TANIZE MOCELLIN FERREIRA

Narratology and Translation Studies: an analysis of potential tools in narrative translation

PORTO ALEGRE
2019

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL
INSTITUTO DE LETRAS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS
MESTRADO EM LITERATURAS DE LÍNGUA INGLESA
LINHA DE PESQUISA: SOCIEDADE, (INTER)TEXTOS LITERÁRIOS E TRADUÇÃO NAS
LITERATURAS ESTRANGEIRAS MODERNAS

Narratology and Translation Studies: an analysis of potential tools in narrative translation

Tanize Mocellin Ferreira

Dissertação de Mestrado submetida ao Programa de Pós-graduação em Letras da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul como requisito parcial para a obtenção do título de Mestre em Letras.

Orientadora: Elaine Barros Indrusiak

PORTO ALEGRE

Agosto de 2019

Tanize Mocellin Ferreira

Narratology and Translation Studies: an analysis of potential tools in narrative translation

Dissertação de Mestrado submetida ao Programa de Pós-graduação em Letras da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul como requisito parcial para a obtenção do título de Mestre em Letras.

Porto Alegre, 16 de Agosto de 2019

Resultado:

BANCA EXAMINADORA:

_____
Professora Doutora Elizamari Rodrigues Becker
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul

_____
Professor Doutor Daniel Soares Duarte
Universidade Federal de Pelotas

_____
Professor Doutor Guilherme da Silva Braga
Universidade de Coimbra

"Narrar é resistir"
João Guimarães Rosa

RESUMO

Teorias literárias e culturais têm, cada vez mais, demonstrado a centralidade do gênero narrativo. Durante o último século, o romance e o conto eclipsaram a poesia tanto como o que os escritores escrevem como o que os leitores leem. No entanto, discussões sobre narrativas literárias – e suas traduções – ainda são distorcidas por teorias e disciplinas que são muito mais apropriadas para a análise de formas poéticas. O objetivo desta dissertação é, então, abordar esse desequilíbrio instrumentalizando o tradutor literário em relação à narratologia – a teoria que nos ajuda a entender, analisar e avaliar narrativas. Neste encontro entre teoria da narrativa e estudos de tradução podemos discutir como capacitar tradutores e críticos para que elas/eles possam produzir e analisar traduções de romances e contos baseadas em critérios específicos do gênero narrativo. Fundamentando-me na noção de *polifonia* de Bakhtin (1981) e na *analítica de tradução* de Berman (2000), proponho que o que distingue a narrativa de outros gêneros é sua *refração discursiva*, e que o maior desafio ao se traduzir o gênero narrativo é respeitar sua inerente multiplicidade de vozes, evitando homogenizações arbitrárias. Esta dissertação é estruturada em três capítulos. No primeiro, examino o progresso da tradução literária para entender por que a disciplina ainda não colaborou plenamente com os estudos da narrativa, apresentando trabalhos anteriores que já abordaram essa intersecção e discutindo qual é, em minha opinião, a tarefa do tradutor de narrativas literárias. O segundo capítulo consiste uma apresentação sobre a narratologia, disciplina dedicada ao estudo da lógica, dos princípios e das práticas da representação narrativa; aqui, foco em três aspectos que são mais intimamente ligados à questão da polifonia: o narrador (especialmente o discurso indireto livre), a (não)confiabilidade e a focalização. Essas três seções explicam o que são esses elementos, como eles funcionam e os problemas que colocam ao tradutor. No capítulo final, o conto *Bliss*, de Katherine Mansfield, é usado para exemplificar como o tradutor pode empregar, de maneira operacional, essas ferramentas narrativas para ler, compreender, traduzir e analisar romances e contos, comparando a tradução de Bliss de César (1999), baseada em uma análise sobre polifonia narrativa, com outra tradução do mesmo texto feita por Cupertino (1991). Em conclusão, pretendo contribuir para uma aliança entre os estudos de tradução e narração, mostrando que a narratologia pode ser um modelo altamente produtivo para a criação de leituras e traduções mais diferenciadas, conscientes e produtivas.

Palavras-chave: tradução literária, narratologia, *Katherine Mansfield*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Literary and cultural theory have increasingly claimed cultural centrality for the narrative genre, and for the last century the novel and the short story have eclipsed poetry, both as what writers write and what readers read. However, discussions about literary narrative – and its translation – are still distorted by theories and disciplines that are much more appropriate for the analysis of poetic forms. This thesis's aims at tackling this imbalance by instrumentalizing the literary translator on the subject of narratology – a theory that helps to understand, analyse, and evaluate narratives. By introducing narratology to translation studies, we can discuss how to equip translators and critics so they can produce and analyse translations of novels and short stories based on criteria that are specific to the narrative genre. Based on Bakhtin's (1981) notion of *polyphony* and on Berman's (2000) analytic of translation, I propose that what distinguishes narrative from other genres is its *discoursive refraction,* and that the major challenge of translating narrative is to respect its inherent multiplicity of voices and avoid arbitrary homogenizations. The thesis is structured in three chapters. In the first one, I examine the progression of literary translation studies and their timid collaboration with narrative studies so far, present previous works that dealt with the intersection between these two fields of knowledge, and discuss what, in my opinion, the task of the translator involves when she/he is translating narratives. The second chapter introduces narratology, the discipline dedicated to the study of the logic, principles, and practices of narrative representation; here, I focus on three narratological aspects that are more closely linked to the question of polyphony: the narrator (especially free indirect discourse), (un)reliability and focalization. These three sections explain these elements, how they function and the challenges they can present to the translator. In the third and last chapter, Katherine Mansfield's short story *Bliss* is used to demonstrate, in a practical way, how the translator can employ narrative tools to read, comprehend, translate and analyse narrative fiction, comparing César's (1999) translation of the shot story, which was based on the analysis of its polyphony, with another translation of the same text published by Julieta Cupertino (1991). In conclusion, I hope to contribute to the alliance between narration and translation studies by showing that narratology can be a highly productive set of tools to generate more differentiated, more self-aware, more fruitful readings and translations.

Keywords: literary translation, narratology, *Katherine Mansfield.*

LIST OF TABLES

APOIO DE FINANCIAMENTO CAPES

INTRODUCTION

This project comes from a personal wish to translate better. As an aspiring literary translator, I've been trying for some time to find new ways to improve my practices, readings and research, comparing source to target texts and different translations for the same text. I quickly discovered that, to be a good translator, I had to be a good reader first – I had to understand how a certain text worked, its subtleties, complexities and functions to be able to transpose it to my native language successfully.

But within Translation Studies the question of evaluation - what "successfully" means -, which could be seen as implicit, is a somewhat tricky one. Currently, it's a consensus that the translation scholar should not criticize the target text for its difference from the source text, especially because this kind of analysis presupposes a measurable closeness of target to source, something that is clearly not simple since there cannot possibly be some sort of fixed and invariant meaning in the text, or effect arising from it.

When Translation Studies moved away from its adherence to a strict notion of equivalence towards a cultural turn which emphasized the historical and ideological dimensions of translation practices, rather than the purely linguistic, it also focused on the periphery of the text rather than the text itself. In this new intellectual climate, old assumptions about the discipline were questioned, and research on the *poetics* of translation was almost completely discarded in the 1990s – since we could not have access to the stable meaning of an original text, talking about any kind of fidelity, equivalence or evaluation did not make any sense.

And yet, if one of the aims of Translation Studies is to make the act and the products of translation visible, accessible, and explicit (HOLMES, 1994), then the only way to analyse a translation as a translation in line with these aims is to do so in relation to its source text. A translation is, by its very nature, a text connected to another text, and for me we cannot discuss one without discussing the other. Paraphrasing an analogy used by Britto (2012), no one would say that, just because we cannot completely eliminate the possibility of airplane crashes, we should stop trying to make commercial aviation safer. The same thing happens for translation: even though it is impossible for a translation to be absolutely faithful to an original (because texts do not have a fixed meaning, because languages are never fully equivalent, etc), that does not mean that a translator should just abandon the notion of correspondence altogether. As Britto says, "absolute fidelity is a perfectly valid goal, even if we know very well that, like every absolute, it will never be reached"

(2012, n. p., my translation).

