AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF REPRESENTATION OF GAY CHARACTERS IN A PARALLEL CORPUS OF SHORT STORIES: A SYSTEMIC-FUNCTIONAL APPROACH

Adail Sebastião Rodrigues Júnior
Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto
adail.sebastiao@terra.com.br

Abstract: This exploratory paper focusses its analysis on the system of transitivity of an English/Portuguese parallel corpus of a collection of gay stories first published in 1966 in the United States of America and retextualized more than thirty years later in Brazil. Since this is an ongoing research project, the paper's main objective is to map out the discursive choices of transitivity in one of the short stories and its translation, in order to reveal how the protagonist is represented in both, as well as to analyse general discursive features in the original and translated corpora as a whole. The analyses carried out suggest that there is a relative frequency of processes that represent human participants acting upon the world and on each other, and parts of the characters' bodies seen as abstract agents or participants that act upon the world as well. Finally, the paper is expected to serve some of the methodological needs of MA students who approach their research data for the first time.

Keywords: corpus-based translation studies, systemic-functional linguistics, transitivity, gay representation.

1. Introduction[1]

With the publication of *The Translation Studies Reader*, Venuti (2000) presented seminal papers and essays on Translation Studies focussing on how the discipline has gradually evolved and reached its position in academic research. The publication seems to have

approached the status of a milestone in the field, given that the very foundation of the discipline and its interdisciplinary basis was first published in one unique collection. One of the essays that intertwines linguistic and cultural approaches to the study of gay translation is Harvey's essay *Translating Camp Talk* (2000). In this essay, Harvey investigates a specific verbal style of male American homosexuals of post-war period known as *camp* and its translation into English and French, with the support of literary theories, cultural studies and linguistics. Harvey affirms that some features of femininity presented in the originals, common to *camp* discourse, may cause pr oblems during translation. In a word, Harvey says that while femininity is easily identified in the linguistic structure of originals, within cultural dimensions, more precisely, Angloamerican and French cultures, that is not the case. In this way, *camp* discourse may be seen as a kind of textual strategy open to diverse discursive functions.

At the end of his essay, Harvey (2000: 466) points to the proximity of Translation Studies and Critical Linguistics (Fowler, 1996), highlighting the central importance of linguistics to the investigation of power and ideology in translation.So In this exploratory paper, however, I focus my attention specifically on a linguistic and small corpus-based analysis of a parallel corpus (English/Portuguese) of a collection of gay stories entitled *Stud*, first published in 1966 in the United States of America and re-textualized as *As Aventuras de um Garoto de Programa* (henceforth *Garoto*) more than thirty years later in Brazil (Andros, 1982 [1966], 1998). The theoretical basis for this study is Systemic-Functional Linguistics (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004), more precisely, the discursive transitivity choices in both source and target texts, in a bid to uncover how the protagonist is represented in one of the stories as well as to analyse general discursive features in the original and translated corpora as a whole. It is also worth noting that the analysis presented in this paper is only one part of an ongoing major research (Rodrigues Júnior, in prep.). Bearing this in mind, the pa-

per is first and foremost intended to provide practical methodological steps to MA students who are approaching their own research data for the first time, supported by Systemic-Functional Linguistics (notably the transitivity model), Corpus Linguistics and the discursive approaches to translation. In what follows, I will briefly present the categories of transitivity I used in this study, the methodology adopted, the analysis and final remarks.

2. 'Clause as representation': the system of transitivity

Halliday (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004) posits that our experiences in the world consist of 'goings-on', that is, a flow of events that represent our outer activities or social manifestations in daily life and our inner thoughts or forms of interpretation of the world. Given that the clause is the central unit whereby meaning is processed and mapped into a grammatical structure (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004), Halliday affirms that it is in the system of transitivity that *experiential* meaning is realized, within a wide range of potential choices available in the system of any language. So for Halliday transitivity is constituted by (i) *processes* in the verbal complex of clauses; (ii) abstract or human *participants* involved in the processes and realized by nominal groups of clauses; and (iii) *circumstances* associated with the processes in adverbial groups or prepositional phrases.

