state.

Similar to the philosophical, literary, and educational thought of difference that inaugurated the actions of research fellows participating in the Escrileituras Project even before these actions began, traversing an independent range of empirically treated data, the research uses a method of operation over the human, that is, an operator of a certain type of human dialogue, a receptive method of experimentation — such as a language, which values more the reverse listening and the wait for the file meaning than its induction or storage.

Thus, it moves on a plane of immanence that did not fall from the sky but that expresses a historical cumulativeness of the educational area and of the research and supervision group itself — named DIF: artistages, fabulations, variations (since 2002) — characterized by opening, construction, and sharing. It deals with this plan as a method, as a work in the thinking of difference, which voices the reality of teaching, responding it in the language in which it is asked. In other words, in the artistry conditions of lessons (Corazza, 2012), populated with transcreative

translational procedures — considering each procedure as "previously planned, artistically armed, and strategically thought out" (Feil, 2011, p. 33, author's translation).

CONDITIONS AND DYNAMICS

We have never expected to find a simple parallelism between the translational functioning of education and the teachers' discourse on such functioning, although we recognize that there is a feature which is common to the two domains: both are processes that hold complex articulations between each other. What works in education is translated in and by discourse, whereas the latter reflects and refracts that functioning as a prism. Of course, the system of correspondence is, at first, deranged, because the discourse about what works has its own medium, which is developed by language and reasoning and have its points of inflection and silence, impasse or suppression — its conditions of possibility, delimited by the theoretical territory. On the other hand, that which works also has its conditions of possibility, defined by the own practice dynamics and reproduced in one way or another at the discursive level. Amid the dichotomous dualistic tradition, we can call these two domains theory and practice, caught in a constrictive chaining of one by the other, whereas here they are studied by a method conceived as the work of the teacher-researchers, who think their own creative experiences.

We can also call one domain theory and the other teaching, in a situation of permanent dialogue. Thus, a theoretical articulation of translation with no reference to teaching carries the danger of approaching delusional thinking manifestations; while the translational teaching with no theoretical conceptualization can be lost in the indiscipline and omnipotence of any classroom floor. Therefore, we deal with a translational theory that both comprises a teaching practice that is also a translation practice as it is circumscribed by this practice; hence, being thus bound, both become a research method which reveals its constructs.

It should be emphasized that, although the theoretical circumscription of the study area and teaching activity of the Escrileituras Project participants was necessary to initially delimit investigation and problematization objects, we adopted precautionary measures so that this circumscription did not occupy the whole scene, anticipate the autobiographeme discoveries (Corazza, Oliveira and Adó, 2015), nor prevented the enigmatic adventures of the unknown. This previously accumulated, selected, inflected knowledge was already conscious but never endowed with a mythical totalitarianism or carried a religious dogmatism, so that it would always be possible to deal with the class topics without it, with another theory resulting from it as a creation.

Everyone knew that theoretical plan was, at that beginning, nothing more than a field statement, an anticipation of the directions in which the project thinking was driven by conceptualizations of the philosophy of difference, demarcated by research experiences and postulates of previous teachings; even though, at the same time, it offered itself, in its domain heterogeneity, as a springboard for each teacher to jump towards a transcreative teaching-research, without obstructions or categorical determinations.

Therefore, letting go of such knowledge, which was being studied during the course of the project, forgetting it, dismantling it or flattening it, put us face to face with the unsaturated — manifested in the particular occasions of seminars, courses, self-workshops, classes, articles, books, notebooks, as places of discovery and invention. After all, there is no theory or practice that overcomes the eternal movement of the teaching life.

And when new ideas and meanings emerged from this pulsing movement of teaching, we returned to theory for putting them in touch with what was already articulated and criticized. Then, we left concepts to be rearranged and confronted with each other, as well as with the didactic translation of the subjects. The panorama that thus opened was a contribution and not the proof of an *a priori*, orderly, and stable theory, disconnected from the teaching experience and from what spilled over from that theory into what we did.

ARTIFICE AND EXERCISES

Once this regime of action and thinking was designed, in which one worked not to learn what is already known, it became urgent for the research to retake the problematic distinction between theory and practice mainly due to the specificity of the empirical treatment of the elements in the Escrileituras file. Despite the conceptual distance between the philosophy of difference and analytics based on binary oppositions, under the influence of poststructuralist or postmodernist think-ing — especially since the criticism of Jacques Derrida (Corazza, 1995; Silva, 1994), this research considers that the distinction between practice and theory consists of yet another one among the so many fabulatory artifices used by humans. These are based on the following procedures:

- identifying one element from a theory and another element from practice and to make them correspond term by term;
- pointing out an element of practice and identifying it to this or that part of the theory, defining it;
- forcing the theory to apply something from practice and vice-versa;
- comparing practice with theory and accuse the latter of not correspond-ing to the former;
- isolating an element from the theoretical set and intend it to accurately express the practice, believing to grasp the absolute;
- equalizing the unequal and undifferentiating the differentiated from both theory and practice.

The so-called empirical work we do now is not devoted to extracting and pointing out all or even several theories that could be at the origin of the curric-ular and teaching experiences of the scholarship students and participants in the Escrileituras Project. In an intentional and selective way, we strive to investigate in these experiences the effects and the efficiency of a given curricular and didactic theory, with a translational and transcreative cut (Corazza, 2013a; 2013b; 2015), since the beginning of the composition and structuring of the group.

