

ARTICLE

THE TEACHING FILE TO-BE-TRANSLATED IN CLASS: DIDACTIC DREAM AND CURRICULAR POETRY

SANDRA MARA CORAZZA I *

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1237-198X>

ABSTRACT: Endowed with essay features, this paper regards teaching as opposed to the educational doxa, the public opinion, the majority spirit, the bourgeois consensus, the Voice of the Natural, the prejudice violence and the common beliefs spread with the blessing of power. It discusses the teaching file with which the Class is made by approaching it as a philosophical concept designed in a translated encounter between Curriculum and Didactics. It performs experimentations of writing-and-reading about both the dreamlike treatment of the file and the teachers' right to dream of it poetically. It concludes that it is up to the teacher to stay alert: act of resistance prepared in the Curriculum, conjured up in Didactics, fought in Class.

Keywords: To-be-translated. Teaching. Class. Poetics. Dream.

A-TRADUZIR O ARQUIVO DA DOCÊNCIA EM AULA: SONHO DIDÁTICO E POESIA CURRICULAR

RESUMO: Dotado de um teor ensaístico, este artigo pensa a docência no avesso da doxa educacional, da opinião pública, do espírito majoritário, do consenso burguês, da Voz do Natural, da violência do preconceito e da geleia geral espalhada com as bênçãos do poder. Discute o arquivo da docência, com o qual a Aula é feita, trabalhando-a como um conceito filosófico, que se forja num encontro tradutório entre Currículo e Didática. Realiza experimentações de escrita-e-leitura acerca do tratamento onírico desse arquivo, bem como do direito dos professores de sonhá-lo poeticamente. Conclui que cabe ao professor permanecer em vigília: ato de resistência, preparado no Currículo, conjurado na Didática, lutado na Aula.

Palavras-chave: A-traduzir. Docência. Aula. Poética. Sonho.

I Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil.

* Sandra Mara Corazza, PhD in Education, Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, 1B Productivity Researcher of CNPq. E-mail: <sandracorazza@terra.com.br> .

INTRODUCTION

We are such stuff as dreams are made on.

—William Shakespeare

This essayistic article uses the Method of the Formless to give continuity to research positions that addresses teaching styles antithetical to the educational doxa, public opinion, the majority spirit, the bourgeois consensus, the “voice of the natural world,” the violence of prejudice, the “Royal” Science, the state apparatus, and the general jelly spread with the blessings of power (ADORNO 2003; CORAZZA 2013A, 2013B; DE ARAUJO and CORAZZA 2018). Approaching teaching archive as a philosophical concept (DELEUZE and GUATTARI 1992), forged into a translation meeting between Curriculum and Didactics, this article experiments with *writreadings* (writing-and-reading) from the oneiric treatment of this archive to the teachers’ right to dream of it poetically.

The translation of the teaching archive is a constant task (Aufgabe) (BENJAMIN, 2008), as an oneiric and poetic construction, since it is part of doing or producing the matter.¹ Since this task is located “halfway to literary creation and theory” (BENJAMIN *apud* DERRIDA 2002b, 29), it finds in the Class its privileged time and space, whose equation can be condensed into the formula EIS AICE: extent–image–sign (EIS) for the Curriculum, and author–infant–curriculum–educator (AICE) for the Didactics (CORAZZA 2017, 2018). It is proper for the translatability of the archive to affirm itself as loyal to the sense of materials, always rebellious, its correlate is the untranslatable, or *to-be-translated* (à-traduire) (DERRIDA, 2002b), which leaves out not the body of the original but, according to Benjamin (2009), the part of the textual body not encompassed by literalness (Wörtlichkeit). This untranslatable is implied by what disturbs the reappropriation of meanings; it institutes the collapse of cognitive coordinates, foreshadows the death of meaning, and is a permanent catastrophe of the signifier—that is, it is everything produced through poetic and oneiric creation in the Class: images, signatures, proper names, figures, and events.

Given that it is the part of matter that we cannot translate (trans-ducere), the *to-be-translated* or untranslatable challenges us and commits us to retelling an impossible account, as Derrida (2002b, 46) stated: “There is the *to-be-translated*. On both sides, it designates and contracts.” Therefore, the need to translate arises as an attempt

to account for this impossibility. When the untranslatable returns to the process, it does so as poetry and dream, driving the task of teachers translating. Dealing with the oscillatory movements between translation and *to-be-translated*, teachers demonstrate, in the exercise of their profession, the statement by Borges (2007, 265–266) that “dreams are the oldest aesthetic activity”—regardless of whether this is a scientific position or not.

CREATION AND CRITICISM

Since the studies of (trans)creative translations by Benjamin (2008), Campos (2013), and Derrida (2002a, 2002b), we consider translation as the central structure or operator of teaching and the main task of teachers: their duty is to translate. To practice teaching—answering the question, “What do we do creatively as teachers?”—we translate the matters of art, science, and thought, which are selected, combined, and arranged by the Curriculum; in the Class, they are taken up again by the Didactics to be updated, reinvented, and recomposed and to acquire the potency of duration and validity of existence.

In the gallery of translations, this configuration “does not fail to preserve a certain originality, that of a family of irreducible events in the history of translation, its problems, and its practice” (DERRIDA 1998, 144). Through them, teachers acquire an affirmative place of matters of letters, as authors, readers, translators and thinking poets; dedicated to comments, paraphrases, interpretations, and nontranslations—since many times the translator only “comments, explains, paraphrases, but does not translate” (DERRIDA 2002b, 21)—which allows the original material to survive in its own language and through time.

In this general plan of our study, the firstness of the teacher—the potency that brings the possibility of movement and multiplicity, full of life and variety (PEIRCE 2010)—is constituted by translatability and untranslatability or by translability and untranslability (DERRIDA 2002a). From within, translatability supports untranslatability as another factor in the teaching equation. Suffering the action of the contemporary, translations are operationalized through didactic and curricular procedures, not being simple speculation, duplication, or repetition of matter; nor are they the homogenizing appropriation of words or the subsumption of the world to concepts, even in the paradigmatic incarnation of the model of representation of an essence.

They are translations that have an asymmetrical relationship to the originals, since “every translation is auratic, a correspondence

relationship” (MATOS 1999, 12); this correspondence is constructed in an undefined space between fidelity and freedom, continuity and rupture, coherence and transgression, without the translators being allowed to lose respect for the creative character of each matter or to consider the contingency of their language and time as having something sacred to preserve.