Halliday (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004) says that speakers and writers construe their outer and inner experiences in three different but interconnected realizations, namely: (i) *Material* experiences realized by material process clauses of 'doing' (the lion [Actor] *caught* the tourist [Goal]) and 'happening' (the lion [Actor] *sprang*); (ii) *Mental* experiences realized by mental process clauses that represent speakers' or writers' p erception (I [Senser] can *feel* something [Phenomenon] on my foot [Circumstance of Location]); speakers' or writers' cognition (I [Senser] *remember* how it was

[Phenomenon]); speakers' or writers' desire (Do you [Senser] *want* lasagna [Phenomenon]?); and speakers' or writers' emotion (I [Senser] *hate* lasagna [Phenomenon]); (iii) *Relational* experiences realized by relational process clauses which reveal th e attributes (Sarah [Carrier] *is* wise [Attribute]) and identities (Sarah [Identified] *is* the leader [Identifier]) of speakers and writers.

Three other forms of representation are realized by *Behavioural*, *Verbal* and *Existential* processes considered by Halliday to be 's ubsidiary' processes (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004). On the borderline of mental and material processes are the behavioural processes, which realize outer manifestations of inner experiences of consciousness (People [Behaver] *are laughing*). On the borderline of relational and mental processes are the verbal processes, which symbolize relationships through language forms, like meaning and saying (I [Sayer] *said* it's noisy [Target] in here [Circumstance of Location]). To conclude, on the borderline of material and relational processes are the existential processes whereby all kinds of experiential phenomena are recognized as to 'be', to 'happen' or to 'exist' (*There was* [Existent] an old person of Dover).

Following a Ha llidayan approach, Simpson (1993) explores how characters are represented in the point of view of narratives, since the "pattern of transitivity squares neatly with the viewing position of the narrator" (p.103). For him, narratives broadly lie in two categories defined as 'category A', or first person narratives narrated by a participating character, and 'category B', or third person narratives narrated by a disembodied or non-participating character. By splitting narratives into two general categories, Simpson (1993: 104) affirms that the transitivity model "has been employed to uncover how certain meanings are foregrounded while others are suppressed or obfuscated". In other words, transitivity analysis is one means of making the point of view of the narrative explicit and showing how characters are symbolized by some linguistic choices speakers or writers make over others available in the system of the language of the narrative under analysis (see also

Montgomery, 1993). The theoretical ground presented in this section shall be clarified during the analysis that follows. For more information about Systemic-Functional Linguistics, Bloor and Bloor (1995), Eggins (2004), Martin, Matthiessen and Painter (1997), and Thompson (1996) provide valuable snapshots of much applied work in this research field.

3. Methodology

This is a small corpus-based study (Sinclair, 2001) and the tool-kit computational software used to analyse the data is *WordSmith Tools* developed by Mike Scott (1996, 1997, 1999). The program tools used to investigate the data were *WordList*, *Concord* and *Aligner*. *WordList* helps researchers identify common words or types in corpora of any length and determine which lexical choices have been made in texts. *WordList* gives a list of types arranged in order of frequency or alphabetically.

Concord gives a list of all occurrences of a selected item (node) in a corpus, displayed in sequence of words in a sentence or clause, that is, in KWIC (KEY WORD IN CONTEXT) format. At the very centre of the sequence lies the 'node' word, along with the words to its left and right positions. Concordance lines allow for the investigation of collocates and lexico-grammatical patterns in that the lines are displayed horizontally, which facilitates the observation of word combinations.

Aligner displays sentences and their translations in parallel format. ThisTh tool allows for the investigation of 'common' and 'uncommon' linguistic choices translators make throughout translation.

After scanning the whole corpus, correcting some mistakes common to the process of scanning, and transforming it into a *.txt* file, the corpus was manually tagged in order to be prepared for the identification of processes in the data. The codes used for each process are the following: < PROMAT> for material process (e.g.

I had been hustling < *PROMAT*> for a few years, but here at Lake McDonald I had to go < *PROMAT*> easy on), < PROMEN> for mental process (e.g. and I hated < *PROMEN*> his gah-damned guts!), < PROREL> for relational process (e.g. I was < *PROREL*> what they called "chief information clerk" — but that was a blind.), < PROBEH> for behavioural process (e.g. I looked < *PROBEH*> at him, cold.), < PROVERB> for verbal process (e.g. "Put the dude's chair so he's facin' the light," he said < *PROVERB*> , doing so), and < PROEXIST> for existential process (e.g. There weren't < *PROEXIST*> many people in the hotel.).