Even if we recognize, despite this punctual intentionality, the subsistence of shaded areas and untranslatable silences, we sought to answer the following questions, which are pivotal to the same axis, namely: once the translational and transcreating theorization about the curriculum and didactics were known, studied, and experienced, what was the incidence of such theorization on each of the teacher's ways of working? In other words: What in the teaching practice originated from this theorization, which was studied before and during the seminars and meetings developed as a formative process, throughout the duration of the project? How much, how, and what of this theory was transferable to teaching? And: Which were the translation procedures used by each teacher-researcher to produce curriculum and didactics in a transcreative way?

Thus, the exercises proposed to the project teachers were not intended to reconstitute the theories that stirred (or still stir?) them professionally but to let see, to let emerge, to make appear the translational theory in the specificity of the didactic field. In the praxis of the project, this was the compass of its operation. And, from this theory, to reconstruct step by step each teacher-translator's experimentation, their work in a given class, in a certain proposal or curriculum theme, in their formulations, hesitations or discoveries, in its obscure and indefinable points. We believe that, by recognizing that this focus is both a cutout and a limit, we maintain the objectivity of the knowledge produced by empirical research, both in that which may make them unique as also generalizable.

DIDACTIC WORK

Differently from other productions dedicated to curricular transcreation (Corazza, 2016; Olini, 2014), the part of the research presented in this article consisted in asking teachers to elaborate the didactic translation procedures that forged their teaching practice. Procedures were requested by the "Script to take inventory of translation procedures in a class" ("Roteiro para inventariar procedimentos de tradução em uma aula", Corazza, 2012), which, as they were being arranged in the answers and according to the repeated readings of the written versions that each could obtain, were reworked or subjected to (per)laboration (*Durcharbeiten*) — just like the end of a psychoanalytic analysis, "a crossing of the fantasy" (Jorge, 1988, p. 167, author's translation).

Since the purpose of the research is to revamp and interpret concepts, in addition to apprehending the action of transcreating translational theory into education, these new elaborations relocate the own theory to each of its formulations. We think that what allowed each researcher to fill in the script was, firstly, their initial teaching experience since, as stated by a teacher on the starting theory of the project, they put the didactics to work. However, teacher responsibility and ethics, implied in this action, required the researcher to then theorize a second or third time so that the game of writings and readings (*escrileituras*) offered by the script itself consisted of a new domain, no longer essentially theoretical or practical.

In the items of the script, there was no intention of comparing theory with practice or that didactic practice would illustrate the correct choices and cutouts made by theory, nor even that the teaching had the power to convey any true theory of a translation didactics. No one in the project considered themselves to be more

strictly a translator than the others; however, some participants have become more attached to certain modes of teaching experimentation, in their most poetic, formal, philosophical, or disciplinary aspects, and so on. What was worth for the research is that the script was another opportunity for the teacher-researcher to draw a panorama, which expressed the various degrees of incidence and contribution of the translation theory on the didactic practice.

For the research to be able to answer if the procedures were necessary and sufficiently transcreative, the condition was that the researcher should not treat the theory as a methodology or as a free and easy association technique. The important thing was that something of the translation procedure used was read, registered, inscribed into a new montage. What was not worth was not being able to say anything about it — as if teaching, in the manner of a failed engagement, precluded any communication possibility, however illusory it may be; or, more serious, precluded the possibility of inheritance trasmission.

During the training process for teachers participating in the project, which continued to occur while the script was being answered by the participants, each institutional coordinator of the four nuclei (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul — UFRGS; Universidade Federal de Pelotas — UFPel; Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso — UFMT; and Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná — UNIOESTE) insisted that the objective was not responding it as they imagined that was expected from them, nor what motivated them to make this or that decision; it was not about locating the center of some structure in the teaching situation but making appear the movements that followed from such translational frame. To do so, the following questions were formulated: Which didactical (and curricular) need was felt by each teacher from the multiple possibilities of the theory? What practical consequences did each of them draw from it? What did they do to make theirs the various modes of transmission of that theory?

There was an explicit agreement, derived from the very transcreative character of the theory, that no one should provide at any time indicators or measures of how to do, nor ever advise any way of practicing the translational approach. This because, in addition to the fact no one had such a knowledge, it was fundamental for the research that each teacher forged their own teaching from what they could integrate with the theory, in the light of their own experimentation, both previous or current. However, this position did not prevent certain procedures from becoming clichés (arising from the thinking of difference), as we usually take from the clichés what is convenient for us or what supposedly helps us to know the practice of others. Anyway, we argued that clichés are never enough; the most important was studying the theoretical plane and rewriting the teaching, so that some theorization has the capacity to directly influence the way we educate.

We have learned that we can only integrate a theory into our practice in a progressive way, and not without difficulties. In fact, the difficulties persist and it is usually much simpler to assign the responsibility of establishing a creative teaching process to this or that conjuncture, institution, fatality or even to the good student or a bad class. This because a theoretical progress of understanding and affection never eliminates the difficulties, which exist with or without theory; although their

appropriation allows us to overcome them, that is, to deal with them differently and convincingly.

A somewhat strong link between what each teacher perceives of theory and what they do when teaching depends on how each one relates to the theories that formed them: more or less obediently or transgressively, more bureaucratically or creatively, as one who doubts or prefers to believe, etc. Perhaps, it is similar to the way we learn a foreign language: if we think of its rules when speaking it or if we simply speak without referring to its syntax, in a way that, little by little, we impregnate ourselves with that new language and no longer need to think as we speak; hence, the more we know it the fewer mistakes we make and the more means of expression we have within our reach.