They are translations driven by interpretation and criticism and affirm themselves not as a cult of beauty, but as monstrous operations that give visibility to the knowledge of others, without repeating or hiding it, by transforming texts, formulas, values, and ideas into the novelty of their energy. They are translations subject to motions, endowed with fluid and constantly tense polarity: digressive, anti-Cartesian, violent, short-circuiting the originals, and interrupting themselves to renew contact with the components of each matter. Due to this condition, there is no way not to be poetic and oneiric, since the translations carry an alleged *pas de sens* (meaninglessness) that does not mean poverty but “*pas de sens*, that it be itself, understood out of a ‘literality’” (DERRIDA 2002b, 71).

This kind of translation shakes the belief in the watertight binarity between prose and poetry; it frees us to use poetry not as a form but as a deviation from the norm and from objective language that would only describe or verify a given reality. Instead, it enables poetic translation, used in the etymological sense of poetry as *poiesis*, *poiein* (to produce), since it “makes up an *Über-Erhebung* (trans-elevation) in which the positive element of criticism far exceeds the negative” (SELIGMANN-SILVA 2007, 21). By using this translation theory, teachers can think about the absence of poetry in teaching, the need for poetry in teaching, poetically teaching, the place of poetry in teaching, and teaching with a poetic thought.

Thus, teachers reaffirm the sense of a recreated world, whose effect shakes the traditional conceptions of knowledge, truth, and pure source of meaning. They create conceptual frameworks to assume that the actions of research and writing on teaching consist of producing literature, considering all literature as poetry “not only in the narrow sense usually attributed for ‘poetry’ as opposed to ‘romance’” (MESCHONNIC 2010, xviii). The teacher translations appear as offerings made by teachers to humanity and constituted by associations, such as those of poems and dreams—full of tension, unfinished business, mismatches, connections, and contagions.

The teaching perspective that derives from this is concerned with everything “that is designated, given to do, given to return” (DERRIDA 2002b, 28). It is teaching that translates: written, oral,

and divine words; gestures and consciousness; ethics and alphabets; dictionaries and novels; national cultures, languages and literatures; scientific knowledge and religions; letters, authors and ideas; values and ways of existing (DESLILE and WOODSWORTH 1998). It is teaching as a singular human action, carried out in a post-Babel world that formalizes, for a certain present, a repercussion of tradition, without pretense of totality, and lending an appearance of antiquity to recent events.

In the search for its own displacement, the purpose of this teaching is to preserve the link between matter already created and its reinterrogation, as well as that which makes all matter foreign to others and to itself. If there is any fidelity there, it is to the insurmountable difference between the languages of production, because this difference allows each one to remain a creator while it sustains it as linguistic, cultural, and historical alterity. Fidelity, as stated by Pound (from CAMPOS 1992, 37) is given “to the ‘spirit,’ to the particular ‘climate’ of the translated piece,” to which the translator adds, “as in a continuous sedimentation of creative strata, new effects or variants, which the original authorizes in its line of invention.”

From this point of view, teaching is epistemologically deadly, because its interpretations go against consecrated meanings; therefore, it is also critical in the artistic direction, which ceases to be the judgment of works of art and becomes a stage in the process of self-knowledge of matter, as perfection. The teaching task thus consists of an endless chain of translations and nontranslations: attention to the lines of invention of the matters; effectiveness in a constant *transitus*; and an original leap between reading and writing. These chains, whose insolubility is a consequence of the plurality of recreations of the world, transform teaching into a singing, which can suffer from frightening symmetries and uncomfortable dissonances, as in a theatrical show, liturgical office, or musical concert; they are situated in the multiplicity of an aria, musical score, dance, play, sketch, or manuscript and developed in the fold between the ancestral text and the new poem formed by the return of meanings nearly abandoned or lost.

This teaching cannot be conceived as one of several instruments of communication or information, but as a task of resistance, in the same way as art: “art resists, even if it is not the only thing that resists. That is why the act of resistance and the work of art are so closely intertwined” (DELEUZE 2016, 342). By translating, teachers do not acquire and transmit, dominate and give, accumulate and pass on; if they did so, they would accept that it would be possible to objectively

apprehend the accuracy of a certain matter, which, by genesis, is inessential, mysterious, and unreachable: “what the translator can only restore by becoming a poet himself” (BENJAMIN 2008, 66).

In the beginning, teachers are profane and magical readers and scholars; they are the critics and recreational poets who make the link (*tessera*)—both complementation and opposition—between the distant past and the present and on whose nonobjective interpretation depends the directions of the matters in the future. By studying the originals, appropriating them in Curriculum and updating them in Didactics, they produce new intensities, making the authors disappear in what they are reading, writing, and enunciating. As late poets, they remove the meanings attributed by the author-parent and break their false autogenous creation, making departures or causing new errors on the matters. In this way, they ensure the survival of the spirit of each matter, in addition to the opposition between life and death of authors, works, and ideas: “Such survival gives a little more life, more than a survival. The work does not only live longer, it lives longer and better, above the means of its author” (DERRIDA 2002b, 33).

Therefore, each time a teaching translation is questioned, it is the very existence of a matter that is being challenged; each time teachers continue the original, through the effects of its translate and *to-be-translated*, they continue the teaching task, and they and their craft remain entangled in an atmosphere of the freshness to-life-to-death (CORAZZA 1998; DERRIDA 1995).

ANCILLARY AND ALLEGORY

Contrary to the ancillary positioning, reserved by tradition to the teaching task, putting it in second place, the movement of transcreative translations can be thought of as an allegory, in the sense of Benjamin (2009). Allegory’s procedures place teachers as critics and creators, beside the author, because this makes individuality of the matters hesitate and shuffles the opposition between model and copy that underlies mimetic teaching. Articulated by this idea of teaching, as a process similar to that of criticism in art and literature, the allegorical conception is focused on the interpretation of what inventive impetus each original carries with it, in the tension between consciousness and object, reader and work, master and disciple.

The task of teaching processes a *continuum* of forms that are self-determining and that refer to the originals, as if the teachers worked all the time in an infinite intertext. It is no coincidence that Willemart

(2009, 62) states that affiliation and intertextuality, between the matter of departure and arrival, “exist from front to back. The author’s name derives from his works and not the other way around, it is not his father.” Allegory is one of the ways of criticizing representation since the trope—purposefully falsifying interpretation—serves as a means for indirect or nonliteral expression. By replacing words with other words, the allegorical trope is experienced by teachers as a textual or imaginary procedure that does not petrify their translation task but transforms it into a mobile act in which there is no fixity of ultimate meaning.

