ISSN 2179-8214
https://doi.org/10.7213/1981-416X.25.087.DS07EN

Dossier

Revista Diálogo Educacional
periodicos.pucpr.br/dialogoeducacional
PUCPRESS

Experiencing, esperiencing: derridean inspirations for other scientific evidence

Experienciar, esperienciando: inspirações derridianas para outras evidências científicas

Experienciar, esperienciando: inspiraciones derridianas para otras evidencias científicas

Nataly da Costa Afonso [a]
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil
Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Instituto de Aplicação Fernando Rodrigues da Silveira, Departamento de Ensino Fundamental

Ana Paula Pereira Marques de Carvalho [b]
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil
Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Pró-reitoria de Pós-graduação e Pesquisa

How to cite: AFONSO, Nataly da Costa; CARVALHO, Ana Paula Pereira Marques de. Experienciar, esperienciando: inspirações derridianas para outras evidências científicas. *Revista Diálogo Educacional*, Curitiba, PUCPRESS, v. 25, n. 87, p. 1850-1860, dez. 2025. https://doi.org/10.7213/1981-416X.25.087.DS07EN

Abstract

The present text aims to problematize the discursive movement highlighted in the National Literacy Policy (PNA) regarding the importance of literacy based on scientific evidence. In this process, a series of discourses have been mobilized and articulated around the emphasis on evidence – for instance, a notion of experience that also requires scientific validation, linking it exclusively to scientific procedures proven to be effective. This entire movement is tied to the endorsement of a robust science that is expected to guide educational policies. Thus, in dialogue with Jacques Derrida, this work seeks to contribute to the deconstruction of the notion of evidence, bringing it closer to the concept of experience as différance, in order to provoke reflections on what counts as evidence and to emphasize that the literacy process must be conceived in relation to the other.

[a] PhD in Education, e-mail: nataly.uerj@gmail.com
[b] PhD in Education, e-mail: app_marques@yahoo.com.br

This relationship unfolds through a constant movement of deferral, in which experiences – including scientific ones – are performed as continuous and unending (re)creations, within processes of signification that move through their own incompleteness. The song "Poema" by Cazuza inspires this reflection on the relations woven with the other, in which familiarity is fleeting and constantly lost. Yet, it is precisely within this loss that the beauty of what cannot be controlled emanates.

***Keywords**: Experience. Literacy. Scientific evidence. Event.*

Resumo

O presente texto visa problematizar o movimento discursivo que se destaca na Política Nacional de Alfabetização (PNA) sobre a importância da alfabetização baseada em evidências científicas. Neste processo, uma série de discursos têm sido mobilizados e se articulam à ênfase nas evidências, como por exemplo, um sentido de experiência que também requer validação científica, relacionando-as, exclusivamente, a procedimentos científicos, comprovadamente eficazes. Todo esse movimento vem atrelado ao respaldo de uma ciência robusta que deve balizar as políticas educacionais. Assim, em diálogo com Jacques Derrida, pretende-se contribuir para a desconstrução do sentido de evidência, aproximando-a da noção de experiência como *differánce* a fim de provocar reflexões sobre as evidências e enaltecer que o processo de alfabetização deve ser pensado na relação com o outro. Relação esta que se dá em um movimento constante de diferimento, em que as *esperiencias* – também científicas – são performadas como (re)criações contínuas e ininterruptas, em movimentos de significação que transitam nas suas próprias incompletudes. A música "Poema", de Cazuza, inspira-nos nessa reflexão sobre as relações tecidas com o outro em que a familiaridade é fugidia e se perde o tempo todo. Porém, é justamente nessa perda que emana a beleza daquilo que não é possível controlar.

Palavras-chave: Experiência. Alfabetização. Evidências científicas. Acontecimento.

Resumen

El presente texto tiene como objetivo problematizar el movimiento discursivo que se destaca en la Política Nacional de Alfabetización (PNA) en torno a la importancia de la alfabetización basada en evidencias científicas. En este proceso, se han movilizado y articulado una serie de discursos en torno al énfasis en las evidencias, como, por ejemplo, una noción de experiencia que también requiere validación científica, vinculándola exclusivamente a procedimientos científicos comprobados como eficaces. Todo este movimiento está asociado al respaldo de una ciencia robusta que debe orientar las políticas educativas. Así, en diálogo con Jacques Derrida, se busca contribuir a la deconstrucción del sentido de evidencia, aproximándola a la noción de experiencia como différance, con el fin de provocar reflexiones sobre las evidencias y resaltar que el proceso de alfabetización debe pensarse en relación con el otro. Esta relación se da en un movimiento constante de diferimiento, en el que las experiencias –también las científicas – se performan como (re)creaciones continuas e ininterrumpidas, en movimientos de significación que transitan por sus propias incompletudes. La canción "Poema", de Cazuza, nos inspira en esta reflexión sobre las relaciones tejidas con el otro, en las que la familiaridad es fugaz y se pierde todo el tiempo. Sin embargo, es precisamente en esa pérdida donde emana la belleza de aquello que no es posible controlar.

