Enunciation and Translation in Quarto de despejo: diário de uma favelada and Child of the Dark: The Diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus /
Enunciação e Tradução em Quarto de despejo: diário de uma favelada e Child of the dark: the diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus

*Poliana Soares**

Feevale University, Novo Hamburgo, RS, Brazil. PhD in progress and Master of Cultural Processes and Expressions. Capes Scholar and Bilingual Education English Teacher.
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3241-5916

*Marinês Andrea Kunz***

Federal University of Paraíba (UFPB), João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brazil. PhD in Linguistics and Letters (PUC-RS). Professor and Researcher at UFPB.
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8964-1573

ABSTRACT

This paper is an interdisciplinary analysis involving the discursive literary genre diary, Linguistics and Translation. It discusses self-writing through the assumptions of Lejeune (2008), associated with Benveniste's (2005, 2006) Theory of Enunciation, relating to categories of person, time, and space to the idea that every translation is a rewriting and manipulation (LEFEVERE, 2007). The objective is to demonstrate that the translation of Carolina de Jesus' work called Quarto de Despejo: diário de uma favelada (QD) into English is the result of a new enunciation that does not necessarily kept the expression of the subjectivity of the original one, changing its meaning. Next, a comparative analysis of the QD's excerpts and from its respective American translation — Child of the Dark: the diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus —, is carried out based on the marks and traits contained in both enunciations and the effects of meaning created by them. The exploratory and bibliographic comparison between the works ratifies the enunciation as the establishment of the subject into it and the translation as a generational process of a new enunciation that seeks to prevail the original meanings, but it does not fully accomplish it.
KEYWORDS: Carolina Maria de Jesus; Child of the dark; Brazilian Literature; Translation; The Theory of Enunciation.

---

*

✉ polianas@feevale.br

**

✉ marinesak5@gmail.com

RESUMO

O artigo propõe uma análise interdisciplinar entre a Literatura do gênero discursivo diário, a Linguística e a Tradução. Aborda a escrita de si a partir dos pressupostos de Lejeune (2008), associada à Teoria da Enunciação, de Benveniste (2005; 2006), relacionando as categorias de pessoa, tempo e espaço à ideia de que toda tradução é uma reescrita e uma manipulação (LEFEVERE, 2007). O objetivo é evidenciar que a tradução para a língua inglesa da obra de Carolina de Jesus, intitulada Quarto de Despejo: diário de uma favelada (QD), é resultado de uma nova enunciação que não necessariamente manteve a expressão da subjetividade do enunciado de origem, alterando seu sentido. Para tal, realiza-se uma análise comparativa de trechos de QD e sua respectiva tradução estadunidense — Child of the Dark: the diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus —, a partir das marcas e dos traços discursivos em ambos os enunciados e os efeitos de sentido produzidos. O cotejo exploratório e bibliográfico entre as obras ratifica a enunciação como instauração do sujeito no enunciado e a tradução como processo geracional de uma nova enunciação, que busca aproximar os sentidos, mas não o realiza por completo.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Carolina Maria de Jesus; Quarto de Despejo; Literatura Brasileira; Tradução; Teoria da Enunciação.

1 Introduction

Human language is surrounded by mysteries, many of which have not yet been fully unravelled, if that is possible. After all, language and speech are in a constant process of transformation and adaptation to the social environment, to the time of enunciation and to all the elements that make up the cultural realm of social organization. Unlike what has already been stated in previous decades, language plays a broad role that goes beyond the scope of the function of individual expression and encompasses collective communication in social relations, as well as the very formation of the subject.

Thus, since written language is understood as an utterance resulting from verbal interaction and as a cultural manifestation of humanity, this article is part of the vast field of the Theory of Enunciation and Translation Studies, and considers the act of translating as a new enunciation. We present an interdisciplinary outline in Social Linguistics by addressing the enunciation categories "person, space, and time", as proposed by Benveniste (2005; 2006), related to aspects of the translation process, which is understood here as a rewriting of the original work. We also integrate this linguistic link to the characteristics of the diary, the speech genre of the analysed text, which preserves stylistic aspects that allow the necessary interweaving between these three ways to experience language.

The research object of this study is the book *Quarto de Despejo: diário de uma favelada* (henceforth QD), by Carolina Maria de Jesus (1960), and its translation into English in the US, *Child of the Dark: the Diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus* (henceforth CD) (1962), by David St. Clair. We have chosen this *corpus* to understand why and how both the book and the author became icons of Brazilian literature nowadays, for the rescue of its ephemeral success at the time of its release in 1960. There is also a particular interest in the study of the translated text, since we believe that much of its canonization results from the countless versions published in the meantime, which have certainly created several and different enunciations[1] from

---

[1] Enunciation means the act of producing an utterance, that is, the use of written or spoken language by the enunciator. The utterance is the text, the object of the enunciation (BENVENISTE, 2006).

the original utterance, arousing the interest of the readers of every society where the work has been published and distributed.

The translations have possibly required adaptations to the culture and language of the target audience. Therefore, it's important to link Lefevere's understanding (2007) of translation as the rewriting and manipulation of ideologies and literary fame to the process of the double significance of the utterances (BENVENISTE, 2006), devised from the precise and necessary interlacing of the instances of enunciation (categories) present in the 'Diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus'. Therefore, we could not choose another genre to analyze other than the writing of oneself, in which the categories of person, time and space are well-determined, such as the enunciation in the first person singular, the use of dates, etc. For Lejeune (2008, p. 15), in an intimate writing, "there needs to be a relationship of identity between the author, the narrator and the character", which leads to the subjectivity equally present in the enunciations of the analyzed diaries. Carolina Maria de Jesus is the author, the character, and the narrator of her diary. There is no doubt the presence of intersubjectivity permeates these three enunciative perspectives, marked by the forms language offers the speaker to insert himself/herself in the discourse.

