ON BECOMING ENTANGLED: THE FORMATIVE EXPERIENCE IN A LETTERS COURSE THROUGH THE TRANSLATION PRACTICE

Raulino Batista Figueiredo Neto[1]
Marilene de Souza Maia[2]

ABSTRACT

In this article we aimed at establishing, through an interdisciplinary perspective, a dialogue with the areas of Translation, English Language Teaching and Philosophy. Such reflections refer, for the most part, on the empowering process of pre-service English teachers in the acquisitional *milieu*. Resorting to this understanding, the present article intends to enable the setting of a reflection around the interdependent and constituting relationship among translation activity, learning process and formative experience. Therefore, we search, all along this text, the establishment of key points which help in the understanding of student's linguistic-communicative development, as well as their movement towards the teaching of this target-language.

Keywords: translation, formative experience, learning, empowerment.

General introduction

When it comes to talking about the formative experience of pre-service English teachers, what normally comes to mind, besides the whole lot of concerns[3], is a twofold *pedagolinguistic* paragon, that is, the mastery of the language (including its interwoven cultural counterpart in the teaching of this target-language) and the pedagogical resources which are, by all means, priceless elements operating as constituent parts of the teaching realm. In fact, when we think upon the teaching/learning of English we, inadvertently, bring to the fore the very question of the theoretical and practical paths

---

[1] PhD student and Master in Language and Culture from the Federal University of Bahia, (UFBA), Salvador, BA. E-mail: raulnetto1@yahoo.com.br

[2] Specialist in Translation from Centro Universitário Claretiano and Specialist in English Language Teaching from Instituto Pró-Saber. E-mail: nenamaia@hotmail.com

[3] Among the concerns we referred to, we may list a few: the method(s) to be employed, the allotted time destined to theoretical and practical components and student's attendance in the academic extracurricular activities.

through which students (pre-service English teachers) start marching on. The referred concern could be best understood by the following question: what materiality matrix do students resort to when brewing their formal training in the target-language and its teaching?

Even though we are well aware that answers are not set in stone (mainly in the contemporary setting of language studies), we could, undoubtedly, take Translation as a possible answer for the posed question and justified by the existing *pedagolinguistic* phenomena materialized in a Letters course. Therefore, it is through its practice of code-breaking that the foreignness of the target language, gives rise to the strategies of subjectivation, that is, "[…] procedures which make way to the production of new identity signs[4]." (MENDES, 2008, p.74)[5]. Thus, working as a trigger to the onset of learning, the subjectivation seen in the translation practice takes charge of the actual professional alongside with his/her linguistic training, for that matter.

To put it plainly, the association between the learning/teaching of English language and Translation, more than a self-evident mingling of theories, codes and signs , turns itself into the *sine qua non* condition for the constitution of subjects and, more importantly, of subjectivities. Under this rationale we take the idea of subjectivation as having a close relationship with the process of negotiation of meaning[6] and as the social counterpart related to it. Aligned to this very construct, Mansano (2009, p.111) sustains:

> [...] the other can be understood as the social other, but also as the nature, the events and the inventions, that is, anything which takes effect in the bodies and in the ways of being. Such effects get spread through the multiple components of subjectivity which circulate in the social field.

It is thus, through the merging of teaching and learning that we set forth, not only the space for discussion and reflection, but also the assumption of Translation as the prime tool for the deciphering process of learning how to teach and, likewise, how to operate in the target-language. In other words, we have envisioned Translation as an

---

[4] We can understand "new identity signs" as the defining features which can be integrated to one's socio-cultural persona.
[5] Our translation.
[6] A process that speakers go through to reach a clear understanding of each other.

important representative of what Figueiredo Neto (2014, p.124) has dubbed *the paradox of linguistic ubiquity*. According to the author this paradox is a conception within which:

> [...] the learner-user is someone who simultaneously occupies two distinctive places, that is to say, he/she is, at the same time, a foreign language learner (with all the implications present in this instance, including his/her languaging[7] process and hybridity) and a pre-service teacher (a subject from whom it is expected the production of a standard language for the oncoming teaching). Unlike the average language learner, the one with whom we operate (pre-service language teachers), move between two realms, that is, this subject is, at the same time, a language learner and an apprentice of the process on how to teach it.[8]

Seen in these terms, the proposal presented here falls within the idea of Translation, not as a void vector of switching codes, but as the main means for the shaping of pre-service English teachers. Therefore, the present article additionally refers to the comprehension of Translation, in the big picture, as the focal point through which the formative experience takes place.