***Palabras clave**: Experiencia. Alfabetización. Evidencias científicas. Acontecimiento.*

The education movement based on scientific evidence

"I love you a lot. So many esperiences!". This was the dedication from L., the nephew of one of the authors of this text, on a morning of autographs for the publication his book in school. The memory of the experiences (and esperiences) during the days that, in the aunt's house, he could open drawers, cut, experience, and produce his creations, incited him to go to his aunt's house that morning to make more experiences. The aunt, a teacher, who worried so much about his learning possibilities – mainly in the pandemic period, while he was in Early Childhood Education and physically away from school – attentively listening his orders; "aunty, let's go to the kitchen. I'll need a pot, a detergent… what else do you have?" The aunt suggested food coloring and corn flour, already thinking on the possibility of adding conditioner and making a recipe for homemade playdough they had done together and, at the time, counted as an experience.

Sitting around the table, each with a pot, the teacher/aunt started the playdough recipe, while the nephew, who was six years old at the time, created: "a bit of detergent. I'll need water and more detergent… a lot of blue coloring, you put more corn flour, aunty, and give me something of your recipe that I need to put here"…"this detergent is over, I need more".

– "I finished my experience!" – the aunt said, with the blue playdough ready, when the boy said:

– "Aunty, I'm doing a scientific experiment. You're just making playdough, everyone does it".

– And the aunt answer: "what if I put my playdough in your experiment?"

– "I'll need just a bit".

So the playdough entered the pot.

The dialogue above was reproduced from a playful moment between the aunt and the nephew. From the child's manifestations, we raised some questions: What is scientific evidence? What is to make science? L.'s statements instigate us to think about the discourses that have been disseminated in the name of science in the education area, mainly the discourses that defend literacy based on scientific evidence as the solution for reading and writing problems and the improvement of literacy rates. Consequently, in this text, we aim to problematize the discursive forces that try to establish a singular meaning for experiences in the service of what they call evidence.

Our restlessness is due to the movement from *Política Nacional de Alfabetização* (PNA- National Literacy Policy), whose objective, announced by its creators, was to insert Brazil "into the list of countries that chose science as the fundament to create their literacy public policies" (Brasil, 2019), highlighting the scientific evidence as guides for teachers' actions and for curriculum policies. PNA is part of a discursive scenario of education crisis that has gained notoriety in our country, based on quantitative results of external evaluations. According to Macedo (2013, p. 445), "the crisis is the enemy exteriorized to guarantee the force of a given discourse about the curriculum and legitimize the exclusion of other meanings".

In the case of PNA, this crisis was mobilized to justify the delegitimization of everything that is outside the possibilities of control, discrediting "individual opinions or ideologies" (Sargiani, 2022, p.2) at the expense of what they defend as scientific evidence, reified as primary sources that should underpin the practice of literacy teachers, as well as the education of these teachers. Thus, we perceive that the discourse that grounds the meaning of evidence in PNA connects to the idea of evidence as a safe pathway, where the effects are completely predictable, subsuming the literacy process as the single possibility of an event.

Though it was repealed in June 2023, through the Decree 11.556/2023 (article 37), we advocate that the political revocation of the policy does not break away from the ideals defended and disseminated, considering that – in a discursive record – there is no a moment of formulation and a previous moment of implementation. The policy is constantly in production and articulation, and the defense that literacy can be based on scientific evidence – as defended at PNA – cannot be revoked via decree and is also not unprecedented.

It is also important to highlight that the discourse surrounding scientific evidence in the discussed policy aims to legitimize a science that seeks to establish itself as an unquestionable source for teachers' education and convey

meanings about its importance for the development process of reading and writing. Hence, we perceive that this emphasis on scientific evidence, under the pretext of guiding teachers' actions, implies attempts to discredit everything that is not considered scientifically proved, also contributing to a binary view of science that foments a polarized logic of practice and reifies the scientific discourse as the source to access truth and quality.