Thus, what the research requested through the script was a reading and a writing in continuity to the didactic acts, performed in the dramatic scenes of the classrooms, that neglected the meanders, hesitations, and sinuosities covered and insisted on the main affirmative movements produced. We also know that those texts that have returned have been present in the teaching, or seemed to be insufficient in delimiting and apprehending the practice, or provided the illusion of a possible absolute presence or an essence of the Escrileituras Project reality, such as: "Ah, this is what really happened in the project class (or workshop)!" It turns out that words make it abstract and therefore carry in themselves the unavoidable dissatisfaction, the hole, the lack of object, as stated by Bataille (1988, p. 94, author's translation): "This negativity that words dig in themselves is one of aspects of this 'lack of object' that makes us run, the Lacanian object *a* [*objet petit a*]. This is its symbolic aspect".

EMPHASIS ON INCLEMENCIES

Until now, we hope, it has been emphasized that we consider the research work — commonly taken as empirical and posterior to the teaching experience — much more important and visceral than some meaning resumption or attribution since, in essence, the script invited each participant to answer the question: "What did I create, productively, in this class?" We could point out, as problems for its completion, the speed with which this work was requested, that is, immediately after the end of a lesson and of the project; each one's difficulty of access to the memories influx, regarded as raw materials of the text; the parallel reports of some participants about the theoretical difficulty of the script, their inability to respond it; or even the absence of philosophical training to read and write more properly.

It seems to us that the important thing is that the research assigns the agency of a discourse to the participants, putting them to work again in a *savoir-faire* position, so that they acquire the place of production. The researcher, however, does not belong to the place of truth, but to the place of the one who gathers truths produced by the participants. It means that, this time, is the researcher — as the author of the script — who will work with the texts from the production organized by the participants. But the researcher does not order, does not make an exegesis, nor condenses the knowledge that is produced from the script, since the researcher does not have the mastery of the situation. The knowledge produced by the par-

ticipants follows its own course, has its own demands, and leads the researcher, in turn, to suffer from its inclemencies.

Inclemencies that are expressed by the very untranslatability, lack of order and organization of the research *episteme*, which make it impossible to cover the infinite dimension of the meetings that took place in class. Even so, through the reading and writing of their previously experienced didactic practice, each participant demarcates what they wanted to create, founding a link of knowledge with the researcher. This link is the one that holds the place of a truth, since the participants expose in it what they wanted and the questions they asked during their teaching practice. In other words, there is, in the filling of the script, a textual formalization of the impregnation degree experienced by each one with the translation theory, which opens the way to produce new knowledge, theories, and fantasies.

In these movements of receiving, collecting, and archiving, the researcher becomes a depository and, at the same time, a rotating spade, like a windmill, to the taste of the winds of knowledge that the participants produce. Thus, nothing else is equal to the silence of practice or to the initial theoretical cry, because the transforming transmission of the script through research changes everything. The pendulum between presence, detachment, deformation, or absence of a starting theory favors the translational progress of starting teacher practices. There is, here, a new rotation from one type of discourse to another, no longer theoretical or practical, that can only be leveraged by research.

This does not occur in the sense that, at each lesson, the participants had a conscious obligation of remembering what they had read in *Caderno de notas 1*, (Corazza, 2011) — or in the other nine notebooks of the Escrileituras Collection. But now, in the script, it is about writing something about what from these *notebooks* has worked, operated, contaminated, entered into a kind of game in which the fantasies of each reader and writer were organized around a sort of agreement, although an always questioned one. This moment in which the research acts — with the aid of a script, key, record, instrument, interview — is that of a time out of class, when theory and practice mingle to produce another link that includes both the teaching of each one as that of the group of participants who have done it together.

The researcher has the dilemma of not privileging one method of didactic translation over another and only gathering the effects that can now be textualized by those teachers (and students — although this must be done by another study) who went through such practice and theory. Or, perhaps, the researcher advances in the knowledge of what is implied in the verb learn, which emits all the responsibilities without fixed rules to comfort the teacher; given that in front of a class of students, the teacher is left alone with those who come to trust him, and nobody or anything can guarantee that he will live up to his task. Not an institutional guarantee nor a formal rule that will be able to mask the reality of a being who would justify accepting the immense responsibility of educating just by possessing a perhaps disproportionate will.

Researching together with teachers what, in their teaching practice, derived from the translation theory, qualifies their performance — not in the perspective of some procedure being evaluated as more or less correct or adequate but for each one

to write about the effectivity degree of this theory. None of this in the research work leads anyone to moral well-being nor negligence; however, what the research explicits is that there have been at least three teaching times, namely: the moment of performing the didactic procedure; the time to understand such a procedure, which extends, therefore, in duration; and the moment (which would be the script) to conclude (in the Lacanian mode of logical time?). The study recognizes that each teacher has their time, even though the elaboration and sending of the script has produced a certain precipitation that forced the teacher to move to the actions of reading and writing.

Because we trust that there is no paralysis of thought and future embarrassment in the teaching activity, the script fulfills the function of making the gears linking words and time work; exercising the constraint of, at each sentence, leading the writer-reader to make a new translation of the reference points boiling within the theory. It leads the teachers, thus, to capturing their own moment of suspending such translation in the wake of time, when circumscribing, as liable to being conclusive (although it is a virtual conclusion) the reading and writing that attest to the possibility of some change in their teaching positions.

What makes me more doubtful, as a researcher, is the moment of making it didactical, that is, of performing the translation procedure in class, for it seems to me that this instant integrates the unforeseen, the unexpected, the derisory, and for this very reason unleashes an abundant flow of constructions and rearrangements. Perhaps, this flow is due to the condition that it is only when understanding the procedure, when reading and writing since the Script, that the teacher can affirm that there was a conclusive look moment: not fixed, but agile, lighter or heavier, more unformed or formed.

