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Abstract

This dissertation aims to investigate the possible occurrence of effects over Explicitation in a translation of Edna Obrien’s short story ‘The Doll’ using Pajubá, an African-Brazilian in-group language used by the LGBTQIA+ community in Brazil. Two version of the same source text were produced in order to have adequate corpora for analysis. The main focus of the these translations was to explore the linguistic resources each of them had to offer in face of Nord’s functional model (2005). Then, one target text was created in Brazilian Portuguese following the guidelines of a documentary translation model. A second target text in Pajubá was created following the guidelines of an instrumental translation model. These translations were analysed in face their source text considering Blum-Kulka’s ‘Explicitation Hypothesis’ (1986/2000) to check for observable effects over Explicitation when an in-group language is applied to a text produced for an audience other than that group. To do so, levels of Explicitation were established according to percentages of changes in three different categories. In analysing these categories, a few variations in the way Explicitation changes within an in-group language translation were reported. There was evidence point at Explicitation being less substantial in in-group language. Overall, even though instrumental translations are more target text oriented, levels of explicitness reported in the opposite direction were also more expressive for the in-group translation than the ones in the Brazilian Portuguese translation.
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Introduction

The process of translation, particularly if successful, necessitates a complex text and discourse processing. The process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text might lead to a TL text which is more redundant than the SL text. This redundancy can be expressed by a rise in the level of cohesive explicitness in the TL text. This argument may be stated as “the explicitation hypothesis”, which postulates and observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved. (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2000: 300)

The ‘Explicitation Hypothesis’ is introduced as a natural constrain of any given interlingual translation process. Blum-Kulka (1986/2000: 298–313) suggests that an increase in the level of explicitness is unavoidable when comparing a TT to its ST. The theorist does not present categories indicating how explicit a segment or text is but refers to cohesive ties as indicators of its constant occurrence. Blum-Kulka (1986/2000: 302) adds that her hypothesis indicates a ‘universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation’. This proposition considers Explicitation to be a natural strategy speakers and translators use to assure a message is delivered as clearly as possible.

Similarly, in-group language can be considered an enabler of simplified communication amongst peers. Initially performed by African-Brazilian religious adherents, Pajubá is a compact cryptolec widely used by the LGBTQIA+ community in Brazil (Barroso, 2017: 5). According to Vip & Libi (2006), Pajubá is not yet a far-reaching or broadly developed linguistic system. In their term-compilation of the language, the vast majority of items are nouns, adjectives and idiomatic expressions. Considering the compact effect such arrangement produces in user communication, a single item could correspond to an entire group of terms with closely related meanings.

The possible limitation in meaning of items belonging to a specific IGL can pose a challenge to the seemingly vague definition of Explicitation in Blum-Kulka’s hypothesis. Thus, it is pertinent to investigate if there is an observable effect over Explicitation when a given IGL used by one specific group is applied to a completely different public or a material designed to be consumed by the latter. In order to find answers for this query in this study, I will be analysing the effects of Explicitation in a translation of Edna O’Brien’s short story ‘The Doll’ in which Pajubá was employed as the TT language.
Edna O’Brien’s outstanding personality and tradition-breaking publications have made her a recognised Irish dandy (O’Connor, 2006: 39). Although there is no definite indication of a very strict or preferred TA, Norton (2006: 83—85) widely refers to O’Brien’s early work as having been written to be read by Irish women. This most certainly helped build her reputation as a feminist writer as both her contents and style represent a rupture with the standards of female publications at the time.

First published in 1982, ‘The Doll’ is one of the stories chosen to be in the author’s latest collection of short stories (O’Brien, 2015). The production narrates the story of a girl who has her favourite doll taken away from her by a bitter schoolteacher and is filled with symbolism and mostly female characters. A predominantly formal register meets concise instances of colloquial language at times. The tone is mainly melancholic and, often, resonates anger and disappointment. Also, the style in her writing is often remarked due to its highly descriptive and rather long sentences. In ‘The Doll’, she definitely plays with ambiguity as she rages along some seventy-word sentences. Opposing Pajubá is simpler and more direct. It is most commonly used as a spoken language, having plenty of different recognised written forms (Lima, 2017). Some great examples are both the adjective ‘uí’ – which refers to anything that is negative, bad or ugly – and the noun ‘mona’ – which is used to refer to a feminine person regardless of their gender being male or female. Netto Junior (2018) discusses the semantics of the dialect and defines another central aspect of it. He reiterates the slang-like role it has in communication since it also contains words deriving from PTBR. However, amidst Pajubá users, terms often indicate the contrary of or something entirely unrelated to their formal meaning (Netto Junior, 2018: 6—7). The adjective ‘destruidora’, which generally means destructive or demolisher in PTBR, designates a very powerful and accomplished person or situation in Pajubá.

Likewise, the opposition between gendered adjectives in PTBR and the neutral gender in English play a significant part in translation. O’Brien’s creations have elements of masculinity, femininity and gender-related aspects veiled by the use of neutral gender to create ambiguity. The tone of mystery and confusion in sexual innuendos were also stylistic traces recognised by O’Brien herself in an interview with the Canadian Journal of Irish Studies (Pearce & O’Brien, 1996: 5—8). The systemic constrains of PTBR as a gender-based language does not permit such practice. As per gender in Pajubá, Barroso (2017) demonstrates that the cryptolect often designates male objects by using female adjectives or creating female nouns.
A ‘beautiful watch’ is ‘relógio bonito’ in PTBR but ‘relógia bonita’ in Pajubá. Whereas ‘bonita’
is an adjective, which means beautiful, relógia is an invented term and does not belong to the PTBR linguistic system.

All the contextual conflicts mentioned above are supplement to the relevance of the analysis to be presented in this dissertation. The ST and the expected TT could characterise extremely different textual aspects as language tone and register, and extratextual features as the context of reception and their targeted audiences. The acknowledgement of systemic features—which are often intrinsic to any particular language—supplements the input given by Blum-Kulka’s Explicitation hypothesis (1986/2000: 298–313) that different systems cannot have an absolutely mirrored transposition of meaning as form may vary. However, since Blum-Kulka (ibid.) bases her studies mostly on sentence length and sentence-level cohesive ties, this research aims at addressing other influential factors in translation using Nord’s functional model for translation (2005).

**Methodology and Materials**

As with most theories in Translation Studies, Nord’s translation-oriented text analysis (2005) embodies a dualistic approach. For this theoretician, translation can be either product-oriented or process-oriented. In order to decide which practice is the most adequate strategy for a given translation, her functional model incorporates elements of textual analysis to exam the organisation of a text at or above the sentence level (Nord, 2005: 155—188). The documentary translation is a Nord’s (ibid) product-oriented process. In literary translation, it can be easily recognised as a translation by the TTA and a translation at unit level is widely recommended. The instrumental translation is defined as an independent message transmitting instrument aiming at fulfilling a communicative purpose in the TL without necessarily making the TTA aware of its ST. Both processes envision preserving the ST content, and the latter also has a function-preserving property. This property makes the TT seem as if an actual ST for the TTA. A feature that differentiates the propositions of Nord from those of other functionalists’ ideals is the attention to the ST. Nord (2005: 41—143) reiterates the importance of translation commission, the role of an appropriate ST analysis, and the functional hierarchy of translation problems.
As with most IGL, Pajubá consists of a considerably limited communication system within another pre-existing and more complex language (Lima, 2017). Considering that, and following a thorough analysis of the ST, a translation of ‘The Doll’ from English into PTBR was produced to serve as a basis for comparison. Centred on the premises of Nord’s function-based model (2005), I decided to make it a documentary translation. A second translation, from the same ST but now into Pajubá, was created following the guidelines of an instrumental translation. Whereas the first version serves as a reference of the ST to the audience accessing the TT, the functions ascribed to the latter turn it into a possible primary source of meaning seemingly non-deriving from another text previously produced. Due to the idea that Explicitation is one universally natural consequence in translation (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2000: 300—301), I have decided to maintain both translations as distant as possible from each other and the source text, too. Hereafter, the first production will be designated TT1, and TT2 will be used to refer to the second.

To ensure precision and keep this research feasible within the available timeframe, a few preventive decisions regarding the material and methods had to be made. Firstly, once Blum-Kulka’s hypothesis was selected as the principle for determining Explicitation, Edna O’Brien’s ‘The Doll’ (1982/2015) was chosen as the corpus due to both its form and meaning. I intended to translate a complete text instead of fragments in order to be able to make comparisons above sentence level. The ST is 2,631 words long and was divided in 132 segments, meaning both TT1 and TT2 would amount to between four to six thousand words altogether and most segments, if not all, could be analysed individually. I have also selected ‘The Doll’ so the ST would be as far as possible from the TT2 reality I had projected. Two elements were relevant when choosing the methodology and materials; the aforementioned distance between the target audiences as well as the difference in temporal settings. O’Brien’s target audience is mostly believed to be women – frequently Irish or acquainted with life in Ireland – with no defined sexual orientation or age span. As per the target audience of both PTBR and Pajubá Translations, I have considered young Brazilian adults who are male and identify as queer homosexuals with interest in camp talk. In that sense, I considered as my TTA the standard user of Harvey’s concepts of camp talk features (2000) and the stereotypical queer speaker of Pajubá (Barroso, 2017) aged between 20 to 30 years of age currently living in the south of Brazil. The time settings are also relevant as my TTA will be consuming a TT set in 2020, whereas the ST is set in the early nineteen eighties.
All things considered and materials determined, the analyses of both TTs and the ST were grounded on a series of restrictive yes or no questions based on the factors presented in the Explicitation hypothesis (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2000) in face of IGL particularities. Each segment will be assigned a rate of 1 to 5 for each item analysed, following the standards in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considerably Less Explicit</td>
<td>Slightly Less Explicit</td>
<td>Equally Explicit</td>
<td>Slightly More Explicit</td>
<td>Considerably More Explicit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Explicitation Levels

The rate attributed to each segment will vary according to the increase or decrease extension of a given item in that segment. Segments in which no differences are found are rated 3, consequently, those will be considered equally explicit. Any segment bearing less than a third of change (33% or below) will remain within ‘slightly’ standards. Equally, any segment presenting more than a third of change (33% or above) will be placed in the ‘considerably’ standards. Any item added or removed from the TT will be immediately placed within the ‘considerably’ standards. That is because no accurate comparative percentage rate can be obtained from inexistent items. The items to be analysed in three categories.

a. Sentence Length:

Does the translated segment have a higher number of words than the ST? If so, it will be considered more explicit.

b. Punctuation:

Does the translated segment have more punctuation than the ST? If so, it will be considered more explicit.

c. Lexical Repetition:

Does the translated segment contain more lexical unit repetitions than the ST? If so, it will be considered more explicit.