PNA lists – in its explanatory book– cognitive science of reading as a branch of science that has most contributed, in the last decades, to the understanding of reading and writing processes, defending it as " a vigorous set of evidence about how people learn to read and write and indicates the most effective pathway for teaching reading and writing" (MEC/Sealf, 2022, p. 7). Under this perspective, science is accessed through an efficiency bias, through cognitive sciences, which dispose a vigorous ensemble of evidence about how people learn to read and write, to provide indications about the most effective ways to teach reading and writing. In this sense, efficiency derives from the idea of methodologic rigor and its envisioned (an impossible) exemption. The scientific evidence is thus understood as a series of resources and procedures that had their effects/results tested and validated in a rigorous experimental control.

In this attempt to control the meaning of scientific evidence, we perceive the discourse about the procedures to validate what is perceived as scientific evidence, under apparently rigid and pre-defined criteria. We observe in this movement a dispute over the meaning of science, mobilized as a form to reach truth, and this science as an applicable procedure that can ground public education policies. Hence, it lists the following steps to validate robust scientific evidence:

> a) analysis of the study methodologies: if the research used an experimental design or other equally rigorous methodologies; if the results of the students submitted to the interventions were compared to similar students who were not submitted to them;
>
> b) analysis of data quality: if the researchers made sure of carefully collecting, storing, and examining the data, and if they methodically reported the procedures followed in each step and the study limitations;
>
> c) support of scientific community: if the study was published in a scientific journal for other researchers to evaluate the results, revise the methods used in the research, and could repeat them in other contexts;
>
> d) use of meta-analyses: if the decision is taken based on meta-analyses, that is, in studies (systematic reviews) that compile a series of evidence and determine the state-of-the-art or most current knowledge about an object (BRASIL, 2019, p. 20, author's highlight).

We can see in this excerpt the recommendation of a scientific approach rooted in systematized studies, establishing a cause-and-effect relationship that can ground teachers' practice, understood as a field of scientific applicability. To be considered scientific, the evidence needs to conform to a pre-existing methodology, as well as undergo steps that validate it, considering the possibility of replication in a different context, so as to produce the same results. Therefore, science is connected to a mechanistic logic, through which the quantitative aspects stand out, seeking to contribute to categorical data that aims to portray the effects of specific evidence. The goal is to guarantee the level of validity and reliability of certain scientific evidence at the expense of other evidence and exclusively possible experiences

In this movement, we perceive that PNA has been articulated in partnerships with the Federal Government and universities from Portugal, aiming to transfer what they call successful experiences in the literacy field to our country. The idea is to share these experiences, measured by the results in international assessments, considering the Portuguese educational reform as a model to promote literacy practices based on the cognitive science of reading. We highlight that there is a discursive refinement around the supposedly more efficient evidence to teach reading and writing and, consequently, we are faced with the reinforcement of the need to share the practices scientifically evaluated by well-known researchers and professionals that demonstrably present quantifiable results. However, projecting results is an – (im) possible-attempt to control the imponderable. The (im)possible, dialoguing with Derrida

(1997), enables a possibility that is, at the same time, impossible; that is, this project is on the level of the something that is never "predicted or planned, or even really decided upon." (Derrida, 1997, p. 232).

When approaching the impossible possibility, Derrida (2001 *apud* Fragozo, 2018) does not state the possibility as something different or even opposed to the impossibility. The author affirms that possible and impossible mean the same, acting over the world that one intends to think, in which one lives and produces, a world and a practice to come. There is always an impossibility in what is stated as a determinant, as well as there are evidence and experiences that do not only overflow but integrate what is named robust scientific evidence.

In 2011, *Academia Brasileira de Ciência* [Brazilian Science Academy] published a news article entitled "Children's Learning: na approach from neuroscience, economy, and cognitive psychology", praising the initiatives of some countries that changed their literacy public policies based on the most recent scientific evidence, such as England, France, Australia, Israel, and Finland. The news affirmed that, consequently, in these countries, particularly in Portugal, there has been a supposed progress, considered meaningful, in reading and writing learning, thanks to the strategies used in these countries for classroom practices, based on science (Brasil, 2021).

Therefore, we have been experiencing a discursive force that reinforces a literacy logic based on scientific knowledge about reading teaching and learning and requires a commitment – and responsibility – of the teacher towards scientific evidence, through the use of practices based on empirically validated knowledge that answers their needs.