It turns out that the script shifts the teacher's gaze to points other than those of familiar, usual, comfort zones. Thus, it is a way of intervention and, therefore, of training, which leaves to the teachers all the initiative to make their choice, accurately punctuate his writing/reading and, as far as possible, disheveling it from ideals, and locating its halts at other points of suspension. Therefore, a new interpretive, translational act is required by each script item — even if it has a comprehensive key and is explicitly taken from the book *Diferança e repetição*, especially chapter III, entitled "A imagem do pensamento" (Deleuze, 1988, p. 215-273).

What guides the textual set of the script, *i.e.*, the didactic (and curricular) transcreative theory of difference, is never exhausted in itself, at the same time it is not resistant in its own finishing. But the script favors the abolition of the very theory, with its open work dimension and emptiness positively valued as infinite. And it is not that the script is a big deal, but it is only worthy because it disrupts the devastating power of any theory that submits the one who uses it, in a debilitating form.

Therefore, the sense of both theory and practice remain enigmatic, though they do not fail in comprising the texture of a teaching life, in what it has of most remarkable: with minimal effect of prescriptive suggestion. So that all that was read (and not read) and written (and not written) from the script becomes consequent, as it creates what enables the expression of the operation of Escrileituras Project in its global grasp by acquiring a second intelligibility. In addition to precisely placing the method as work of thought since, more than referring to the Escrileituras

Project, the script also operates in this project, extending the duration of its actual effectiveness in teacher training.

THE SCRIPT TO TAKE INVENTORY

Before proceeding to the theorization about this new meeting, comprising: plane of difference; transcreative translational theory; teaching practice; class; didactic procedure; script; new translation = plan, theory, practice, Class, we presented in full the "Script to take inventory of translation procedures in a class". First, the identification data of the selected class (or workshop) were requested, which included: "Title, duration, and date(s) of the class/workshop that will be focused [...]". Subsequently came the "How to do it", namely:

1. Think of a class or workshop already held and of you as a teacher-translator of this same class or workshop. 2. Then, answer what is asked, digitally recording your answers on a separate sheet. 3. Send the responded Script with the title SCRIPT TRANSLATION PROCEDURES to the following e-mail [...] by the day [...].

The main movements required were five, together with their corresponding specifications and possibilities to be thought of, which were presented in complementary notes located below each movement and that corresponded, respectively, to the same number of asterisks, which are:

I — "Indicate the STARTING** THOUGHT* that was translated".
* THOUGHT: Idea. Text. Language. Thesis. Content. Unity. Reading. Chapter. Excerpt. System. Plan. Set. Score. Reference. Perspective. Chain. Order. Form. Mode. Figure. Scene. Drama. Case. Image. Sign. Space. Brand. Clue. Icon. Trace. Myth. View. Portrait. Significance. Sense. Opinion. Concept. Argument. Theme. To know. Knowledge. Discourse. Voice. Talk. Source. Value. Truth. Universal. Bullshit. Assurance. Difficulty. Presence. Relationship. Elaboration. Author. Work. School. Philosopheme. Logic. Theory. Practice. Thing. Object. Subject. Treated. Structure. Fact. Real. Reality. Ideology. Operation. Track. Parameter. Hierarchy. Process. Mechanism. Method. Curriculum. Statement. Sentence. Proposition. Example. Reflection. Rule. Operation. Calculation. Formula. Function. Problem. Puzzle. Etc.
** STARTING: "Original".

II — "Describe the DOGMATIC IMAGE* OF the THOUGHT from where you started**".
*DOGMATIC IMAGE: Orthodox, moral, judgmental.
**WHERE YOU STARTED FROM. Use the following indicators: DIT [dogmatic image of thought] grounded in the good will of the thinker and good nature of thought, based on the ideal and illusion; image of natural com-

mon sense, consensus and common sense of law; contains subjective or implicit assumptions, like "everyone knows...", "No one can deny...", "Everyone recognizes that..."; image of opinion or *doxa*; meets the model of recognition: the State, the Church, the established values of the time, etc.; subordinates the difference to the representations: of identity, similarity, analogy, opposition; image whose problems are defined by the possibility of being resolved; follows the postulate of the negative or error and the postulate of knowledge, for which there is subordination of learning to knowledge and of culture to method.

III — "Describe the INVENTION METHOD*, created or used by you, that posed** a PROBLEM***, or a problematic field****, as a problematizing and problematic IDEA, concerning an order of events or affections, which made an effective genesis of truth; one true production in thought; and that created the terms in which the problem is formulated, the means, and the terms you used to formulate it".

*INVENTION METHOD: Essentially problematizing (criticism of false problems and invention of true ones), differentiating (cuts and intersections) and temporalizing (think in terms of duration).

**POSED: Provoked, concocted, constituted, placed a problem, "posing the problem is not simply to find out, is to invent" (Deleuze, 1999, p. 9).

***A PROBLEM: Essentially problematizing, differentiating and temporalizing, which made a criticism of false problems and the invention of the real problems.

**** PROBLEMATIC GROUND: As ideal objecthood, which has its sufficiency and involves constituent and investment acts.

IV — "Show how your translations made the REVERSAL OF THE DOGMATIC IMAGE of the starting THOUGHT*".

* REVERSAL OF THE DOGMATIC IMAGE OF THE THOUGHT: Reversal from the following operations: active subtraction and critique of transcendence and its effects, fictions and universals, which ensure a thought of judgment as a theory of knowledge and as a moral doctrine; fighting between forces of thought, submitted to twists, to compose one metamorphosis center; operations of deprivation of constants and stabilizing elements; extraction of stable elements, power markers, and pre-existing criteria (higher values); transposition in smaller terms, exposing the majority sense to virtual determinations; subordination of the form to the movement and of the subject to the intensity of affects; subtraction of one (or more than one) of the terms of thinking/problem/text/idea/etc., which sustain the problems developed by the systems that your translation was transforming; redefinition of issues, repressed characters, figures from the knowledge, in their moral or theological form; fight against weakness, bad conscience, the folly, and baseness of thought; apprehension of what is new in the existing, without determining new ways of behaving

or existence; creating new rules of transformation, inversion and shift; devastation of meanings/senses/content/etc., for the translation to be able to confront its limits; activation of thought experiments, activation of problems not given, and creation of new problems.