Although the importance of the cultural turn for Translation Studies is undeniable, I have always been more interested in questions of *form*, and this is why I sought Narratology to help me appraise certain notions about literary translation. As Terry Eagleton puts it, regarding our choices of theoretical background

> (…) is not a matter of starting from certain theoretical or methodological problems: it is a matter of starting from what we want to do, and then seeing which methods and theories will best help us to achieve these ends (EAGLETON, 1996, p. 183).

I realized that Narrative Theory could provide me with tools and concepts to understand, and therefore analyse, translations in a way that was not purely prescriptive nor entirely subjective; it could help devise processes for better readings, readings that would allow the translator to see or make connections between aspects of the narrative text that otherwise would go unnoticed. However, I quickly realized that these two disciplines had not yet collaborated fully. According to Britto (2012), Bassnett (2010) and Galindo (2009), even if most of academic work inside Translation Studies uses novels or short stories as objects of discussion, the language used to analyse them is still permeated by formal resources that are more adequate do discuss the translation of poetry – metric, rhythm, rhyme, sound resources – than the translation of narrative prose. Of course prose translators and critics can still apply this apparatus to inform their texts and analysis, but if we rely on these instruments only, the analysis is far from understanding what makes a narrative a narrative. Personally, it has always been a "pet peeve" of mine to hear translators justifying their choices because it "sounded better" - sound, rhythm, rhyme and other similar features are extremely important characteristics of almost every text, prose or poetry, but they are not specific enough if we're talking about narrative texts. There are other aspects working in narratives, structural elements like the narrator, focalization and the arrangement of events that are far more decisive to the quality and intensity of narratives. The aesthetic potential of a narrative, its literary effect, lies mostly on *how* it is done, on its form rather than content, and this form is significantly different from the form of poetry, while also undoubtedly less considered inside translation studies.

This reveals an unarticulated faultline in research on translated narrative. Nobody will deny that the act of translation changes the stylistics anchoring of the text. But does the translator also fundamentally alter its structural decisions? This was the question that prompted this research and my interest in connecting narration and translation studies. I turned to Narratology, "the ensemble of

theories of narratives, narrative texts, images, spectacles, events; cultural artifacts that 'tell a story'" (Bal, 2009, p. 3) to help me understand, analyse, and evaluate narratives through another perspective. If I wanted to verify what translations could do to narrative structures, first I needed to understand what those structures were.

Bal (2009) divides narrative texts in three levels: fabula, story and narrative text.

> A narrative text is a text in which an agent or subject conveys to an addressee ('tells' the reader) a story in a particular medium, such as language, imagery, sound, buildings or a combination thereof. A *story* is the content of that text, and produces a particular manifestation, inflection, and 'colouring' of a fabula; the fabula is presented in a certain manner. A *fabula* is a series of logically and chronologically related events that are caused or experienced by actors (BAL, 2009, p. 5).

At the level of the narrative text, we have aspects like the narrating agent, levels of narration and speech representation; at the story level, aspects of time, space, characters and focalization; and at the level of the fabula, events, actors, time and location. The model that results from the combination of these three levels allows the reader to connect all the aspects of a narrative text. For example, characterization can combine itself with space, or narration can be linked with the point of view (focalization) through which events are perceived. All this leads to better insights about the text's formal organization, while also allowing the reader to connect form and content.

Initially, I wanted to verify if translation could alter aspects in the story level. For me, those were the structures that shaped the narrative, that gave it its *how*. But throughout my studies in the last two years, especially during my "teaching internship", I realized that modifications in elements like frequency, the construction of characters and the function of different spaces inside the narrative were exceptions, and that analysing these possible changes in the intermediary level of narrative would not be as significant as I thought.

I realized that, even if I could point out, measure or classify changes at the story level, the text layer is the only *material* we have for investigation, the only level directly accessible, and any discussion about modifications occurred in other levels would have to go through what was changed in the discourse, the words on the page. Narrative is created through *narration*, which may sound quite obvious at first, but is indeed a complex, subtle feature that poses serious challenges for the translator.

The biggest challenges all derive from the concept of *polyphony*. Bakhtin (1981) introduces this concept in his "Discourse in the Novel", stating that narrative discourse achieves its particular effects through a system of different languages, which are subordinated, yet still relatively

autonomous, to the text as a whole. Novels and shorts stories present an assortment of types of social speeches (dialects, jargons, languages of different age groups, slogans, vocabularies) and also distinct individual voices, who enter the genre through the narrator and the characters, and which are the fundamental prerequisite for narrative as a genre.

This means that no narrative voice, however apparently objective or unbiased, is ever undivided, because all narrative discourse is, implicitly or explicitly, *compound discourse* (O'NEILL, 1994). Literary narrative collects and intermingles a multiplicity of languages, dialects, registers, accents, expressions, mobilizing and activating the totality of the "voices" that are present in any language. We can see this compound discourse in the works of many of the most prominent prose writers of the 20th and 21st century: Proust, Joyce, Faulker, James, Guimarães Rosa, etc. Consequently, the novel and the short story are characterized by this *shapeless polylogic* (BERMAN, 2000), a nonspecificity regarding the number and the source of the distinct voices inside the text.

Aside from the obvious difficulties in translating texts with linguistic diversity – geographical dialects, slang expressions or any nonstandard form of speech – the question of polyphony also brings about more subtle, nuanced difficulties. Even if we are dealing with a narrative where both narrator and characters speak standard English, for example, we can still have many forms of discourse refraction manifested through narrative structures. The theory of narrative can provide the translator with tools to identify polyphonical aspects and, more important, to reproduce them in the target-text without homogenizing it, that is, without erasing any voices.

For better comprehension, we could make another analogy. In music theory, polyphony is music in which autonomous melodies intertwine. This form seem strange to the modern listeners because it was surpassed by music in which a unified rhythm and melody holds the composition together. Today, we listeners are used to hearing music with a single perspective. When we listen to polyphonic music, we are forced to pick out separate, simultaneous melodies and listen for the moments of harmony and dissonance they created together. That's the same task the narrative translator has to perform – recognize the distinct voices playing in the text and the effects they create, noticing the multiple rhythms and trajectories made possible by this assemblage.

Both exercises are only possible with skills, tools and practice, of course. Narratology can offer some of these tools, in the form of concepts that help translators pay attention to words, sentences, syntax, types of punctuation, etc, that are connected to deeper narrative levels and structures. If heterogeneity is constitutive of the narrative genre, translators need to be able to recreate it, and they can start doing so by learning how this characteristic is organized, tangibly, in novels and short stories.

With this goal in mind, this thesis is divided into three chapters. The first chapter discusses questions of translation, starting with why Translation Studies has yet to fully collaborate with Narratology. I consider Britto's (2012) and Bassnett's (2002) perspectives on translation to debate that, while the translation of poetry has instruments and criteria for formal analysis that are well established in our literary tradition, the translation of prose/narrative still lacks studies to define its distinctive characteristics and devise operational concepts that can be systematically applied. By examining the evolution of literary translation studies, I delineate some reasons for this theoretical vacuum, following Bernaerts et al (2014) overview on the topic. The same article is used to comment on the theoretical framework of the overlaps between the fields of narratology and translation studies, from Theo Hermans' *The translator's voice in translated narrative* (1996) to Prince's *Narratology and Translation* (2014). I finish the chapter with some personal remarks regarding the "task" of the translator, reinforcing Berman's (2000) claim that "the principal problem of translating the novel is to respect its *shapeless polylogic* and avoid arbitrary homogenization" (p. 287).