The crux of the matter: the idea of translation in the formative process

Transfering, expressing, interpreting. Alongside with these words – synonym signs for translation - we can start off the weaving of our discussion, that is, the actual depiction of the ways Translation encompasses student's formative process. In addition, the multiple uses of different words conveying and converging to the same idea[9] help us in the outlining of the construct on which we base our considerations. In other words, a more comprehensive grasping of translation, at least the one we present here, can only take place when, and if, we face it as an (inter)cultural process of interpretation unveiled *in* and *through* the language.

This way, admitting it as Translation's counterpart, we can also bring forth the notion of *cultural interpretation* by Geertz (1973). According to this concept, the idea

---

[7] A term coined by authors like Phipps (2007) to whom learners/users of a foreign language, in the process of language utterance, establish a linguistic negotiation taking advantage of meaningful, comprehensible output along the interactions in the foreign language.
[8] Our translation.
[9] We could also call it as the *heteronimic device*, one of the stratagems employed in the very labor of translation.

of interpreting must be tied to a deep comprehension of the cultural phenomena which permeate society, (the investigated microcosm).Ratifying this understanding, the author states:

> If anthropological interpretation is constructing a reading of what happens, then to divorce it from what happens-from what, in this time or that place, specific people say, what they do, what is done to them, from the whole vast business of the world-is to divorce it from its applications and render it vacant. A good interpretation of anything- a poem, a person, a history, a ritual, an institution, a society-takes us into the heart of that of which it is the interpretation. (GEERTZ, 1973, p. 18).

Thus, the "good interpretation", referred to by Geertz, allows us to establish a blatant analogy between the process of translating/interpreting and the efforts employed by students along their *pedagolinguistic* learning. In this sense, by assuming the so-called "good interpretation" as a major aspect in the language teacher training, it is fundamental to make room for a twofold gearing, a procedure which gathers both an operating mode and a theoretical construct. Thus, the fusion of those elements, along with Geertz's enterprise, points out to a perspective very much in line with the idea of cultural interpretation and its overt connection with interculturality. Such a link permits us to take Translation as the privileged discursive arena for the development of language teachers as *intercultural interpreters*, an accurate epithet for the constant exchanges between the source and the target languages, as well as the theoretical contents present in the pedagogical training for the language teaching.

Furthermore, what we find in this place is an ongoing back and forth movement, a march towards the cracking of both linguistic and pedagogical codes, an effort with which students turn themselves into "crossers of cultures" as stated by Anzaldua (1987). According to her, this border crossing, (a genuine bridging tool), manages "[…] to transfer ideas and information from one culture to another" (ANZALDUA, 1987, p. 107). In light of that, students end up taking on a new discursive dimension, something we could ascribe to their ubiquitous condition. Accordingly, being in this moving place demands a set of ways to interpret the verbal signs materialized in the classroom setting.

Following this understanding, Jakobson (1958/2000) further states that, in order for anyone to grasp the meaning present in verbal signs, it is fundamental to resort to other linguistic signs. To put it another way, it is vital, for the sake of communication,

the searching for signs which can enrich and reinforce the meaning we previously dealt with. In tune with this rationale Jakobson points out that:

> [...] translation from one language into another substitutes messages in one language not for separate code-units but for entire messages in some other language. Such a translation is a reported speech; **the translator recodes and transmits a message received from another source[10]**. Thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes. (JAKOBSON, 1958, in VENUTI, 2000, p. 114).