The connection between such specific yet inseparable theories justifies this research, since language is a complex phenomenon that cannot be studied only by separating its variables. It should be studied in operation and applied to literary productions to help understand human beings and society.

The objective is, therefore, to show the manipulation and change of meaning resulting from translating QD, since the physical text of CD results from a new enunciation by the translator, in which interferences and modifications of meaning are caused by changing the categories of person, time, and space. When translating, a new enunciation is produced and, inevitably, a new utterance, different in its meaning.

The methods chosen to perform this interface include exploratory actions, reading, and analysis of the selected bibliographic references, as well as a critical comparison between the utterances and the meanings expressed. When conducting the comparative analysis between QD and its translation, a question arises: are the instances of enunciation, such as person, time, and space, included in the translation, keeping the pre-established expressiveness and subjectivity inherent to the source utterance?

In order to meet the proposed objective and question, this article is organized in four sections. This introduction is followed by the presentation of the theoretical bases of the study, introducing the Theory of Enunciation and the categories to be analyzed, as well as its relationship with the genre 'diary' and its translation. The third section describes the study classifications, and the methodological procedures used for the analysis. The fourth section consists of both the application of the basic concepts of the study through

a comparative analysis of the *corpus* outline and a discussion of the findings in light of the theoretical bases. The paper finishes with the final considerations and references.

2 From Linguistics to the Theory of Enunciation

It's essential to refer to concepts such as language and speech, albeit superficially, since almost the entire corpus exemplifies the primary concepts of Benveniste's Theory of Enunciation (2005; 2006), and the concept of discursive interaction by Volóchinov and Bakhtin Circle (2018), equally related. Nonetheless, the concepts regarding linguistics, whether a strand of philosophy or of enunciation, used for scientific analysis in this study, have their origin in Saussure's propositions, which were often questioned and induced to undergo in-depth research both by Bakhtin (2000) and Benveniste (2005; 2006).

If we thoroughly investigate the studies of Saussure, Bakhtin, Volóchinov, and Benveniste, we inevitably find approximations and dichotomies, and even different terms to refer to the same linguistic phenomena. However, these theorists converge on the complexity of language and on the demand of studies that prove or question this complexity.

Among the postulates, the definitions for language, sign, speech, and enunciation, among others, are usually part of the broad process of language, which makes it difficult to separate and label each instance of this human phenomenon in isolation. Therefore, it's often necessary to resume them in the relational context in order to understand them.

Before discussing the Theory of Enunciation, its categories, and functionalities, it's necessary to clarify that this article aims to present a theoretical construct on enunciation and conceptual intricacies of the propositions of the General Linguistic Problems I and II, organized in several articles by Benveniste (2005; 2006), which are the theoretical basis of this study. Translation and the genre 'diary' are parts that complete the study and are related to the choice of the *corpus*. However, due to the length of this article, we may not deal in depth with these topics, which certainly deserve more attention.

Next, we present a conceptual line to understand the steps and the pre-established connections in the choice and design of this study, which begins with language itself, starting from the macro understanding and moving on to the units of minor meaning (but not less important), in order to view the process as a whole. To conclude, we cover the basic concepts of translation such as enunciation and the reasons why we selected the genre 'diary'. Then, we discuss language to understand its constitution and its use in communicative and interactive situations in the social environment.

2.1 Language in use

For Saussure (2006), language consists of a set of linguistic habits (language and speech) which allow people to communicate. In the unity of language, the signs that result from the combination of the concept and the acoustic image generate an arbitrary meaning, attesting to the autonomy of language in relation to the world.

Starting from Saussure's notion of sign and privileging the dimension of *parole* and, thus, of social interaction, which was not the focus for the Swiss theorist, Volóchinov (2018, p. 91, emphasis in the original) states that "everything that is ideological has a *meaning*: it represents and replaces something found outside of it, that is, it is a *sign*". Every means of expression of the language tries to convey an idea or meaning that shows an ideology, a set of ideas and conceptions that cover the sign - "axiological values" -, whose understanding does not disregard the analysis of the social-historical-cultural context, rehabilitated by Volóchinov's theoretical approach. Thus, as a semiotic-ideological phenomenon, language is established between an individual consciousness and another by the discursive interaction in a given socially and historically situated communicative situation.

Discursive interaction is only possible through the word, considered "the most accurate and sensitive *medium* of social communication" (VOLÓCHINOV, 2018, p. 99), and it implies the participation of a speaker[2] and an interlocutor, who must be socially involved so that communication takes place through language. Language, in turn, "takes place in the form of concrete and unique utterances (oral or written)" (BAKHTIN, 2000a, p. 279). Therefore, there is a clear relationship between the processes of discursive interaction and enunciation, both attributed to language, established by subjects' participation and with the converging aim of performing communication through discourse and production of meaning.

It's not unusual to find the definition that language is a tool to communicate or transmit speech and language, but Benveniste (2005, p. 285) highlights that "speaking of a tool is to oppose man and nature. The pickaxe, the arrow, the wheel are not in nature. They are manufactured. Language is part of human nature, and man did not manufacture it". Therefore, it surpasses this primitive concept and thus inhabits the universe of human nature, manifesting itself through the uttered word.

---

[2] Speaker or enunciator.

Nevertheless, the word alone, out of context and without social objective, is nothing. It's empty, neutral, and only has a meaning when enunciated, put into use, in the enuciators' subjectivities of particular and unique contexts, because

> the words of the language are nothing, but, at the same time, we only hear them in the form of individual utterances, we only read them in individual works, and they have an expressiveness that is no longer typical and has also become individualized (according to the genre to which it belongs) depending on the irreproducible individual context of the utterance (BAKHTIN, 2000b, p. 312-13).

To say that a word is endowed with expressiveness when it's individualized presupposes the understanding that the same word can be uttered several times both by different individuals and by the same person, without, however, having the same meaning, because of the subjectivity that each enunciation introduces and by its property of unrepeatable nature.