The translation of teachers thus consists of an endless chain of passages (ARAGON 1996; BENJAMIN 2009) between signifiers, as a *medium*, “as an environment, space where perception occurs, as opposed to an instrumental sense of ‘medium to a certain end’” (MACHADO *apud* BENJAMIN 2012, 25–26). Medium tends not only toward the absence of meaning but toward the image of reading and the gesture of writing, playing with loss and emptiness in a litany of evasions, which are imposed as necessary for the emergence of new forms. As an allegorical translation, teaching does not claim any presence, nor can it be reduced to the subordinate position of serving any purpose. Rather, it functions as a happy force, because it is creator, destroying the thought of representation and communicative speech, in its logocentric empire of discourse, logic, reason, the word of God; it emphasizes the mere allusion and insists on not inscribing itself in the sublime negativity of the enigmatic, which is what does not stop not writing itself.

Allegorized, traditional actions destroy the appearance of materials, abdicating their temporal distance and pulling them out of their organic context. Thus, there is no longer weight emanating from nature in the matters that govern the relationship between words and meanings. Instead, the teacher–translator acts in the creative circulation of inputs and outputs, deconstructing the original context and creating new complexes in the Class. The teacher–translator’s greatest challenge is not only “to start from where knowledge would emerge, to take note of this original knowledge presupposed by any critical delimitation” (DERRIDA 1998, 146) but to transcreate matters that are inexhaustible as message or communication of meaning.

Without any attempt at fragmentation or ease of figuration, without objectifying readers of the target language as the destination, without submitting to transportation from one language to another, teachers who allegorize are aware that their translations bring to life a posthumous part of knowledge. In reading and rewriting a matter, teachers do not simply restore it to its original time, nor

impose the problems of the present, nor stick to its presuppositions that disregard what each one has in principle. They know that the transcreative *writreading* of a matter requires brush, feather, and hammer to keep what is proper to it, in terms of wandering meaning, without, however, being restricted to it.

To function as an allegory, each matter depends on the translations, so as to continue having a de facto existence and to exercise the intercomplementarity of languages necessary for culture and civilization to follow their course. To carry out the teaching task is to transcreate a diabolical language into human communication, thoughts into names, things into words, images into signs. Speaking, reading, writing, and teaching allegorically consist of translating; all teaching is made up of translation; each translation is a translation of another translation. That is, there are translation layers for which generations of teachers have been responsible. That is why readings, speeches, and texts by teachers arouse the desire for more readings, speeches, and texts, and this desire in turn leads the matters to be transported by the mobility of these translations.

For a translation to be neither sterile nor unproductive, it must express the kinship that exists between the languages, since they all point to an ideal, pure language, according to Benjamin (2008). As a pure creative, interpretive, and critical action, teaching allegorizes an effective unit of expression and content and operationalizes the relationship between the original and the translation “as a couple of lovers, who complete each other, although each one can have an autonomous and independent life” (KOTHE 1976, 63). Such teaching does not have any added value but has a function of releasing “a power of life that was imprisoned or outraged” (AGAMBEN 2018, 60)—a liberation that goes beyond the planes of meaning, signifier and signification, since there is a latency of signified totality on each matter that the allegorists themselves attribute to the (impossible) task of translating.

AN EVENT TO-BE-TRANSLATED

In light of these theses about positively artistic teaching, for our purposes, it is essential to think again about untranslatable matter. The reason is that in the process of reappropriation of meaning promoted by translation, the untranslatable is the disturbing element that integrates all the translatabilities, constituting a theoretical problem for contemporary linguistics:

[W]hether we accept the current theses on the structure of lexicons, morphologies, and syntaxes, we will be led to affirm that translation would be impossible. However, the translators exist, they produce, we use their productions to our advantage. It would almost be possible to say that the existence of translation is the scandal of contemporary linguistics. (MOUNIN 1975, 19)

Rónai (1987, 14), in turn, asks whether all art would not be formed precisely by this impossibility: “the poet expresses (or wants to express) the inexpressible, the painter reproduces the irreproducible, the statuary fixes what cannot be fixed. It is not surprising, therefore, that the translator is committed to translating the untranslatable.” When we consider the poetic and the oneiric as the untranslatable of teaching, we find, in Derrida (2002b, 11), the proper name written next to the Tower of Babel, which “is almost untranslatable, as a proper name.” By referring a pure signifier to an event (CORAZZA 2004)—to what we translate and the *to-be-translated*—we endow it, in its psychic anteriority, with a performative force equal to the feast of living, which intensifies by loving itself.

The translatable–untranslatable is full of the irreducible multiplicity of matters, a condition that does not allow us to reach it in its sufficiency and leading us to make inadequate translations. Precisely because of this multiplicity, Derrida (2002b, 11–12) states that there is an “unfinished business, the impossibility of completing, totaling, saturating, finishing anything that would be of the order of identification, of the architectural construction, of the system, and of the architectonic.” It is not that this condition of loss occurs because the originals are superior, but because the *to-be-translated* is proper to the translate; that is, it is proper to the opening of the nonmeaning to a new discourse.

Above all, the task of translation is paradoxical; while teachers must translate, they cannot translate either in full or to their own satisfaction; in other words, if the translation is necessary, it integrates the order of the impossible: “the necessary and impossible task of translation, its necessity as impossibility” (DERRIDA 2002b, p.21). Consequently, teachers must deal with the incompleteness of translations and their own unsatisfactory solutions, which might appear to be defects, but that are, in fact, vital because they impel them to proceed with the translation process.

It is because we inhabit a post-Babel world that we are condemned to translate; that is, that is why we receive the task, the mission, the problem, the task of translating, “to which we are (always for the other) destined: the commitment, the duty, the debt, the responsibility”

(DERRIDA 2002, 27). Perhaps, more than any other professional, teachers experience this subpoena of *to-be-translated*; to teach, they need to translate and cannot not do so: “in relation to the text to translate (I do not speak of the signatory or the author of the original), the language and the writing, the love bond that signs the nuptial between the author of the ‘original’ and his own language” (DERRIDA 2002b, 28).

Teachers are indebted as are heirs to the teaching archive; forced by their translation duty, they are guilty of not restoring the original in full, of surviving as characters of a genealogy (DERRIDA 2001); teachers end up being agents of the transmutation of creations, leading their interpretive spirits to substitute for the spirit of the original author. However, the debt of translating and *to-be-translated* should not be understood as a moral order of inheritance, since “it does not pass between a donor and a grantee, but between two texts (two ‘productions’) or two ‘creations’” (DERRIDA 2002b, 33).