Thus, assuming translators as recoders and transmitters of the languages at stake, the creation of strategies for the comprehension and development in the language teaching training becomes an inescapable issue. With this in mind, we go back to Jakobson's premises and what he refers to as the *three different kinds of translation*. Once these categories have become pretty much known in the area, we have decided to bring them with their respective labels as well as their connections with the language classroom and the metalanguage it originates from.

To start with, we can take the *intralingual translation[11]*, (the rewording process within the language[12]), as the very device through which students start operating with when exposed, for instance, to pedagogical issues, regardless they are conducted in English or in Portuguese[13]. In this instance, students resort to some sort of paraphrastic operation with which they reformulate meaning while exposed to the myriad of technical terms of the language teaching.

In such a way, it is very frequent to observe students coping with difficulties related, in most cases, to the understanding of conceptual jargons of the area. To give just a few examples, we can mention the words *Method*, *Approach* and *Technique*, recurrent terms in Disciplines such as *English Teaching Practicum* whose meanings are taken by students, in general, as synonyms. Therefore, it is within the seemingly misunderstanding of the words, that students start, via the help of the teacher trainer, the

---

[10] Our emphasis.

[11] Even though we know this kind of translation happens in an intuitive way, it has been important to take advantage of its definition and scope in order for us to figure out student's evolving in the classroom.

[12] The *rewording process* can be associated to whatever language used by students, (English or Portuguese in our case).

[13] Besides the components conducted in English, there are those which are mostly worked in Portuguese, like English Teaching Practicum.

rewording process towards the reformulation and negotiation of meaning in the intralingual translation.

As for the *interlingual translation*, the "proper translation" as states Jakobson (1958/2000), we deem it to be the one which best resonates the crossing of the language-cultures at stake, the operating mode where languages and cultures, irrespective of their *languacultural[14]* clash, manages to generate the metalinguistic learning process.

Given the fact that students are faced with a sizeable amount of input, (both linguistic and pedagogical), it becomes clear that, in order for them to empower themselves in this learning process, they need to constantly feed on the verbal codes through which they have become ,not only learners, but users. In this sense, with the purpose of illustrating this *interlingual translation*, we resort to some excerpts originated from our ethnographic observations in the *Language Laboratory* classes with the students of Letters at the State University of Bahia – UNEB/Campus XIV. In the following fragment it is noteworthy the way students take chances in the language, trying to accurately approach the best translation for the Portuguese word *FIÉIS[15]*.

97. **Léo** – I start (…) This is my classroom and…and I will comment about my TRUE friends of this room (…) What is a friend guys? (...) in my opinion, (...) in my opinion, I think… that (.) a friend is someone who show (…) show the best in you (…) é[16] (…) I have many (...) many friends and I always can count with my friends (…) and they can count with me too (…) because I think I'm a good friend for them… finish. 98. **Thales** – I'm really happy to be… uh…to have my friends. I think that friends bring out (...) how can I say? Uh… they BRING OUT positive feelings, but if they are false it's better to be alone (…) for my luck my friends are good people and very (…) How do you say *FIÉIS*? 99. **SS[17]** – (superposition of voices) 100. Samuel – Faithful? Isn't it faithful? (superposition of voices) 101. **Caio** – I guess (superposition of voices.)… I think LOYAL would be a nice pick (.) loyal (...) it would be my choice. 102. **T1[18]** – RELIABLE ((writing on the board)) is a good option for the meaning (...) the meaning you want to (...) convey… go on

---

[14] Term borrowed from Agar (2002) related to his comprehension of language and culture as interdependent chains.

[15] Faithful in English.

[16] A hesitation marker used in Portuguese and which represents, in the given excerpt, a code switching process.

[17] Superposition of student's voices.

[18] Once we have researched two different teachers we needed to identify them by using T1 and T2.

Thales (…) just go on… 103. Thales – I'm lost now ((laughs)) (superposition of voices)… YES, right (…) reliable friends, that's all (.) NEXT ((laughs))

With the purpose of carving the most accurate word, students make use of their *interlinguistic knowledge* turning themselves, by this means, into linguistic border crossers. Together with the dialogic interaction in the search for the best translation, it becomes clear the little lapses produced by students when uttering in the target language[19], a process that shapes learning as well as represents the negotiation of meaning and the development of translation itself.