> We hope that, like scientists, literacy teachers can prioritize empirical evidence in reformulating their knowledge and literacy practices. The greatest advantage of evidence-based teaching is that teachers can, from the start, have a higher degree of trust in the efficiency of strategies used with their students (Brasil, 2021, p. 3).

We can perceive that the discourse about scientific evidence gains a strong support as an efficiency guarantee for the formation of children, even considering, according to Beard (*apud* Brasil, 2021, p. 8), that "good training is an instrument to overcome social vulnerabilities and a condition for the full citizenship exercise, which affect the whole national economy".

About these mottos of overcoming social vulnerabilities and the guarantees of the right to education, undoubtedly, we, literacy teachers, are fully involved in the fight to improve the quality of public education, the formation of readers and writers, a literate Brazil, as a society respected in its rights, with better life conditions, and social justice. However, these publicized mottos fade when others emerge in favor of binaries – right or wrong; good or bad – with propaganda for a fight for public and plural education, which is grounded in a universalizing training horizon, based on assessment indexes. That is, paraphrasing Lopes and Borges (2015, p. 501), we are committed to "projects to change the world".

That said, we advocate that the scientific action goes beyond a set of evidence, of procedures to be repeated and applied. We understand that the meaning of the pieces of evidence goes through this application logic, being established by a logic of experience, of event, understanding that scientific evidence is part of a scientific production process, allowed through hypotheses, experiences, observations, and questions that are endless and do not reach an absolute truth.

As Derrida (2004) defends, there is a scientific discovery only when there is unpredictability. Thus, we argue that the logic of experience and evidence isis imbricated, favoring the possibilities of meaning in scientific action, rather than limiting them to a single sense and/or a single way of teaching how to read and write. Hence, we propose an opening to the scientific action that collaborates with the displacement of the meaning of scientific evidence, articulated in L.'s *esperiences*. Derrida (*ibidem*) highlights experience as performance that not only involves the production of a fixed and applicable knowledge but, simultaneously, a constant and unconditional questioning.

Therefore, we move towards the defense of evidence/experience as a language game that articulates itself, involving theoretical meanings, wills of knowing, power, and truth, because, as Lopes and Macedo (2011, p. 91) observe

" it is not just words at stake, but theoretical and practical meanings in dispute operate in the world. They are discourses with which we establish the meaning of the world" (Lopes; Macedo, 2011, p. 91). So, we let the possibilities of this process flow to the imponderable that always escapes control, as we are weaved in the truths of traces that send us to other meanings.

In check... risks of a single pathway for evidence

The mobilization in favor of science has a history that is not recent in the Education field, as well as decades of discussion in the field of medicine. This discussion has resonated in several other fields and stands out in the educational area, mainly in countries such as the United States and Portugal. Davies (2007) claims that this discussion is as old as the Enlightenment, emphasizing the substitution of theology as a knowledge base. Chizzotti (2015), in turn, continues the discussion since the 1990s, highlighting discourses that ground education policies based on scientific evidence, created by English and North-American conservative governments, as a way to validate the political objectives and the funding strategies of education institutions that proved a supposed efficiency in the competitive standards forged.

The idea of science as being able to dictate reality is taken as a metaphysics that Derrida (Derrida; Roudinesco, 2004, p.63) calls scientism. The author uses the term scientism to name the belief that science can explain and solve human phenomena, and an alleged scientific neutrality "that intends to reduce all human behaviors to physiological processes experimentally[1] verifiable" (Derrida; Roudinesco, 2004, p. 63). However, Derrida (2004) clearly distinguishes science and scientism, arguing that scientism disfigures the ethics of science itself when confusing human behaviors with reducionist procedures.

According to the philosopher, the problem, however, is not only on the idea of seeking to translate human behaviors into mechanic phenomena but in the reducing and simplifying system in which the mechanical phenomena themselves are approached, in which scientists propose mechanic models that cannot handle the complexity of machines (real or virtual) produced by man and exporting theorems beyond their respective fields. The author defines machines as devices of calculation and repetition, "as long as there is calculation, computability, and repetition, there is machine" (Derrida; Roudinesco, 2004, p. 65).

Nevertheless, we need to be cautions about the machine and non-machine relationship, as it is not only a simple opposition, but a complex relationship in the understanding that there is always something in the machine that exceeds it regarding the machine itself, which regards the effect of the machine and what frustrates the mechanical calculation, to what Derrida calls unpredictable event, that was not programmed, and goes beyond every calculation, the incalculable, the other. This other who escape the calculation produces affectations that cannot be given a priori, complexifying the machine relationship. In this context, we highlight the complexity of the calculation order itself that seeks to establish mechanical phenomena as portraits of a stagnant reality, which refers to scientism.