Considering the relations established between Explicitation (Blum-Kulka, 1986: 300) and the cohesive ties in English (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), the questions above were determined as to have at least three different indicators of increase or decrease in
Explicitation levels. Further reasoning for establishing categories as more or less indicative of Explicitation is provided in chapter 2 alongside data analysis. Initially, a comparative analysis of the final product as a whole is presented to determine whether IGL has significant changes paralleled to more formal systems of communication. Then, a quantitative analysis of segments delimited by full stops was carried out to determine if there was an observable effect in explicitness and whether it has solid linkage to IGL. A comparative qualitative analysis be the last one presented as a way to compare and contrast the figures obtained with a more subjective examination of translation choices and strategies. This last part will be assisted by Cronin’s theory of translation and identity (2006). Considering the incongruence between the users of the language and the content of the ST; does it still get the same message across with the same level of explicitness as expected in an instrumental translation? Or does the IGL undermine the explicitness? Or does the complexity of the message make a constricting IGL unsustainable?

**Justification**

Terminology can often present multiple nebulous meanings, especially in relatively young branches of science such as Translation Studies. Numerous authors have defined and discussed the term Explicitation. Darbelnet & Vinay (1958/1995) identified tools for assessing translated materials and established Explicitation as one of the universals of translation. Antoine Berman (1985/2012: 240-253), as well as Nida (1964), perceived the practice as a technique for addition in translation practices. The reason Blum-Kulka’s definition of Explicitation was chosen to permeate this work is the fact that her definition is the most all-encompassing one and suggests inevitable manifestations of the phenomenon, entirely based on two simple premises, which were not thoroughly defined.

The first principle is that of interpretation. According to Blum-Kulka (1986/2000: 300—303) any language user, including professional translators, interpret a ST according to their own perspective. In doing so, explicitness levels rise as choices need to be made and other possible interpretations are left out. The second principle is that of any linguistic system being unique. No matter how close two languages are or how minimal a difference in form or meaning is, it affects the levels of explicitness simply. The theory appears to be solely based on those premises, which can be redundant, and it does not include discussion regarding the
occurrence of a possible decrease in those levels. Therefore, I anticipated extensive verification considering cohesive factors using different corpora was relevant.

This could be the opportunity of developing an experiment to find different patterns in Explicitation and evaluate them considering how noticeable or subtle these patterns are. Equally important, in case these levels diminish in considerable number of occasions, an analysis of IGL as a conscious tool for crypto communication could also become relevant. The questions to be answered here can possibly help clarify the term or unfold into new ways of assessing, producing and consuming function-oriented translation.
Chapter 1: Two Translations of ‘The Doll’

Both translations created in order to analyse variations in Explicitation are displayed in juxtaposition in this chapter. As previously introduced, both texts considered the same TTA but each was produced within a different systems of communication. The first one uses a formal register of PTBR. The second translation incorporates the IGL denominated Pajubá to a more colloquial form of PTBR. It is suggested that the semantics of Pajubá as a system only functions because it borrows the internalised syntax and, mainly, the morphology of a more established language its user already possessed (Vip & Libi, 2006: 18). In this case, the Portuguese spoken by Brazilians rather than its official written format.

The focus of this work remains on the relationship between the IGL used on the TT2 and Explicitation (Blum-Kulka: 1986/2á00). Therefore, the TT1 is mostly a source of data and a tool for comparison.

This chapter is to introduce the corpus, as it was produced to provide this work with data. The most challenging aspects of this translation are more related to the difficulties in adequation of content in the TL. These issues will be addressed in Chapter III, where a more philosophical investigation will be carried out. The material used as ST for both these texts can be found in the first appendix of this dissertation.

TT1
A Boneca
Todo Natal, chegava uma boneca de presente de uma senhora que eu mal conhecia.
Ela era uma amiga da minha mãe e, embora elas só se enconstrassem raramente ou, acidentalmente, em um funeral, ela manteve o milagroso hábito de me mandar uma boneca.
Chegava no ônibus da noite, pouco antes do Natal e se somava ao brilho eufórico.

TT2
A Boneca
Todo Natal, chegava uma boneca de presente de uma amapô que eu nem conhecia direito.
A mona era amiga da minha mãe e as bonitas só se trombavam por acaso ou em funerais, mas ela seguiu firme me mandando bonecas.
Vinha no ônibus da noite, pouco antes do Natal e deixava aqueles dias mais
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Boneca</strong></td>
<td><strong>A Boneca</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daqueles dias, quando tudo era carregado de entusiasmo e agitação.</td>
<td>fechativos, quando tudo era ferveção e gritaria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nós fazíamos recheios de batata, nós fazíamos tortas de carne, nós fazíamos travessas de pavê, nós decorávamos os peitoris das janelas com azevinhos e ouropel, e era como se uma felicidade inesperada estivesse prestes a nos cobrir.</td>
<td>A gente fazia recheio de batata, bolo de carne, pavê, arrumava a janela com folhas e glitter. Era como se uma felicidade destruidora estivesse chegando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A boneca de cada ano parecia ser mais bonita, mais encantadora e mais suntuosamente enroupada do que a do ano anterior.</td>
<td>Todo ano, a boneca parecia mais trabalhada e mais montada do que a anterior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elas eram de ambos sexos.</td>
<td>Tinha racha e tinha bofe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havia um jóquei em vermelho vibrante e açafrão, havia um menino holandês baterista em veludo marrom, havia uma boneca adormecida em crinolina, uma criatura de tão frágil beleza que eu costumava temer por ela quando minhas irmãs a pegavam desajeitadamente ou tentavam fazê-la mover os cílios.</td>
<td>Um peão de vermelho babado e urucum; um boyzinho baterista holandês de veludo marrom; uma boneca em crinolina que fecha o olho. Ela era tão delicada que eu tinha medo quando minhas irmãs pegavam a bicha de qualquer jeito ou tentavam fazer os cílios dela mexerem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seus olhos eram sugestivos de porcelana chinesa e pequenas flores azuis, tendo a cor assombrosa de uma e o esmalte suave da outra.</td>
<td>Seus olhos davam truque de porcelana chinesa e florezinhas azuis, tendo a cor babado de uma e o esmalte choque da outra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ela foi nomeada Rosalind.</td>
<td>Foi batizada de Rosalind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Minhas irmãs, é claro, ficaram com ciúmes e questionaram a injustiça de eu ganhar uma boneca sendo que elas só recebiam a
costumeira desinteressante meia de flanela
com coisas minúsculas nela, coisas
necessárias como lápis, cadernos, mais
alguns caramelos e um pito de alcaçuz.
Cada uma das minhas bonecas recebeu um
nome e um local de descanso, em um canto
ou algo do tipo, ou em uma lata de biscoitos
vazia, e cada uma teve conversas especiais
designadas a elas, carinhos especiais e,
caso necessário, castigos especiais.
Elas tinham momentos especiais para ar
fresco - uma boneca era trazida e
esparramada em um parapeito de janela,
or afundada na grama alta e,
aparentemente, abandonada.
Eu não tinha favoritas até a sétima boneca
chegar e ela era, para mim, a representação
viva de uma princesa.
Ela também era uma boneca adormecida,
mas uma de tamanho considerável, e ela
estava vestida com um vestido azul claro,
com uma cobertura de gaze, um gorro azul
claro e sapatos infantis brancos de botão.
Minhas irmãs—que eram mais velhas—
eram tão encantadas por ela quanto eu.
Ela era estonteante.
Todos nós concordamos que ela era quase
realística e que, com persuasão, ela talvez
falasse.

flanela uó com trambolhos mati dentro,
coisas necessárias tipo lápis, cadernos, uns
doces e uma neca de açucar.
Todas as minhas bonecas tinham nome e
um lugar delas, num canto ou lata vazia, e
cada uma tinha seus babados lacre, cafuné
lacre e, se preciso, seu tombo lacre.
Elas tinham momentos lacre para ar fresco
- uma boneca ficava largada na janela, ou
enfiada na grama alta e, aparentemente,
abandonada.
Eu não tinha favoritas até a sétima boneca
chegar. Para mim, ela representava o pisão
do pisão.
A mona também dormia, mas era odara, e
ela tinha um vestido azul claro, com uma
montada de gaze, um gorro azul claro e um
abatá branco de botão.
Minhas irmãs— mais tias—ficam tão
passadas com ela quanto eu.
Ela era destruidora.
A gente concordava que ela era quase uma
mona e que, na pressão, ela talvez
conversasse.
Seu cabelo fulvo era como uma pena ao toque, seus pequenos pulsos se moviam em círculos, seus cílios eram pretos e elegantes e a expressão em seus olhos era tão intensa que nós, frequentemente, pensávamos que ela não fosse uma criatura inanimada, que ela tivesse uma alma, e uma noção de nós.

As conversas com ela eram as mais intensas e as mais incriminatórias de todas.

As conversas com ela eram as mais grito e as mais magia negra de todas.

Eu amava aulas, era a primeira com minha lição de casa, sempre adiantada para a aula, depois sempre acendia o fogo da escola, limpava as cinzas, e tinha um cesto cheio de mato e lenha quando ela chegava.

De fato, era bem a minha diligência o que a incomodava, e ela me insultava em relação a isso, e proclamava o quão “boazinha” eu era.

Era bem o meu brilho que incomodava mesmo, e ela me gongava por isso, e berrava o tanto que eu era “boazinha”.

Ela fazia piadas sobre meu cardigã ou meus cadarços, ou a lisura do meu cabelo e, para fazer as outras meninas rirem, ela se referia a mim como "coisa".

Ela dizia “a coisa tem um buraco na meia”, ou “a coisa não tem um blazer adequado”.

Ela zoava minha brusinha, meu cadarço, o jeito do meu picumã, para as outras bees racharem, ela me chamava de "coisinha".

Ela falava “a coisinha está com a meia furada”, ou “a roupa da coisinha está gongada” ou “olha o caderno da coisinha".
ou “a coisa tem uma marca em seu caderno”.

Eu acredito que ela me odiava.

Se em uma prova eu fosse a melhor - e eu geralmente era - ela lia as notas de todos, deixava a minha por último e dizia: “Nós sabemos quem estudou mais”, como se eu estivesse em apuros.