   Given that the corpus was written in a first person narrative, the codes were tagged after the subject pronoun *I* of the first short story of both original and translation. This kind of annotation is supposed to reveal the way the protagonist of the stories is represented through linguistic choices of transitivity *vis-à-vis* the other gay characters with whom he is discursively construed. It is important to note, however, that the elliptical subject pronoun "Eu", common to Portuguese language was taken into account throughout the target text annotation. That is to say, whenever the process was linked directly to such an elided subject, represented linguistically through ellipses, the process was tagged as well. Therefore, differences in the frequency of occurrences of the first person pronoun "I" in the original and its equivalent translation "Eu" may be probably due to this linguistic characteristic of the Portuguese language system (see further analysis through *WordList*). Thus, one main research question was posed: What are the general discursive features of both original and translation in relation to processes, participants and clausal elements used to represent these features? Given that this paper presents an exploratory study of the corpus under analysis, only the protagonist of the first short story and the processes linked to him will be taken into account.

   After this, the corpus was ready to be processed by *WordSmith Tools*. The analyses are shown in next section.

4. *WordList*-derived analysis

Table 1 shows the first quantitative results *WordList* demonstrated of the whole corpus.

Features	Stud	Garoto
Tokens	55,077	53,221
Types	6,429	7,379
Type/Token Ratio	11.67	13.86

Table 1: General features of the corpus presented by WordList

As presented in *Table 1*, the number of types and tokens in *Stud* in comparison with *Garoto* suggest that the translation ha s a broader range of lexical variety and consequently fewer re peated words. The same is true when observing the higher type/token ratio in the translation if compared to the original, which also indicates a higher lexical variety in *Garoto*, considering that "[w]here there is a lot of repetition, we can expect the type/token ratio to be lower than in cases where writers avoid re-using the same words" (Kenny, 2001: 34).

The results presented in *Table 1* are largely due to the textual features of the English language system as well as the Portuguese language system. Two examples extracted from the corpus may clarify this difference:

> (1) Strange, how *in the midst of* such serene surroundings a hatred like this could spring into being.
> (2) Era estranho que um ódio como este pudesse florescer *num* ambiente tão sereno.

The translated version (2) re-textualized the preposition group "in the midst of" using only one prepositional complex in Portuguese (1) "num" (em + um). Consequently, the number of occurrence of tokens in the original is higher (17 occurrences) than the re-

textualization (13 occurrences). So the number of tokens in the original is higher than the number of tokens presented in the translation.

Another example provides evidence for the higher number of occurrence of types in *Garoto* in comparison with the number of occurrence of types in *Stud*:

> *(3) His* dark *and* heavy eyebrows winged upwards at the outer ends, *and his* eyes were black *and* snapping.
> (4) Os cantos externos de suas sobrancelhas escuras *e* espessas arqueavam-se para cima *e* seus olhos eram negros *e* incisivos.

As the examples (3) and (4) show, the number of types in the original (15 occurrences) is lower than the number of types in the translated version (17 occurrences), which somehow or other corroborates the data provided by *Table 1*. The main point here is that the number of tokens and types of *Stud* and *Garoto* are owing to the differences of systemic textualizations of English and Portuguese languages, respectively, which naturally represent world realities according to the linguistic resources each language utilizes.

Table 2 shows the number of processes used in the original and translated version of the first story.

Stud	Garoto
PROMAT (50)	PROMAT (39)
PROMEN (28)	PROMEN (26)
PROVERB (28)	PROVERB (26)
PROBEH (21)	PROBEH (22)
PROREL (11)	PROREL (7)
Total: 138	**Total: 120**

Table 2:Processes in the first short stories of Stud and Garoto

It is clear that *Stud's* first short story shows a higher frequency of material processes than *Garoto*, even though the latter presents

a high frequency of material processes as well if compared to other processes, which suggests that the corpus under study is comprised of a protagonist who acts upon the world. Nonetheless, it can also be seen that mental, verbal and behavioural processess have considerable frequencies in both texts, pointing to the fact that the corpus under investigation has a protagonist being represented as, respectively, Senser, Sayer and Behaver. In other words, the first stories selected here show a protagonist who, besides acting on the world, thinks of and talks about it as well. Relational processes, in turn, do not present outstanding statistical differences between original and translation.

Table 3 shows the same tagged corpus in percentages.