Coupled with the cited processes, we add Jakobson's *Intersemiotic Translation*, or, as the author dubs, "transmutation". Strictly speaking, this transmutation establishes a movement which enables students to interpret the "[…] verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems" (JAKOBSON, 1958, in VENUTI, 2000, p. 114). Therefore, this third kind of translation takes on the role of a semiotic vehicle working, by this means, as a meta-metalinguistic device. To put it another way, it is under the guise of linguistic training that students are led to recreate and transform the primary semiosis they deal with, (the linguistic code[20]), into different ones, like the filmic[21], for example. Thus, what stands out in the intersemiotic translation, as observed in the course, is the student's ability to move from one code to another with the aim of evolving in the language they learn/use.

Translation: awareness raising and autopoiesis

To what extent could we associate Translation to the awareness raising[22] in the target language? Similarly we ask: in what way does Translation account for the notion of *autopoiesis*?

Having started this section with such questions, we are left in charge of weaving the grounds for the intersection between *metacognition* and *autopoiesis*. Thus, reflecting on Translation as conducive to the learning may help us, and our students, take stock of

---

[19] Even though some of their utterances are not in tune with the standard English, there is a blatant development when it comes to linguistic resourcefulness.

[20] The literary texts, song lyrics,etc.

[21] We have developed in the course a Project called *Dramarama*, which aims at transforming the English literary texts into short films or even plays.

[22] As awareness raising we consider the metacognitive learning of the target language and, as a consequence, the pedagogy on how to teach this language.

the *pedagolinguistic* situation in which they are located. In other words, it is by means of this perception that students ignite their metacognitive action in the stream of translation. Therefore, in line with these observations Anderson (2002, p. 02) asserts:

> Metacognition can be defined simply as thinking about thinking. Learners who are metacognitively aware know what to do when they don't know what to do; that is, they have strategies for finding out or figuring out what they need to do. The use of metacognitive strategies ignites one's thinking and can lead to more profound learning and improved performance, especially among learners who are struggling. Understanding and controlling cognitive processes may be one of the most essential skills that classroom teachers can help second language learners develop. It is important that they teach their students metacognitive skills in addition to cognitive skills.

As Anderson points out, metacognition should be granted a significant role in the language classroom as it aims at promoting awareness on strategies and, more importantly, on the understanding and controlling of these processes. What comes together with this assertion, then, is the assumption that Translation, taken here as omnipresent in the language classroom, has meant the main propeller for the onset of language learning/use and, as we have stated, for the emergence of metacognition in the classroom setting.

In view of this, Translation's alluded omnipresence must be seen as the igniter of both linguistic and pedagogical training, once it enables student's potential development in the target language and thereby in their ensuing *ownership* of the Other's sign[23]. In plain words, translation must be seen as a communicative action *per se*, something that goes far beyond the immediate scope of changing and transporting codes. According to this rationale, Translation, we reckon, should be placed in the linguistic stream of communication and given the status of linguistic-communicative booster. It is thus with the idea of metacognition, within and through the Translation labor, that we depart to the philosophical concept of *autopoiesis*[24]. Originated from the Greek language, the word *poiesis* means production and its derivative term, *autopoiesis*, self-production. Following this concept the autopoietic systems are, by definition,

---

[23] With the idea of owning the other's sign we refer to the process of appropriation that students normally take in order to move between the mother tongue and the Other's. It is thus, according to what we have noticed, a phenomenon which accounts for student's acquisitional evolving.
[24] The word was first employed in 1974 in an article published by Varela, Maturana and Uribe, with the aim of defining living beings as systems which continually produce themselves.

continually composed and recomposed as an ongoing cycle, something taken by Mariotti (1999) as a system which is, at the same time, "producer and product".