Se nas aulas de culinária eu fizesse panquecas e oferecesse uma a ela, ela fazia uma cara como se eu tivesse lhe oferecido tripa ou estricnina.

Ela, uma vez, pediu a uma menina maior que me desse laxantes de frutas fingindo que eles eram doces e tirou muito sarro quando eu tive que ficar entrando e saindo do banheiro o dia todo.

Foi uma cruz cruel de carregar.

Quando o inspetor veio e me elogiou, ela disse que eu era esperta, mas que eu carecia versatilidade.

Em contraste direto, ela era adorável com minhas irmãs e, ocasionalmente, perguntava como estava minha mãe, e quando ela iria enviar uma boa compota de geleia caseira ou um pedaço de bolo.

Eu costumava orar e fazer novenas para que um dia ela examinasse sua consciência.
TT1  
A Boneca

e pensasse em como errou comigo e se arrependesse.

Um dia, minhas preces pareceram estar a ponto de serem atendidas.

Era novembro e as meninas já estavam economizando para o Natal e nós sabíamos que logo haveria o mercado de rua e, pouco depois, presuntos e pequenas laranjas sem sementes na vitrine do armazém.

Ela disse que, como todos nós tínhamos nos saído tão bem no exame de catecismo, ela conseguiria os bebês para atuar na peça da escola e que construiríamos um berço e o montaríamos com feno fresco e estátuas.

“Ela é utilizável”, disse ela, e disse a uma das meninas para colocar a boneca na prensa da cozinha até a hora em que fosse necessária.
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Um dia, eu estava jurando que minhas preces iam ser atendidas.

Era novembro e as meninas já estavam economizando para o Natal e a gente sabia que logo ia ter feirinha e, pouco depois, presuntos e pequenas laranjas sem sementes na vitrine do mercado.

Ela falou que, já que todo mundo tinha arrasado na prova de catecismo, ia arrumar os erês para atuar na peça da escola e que a gente ia construir um bercinhol e o montar com uns bafinhos.

Alguém falou que minha boneca ia dar uma Virgem destruidora.

Muitas meninas haviam vindo para casa comigo para ver a boneca e tinham recebido permissão para espiá-la em sua caixa, que era forrada com palha prateada.

Eu levei a gata na escola outro dia e todo mundo bateu o picumã enquanto a querida erguia a tampa da caixa preta envernizada e olhava dentro.

“Dá para o gasto”, ela falou, e mandou uma das monas colocar a boneca na mesa da cozinha até a hora em que fosse precisar dela.
Eu lamentei por ser separada dela, mas estava orgulhosa do fato de que ela estaria na peça da escola e seria o centro das atenções de todos.

Eu tinha feito a ela um manto, um manto esvoaçante azul com uma bainha de rede por cima e um pequeno fecho de diamante.

Era como uma criatura da luz da lua, cintilante, mesmo em dias escuros e úmidos.

A mesa da cozinha não era um hino de local para ela, mas é aquele ditado, vamos fazer o quê?

A peça não ocorreu sem incidentes.

O primo da professora, Milo, estava bêbado, beligerante e ofensivo.

Ele chamava meninas até o fogo para fingir que conversava com elas e então tocava as panturrilhas de suas pernas e fazia cócegas na parte de trás dos joelhos.

Ele me chamou e perguntou se eu estaria interessada.

Ele era um leiloeiro da cidade e solteiro.

Os dois filhos da professora também vieram olhar a apresentação, mas um deles partiu no meio.
Ele era estranho e ria sem motivo e, embora tivesse mais de vinte, chamava a professora de “mãezinha”.

Ele tinha cabelos ruivos muito brilhantes e uma expressão peculiar em seus olhos. Na maior parte, os bebês esqueciam suas falas, perdiam a cabeça e o monitor estava sempre atrasado para que as garotas erradas pegassem suas dicas.

Ela estava atrás de uma cortina, mas podia ser ouvida na rua.

A coisa toda foi um fiasco.

Minha boneca foi a estrela da ocasião e todos deliraram com ela.

Depois, teve chá e pãezinhos e a professora falou uns bafos para aquelas poucas mães que apareceram.

Minha mãe não havia ido pois, na época, ela era incapaz de confrontar multidões e até temia ir à missa aos domingos, mas acreditava que Deus a preservaria das tonturas e sufocações das quais ela estava sofrendo.

Depois que todos eles haviam partido e alguns de nós tinhamos feito a limpeza, eu fui até a professora e, para o meu deleite, ela me deu um sorriso largo genial.

Ela me agradeceu pela boneca, disse que não havia como negar que a boneca salvou
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Ela pegou uma régua e fez carão.

Você acha mesmo que eu vou deixar você ficar com ela agora, eu me apeguei horrores com ela... essa coisiquinha,” falou e deu um toque na bochecha de porcelana.

Em casa, eu fiquei bem louca.

Minha mãe falou que a professora devia estar cutucando e que ela ia me dar a boneca dali um ou dois dias.

Meu pai falou que se ela não devolvesse, ela ia se ver com ele ou o tempo ia fechar pra ela.

Os dias passaram e as férias chegaram e, ela não só não me devolveu minha boneca, como levou para casa dele e botou num armário chinês com um monte de tranqueiras.

Passando janela, eu olhava para dentro.

Eu não conseguia aqaudar por que o armário chinês ficava num canto, mas eu sabia onde ela estava, pois, a doméstica Lizzie me contou.

Eu pressionava minha testa na janela e chamava pela boneca e dizia que eu estava pensando nela, e que o resgate estava sendo providenciado.
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na peça. Aí, quando eu fui catar a boneca, ela pegou uma régua, não deixou e fez carão.

“Você não acha que eu vou deixar você ficar com ela agora, eu me afeiçoei muito a ela... a pequenina,” disse e deu um toque na bochecha de porcelana.

Em casa, eu estava furiosa.

Minha mãe disse que a professora estava provavelmente provocando e que ela devolveria a boneca em um dia ou em dois.

Meu pai disse que se ela não o fizesse, ela teria que responder a ele, ou então sofreria.

Os dias passaram e as férias chegaram e, ela não só não me devolveu minha boneca, mas a levou para sua própria casa e colocou em um armário chinês junto de xícaras e ornamentos.

Passando por sua janela, eu olhava para dentro.

Eu não podia vê-la por que o armário chinês estava em um canto, mas eu sabia onde ela estava, pois, a doméstica Lizzie me contou.

Eu enfiava minha testa na janela e chamava a boneca. Eu falava que eu estava pensando nela, e que o resgate estava a caminho.
Todos concordavam que aquilo era monstruoso, mas ninguém falou com a professora, ninguém a confrontou.
A verdade é que eles estavam com medo dela.
Ela tinha uma língua amarga e também, sendo supersticiosos, eles sentiam que ela poderia nos dar cérebros de crianças ou levá-los embora como uma bruxa faria.

Era como se ela pudesse levantar os cérebros fora de nós com um fórceps e os conservar em salmoura.
Ninguém fez nada e, com o tempo, fiz as pazes com aquilo.
Eu perguntei, uma vez, em um momento de coragem e a professora questionou se eu não estava ficando imprudente.
Eu não mais caminhava hesitante para olhar pela janela de sua casa, ao invés disso eu atravessava a rua e não falava com a Lizzie, caso ela fosse me dizer algo perturbador.

Uma vez, eu fui enviada à casa da professora com um lombo de porco e a encontrei perto do fogo com seu filho esquisito, ambos com suas meias abaixadas, se aquecendo.
Havia zigzagues do calor em suas canelas.
Ela perguntou se eu queria entrar e ver a boneca, mas eu recusei.
Na época, eu estava me preparando para ir para o internato e eu sabia que eu estaria livre dela para sempre, que eu me esqueceria dela, que eu me esqueceria da boneca, me esqueceria de quase tudo o que aconteceu, ou, ao menos, me lembraria daquilo sem uma palpitação.
Os anos vão passando e tudo e todos são substituídos.
Aqueles que nós conhecíamos, embora ausentes, estão ainda inextricavelmente fundidos em novos sujeitos de modo que cada pessoa nos seja uma soma de muitas outras e o efeito seja de abrir caixa após caixa, nas quais o original está para sempre escondido.
A professora morre uma morte lenta, magra como um palito graças ao câncer, contudo, luta contra ele e diz que não está pronta.
Eu ouço a quantidade de dinheiro que ela deixou e suas lamentáveis últimas palavras, mas não sinto nada.
Eu não sinto nada de raiva e nada de desespero.

A professora morre aos poucos, ficou só pele e osso por causa do câncer, mas luta contra ele e fala que não está pronta.
Aí, eu fico sabendo do tanto de aqué que ela deixou e as últimas palavras da gata, mas faço a Kátia cega.
Eu não sinto nada de recalque e nem de ranço.
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Ela não importa mais para mim.
Eu estou fugindo deles.
Eu me debandei.
Eu moro em uma cidade grande.

Eu sou cosmopolita.
Pessoas vêm à minha casa, todos os tipos de pessoa, e eles fazem proezas como dançar, ou brincar, ou cantar, inventando um tipo de teatro particular onde todos nós temos um papel.

Eu também interpreto um papel.
Minha parte é recebê-los e desarmá-los, dobrá-los com comida e bebida e secretamente ser cautelosa com eles, estar distante deles.

Como eles, eu sorrio e perambulo. Como eles, eu fumo ou bebo para induzir uma febre ou uma agradável alucinação errante.

Não é algo que eu cultivei.
Desenvolveu-se por vontade própria, como um esporo que respira na escuridão.

Então, estou longe daqueles com quem estou, e longe daqueles que me restam.

De noite, eu aprecio a distância.
Pela manhã, eu toco uma mesa ou uma xícara de chá para ter certeza de que é uma mesa ou uma xícara de chá e eu falo com ela, e eu rego as flores e eu falo com elas, e
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Estou cagando e andando para ela.
Eu estou correndo deles, bebê.
Eu desaquendei.
Eu estou morando na uma cidade grande, meu amor.

Eu sou cosmopolita, querida.
A galera vem aqui em casa, é gente de todo tipo, e eles fazem coisas tipo ferver, ou zoar, ou cantar, inventando um tipo de teatro particular onde todos temos um papel.

Eu também interpreto um papel.
Minha parte é receber e desarmar as bees, dar o truque neles com ajeum e otim e ficar esperta com eles na surdina, ficar longe deles.