The second chapter, "Questions of Narration", is an overview of the study of the narrative genre through the years, focusing primarily on the already mentioned notion of polyphony devised by Bakhtin (1981). I also rely on O'Neill's (1994) vision of what a narrative is, since he proposes a narrative theory that reads every narrative in terms of its embeddedness, its ability to disguise the origin of its discursive voice. The evolution of Narratology as a discipline is laid out, along with its major notions, like the division of the narrative text in levels and the different agents at play inside the discourse. After that, I focus on three main concepts that are, in my opinion, the points where the question of polyphony becomes a concrete challenge for the translator: narrator, (un)reliability and focalization. The narrator is the most central concept in the analysis of narrative texts, and it is through this agent that we arrive at the conceptual core of our discussion: free indirect discourse, a form of speech representation that merges the voice of the narrator with that of the characters to the point where they are almost indistinguishable. The notion of free indirect discourse is also present on the other two sections of this chapter, about (un)reliability and focalization; (un)reliability is discussed mainly through Sternberg and Yacobi's (2015) cognitive approach, while the review on focalization is backed up by Bal's (2009) theories.

The third and last chapter is dedicated to Katherine Mansfield's *Bliss* and its 1999 annotated translation into Portuguese by Ana Cristina César. César's translation is based on a narratological analysis of Bliss: she notices that the short story is structured on a regular alternation between the voice of the narrator and that of the character. Identifying the distinctive features of both voices, César is able to produce a translation that respects the polyphony of the narrative without

homogenizations. Following the division of the previous chapter, I present examples of free indirect discourse, unreliability and focalization in *Bliss* and describe César's strategies to translate the most challenging aspects of the narrative, while also comparing her translation to Cupertino's (1991), in order to provide a contrastive example of different types of translation approaches to the same text.

I intend this thesis to reveal the substantial relevance of an alliance between Narratology and Translation Studies. Today, stories are the main way we make sense of things, whether in thinking about our lives or in telling ourselves what is going on in the world. Literary translators are text professionals, and it seems pivotal to understand as much as possible about this genre that is at the center of how we structure our knowledge, connecting it to our translation theories and practices in order to instrumentalize our readings and discover new possibilities of interpretation in the text.

1 QUESTIONS OF TRANSLATION

A significant portion of the theoretical thinking about literary translation focuses on the translation of poetry (BASSNETT, 2002; BRITTO, 2012). The instruments and criteria for defining and evaluating poetry have been well established in our literary tradition for many years; at least since Aristotle's Poetics, scholars have been attempting to account for its effects by describing elements like rhythm, meter, metrical patterns, rhyming schemes and the articulations of these formal resources with the poem's semantic progression.

A poem being somewhat easier to "dissect", the translation of poetry has, therefore, stronger foundations for its evaluation. Most translators have the tools to determine which formal elements are being used in a sonnet, to relate those formal elements with their semantic counterparts, considering which of those aspects are more important to the sonnet's effect and meaning, and to eventually rewrite the sonnet in another language, trying to maintain it's formal logic and/or its semantic content. It is also possible for a reader or for a critic, comparing source and target, to infer, fairly easily, what happened in the process of that translation – the translator's difficulties, the gains and losses confronted, the strategies and solutions proposed.

Which doesn't mean, of course, that scholars and critics have reached some kind of theoretical consensus regarding the translation of poetry; in fact, few topics have led to such radically opposed standpoints as poetic translation, one stance defending the impossibility of translating poetry, viewing its creation as a "divine inspiration" which cannot be reproduced in another language without losses to its "spirit", while other positions affirm that a poem can be translated just like every other text.

In one of the essential texts on the subject, Lefevere (1975) catalogues seven different strategies for translating poetry, including phonemic translation, poetry into prose, rhymed translation and interpretation, each one of them describing some privileged aspect (sound, word-to-word, metre, etc). The peculiarity here is that, even though Levefere is able to create these classifications by observing and analysing a series of poem translations, in the end his conclusion is that "the resulting texts simply cannot be considered literary translations" (Lefevere apud Britto, 2012, n.p.), because they don't give the reader an exact impression of the original text.

For Britto (2012), on the other hand, it is pointless to analyse a translation just to conclude that it is not a perfect reproduction of the source-text. Lefevere's classifications are indeed a substantial contribution to the study of poetic translation, but his position on the correct way of

translating is an "unacceptable premise". After all, no translation is ever perfect; by its own dialectic and derivative nature, the process of translation always implies some type of deconstruction and reconstruction. For Britto, scholars should be concerned with devising a system that makes it possible to evaluate the positive and negative aspects of translations, through a careful analysis, using rational and relatively objective arguments.

This is what he does in "Literary Translation" (2016) - assuming that "the impossibility of making an evaluation that is absolutely irrefutable does not imply that each and every evaluation is absolutely arbitrary" (my translation, n.p.), Britto consistently demonstrates how it is possible to build exegetical mechanisms through objective parameters. His model is intended for comparative analysis, but it can also be used in the process of translation.

The first step in Britto's interpretive/evaluative mechanism is defining poetry's specific characteristics. Citing Meschonnic, Britto states, simply, that what characterizes the genre is its rhythm, everything that involves the sound aspects. Therefore, the task of translator of poetry

> Consists in identifying the text's poetically relevant characteristics and in reproducing the one he judges to be more important. The meaning of the text is, in most cases, fundamental; but the formal elements can be just as important as the meaning, and, in some poems, even more important. (BRITTO, 2012, my translation).

The author then proceeds to analyze a poem by Emily Dickinson, first explaining what the poem "says" and listing its formal aspects - four verses, 9 iambic feet, 3 feet with no stressed syllable, a ballad meter, the pattern of alliterations. Britto says that a good translation of Dickinson's poem has to reproduce not only its semantic network, but these formal aspects too. He then proposes two translations for the poem, detailing which aspects were maintained, and to what degree, and which aspects were "lost".

Original	Translation A	Translation B
"Faith is a fine invention When Gentlemen can *see*- But *Microscopes* are prudent In an Emergency.	Quando se pode enxergar, A "Fé" tem conveniência; Mas *Microscópios* convêm Em caso de Emergência.	A "Fé" é um ótimo invento Quando se enxerga a contento; Mas numa Emergência, não: Tenha um *Microscópio* à mão.

Table 1 – Comparision between translations, adapted from Britto (2012)

In "Translation A", regarding formal aspects, the three first verses have a different meter

from the last one. This irregularity creates a problem, since the poem is metrically regular. However, says Britto, the problem is not all that serious when we realize that Dickinson's poetry frequently has similar irregularities, and that this translation was still able to maintain the rhyming scheme.

Semantically, Britto notices that "Translation A" inverts the ideas of the first two verses, resulting in a structure that is less symmetrical, which, although not irrelevant, "does not affect the essence of the argumentation" (2012, n.p., my translation). A more serious problem for him is the loss of the idea of faith as a "good invention", a major question concerning what the poem is trying to convey, seeing that Dickinson turns upside down the truism that people only appeal to faith in moments of crisis. Likewise, the poem classifies "faith", and not "microscopes", as an invention. Britto also sees as a semantic loss the lacking of the word "Gentlemen", with a capital G, which makes his translation less ironic than the original. Finally, he mentions the repetition of a morphological element: "convém" is contained in "conveniência", but this duplication does not exist in the original.

In his second attempt, Translation B, there are no irregularities in meter, but there's a different rhyme scheme than the one used by Dickinson. Concerning meaning, in the first verse, B is better at preserving the original's semantic content; the second verse does not maintain the ironic touch of "Gentlemen", but this also happened in A. The semantic content of the third and fourth verses are inverted, and where in the source-text there's a declarative statement, in Translation B we have an order ("tenha um microscópio à mão"). But for Britto this isn't a drastic change in meaning, since the advice of owning a microscope is a "reasonable paraphrase" (2012, n.p., my translation) of "Microscopes are prudent".

In short, the advantage of version B is assured by the accuracy of the translation of the first verse; concerning form, however, version A is closest to the original because it keeps the rhyming structure of Dickinson's poem. If the "gains and losses" of both versions are equivalent, how do we evaluate which strategies are more satisfactory then?