Hence, we sustain that the philosophical dimension drawn from *autopoiesis* comes very much in handy with the notion of subjectivity and the production of subjectivation we have earlier mentioned. Bringing this rationale to the *milieu* of Translation we end up reinforcing the notion of "producer and product" as a symbiotic process integrated and entangled with the linguistic-communicative experience. By virtue of this twofold concept, we fall back on Maturana, Uribe and Varela´s proposal of "autopoietic machines" (MATURANA; URIBE; VARELA, p. 78, 1974). According to the authors:

> An autopoietic machine is a machine organized […] as a network of processes of production (transformation and destruction) of components that produces the components which: (i) through their interactions and transformations continuously regenerate and realize the network of processes (relations) that produced them; and (ii) constitute it (the machine) as a concrete unity in the space in which they (the components) exist by specifying the topological domain of its realization[25].

This "network of processes of production", as stated above, is in tune with the admission of Translation as a catalyst of the language learning development. Thus, the continuous process of experimentation needed in the Translation labor, as we have outlined, fully meets the logic of recreation originated in *autopoiesis*. As such, we can promptly take Translation as an autopoietic machine itself. In other words, as a means for the recreation, not only of codes in another language, but for the emergence of an interculturally sensitive individual to differences which forge him/her as both a language user and a language teacher.

Running through the concepts

As we have presented so far, the *pedagolinguistic* formative experience is encompassed by Translation, inasmuch as it operates as a multiple learning agent in the sense we have been sustaining. The referred *multiple agency* is, therefore, housed in the ongoing process of experiencing the languages involved and their cultural substrate. It is, thus, through the intercultural construct, a blatant languacultural mingling, that we

---

[25] Italics by the authors.

line up with Widdowson (1991). According to him, Translation, taken in a certain way, is supposed to be a highly efficient pedagogical device, mainly when it is used for specific purposes[26].

This way, when we think upon Translation as a language learning vector, it is equally important to consider what Branco (2009, p. 188) states. For the author the languacultural influences over the learning of a foreign language must be explored so we can, as language teachers, present the underlying peculiarities associated to both the student's mother tongue and the target one. Following this standpoint, it becomes clear that the very exercise of Translation enables our students to perceive that the absence of a thorough symmetry between languages is, precisely, what enriches and makes way to the autopoietic production as already mentioned.

Thus, it could be said that Translation is the catalyst of differences and, as a result, the propeller of the languacultural subject along with its emergence in the classroom setting. To put it another way, Translation sets up the acknowledgement of a distinction between languages giving rise – within the very process of acquisition – to the application of something we could name *neighboring meaning*. According to this, it is along their journey towards meaning-making that students can capitalize, not only on syntactic aspects, but above all, on communication itself, that is, the ability to produce and convey messages.

Given this, we can state that the Translation labor, (in the fashion we have been discussing), assembles essential components without which no meaningful result, in terms of communication, can be accomplished. Thus, this mingling is comprised of, at least, seven components, namely, *Strategies of subjectivation*, *Interpretation*, *Jackobson's three kinds of translation (Intralingual, Interlingual and Intersemiotic)*, *Metacognition* and *Autopoiesis*.

As stated above, it is through the joining of those mutually related components that we can encourage the admission of Translation as a complex operation, something which goes far beyond a mere deciphering source. Translation then takes on an important role as a language teaching device; a set of *languacultural* procedures working together and competing for the onset of language learning. Considering this and examining each of the components we summarize their potential scope as follows:

---

[26] Unlike Widdowson, we think that the effectiveness of Translation has a much broader scope, as we have suggested so far.

a) **Strategies of subjectivation:** the processes implied in the triggering of subjects as producers, encoders and decoders of new identity signs;

b) **Interpretation:** an (inter)cultural process unveiled through the language and inescapably integrated to it. An operation in which interculturality, along with its semiotic interrelantionships take place;

c) **Intralingual Translation:** a paraphrastic operation with which interpreters (meaning makers) reshape and reframe the languacultural signs at stake;

d) **Interlingual Translation:** the operating mode where languages and cultures collide and converge, at the same time, generating a new languacultural materiality;

e) **Intersemiotic Translation:** a transmutation of codes; an adaptation of the verbal language to the non-verbal one;

f) **Metacognition:** awareness of one's cognitive operations implying in the mastery and monitoring of important cognitive processes[27];

g) **Autopoiesis:** one's self-organized operation, that is, the processes of production accomplished by and within the relationships one builds around himself/herself. In other words, one's critical and creative construction.