Igual eles, eu faço carão e dou close. Igual eles, eu vou no chanam ou no otim para ficar meio passada ou bem louca.

Não é uma coisa que eu cultivei.
Foi uma coisa bem natural, tipo uma maquiagensinha básica de usar de dia.

Aí eu estou longe de quem está comigo, e longe de quem me sobrou.

De noite, eu curto a distância, linda.
De manhã, eu passo a mão nas coisas para ter certezas que elas são de verdade e converso com elas. Eu rego as flores e eu falo com elas, penso no lacone que é a maciez.
eu penso quão macias são as flores, e
tarde e fumaça de madeira e,
possivelmente, quão ternos são meus
novos amigos, mas que, como eu, eles
estão intencionados em disfarçar.
Nenhum de nós nunca diz de onde nós
viemos ou o que nos assombra.
Talvez estejamos aturdidos ou
envergonhados.
Eu retorno.
O dever me arrasta de volta para ver os
parentes restantes e eu interpreto o papel
esperado.
Eu tive que ligar para o filho da professora.
Ele era o coveiro e estava encarregado do
enterro da minha tia.
Fui pagá-lo para, como se diz, "ajeitar tudo"
e sua esposa, que eu sabia estar um pouco
dispersa, me recebeu em meio a
gargalhadas.
Ela disse que ela sempre achou que eu
tivesse cabelo preto, ao passo que corria
pelo corredor chamando o nome dele.
O nome dele é Denis.
Ele aperta minha mão muito formalmente,
pergunta que tipo de coroa de flores eu
amo e se deveria ser em forma de
coração, circular, ou na forma de uma cruz.
Deixo isso tudo com ele.
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delas, da madeira e da fumaça de madeira.
E, pode ser que, penso nas minhas migas
novas e como elas são bafônicas, mas que,
tipo eu, eles tentam dar o equê.
Ninguém fala de onde a gente vem ou o que
deixa a gente tombado.
Talvez a gente esteja passado ou com
vergonha.
Eu retorno.
O dever me chama de volta para ver os
parentes que sobraram e eu faço a Sandy.
Eu tive que ligar para o filho da professora.
O boy era o coveiro e estava encarregado
do enterro da minha tia.
Fui pagar para ele "dar um jeito" e a esposa
dele, que eu cai ter estar meio passada, me
recebeu mostrando os dentes.
Ela disse que sempre achou que eu tivesse
 cabelo preto, enquanto corria pelo
corredor chamando ele.
O nome do ócio é Denis.
Ele pegou na minha mão, bem sério,
perguntou que coroa de flores, se é pra ser
em de coração, redonda, ou de uma cruz.
Deixe isso tudo com ele.
Lá no abarrotado armário chinês está minha boneca confiscada e, se bonecas podem envelhecer, ela certamente havia.

Cinza e mofada, o vestido e o manto são como uma mortalha e eu pensei que se eu fosse pegá-la, ela iria se desintegrar.

"Deus, minha mãe gostava dela", disse ele, como se ele estivesse tentando me dizer que ela gostava de mim também.

Se ele o tivesse dito, eu poderia ter sibilado.

Eu era mais velha agora e era claro para mim que ela tinha mantido a boneca por perversidade, por ressentimento e ciúmes.

De alguma forma, ela já catava que eu ia teria uma vida longe deles e aventuras que ela mesma nunca provaria.

Notando meu arrepio, ele se gabou de não ter deixado seus próprios filhos brincarem com a boneca, assim implicando que ela era um objeto sagrado, uma lembrança preciosa.

Ele arrastou uma garrafa de conhaque e piscou esperando que eu dissesse sim.

Eu recusei.

Um mal-estar havia me tomado, uma espécie de náusea por ter me preocupado tanto com a boneca, por tê-los deixado me
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Lá no armário chinês, entupido de coisa, está minha boneca confiscada e, se bonecas envelhecem, ela envelheceu com certeza.

Cinza e mofada, o vestido e o manto estão muito úo e eu pensei que, se eu fosse pegar a bicha, ela ia se desmanchar.

"Nossa, minha mãe adorava ela", ele falou, tipo dando o truque de que ela gostava de mim também.

Se ele tivesse dito aquilo, eu poderia até dar o doce.

Agora que eu era cona, eu catava bem que ela tinha ficado com a boneca pelo afronte, recalque e ciúmes.

De algum jeito, ela já catava que eu ia ter uma vida longe deles e aventuras que ela mesma nunca ia ter.

Sacando meu carão, ele ficou se achando por não ter deixado os filhos dele brincarem com a boneca, como se ela fosse um objeto sagrado, uma lembrança preciosa.

Ele puxou uma garrafa de conhaque e piscou esperando que fosse falar sim.

Eu cortei ele!

Um encosto tinha me tomado, meio que uma náusea por ter me preocupado tanto
maltratar e, agora, por não mais me importar.
Minha partida abrupta o confundiu.
Ele fez algo desagradável.
Ele tentou me beijar.
Ele pensou que talvez, no meu mundo, fosse a coisa esperada.
Exceto que o beijo foi oferecido como um beijo de empatia, um beijo de condolências pela morte da minha tia.
Seu rosto tinha o cheiro azedo de uma toalha na qual ele deve ter se secado, pouco antes de ele vir me receber.
O beijo foi um mau jeito personificado.
Eu tinha pena dele, mas não podia ficar, e não conseguia relembrar, e não podia fingir ser a rápida mulher fácil de beijar que ele imaginava que eu fosse.
Descendo pela rua, onde ando pela memória, manhã e noite, não pude dizer o que era, precisamente, que me reduziu a tamanha miséria.
Realmente, não foi a morte, mas sim a convicção corrosiva de não ter ainda vivido.
Tudo o que eu podia dizer era que as estrelas eram tão singulares e tão maravilhosas quanto eu me lembrava delas e que elas ainda pareciam um elo, uma sedução para os grandes céus, e que um dia

com a boneca, por deixar terem me maltratado e por não ligar mais agora.
Quando desaquendei ele ficou perdido.
Ele fez algo uó.
Ele tentou me beijar.
Ele achou que talvez, no meu mundo, estava tudo liberado.
Mas que o beijo foi oferecido como um beijo de empatia, um beijo pela morte da minha tia.
O rosto dele tinha um cheiro uó da toalha que ele deve ter se secado, pouco antes de ele vir me receber.
O beijo foi um tombamento só.
Eu tinha pena dele, mas eu não estava podendo, e não conseguia lembrar, e não conseguia fazer a fácil de beijar que ele achava que eu era.
Descendo a rua, toda trabalhada na memória, manhã e noite, não sabia o que era que tinha me gongado daquele tanto na real.
Não foi a morte, mas sim o baque de ainda não ter vivido.
Tudo que eu podia dizer era que as estrelas estavam singulares e bafônicas igual eu me lembrava delas e que elas ainda pareciam um elo, uma sedução para os céus odaras, e que um dia eu ia chegar nelas e ser
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT1</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>eu iria alcançá-las e ser absorvida em meio a sua glória, e passar de um mundo que, naquele momento, eu descobri ser repleto de crueldade e estupidez, um mundo que havia se esquecido como doar.</td>
<td>absorvida pelo glamour delas, e desaquendar de um mundo que, naquela hora, eu cai ser cheio de coisa uó e bagaceira, um mundo que tinha se esquecido como dar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Amanhã...” Eu pensei.</td>
<td>“Amanhã...” Eu pensei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Amanhã eu posso ter partido&quot;, e percebi que eu não tinha perdido o desejo de escapar ou o hábito extenuante de ansiar.</td>
<td>&quot;Amanhã eu posso desaquendar de vez&quot;, e cai que eu não tinha perdido o desejo de vazar ou a mania uó de querer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following chapter embodies a series of small analysis of three central aspects of Explicitation that are mostly considered to be bond to cohesion. These analyses will help to investigate more concrete similarities or discrepancies between the TT2 and the theory chosen to guide this dissertation (Blum-Kulka: 1986/2000). Hopefully leading to new ways of considering the known developments of explicitness levels in translation as well as original ones. Above all, these analyses may provide a suitable data for comparing Explicitation within two unlike textual systems.
Chapter 2: A Comparative Analysis of Levels of Explicitation

This chapter consists of a comparative analysis based on smaller analyses of quantitative data obtained from paralleling the textual productions presented in chapter I in face of their ST. According to Swanson (1971: 146), the comparisons the human mind is capable of making are numberless, whether within academic research or not. The author insists that ‘Thinking without comparison is unthinkable. And, in the absence of comparison, so is all scientific thought and scientific research’ (Swanson, 1971: 145). Comparative methods suggest qualitative analyses as the key for successful investigation in more subjective fields dealing with the human mind processes, language included. Based on the premises of Swanson’s combined methods of assessment, the set of brief analyses in this chapter aimed at quantifying Explicitation level changes in the most relevant segments of the TT2. These were different segments in each item analysed and a few intersections were considered. Different textual components were compared and discussed in order to have a more qualitative-oriented study.

The data observed indicated different levels of increase and decrease in each item examined. As state below, variations in the word count, punctuation, and lexical repetition have led to a few conclusions.

The word count, generally expected to experience an increase (Blum-Kulka: 1986/2000: 301), was lower in both translations. The punctuation count was higher in TT1 but equally expressive in TT2 if compared to the ST. The ST. The repetition count was also higher in the ST, the lexical item reduction in the TT2 in relation to the ST was more expressive than the one in the TT1. These figures can be found in table 2. Another relevant aspect is the fact that every count in the TT2 was lower than the ones in the TT1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Punctuation Count</th>
<th>Repetition Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT1</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT2</td>
<td>2481</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 – Word, Punctuation and Repetition Count*
Although a thorough analysis of every individual segment was not feasible, a per-
segment comparison helped determine a more reasonable corpora to investigate the levels 
of explicitation. A more segmented analysis help scale the value of smaller items, according 
to Swanson (1971). Each subsections of this chapter contains tables indicating the number of 
segments containing a certain level of Explicitation and their correspondent percentage of 
textual portion, as with the proposed methods previously presented in the methodology 
section. Segments were determined by the presence of full stops in the ST. In these tables, 
each segment represents an equal portion of textual percentage—approximately 0.76%—
regardless of the number of lexical items each segment encapsulates. The selected examples 
discussed in each section reflect the variance and relevance they seem to demonstrate 
compared to segments with less noticeable variations.