Britto claims, again, that we have to look at what we judge to be the poem's most important characteristics. For him, the poem is based on the idea that, on a daily basis, people turn to faith, but in cases of emergency they have to appeal to reason, which is a reversal of popular ideas about

faith/reason. And since version A leaves out the conclusion that "faith is an invention", he prefers version B, even though B alters Dickinson's rhyming pattern. His conclusion is that "a translation that alters an important element of the original is better than one that omits an important element" (2012, n.p., my translation).

The author does the same exercise with a poem in free verse, following the same steps: 1) analyse and describe the poem's formal aspects and 2) translate, reproducing what we judge to be the poem's most important characteristics. This seems like a very simple method to understand and apply, but what I want to stress is that a reader/translator/critic can only complete the first step of Britto's interpretive/evaluative mechanism if he/she has a meaningful comprehension of theories about poetry's form and discourse. The author's extensive knowledge on how poetry works is even more clear in his second example: a reader who's not familiar with the structures and operations of prose poems could fail to notice the

> division of each stanza in four sound blocks that not always coincide with the graphic verses; the relation between pauses and the end of the verse differing according to the explanation; and the presence of two or three strong syllables in each sound block (2012, n.p., my translation)

Britto knows that those are the essential features of this poem because, as stated above, the instruments and criteria for defining and evaluating poetry are well established and widespread in our literary tradition. But the same thing does not happen with the analysis of narrative, even though, as a genre, it has been at the center of literary and cultural theory at least since the 1960's. When Britto (2012) attempts to do the same translation exercise with prose instead of poetry, the results are not so clear and didactic. Of course, one of the major reasons for that is the mere extension of the typical narrative text; his method can almost exhaust Dickinson's four verse poem in a few pages, but how long would it take for a translator to undertake a similar exegesis for, say, "Pride and Prejudice"?

A more pertinent factor is, however, that the analysis of said formal elements and their conjunction with the respective semantic content is far away from representing the distinguishing features of narrative. A translator can and may undertake an analysis of a novel using those techniques the scholar applied to poetry, and this investigation can turn out to be a very rich reading of the text, but probably it won't be close to its specificity.

It is possible to illustrate this gap regarding the analysis of translated narratives with Britto's

(2012) own examples. He starts his chapter on the translation of fiction by asking similar questions: which characteristics of a text should be considered essential to reproduce in translation? Which elements in this text will necessarily have to be reconstructed in my translation? His answer is "Let's us start with the obvious: there is a story to be told, with a determined set of characters, a plot with several levels (...)" (n.p., my translation).

In terms of aligning narrative theory with translation this is a good start: story, character and plot are indeed elements of the formal aspect of narratives, concepts of a *poetic* of narrative that can help translators understand how the genre works and achieves its effects. But these "obvious" elements are quickly dropped by Britto in favor of a discussion about syntax and authorial style. The word "narrator" (which is, as I will show later, the most important element of a narrative) is mentioned only once. Even though Britto's discussion about the translation of fiction (narrative, prose) is extremely pertinent for any literary translator, it does not have the same operational force his method for poetry analysis have, mainly because, in my opinion, he does not adopt narrative concepts and structures (narrator, focalization, character, speech representation, etc) in the same analytical way he employs poetry's (meter, rhyme, metaphor, alliteration, etc).

A similar issue happens in Susan Bassnett's (2002) acclaimed *Translation Studies*. In a section called "Translating Prose", Bassnett attempts to demonstrate useful criteria for the translation of prose, in part because she sees that prose translators tend to stress content at the expense of the "total structure" (p. 114) of the source-text. To show what happens when a translator considers content as separable from form she gives two examples, comparing excerpts of original texts with their respective translations. For Bassnett, the "form" of a narrative text involves, then, "authorial values" (p. 115), "descriptive passages" (p. 115), "codes" (p. 115), "devices" (p. 116), "modes" (p. 116), "characterization" (p. 116), "tone" (p. 117), "verbal phrases" (p. 117), "stylistic devices" (p.118) and many more.

We can find many of these criteria inside narrative theory, as I will show later, but there are also a lot of them that are clearly borrowed from poetry analysis, as we can see in her conclusion: "the English translators have not given adequate consideration to the function of the **stylistic devices** used by Silone" (BASSNETT, 2002, p. 118, my emphasis). The form of a narrative obviously includes the author's stylistic choices - number of sentences and their divisions, patterns of repetitions, use of verbs and syntax, for example - but it also includes notions that are specific of narrative prose that are not mentioned by Bassnett in her research, or are mentioned in general, layman-terms, like in the following segment.

If the translator, then, handles sentences for their specific content alone,

the outcome will involve a loss of dimension. In the case of the English translation of the texts above, the sentences appear to have been translated at face value, rather than as component units in a complex overall structure (BASSNETT, 2002, p. 119, my emphasis).

What the author is stressing here is exactly what I'm trying to accomplish connecting narrative theory to translation theory - to present analytic resources that can help the reader/translator identify unsuspected relations between all the components of a narrative text, so there are no losses of "dimension", as Bassnett puts it. What I feel is lacking, and therefore what I'm trying to include in the discussion about literary translation, is a description of the elements of this "complex overall structure", because if the translator does not know what constitutes this structure and how it works, how can he/she visualize it as to make it a factor in the translation process?

1.1. Evolution of literary translation

In the previous section I pointed out that the discussions about narrative, its translation and analysis, tend to be influenced by discourse about poetry, a genre that is more established and canonical inside the domain of literary theory; as a consequence, many scholars, translators and readers use the *poetics* of poetry (classifications and criteria such as meter, rhyme, verse, rhythm, etc) as an instrument to examine and evaluate the translated narrative.

This difficulty in dealing with the specificity of the narrative genre has been a problematic topic for literary theory for many years; Bakhtin (1981) said that

> For a long time treatment of the novel was limited to little more than abstract ideological examination and publicistic commentary. Concrete questions of stylistics were either not treated at all or treated in passing and in an arbitrary way: the discourse of artistic prose was either understood as being poetic in the narrow sense, and had the categories of traditional stylistics (based on the study of tropes) uncritically applied to it, or else such questions were limited to empty, evaluative terms for the characterization of language, such as "expressiveness," "imagery," "force," "clarity" and so on-without providing these concepts with any stylistic significance, however vague and tentative (p. 260).

For him, the utter inefficiency of literary theory was exposed when it was forced to handle the novel - after not finding a "purely poetic formulation" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 260) in prose discourse, scholars dismissed it as a practical form of speech, everyday-life speech, a form of communication with no real artistic purposes.

This situation was eventually solved with the advent of narrative theory and the

development of a concrete, systematic method for analysing the genre, but the difficulties of literary theory regarding narrative can help us understand the struggles of translation theory with the same type of discourse.

In Narration and Translation, Bernaerts et al. (2014) give us a very comprehensive view about the history of the intersection between narrative and translation studies. For them, the perception that translation studies has "merely skimmed the surface of narratological issues" (p. 204) is related to how the discipline emerged and developed.

Early scholarly interest, starting in the 1950s and 60s, revolved around linguistics, as theoreticians began to construct more systematic analysis of translation. The major issue in this phase was that of equivalence, in other words,

> the idea that what we can say in a particular language *can* have the same value (the same weight or the same function) when it is translated to another language. The relationship between the source-text and its translation will be of equivalence (same value), where "value" could be on the level of form, function or some intermediate level between them (PYM, 2017, p. 27, my translation).

One of the first scholars to deal with the problem of equivalence was Jakobson (1959 apud MUNDAY, 2001), who examined the problem of linguistic equivalence through Saussure's classification of signifier and signified. Jakobson calls attention to the fact that usually there is no equivalence between isolated signifiers in different languages, only between entire messages. In his discussion, the issues of meaning and equivalence are directed at the structure of languages, since linguistic contrasts happen because of obligatory grammatical and lexical forms, like gender, morphology, semantics, etc.

Another important figure in the discussion about equivalence is Eugene Nida, whose theory developed from his translations of the Bible. Like Jakobson, Nida's work was also influenced by a famous linguist, this time Noam Chomsky's generative-transformational model.