This movement of meaning production takes place by the act of communication, that is, by the discursive interaction, either written or oral, when a speaker sends a message - the enunciation -, aiming at a certain addressee[3], even if it's fictional or if it's the speaker himself in an internal discourse, with a specific social objective. In this sense, "the enunciation is the act of putting language into operation by an individual act of use" (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 82).

Besides, the enunciation concentrates the subjective participation of the speaker, a specific *I*, in certain *space* and *time* as opposed to a *you*, which gives meaning to the utterance. For this to be possible, the speaker must accept what Benveniste (2006) calls "Formal Apparatus of Enunciation". This process occurs through language, understood as something beyond a tool, because "it cannot be divided, but decomposed. Its units are base elements in limited number, each is different from the other, and its units are grouped to form new units, which, in turn, may form others, of a higher and higher level" (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 225), which results in the production of sentences and texts.

The sentences, in turn, are key elements to link the connections of this complex system. Once in use, the sentences begin to express meaning, defined by a set of words, regardless of language, because

---

[3] Listener or enunciatee.

> the semiotic sign exists in itself, establishes the reality of language, but does not find particular applications; the sentence, expression of semantics, is nothing *but* private. With the sign, we have the intrinsic reality of the language; with the sentence, we connect things outside the language; and while the sign inherently has meaning, the meaning of the sentence implies reference to the speech situation and to the speaker's attitude (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 230, emphasis in the original).

Therefore, from the understanding of the sentence as a system of signs, we enter this action context of "language as a communication tool" (BENVENISTE, 2005, p. 139), but not only that, because it's expressed by the enunciator's intended discourse. A new concept emerges, one that we need to clarify and place within these axioms: discourse.

Discourse is an integral and unique part of the utterance. When it comes to discourse, one does not refer to the utterance, to the written text, but to the meaning it expresses in each enunciation. It consists of the speech act and the intention of the speakers to give to the language act. As highlighted by Benveniste (2006, p. 83), regarding the discourse:

> the very difficult and little studied issue is to see how 'meaning' is shaped into 'words', to what extent one can distinguish between the two notions and in what terms one describes their interaction. The semantization of language is at the center of this aspect of enunciation, and it leads to sign theory and to the analysis of significance.

In short, enunciation is characterized, precisely, by the intonation of the discursive relationship between the participants (speaker and listener; enunciator and enunciatee; speaker and addressee), in particular, the form and meaning that the speaker produces in the enunciation. Besides, an utterance can be repeated, but an enunciation cannot.

Consequently, the alteration of the language functionality moves from a collective and an interactionist space to an individual and a subjective space, to which Benveniste (2006, p. 84) refers as the "individual act of language appropriation", in which the speaker is inserted in his own speech through enunciation, giving the utterance form and meaning.

In the same way, form and meaning result from the interaction between the enunciative categories and the semiotic and semantic meaning expressed by the subjectivity of the enunciator, a topic addressed below.

2.2 Double Significance and Enunciative Categories

In view of this study objective, we start the analysis of the establishment between the linguistic resources and the linguistic choices (form) of the speaker to communicate himself/herself (meaning). Thus, Benveniste (2005, p. 135) states that "form and meaning must be defined one by another and must be articulated together across the entire length of the language", which occurs "through specific indexes, on the one hand, and accessory procedures, on the other" (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 84).

For now, what matters are the definitions of meaning, which are the *status* that all linguistic forms need to achieve for the language to perform its function. Therefore, language expresses meaning in two different modes, which combine with each other: the semiotic mode and the semantic mode. The semiotic meaning is "closed in itself and contained in some way in itself", and we understand it in the relationship between signifier and signified. On the other side, the semantic meaning "results from the linkage, from the appropriation by circumstance and from the adaptation of the different signs between them. This is completely unpredictable. It's opening to the world" (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 21). Thus, it's important to understand that semiotics is a property of language, while semantics raises the use of this language by the speaker.

In language, both fields of meaning production have attributions within the system, but only language is able to articulate them through Enunciation, which makes the sign (semiotic meaning) pass to speech (semantic meaning) and establish communication. According to Benveniste's principle (2006, p. 66, emphasis in the original), it's assumed that "semiotic meaning (sign) must be RECOGNIZED; semantic meaning (discourse) must be UNDERSTOOD".

In this discussion, the fundamental question in this study is enunciation, in relation to which "the semantic order is identified" together with the "universe of discourse" (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 66). The fact of generating different meanings each time the enunciation occurs is linked to the specific indexes of ostentation (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 85). As the complexity of language moves beyond the sign system and is assumed by individuals as an action of the language in operation, which is the Enunciation, it presupposes a reference between the participating individuals, who start to assume positions, since,

> in enunciation, language is employed to express a certain relationship with the world. The very condition of this mobilization and this appropriation of language is, for the speaker, the need to refer through discourse, and, for the other, the

possibility to co-refer identically, in the pragmatic consensus that makes each speaker a co-speaker. Reference is an integral part of the enunciation (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 84).

In this mobilization of referring through discourse, the instances of enunciation fulfill their roles. Benveniste (2005; 2006) suggests three categories of enunciation responsible for giving it meaning: category of person, time, and space. Thus, every enunciation is produced from an enunciator '*I*', which places himself/herself as the subject in his/her speech, in which we also notice time is determined and space is positioned where this enunciator is inserted in the moment of his/her allocution.

2.2.1 The Categories of Person, Time, and Space

Regarding the category of person, the enunciation is always directed to the listener, even if s/he is fictitious. The instance is established in the instance of the enunciation by the forms of personal pronouns, so that the speaker always refers to himself/herself by the index '*I*', as opposed to a '*you*' and a '*he*'. Thus, subjectivity is established, because

> self-awareness is only possible if experienced by contrast. I do not use '*I*' unless I address someone, who, in my allocution, will be a '*you*'. It's this condition of dialogue that constitutes the *person*, because it implies reciprocity – the fact that I become *you* in the allocution of the person who, in turn, designates himself or herself as *I* (BENVENISTE, 2000, p. 286, emphasis in the original).