V — "Write how you translated and created another PLANE OF IMMANENCE or a NEW IMAGE OF THOUGHT*".
* NEW IMAGE OF THOUGHT. To: overcome the limits to extract from them new ideas/thoughts/texts/etc.; proliferate the new philosophical/artistic/scientific position; vary the idea/issues/etc.; perform another writing/interpretation/ reading, this time with extension of immanence, which evaluated how the existing is filled with the immanence; think again, nonjudgmentally, the transcendence and the DIT; creation of a method of invention of new issues/ideas/texts/etc.; affirmation of difference, power of jumps, range, intensive, simulacra, and demons; exercises of the unformed or the becoming of form, the nonsense and paradoxes of meaning; thinking of the difference via new signs, or the starting point of what forced the mind to think; achievement of higher or transcendental empiricism, which thinks the conditions of real experience and creates concepts, percepts and functions; fidelity to immanence, against the doctrine of judgment and the predicative form of transcendent selection among the candidates; affirmation of immanence and univocity of being, refusing categorical and analogical thinking.

Then, came the following *Note*:

1. Visualize, now, to aid, a scheme with the five descriptions/inventions/translations previously requested. 2. But do NOT indicate them here so synthetically (*i.e.*, within the squares). 3. Report in a dissertative way on the issues, seeking to be the most denotative and explicit as possible. 4. Make it appear, that is, effectively show through writing/reading, the procedures that you, as a teacher-translator, used in each of the five listed domains.

METHOD ROTATING FALSELY

As a response of the four nuclei to the script sent, we received also by e-mail a total of twenty-six filled-in scripts. Of these, considering that many researchers have chosen to respond in groups of varying size, the following number of files correspond to each nucleus:
- UFRGS: 4 files
- UFPel: 5 files
- UFMT: 7 files
- UNIOESTE: 9 files

Regarding these responses, the researcher does not intend to bundle the respondents' discourse, but she is interested in the way this discourse positions the starting theory, the starting practice, and the method (as work of thought), as well as how the text of each teacher stands concerning these dimensions; how it deals with both the emotions and the near or remote connections; what it invents in terms of new logics to break all the assumptions on which the *Caderno de notas 1* rested (Corazza, 2011).

The effect of these processes of crisis, perdition, and disruption of theoretical and practical areas make us glimpse the structuration of a new field, since both are being obliquely forced by each teacher; that is, if the script evokes some symmetry with the theory or practice (or with the fantasy of each domain), the teacher draws on the strength of this evocation to expose, disrupt, and distort the very symmetry. It is as if the script offered the altar but prevented the rite to be officiated, since it opens endless classes of possibilities. If the theory guides the teacher's attention to certain issues and problems, it provides no general methodology for finding the solution of specific problems he had to consider in class and in the script.

Depending on the research work, the new text, which emerges from the returned and revamped scripts, proves to be vibrating — it ends up creating not merely substitute blocks or a structuring of theory or practice, but a new path, a series of crossings and production of meanings, which are available for further re-significations. This writing-reading exercise of the research enables information gain, greater control over the teaching practice, and an in-bloc meaning capture of the project three didactic times.

Initially, willing to show the didactics used by the Escrileituras Project — of practical, empirical, and field order —, the research method procedure establishes such a break between the two tracks — theoretical and practical — that both are mistaken again with the very translation of theory and practice; which allegedly was only stating what, happened didactically during the project. A new form of expression and content begins to circulate there, in the texts, which is not an obstacle but a new contact between the theory vitality and the practice capacbiliyy, in its articulation and disarticulation.

This happens as if there had never been an original text, a support of certain concreteness — in this case, the *Caderno de notas 1* — which should be understood, unraveled, exhumed, restored to its originality, applied, and proven. The semantic equation would effectuate the need for its translation into practice, done in accordance with explicit rules that established the criteria of agreement or disagreement between both versions: theoretical and practical.

In addition to this kind of exegesis, setting the project in motion just showed that participants also resisted to the decoding operations. This because it was revealed, in the very *Caderno de notas 1*, a transforming force just capable of creating a third universe, a third language, a third dimension: the transcreative didactics. Thus, didactics research requires the priority in operating the theoretical dynamics of teaching, and not simply the provision of another meaning to the theoretical discourse, but the uncovering of the existence, presence, and operation of teaching life forms beyond theory and practice. Perhaps they are unapparent, but are as real

and active as explicit: previous theory and subsequent practice. The result is not the provision or possession of an original knowledge base but the revelation of existence and operation of replacement translational processes, which do not explain because they know, but which acquire consistency as long as they are expressed.

This is therefore a new bundle of production, generated in the space of the complex relationship between theory and practice, in which the formal aspect is transcended by the functionality. Being useful to the research method, directed to the educational field and oriented by it (with the philosophy of difference as plane), the classroom didactics becomes a thinking activity that disrupts theory and confronts the very practice, placing a wedge in the compulsion to repeat the same things and imposing a differential by implying in divergence, elimination, and reorganization.