As we have sustained so far, Translation ends up taking charge of an important part in the teaching/learning *milieu*, once it operates equipping teachers and language students with the appreciation of a twofold culturality: one's and the other's. In plain words this alluded twofoldedness could be best illustrated as an intercultural endowment, something made possible through what we have termed *collision and convergence complex*. It is also valid to state that it is through this operation that we can make way to the empowering process of both teachers and pre-service language teachers. In this sense, it seems suitable to us to admit Translation as a privileged stage for the learning of a foreign language and its teaching.

Legal documents: what do they say?

Having scrutinized the elements immediately related to the teaching, production and learning of English language,[28] it is necessary the setting of an analysis geared

---

[27] Among the cognitive processes we may list: reasoning, memory, perception, action and emoting.

towards the instance in which the institutional practices of teaching and learning are depicted. In other words, a document analysis on the formative instance governed by the English Language curriculum of the State University of Bahia. Hence, we deal in this section with some of the guiding elements of the Course, here represented by the Curricular Guidelines as well as by their related aspects.

This way, and in tune with the Guidelines presented in the Curriculum of the Department of Education – Campus XIV, the main purpose of the Course is that of "[...] forming interculturally competent professionals, able to critically cope with the languages, especially the verbal one, in the oral and written contexts, as well as being aware of their full participation in society including the relationship with the other". With the argument that the main purpose of the Course is "forming interculturally competent professionals", the legal document leaves the way open for the setting of an intercultural rationale as a condition for the critical formation of pre-service teachers. Thus, the cultural/intercultural prevalence in the Translation labor is endorsed by the institutional sphere and regarded as a mandatory aspect in the spheres of teaching and learning languages. Furthermore, what we observe in the Guidelines is a clear reference to the language professionals and the overall languacultural demands expected from them.

To put it plainly, the inner idea present in the document has to do with something we have termed *Translation beyond the immediacy of codes*. In this respect, we also find in the Guidelines a clear reference to the language professional as someone supposed to hold the "[...] mastery in the language(s) use which are the target of his/her studies, in terms of their structure, functioning, cultural expressions, and the awareness on language and cultural varieties. In addition, we sustain, it is also expected from this subject, and the others to whom they relate, the ability of theoretically reflecting on the linguistic phenomena, through both a covert and an overt Translation. Such considerations gain an increasingly resonance when articulated, as we find in the document, "[...] in the perspective of perception of the language role within society." (2010, p.109) It is, thus, through the perception outlined in the excerpt, that we take the communicative practices as a co-construction, a dialogical negotiation made possible through the act of translating.

---

[28] The processes of teaching and learning we have brought are related, here, to the Translation labor in the fashion we have been dealing.

In accordance with these considerations we find in the Curriculum an important reference to the learner's expected abilities and competences. For the accomplishment of such, we must establish, as stated by the Document, the development of processes which lead learners to the following actions:

• having the mastery of linguistic structures and their use in a variety of contexts, with competence for the production and grasping of oral and written texts in the target language;

• establishing interrelationships between the social-historical transitions and the linguistic changes as well as the establishment of a relationship amongst language, culture and society;

• critically analyzing the linguistic and literary theories;

• reflecting about the diverse textual and literary genres with reference to their defining and distinguishing structural characteristics;

• proceeding with the analysis of the literary text while setting a connection between literature and racial-ethnic, social, historical, political and cultural events;

• *performing translation activities carrying out the semantic, syntactic and stylistic matching in the transposition of the studied source language to the target one*[29].