In this perspective, language expresses subjectivity, providing the appropriate linguistic forms for it. In this category, we notice that the pronoun 's/*he*' does not appear in the relationship, because using '*I*' implies talking about me and presupposes a '*you*', which is necessary and requested by the '*I*', and cannot be thought of out of this context. The enunciation of the 's/*he*' occurs out of this '*I-you*' relationship, that is why the "third person" is not considered a "person", constituting the verb form whose function is to express impersonality (BENVENISTE, 2005).

This understanding of subjectivity or the impersonality evoked in the discourse is corroborated by another category of equal importance: time. Time can be divided into three different classifications clarified by Benveniste (2006): physical time, chronological time, and linguistic time. In summary, physical time is part of the universe, a continuum, and an infinity, which each individual measures by his/her rhythm and notion of life. Chronological time encompasses the events

contained in time: it's the limited time. Linguistic time, our interest in this analysis, is the moment of enunciation.

Linguistic time is the time of the Enunciation, which is always the present time, as it establishes the "now". From that moment on, it's possible to establish the events that occur before (past) and those that occur after (future) the moment of enunciation. Therefore,

> the present is the proper origin of time. It's the presence in the world that only the act of enunciation makes possible, because it's necessary to reflect well on this; man has no other way of living the 'now' and making it current except by doing so through the insertion of discourse in the world (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 85).

Language organizes itself by the linguistic category of time. Therefore, the speaker always places himself/herself in the present, and every time s/he produces some utterance, it will always be a new present. The establishment of verb tenses does not set a chronological time, but places the speaker in relation to the present where s/he finds himself/herself when making his/her enunciation explicit. The relationship of time with the '*I*' is established when the interlocutor is able to accept "my time" as "their time", while the existence of this present time is implicit.

The instances of enunciation, as we can see, are responsible for the subjectivity and the enunciation discourse meaning. Person and time are related through personal pronouns and verb tenses, whereas space, the place from where we enunciate speech, is usually established through demonstrative pronouns and adverbs. Thus, Benveniste (2005, p. 280) assures that "the essential thing is, therefore, the relation between the indicator[s] (of person, time, and place) and the *present* instance of discourse". Certainly, it's by the order of practice that the person is placed in society as a participative and subjective being, and this order develops into a complex system of "space-temporal relations that determine the modes of enunciation" (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 101).

The language included in this theoretical basis makes no distinction of language (tongue), since it understands that these aspects are common to any human language. Regarding the categories of enunciation, Benveniste (2005) believes that any language can establish this relation of meaning in discourse. Categories certainly do not occur in the same way, but each language finds a way to express meaning.

In this sense, we find it necessary to briefly address, in the next section, some aspects of the translation process and the genre, in order to carry out the analysis of the categories in *Quarto de Despejo: diário de uma favelada*, both in Portuguese and in English. In the analysis, we show the use of these categories in some text excerpts.

2.3 Translation as a New Enunciation and the Genre 'Diary'

Presenting an analysis of the Theory of Enunciation linked to translation is a way of stating, beforehand, that translations undergo a process of meaning production, which starts from the translator's contact with the original text. From that moment on, the translator also becomes an author, but of his/her own enunciation, because translating constitutes an act of interpretation, which requires moderation to establish meanings, if not equal, at least close to those of the text of the original enunciation.

In this process, the translator starts to use his/her subjectivity to mark himself/herself in the text s/he translates, because s/he is the one who decides and establishes which terms to use or not. For this reason, translation is a valuable and sample-rich option for an analysis of categories of enunciation, since it can be considered "a rewriting of the source text. Every rewriting, whatever its intention, reflects a certain ideology and a poetics and, as such, manipulates literature so that it functions within a determined society and in a determined way" (LEFEVERE, 2007, p. 11).

This manipulation confers on the translated text the need to think, adapt and, if necessary, modify the categories of enunciation, causing changes in meaning. Benveniste (2006, p. 233), who established basic criteria on the matter of meaning in the translation process and in the double significance of language, argues that one can "convey semanticism from one language to another; [...], but one cannot convey semioticism", which would result in the impossibility of translation by this mode of significance, precisely by the arbitrariness of the sign.

Therefore, it's possible to find corresponding words, able to bring the semantic meaning between the languages closer together in this process. However, its semiotic meaning in different socio-cultural contexts will be an obstacle to obtain a literal translation, making it necessary to manipulate, change or even omit terms and expressions that do not find equivalence in the two cultures. Consequently, it's not possible to translate without interference, which is why we confirm Lefevere's position (2007) that, when translating, we have a new enunciation, though based on the

same utterance. Besides, changes and adaptations in translated texts are also the result of the translator's ideological choices and strategies. These choices and strategies can either favor the source text in an attempt to remain faithful to the original, without interferences - which is not possible -, or privilege the understanding of the readers of the target language, bringing the translated text closer to the cultural reality of the society that will read it.

Besides choosing a comparative analysis between the original and the translation, the genre also focuses on the research results. Carolina Maria de Jesus' work is a diary, a written genre that presupposes a specific type of language to discuss about a particular reality, which is also understood as a social act (LEJEUNE, 2008).

Genres, in Bakhtin's conception (BAKHTIN, 2000a, p. 279, emphasis in the original) are *relatively* stable types of utterances, in which it's essential to apply enunciative styles and categories to compose the desired genre. In the case of the diary, "of the writing of oneself, it's assumed that there is a name identity between the author, the narrator and the person we talk about. This is a very simple criterion, which defines, not only the autobiography but all other genres of intimate literature" (LEJEUNE, 2008, p. 24).

The diary can have several functions, but, in general, the main one is "the expression, reflection, memory and the pleasure of writing" (LEJEUNE, 2008, p. 275). This is closely linked to the characteristics of Carolina Maria de Jesus, who writes for pleasure and for the desire of writing, through which she could express herself in a certain space, free of judgments, until publishing her text.