2.1. Sentence Length

As Blum-Kulka (1986/2000) emphasised, sentence length is what she considers as the 
most determining factor in Explicitation. Here are the Explicitation percentages obtained 
based on a segment-as-unit calculus, according to the pre-established levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lvl.</th>
<th>Seg</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Seg</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Word Count

Table 3 indicates that, in both cases, the translations experienced less explicitation 
than the reverse process. The phenomenon of word decrease will also be addressed in this 
discussion as implicitation as to make assimilation and comparison easier. In the first case, 
the number of segments undergoing considerable changes are minimum, around 1.5% of the
entire text. TT2 has also experienced low rates of considerable changes. However, in that case, all affected items are on the realms of Explicitation and segments containing considerable explicitation in the TT2 represented almost 4% of the text altogether. Although the numbers determining Explicitation were not exactly similar in both TTs, the occurrence of slightly less explicit segments was the highest figure in both texts. Levels three and four have showed a similar pattern as of level two in both cases, being the third and second most common occurrences respectively. Less than a third of all segments in the TTs were considered more explicit.

Around 30% of the TT1 and 17% of the TT2 are believed to have remained in a similar level of Explicitation as the ST. Still, more than two thirds of the translation were somehow affected in this category. This outcome points at the possibility of an IGL having different effects over explicitation than that caused by a translation using a more complex language system.

Another finding regarding the word count is the final sum of items encountered in each of the texts. Explicitation has been repeatedly remarked as an expected phenomenon of explicitness escalation (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2000). However, the total of lexical items was smaller in both TTs. Likewise, the report above indicates slightly less explicit occurrences to be the most frequent in both TT1 and TT2. The TT1 was 2600 words long and such figure represented a reduction of 1.2% in the lexical item count when compared to the ST (2631 words). In the case of TT2 the figure presented was even higher, expressing a total decrease of 5.7% with 2481 terms. If evaluating the texts as a whole or at a segment level, both productions would be mostly placed in the second level of Explicitness, being slightly less explicit than their ST. Furthermore, the TT2 was even more implicit than the TT1.

For the purpose of further verification, a more detailed record of each individual segment is offered as a table in appendix 1 at the end of this document. There, each segment is shown accompanied by; the difference in the number between lexical items in comparison to the same ST segment; the approximate percentage this difference represents within that segment; and the level of explicitation expressed by that percentage. In assessing the data displayed in the appendix, a few segments were chosen to be analysed more closely. The segments selected were the examples gathered according to a few categories. These are:

a. The segment(s) containing the highest word difference percentage.
b. The segment(s) containing the highest number of lexical items.

c. The segment(s) containing the highest increase in word difference.

d. The segment(s) containing the highest decrease in word difference.

The segments containing the highest word difference percentage in the TT1 and TT were segments 86 (-43%) and 88 (-80%) respectively. Segment 86 went from 7 to 4 words, segment 86 went from 5 to 9. In both TT1 and TT2, segment 130 was the one with the highest figure of lexical items. It was the longest segment in all three texts. It was 70 words long in the ST, 74 in the TT1, and 72 in the TT2. A five-word increase happened in three segments in each text, these were the representatives of highest increase in word difference. In the TT1, segments 15 (65—75), 22 (33—38), 98 (30—35). In the TT2, segments 44 (15—20), 81 (40—45), 83 (17—22). The highest decrease in word difference in the TT1 was in segment 8 (-8 words) and segment 12 (-11 words) in the TT2. Although the intersection was minimal, segments 8, 12, 15, 22, 44, 81, 83, 86, 88, 98 and 130 of both TTs were selected to be examined. See table 4 at the end of this chapter.

In regard to Explicitation levels, it is relevant to point that, even though the levels of explicitness were similar overall, this selection shows that this did not always happen within the same segments. Whereas 9 segments were more explicit in the TT1, only 6 were in the TT2. The most explicit segments were purposely not selected as the considerably more explicit levels represented a minimal portion of the TTs and had could be of lower relevance for this study. In the case of TT1, the most explicit segment did not appear in this reduced corpus. However, in the TT2, only 1 out of 5 did. This consideration helps to verify if the percentage levels per segment would accompany those of the totals. As per the lowest ranks, the only segment considered considerably less explicit in TT1 was also the highest WDP. That, however, can be attributed to the segment length. If compared to segment 8, for example, it has lost considerably less lexical items and the percentage rates are very different.

Another factor to be mentioned is that of segments with the most expressive figures in TT1 being mostly outside the level two, which was the most common in the totals of both TTs. In the TT2, levels two and four appeared as often, being more consistent to the total. That could be an indication that the IGL translation had a more consistent display of Explicitation at sentence level, keeping it closer to the original Explicitation level than a non ILG.
It is mostly presumed that percentage rates are higher in smaller figures and, in fact, the only short segments in this corpus are those with the highest percentage difference. In the TT1, however, figures were less expressive than in the TT2. This can be another indication reinforcing a possible effect over Explicitation due to IGL oriented practices and more levelled. Again, the Explicitation level varied less in the IGL production.

A third factor adding to the indication of this effect IGL translations might have in Explicitation levels is that the TTs were undergoing reverse processes. In two cases, the TT2 has presented a loss of words in the same segment the TT1 gains them. The reverse was documented once. The word difference rates were also different in 10 out of the 11 segments here. Other than segments 8 and 130, all percentage rates were different, and in the latter, it was one of the two segments accounted as having experienced the reverse process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>WDP</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>WDP</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Word Difference Rates and Percentage

2.2. Punctuation

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976) punctuation in translation helps contain ideas. Therefore, making them clearer. As Blum-Kulka (1986/200) advocates that clarifying is a limiting process that reduces the chances the TT reader has of absorbing the multiple
meanings of a text, increase in punctuation will be consider an indicator of increased Explicitation as well.

Displayed at the end of this section, table 5 contains the total punctuation used in every text. The total punctuation used in both TTs was considerably higher. In the TT1, it amounts to a 35% increase in punctuation. In the TT2, the increase is of nearly 28%. The only individual item with a decrease compared to the ST was the number of hyphens in the TT2, with no decrease reported in the TT1. Comparing both TTs, only two items were less expressive in TT2. However, those were two of the three most relevant items, which had the highest occurrences in the ST.

In punctuation, the most significant changes were related to periods, commas and hyphens. Out of the 9 forms of punctuation encountered in the texts, 4 remained unchanged in number. Also, the number of occurrences in all four were extremely low. En dashes, quotation marks, ellipses, and question marks represented, respectively, approximately 0,19, 0,49, 0,04 and 0,08 per cent of the total punctuation used. Hence, affecting less than 1 percent of the punctuation in each text altogether. Two punctuation resources were added to the TT2 and one of them was also added to the TT1. According to displayed relevance, this section will focus on analysing the first three items here presented.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>.</th>
<th>,</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>“”</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>!</th>
<th>:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

*Table 5 – Punctuation Rates*

### 2.2.1. Periods

Since Nord’s functional model was applied, certain changes could be related to stylistic choices or the translation function itself. However, periods are almost unavoidable for the majority of the sentences in a literary text. The variation in period figures was very subtle. Every sentence with a period in the ST has also received one in the TT1 and, in one case, there was an extra period added. For the TT1, the change was almost insignificant, but the one
affect segment was equally affected in the TT2. Although the TT2 did not present a very significant change either, it has faced both increase and decrease of periods. Two segments with periods in the ST had no period in TT2, reducing the Explicitation level. Also, periods were present in 99% of the segments but differences in periods affected only 9% of them. As far as the Explicitation levels established in this work go, All the affected segments indicate a very high or very low level. This is due to the fact that every segment in the ST could only contain one period as periods were used to determine segments. Conversely, none of these segments had been considered to be level one or five in word count analyses. See table 6 for more details below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>PDP</td>
<td>Lvl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 – Period Rates

2.2.2. Commas

The number of segments affected by comma changes was the highest within punctuation, happening in 89 segments. For that reason, as it was done with the word count,
a few criteria were established to try and analyse the portion with the most significant numbers. The segments selected are those containing:

- a. The highest percentage of comma difference.
- b. The highest number of commas.
- c. The highest gain of commas.
- d. The highest loss of commas.

The highest percentage of comma difference was found in segment 23 in the TT1, with a 300% rise. In the TT2, that figure was 400% and it happened in 3 different segments: 32, 60, and 24. Both TTs saw segment 98 as the one with the highest number of commas. It had 9 commas in the TT1 and 8 in the TT2. Segment 98 was also the one with the highest gain of commas, with an addition of 6 in the TT1 and 5 in the TT2. The highest loss of commas occurred in segments 6, 25, and 27 for the TT1. All of them have one less comma than the ST. In the TT2, segment 8 has lost three comma and was the one with the most considerable loss of that punctuation element.

Considering Explicitation, most segments affected by comma variation were placed in level five in both TT1 and TT2. Comparing the effects each TT could have had regarding Explicitation in relation to one another, the TTs were placed in different Explicitation levels only in one case. Whenever the TT1 experience a reduction of items, the TT2 did, too. However, in one segment, the TT2 lost an item and the TT1 kept it. There are no cases of segments undergoing reverse processes. Another factor observed here is that the TT1 generally gained more commas than the TT2. In three cases, TT1 had more commas. In one case they gained the same number of these item. And, once, TT2 gained more commas than the TT1. This can be another indication that this IGL uses other resources instead of punctuation in order to be more explicit but, in comparison to the TT1, it was less Explicit within the parameters here considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>PDP</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>PDP</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.3. Hyphens and Other Punctuation

Hyphens were used for the purpose of joining terms in all texts. However, in the TT1, it has only appeared as the auxiliar of a specific verb form, joining pronouns and verbs, which does not happen in English. According to Blum-Kulka (1986/2000: 300), items varying according to the rules of language are definitely more explicit. As the focus is finding Explicitation patterns in the TT2, the lack of any intersection makes hyphens harder to analyse. Thus, the occurrence of hyphens in the TT1 is not as relevant to this study, even when higher than the ST rates. In the TT2, there was only one segment containing a hyphen and, in that case, it served the same purpose as it had in English, creating a two-word adjective. For that reason, it can be considerate that the TT2 and, therefore, IGL were more closely related to the ST. Again, there was no intersection between texts. The Explicitation level displayed by that segment was then considerably more explicit due to a lack of intersection between ST and TT2. An observable effect over Explicitation here is that the TT2 was less explicit, whereas the TT1 was more explicit.