> Central to Nida's work is the move away from the old idea that an orthographic word has a fixed meaning and towards a functional definition of meaning in which a word 'acquires' meaning through its context and can produce varying responses according to culture. Meaning is broken down into linguistic meaning (borrowing elements of Chomsky's model), referential meaning (the denotative 'dictionary' meaning) and emotive (or connotative) meaning" (MUNDAY, 2001, p. 38)

This classification is followed by a series of techniques that help the translator identify the

different types of meaning in linguistic items, like the semantic structure analysis, in which Nida divides visually the distinct meanings of a certain word according to their features inside the text. The purpose of this method is to make the translator realize that the sense of a complex semantic unit (he uses the biblical word 'spirit' as an example) can vary according to its context ("spirit" doesn't always have a religious connotation as in "Holy Spirit", it can also mean "ghost", "demon", "alcohol", etc).

In another move to solidify the "science" of translating, Nida also rejects old terms like "free" and "faithful" translation in favour of two types of equivalence: formal and dynamic (MUNDAY, 2001, p. 41). Formal equivalence is concerned primarily with the source text (ST) message, both in form and content, and its goal is to reproduce this message matching all the elements in the ST with the TT in the most exact way possible. Dynamic equivalence, on the other hand, is concerned with "effects", as a receptor-oriented approach, and its goal is to minimize the foreignness of the ST by adapting grammar, lexicon and cultural references.

Still within the equivalence paradigm, we find a series of proposed classifications and taxonomies with the intention of categorizing translational shifts. The most influential one belongs to Vinay and Darbelnet, who carried out a comparative stylistic analysis of French and English, noting different translation strategies and procedures. They identified two general translation techniques, direct and oblique, and then subdivided them into other procedures - direct translation covers "borrowing", "calque" and "literal translation", while oblique covers "transposition", "modulation", "equivalence" and "adaptation" (MUNDAY, 2001, p. 56).

And it is here, inside these early discussions about translational processes, that we find the first attempt to match translation studies to narrative studies: Van Leuven-Zwart's comparative-descriptive model of translational shifts, the "most detailed model" of this kind, according to Munday (2001). Her method is "intended for the description of integral translations of fictional texts" (LEUVEN-ZWART, 1989, p. 154), and it consists of two models: comparative and descriptive.

The comparative model, much like Vinay and Darbelnet's, comprises a detailed comparison between ST and TT and a classification of "microstructural shifts", shifts that happen at the level of sentence, clauses and phrases, although she goes one step further here and creates comparison units called "transemes". Once all the micro-shifts between ST and TT are categorized, Leuven-Zwart's model adds a new, unprecedented step: the descriptive model, based on concepts borrowed from Mieke Bal's narratology and Leech & Short's stylistics (LEUVEN-ZWART, 1989).

The scholar proposes that the mere linguistic analysis that was being done by other academics was not relevant if it could not be linked to the text's deeper levels. That is to say,

classifying translational solutions as "transpositions", "literal translation" or "modulations" is only relevant as a method of analysis if we can extrapolate this first stage as to understand how those shifts modify the effects, meaning and the narrative structures of the text.

There are, however, disadvantages to her model; Leuven-Zwart (1989) herself recognizes that her method is extremely complex (there are 8 categories and 37 subcategories of classification), and of course it is very complicated to analyze a whole text when you have to come up with the transemes for every segment. In the long run, Leuven-Zwart's method is not really operational, even though it deserves its merit for being the first study inside translation theory to realize that the process of translation could alterate a text beyond its sentence level.

After the 1980s, the whole paradigm of equivalence started to be seen as limited, and it came under heavy criticism, "mainly for three reasons: its narrow focus on language, its adherence to a strict notion of equivalence (i.e. the idea of a symmetrical relationship between different languages) and the fact that precious little 'real translated text' has been analysed" (BERNAERTS et al, 2014, p. 205).

As a reaction to the static linguistic and prescriptive models, Translation Studies saw the rise of the polysystem theory, developed by Itamar Even-Zohar, which saw texts not as isolated discourse, but as something that should be studied within its social, literary and historical context. Even-Zohar wanted to emphasize the position of translated literature inside the larger polysystem of literature as a whole, discussing the way translation norms, behaviour and policies are influenced by other co-systems (MUNDAY, 2001).

If translated literature occupies a primary position in the polysystem, it participates actively in the shaping of it, being linked to major events of literary history and leading innovative poetic practices. On the other hand, if it occupies a secondary position, translated literature can be seen as a peripheral form inside the system, having no influence over it and even becoming a conservative element. For Even-Zohar, these positions conditioned different translation strategies: if translated literature is primary, translators feel more free to break conventions, producing TT that introduce new literary models to the target culture; but if translated literature is considered secondary, translators tend to only reproduce what is already conventional in their target language and culture

Working alongside Even-Zohar, Gideon Toury was also interested in moving away from the paradigm of equivalence, focusing on developing a general theory of translation that could replace isolated studies that were common at the time (MUNDAY, 2001). His theory was eventually called Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), which became a crucial branch of translation studies, aimed at identifying norms and laws of translation.

Toury's goal with DTS was to detect trends in translational behavior and to derive "norms"

from this decision-making process of the translators, formulating, then, hypothesis that could be tested.

> In its socio-cultural dimension, translation can be described as subject to constraints of several types and varying degree. These extend far beyond the source text; the systemic differences between the languages and textual traditions involved in the act, or even the possibilities and limitations of the cognitive apparatus of the translator as a necessary mediator. In fact, cognition itself is influenced, probably even modified by socio-cultural factors. At any rate, translators performing under different conditions (e.g., translating texts of different kinds, and/or for different audiences) often adopt different strategies, and ultimately come up with markedly different products. (TOURY, 2000, p. 199).

Toury proposed a system of classification for different types of norms (initial, preliminary, operational, etc), ranging from behavior that is mandatory to trends that are common but not mandatory; the cumulative identification of these norms, which can come both from the examination of texts and from explicit statements made by translators, would enable the construction of probabilistic "laws" of translation, creating an area inside Translation Studies that would describe what happens during translation, instead of prescribing what should be done.

These new approaches helped establish Translation Studies as a discipline and were the first step towards looking at the process and product of translation as an object inside a cultural, social context, instead of something that happens inside a linguistic vacuum. This move from translation as text to translation as culture and politics has been called "The Cultural Turn" (MUNDAY, 2001), since now scholars were debating the power exercised in and on the publishing industry, ideologies, feminist writing, translation as rewriting, translation as appropriation, translation as colonization.

> Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society (BASSNETT; LEFEVERE, 2003, p. xi).

The cultural turn added new meanings to translation; it was an important step towards realizing that translations are also a political, ideological product, not only the result of linguistic choices made in a vacuum. The contact with other areas enriched the discipline, but, at the same time, the "cultural turn" was more focused on the extratextual rather than the text itself, leaving no space for narrative theory. So, according to Bernaerts et al (2014), "the first explicit use of

narratological models in translation studies has grown out of unease with this primary focus on the macrostructural" (p. 205).

1.2 Background: Translation studies meets Narrative Theory

As I've shown in the last section, Translation Studies never fully merged with Narrative Theory because it was either too focused on linguistics alone (the equivalence paradigm) or too preoccupied with analysing the extratextual elements of translations (system theories, the cultural turn). One of the first studies to explicitly combine Narrative Theory to the study of translation was Theo Hermans' *The translator's voice in translated narrative* (1996). Herman's study was an attempt to account for the translator's discursive presence in the translated text, since the translating subject had been markedly missing in research regarding norms or market-place dynamics.

For that, Hermans (1996) proposed the integration of the "translator voice" into existing models of narrative communication.

> Translated narrative discourse, it will be claimed, always implies more than one voice in the text, more than one discursive presence. It may be that in many narratives this 'other' voice [the translator's] never clearly manifests itself, but it should nevertheless be postulated, on the strength of those cases where it is manifestly present and discernible (Hermans, 1996, p. 27).