The records of the genre diary 'are dated, specifying the chronological time that shows a space in the enunciation time of the event; in utterances, there is a prominant use of the first person singular (*I*), through which the speaker enunciates and inserts himself/helself in the speech by means of his/her subjectivity. The time of the enunciation takes place in the past tense, since facts usually occurred in a certain place in the time-frame (past) before the enunciation is registered (present). At the same time, we understand that, in the diary, "someone who tells the truth about their own life is asking for their person to be approved, judged positively [...], and is also asking for a certain admiration for their text and their writing skill" (LEJEUNE, 2008, p. 210).

This section finishes with this brief conceptualization of the relationship between translation and the genre 'diary'. However, we do not overlook the fact that Carolina Maria de Jesus wrote diaries unaware of the genre parameters and under reporter Audálio Dantas[4]'s guidance, which was not an obstacle, but a great chance to expand and prove the complexity of language. In section three, we explain the analysis method.

3 Analysis Method

In accordance with the exposed theory, in this study we chose as an analytical *corpus* the book Q*uarto de Despejo: diário de uma favelada*, by Carolina Maria de Jesus, and the US version, by David St. Clair, entitled *'Child of the Dark: the Diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus'*. The books belong to the genre diary and are catalogued here with date entries. For that reason, in this article, we decided to select the records of the first year of the report, from July 15 to July 28, 1955. The research outline aims to summarize the analysis. Once the content and structures are recurrent, the results extend equally to the other chapters of the books, with no data modification or loss, for the moment. Besides, the outline encompasses the period when the author wrote without being sure if she would publish her texts, a fact that changed from 1958 onwards, when she and Audálio Dantas met.

This study follows a qualitative, exploratory, and bibliographic methodology. The analysis aims to identify the categories of enunciation proposed by Benveniste (2005; 2006) - person, space, and time - in the text considered the original, written in Portuguese. Then, we perform the same process with the translated text, contrasting the results to those found in the original text. Afterwards, the modifications found in each category are analyzed, examining whether the changes of meaning resulted from the new enunciation of the translation.

The criteria of comparative analysis and categories will take into account both the characteristics of the 'diary', the discursive genre studied and theorized by Lejeune (2008), as well as the aspects of the translation process to which the texts were submitted, a process understood as manipulation, but not necessarily in a negative sense. The analysis results will be summarized

---

[4] Carolina Maria de Jesus stopped writing her diary in 1955. She resumed writing after meeting reporter Audálio Dantas, in 1958. Excerpts of her manuscripts and of QD show that there was a certain guidance on what to write, which provides content for a new piece of research, not included in this study.

to check whether the modifications in the categories are enough to promote changes or new content in the utterance. The following section presents a description of the analysis and its results.

4 Analysis of the categories of enunciation

In the previous sections, we discussed the systems that make up language, its concepts, and possibilities, but mainly the use of language by humans. In this case, this article is an attempt to analyze the genre 'diary' - original text and translation - from the perspective of theTheory of Enunciation, which presupposes the categories of person, time, and space, in a written enunciation.

Therefore, in this section, we compare two texts by Carolina Maria de Jesus *Quarto de Despejo: diário de uma favela* and *Child of the Dark: the Diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus*, to check if the rewriting, from the translation process, caused modifications that changed the meaning expressed in the original text.

Naturally, the objective is not to judge the quality of the translation, but to seek evidence that can lead to understand the success of the work in Brazil and in the United States and, therefore, of the author. We established the categories of enunciation - person, time, and space (BENVENISTE, 2005; 2006) - as the categories of analysis.

4.1 Contextualization and analysis

Carolina Maria de Jesus was born in Sacramento, Minas Gerais, in 1914. Descendant of slaves, she came to the city of São Paulo after her mother's death to flee from hunger and misery. She attended primary school for two years, still very young, guided by her mother's bosses. In this context, she received her short formal education, but the love for reading and writing was always present throughout her life.

As she moved to São Paulo, Carolina settled in Favela do Canindé, on the banks of the Tietê River, which gave way to the Marginal Tietê highway and the Portuguesa Stadium. A mother of three small and uneducated children, Carolina began to collect paper and other recyclable materials to survive. To her shack, she took books, magazines, and used notebooks she found, which she saved for reading and/or writing moments. That is how the writer Carolina was born, a

woman who wrote poems and short stories, but who also wrote about the daily life of the favela to escape the harsh reality of poverty.

In 1958, Audálio Dantas, who was then a reporter, heard about Carolina's manuscripts and helped her publish them. The first book she published was *Quarto de Despejo: Diário de uma Favelada,* in 1960, two years after they had met. The sales success was completely unusual for the Brazilian literary system, according to critics at the time. Carolina's book sold more than Jorge Amado's did. The fact that the author did not fit literary, grammatical, and social parameters of a literary person of the time also aroused the readers' curiosity. It called the attention the impressive content never-before-exposed or, perhaps, the fact she was a woman relegated to the fringes of society and, therefore, excluded from the literate universe.

All this excitement aroused worldwide interest. Not only QD, but also other titles she published were translated and disseminated in different cultures and societies, which justifies this analysis. David St. Clair translated CD two years after the first edition of the original. He picked the text in Portuguese, which had been edited and published by Dantas, and tried to learn more about the Brazilian culture and Carolina's daily life to keep a certain degree of fidelity in his translation. However, there are no records of him accessing the manuscripts of the book, and, when we analyze the titles, it's clear that there were changes in the utterance in English.

The title of the original book mentions the genre the reader will read: a diary. It also mentions the miserable condition of the author, confirmed by the adjective "*favelada*" (slum dweller). Both pieces of information are in the subtitle: "***Diário** de uma **favelada***". The title and the subtitle chosen for the US version keep the author's name and prove to be a diary. However, they erase the presence of the favela and dramatize the meaning of the discourse, focusing on the author-character as "*filha da escuridão*"[5]: "***Child of the Dark***: the ***Diary*** of *Carolina Maria de Jesus*"[6].