As a-moral, the need to cannot-not-translate is due to an artist’s fate, that is, to the teachers’ desire to work with the transformation and recreation, when they claim their main inheritance: to find happiness in the poetic and oneiric work of the Didactics and the Curriculum, while experiencing the dramatization of the Class. It is a liberation provided only by creative work and carried out on the table of existence, through which teachers acquire the right to dream, opening the two wings of the imagination, like a Hellenic victory. This sounds similar to Pessanha’s (1985, xxi) description of the worker–artist, conceived by Bachelard as an active dreamer who “creates from his own daydreams, self-determined by his dreams, by his will to power.”

The artists’ charge of translation by teachers is to enable their own conditions of invention, which implies engendering a common ground for original creations: teaching as a direct opening to the game of the difference of matters, engaged in a process of continuous unfolding; teaching as an oxymoron of absolute creation and translation into several languages at the same time; teaching that consists simultaneously of an art, a knowledge, and a *technai* of translation, and frees from the opposition between ingrained knowledge and acquired knowledge; teaching that takes the translation not as a mode of representation, but as a *medium* of forms—explicit affirmation, insinuation, codified allusion—that reveals its poetic and oneiric nature, without reference to the eternity of matter; and teaching that carries out autonomous constructions, agglutinating moments of the day before with scenes of the day before yesterday and expressing the eternal return of the difference in its infinitive character.

Teacher translations do not find their validity in the fact that they are copies of some reality, nor do they deform the originals; on the contrary, they take the form of texts dreamed of by dreamers. If these translations preserve some structural features of the materials, even if they have altered their verbal configuration, it is because oneiric and poetic traits (creation) are preserved in them. Through them, teachers articulate two records: criticism of the rationality of false consciousness and the dialectics that discard illusion, in the name of combating ideology (ARROJO 1992). To activate this constellation, they refer to the primary and secondary elaboration of the translations, which implies inserting the metalanguage into the curricular and didactic language. In this way, in the Class, they can aggravate a permanent crisis in society, which may explain the historical ambivalence of love and hatred for their task.

DREAM ARCHIVE

In the book *The Interpretation of Dreams*, published in 1899, Freud (2005a, 144) wrote how easy it was “to show that dreams often reveal unreservedly the character of fulfillment of desire, so we can be surprised that their language has not been understood for a long time.” By distancing teaching from the hermeneutic vision of the world and its total translatability, as well as from the semiotization of knowledge, we can think of it, as Benjamin did (*apud* KOTHE, 1976, 64), as having similarity with the *Traumdeutung*, for which: “the dreams are interpreted as they already are.” Like the dream, teaching is not an accessory or random phenomenon but a complex psychic and political work that expresses the realization of teachers’ wishes for a vital work.

Desiring work, which integrates translations of teachers into the concept of *Bildung*—both culture and training—it preserves the imaginative side that goes beyond reality and emphasizes its value of broadening horizons. Work as the exercise of a faculty on the humanity of the teachers, who, when translating the matters, pass through translation themselves: “From the first German romantics [...], this idea of Being as reflection and constant ‘translation of oneself’ becomes paradigmatic and replaces the ontological conception of Being” (SELIGMANN-SILVA 1998, 161). In eighteenth-century poetic and aesthetic theories, the concept of poetic image emerged as a metaphor “of the signifier that cannot be copied into another linguistic system” (SELIGMANN-SILVA 2007, 32), mobilizing the description of the being not as a constant construction but as a bastion of natural identity,

while the study of contemporary theories of translation (DERRIDA 1971, 1998) indicates that we can apply the figure of the untranslatable not only to poetics but also to the oneiric landscape.

In this way, teaching turns to a literary verbal body, to a poetic gesture, and to an oneiric scene; these are not transported to another language because they consist of what the translation cannot handle, as Seligmann-Silva (2007, 33) have stated: “Drop the body: this is the essential energy of translation. When it reinstitutes the body, it is poetry. In this sense, the signifying body constitutes the language for the whole scene of the dream; the dream is the untranslatable.” As the untranslatable, poetry and dreams escape the logic of meaning and serve to critique applied metaphysics and the weight of the flesh of data. Thus, to interpret and think about teaching, it is important to add phantasmagoria and fantasy (CORAZZA 2010) to the oneiric; this cultural compound places it at the interface between the phenomenal world of the archive and the supra real dimension of archetypes created by the archiving process (DERRIDA 2001). Without exaltation and without prophetic visions, we pursue a poetics of the Class dream, integrated by the bereavement and the playfulness that indicate the two faces of baroque drama (DELEUZE 2000): the bereavement of each original material and the playfulness of the Class, made by the Didactics and the Curriculum.

The dream archive works in every transcreative act when it comes into conflict with the denial of chaos, through didactic adventures and curricular misfortunes, which do not safeguard teachers from the inexpressive and the misshapen. Together with the musical, pictorial, cinematic, and scientific corpus that make up the teaching archive, the dream catalyzes a virtual strangeness of the concreteness of the *School Floor* and a decentralization of the *Classroom*. As Pedro Calderón de La Barca (1992, 47) wrote, the oneiric is not the opposite of the vigil, but a virtual presupposition: “What is life? A frenzy. / What is life? An illusion, a shadow, a fiction, and our greatest good is but small, for all of life is a dream, and even dreams are dreams are.”

In function of a poetic philosophy, which incorporates the thought and the language of the dream in teaching, it is important to ask the same question Derrida asked (2002b,): “Will there be an ethics or a politics of the dream that does not give in to the imaginary nor to the utopia and that, therefore, is not of renunciation, irresponsible and evasive?” Endowed with a dynamism that affects the Class, the archive dream converges the planning and organization of curricula with the didactic staging, leading the teacher to act in the

transmutation of the language, as well as in the postmaturation of matter. Now, this entangles the life of the teaching archive with the history of the dream, a story to be made in the territory of education that is yet to be written, as Benjamin calls for things banal and spent by habit acquire new contours and may open door to new visibilities:

The story of the dream is yet to be written and understanding this story would mean a decisive blow to the superstition of being-attached to nature (*Naturbefangenheit*) through historical enlightenment. The dream is part of the history... It is not open to a distant blue. It turned gray. Its best part is the layer of dust on things. (BENJAMIN *apud* ROUANET 2008, 88)

Confronted with a world of inert things, the translation cogito leads us to hallucinate teaching to be able to dream it; in this way, we can remove it from the intellectual context in which it works as *kitsch*, covered by layers of dust from ancestors and archaisms. Dreaming of teaching, as a task of teachers' self-training, strengthens the reappropriation of the fantastic and wonderful forces of the Class that emanate from works, authors, and ideas; dreaming brings, from the depths of time, that which has passed but is significant for the present and organizes the rearrangement of what will come.