Borrowing the concept of "voice" from Chatman's (1978) representation of the narrative-communication situation, Hermans says that the translator's voice is likely to manifest itself mainly in three cases: "orientation towards an implied reader", "cases of self-reflexiveness and self-referentiality" and "contextual overdetermination" (1996, p. 28). Also, when not overtly present, the voice can be hidden behind that of the narrator or the "Implied Translator". Denouncing both translation studies' incapacity of dealing the subject of the real translator, and narratology's "blind spot" (p. 43) regarding this other type of voice, the author claims that the translator's voice has been ignored because the dominant concept of translation in our culture is that of transparency, reproduction, of the primacy of the source-text.

Alongside Hermans, Schiavi (1996) postulated that the process of translation changes significantly the structures of narrative, not only its stylistic, also using the concept of the "translator voice" to analyse shifts in translation with a narratological approach to literature. She claims that "translated narrative communication has as a textual characteristic two addressers addressing one addressee" (1996, p. 17), and therefore should be read and examined through a new

narrative communication model.

However relevant for the development of the possible links between Translation Studies and Narrative Theory, the conflation of translator/implied author/narrator that both theorists make has been criticized (ALVSTAD, 2014) for its confusion regarding where to accommodate the translator inside communicative models. Indeed, the fact that a translation changes narrative structures and adds a new discursive voice,

> does not mean that the implied translator becomes the counterpart of the implied author in translated narrative. I argue instead that the implied author will be reconstructed by readers in very much the same way regardless of whether they read a translation or a non-translated text, and that the discursive presence of the translator in the translated text is just one of many voices (and other indexical signs) out of which the individual reader will reconstruct the implied author (ALVSTAD, 2014, p. 274)

Nonetheless, their overall concern about the presence of an additional "voice" in translated narrative meets one of the premises of this thesis, which is, that narrative's main characteristic is an "intertextual transformative streak in all writing, to assert the plurivocality of discourse (...) inflation of voices and meaning" (HERMANS, 1996, p. 44), and that translation should not silence this plurivocal speech, although it traditionally does. Both essays constitute one of the earliest and most convincing examples of the theoretical integration of narratology, translation studies and literary theory, even though the question here should have been what kind of alterations this discursive presence actually causes.

Still working with the discursive presence of the translator, we have O'Sullivan's (2003) *Narratology meets Translation Studies, or, The Voice of the Translator in Children's Literature*, which again presuppose the existence of the "implied translator" as an "agent of change" (p. 197) inside translated narrative. Her work takes Schiavi's and Hermans' one step further, as it tries to understand what kind of modifications the translator's voice incites, giving several examples from children's literature, which, according to her, makes it more visible or audible as a result of adults acting on the behalf of children, redirecting the translation towards what they believe are the necessities of the target-audience (BERNAERTS et al, 2014).

However, O'Sullivan makes the same mistake when placing the translator within Chatman's diagram, creating what she calls "the voice of the narrator of the translation", blurring the lines between a "real person" (the author and the translator) and a "rhetorical person" (the narrator). Of course the translator can change the way a narrator is depicted in a narrative (this is basically my entire hypothesis here), but to claim that they can occupy equivalent positions in a communicative

model is to make the very old literary mistake of equating author and narrator.

As it can be seen, the conceptual gains from positing the translator as a separate enunciator in narrative transactions are limited. But there are other approaches to the overlap of Narratology and Translation Studies that are more productive. Bosseaux (2007), for example, borrows narratological structures in order to explain observed shifts in literary translations. She applies Leuven-Zwart's model (discussed in the previous section) to the comparison between French translations of two novels by Virginia Woolf, using corpus-based analysis to detect modifications in "deixis, modality, transitivity and free indirect discourse", and to see if these modifications "affect the transfer of narratological structures" (BOSSEAUX, 2007, p. 30).

Free indirect discourse, as I will demonstrate later, is one of the biggest challenges for the translator of narratives, since it can activate subtle plays with polyphony inside the discourse that are difficult to identify if the translator is not familiar with the technique. Bosseaux offers important evidence to support the hypothesis of an enunciative homogenisation in translation.

> Although the results of the first case study on To The Lighthouse and its French translations were limited, it emerged that the hybridity of free indirect discourse is largely maintained in Pellan's translation. The narratological structure of Lanoire's text is more homogeneous than that of the original as the boundary between the voices of the characters and the narrator is more clearly marked than in the original. Merle's and Pellan's versions proved more faithful to the original's enunciative structure with Pellan's translation being the closest (BOSSEAUX, 2007, p. 247).

Bosseaux's thesis backs up the claim that, although it is very hard for a translator to change narrative structures like characters and sequence of events, when it comes to the point-of-view from which the story is told, the impact of a translation can be much more pronounced - the cumulative effect of minor changes in deixis, modality and transitivity can significantly affect aspects of narration and focalization.

Other works that deal with how translation can alter narrative structures are Kullmann's, which "examine free indirect discourse in the European novel since 1850 and analyse how this once innovative stylistic feature is altered in translation" (BERNAERTS ET AL, 2014, 206); Czenia's, that "combining translation studies and literary theory, examines the functions and translations of character speech, marked in Dickens' works by the use of nonstandard language" (BERNAERTS ET AL, 2014, 206) and Zuschlag's, which explores the implication of classical narratological models (Barthes, Genette, etc) for the analysis of translations, demonstrating how "speech and thought representation and narrative tense to deictic indicators of time and space" (BERNAERTS

ET AL, 2014, p. 207) can be altered in translation, and that these changes in the narrative level can also affect the level of the story.

Another important background material are the articles from the 23rd volume of *Language and Literature*, dedicated entirely to the discussion of the overlaps between the fields of narratology and translation studies. The topics explored in this issue range from cognitive narratology to Benveniste's theory of enunciation, and they offer a meaningful outline on how to connect the two disciplines, suggesting different analytical tools.

Among the most relevant articles in the number is Boase-Beier's (2014), which highlights the importance of a narratology background for translators, since "prose translators (...), even when they are highly sensitive to style, often seem relatively unaware of narrative structures in texts" (p. 214). The author claims that some knowledge about narratives and how they work can enhance possibilities of reading for the translator, allowing he/she to detect possible links between details in the text that may go unnoticed otherwise, a proposition that I will later develop.

Using concepts from cognitive narratology, Boase-Beier (2014) analyses representation of thought in three novels by the Romanian writer Herta Müller and how certain aspects of it are represented in the English translations, notably free indirect thought and focalization, arguing that

> the perspective is generally somewhat changed in translation. In examples (3) and (6), the narrator's perspective appears reinforced, the ambiguity diminished. In both example (1) and the translation of the titles, some of the mental processing the originals suggest, and demand, is made less complex (BOASE-BEIER, 2014, p. 222).

Another article in "Language and Literature" that supports my discussion here is Boyden's (2014), which updates the previously mentioned debate about the attempts to integrate the translator as an agent in existing models of narrative communication, like Herman's and Schiavi's. The author's intention is to

> Work towards an etiology of translated narrative that moves away from the charged question as to who is responsible for the text and towards a more profound appreciation of the ways in which translation shapes the modalities of narrative (BOYDEN, 2014, p. 259).

Dealing with the "doublevoicedness" of translations, Boyden compares two Dutch translations of Melville's novela "Benito Cereno", the first published in 1950 and the second in 1977. Drawing from Genette's distinction between "voice" (the act of telling a story) and "mood" (perspective from which the story is told), Boyden notices that there's a dual perspective in the

novella, an opposition between the omniscient narrator and the voice of the character Captain Delano. To express this dissonance, the double perspective, the narrator uses several double negatives, like "not unaffected" and "not ungratefully", modal verbs, passive constructions and metonymies (BOYDEN, 2014). One of translators changes most of these double-negatives to positive expressions, impacting the overall "mood" of the narrative, according to the author.