Regarding the analysis of the categories of enunciation in QD and CD, we defined the outline and limits to interpret the meanings presented in each utterance. The outline covers the

---

[5]Our Portuguese translation for: "*Child of the Dark*".
[6]There is also a British version of the book: "*Beyond all Pity: the Diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus*", by the same translator and with the same content. However, the title was probably addressed to the audience and context that would read the book.

records on the diary from July 15 to July 28, 1955, a time period that was the beginning of her experimental work, with no apparent purpose other than writing itself.

First, we read the diary in Portuguese and, later, the corresponding text in English, following the sequence of the chapter, which is divided into dates. In this first contact, we identified the characteristics of the genre and the categories of enunciation most frequently used, in which moments and with which intention of meaning.

As we read it for the second time, we created a comparative table with passages of the diaries that presented possible manipulations and changes of meaning. Then, based on the Theory of Enunciation, we performed a qualitative analysis of the discursive characteristics of the genre diary and of the translation process. The results were separated into the respective categories for a better understanding, starting with the analysis of the Category of Person, presented in the next section.

Because it's enunciation and meaning, the general context of the book and the analysis of the entire utterance are fundamental to achieve the meanings expressed by the author and by the translator, who are taken as authors of their enunciations, responsible for different utterances, according to the language.

4.1.1 Category of Person

Carolina's writing in the diary is performed by using the first person singular (*I*), and, in some passages, the first person plural (*we*), besides the impersonality of the third person singular (*he/she*). Even without advanced education, the author seems to know the proper use of the "Formal Enunciation Apparatus", as she used the category of person effectively, in a variety of ways.

The use of the '*I*' is associated with the excerpts in which Carolina reports her daily activities, such as making coffee, feeding her children, washing clothes, waking up, etc. The author reveals her position as a subject because she includes herself in the enunciation, ensuring more veracity to the narrative. For example, as the excerpt indicates: *"**Eu achei** um par de sapatos no lixo, **lavei** e **remendei** para calçar"* (JESUS, 1960, p. 13), and "I **found** a pair of shoes in the garbage, **washed** them, and **patched** them for her to wear" (JESUS, 1962, p. 3).

Unlike the subjectivity expressed by the pronoun '*I'*, the pronoun '*we'* presents Carolina's collective discourses. She includes herself in the discourse but uses the plural to elaborate a sense of validation and approval to her social perspectives: *"Todos **nois** temos o nosso dia de alegria"* (JESUS, 1960, p. 25) and "All of **us** have one happy day" (JESUS, 1962, p. 17). The use of plural can also be understood as a resource to acknowledge the author's ideas that express social voices with which she agrees, since the use of "plural is a factor inclusiveness" (BENVENISTE, 2006, p. 258), and constitutes the presence of the self.

The impersonality is also very clear and marked in her utterance, as it's used in records in which Carolina refers to favela residents, from which she excludes herself: *"**Elas** alude que não sou casada"* (JESUS, 1960, p. 17), and "**They** gossip that I'm not merried[7]" (JESUS, 1962, p. 8). The use of the third person, in this case, reveals the difference the author establishes between herself and her neighbors, once she does not identify with them, insofar as she longs to live outside the eviction room. Seeing the other residents' prejudice and distinguishing herself from them by the way she sees the world and by her writing, she identifies with those who live in masonry houses. Therefore, the use of the third person constitutes a significant resource as to identity relationships in Carolina's diary.

Regarding the translation, the rewriting pretty much managed to keep the same person in the utterances. However, there are some changes of person in the enunciation that alter the meaning, which are due to translation misconceptions on the basis of the social context, a topic we will not address in this article.

We highlight two passages in which there was a change in the category of person (Table 1).

Table 1: Changes in the Category of Person

a) *"Avisei as crianças que **não tinha** pão"* (JESUS, 1960, p. 13).

---

[7] In the preface, the translator mentions the inconsistent writing in Portuguese and informs that none of this was changed in the translation, but the opposite occurs. Despite keeping the categories of person when translating, there is no interest in keeping the oral style of the author's writing, according to the excerpts presented. In the first, the pronoun "nóis" is translated and corrected to "us". In the second, the expression "Elas alude" is translated to "*They gossip*", without taking into account the inappropriate inflection of the verb in the source text, which extends to the entire translated text.

"I told children that I **didn't have** any bread" (JESUS, 1962, p. 4).
b) *"**Deu** 13 cruzeiros"* (JESUS, 1960, p. 13).
"**He gave** me 13 cruzeiro" (JESUS, 1962, p. 3).

Source: The author (2021).

In both cases, the enunciation of the original was in the impersonality, the category of no-person. In the translation under "a", the speaker assumes the position of '*I*', emphasizing the speaker's subjectivity. In Portuguese, the expression "*não tinha*" can be understood as "there was no", which is a form of impersonality that is changed in the translation. In "b", on the other hand, the verb "*deu*" expresses the meaning of "resulted", whereas in the translation, there is an emphasis on the personal pronoun of the third person singular – 'he', changing the meaning expressed by the impersonality. Therefore, this pronoun refers to a character of the narrative, subtly altering the meaning and the very characteristic of the subjectivity of the author's enunciation. Since Person and Time connect and establish important meanings for the enunciation, we continue with the analysis of the Category of Time.

4.1.2 Category of Time

Closely related to the category of person, the use of the category of time is more affected than the other categories in the translation relations, since not all verb tenses match in Portuguese and English. The linguistic time places Carolina, the enunciator, at a time before or after the present enunciation, but there is no aesthetic concern to order these positions through verbal resource. However, in the translation, this concern is evident, and sentences are reorganised in linguistic times to ensure cohesion and coherence. However, the mark of the author's personal writing is erased, as well as her presence in the enunciation, which gives space to the translator's utterance. Thus, the enunciation is no longer the same, and the meanings no longer express the same ideas, but there is an attempt to make it closer together in the meaning of the sentences. In the rewritten work, on the other hand, the interests of the audience prevail to the expense of the visibility of the characteristics of the author's fragmented writing.