• proceeding with a comparative analysis involving the morphosyntactic, semantic, stylistic and pragmatic levels between the studied foreign language and the mother tongue;

• providing teaching with the ability of methodological intervention in the teaching-learning process, problem solving and promotion of educational alternatives in his/her workplace as well as an ongoing assessment of students' process and product;

• using both knowledge and resources produced in the technological fields available for the implementation in the teaching practice;

• designing projects and developing researches while establishing an inter- and/or trans-disciplinary connection with the constituting thematic axes of the Course, as well as articulating the researches results with the teaching practice towards its (re)signification.

As seen in the excerpt, the development proposed by the Course must be taken as an important hallmark for the acknowledgement of Translation as a key tool for the

[29] Our emphasis.

interpretation, negotiation and meaning-making in the realms of both language and teaching. For the sake of comprehension, it is worth noting that the abilities and competences, as depicted above, further reinforce the role of Translation alongside with their components in the *pedagolinguistic* agenda outlined by the Course.

Accordingly, the document provides important considerations about one's interaction towards the process of linguistic use and the inherent cultural component present in this operation. Hence, what stands out in this procedure is the arousal of a mediation between the source language and the target one. In this view, the subject majoring in the teaching of English or any other foreign language, much more than operating ways of teaching, must be someone who performs/translates as a means to bring up a social and languacultural action; a Translation of the microcosm represented by the language classroom.

Final Considerations

In this paper, we have discussed the role of Translation as a primary means for the formative experience in a Letters Course and the processes that engender both teaching and learning. Irrespective of the method or multimethods employed, the language taught/learned, we must acknowledge, is always dependent on a plethora of interpreting and meaning making operations within the Translation labor itself.

Posing as an omnipresent part of the foreign language classroom, Translation, as we have highlighted, embodies some key aspects in language education by virtue of its prime character: the interpretative one. It is thus within this realm that we unveil two distinct and complementary operations, that is, the increase of one's linguistic awareness, on the one hand, and the pedagogical training required from the pre-service teacher on the other hand. With regard to the linguistic awareness we side with Dagiliene (2012, p. 124) who argues that,

> Translation heightens language awareness. While translating students are focused on identifying differences in structure and vocabulary, they have to evolve strategies to deal with them and to negotiate the potential of both languages. The real usefulness of translation in foreign language classes lies in comparison of grammar, vocabulary, word order and other language points in the target language and the student's mother tongue. Students are directly exposed to contrasting language systems of the target and the native languages. Therefore,

the learners should be required to discuss and correct common mistakes.

As for the pedagogical training it is clear that to achieve a thorough comprehension about teaching and its multifaceted realm, it is equally important to capitalize on the same procedures used for the evolving of language awareness. In other words, it is by way of these procedures that students start off their enabling process towards the technical and structuring aspects of language teaching. Therefore, in line with this, we fall back on Figueiredo Neto (2014, p. 124), according to whom:

> [...] there is in the very nature of the Course a mediation and a steady balance of forces with regard to the student's formative process. Therefore, these subjects, far from posing "solely" as language learners, are, above all, acquirers of the metalanguage which characterizes teaching training, and it is precisely from this condition which must derive a continuous comprehension regarding the complexity of the Course and that of the languacultural phenomena entangled with it.[30]

From this perspective, we may infer that Translation, due to its inherent intercultural status, an ubiquitous condition, poses as an undeniable source of support and, moreover, of ignition for the strengthening of the language teaching/learning. It is not without reason that we take Translation, as the materiality matrix of the formative weaving in a language teacher training Course. Performing in a foreign language and employing the pedagogy on how to teach it, require, as we have hinted, a resourceful use of both the languages and the cultures at stake. In light of this, we are left with the belief that the link that cements the learning of a foreign language and its pedagogy lies in the complex and pervasive act of Translation.

Observing the context of the linguistic teaching/learning at UNEB, it is customary to find students taking chances and meaning making with the language while interpreting and reframing their pedagolinguistic experience. By using Translation, students end up bridging the gap between the linguistic learning and the teaching one. Moreover, it could be said that this whole operation shapes students as much as it is ceaselessly shaped by them, a co-constructive process in linguistic education.