The punctuation items with same figures were represented at the exact same segments in all three texts, indicating no variation in Explicitation.

The colons added to both TTs as well as the exclamation point in the TT2 were in accord to the grammar rules of their TLs. Because of that, their appearance can be considered indicators of Explicitation. However, it is hard to establish that given that they occurred in less than 2% of the punctuation total.
2.3. Repetition

Repetition was one of the items listed in Halliday and Hasan’s cohesive ties list (1976). According to Blum-Kulka (1986/2000), these ties determine the levels of cohesion in a translation. For that reason, a few items from there were selected but, due to the constrains of this work, only one could be analysed. Still, it would be relevant to apply this same analysis to the other ties listed by them in future research.

According to Hatim & Mason (1990), repetition plays a role in translation as languages with neutral gender are more likely to employ repetitions. Thus, this was the category chosen to be analysed here. Repetition can be described as the reiteration of the same word. However, not all repeated items were counted for the purpose of investigating Explicitation. Three classes of word were selected; pronouns; nouns; and adjectives. Also, only personal, object and possessive pronouns were considered in the first one. Demonstrative pronouns were not registered in the sum present below.

In an overall analysis of amount of repetition manifestations, it is noticeable that pronouns were repeated less when comparing the TT1 to the ST. That figures in the TT2 were equally lower and even more distant from the ST. In the noun rate, there was an increase of Explicitation in the TT1 and a decrease in the TT2. As per the adjectives, there was an increase in the TT2 and a decrease in TT1. This shows that the TTs were more explicit in one category and less explicit in two categories of lexical repetition even though they were different categories. The sub-sections that follow illustrates in more detail how these items performed individually. For these micro analyses, only segments that represent an intersection between ST, TT1 and TT2 will be displayed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8 – Repetition Count*
2.3.1. Pronouns

According to an evaluation over the total values, both TTs should be less Explicit than the TS in pronoun repetition. The 55 occurrences of pronoun repetition in the ST happened within 48 segments. In the TT1, a total of 29 times in 27 segments. The TT2 had 28 occurrences of pronoun repetition in 26 segments. This means that less than 37% of the ST presented repetitions of these categories. Figures were even lower for the TT1 and TT2, they were 21 and 19 per cent, respectively.

Different from the results shown in the total word count, this category has seen its results entirely placed within levels one, three and five of Explicitation, meaning that no slight explicitness was reported. The increase or decrease in Explicitation percentage were always at 0, 100 or 200 per cent difference. This is probably due to the low amount of repetitions per segment. No more than two different lexical items of the same category were repeated in the same segment. It is important to consider that repetition here relates to the quantity of lexical items repeated and not the number of times they appeared in the same segment.

The volume of occurrences was relatively high in all texts. In order to verify any possible intersection in the Explicitation between the sentence length and the number of pronoun repetitions, a few segments that represent a repetition intersection amongst the three texts are displayed in table 9. However, no intersection in Explicitation was found between the ST and the TT2. All of the 17 segments displayed, were slightly explicit in the sentence length section but are mostly within the equally explicit level here. A segment was considered considerably more explicit and 4 textual segments were considerably less explicit. This was not true for TT1, where more than half of the segments maintained the same Explicitation levels as the sentence length study did. This indicates that sentence length and lexical repetition do not agree in Explicitation levels even when both report an increase of the phenomenon. Therefore, an observable effect over Explicitation in IGL can be attributed to this variance as well.
2.3.2. Nouns

Levels of Explicitation reported in segments affected by noun repetition in the TT1 were; 2 level one items; 6 level three items; and 4 level five items. For the TT, the figures were; 5 level one items; 3 level five items; and 4 level three items. TT2 had a higher occurrence of considerable implicitation and a lower amount of equally explicit or more explicit segments than the TT1. The noun repetition intersection amongst the three texts is found in table 10. No intersection was found between sentence length and repetition of this item.

Segment 12 from TT1 and segment 15 from TT2 were both slightly more explicit in the sentence length analysis. That figure went down for the former, which became considerably less explicit and showing the most significant difference. The latter underwent the reverse process, going from slightly to considerably more explicit. Segment 12 from TT2 and 15 from TT1 experience the phenomenon describe above in a reverse form. The first one experienced a decrease in Explicitation levels, going from slightly to considerably less explicit. The second case had an increase in those levels, going from equally explicit to considerably more explicit. Segment 86, in both TTs, had the same shift from slightly less explicit to equally explicit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9 – Pronoun Repetition Intersection*
explicit. However subtle, this points at a variation between components influencing a regular translation in face of an IGL one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 10 – Noun Repetition Intersection*

### 2.3.3. Adjectives

Levels of Explicitation reported in segments affected by adjective repetition in the TT1 were; 3 level one items; 1 level three item; and 2 level five items. For the TT2, the figures were; 4 level five items; 2 level three items; and 3 level 1 items. TT2 had a higher occurrence of considerable explicitation, a lower quantity of equally explicit segments, and an equal number of less explicit segments than the TT1.

The only intersection regarding Explicitation levels found between the adjective repetition and the sentence length was of a single segment in the TT2. Segment 124 remained equally explicit as it was in the sentence length analysis. In the case of TT1, segment 124 went from slightly more explicit in sentence length to equally explicit in adjective repetition. As per segment 42 and 81, both TTs went from slightly more explicit to equally explicit in this analysis. Segment 60 made a reverse shift going from slightly less explicit to equally explicit in both TTs. However brief, this comparison shows similar intersections between a non-IGL translation and an IGL translation. Differently from most comparisons, this one indicated a very low variance between these two types of practices. Also, no relevant effect over Explicitation is reported by this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11 – Adjective Repetition Intersection*
Chapter 3: An Incongruous Relationship between Pajubá and ‘The Doll’

It means ‘gossip’ and ‘news’ and it is widely used by the LGBTQIA+ community (Netto Junior: 2018). That is a common definition for Pajubá, or Bajujá, as it can also be called. However, the author emphasises the non-exclusive use of these lexical items as a linguistic code. According to Netto Junior (2018: 3), it is based in a combination of terms deriving from a series of African languages, including Umbundo, Nagô and Iorubá. It is quite difficult to determine the source of all of its components but the African origin and stronger presence in areas of great African influence in Brazil is mostly undeniable. The language primarily remained as an exclusive cryptolect amongst the transexuals and transvestites due to the vulnerability these groups encountered—and probably face still—in Brazilian society. Barroso (2017) adds that the dialect has evolved to become a flag of resistance for other tribes within the LGBTQIA+ community. Its presence can be reported in other groups that, in appropriating the use of this language and adequating it to their in-group setting, expanded the Pajubá vocabulary, adding terms to it and using it in other social spheres.

The particularities of this language as an in-group mechanism for communication and the constrains of literary translation could create a challenging combination for the translator. Foucault (1969) discusses the voice of the author and the extension of what is known about them.

Assuming that we are dealing with an author, is everything he wrote and said, everything he left behind, to be included in his work? This problem is both theoretical and practical. If we wish to publish the complete works of Nietzsche, for example, where do we draw the line? Certainly, everything must be published, but can we agree on what ‘everything' means? (Foucault, 1969: 302)

The extensiveness of what makes an author is difficult to determine, states Foucault (1969). The awareness level audiences have of the authors they read is equally hard to define. The author continues and suggests a common practice of ignoring the author’s presence and what defines them beyond their written productions. In that sense, it is important to revisit Edna O’Brien’s style. Specially in ‘The Doll’, it could be suggested that the author is lengthy,

---

1 Although the author used the term LGBT+ in his work, in order to be more accurate, a more up-to-date acronym was used in this section (LGBTQIA+), according to Shelton (2019).
melancholic, descriptive and deals with sexuality in subtle ways. A good pointer to the last statement is the way in which the teacher’s queer son is said to giggle and behave awkwardly. If compared to Pajubá and its conditions of production, linkage between the author and this language in translation may be viable but hardly consistent or congruous.

Pajubá in Lima (2017/2019: 1—3) is define as cultural re(ex)sistance and as being subversive to what is heteronormative. Direct, short and heavily loaded with sexual connotations, it deals with sexuality and queerness in rather explicit ways. Therefore, a combination of this specific IGL with an author known for a customarily different style in a functional translation (Nord: 2005) can mean the translator may force the author through what Barthes (1967/1977) refers as the death of the author. The ideas of Barthes go in the same direction as the concepts of invisibility in Venuti (2008) and identity in Translation of Cronin (2006). The author should leave his identity aside in Barthes (Ibid.), so should the translator in Venuti (Ibid.) and in Cronin (Ibid.). In that sense, a translation of Pajubá should make both its ST and TT author invisible somehow to best accommodate these differences in a function-oriented translation.

The premises of the Explicitation Hypothesis of Blum-Kulka (1986/2000) suggest none of these processes mentioned above can efficiently occur in translation as it is an interpretative practice. Even though the translator is responsible for the naturality of a text in a target context (Venuti, 2008), in interpreting and creating a translation based on that choice, a translator abandons other multiple meanings and become more explicit. Still, a series of outside factors other than a translator’s identity may influence a production. In the case of a Pajubá translations, the concepts of multilingualism and cultural translation are equally relevant.

Pajubá is a mixture of African languages based in PTBR grammar and rules to create effective communication (Lima, 2017). Hence, a Pajubá translation could be considered a multilingual text in a way. Lenon (2010) explains the imbalance levels in a multilingual text and addresses these as ‘weak’ or ‘strong’ multilingualism. Weak multilingualism is characterised by the dominance of a language even if the other one is evident or noticeable throughout a text. For Lenon (Ibid.), in order to identify the non-dominant language within a text, cohesive ties or visual artifices can be made necessary. If that is the case, a Pajubá translation can also be seen as a ‘weak’ multilingual production. This, once more, may lead a translation toward the occurrence of unavoidable Explicitation.
3.1. Pajubá and Explicitation

In order to make more subjective considerations of the levels of Explicitation in this Pajubá translation, a few popular lexical items in Pajubá and their variations were selected to be compared to the ST and discussed.

3.1.1. ‘Uó’

Explained in the introduction of this dissertation, the adjective ‘uó’ indicates anything and all that is negative, unpleasant or lacking joy. However broad, it is as simple as that definition goes. This characteristic of Pajubá helps explain things more easily rather than more clearly. A person, object, or situation. In Vip and Libi’s (2006) unofficial dictionary of Pajubá, a few other entries can be used to describe negative traits. It is the case of the term ‘bagaceira’, which means trashy. However, due to the fusion with PTBR and the offensive meaning ‘bagaceira’ could have outside a Pajubá context, ‘uó’ was employed more often.