The scientific responsibility of vigilance is evoked by Derrida (2004) as an opening to the incalculable, considering that

> No brain, no neurological analysis, supposedly exhaustive, is able to allow the meeting with the other. The advent of the other, the arrival of those arriving, is (the one) that arrives as an unpredictable event. Knowing how to "take into account" what challenges accountability, what challenges or inflects in another way the principle of reason while it is limited to "given an account" ("*reddere rationem*", "*logon didonai*"), not denying or ignoring this unpredictable and incalculable advent of the other– this is also knowing, and the scientific responsibility (Derrida; Roudinesco, 2004, p. 66).

[1] In an interview given to Roudinesco (2004), Derrida makes an observation on the word experimentalism/experimentation, calling attention to the fact that the experimental gesture is not necessarily a scientism gesture. The author argues that there might be experiments in different sciences, adjusted to the rational specifities in which they develop. Physchology, highlighted by Derrida, can have experimentation but in a different way, so as not to establish itself as scientism, not seeking to find answers that intend to be universal.

Science, from this perspective, should not offer any ready solution to organize human life, also encompassing the responsibility of opening to the unpredictable, to the event. This does not mean, as Frangella (2020) warns, a relativism or nihilism, but the understanding that any attempt of halting will always be precarious and contingent, an attempt to interrupt the game of meanings that is never over, considering that the different structures are open to a variety of interpretations and deductions, in a ceaseless process that displaces the possibility of closing flows and significations (Willians, 2005).

When questioning the idea of scientific evidence mobilized at PNA, we do not aim to deny the value of science in thinking literacy but rather call attention to other possibilities of reading and scientific action. As Hammersley (2007) argues, we defend that the idea of evidence-based education, as proposed at PNA, follows a dangerous path because it develops a utilitarian relationship with knowledge when reinforcing certain knowledge is more important and useful to society, at the expense of others, considering fast and tangible results, immediately profitable. In this relationship, the quantitative aspects are prioritized over qualitative aspects, and non-measurable evidence is marginalized. There is an exaggerated emphasis on quantitative data that can be used to measure the efficiency of evidence/experiences.

The privilege given to systematic evidence suggests a delegitimization of other types of evidence, particularly evidence from professional experience (Hammersley, 2007). This happens because what is named scientific in this movement is connected to knowledge rigor and objectivity, while professional experience is taken as unsystematic, being disqualified as a scientific knowledge by – supposedly– reflecting particular cases and that cannot be replicated. This movement reinforces the notion that evidence and experience are opposites, an understanding that we distance ourselves from. Frangella (2019), in a discussion about curriculum policy questioned in this text, argues that taking this problem in a binary way is to exclude and limit the possibilities of developing other pedagogical practices.

> When problematizing the emphasis on scientific evidence as presented, we argue that a polarization might imply an atrophy of the debate around literacy, reducing the issue to a methodological question and the political task of recovering other possible meanings for curriculum (Frangella, 2020, p. 11)

We resume the author's discussion to also highlight our political task in problematizing other meanings of science, such as an education based on scientific evidence. We do not deny science, as this would lead to a binary logic between scientific or non-scientific evidence, science versus practice, evidence versus experiences, words that, placed in opposition, become little production, in a binarism that limits subjectivities and seeks to erase other possibilities and ways of doing and thinking science. Faced with the defense of evidence-based literacy, our concern is also to appoint a single scientific approach, related to the cognitive reading sciences, which corroborates evidence of an epistemological unity in literacy practices.

Thus, we once again echo L.'s provocation in the begging of the text: "You're just making playdough, everyone does it", which helps us to put in check the idea of evidence and scientific experience as statutes of truth, to think about the possibility of opening for the unpredictable, in the constant ethical responsibility with alterity. As Fragozo (2019) argues, it does not refer to seeking novelty or a futuristic hysteria, but rather to the constant and radical questioning in which certainties, positions, and conclusions themselves are continually and permanently questioned. Therefore, we move away from understanding science as a playdough recipe and think about the possibility of science as experience, such as *esperiences* as science.