Boydens's conclusion is that postulating the translator as a second voice in the narrative is not as productive as analysing how "Melville's own doublevoiced discourse (...) gets reperspectivized in translation" (p. 267), which, according to him, happens through a large number of modal shifts that, combined, make an impact upon the narrative structure of the text and the angle from which it is narrated. I will explore more of Boyden's idea of "doublevoicedness" and "angles" that are homogeneized or shifted in translation in the next chapters, with the discussion of the impact of free indirect discourse and focalization changes for the narrative.

Seidinger's "Guimarães Rosa em tradução: o texto literário e a versão alemã de Tutaméia" (2011), is another important thesis that attempts to bridge narratology and translation, understanding

> (...) the relations between enunciation, enunciated and story - between narration, discourse and diegesis, in Gérard Genette's perspective – having Tutaméia (Rosa, 1976) and its German version, also called Tutaméia (Rosa, 1994a), as objects. The main goal is to locate eventual transformations generated by the translation on these aspects of the narrative, taken separately and in their dynamic (p. 21, my translation).

In his study, Seidinger focuses on the "voice of the translator" and the traces it leaves throughout the translations' path; he analyzes the German translation of Rosa's *Tutaméia* from a narratological point of view, concluding that it did not alter the story too deeply, but it modified the discourse, which produced effects in the relations between those two levels. Considering the hypothesis that *Tutaméia* (a compilation of short stories) could be read as a novel, Seidinger concentrates on elements that could allude to this effect of unity, and then searches for those elements in the translation, to verify at what extent that unity was preserved. Although I'm not going to deal with the different levels of narration here (fabula, story and discourse), the way Seidinger leans out his findings was essential to my comprehension of theoretical and practical ways translation and narrative studies could go together.

Finally, the most relevant discussions for this dissertation come from Galindo's (2015, 2016) quest for what is particular only to narrative discourse, in the same fashion of Britto's interpretive mechanism mentioned in the first section of this chapter. Borrowing from Bakhtin (1918) the idea that narratives are characterized by a weave of different voices and registers, that come from

distinct parts of society, world views, morals, aesthetic visions, etc, Galindo (2015) postulates that the defining characteristic of narrative discourse is a "discursive refraction".

The "ideal" translation, then, should be able to distinguish and reproduce this variety, allowing this whole "choir" to speak. The theory of narrative comes in when Galindo claims that this multiplicity of voices reaches its peak in a radical, sophisticated use of free indirect discourse.

According to him, radical uses of free indirect discourse cause the greatest difficulties for translators, since they have to be able to not only identify the distinct voices, but to maintain the ambiguity produced by this technique, which is the oscillation between narrator and character speech that never settles in just one pole. In those cases, a good translation rarely depends on dictionaries, fidelity, stylistics; it relies, instead, on the attempts to protect the several possible readings and interpretations caused by this permeable narrator, the subtle fluctuations of voices, registers, ironies, speeches, mimics between one pole and the other.

Galindo's ideas could be seen as the starting point of this dissertation - beginning from the assumption that the use of more plural, radical narrative voices is what distinguishes the narrative genre from others, understanding where and how discursive refraction happens becomes a fundamental exercise to the literary translator that wishes to (re)produce a text that doesn't homogenize the array of voices mobilized inside the fabric of the discourse.

1.3 The task of the (narrative) translator

Circling back to Britto's (2012) interpretive/evaluative mechanism for translation, now we have the defining characteristic of the narrative genre: its discursive refraction, or, as Berman (2000) puts it,

> Literary prose collects, reassembles, and intermingles the polylingual space of a community. It mobilizes and activates the totality of "languages" that coexist in any language (...) Hence, from a formal point of view, the language-based cosmos that is prose, especially the novel, is characterized by a certain shapelessness, which results from the enormous brew of languages and linguistic systems that operate in the work (p. 287).

For Galindo and Berman, and for many other scholars, as we will see in the next chapter, the main characteristic of the narrative genre is this linguistic overlapping, that includes sociolects, idiolects, voices and registers. The novel, mainly, congregates a considerable diversity of discursive and linguistic forms - a problem that demands intensive reflection from the translator. The

conclusion is that the effects of the genre - suspense, curiosity and surprise, according to Sternberg (1992) - rely on this polyphonic fabric; the task of the (narrative) translator would be, then, to keep open the multiple possibilities of interpretation that are activated by this ensemble of voices, translating what is marked by what is marked, avoiding homogenizations.

To translate the narrative genre is to deal with "of the most significant aspects of late modernist, avant garde, and postmodern narrative—the creation, fragmentation, and reconstitution of narrative voices" (RICHARDSON, 2006, p. ix). The recreation of this oscillation of speeches is one of the biggest challenges of literary translation, since failing in perceiving and reproducing this protean use of voices within narratives can erase the defining characteristic of the genre.

According to Berman (2000, 2013), our literary tradition in the Occident does have the tendency to erase this polyphony when translating, creating texts that are more clear, elegant, fluid. He develops an *analytic of translation* to address this "system of textual deformation" (2000, p. 286), classifying twelve tendencies that cause translations to diverge from the "shapeless polylogic" (2000, p. 287) that is at the heart of the narrative genre: rationalization, clarification, expansion, ennoblement and popularization, qualitative impoverishment, quantitative impoverishment, the destruction of rhythms, the destruction of underlying networks of signification, the destruction of linguistic patterns, the destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization, the destruction of expressions and idioms, and the effacement of the superimposition of languages.

Generally, they are all forms of homogenization, ranging from changes in syntax and punctuation to the relation between dialects and common languages; for example, "clarification" relates to the prevailing, unconscious tendency to make a translation "a little clearer" than the original, whereas "ennoblement" refers to the propensity to translate producing "elegant" sentences, and "the destruction of underlying networks of signification" means not reproducing the effects of subtexts that carry signifying processes.

My proposal here is that, to avoid this homogenization, this tendency to make the text clearer, translators may need to understand that the words that make up a discourse in a ST are not mere stylistic choices, but part of narrative structures that compose the "content" of that narrative. Many translators, even when they are highly sensitive to style, often seem unaware of narrative structures, focusing instead their discussions on issues like authorial style or the linguistic and cultural differences between source and target languages. This is, of course, not to say that translators have no intuitive understanding of such structures. Nevertheless, if narrative theory can be used of any practical use for translation, it is surely in raising awareness of the possible deeper levels of the text, those which might not be immediately obvious to the reader, and therefore to the translator, but whose existence can prove of interest when translating, or when reading and

analysing translations.

Factors like the status of the narrator, speech representation and focalization, can be just as decisive to the effects of a narrative, and therefore to the effects of a translation, than all the linguistic, cultural and extratextual aspects that we mentioned in the previous section, and that have been exhausted by Translation Studies. By looking at tools the theory of narrative can offer, the translator can avoid Berman's "deformations", or the sense of loss of dimension mentioned by Bassnett (2002), by understanding that most of these effects come from some form of linguistic superimposition that is actualized in structures like free indirect discourse, change in focalizers, etc.

It is necessary, then, to delineate an alliance between Translation Studies and Narrative Theory, creating methodologies where narrative studies are able to instrumentalize the interpretive reading that is intrinsic to the translation process. I believe the translator is, in the first place, a reader, a specialized reader that has to scrutinize every nuance of form and content in the ST, so that all of its exegetical possibilities can be (re)signified in the TT. Narrative Theory is then seen as a new resource that allows this reader/translator to visualize a new spectrum of potential significant associations inside the dialectic effort that is translation.

In the next chapter, I will present this notion about this main characteristic of the narrative genre, develop what is narrative theory, or narratology, and discuss four concepts that I believe are central for any translator that is concerned with the "task" exposed so far: the figure of the narrator; the question of its "reliability"; the techniques of speech representation, specially free indirect discourse; and the concept of focalization.