Process	Stud	Garoto
PROMAT	36.23%	32.50%
PROMEN	20.29%	21.67%
PROVERB	20.29%	21.67%
PROBEH	15.22%	18.33%
PROREL	7.97%	5.83%
Total	100%	100%

Table 3: Processes in percentage in the first short stories of Stud and Garoto

The percentages of process types indicate that patterns of both textualization in the original and re-textualization in translation are almost similar in both texts, which suggests that the lexicogrammatical choices in the translation version in comparison with the original are probably the same. The percentages of material processes in *Stud* and *Garoto*, however, are higher if compared to the other processes. This data is supported by the fact that, according to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 174), "the setting or orientation of a narrative is often dominated by 'existential' and 'relational' clauses, but the main event line is construed predominantly by 'material' clauses". Likewise, given that the corpus is a narrative, the outstanding presence of mental and verbal

clauses is justified, since both process types project ideas and speeches, respectively, by using reported speech constructions. Behavioural processes, in turn, share discursive characteristics with material processes, given its quasi-materiality representation in the course of clausal meaning formation.

Table 4 presents the top twenty most frequent types of the original corpus in its entirety. According to Kenny (2001), normally the most common types in any corpus are "function words" (p. 39), like conjunctions, determiners, relative pronouns, *inter alia*.

Word	Frequency	Percentage
The	2,663	4.84%
I	1,997	3.63%
And	1,995	3.62%
A	1,547	2.81%
He	1,226	2.23%
Of	1,187	2.16%
To	1,131	2.05%
Said	863	1.57%
Was	856	1.55%
It	746	1.35%
In	719	1.31%
His	698	1.27%
You	677	1.23%
That	588	1.07%
On	515	0.94%
My	482	0.88%
Me	459	0.83%
At	399	0.72%
For	391	0.71%
With	386	0.70%

Table 4: Twenty most frequent types in Stud

Types are ranked according to their frequency. .The second column displays the absolute frequency, or occurrences, whereas the third column shows the relative frequency, or percentage. As is clearly seen, there is a high frequency of function words like conjunctions, prepositions and pronouns. The high frequency of the personal pronoun *I* (1,997 occurrences) is worth noting, since the corpus is a first person narrative, that is, according to Simpson (1993), the data represents a protagonist who is 'incorporated' in the stories. Also worth noting, the second most outstanding data are the presences of the verbal process *Said* (863 occurrences) and the relational process *Was* (856 occurrences), which may indicate, respectively, that gay characters, and probably other participants, are depicted as personages who talk about the world that surrounds them and, also, are portrayed as characters who are identified with specific attributes and/or values in the narratives.

Another very interesting figure shown in *Table 4* is the presence of the preposition *Of* (1,187 occurrences) and possessive pronouns *His* (698 occurrences) and *My* (482 occurrences). These elements may represent linguistic choices related to the protagonist and other human participants, as well as other linguistic structures probably referring to some elements, mostly abstract elements linked to both the protagonist and other characters, that gain *agency*, for instance, by means of material processes (cf. Halliday, 1973; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 292). These hypotheses shall be clarified further in the section *Aligner*-derived analysis.

To conclude this part, *Table 5* demonstrates the twenty top types in *Garoto* as a whole.

Word	Frequency	Percentage
De	1,889	3.55%
E	1,869	3.51%
Eu	1,344	2.53%
Que	1,331	2.50%
O	1,280	2.41%

A	1,236	2.32%
Ele	1,200	2.25%
Um	1,044	1.96%
Disse	826	1.55%
Para	713	1.34%
Não	665	1.25%
Se	572	1.07%
Uma	561	1.05%
Com	553	1.04%
Me	472	0.89%
Do	454	0.85%
Em	439	0.82%
Por	359	0.67%
Era	356	0.67%
É	348	0.65%

Table 5: Twenty most frequent types in Garoto

Like in the original, *Table 5* shows significant occurrences of "function words", as Kenny (2001) affirms. The personal pronoun *Eu* ([I]1,344 occurrences) has a high frequency, since the stories are narrated in the first person. When we compare this data with the original, we see that the pronoun *I* in the original has a higher frequency than *Eu*, which generally means that the pronoun *Eu* was elided. It is acknowledged that ellipsis of the pronoun *Eu* is a common ocurrence in Portuguese and it signals the differences of realization between English and Portuguese (cf. Gouveia and Barbara, 2004). Following similar discursive patterns presented in *Table 4*, *Table 5* shows a high frequency of the preposition *De* (1,889 occurrences) as a possible re-textualization for *Of* (cf. *Table 4*). So this data demonstrates that the translation seems to have followed the same discursive patterns of the original text.