Transgressing the evidence as *esperience*: the beauty of the future

The word play "experience" by *esperience*, mobilized in this text dialoguing with L., reminds us of the spelling of the word *differénce* that Derrida (2005) purposely rewrites, when changing the "é" to "á", highlighting difference as *differánce* to problematize the process of language as deferment. This is an important question about what we propose to reflect on the literacy process and, consequently, about teachers' actions, as experiences/events. Our relationships

are marked by the difference in which the other – and not only the personified being, but also our ideas and meanings– is in a constant displacement process. Displacement in relation to otherness is part of a dialogical process, and we are entangled in it, also experiencing attempts at control. However, there is always something unexperienced that flows in the gaps between non-linear and non-homogeneous space/time and that delineates the blindness and incompleteness in the production of meanings (Derrida *apud* Freire, 2014).

Dialoguing with Lopes (2015), we understand that the signification game is endless and, therefore, the attempts to fixate and reproduce them, which permeate the logic of evidence and scientific experiences, are always exposed to ruptures and other possibilities of signification. They are transitory and unfinished processes, as any attempt at repetition, they are immersed in a translation process. The translation involves the negotiation of meanings in a game of alterity in which the other, in their differences, constantly makes something new emerge; a novelty that is contaminated, produced in a hybrid game of neither one nor other meaning but all at the same time (Siscar, 2013). Thence, the attempts to reproduce evidence/experience area are always flawed, considering that they are immersed in a translation movement that involves continuous production of meanings due to this relation with the other.

Our commitment refers to the experience to come which involves "the experience of impossible and the necessary" (Lopes; Siscar, 2018, p. 8), experiencing our classrooms through layers of meanings that unfold complicated conversations in which we are involved, as Pinar (2016) observes. In our studies on educational policies, we have been discussing curriculum as a discursive practice that enables us to think about teachers' practices in the context of intersubjective relationships. In this process, teaching should be perceived as a continuous experience, whose set of evidence is never ready or finished but displaced in dialogue and in the relationship between the subjects involved in the "confrontation field between discourses, acts of cultural negotiation that refer to different groups" (Frangella, 2009, p.11). These relationships are always translations, mobilized in the process of *differánce* referred by Derrida (2005).

In this regard, we distance ourselves from a reproductivist approach that assumes something already given for teachers' practice. Defending that the "curriculum is not implemented nor applied" (Frangella, 2009, p.12), we emphasize that our practices are continually crossed and negotiated because we are mobilized and part of the contingency. That is, we displace ourselves beyond what is prescribed or determined, producing other meanings that question the homogeneity and the intended rigidity of teaching. Reflecting on the meaning flows present in schools and the differences they reveal gives rise to the (im)possibility of closure, as the complexity of relationships does not fit into a single narrative or origin.

Art has inspired us, in the articulation with the field of curriculum, to think about these complicated conversations that perform the teaching practice and policy production. In an interview with Mia Couto, the poet mentions the following: "more important than reading is to rediscover the unique pleasure of creating one's own stories and be others" (Almeida, n.d.). Paraphrasing the poet, we are continuously others, hybrid, and ambivalent, in our lived lives.

The music *Poema*, written by Cazuza in honor of his grandmother and sang by Ney Matogrosso, crosses us as a trace of experience that is not fixed but that insists on lingering, even in absence.

[...] From darkness, I saw an infinite with no present, past, or future[2]
I felt a strong hug, it was no longer fear
It was something yours that stayed on me
Suddenly, we see that we lost
Or is losing something
Warm and naïve
Left behind along the way
That is dark and cold, but also beautiful

[2] Translated from the original in Brazilian Portuguese: Do escuro, eu via um infinito sem presente, passado ou futuro/Senti um abraço forte, já não era medo/Era uma coisa sua que ficou em mim/De repente, a gente vê que perdeu/Ou está perdendo alguma coisa/Morna e ingênua/Que vai ficando no caminho/Que é escuro e frio, mas também bonito/Porque é iluminado/Pela beleza do que aconteceu há minutos atrás [...]

Because is illuminated
By the beauty of what happened minutes ago [...]

Cazuza raises in this excerpt the possibility of thinking through the childhood that is left behind along the way, amidst fleeting times, immersed in a strong hug that is a safe port, but, at the same time, in the dark of what is impossible to be fully known. Darkness that raises fear but also shines in the traces that are, inevitably, lost and cannot be controlled. This is the naïve beauty that teaches us the subtlety of the experiences with the other, which escape the attempts to capture through metrics or objective validations but that, as traces, inscribe themselves as marks of what is no longer there and, thus, continue to give meaning to something that stays and, at the same time, vanishes.