By digging, cutting, and exhuming the didactic and curricular archive, through the dreamed dream, teachers move their portion of conceptual persona (DELEUZE and GUATTARI 1992) like coroners, archaeologists, sand diggers, discoverers of the domes of old sanctuaries. By rearticulating the teaching dream and its interpretation, research is placed at the service of the collective consciousness of teachers, which goes back to their mythical positions, to overcome exhaustion, unfinished, and nonoperational translation, impregnating the old with the new and generating utopia (BLOCH 2005–2006).

We thus see how, in the way of literary work, the dream of the teaching archive possesses the timelessness of the unconscious that allows the encounter, in children's and adults' plots, with matters that are not yet codified. To read and interpret this dream, it is important to know the function of each matter in the intellectual and psychic life of translators—whether they are readers, writers, teachers, or students. To show the oneiric acting as an ontological principle of teaching is to show the very immanence of this profession by attributing pleasant valence and vital operation to the desiring forces of teachers.

We can even visualize the Class in vertigo, as if it was a City of Dream—as in Benjamin's "The Paris of the Second Empire" (2009)—erected with curricular poetry and didactic dream, which can then be considered passages in the Class for the translation of

the archive: from the language of departure to that of arrival; from a territorial space to a nonplace; from a time to the timeless; from a state of alert to sleep; from day to night; from discipline to matter. Passages composed of impotence, losses, sacrifices, abandonment, and exhaustions move in a field of tensioned forces in the interlacing between the artwork and the teachers' struggle. Passages paint for us feelings, reason, and experiences that enliven affections, combat complacency and the lukewarmness of acquired positions, and the submission to majority groups and automatic repetitions.

During the Class dream, teachers find themselves in fruitful loneliness, populated by friendly and enemy voices; by voices of influences, affiliations, and guerrillas; by tormented, labyrinthine, abyssal, contradictory voices; by voices that, despite all efforts, do not require any translation or communication. While dreaming, teachers know that they can sleep, want to go on sleeping, or even wake and run away. For these reasons, as Deleuze wrote, we understand the dream as a combative dimension in favor of the right of teachers to dream their own dream and not those of others:

The dream of those who dream concerns those who do not dream. Why would it concern them? Because if there is another man's dream, there is danger. People's dream is always a devouring dream, which threatens to swallow us. It is very dangerous for others to dream. The dream is a terrible will of power. Each of us is more or less a victim of the dreams of others. [...] Be wary of the dream of the other, because if you are caught in the dream of the other, you will be screwed. (DELEUZE 2016, 338)

CLASS POEM

In the creative and critical galaxy of the teaching archive, the material worked in the Class does not work through interpretative tables or evaluations of universal and fixed meaning. The search for some identification for this matter, such as disciplinarization, is false, for it is proper to acquire meanings different from those of the originals. Moreover, it is innocuous to take the matter in a narrowly realistic sense or to demand that the curricular text and didactic actions be relegated to the category of mere documents, as any didactic guideline or a common national curriculum basis would wish.

This is because the Class is made up of encrypted, multifaceted, and often hermetic matters; to some extent, teachers make them intelligible, thanks to the translation process. To interpret the Class through the filters of poetry and dream is to discover its stridency in a

series; it implies that, by deciphering it, we deviate its manifest content from the truth, just as Freud (2016a, 2016b) made the analysis of dreams comparable with the translation between languages. Since the Class does not have an original sense and its latent content is always subject to an *Entstellung* (transposition), before the conception of a true knowledge, the degree of the lie or falsification of translations “is the same degree of truth that is sheltered and expressed in the autonomous dimension of dream. The same may be true for art” (KOTHE 1976, 68).

The artists’ interpretation of the Class is an endless task, because it is always possible to restart it in another direction and to reach other senses, or to engender an extra sense or no sense at all, because the quota of condensing its components is indeterminable. As a result, the Class is a matter only of literary interpretations; that is, it is selective, incomplete, and lacunar. Artists ask themselves, “How far can I go?” because they need to maintain the autonomous character of the original, under the condition that the processed matter constitutes a Class—that is, they need to transpose its *hic et nunc* (here and now) appearance.

Dream, Poetry, and the Class thus become operative concepts for philosophically thinking about teaching as if, through them, we could constitute systems or methods such as a *Dreamography*, a *Poemography*, or a *Classography*. In this instance, the Curriculum and the Didactics appear as images of changing shades that move in an exchangeable treatment between nonstructural functionalism, involved in the blurring of the Class, and an oneiric language, expressed in an excessive and transgressive poetics.

However, let us not deceive ourselves with the eccentricity of those possibilities, because there will always be the wound of the Class, the scar of the Poem, the navel of the Dream—something obscure and unknown, like a point, a bridge, or a loose tip—that suspends and stops the rational conquest, leading us to an estrangement of ourselves. That is because every Class is a dream world. Each world is an encounter of adventurous lives. Every encounter is a collection of poems. Each Class carries a haunted dream and a miraculous poetry. Every Class produces a *clinamen* as an extension of the previous matter. It transforms the teaching beaker into the luminosity of a dream and the deflowering of a poem. Dreams that take up matters already translated, such as the epics and tragic ones, and poems that produce freely: butchers from La Villette, fire-eaters, ragpickers’ huts, string dancers, children from Vigeland Park, daggers in smiles, damaged suns, lost scorpions, smoke lizards, branches from the Black Forest, jellyfish boulders, silver alleys, troops of silence, specters, and cherubs.

By emphasizing the need for poetry and the preciousness of the dream to fulfill the teachers' desire for creative work, we allow teaching to be driven by the flames of the fire of reveries accumulated in the history of pedagogy—dreams of a new world, society, culture, relationships; new beings and better professional conditions; new teachers and students; reformed civilization and inclusive culture—with completeness always to come. Because we know, as Bachelard (2013,4) wrote, that “in the order of philosophy, one can only be persuaded well by suggesting the fundamental daydreams, restoring to thoughts its avenue of dreams.”

Operating a prismatic thought of the Class, we claim a poetic and oneiric propaedeutic to interpret the history of our own successes and translation ruins; we claim to describe a political practice that no longer believes in the possibility of identical repetition of the original, in correct and definable meanings, nor in the unequivocal recovery of the intentions of an author. Whether the dream is the guardian of sleep, the Class can be considered the golden moment of awakening, although it may keep the dream thread close at hand. It happens that the Class is the *now* of cognizance, the form of remembrance and the critical instant of curricular and didactic *writreading*; at the same time, it may also be somnambulism, the dream in movement or sleep with the candle lit.