5. *Concord*-derived analysis

Hunston (2002) says that concordance analysis ca n be influenced by human intuition. In order to minimize this kind of 'influence', Hunston suggests that a more detailed statistical analysis using *WordList* may be helpful to the researcher, since some questions might emerge fr om the data *WordList* presents. For the analysis of the forty top concordances for the personal pronoun *I*, I used the data provided by *Wordlist*. *Figure 1* shows the concordance lines of *Stud* in its entirety.

```
 1    for I had no idea what I had done or said, I ste
 2       hole suite." "Yessir," I said. Mr. Perkins hardl
 3   hurry. That would mean I really hated Negroes, a
 4        of books." "Yeah," I said, thinking of other
 5   ittle. "Thanks," he said. "I like you. You remind
 6       tree. From the floor." I choked. "Anudder,"
 7           "A male whore," I said, savagely—and wo
 8   good deal, even before I got him in bed. And th
 9    intuition. "Your uncle?" I said. "The one you tol
10  A good idea," Ace said. "I feel like one. Trevil
11     candal to the jaybirds,"I said, using another So
12     at. "Men or women?" I asked. "Bi," said Ve
13     a two-bit whore first," I said. "Not hard," sai
14   little activity myself. So I laid off that routine and
15  aren't blue-veined hand. "I am not unaware of th
16     a photographer whom I'd known a long time in
17       a nice sweet kid and I think you're swell. But
18     atthias said. "Okay," I said. "Now listen. I'm
19    a week after my return I called that number, as
20  long, long time. Usually I went off to an isolated
21     third grade white boy," I said. "As for wanting t
22       long time?" "Far as I know, yeah," I said. "I'
23     usurper. An interloper. I kept thinking he was g
24       days ago. "Okay," I said, and gave him the
25     in a way," I said. "Only I think you'd really just
```

26   a black sea-world, and **I** closed my eyes briefly.
27   a lapse of time while **I** thought that one over.
28   nettled. "Except me. **I**'m new here, remember
29   expression. "I mean," **I** added in a hurry, "you
30   and chilly smile. "**I** think it's more curiosi
31   fine, fun-filled summer," **I** said. "It's your afternoo
32   a far-forward one; and **I** learned what he meant
33   patsy for anybody. And **I** hate anybody who scre
34   drink once, just before **I** was to go on duty, an
35   out a trick," I said, "but **I** reckon I can trust you,
36   out a lot in me that **I** never knew was there.
37   "What happened?" **I** asked the nurse.   Sh
38   a nut for wanting to, "**I** said, "but if you really
39   bed—a helluva lot of fun. **I** began to feel a little no
40   a sort of dry sobbing. **I** let him have it out. Wh

Figure 1: Forty top concordance lines of Stud

In the examples in the concordance lines of *Stud*, the protagonist is represented as an incorporated and active character in the narrative, construing his world experiences by discursive instances of material processes (*I had done*, line 1), mental processes (*I think it's more…*, line 30), relational processes (*I am not unaware…*, line 15), behavioural processes (*I closed my eyes briefly*, line 26), and verbal processes (*Okay, I said*, line 18). The prominent presence of verbal process *Said* in *Figure 1* exemplifies the information *WordList* (*Table 4*) demonstrated, that is, a high frequency of *Said* in the corpus. In view of this, the data shown in *Figure 1* seems to represent the protagonist more as Actor and Sayer than Behaver and Carrier.

Following the same methodology for *Stud*, *Figure 2* shows the forty top concordance lines of *Garoto* in its entirety.