This is the thought-generating process in education and, as such, it is tran-screative. Not merely about a mechanical simultaneous translation, of deciphering codes and replacing a domain with another, but of teaching experiments that function as openings in the interrelation between theory and practice. However, only the supposed constancy of the match between theory and practice seems to allow participants to disorganize it; it seems that its alleged relational symmetry enables asymmetric movements, leading one dimension to always be the other so that there is no fusion between them. If the perspective of difference remains, we avoid mirroring and stimulate motility, as if we used a crazy method, rotating falsely, to bring about a surprise effect of thinking.

Such surprise effect relocates the teacher within a conflict that becomes discernible through the relationship between practice and theory. We are far from pure hermeneutics, which aims to regulate both dimensions, because the inventory method proposes no explanation but questioning. The inventory makes the presentification gesture: didactics is placed before the eyes because it is part of the teacher and is based on sound reasons to exist. The inventory is embodied within the translation existence, which arises illicitly in factual reality and prevents the translation act to have one single meaning. The disrupting element between teaching theory and practice is the need to getting along with it, to grasp the presence of a double record, insert it, keep it, and instrumentalize it considering the entire perceived procedure expressed during the filling of the script.

If the reunion with the script presents a possibility for the teachers to confer new meaning to the theory and ask the reason for the constitution of their teaching practice, its publication (as in this article) produces the turbulence that the practice, theory, and method reanimate at every letter read and written. The interpretation-translation of the script leads to something beyond mere disclosure: it induces a frequency between intimate enemies, a diabolical conjunction, about which its creators no longer have control over theory, practice, nor method.

Thus, the research performs a figuration of contiguous attendance, which are clarified by the non-reciprocal exclusion. Here, we have a tension generated by the neighboring between the three areas, with no syntheses at any point and without that tension being resolved due to a constant alertness state since each didactic translation (or its permanent deferral) reinstalls the need to challenge the unknowledge of teaching, stimulating the urge to carry on with the investigation. This is the

maintenance of the dilemma and struggle not to legitimize the knowledge gained by the research, as well as the maintenance of an open space and a field liable to rupture, which expresses its own power and is faced with the narrowness of its limits.

Theory is the previous cut; practice is the restoration of simultaneity, condition of visibility, and virtuality of daze; whereas the words read-written from the script are like incisions in the flesh of the teacher-researchers produced by their living words. The research method thus allows us to glimpse not the original truth, but the construction of truth in conflict, this object range in which we are and that inhabits us when we educate. The script enables reworking of the teacher's work during his stay on the practice-theory continent, a work which is also a research procedure, *i.e.*, the particular way the continent deals with hidden aspects and saturate the pores of the answers, since they are conveyed in conjunction with it.

Thus, the product (production) that the researcher gets back is saturated with the method with which the theory and practice were made. In this product, no historical-existential recollection is demanded but the establishment of a space where indication seeps in — which is now possible to capture — that what had to be developed is amenable to different approaches and is even formed by the infiltration of foreign elements that are inadaptable, both to the practice and theory, inasmuch as they do have a greater contact with the classroom reality. The teachers thus allow their translations to change and get enriched, learning to use them thus retooled in a relationship of creative dependency. The method is not intended to make the intolerable tolerable, but to capture the heart of this intolerability and integrate it in the very condition of educating.

The continuous operation of the method, as work of thinking (and writing/ reading), then provides the teacher-researchers with the ability of putting their teaching into perspective, of placing themselves on a corner that also makes them observers and participants of didactic experiences, causing them to take on the role of translators-interpreters. Therefore, the ultimate goal of the script would be to unleash the authoring character of our profession, latent in every teacher, entitling each one of them for creating their own translational mode. Let us not forget that, to produce oysters, the irritations produced by the grains of sand are indispensable.

INVENTORY OF A NUCLEUS

We present here[1] excerpts of the inventory performed on nine files, sent by the nucleus located in the School of Philosophy of the UNIOESTE. We received from the respondents the following starting thinking:
- Thinking or teaching by signs (4 files).
- Translation of works: Proust and Kafka (2 files).
- Transcreation of teen writing, from meetings between philosophy and literature (1 file).

---

1   With the help of post-doctoral student Karen Elisabete Rosa Nodari (2016).

- Thinking, rethinking, and expressing children's understanding of life through the invention and creation of its multiple meanings (1 file).
- Introduce the study of philosophy to children, to develop in them a critical, creative, and ethics dimension of thinking (1 file).

Regarding the dogmatic image of thought, teachers indicated:
- There is no universal idea of philosophy; that is, philosophy is an encounter (1 file).
- There is a method to think and reach the truth (1 file).
- Fixation of identity and repetition (1 file).
- Against the moral image of thought (2 files).
- Against the still image of thought or the Platonic dualistic view of the world (1 file).
- Escape from representational thought and re-cognition (1 file).
- Only adults can make poetry; it is very complex, a gift or an special talent (1 file).
- Does not mention (1 file).

As for the invention method, the following were described:
- There is no way to think and get to the truth, but signs that arouse our faculties and truths about the world come to us (1 file).
- Providing encounters with signs through a game (2 files).
- Provide situations of possible encounters where signs pose violence to the brain (1 file).
- Force, violence capable of bringing up thinking (1 file).
- Reading of Kafka's texts and contexts in the reciprocity between author (Kafka) and reader-author (student) (1 file).
- Children and youth literary works as writing triggers (1 file).
- What the word *life* suggests to every child: writing words, sentences, pictorial production (1 file).
- Doing poems-problems and vice versa (1 file).

As for reversal of the dogmatic image of thought, we have:
- The exposure to hearing, seeing, touching, forces one to choose among all possibilities; unconscious choices are promoted when signs trigger these faculties; reading of sounds, silences, images, objects, and people (2 files).
- Dramatic reading of texts that were instrumental to think the world by capturing (sense, think) the becoming of things, by different forms of perception (2 files).
- For an agency between philosophy and literature, to generate new practices and new ways of thinking (1 file).
- For the investigation of elements forming a poem, and living this experience trying to produce answers to problems through poetry (1 file).
- Do not mention (3 files).