The predominance of the linguistic time is the use of the simple past for daily activities, enunciated by '*I*', as in the examples: "***Peguei*** *uma revista e* ***sentei*** *no capim"* (JESUS, 1960, p. 14), and "**I picked up** a magazine and **sat on** the grass" (JESUS, 1962, p. 4). Carolina uses the present simple in the political and social rescue of her ideologies, enunciated by *us*, "*Mas o custo*

*dos generos alimenticios **nos impede** a realização dos nossos desejos”* (JESUS, 1960, p. 13), and "but the price of food **keeps us** from realizing our desires" (JESUS, 1962, p. 3). Also, in some moments, the author uses the present simple to reproduce in her enunciation the dialogues of the characters of her daily stories: *"A dona da tinturaria disse: Coitada! Ela é tão boazinha”* (JESUS, 1960, p. 26), and "Poor thing. She **is** so good" (JESUS, 1962, p. 17).

Similarly, the present simple shows the author's thoughts and feelings when she is writing her diary, manifesting her conscience: *“Pensei na vida atribulada que eu levo. **Cato** papel, **lavo** roupa para dois jovens, **permaneço** na rua o dia todo. E **estou** sempre em falta”* (JESUS, 1960, p. 14). In the US version, the translator replaces the present tense for the verb as the subject, plus the suffix -ing, *being*, in this case, in the gerund: "I thought of worrisome life that I led. **Carrying** paper, **washing** clothes for the children, **staying** in the street all day long. Yet I'm always **lacking** things" (JESUS, 1962, p. 4). However, if we translate the gerund in this situation, it corresponds to the infinitive in Portuguese. Consequently, we notice one more characteristic between the linguistic systems in analysis, which causes a change in meaning from the enunciaton, when the category of time is modified and adapted.

In contrast, the use of the future is related to moments when she projects in her enunciation an action to be done after finishing writing her diary: *“E **vou sair** para catar papel”*, or, *“E eu, **vou lavar** as crianças **para irem** para o leito, porque eu **preciso** sair”* (JESUS, 1960, p. 14 and 18), and "**I'm going out** to look for paper", or, "And I, **I have to** wash the children so they **can go** to bed, **for I have to** go out" (JESUS, 1962, p. 4 and 9). In the first example, the translation keeps the future tense, but in the second it's adapted to use the modal verbs *have to* and *can*, respectively expressing necessity and possibility to perform such activities. However, in the original text, only the sentence "*eu preciso sair*" ("I need to leave") expresses a need, while the other actions are determined by the condition for the last fact to take place. These are subtle changes, but they are responsible for building the profile of the author-narrator-character, and they have implications in the reception of the work.

In the translation, the category of time is a challenge for the translator, because English does not specify the past imperfect tense. However, as highlighted by Benveniste (2005; 2006) about the differences in languages, English has other ways and linguistic resources that can help reach the meanings evoked in these discourses, such as the use of pronouns and adverbs, for

example. We highlight other passages with changes in the language time that modified the meaning of the utterances (Table 2):

Table 2: Changes in the Category of Time

a) *"A minha filha Vera Eunice **dizia**: - Vai buscar agua mamãe!"* (JESUS, 1960, p. 13).
"My daughter Vera Eunice **said**: "Go get some water, Mother!" (JESUS, 1962, p. 4).
b) *"Fui ao **seu** Manoel **levar** umas latas para vender"* (JESUS, 1960, p.13).
"I went to **Senhor** Manuel, **carrying** some cans to sell" (JESUS, 1962, p. 4).

Source: The Author (2021).

The change in language time in the translation of the QD into English relates to the issue of language incompatibility and the difference between semiotic translation, which is not possible, and semantic translation, which is feasible, as not all languages express their categories of enunciation in the same way, which does not prevent the translator from expressing them. In the translation, in "a", there is a change from the imperfect past tense to the simple past tense. By using the imperfect past tense, the meaning expressed by the category of time (verb) in the original enunciation brings sensitivity in the narrative to the reader. It's the notion that, when the action took place, the reported fact was not an isolated event, but part of a combination of acts that occurred in the moment before the enunciation, unlike the meaning expressed in the translation, where the situation becomes less sentimental and sounds more like a command, an order.

In "b", by changing the infinitive for the gerund, the understanding of meaning links to the understanding of the cultural context and the writing. In the original language, the meaning expressed by the linguistic time is that 'the cans were taken to be sold to Manoel', whereas, with the use of the gerund in English, the comprehension is vague. We can also understand that the enunciator was 'going to Manoel's place, carrying only the cans'. Thus, it's not evident that they would be sold to him. They could be sold to anyone.

4.1.3 Category of Space

The category of space is less marked in the enunciation of the diaries, perhaps because it's implicit that the stories occurred in Favela do Canindé, where the author lived, and because she understands that the writing of the diary took place in that space, already demarcating the place, the space from which she enunciated. The demarcation of the place of enunciation is subtle. It's

done by using few adverbs of place or demonstrative pronouns, as in this example, which defines the space by the name of the street and by the adverb: *"Êle estava na **rua Felisberto de Carvalho perto do mercadinho"*** (JESUS, 1960, p. 13), and "He was at **Felisberto de Carvalho Street near the Market**" (JESUS, 1962, p. 3). However, proper names and addresses are used frequently to assign the author-narrator's speaking place, and it's exactly the use of words performing other functions that changes the meaning of the translation (Table 3).

Table 3: Changes in the Category of Space

*"Escrevi um bilhete e dei ao meu filho João José para **ir ao Arnaldo** comprar um sabão, dois melhoraes e o resto de pão"* (JESUS, 1960, p. 14).
"I wrote a note and gave it to my boy João **to take to Senhor Arnaldo** to buy soap, two aspirins, and some bread" (JESUS, 1962, p. 4).