Considering teaching as a “sleep full of dreams” (BENJAMIN 2009, 436), those teachers who use oneiric rationality to think about and work the Class may not know well the difference between dreaming and thinking that they dream:

Between dreaming and thinking you dream, what is the difference? And first, who has the right to ask that question? Is it the dreamer, immersed in the experience of his night, or the dreamer when he wakes up? Could a dreamer, by the way, talk about his dream without waking up? Could he describe the dream in general, analyze it accurately and even use the word “dream” with discernment without interrupting and *betraying* sleep? (DERRIDA 2002a, 165)

From these questions, we can extract a first position of the teacher as a Class Artist, while the second would be that of the Class Scientist. For the scientific position, no one can maintain a serious and responsible discourse about the dream, nor describe a dream, without being awake. Such severity links the Science of the Class to the sovereign self of consciousness and to the rational and vigilant imperative; the awakening is entrenched in this position and results from it. The Class Artist, on the other hand, is implicated in a perspective corresponding to “the poet, the writer or the essayist, the musician, the painter, the playwright, or scriptwriter” (DERRIDA 2005, 166); this consists in

answering no, but perhaps yes, because this can happen sometimes, and so on. That is, unlike the Scientists, the Artists accept that, in the exceptional singularity of the dream, they can express some dreamed truth by sleeping, whether with eyes closed or eyes wide open.

In the first treatment, we find the perspective that the most beautiful dreams of the Class are damaged by the awakened consciousness, which throws them into the ditch of pure appearance; in the second treatment, we find that reflections on the Class do not affect the lives of teachers, whose dreams, if they are hurt, move from themselves. As teachers, we need to inquire and answer about our position before the dream, which carries in itself a stain (*wie ein Makel*) of imperfection. In this condition, we can use the paradox of the possibility of the impossible in Adorno (1992) to feel liberated to banish the dream without betraying it and without assuming the position that dreaming is harmful when thinking.

Therefore, we argue that the dream experience can provide teachers with greater imaginative lucidity and adherence to the invisible, because it brings it impossible things to think of the Curriculum, the Didactics, and the Class. When there is contact between the dream and life, we can wake up in the Class, stand as a sentinels and, in a single stroke, continue as the poetic teaching. Even awake, we continue to watch over our castles in the air, as they relate the possible of the Curriculum to the impossible of Didactics. This idea of the possibility of the impossible can continue to be dreamed of, while consciously we work for the conduct of the Class. Although teachers' dreams do not have the sovereignty of unanimity and the sole sense, it is important to continue proliferating them, because they are always thought of in an unconditionally strange way (*unheimlich*): "Poems, like dreams, can remind us of something that we consciously did not know, or we thought we did not know, or make us remember types of knowledge that we thought were no longer possible for us" (Bloom 1995, 95–96).

Derrida adds that the dream is "the element most receptive to mourning, to haunting, to the spectrality of spirits and for the return of those who return [...] to the demand for justice, as well as for the most invincible messianic hopes" (2005, 173–174). Since each era "not only dreams the next, but in dreaming awakens the force" (BENJAMIN 2009, 178), it seems to us that the Class is one of the last hospitable places in an intellectual community to dream of other times, vibrations, texts, errors, flowers of reason, and archives. Dreams made with the strength of the camel and the fury of the lion, with a process individuation, with a foreign dialect, neither maternal nor paternal, in

an innocent philosophical admiration before the facialized landscape of the world. Where the dream language—unconscious, childish, feminine, animal—speaks of the Class, there begins the poetics of teaching to be cultivated by the dreamy sensibility of the dreamer.

To teachers who are open to interpretations of the constancy of teaching as poetry, it is interesting to maintain a spirit that “loves the distance of the future and the past, the surprises of everyday life, the extremes, the unconscious, the dream, the madness, the labyrinths of reflection” (SAFRANSKI 2010, 17). Dreams and poetry are not mere illusions to be demolished by attacks of consciousness; on the contrary, both expand the consciousness of the teachers, signaling the unusual of the primary senses and the ephemerality of the intermediate stages between the sensory world and the metaphysics of things. In the Class, the dream archive is not presented in its immediacy but is involved in the web of theoretical elaboration that results from the interpretative flow, consisting of the oneiric aspect, the epistemological question, and the remembrance of the history of teaching. In this way, the Class acquires an accentuated character of “dreaming face-to-face, beyond the day that is there” (BLOCH 2005–2006, 1:21), generated by a kind of mental oneirocriticism of teachers. As Lenin said of our capacity to dream:

Whether man were completely deprived of the capacity to dream, whether he could not at one time or another anticipate and contemplate with his imagination the entirely finished picture of the work he is beginning to outline with his hands, I cannot think that other motives would force him to undertake and carry out vast and painful undertakings in the field of arts, science, and practical life.... (LENIN 1981, 188)

Classwork, delineated by charming mirrors, foam omens, mobile swarm. Furious cage. Angry tarantula. Marrow capsule. Fancy fable. Pustule macula. Kabbalah gargoyle. A Class that rides, hits the road, and shuts up. Syllable choking class. A Class that is disassembled in cotton threads. A Class that is disemboweled, precipitated by shocks and jolts, parodied in painful contortions. A submerged, stuffed, and viscous Class. Human aquarium. Tactile emotion. Blood clots. Grouchy polyps. Yellow fibers. Sharp colors. Copper pot overflow. Rotten egg in the albumen. Sails that roar. Meat-exfoliating limes. Class in fantastic marxylartic. Snake barrage. Bark, house, and shell. Poisoned star. Jelly black from the sky. Bead stridor. Awesome breaches. Rancid marrow. Calloused, colossal Class. Haughty and angry. Soaked and beaten. Demented and thoughtful. Erinia and Medea. Writing and reading class, now; done while living (CORAZZA 2012).

RETROUVED MATTER

She is retrouved! Who? Madame Eternity...

—Arthur Rimbaud

It remains that, with these contents of thought about teaching, we aim to engender a rediscovered Class—that is, a deviation from the usual senses, in the finding of Torres Filho (1993): a *trouvaile*, a rediscover, a *retrouver*. Take the Class to find the path of poetry and dream, which comes back with the sun and the moon. Redo the instantaneous and the obstacles at the edge of the students and matters. Get around the time and take the teaching verb back to the beginning. Experiment with translation as ascending poetics. Intensify the exchange with the fictional to activate the invention. In the beginning, be teacher as troubadour, *troubadour*, *trouver*, producing dream images in the trope of the Class like a child who plays at living in curiosity.