Regarding the possible creation of another plane of immanence or a new new image of thought, we find the following:

- Multiple issued signs that could promote in the participants new brain circuits; deciphering puzzles — meanings concealed by habit, repetition; break the sequence of empirical process (1 file).
- Interrupt of repetition through the encounter with the signs; being encounter with the signs = awakening of faculties (1 file).
- Encounters with signs to abuse the thinking; new circuits in the brain (2 files).
- Traffic between reading and life practice — deterritorialization of thought (1 file).
- Denaturalization of the relationship between problem — single answer and, also, between the problem of mathematics and science, through reading and discussing the text (1 file).
- Do not mention (3 files).

One can identify that there is no convergence in the answers of the participants of the UNIOESTE nucleus, especially regarding the following script items:

- dogmatic image of thought;
- method of invention;
- reversal of the dogmatic image of thought; and
- plane of immanence or new image of thought.

Moreover, almost all the instruments referring to the dogmatic image of thought stand against a method for thinking and getting to the truth; pointing to the fact of a single image being fought for belonging to morality and common sense: "Everyone knows..."

Regarding the method of invention, the texts mention that there is no method to be discovered to think and get to the truth. However, six analyzed files indicate that the classes (and workshops) provided encounters with the signs to awaken the faculties and the truths about the world. That is, they bet on the force and violence of the work with the signs, capable of giving rise to thinking. Signs were worked through literary works, dramatic readings, poems, *brainstorming*, and games involving sensitization of feeling.

Regarding the item reversal of image thought, teachers exposed the different types of signs that caused a mismatch of the participants faculties, to break with re-cognition schemes. Therefore, they mentioned dramatic reading, exposure to hearing, seeing, touching; *i.e.*, they indicated that affects and percepts were triggered. Regarding the item plan of immanence or new image of thought, at least four files mentioned that it was possible to create by breaking with the action-reaction-action and sensorimotor schemes, so that the thought made direct contact with the forces and the subjects, instead of being stuck in the forms-subject relationship.

DENIALS AND AFFIRMATIONS

By refusing any theory of knowledge, whether of the Cartesian or Kantian kind, in the Escrileituras Project, we deny the founding role of the subjectivity of the *cogito* and contented ourselves, from the beginning, with writing, speaking, and defending the following thesis as a fact: *the teacher creates theory, practice, and method because, in educating and translating, it is impossible not to create them*. From this thesis, we did not draw any transcendental or teleological conclusion; we did not make comparisons between translation degrees or types; we did not ascribe creation to a founder of all meaning; we did not delegate a preset eschatological destination to it; nor hinted a creative end as its originary cause, in specular reflection. On the contrary, with this thesis, we experience nominalism in the research as a real path to the materialism of a method, which ultimately flows into itself. Without drafting any genesis of the original meaning of such creation, we state this fact: *in translating science, art, and philosophy into a curricular and didactic way, the teacher necessarily has creative ideas*.

This is the factuality of teaching in the Escrileituras Project: to take the project on the move, without knowing where it was going, but to take it as a path that continued by itself and opened as we went on. Thus, there were no concepts or teaching experiences, on the one hand, and its sensitive referents on the other. In the manner of Spinoza, there were only bodies, whose most forces were unknown to us but which functioned as *potentias*, as a fervor (*fortitudo*), as an opening to the world (*generositas*), as a gift. We spoke of a vital *conatus*, in continuous expansion and joyfulness, leading us to think freely and intensely with our bodies, in themselves, and through them by the manifestation of their forces.

In other words, summing that up:

- in classroom situations, teachers are affected by theory, which gives them possibilities and coordinates for the route but no general method or technique to find the specific teaching required for that circumstance;
- thus, we cannot conceive practice as the application of theory; although it is also valid to think that a teacher, deprived of any contact with any theory, cannot contribute to effective interventions other than those based on a dogmatic image of the educational thought;
- the simplest function of theory is to inform the interpretation and concrete form of practice, but its most important function concerns a work of thought by the teacher during, after, and from practice;
- and, here, we have the file search function forwarded by the method, *i.e.*, as writing/reading work consigned into the "Script to take inventory of translation procedures in a class".

Facing the script, the teachers no longer speak to their students, no longer wish to find suitable teaching translation to the curriculum content or their thoughts from the experienced class, instead, they seek to account for the way it was translated and what caused the students to translate it, in conceptual terms. In this gesture to respond to the script, the theory has the function of linking the uniqueness of what the teacher experienced and the circumscription of the philosophy of difference and its concepts. The text written by the teacher from reading the script is not the final link of a process nor a synthesis of theory and practice but indicates the type of

process and the degree of articulation between fantasies and schemes, which were under scrutiny to produce didactical translations. Here, teachers perform their own original research and analysis, propose elaborate sets, form theoretical territories, and map new practices.

An action scope is the study of theories by themselves. Another one is what every teacher accumulates in their bodies, memories, and understandings of what one can learn through readings, discussions, and teaching self-training work, and which results in a cluster of notions, hypotheses, own schemes that may be more or less fertile, systematic, or creative. Anyway, there was, between all the script respondents, a shared conception: the translational one, which nevertheless was seized from different angles, enabling the existence of other theories and the extrapolation of new practice emanations, even though coming from the same conceptual territory. These formations are not reducible among themselves nor emerge simultaneously but they travel a winding route, which sometimes returns on their own steps. Formations that remain to be used by the teacher in various correlations, sometimes proto-theoretical or semi-practical but indicating directions to follow in future classes (and research), for their heuristic value, in their greater or lesser compatibility with the existing conceptual framework.