1 — eu disse, cedendo. **Eu** estava sentado sobre
2 — ele aquiesceu quando **eu** disse 28 — sem nun
3   deixei no meu armário. **Eu** gostava de beber da
4   asa está uma bagunça. **Eu** estava lavando a louç

```
5     voz velha e cansada. Eu agradeci, desliguei e
6      a catraca. — E talvez eu queira — murmurei.
7    desvantagem era que eu não podia sustentar a
8   hei a porta.    — Não! — eu disse, e então mande
9  a a primeira vez em que eu subia numa daquelas
10   ponto de quase cegar. Eu umedeci os lábios co
11  eu a como.    — Cara — eu disse. — É muito per
12   morar com vocês dois. Eu podia muito bem fica
13           — A primeira vez! — eu disse explosivamente
14        a mesa e as cortinas. Eu ainda tremi algumas
15        ais extravagante que eu já vivi. Achei que Lef
16        s choques ocasionais. Eu vi as grotescas muda
17        painha da frente tocar. Eu apertei o botão e ab
18  lar a verdade, foi lá que eu comecei a fazer progr
19        a cara de Milwaukee — eu disse amargo. — O
20      ui a mim — ela disse. Eu agradeci e fui embor
21  a altura do campeonato eu já tinha bastante tem
22        maçã quem comeu fui eu. Espelho,
23           — Com certeza — eu disse. Ela estava
24        te nada, disse Rudolf. Eu apenas me deito e d
25        e chegar, como depois eu soube, de férias no
26        edendo e nós subimos. Eu estava nervoso e sua
27      Ace riu um pouco. — Eu gostaria de experime
28        — Ace, esta noite não — eu disse, num protesto
29  e, o primeiro negro que eu realmente havia conh
30      uma coisa para fazer. Eu usei uma das minha
31   hava isso.    — Por que eu não posso ir lá e faz
32        — Acho que agora, se eu quiser, vou ter de pa
33        ir?   — Acho que sim — eu disse — A menos qu
34        o caminho pela cidade. Eu apenas o agarrei mai
35        onteceu a um cara que eu conheço. — E daí?
36        naquela primeira noite, eu era um cara realment
37        inha coloração", como eu acho que os biólogos
38        dolescente. Eu não ia — eu não podia pagar, ele
39        ctiva era perpendicular. Eu vi o horizonte negro
40        Rex — ele disse.    Eu relaxei por completo.
```

Figure 2: Forty top concordance lines of Garoto

In *Figure 2* the protagonist is retextualized as Actor (*Eu umedeci os lábios* [literally rendered as 'I moistened my lips'], line 10), Behaver (*Eu relaxei por completo* [literally rendered as 'I relaxed completely'], line 40), Senser (*Eu vi o horizonte negro* [literally rendered as 'I saw the black horizon'], line 39), Sayer (*Acho que sim – eu disse* [literally rendered as 'I guess so – I said'], line 33), and Carrier (*Eu estava nervoso* [literally rendered as 'I was nervous'], line 26). Verbal processes have a higher frequency in *Figure 2* if compared to other processes, which indicates that the data shown in *Figure 2* followed similar lexico-grammatical patterns present in the original, as *Table 5* (*Disse* [Said], 826 occurrences) above also suggests.

6. *Aligner*-derived analysis

Thus far the corpus of this study has been analysed from *specific* discursive perspectives. In what follows, a more *comparative* analysis is done, since *Aligner* allows texts to be aligned with respect to each other, in a bid to identify discursive choices in the an original and their translation into target texts. Bearing the previous analyses in mind, the excerpts in this section were selected to demonstrate some discursive choices of *agency* in both original and translation. According to Thompson (1996), the notion of agency is deeply related to the presence or absence of an external cause to the realization of material processes. Downing and Locke (2002) also state th at the concept of 'animate agent' is linked to discursive features of intentionality, motivation and reponsibility, whereas in the concept of 'inanimate agent' these discursive features are not present.

Vasconcellos (1998), a Brazilian translation scholar, advocates that the notion of agency has a central role for the comprehension of how discursive choices represent the actions people perform in narratives. According to Vasconcellos, the overall linguistic marks used to minimize or even neutralize agency in narratives are, among

others, (i) passive constructions, (ii) inanimate and abstract sub-
jects, and (iii) impersonal constructions. So the excerpts in italics
in *Figure 3* were selected keeping Vanconcellos' standpoints in mind.

5 < !—L1, S 3—> Strange, how in the midst of such serene sur-
roundings *a hatred like this* could spring into being.

6 < !—L2, S 3—> Era estranho que *um ódio como este* pudesse
florescer num ambiente tão sereno.

11   < !—L1, S 6—> *You* were free to take a saddle-horse
ride on those days when you didn't have to work, or to go fishing in
the noisy streams in the afternoons.

12   < !—L2, S 6—> *Tínhamos* permissão para dar uma volta
a cavalo nos dias de folga ou ir pescar à tarde nas ruidosas corredeiras.