On the dream of translations depends the poetry of the Class, the criticism after the post-criticism of the Curriculum, the transcreation in the pursuit of the recreation of the Didactics. Therefore, translations are dangerous: risk of too many sudden realizations. Of softened, mediated, and measured inheritance. Of crested paths and waning slopes, which spread diseases and larval rot. The great secret of being stabbed with a cliché. Teachers need to be careful about established and unidirectional forms. To care for the lineage of creation and translations without defined affiliation. To value the enchantment in their readings, jump with one leg into the writing, and condense the flow of influence. Make teaching a brave and voluptuous task of invention, digging paradoxes from different angles. Use insight to short-circuit lyricism and salvationism. Announce a half-absence to be decrypted. Disconcert the nominee who was nameless. Form the Class in a straightforward manner. Launch a fast and accurate arrow to the Curriculum. Mix the winged twilight with the Didactics.

Teachers—translators dream...dream even if they forget. Dream even if they don't want to. Dream even when they don't know. Provide blossom to the germ of discovery. Mark and inflex with verve. Integrate the purifying *askesis* with the lightness of grace. Research perplexities to make intellectual poetry that tends to *witz* (joke). Face moments of weakness, discouragement, and boredom. Hybridize books with colored beads. Catch virtuosic tricks of verbal ability and misleading springs. Their dreams proceed to anacoluthons,

assonances, alliterations, anamorphoses. Move a paraphernalia of paranomasias, to reverse the winds of syntax and trap the timeline. Clear their hands. Scrub away the pox of routine so they do not kill each other. Just breathe. They speak, gesture, and eroticize the Class with an oneiric language: dream language, dreamed language, language that dreams of speaking with itself in other languages.

So far, with writing ink, we have shown the Didactic dream and the Curricular poetics, in the act of translating and *to-be-translated* in the Class. We have stood for a thinking that dreams and a poem that thinks. We have rehearsed what we understand as the Class, contrary to standard reason. We have staged ideas as *writreadings* experimentation. We have demarcated the artistic value of dream and poetry for the training of thinking teachers. We have highlighted teachers as translators and critics who exercise the function of the unreal. We have valued the reinterpretations of the precursors to the teaching archive. We have dreamed that Curricular weakness is reversed in Didactic strength through translation relations that rejuvenate and beautify matters. Against contemporary dogmatism, we have underlined the truth that it is up to us, as poets and dreamers, to remain vigilant. Vigil is the task conjured in the Class, prepared in the Curriculum, and fought in the Didactics. This is a task performed by teachers, who work and fight for people not present, since “there is no work of art that does not appeal to a people that does not yet exist” (DELEUZE 2016, 343).

Even so, why do these theses about the thought and research of teaching not convince us? By what excessive burden of demand do we not rejoice in the raising of questions about the translation process? Why is it not enough for us to emphasize the teachers’ right to dream about Didactics and to poetize the Curriculum to make them effective in the Class? Why are we not content with the philosophical effects derived from the collection of Curriculum and Didactics studies that were put on the journey of this writing-and-reading, which here goes to the end? Why are we still worried about the vagueness of some arguments, which have been erected as scaffolding for new dreamers to translate and *to-be-translated*? Why do we complicate the paths of chimerical interests, sand monuments, succumbing science, insignificances, and depositions of the archive, of which the Class is the guardian and traitor?

What is this profligacy that considers it unsatisfactory to paint teachers as beings of artistic sensation, co-producers of science and thought, users of the clash between constituted matters and those still reported, to develop the creative capacity of a proper teaching?

Why are we not satisfied with the idea that teaching consists of the insensitive activity of dreaming and poetry, which puts in place the individuations of codes, language, and matters of education? Is it not enough to add something that we have not yet seen and make it visible to others without slipping into a frivolous and useless generality? Cannot we find our own base-points by breaking with learned preconceptions about spontaneous and natural teaching and situate teachers as the executors of an interventionist research in the reality of their performance?

Why are we not satisfied with bringing light to teaching, through sparks of cosmic burning, smoking and vestiges of the new, eternal materials of the remarkable and interesting, and replace the appearance of truth by being more prodigal? Why does it seem needy to propose a teaching research that is always being done and is never over? Why would it still be too little to say that the teachers' translations work like wind harps, which not only play the meaning of the originals, but also set them flying? To write about the Curriculum as an epiphany, beyond the irruption of a book, a work, a world? To affirm that the Didactics pulsate in the dark region of the dream and manifest in a material projection that goes back to and ascends from inhuman sources? Why does it seem like a poorly rewarded enthusiasm to speak of teaching as a suffering of God's judgment? Not plastered in the grounds of judgments prescribed by reason, but sanctioned by the philosophy of difference and attentive to the becomings of teachers to the possibilities of transformation of matters?

Even if the results of this article are unfinished, formed by open and suspended discourses of initiation, incitement, or exhortation, proper to stimulate and intrigue research on the Class; even if this text, which ends here, does not cache knowledge of the truth about the Didactics and the Curriculum; even if we do not know how some of their conjecture, consequences, conclusions, suggestions, and speculation work; even if what is impossible to translate is our despair, but also our greatest rematch as teacher-writers—we must also indicate a final precaution. Precaution uses the metaphor of translators as boatmen, as found in Meschonnic, for which it is important not to proceed as Charon. That is:

What matters is not getting through but in what state that that has been transported arrive in the other side. In the other language. Charon is also a boatman. However, he carries the dead to the other side. Those who have lost their memory. This is what happens to many translators. (MESCHONNIC 2010, xxv)