The term appears nine times in the TT2 and substitutes a variation of terms as seen in table 12. These variations can be a great indicative of an evident effect over Explicitation. As Blum-Kulka (1986/2000: 301) emphasises, a translation choice leaves multiple interpretations behind and, therefore, makes a translated text more explicit. If that is the case, this term produces an inverted effect. This multiple-meaning term can easily allow the TT reader to decide whether something was dull or strenuous. Added to that, there is the substitution of terms from other classes of word. In segment 27, ‘to be in disgrace’ became ‘to be uó’ in the translation. As per segment 41, the narrator ‘grieved’ in the ST but ‘felt uó’ in the TT2. The last variation was in segment 130, in which ‘to be filled with cruelty’ simply became ‘to be uó’. All other cases were displayed as a direct substitution of other adjectives. This shows that, regardless of moving them up or down, it did change Explicitation levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>Uó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>In disgrace</td>
<td>Uó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Grieved</td>
<td>Uó</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.2. Mona

This noun is used to denote anything with effeminate traces, or which is feminine or female (Vip & Libi 2006). In this case, there were five occurrences of substitution; the personal pronoun she; the adjective lifelike; and the noun girls. Again, Explicitation can be easily inferred as classes of words changed (Blum-Kulka, 1986/2000).

Once again, there was the explicit effect of shifts in classes of words. Although the pronoun she appeared numerous times, it only became ‘mona’ in two occasions and, in each of them, it referred to a different she. In segment 3, it was the sender of the dolls. In segment 15, it was the doll itself, which could have also been ‘it’ in English. Segment 18 experienced a shift as well. In this third case, ‘to be lifelike’ became ‘to be a mona’ meaning ‘to be womanly’. Explicitation here was certainly increased as lifelike can be more broadly interpreted than womanly. At last, ‘girls’ have become ‘monas’ in segments 40 and 47. Overall, levels of Explicitation reported by the analysis of this term have fluctuate between being more and less explicit. Still, an effect over Explicitation was observable once more.
3.1.3. Bafo, Bafinho, Bafão e Bafônico(a)

The noun ‘bafo’ means bad breath in PTBR and, in Pajubá, anything that can cause shock, a relevant impact or make a difference. ‘Bafinho’ is the diminutive form of the term as ‘bafão’ is the augmentative one. To tell ‘bafos’ is to chat or gossip. ‘Bafônico’ and ‘bafônica’ are, respectively, masculine and feminine adjectives to describe the ability of something to cause the ‘bafo’ effect.

There were seven occurrences in six different forms. In segment 36, ‘hay and statues’ become ‘bafinhos’ in the TT2. The effect observed in the diminutive form is that of diminishing the importance or impact. Then, as the ‘incident’ became ‘bafão’ in segment 45, it is presumed that it indicates a higher relevance of such incident. Explicitation could occur as the terms selected in both cases indicate the level of importance of something. Thus, an increase in explicitness can be reported. ‘Falar bafos’, in segment 45 may be as explicit. In PTBR, ‘falar’ is ‘to talk’ and would have been enough substitute. However, to conform with Pajubá, it had the term ‘bafos’ combined with it. In that sense, due to the increase in word count and specific indication of the ‘sort of talk’ these characters would have, it could have made the segment more explicit. Similarly, ‘bafos’ in segment 79 indicates a change but a reverse one. ‘What happened’, indicating the situation between the girl and the teacher became ‘bafos’, which can be a series of situations. As far as Explicitation is concerned, it may give the segment a slightly different margin for assumptions, making it less explicit. The adjectives ‘bafônico’ and ‘bafônicas’ were used to substitute other adjectives. However, in comparing tender and wondrous, it is clear that term ‘bafônicas’ was used as a more general idea than the adjectives in the ST, putting both terms in the same category. This is then another indication of variation in explicitness. However, determining if this makes a sentence more or less Explicit is quite subjective and related to the reader’s ability to make more broaden or specific associations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Hay and statues</td>
<td>Bafinhos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Incident</td>
<td>Bafão.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>To talk</td>
<td>Falar bafos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Genial</td>
<td>Bafônico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.4. Aquendar

This verb originated in the expression ‘aquenda!’ or ‘acuenda!’ meaning ‘check that out!’ (Vip & Libi, 2006). This verb is a more recent development of the cryptolect, conjugated based on the verbal desinences existent in PTBR. It is an adaptation of the original expression and can mean ‘to look’, ‘to pay attention’, ‘to take’ or ‘to have sex’ even. This verb appears only in four occasions in the TT2. Even though it has a broad meaning, its sexual connotation could restrict the ideas in a sentence towards a more sexual inuendo. This is most certainly an important effect over Explicitation.

In segment 38, ‘to peep in’ became ‘aquendar’, bringing it closer to the idea of looking at rather than spying on something. Segments 50, 66 and 67 had a more direct connection with the most commonly attributed meaning of ‘aquendar’. Although ‘to look’ and ‘to see’ are not the same, their meaning can be pretty similar. The effect in explicitation in this section is more subtle as no word class shifted and no substantial change in meaning have been reported.

![Table 14 – Occurrences of the term bafo and its variants](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>What happened</td>
<td>Bafos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Tender</td>
<td>Bafônicas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Wondrous</td>
<td>Bafônicas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Table 15 – Occurrences of the term Aquendar](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>To peep in</td>
<td>Aquendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>To look</td>
<td>Aquendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>To look</td>
<td>Aquendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>To see</td>
<td>Aquendar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

Overall, the analyses have shown inconstant patterns of Explicitation, according to certain given categories. As with seeing the overall numbers, all three main analyses indicated similar pattern when the ST was compared to both TTs. Findings showed that the overall word and repetition counts suffered reductions, but the punctuation count did not. In fact, there was a significant increase in the number of punctuation items from the ST to both TTs. Most importantly, these figures have also varied from the TT1 to the TT2. A consistent reported reduction of 4.6 % in word count, an increase of 7.1% in punctuation use, and a decrease of 8.3% in the number of items experiencing lexical repetition.

Considering sentence length, the per-segment analysis also agreed with the overall word count. Both TT1 and TT2 were considered slightly less Explicit than the ST. Likewise, in comparing the number of more and less explicit items, there was a more significant value of less explicit items in the TT2 than the TT1. Very low reports of considerable changes also indicate that, as far as it concerns the number of words in a segment or sentence, explicitation varies in rather subtle ways. For both TTs, levels two, four and three of explicitation were the most common respectively. Both levels two and four were more expressive in the TT2. In an at-sentence-level observation, TT2 has shown a more levelled rate of Explicitation in comparison to the TT1. This is a relevant indication that an IGL translation can have a more consistent display of Explicitation at sentence level.

Punctuation saw changes in five out of the nine items present within all three productions. However, only three of them seemed relevant for analysis. The overall punctuation count showed reverse patters as those seen in sentence length and word count. Punctuation reports point at more explicit TTs. Here, TT1 always displayed increase or maintenance of the punctuation figures. Except for the case of hyphens, the TT2 had an equal or higher occurrence of punctuation in face of the ST as well. The analysis of periods showed increased Explicitation in both TTs and, in the TT2, a more expressive change. Comma analysis pointed to different results, indicating a less explicit TT2 in relation to the TT1. Other punctuation analysis pointed at distinct explicitation levels in which the TT1 was more explicit and the TT 2 was less explicit than the ST.

The overall repetition count indicates that the TT1 was less explicit than the ST and TT2 was even less explicit than both. In a category analysis, Explicitation increase was
reported in one category for both TTs. However, these were different for each of them. TT1 had experienced an increase in the number of noun repetitions, whereas the same happened with adjectives in the TT2. The study of each category faced, as the punctuation, low rates of occurrence and, therefore, considerably or equal explicitness was reported for the majority of cases. However, in this case, levels of Explicitation were very similar between the TT1 and TT2. In the specific case of adjectives, no effect of IGL—or a regular language—over Explicitation was reported when it comes to quantity in lexical repetition.

The analysis of the specific terms within the language in the translation also showed that Explicitation can be associated to these substitutions. That was mostly based in two factors; how broad the meaning of a term is; and shifts in word classes.

As with the information above, and considering the incongruence between the users of the TT2 language and the content of the ST, the TT2 message came across with different levels of explicitness that the ones established for the ST. Although an In-group language does not undermine Explicitation, the complexity of a message does not make Pajubá unsuitable for a translation either. Due to variation in results according to different specific analyses, it is still not possible to affirm with certainty what specific effect an IGL has over Explicitation, but it certainly affects it.

Unfortunately, the nature of this work is limiting. Only one relatively small textual production from one language to another was employed and it is possible that Explicitation patterns may be different if more or different data could have been employed. Also, not every single datum was crossed, and different categories and approaches had to be employed to conform with the needs of each specific section.

Furthermore, this work incites more extensive research using longer or more detailed corpora. Comparison at unit level could be confronted with those at sentence level. This could help understand what textual levels bear the most significant shifts in Explicitation levels. Besides that, cultural translation studies as those of Snell-Hornby’s (1990) could benefit from the investigations to check the extent in which cultural translation and cultural references have over Explicitation as well. Finally, Multilingualism research could use be favoured with in-group language translation since, as it is with Pajubá, some can gain very large dimensions.
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### Appendix 1 – Explicitation Level Per Segment (Complete Table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seg.</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>WDP</th>
<th>Lvl.</th>
<th>TT2</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>WDP</th>
<th>Lvl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seg.</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>TT1</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>WDP</td>
<td>Lvl.</td>
<td>TT2</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>WDP</td>
<td>Lvl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seg.</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>TT1 WD</td>
<td>WDP</td>
<td>Lvl.</td>
<td>TT2 WD</td>
<td>WDP</td>
<td>Lvl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seg.</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>TT1</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>WDP</td>
<td>Lvl.</td>
<td>TT2</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>WDP</td>
<td>Lvl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2481</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Doll

Every Christmas there came a present of a doll from a lady I scarcely knew.

She was a friend of my mother’s and though they only met rarely, or accidentally at a funeral, she kept up the miraculous habit of sending to me a doll. It would come on the evening bus shortly before Christmas and it added to the hectic glow of those days when everything was charged with bustle and excitement.

We made potato stuffing, we made mince pies, we made bowls of trifle, we decorated the window sills with holly and with tinsel, and it was as if untoward happiness was about to befall us.