Finally, we believe that Translation should be given a more overt recognition in the language educational setting. Such importance, we argue, may be attributed to its

---

[30] Our translation.

Revista de Letras Norte@mentos
Estudos Linguísticos, Sinop, v. 9, n. 19, p. 36-52, jul./dez. 2016.

50

undeniable pervasiveness within all levels of both pedagogical and linguistic experience. Whether Translation enjoys the position of an intercultural broker, the fact remains that there is still the urge to place it as the synergic counterpart of language teaching training courses everywhere else.

References

AGAR, Michael. *Language shock*. 1. ed. Nova York: Perennial, 2002.

ANDERSON, N. J. *The Role of Metacognition in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. ERIC Digest. Washington, DC, 2002. Disponível em: <http://www.ericdigests.org/2003-1/role.htm>. Acesso em: 01 dez. 2015.

ANZALDÚA, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1987.

BRANCO, Sinara de Oliveira. Teorias da tradução e o ensino de língua estrangeira. *Horizontes de Linguística Aplicada*, v. 8, n. 2, 2009, p. 185-199.

DAGILIENE, INGA. Translation as a Learning Method in English Language Teaching. *Studies about languages*, n. 21, 2012, p. 124-129.

FIGUEIREDO NETO, R.B. *Dialogando no terceiro lugar: o uso intercultural da língua inglesa por professores em formação em um curso de Letras*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Língua e Cultura). 2014. 169f. Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador.

GEERTZ, Clifford. *The interpretation of cultures*: selected essays New York: Basic Books, 1973.

JAKOBSON, Roman. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: VENUTI, Lawrence (Ed.). *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge, 2000. p. 113-118.

MANSANO, S. R. V. Sujeito, subjetividade e modos de subjetivação na contemporaneidade. *Revista de Psicologia da UNESP*, v. 8, p. 110-117, 2009.

MARIOTTI, H. *Autopoiese, cultura e sociedade*. 1999. Disponível em: <http://www.geocities.com/pluriversu/autopoies.html>. Acesso em: 2 nov. 2015.

MENDES, Edleise. Língua, cultura e formação de professores: por uma abordagem de ensino intercultural. In: MENDES, Edleise. CASTRO, M.L.S. *Saberes em português: ensino e formação docente*. Campinas/SP: Pontes Editores, 2008. p. 57-77.

PHIPPS, A. *Learning the Arts of Linguistic Survival*: Languaging, Tourism, Life. Multilingual Matters / Channel View in press, 2006.

VARELA, Francisco, MATURANA, Humberto, URIBE, Roberto. *Autopoiesis*: the organization of living systems, its characterization and a model. Biosystems 5:187-196, 1974.

WIDDOWSON, H. D. *O ensino de línguas para a comunicação*. Trad. José Carlos Paes de Almeida Filho, Campinas, SP. Pontes, 1991.

EMARANHANDO-SE: A EXPERIÊNCIA FORMATIVA EM UM CURSO DE LETRAS PELO VIÉS DA PRÁTICA TRADUTÓRIA

RESUMO

Neste artigo procuramos estabelecer, por intermédio de uma perspectiva interdisciplinar, um diálogo com a Tradução, Ensino de Língua Inglesa e Filosofia. Tais reflexões relacionam-se, principalmente, ao processo de empoderamento do professor pré-serviço de língua inglesa na seara aquisitiva. Lançando mão desse entendimento, o presente artigo objetiva o estabelecimento de uma reflexão em torno da relação de interdependência e constitutividade entre ação tradutória, aprendizagem e experiência formativa. Assim, buscamos, ao longo desse trabalho, a instauração de pontos que auxiliem na compreensão do desenvolvimento linguístico-comunicativo dos alunos do curso de Letras com Inglês e de seu movimento rumo à docência dessa língua-alvo.

Palavras-chave: tradução, experiência formativa, aprendizagem, empoderamento.