REFERENCES

- ADORNO, Theodor. **Minima moralia**. Reflexões a partir da vida danificada. Tradução Luiz Eduardo Bicca. São Paulo: Ática, 1992.
- ADORNO, Theodor. O ensaio como forma. In: ADORNO, Theodor W. **Notas de literatura I**. Tradução Jorge M. B. de Almeida. São Paulo: Duas Cidades; Ed. 34, 2003, p.15-45.
- AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **O fogo e o relato**: ensaios sobre criação, escrita, arte e livros. Tradução Andrea Santurbano, Patrícia Peterle. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2018.
- ARAGON, Louis. **O camponês de Paris**. Tradução Flávia Nascimento. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1996.
- ARROJO, Rosemary (org.). **O signo desconstruído**: implicações para a tradução, a leitura e o ensino. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 1992, p. 71-79.
- BACHELARD, Gaston. **A água e os sonhos**: ensaio sobre a imaginação da matéria. Tradução Antonio de Pádua Danesi. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2013.
- BENJAMIN, Walter. **A obra de arte na época de sua reprodutibilidade técnica**. Tradução Francisco De Ambrosis Pinheiro Machado. Porto Alegre: Zouk, 2012.
- BENJAMIN, Walter. A tarefa do tradutor. Tradução Susana Kampff Lages. In: BRANCO, Lucia Castello (org.). **A tarefa do tradutor, de Walter Benjamin**. Quatro traduções para o português. Belo Horizonte: Fale/UFMG, 2008.
- BENJAMIN, Walter. **Passagens**. Tradução Iren Aron e Cleonice Paes Barreto Mourão. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG; São Paulo: Imprensa Oficial do Estado de São Paulo, 2009.
- BLOCH, Ernst. **O princípio esperança I**. Tradução Nélio Schneider. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ; Contraponto, 2005.
- BLOOM, Harold. **Um mapa da desleitura**. Tradução Thelma Médici Nóbrega. Rio de Janeiro: Imago Ed., 1995.
- BORGES, Jorge Luis. La pesadilla. In: BORGES, Jorge Luis. **Obras completas III**. Buenos Aires: Emecé Editores, 2007, p.257-271.
- CALDERÓN DE LA BARCA, Pedro. **A vida é sonho**. Tradução Renata Pallottini. São Paulo: Escrita, 1992.
- CAMPOS, Haroldo de. **Metalinguagem e outras metas**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1992.
- CAMPOS, Haroldo de. **Transcrição**. Organizadores Marcelo Tápia, Thelma Médici Nóbrega. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2013.
- CORAZZA, Sandra Mara. Didática-artista da tradução: transcrições. **Mutatis Mutandis**, Medellín, v. 6, p. 185-200, 2013a. Disponível em: <<http://aprendeenlinea.udea.edu.co/revistas/index.php/mutatismutandis/article/view/15378/13513>> Acesso em: 02 dez. 2016.
- CORAZZA, Sandra Mara. **Didaticário de criação**: aula cheia. (Caderno de Notas 3. Coleção Escriteiras.) Porto Alegre: UFRGS, 2012.

CORAZZA, Sandra Mara (org.). **Docência-pesquisa da diferença**: arquivo de poética-mar. Porto Alegre: Doisa/UFRGS, 2017.

CORAZZA, Sandra Mara (org.). **Fantasia de escritura**: filosofia, educação, literatura. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2010.

CORAZZA, Sandra Mara. **História da infanilidade**: a-vida-a-morte e mais-valia de uma infância sem fim. 1998. 619f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação). Programa de Pós-Graduação, Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. Porto Alegre, 1998. Disponível em: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/scoxko9i9ghhylk/Sandra_Corazza_Tese.pdf?dl=0> Acesso em: 07 jul. 2016.

CORAZZA, Sandra Mara. Inventário de procedimentos didáticos de tradução: teoria, prática e método de pesquisa. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v.1, n.23, p.1-23, 2018. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S141324782018000100225&script=sci_abstract&lng=pt> Acesso em: 11 jun.2018.

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

CORAZZA, Sandra Mara. Pesquisar o acontecimento: estudo em XII exemplos. In: TADEU, Tomaz; CORAZZA, Sandra; ZORDAN, Paola. **Linhas de escrita**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2004, p.7-78.

DE ARAUJO, Roger; CORAZZA, Sandra Mara. Método maquinatório de pesquisa. **Pedagogia y Saberes**, Bogotá, Colombia, v.49, n.1, p.67-80, 2018. Disponível em: <<http://revistas.pedagogica.edu.co/index.php/PYS/article/view/8171/6364>> Acesso em: 01 jul.2018.

DELEUZE, Gilles. **A dobra**: Leibniz e o barroco. Tradução Luiz B. L. Orlandi. Campinas, SP: Papirus, 2000.

DELEUZE, Gilles. Foucault. Tradução C © ych. **Qué hacer?** Problemas candentes de nuestro movimiento. Traducción Editorial Progreso. Moscú, URSS: Editorial Progreso, 1981.

MATOS, Olgária C. F. **O iluminismo visionário**: Benjamin, leitor de Descartes e Kant. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1999.

MESCHONNIC, Henri. **Poética do traduzir**. Tradução Jerusa Pires Ferreira e Suely Fenerich. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2010.

MOUNIN, Georges. **Os problemas teóricos da tradução**. Tradução Heloysa de Lima Dantas. São Paulo: Cultrix, 1975.

PEIRCE, Charles Sanders. **Semiótica**. Tradução José Teixeira Coelho Neto. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2010.

PESSANHA, José Américo Motta. Introdução. Bachelard: as asas da imaginação. In: BACHELARD, Gaston. **O direito de sonhar**. Tradução José Américo Motta Pessanha *et alii*. São Paulo: DIFEL, 1985.

RÓNAI, Paulo. **Escola de tradutores**. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1987.

ROUANET, Sérgio Paulo. **Édipo e o anjo**: itinerários freudianos em Walter Benjamin. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 2008.

SAFRANSKI, Rüdiger. **Romantismo**: uma questão alemã. Tradução Rita Rios. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2010.

SELIGMANN-SILVA, Márcio. Haroldo de Campos: tradução como formação e “abandono da identidade”. **Revista USP**. São Paulo n. 36, p.158-171, 28 fev. 1998. Disponível em: <<http://www.revistas.usp.br/revusp/article/view/26996/28771>> Acesso em: 01/03/2011.

SELIGMANN-SILVA, Márcio. **Leituras de Walter Benjamin**. São Paulo: FAPESP; Annablume, 2007.

TORRES FILHO, Rubens Rodrigues. **Retrovar**. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 1993.

WILLEMART, Philippe. **Os processos de criação na escritura, na arte e na psicanálise**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2009.

NOTAS

1 We consider matter in the philosophical sense of Deleuze (1991) and Deleuze and Guattari (1992), as this: (a) the hyle that goes from Plato to Aristotle; (b) the Body without Organs or the plane of consistency; (c) unformed, amorphous, undifferentiated, or nebulous matter; (d) the raw material of which the objects of the world are composed; and (e) a semiotically nonformed substance. We do not reduce the sense of matter to that of discipline, although each discipline, taken as a whole, comprises a certain matter, giving it one form rather than another, transforming it from to form. Thus, a discipline has substance, since it consists of matter defined by form, unlike matter, which does has neither substance nor form. This text uses the notion of matter, sometimes in a transversal remission to what is considered a discipline—physics, French, chemistry, history, philosophy, theater, etc.—although it emphasizes the concept of matter in the philosophical sense of the thought of difference; that is, it holds matter to be irreducible to the discipline, since this always overflows due to its formless nature.

Submission: 17/12/2018

Approbation: 20/02/2019

Contact:

Rua João Berutti, nº 185 - Chácara das Pedras
Porto Alegre | RS | Brasil
CEP 91330-370