13   < !—L1, S 7—> Only in the evenings, every evening, did
you have to put on a suit and try to sell saddle-horse trips, complete
with authentic Western guide, to the dude tourists who came to Gla-
cier National Park.

14   < !—L2, S 7—> Somente à noite, toda noite, *era* preciso
vestir um uniforme e tentar vender passeios a cavalo aos veranistas
que vinham ao Glacier National Park. Passeios completos, com um
autêntico guia do oeste.

17   < !—L1, S 9—> *You* ate in the main dining room, slept in
a small cabin, and in general enjoyed your paid vacation.

18   < !—L2, S 9—> *Podíamos* comer na sala de jantar prin-
cipal, dormir num pequeno beliche e, no mais, aproveitar as férias
pagas.

27   < !—L1, S 14—> *You* developed quite a line as *you* learned
more about the work.

28   < !—L2, S 14—> *Fui* desenvolvendo um estilo próprio à
medida que *aprendia* mais a respeito do trabalho.

31   < !—L1, S 16—> *You* never said anything about the mos-
quitoes, the ever-present wood ticks, the dangers of spotted fever and
snakes, and *you* soft-pedaled the extraordinary price of the tours.

32   < !—L2, S 16—> Nunca *se dizia* qualquer coisa a respeito
dos mosquitos, dos inevitáveis carrapatos, dos perigos da febre tifóide
ou das cobras, e com muito tato *mencionava-se*, no meio da conversa,
o extraordinário preço das excursões.

117   < !—L1, S 59—> *His dark and heavy eyebrows* winged upwards at the outer ends, and his eyes were black and snapping.
118   < !—L2, S 59—> *Os cantos externos de suas sobrancelhas escuras e espessas* arqueavam-se para cima e seus olhos eram negros e incisivos.
459   < !—L1, S 230—> *I* pulled them off promat, and *my hand*—of its own will, with no conscious command from me—passed itself briefly over the warm damp wool of his sock.
460   < !—L2, S 230—> *Puxei*-as, e *minha mão* — por vontade própria, sem nenhum comando consciente de minha parte — raspou rapidamente sobre a lã quente e úmida de sua meia.
473   < !—L1, S 237—> *His flesh* was hot under my hand.
474   < !—L2, S 237—> *Senti* sua carne em minhas mãos.
489   < !—L1, S 245—> *His legs* hung down over the side of the bed, and *his crotch* was at eye level.
490   < !—L2, S 245—> *Suas pernas* pendiam para for a da cama e *seu pau* estava na altura do meu olhar.

Figure 3: Stud-Garoto first short stories Aligner sample

Building on Vasconcellos' categories, *Figure 3* shows the following discursive marks:

(i) *Passive construction*s: there were no cases of passive constructions in the original; the translation, on the other hand, presents in line 32 two cases of passive constructions: *nunca se dizia* [literally rendered as 'it was never said'] and *mencionava-se* [literally rendered as 'it was mentioned'].

(ii) *Inanimate or abstract subjects: a hatred like this/um ódio como este* (lines 5 and 6); *His dark and heavy eyebrows/Os cantos externos de suas sombrancelhas escuras e espessas* (lines 117 and 118); *… and my hand (…) passed…/ … e minha mão (…) raspou…* (lines 459 and 460); *His flesh was hot/Senti sua carne em minhas mãos* – part of the body re-textualized as a mental process and its agent *Eu* (I) elided within the process: *Senti sua carne…* (lines 473 and 474); *His legs hung down (…) his crotch was…/Suas pernas pendiam (…) seu pau estava* (lines 489 and 490).

(iii) *Impersonal constructions:* there are cases of impersonal *you* in the original and no cases of impersonal constructions in the translation; all cases, on the other hand, are re-textualized as first singular and plural subjects elided within the processes chosen to construe or represent the characters: *You were free/Tínhamos permissão* (lines 11 and 12); *You ate/Podíamos comer* (lines 17 and 18); *You developed (…) as you learned/Fui desenvolvendo (…) à medida que aprendia* (lines 27 and 28).