In this sense, the song announces the impossibility of completing the senses, reminding us of experience/evidence as something that takes place in the in-between – between what was and what still is not, between what is lost and what is reinvented, as an event that destabilizes us and that connects with what we have been calling here *experience*, which happens when opening to the other, in the incompleteness that establish us, produced in the suspension of certainty and that transgresses the attempts of control. Cazuza provokes us to experience the weight of affection and lightness of the unsaid, in the defense for *experienc*ing our practices in what opens to the incalculable – in what remains, in what insists, and in what reinvents itself as (im)possibility. The homage to his grandmother is a lived encounter with the other – be it in the family relationship or in the pedagogical practice –, which escapes any anticipation and falls apart, leaving its marks. This mark is not a trace of something that is over, but the opening to the possibility of an experience that is not concluded, which is reenacted in the gesture, the memory, and the affection, as a powerful language to think about other possibilities in science and teaching.

We follow with L. who makes us think science through the bias of what cannot be predicted and that should not be reduced to methodologies and guidelines that seek to control meanings and produce calculated recipes. Years later, when resuming the dialogue with L., he says, as a confession, that he "had no idea of what would be the result of that…I just experimented". In this gesture, there is something that escapes the logic of anticipation and that gets closer to an inventive movement, as Manoel de Barros (1996, p. 53) reminds us:

Science can classify and name the organs of a thrush[3]
But do not measure their wonders.
Science cannot measure how many horsepower there are
in the wonders of a thrush.
Who accumulates much information loses the power to divine: divinare.
Thrushes divie.

There is something that exceeds calculation and that, hence, demands another type of knowledge: the enchantment that crosses and resists exactness. When raising L.'s *esperiences*, we highlight the possibility of giving meaning to the world through its incompleteness. In this sense, incompleteness is not a lack, but a condition of possibility for meaning. What does not happen as full presence, but as a movement that differs, that postpones, that reinscribes itself, transgresses, "divining" in our classrooms, in the processes of reading and writing, amidst the many beauties we do not know and will always be left behind along the way…let us dive in the darkness that is also illuminated!

[3] Translated from the original in Brazilian Portuguese: A ciência pode classificar e nomear os órgãos de um sabiá/mas não pode medir os seus encantos./A ciência não pode medir quantos cavalos de força existem/nos encantos de um sabiá./Quem acumula muita informação perde o condão de adivinhar: divinare./Os sabiás divinam.

References

ALMEIDA, Marcia Furlan de. A desconstrução derridiana e o processo criativo de Pina Bausch. *ETD - Educação Temática Digital*, v. 20, n. 1, p. 118, 15 jan. 2018. DOI 10.20396/etd.v20i1.8647809. Disponível em: https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/etd/article/view/8647809. Acesso em: 11 dez. 2019.

ALMEIDA, Marina. *Mia Couto: contar histórias para tomar posse do mundo*. Disponível em: https://www.escrevendoofuturo.org.br/blog/literatura-em-movimento/mia-couto-contar-historias-para-tomar-posse-do-mundo. Acesso em 08 jul. 2023.

BARROS, Manoel de. *Livro sobre nada*. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 1996.

BERTÉ, Odailso Sinvaldo. Dança e cultura pop. *Revista Digital do LAV*, v. 8, n. 4, p. 18–42, 2015.

BHABHA, Homi K. *O local da cultura*. 2. ed. Belo Horizonte, MG: UFMG, 2013.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Alfabetização baseada na ciência: manual do curso ABC*. 2021. Disponível em: https://alfabetizacao.mec.gov.br/images/pdf/manual_do_curso_abc.PDF. Acesso em: 7 maio 2023.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Alfabetização. *PNA: Política Nacional de Alfabetização*. Brasília, DF: MEC/SEALF, 2019.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Alfabetização. *Relatório Nacional de Alfabetização Baseada em Evidências (RENABE)*. 2020. Disponível em: https://www.gov.br/mec/pt-br/media/acesso_informacacao/pdf/RENABE_web.pdf. Acesso em: 7 fev. 2023.

DERRIDA, Jacques. *A escritura e a diferença*. Trad. Maria B. M. Nizza da Silva et al. 4. ed. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2009.

DERRIDA, Jacques. Carta a um amigo japonês. In: OTTONI, Paulo (org.). *A prática da diferença*. Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp, 2005. p. 19–25.

DERRIDA, Jacques. *Une certaine possibilité impossible. Dire l'événement, est-ce possible? Séminaire de Montréal*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2001.

DERRIDA, Jacques; ROUDINESCO, Elizabeth. *De que amanhã: diálogo*. Trad. André Telles. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2004.