Each year’s doll seemed to be more beautiful, more bewitching, and more sumptuously clad than the previous year’s.

They were of both sexes.

There was a jockey in bright red and saffron, there was a Dutch drummer boy in maroon velvet, there was a sleeping doll in a crinoline, a creature of such fragile beauty that I used to fear for her when my sisters picked her up clumsily or tried to make her flutter her eyelashes.

Her eyes were suggestive of china and small blue flowers, having the haunting color of one and the smooth glaze of the other.

She was named Rosalind.

My sisters, of course, were jealous and riled against the unfairness of my getting a doll whereas they only got the usual dull flannel sock with tiny things in it, necessary things such as pencils, copybooks, plus some toffees and a licorice pipe.

Each of my dolls was given a name, and a place of rest, in a corner or on a whatnot, or in an empty biscuit tin, and each had special conversations allotted to them, special endearments, and if necessary special chastisements.

They had special times for fresh air — a doll would be brought out and splayed on a window sill, or sunk down in the high grass and apparently abandoned.
I had no favorites until the seventh doll came and she was to me the living representation of a princess.

She too was a sleeping doll but a sizeable one and she was dressed in a pale-blue dress, with a gauze overdress, a pale-blue bonnet, and white kid button shoes.

My sisters—who were older—were as smitten with her as I.

She was uncanny.

We all agreed that she was almost lifelike and that with coaxing she might speak.

Her flaxen hair was like a feather to finger, her little wrists moved on a swivel, her eyelashes were black and sleek and the gaze in her eyes so fetching that we often thought she was not an inanimate creature, that she had a soul, and a sense of us.

Conversations with her were the most intense and the most incriminating of all.

It so happened that the teacher at school harbored a dislike for me and this for unfathomable reasons.

I loved lessons, was first with my homework, always early for class, then always lit the school fire, raked the ashes, and had a basket full of turf and wood when she arrived.

In fact my very diligence was what annoyed her and she would taunt me about it and proclaim what a “goody-goody” I was.

She made jokes about my cardigan or my shoe laces or the slide in my hair and to make the other girls laugh she referred to me as “It.”

She would say “It has a hole in its sock,” or “It hasn’t got a proper blazer,” or “It has a daub on its copybook.”

I believe she hated me.

If in an examination I came first—and I usually did—she would read out everyone’s marks, leave mine until last and say, “We know who swotted the most,” as if I were in disgrace.

If at cookery classes I made pancakes and offered her one she would make a face as if I had offered her tripe or strychnine.

She once got a big girl to give me fruit laxatives pretending that they were sweets and made great fun when I had to go in and out to the closets all day.

It was a cruel cross to bear.
When the Inspector came and praised me she said that I was brainy but that I lacked versatility.

In direct contrast she was lovely to my sisters and would ask them occasionally how was my mother, and when was she going to send over a nice pot of homemade jam or a slab cake.

I used to pray and make novenas that one day she would examine her conscience and think on how she wronged me and repent.

One day my prayers seemed on the point of being answered.

It was November and already the girls were saving up for Christmas and we knew that soon there would be the turkey market and soon after hams and little seedless oranges in the grocery shop window.

She said that since we’d all done so well in the Catechism exam she was going to get the infants to act in the school play and that we would build a crib and stack it with fresh hay and statues.

Somebody said that my doll would make a most beautiful Virgin.

Several girls had come home with me to see the doll and had been allowed to peep in at her in her box that was lined with silver chaff.

I brought her next day and every head in the classroom craned as the teacher lifted the lid of the black lacquered box and looked in.

“She’s passable,” she said, and told one of the girls to put the doll in the cookery press until such time as she was needed.

I grieved at being parted from her but I was proud of the fact that she would be in the school play and be the cynosure of all.

I had made her a cloak, a flowing blue cloak with a sheath of net over it and a little diamanté clasp.

She was like a creature of moonlight, shimmering, even on dark wet days.

The cookery press was not a fit abode for her but what could I do?

The play did not pass off without incident.

The teacher’s cousin, Milo, was drunk, belligerent and offensive.

He called girls up to the fire to pretend to talk to them and then touched the calves of their legs and tickled the backs of their knees.
He called me up and asked would I click.

He was an auctioneer from the city and unmarried.

The teacher’s two sons also came to look at the performance but one of them left in the middle.

He was strange and would laugh for no reason and although over twenty he called the teacher “Mammy”.

He had very bright red hair and a peculiar stare in his eyes.

For the most part the infants forgot their lines, lost their heads and the prompter was always late so that the wrong girls picked up her cues.

She was behind a curtain but could be heard out on the street.

The whole thing was a fiasco.

My doll was the star of the occasion and everyone raved about her.

Afterwards there was tea and scones and the teacher talked to those few mothers who had come.

My mother had not come because at that time she was unable to confront crowds and even dreaded going to Mass on Sundays, but believed that God would preserve her from the dizziness and suffocations that she was suffering from.

After they had all left and a few of us had done the washing up, I went to the teacher and to my delight she gave me a wide genial smile.

She thanked me for the doll, said that there was no denying but that the doll saved the play and then as I reached out she staved my hand with a ruler and laughed heartily.

“You don’t think I’m going to let you have her now, I’ve got quite fond of her… the little mite,” she said and gave the china cheek a tap.

At home I was berserk.

My mother said the teacher was probably teasing and that she would return the doll in a day or two.

My father said that if she didn’t she would have to answer to him, or else get a hammering.
The days passed and the holidays came and not only did she not give me my doll but she took it to her own home and put it in the china cabinet along with cups and ornaments.

Passing by their window I would look in.

I could not see her because the china cabinet was in a corner, but I knew where she was as the maid Lizzie told me.

I would press my forehead to the window and call to the doll and say that I was thinking of her, and that rescue was being hatched.

Everyone agreed that it was monstrous but no one talked to the teacher, no one tackled her.

The truth is they were afraid of her.

She had a bitter tongue and also, being superstitious, they felt that she could give us children brains or take them away as a witch might.

It was as if she could lift the brains out of us with a forceps and pickle them in brine.

No one did anything and in time I became reconciled to it.

I asked once in a fit of bravura and the teacher said wasn’t I becoming impudent.

No longer did I halt to look in the window of her house but rather crossed the road and I did not talk to Lizzie in case she should tell me something upsetting.

Once I was sent to the teacher’s house with a loin of pork and found her by the fire with her queer son, both of them with their stockings down, warming themselves.

There were zigzags of heat on their shins.

She asked if I wanted to go in and see the doll, but I declined.

By then I was preparing to go away to boarding school and I knew that I would be free of her forever, that I would forget her, that I would forget the doll, forget most of what happened, or at least remember it without a quiver.

The years go by and everything and everyone gets replaced.

Those we knew, though absent, are yet merged inextricably into new folk so that each person is to us a sum of many others and the effect is of opening box after box in which the original is forever hidden.
The teacher dies a slow death, wastes to a thread through cancer, yet strives
against it and says she is not ready.

I hear the amount of money she left and her pitiable last words but I feel nothing.

I feel none of the rage and none of the despair.

She does not matter to me anymore.

I am on the run from them.

I have fled.

I live in a city.

I am cosmopolitan.

People come to my house, all sorts of people, and they do feats like dancing, or
jesting, or singing, inventing a sort of private theatre where we all play a part.

I too play a part.

My part is to receive them and disarm them, ply them with food and drink and
secretly be wary of them, be distanced from them.

Like them I smile, and drift, like them I smoke or drink to induce a feverishness or a
pleasant wandering hallucination.

It is not something I cultivated.

It developed of its own accord, like a spore that breathes in the darkness.

So I am far from those I am with, and far from those I have left.

At night I enjoy the farness.

In the morning I touch a table or a teacup to make sure that it is a table or a teacup
and I talk to it, and I water the flowers and I talk to them, and I think how tender
flowers are, and woods and wood smoke and possibly how tender are my new
friends but that like me they are intent on concealment.

None of us ever says where we come from or what haunts us.

Perhaps we are bewildered or ashamed.

I go back.

Duty hauls me back to see the remaining relatives and I play the expected part.

I had to call on the teacher’s son.

He was the undertaker and was in charge of my aunt’s burial.
I went to pay him, to “fix up” as it is called, and his wife whom I knew to be a bit scattered admitted me amidst peals of laughter.

She said she always thought I had jet-black hair, as she ran down the hall calling his name.

His name is Denis.

He shakes hands with me very formally, asks what kind of wreath I want and if it should be heart-shaped, circular, or in the form of a cross.

I leave it all to him.

There in the overstuffed china cabinet is my confiscated doll and if dolls can age, it certainly had.

Gray and moldy, the dress and cloak are as a shroud and I thought if I were to pick her up she would disintegrate.

“God, my mother was fond of her,” he said, as if he were trying to tell me that she had been fond of me too.

Had he said so I might have hissed.

I was older now and it was clear to me that she had kept the doll out of perversity, out of pique and jealousy.

In some way she had divined that I would have a life far away from them and adventures such as she herself would never taste.

Sensing my chill, he boasted that he had not let his own children play with the doll, thereby implying that she was a sacred object, a treasured souvenir.

He hauled out a brandy bottle and winked expecting me to say yes.

I declined.

A sickness had come over me, a sort of nausea for having cared so much about the doll, for having let them maltreat me and now for no longer caring at all.

My abrupt departure puzzled him.

He did something untoward.

He tried to kiss me.

He thought perhaps that in my world it was the expected thing.

Except that the kiss was proffered as a sympathy kiss, a kiss of condolence over my aunt’s death.
His face had the sour smell of a towel that he must have dried himself on, just before he came to welcome me.

The kiss was clumsiness personified.

I pitied him but I could not stay, and I could not reminisce, and I could not pretend to be the fast kiss-easy woman he imagined me to be.

Walking down the street, where I walk in memory, morning noon and night, I could not tell what it was, precisely, that reduced me to such wretchedness.

Indeed it was not death but rather the gnawing conviction of not having yet lived.

All I could tell was that the stars were as singular and as wondrous as I remembered them and that they still seemed like a link, an enticement to the great heavens, and that one day I would reach them and be absorbed into their glory, and pass from a world that, at that moment, I found to be rife with cruelty and stupidity, a world that had forgotten how to give.

“Tomorrow…” I thought.

“Tomorrow I shall be gone,” and realized that I had not lost the desire to escape or the strenuous habit of hoping.