This article, which is now closing, is much more a document of the thought file work as a method, which integrates the nonlinear cumulativity of the Escrileituras Project — Escrileituras: um modo de ler-escrever em meio à vida — thanks to a reworking of the teaching theory and practice, than a text to present research findings. After reading it and writing with it, everyone can, like Althusser (1992, p. 34), write about themselves, in the drama — of classroom — they lived: "I will say it clearly: here is what I did, what I thought, what I was. [...] What I understood or believed I understood, this that I no longer command, but what I became". Or, to the effort above, one can add up — as researcher — with Spinoza (2007, p. 411, author's translation), at the end of part five of *Ethics*: "If the way which I have pointed out as leading to this result seems exceedingly hard, it can, nevertheless, be discovered. It must be hard since it is so seldom found. [...] But all things excellent are as difficult as they are rare".

REFERENCES

Adó, M. D. L. *Educação potencial*: autocomédia do intelecto. 2013. 194p. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) — Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2013.

Althusser, L. *O futuro dura muito tempo*. Seguido de Os fatos: autobiografias. Tradução de Rosa Freire d'Aguiar. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1992.

Bataille, L. *O umbigo do sonho*: por uma prática da psicanálise. Tradução de Dulce Duque Estrada. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1988.

Corazza, S. M. O construtivismo pedagógico como significado transcendental do currículo. In: Veiga-Neto, A. (Org.). *Crítica pós-estruturalista e educação*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 1995. p. 211-229.

Corazza, S. M. Labirintos da pesquisa, diante dos ferrolhos. In: Costa, M. V. (Org.). *Caminhos investigativos*: novos olhares na pesquisa em educação. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 1996. p. 105-131.

_____. Notas. In: Heuser, E. M. D. (Org.). *Caderno de Notas 1*: projeto, notas & ressonâncias. Cuiabá: EdUFMT, 2011. p. 31-96.

_____. *Didaticário de criação*: aula cheia. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, 2012. (Escrileituras, Caderno de Notas 3.)

_____. Didática-artista da tradução: transcriações. *Mutatis Mutandis*, Medellín, Colombia: Universidad de Antioquia, v. 6, n. 1, p. 185-200, ago. 2013a. Disponível em: <http://aprendeenlinea.udea.edu.co/revistas/index.php/mutatismutandis/article/view/15378>. Acesso em: 10 set. 2013.

_____. *O que se transcria em educação?* Porto Alegre: UFRGS; Doisa, 2013b.

_____. Didática da tradução, transcriações do currículo: escrileituras de AICE (Autor-Infantil-Currículo-Educador). 2014. 55p. Projeto (Pós-Doutorado) — Faculdade de Educação, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2014.

_____. *Didática da tradução, transcriação do currículo* (uma escrileitura da diferença). *Pro-Posições*, Campinas: Universidade Estadual de Campinas, v. 26, n. 1, p. 105-122, jan./abr. 2015.

_____. Currículo e didática da tradução: vontade, criação e crítica. *Educação & Realidade*, Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, v. 41, n. 4, p. 1.313-1.335. Epub Aug 22, 2016. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/2175-623658199.

Corazza, S. M.; Oliveira, M. R.; Adó, M. D. L. (Orgs.). *Biografemática na educação*: vidarbos. Porto Alegre: UFRGS; Doisa, 2015.

Corazza, S. M.; Rodrigues, C. G.; Heuser, E. M. D.; Monteiro, S. B. Escrileituras: um modo de ler-escrever em meio à vida. *Educação e Pesquisa*, São Paulo: USP, v. 40, n. 4, p. 1.029-1.043, out./dez. 2014.

Deleuze, G. *Diferença e repetição*. Tradução de Luiz Orlandi e Roberto Machado. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1988.

_____. *Bergsonismo*. Tradução de Luiz B. L. Orlandi. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1999.

Derrida, J. *Mal de arquivo*: uma impressão freudiana. Tradução de Claudia de Moraes Rego. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará, 2001.

Farge, A. *O sabor do arquivo*. Tradução de Fátima Murad. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 2009.

Feil, G. S. *Procedimento erótico, na formação, ensino, currículo*. Jundiaí: Paco Editorial, 2011.

Foucault, M. *A arqueologia do saber*. Tradução de Luiz Felipe Baeta Neves. Petrópolis: Vozes; Lisboa: Centro do Livro Brasileiro, 1972.

Jorge, M. A. C. *Sexo e discurso em Freud e Lacan*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1988.

Marx, K. Teses sobre Feuerbach. In: _____.; Engels, F. *A ideologia alemã*. Tradução de Luis Cláudio de Castro e Costa. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2001. p. 99-103.

Nodari, K. E. R. *Procedimentos didático-tradutórios sob o signo da invenção*. 2016. 19p. Projeto (Pós-Doutorado) — Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2016.

Olegário, F. *Didática da tradução*: transcriações do currículo. 2016. 52p. Proposta de Tese (Doutorado em Educação) — Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2016.

Olini, P. *Noologia do currículo do Projeto Escrileituras*. 2014. 100p. Proposta de Tese (Doutorado em Educação) — Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2014.

Silva, T. T. O adeus às metanarrativas educacionais. In: _____. (Org.). *O sujeito da educação*: estudos foucaultianos. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1994. p. 247-258.

Spinoza, B. *Ética*. Tradução de Tomaz Tadeu. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2007.

Tadeu, T.; Corazza, S.; Zordan, P. *Linhas de escrita*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2004.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Sandra Maria Corazza has a doctorate in education from the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). She is professor at the same institution.
E-mail: sandracorazza@terra.com.br