FRAGOZO, Fernando. Ciência, verdade, invenção: uma reflexão sobre a questão da ciência em Heidegger e Derrida. *Especiaria – Caderno de Ciências Humanas*, v. 19, n. 34, jan./jun. 2019.

FRANGELLA, Rita de Cássia Prazeres. Currículo como local da cultura: enunciando outras perspectivas em diálogo com Homi Bhabha. In: REUNIÃO ANUAL DA ANPED, 32., 2009, Caxambu. *Sociedade, cultura e educação: novas regulações?* Rio de Janeiro: ANPEd, 2009. v. 1, p. 1–13.

FRANGELLA, Rita de Cássia Prazeres. Ou isto ou aquilo: ou isto ou aquilo... e vivo escolhendo o dia inteiro! – Currículo e alfabetização para além das evidências. *Revista de Educação*, PUC-Campinas, v. 25, 2020. Disponível em: https://www.redalyc.org/journal/5720/572064945030/572064945030.pdf. Acesso em: 10 mar. 2023.

FRANGELLA, Rita de Cássia Prazeres. Palestra proferida na mesa Ciclo Dialógico 2: Conhecimento, cultura e tecnologias. 4 nov. 2019. *VI Seminário Web Currículo Educação e Humanismo*. Disponível em: https://www.pucsp.br/webcurriculo/programacao. (informação oral).

FREIRE, Maria Continentino. Pensar ver: Derrida e a desconstrução do 'modelo ótico' a partir das artes do visível. 2014. 194 f. Tese (Doutorado em Filosofia) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, 2014. Disponível em: https://www.maxwell.vrac.puc-rio.br/24546/24546.PDF.

HADDOCK-LOBO, Rafael. Notas sobre o trajeto aporético da noção de experiência no pensamento de Derrida. *Educação e Filosofia*, v. 27, n. 53, p. 259-274, 2013. Disponível em: https://seer.ufu.br/index.php/EducacaoFilosofia/article/view/14271/12687. Acesso em: 1 ago. 2022.

HAMMERSLEY, Martyn. Algumas questões sobre a prática baseada em evidências na educação. In: THOMAS, Gary; PRING, Richard (orgs.). *A educação baseada em evidências: a utilização dos achados científicos para a qualificação da prática pedagógica*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2007. p. 143-160.

LOPES, Alice Casimiro; BORGES, Veronica. Formação docente, um projeto impossível. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, v. 45, n. 157, p. 486–507, set. 2015. DOI: 10.1590/198053143065. Disponível em: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0100-15742015000300486&lng=pt&tlng=pt. Acesso em: 3 fev. 2020.

LOPES, Alice Casimiro; MACEDO, Elizabeth. Currículo e cultura: o lugar da ciência. In: LIBÂNEO, José Carlos; ALVES, Nilda (orgs.). *Temas de pedagogia: diálogos entre didática e currículo*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

LOPES, Alice Casimiro; MACEDO, Elizabeth. *Teorias de currículo*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

LOPES, Alice Casimiro; SISCAR, Marcos. *Pensando a política com Derrida: responsabilidade, tradução, porvir*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2018.

LYOTARD, Jean-François. *A condição pós-moderna*. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 2021.

MACEDO, Elizabeth. A noção de crise e a legitimação de discursos curriculares. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, v. 13, n. 3, p. 436-450, set./dez. 2013.

MEC. Secretaria de Alfabetização (Sealf). *Relatório de programas e ações 2019-2022: Secretaria de Alfabetização*. Brasília, DF, 2022. Disponível em: https://alfabetizacao.mec.gov.br/images/pdf/relatorio_sealf_2019_2022.pdf. Acesso em: 21 jun. 2023.

PINAR, William. *Estudos curriculares: ensaios selecionados*. Seleção, organização e revisão técnica de Alice Casimiro Lopes e Elizabeth Macedo (orgs.). São Paulo: Cortez, 2016.

PLATÃO. *A República*. Tradução de Maria Helena da Rocha Pereira. 7. ed. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1993.

SOUSA, Demmy Cristina Ribeiro de. *Macbeth (1606) de Shakespeare, entre o teatro clássico e a dança-teatro contemporânea: obras de Pina Bausch (1977-1978) e dois processos criativos*. Manaus: Universidade do Estado do Amazonas, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras e Artes, 2020. Dissertação (Mestrado).

Editor Responsável: Alboni Marisa Dudeque Pianovski Vieira

Recebido/Received: 30.07.2025 / 07.30.2025

Aprovado/Approved: 02.11.2025 / 11.02.2025