Source: The Author (2021).

The meaning change in these instances influences the understanding of the author's writing style and removes from her enunciation the idea of enunciation space and of the place where Arnaldo is. In the Portuguese excerpt, the name is changed into a space, whereas in the translation, Arnaldo assumes the *status* of person by the inclusion of the second preposition "*to*" and the inclusion, in Portuguese, of the pronoun "Senhor" *(Sir)*.

After this brief analysis, we identified, in addition to some changes in enunciation categories, some terms with strictly cultural meanings that the translator changed to improve the understanding of the target audience, a strategy that corroborates the efficiency in manipulating rewriting (LEFEVERE, 2007).

The changes were due to the need for adaptation between the systems of text, language, and culture. However, the translator did not address possibilities that could be used in the translation to bring the senses even closer and maintain the fidelity of the enunciative discourse of the work, one of the reasons for its permanent success abroad.

Final Considerations

This study performed an analysis according to the assumptions of Benveniste's Theory of Enunciation (2005, 2006), from an interdisciplinary perspective between the areas of Literature, Linguistics, and Translation Studies.

Because we understand language as necessary to society and as a part of this communication system through speech and writing, we have established a relationship between these concepts, defined by the selection of a book of the genre diary and its translation into English. The diary was understood according to Lejeune's concepts (2008), in relation to the categories of person, time, and space and in light of the idea that every translation is a rewriting and manipulation (LEFEVERE, 2007), since the translator generates a new enunciation with a new utterance, which, finally, triggers meanings that are different from the original.

The analysis was based on the question of whether enunciation instances, person, time, and space, are part of the translation, keeping the expressiveness and subjectivity pre-established in the original utterance and by its original genre. In this sense, the main objective was to demonstrate the meaning change that arises from the translation process of the book *Quarto de Despejo: Diário de uma Favelada,* published by Carolina Maria de Jesus, since the utterance of *Child of the Dark: the Diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus* is the result of the translator's enunciation, in which modifications in meaning and other interferences take place by changing the categories of person, time, and space (Categories of Enunciation). The changes occur both by the author-translator's subjective options and choices and by the syntactic differences between the source and the target language.

Through a comparative analysis, by limiting time in the records, from 15 July 1955 to 28 July of the same year, we found, in the translation, marks and traces that caused effects of meaning different from those in the original utterance. They are a result of strategies adopted by the translator aimed at the target audience for the book.

The exploratory and bibliographic comparison between the works ratified enunciation as the establishment of the subject in the utterance and the translation as a process that generates a new enunciation that seeks to bring the meanings closer but does not fully accomplish it. In his enunciation, then, the translator prioritizes the social content and not the original aesthetic content, which redefines the literary value of the work in the way he translates it. This is in line with the premises of Lefevere (2007), who discusses refraction, that is, the concept that translation is a way of reflecting the original work, once it's adapted to the target audience. In parallel to the translation,

the explanatory footnotes and other paratext notes aim to outline and guide the reception of the work, in order to ensure its success. The translation choices were certainly influenced by the profile of the target audience and the image of the book and the writer, which the translator intended to show, as well as by the social objective the translation aimed at when there was intention to translate and publish the book.

These changes range from the translation of proper names, the adaptation of verb tenses that are different in Portuguese and in English, and, mainly, the change of categories of enunciation, the focus of this study. Changing the person often reduced the subjective character of the original enunciation and established an impersonal nature, turned to another discourse, with strong social nature. The change of time, caused by the linguistic tenses, most of the time, resulted from the differences between the languages, preventing the translator from writing literally what is understood in the original. The changes in the category of space are related to the socio-cultural context, since the meaning of words was not possible to translate, but the translator managed to find an approximate meaning.

All these aspects have no effect on the readers of the original text, but on those who read the translation and make the translation their original, because the discourses are similar, but have different meanings, which relate to the translator's subjectivity and to the culture that receives the translation. Therefore, the analysis contributed to state the complexity of the system of human language, especially language, speech, and enunciation. From the discursive perspective, the speech act is much more revealing than we can see in simple decoding.

In this sense, we highlight the importance and responsibility of the translator's role. He needs to understand the translation beyond a system of signs, as part of a cultural system. Translation studies can also provide research on Aesthetic Reception, which can deal with the reception of the work of Carolina Maria de Jesus in other countries, considering the translation of her texts into thirteen different languages.

Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysys, Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing: SOARES, Poliana.

Visualization, Writing – review & editing: KUNZ, Marinês Andrea.

References

BAKHTIN, M. M. Estética da criação verbal. 3. ed. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes, 2000.

_____. Os Gêneros do Discurso. I Problemática e Definição. In. _____. Estética da criação verbal. 3. ed. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes, 2000a. p. 279 – 287.

_____. Os Gêneros do Discurso. II O Enunciado, unidade da comunicação verbal. In. _____. Estética da criação verbal. 3. ed. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes, 2000b. p. 289 – 326.

BENVENISTE, Émile. Problemas de linguística geral II. 2. ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 2006.

_____. Problemas de linguística geral I. 5. ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 2005.

JESUS, Carolina Maria de. Quarto de despejo: Diário de uma favelada. 1 ed. São Paulo: Francisco Alves, 1960.

_____. Child of the dark: the diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus. Trad. David St. Clair. Nova York: New American Library, 1962.

LEFEVERE, André. Tradução, reescrita e manipulação da fama literária. Tradução de Claudia Matos Seligmann. Bauru: Edusc, 2007.

LEJEUNE, Philippe. O pacto autobiográfico: de Rousseau a internet. Belo Horizonte: Ed. UFMG, 2008.

SAUSSURE, Ferdinand de. Curso de linguística geral. 27. ed. São Paulo, SP: Cultrix, 2006.

VOLÓCHINOV, V. Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem: problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem. 2. ed. São Paulo, SP: Editora 34, 2018