The analysis above shows the protagonist as an omnipresent participant in the stories and also some linguistic choices of impersonal *you* in the original re-textualized as processes. Most strikingly, the presence of inanimate and abstract agents in *Figure 3* seems to provide some first answers to the hypotheses concerning the high frequency of possessive pronouns (*his, my*) as shown in *Table 4* above. In summary, the possessive pronouns in the sample are used to 'give life to' abstract and inanimate agents, as if they had their own will, like in *His dark and heavy eyebrows winged upwards*, *my hand (…) passed*, *His flesh was hot*, *His legs hung down*, and *his crotch was*. It is clear, therefore, that the protagonist is fragmented into parts of his own body that gain life by means of linguistic representation chosen in the transitivity system model of *Stud* and its re-textualization *As Aventuras de um Garoto de Programa*.

7. Final remarks

The exploratory analyses carried out in this paper emerged from the *experiential metafunction* of transitivity, that is, meaning construed by a model of outer and inner experiences language users realize through discourse. By and large, the data analysed has shown a relative frequency of material processes related to the protagonist of the short stories studied here, which points to an active protagonist. The data has also demonstrated that parts of the body of the protagonist gain agency by means of transitivity, more specifi-

cally, material processes. This linguistic phenomenon reflects what Giddens (1991) has discussed about the discursive features of reflexivity and the active role the body plays on the project of the late modernity age as a basic element in the construction of human identity. In view of this, the systemic model of transitivity may help the humanities and the social sciences in the understanding of how language plays a significant part in the constitution of human reality. Finally, notwithstanding the data investigated have demonstrated partial results, the study carried out in this paper is also expected to be a guideline for principally MA students who intend to approach their research data for the first time, within the interface of Systemic-Functional Linguistics, Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies.

Nota

1. I would like to thank one anonymous *Cadernos de Tradução* reviewer for her/his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

References

ANDROS, P. (1998). *As Aventuras de um Garoto de Programa*; trans. by Dinah Klebe. São Paulo: Summus.

_____. (1982 [1966]). *Stud.* Boston: Perineum Press.

BLOOR, T. and M. Bloor. (1995). *The Functional Analysis of English: a Hallidayan Approach.* London: Arnold.

DOWNING, A. and P. Locke. (2002). *An University Course in English Grammar.* London and New York: Routledge.

EGGINS, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.* 2 ed. London and New York: Continuum.

FOWLER, R. (1996). "On Critical Linguistics". In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard (eds). *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 3-14). London and New York: Routledge.

GIDDENS, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age.* Oxford: Polity Press.

GOUVEIA, C. A. M. and L. Barbara (2004). "Marked or Unmarked that is NOT the Question, the Question is: Where's the Theme?" *Ilha do Desterro*, (4): 155-177.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K. and C. M. I. M. MATTHIESSEN (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* 3 ed. London: Arnold.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K. (1973). *Exploration in the Functions of Language.* London: Edward Arnold.

HARVEY, K. (2000). "Translating Camp Talk: Gay Identities and Cultural Transfer". In L. Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader.* (pp. 446-467). London and New York: Routledge.

HUNSTON, S. (2002). *Corpora in Applied Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KENNY, D. (2001). *Lexis and Creativity in Translation: a Corpus-Based Study.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

MARTIN, J. R., C. M. I. M. Matthiessen and C. Painter. (1997). *Working with Functional Linguistics*. London: Arnold.

MONTGOMERY, M. (1993). "Language, Character and Action: A Linguistic Approach to the Analysis of Character in a Hemingway Short Story". In J. M. Sinclair, M. Hoey and G. Fox (eds) *Techniques of Description: Spoken and Written Discourse*. (pp. 127-142). London and New York: Routledge.

RODRIGUES JÚNIOR, A. S. (in prep.). *Representation of gay characters in a parallel corpus of short stories: a systemic-functional approach*. Ph.D Dissertation. Belo Horizonte: FALE/UFMG.

SCOTT, M. *WordSmith Tools* (versions 1.0, 2.0, 3.0). (1996, 1997, 1999). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SIMPSON, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

SINCLAIR, J. M. (2001). "Preface". In: M. Ghadessy, A. Henry and R. L. Roseberry (eds.). *Small Corpus Studies and ELT: Theory and Practice*. (pp. vii-xv). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

THOMPSON, G. (1996). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

VASCONCELLOS, M. L. (1998). "*Araby* and the Meaning Production in the Source and Translated Texts: a Systemic Functional view of Translation Quality Assessment", *Cadernos de Tradução*, 3 (3): 215-254.

VENUTI, L. (ed.). (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.