2 QUESTIONS OF NARRATION

"The narratives of the world are numberless", says Barthes (1975) in his Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative. "Narrative is present in every age, in every place, in every society (...) Narrative is international, transhistorical, transcultural: it is simply there, like life itself" (p. 79). Indeed, the cultural relevance of narrative discourse is unquestionable. As any person who reads the news can confirm, the word "narrative" has surpassed the realm of literature to be a central concept in our current social and political paradigm - a Google Ngram search shows that the application of the term is four times bigger than it was in the 1950s, appearing not only in academic publications, but also, significantly, in political publications. Although I won't be dealing with this definition of narrative here - the "competing narratives" one - the increasing use of the word demonstrates the influence this concept has in our current episteme.

My primary focus in the present dissertation will be literary narrative. Considering the pervasive presence of narrative discourse in the way we make sense of the world around us, it should be expected that literary forms of narrative (novels, short stories, etc) have always occupied a pivotal position in the literary canon. However, as I mentioned in the previous chapter, in the history of western poetics, narrative have traditionally been seen as inferior to two other canonized genres, drama and poetry, which were at the center of literary discourse for more than two thousand years, from the Greeks to about two centuries ago.

In Discourse in the Novel, Bakhtin (1981) writes

> For a long time treatment of the novel was limited to little more than abstract ideological examination and publicist commentary. Concrete questions of stylistics were either not treated at all or treated in passing and in an arbitrary way: the discourse of artistic prose was either understood as being poetic in the narrow sense (...) or else such questions were limited to empty, evaluative terms for the characterization of language… (p . 260).

Although narrative, especially in the form of the novel, had been universally recognized as major genre at least since the Romantic period, narrative theories only started to appear around the 1920s, when systematic attempts were made to identify and analyse the "uniqueness" of the genre in contrast with poetry. Before that, attempts at concrete analysis of prose were either descriptions of the style of a particular novelist or else limited to the elements of the narrative that could be

included in traditional poetics. In both cases, narrative's[1] defining characteristics eluded scholars and critics.

Bakhtin (1981) defines the novel, in contrast to other genres, as "a phenomenon multiform in style and variform in speech and voice. In it the investigator is confronted with several heterogeneous stylistic unities, often located on different linguistic levels and subject to different stylistic controls" (p. 261) and listed five "stylistic unities" that can form it, including "direct authorial narration", "various forms of oral everyday narration" and the "individualized speech of characters". The discourse of poetry, on the other hand, is always composed by one unitary voice.

According to him, narrative discourse achieves its particular effects through this system of different languages, which are subordinated, yet still relatively autonomous, to the text as a whole. Novels and shorts stories present an assortment of types of social speeches (dialects, jargons, languages of different age groups, slogans, vocabularies) and also distinct individual voices, who enter the genre through the narrator and the characters, and which are the fundamental prerequisite for narrative as a genre.

> The novelist working in prose (...) takes a completely different path. He welcomes the heteroglossia and language diversity of the literary and extraliterary language into his own work not only not weakening them but even intensifying them (...) It is in fact out of this stratification of language, its speech diversity and even language diversity, that he constructs his style (....) The prose writer (...) does not destroy the seeds of social heteroglossia embedded in words. (BAKHTIN, 1981, p. 298)

Bakhtin's concept of polyphony and heteroglossia goes way beyond literary speech; according to his understanding of language use, a "social person," who is also a "speaking person," operates not with language as an abstract regulatory norm, but with a multitude of discourse practices that form in their totality a dynamic verbal culture belonging to the society concerned. But this concept is a good way to start understanding the particularities of the narrative genre, how it is treated by the theory of narrative and, later, its implications for the process of translation. The phenomenon of heteroglossia is relevant to narratology in so far as the narrative text is composed of two elements, the narrator's text and the characters' text (BAL, 2009). The effect of heteroglossia can be used in widely different ways by the presentation of the narration, ranging from a chaos of several distinct languages to "zero heteroglossia", which would be closer to poetry. Between these poles, we find various ways of incorporating intratextual discourses into the narrator's text in the

---

1   Here and throughout this work. "narrative" means literary narrative, prose, written fiction – novels and short stories. The genre comes in many other media and forms, of course: movies, music, TV shows, and even paintings, as Bal (2009) mentions, and also the narrative tradition of the epic, poetic narrative, narrative in drama, etc.

manner of quotation, as well as various forms of "textual interference" (BAL, 2009) or, as Bakhtin puts it, "hybrid construction", namely "an utterance that […] contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two styles, two 'languages', two semantic and axiological belief systems" (p. 304).

By describing the distinct element of the genre, its workings and functions, Bakhtin's project was to establish a legitimate place for the genre inside general poetics, to create a still nonexistent "theory of the novel". We could say that this systematic method for the analysis of the genre was later realized in the form of narratology, a "humanities discipline dedicated to the study of the logic, principles, and practices of narrative representation" (MEISTER, 2019, p. 1). Initially influenced by structuralist approaches, narratology now encompasses several concepts, theories and analytic procedures. Its notions are widely employed as interpretative, analytical tools, and models derived from the discipline play a central role in the exploration of our capacity to make and comprehend narratives in different forms, media and contexts.

The French term "narratologie" was coined by Todorov in 1969, but foundational elements of the structure of narrative were introduced as early as Greek antiquity. In "The Republic", Plato presented a differentiation of literary genres based on two modes of speech: mimesis, the direct "imitation" of speech in the form of dialogues, and diegesis, when the author narrates action indirectly and describes what is in the characters' minds and emotions. Based on this distinction, Plato classified three literary genres, the lyric, the dramatic and the epic. The first one only uses diegesis, the second, mimesis, and the epic is the only one that combines both. This fundamental distinction of the two principal modes of narrating anticipated the 20th-century opposition of "showing vs. telling", which I will discuss later.

Despite these early developments, prose narrative as we know it today became an accepted part of the literary canon only from the 18th century onward. As discussed by Bakhtin (1981), the main questions motivating early theorists revolved around the status of this new literary form - is it "art" or merely "rhetoric"? This concern continued to dominate many theories of the narrative genre right into the early 20th century, when a theoretical attempt to reduce literary narratives to basic principles was presented by authors like Forster and Propp, who introduced a model of the basic components of folklore narratives and the way they are combined, identifying 31 basic structural elements that typically occurred within Russian fairy tales and seven types of character-functions.
Around the same time, Russian formalists were also trying to propel a "scientific" method for studying poetic language, defining a set of properties specific to literary language, be it poetry or prose, and consequently analyzing them as such. The most influential contribution from a narratological perspective was the formalist differentiation of fabula and sujet (MEISTER, 2019, p.

25), the fabula being a series of events experienced by actors, and sujet the way these events are organized and narrated.

Russian formalists were the major influence of French structuralism, which eventually gave the conclusive impulse for the formation of narratology as discipline. According to Meister (2019), "this new paradigm was proclaimed in a 1966 special issue of the journal Communications, programmatically titled "L'analyse structurale du récit." It contained articles by leading structuralists Barthes, Eco, Genette, Greimas, Todorov, and the film theorist Metz" (p. 34). Structuralism was also informed by structural linguistics in the Saussurean tradition as well as the structural anthropology of Lévi-Strauss, and the transformational generative grammar of Chomsky. They engaged in a systematic re-examination of those two dimensions of narrative, fabula and sujet, which were later re-labeled by Genette as histoire and récit.

Genette's taxonomy soon became the narratological standard - he proposed a comprehensive classification of discourse phenomena developed alongside a detailed analysis of narrative composition and technique in Proust's À la recherche du temps perdu. This approach has led to the division of the narrative text into three levels. The "surface" level is the narration, which refers to the concrete and directly visible way in which a story is told (word choice, sentence length, and narrating agent). The second level is slightly under the surface and it's called narrative. It has to do with organizational principles such as (a)chronology and perspective. Genette's final and deepest level is story. This level is not readily available to the reader - instead, it amounts to an abstract construct. On this level, narrative elements are reduced to a chronological series. The setting is reduced on this level to abstract characteristics such as high or low and light or dark. His narrative discourse analysis is also based on the concepts of tense, the temporal relations between narrative and story; mood, the forms and degrees of narrative representation; and voice, the way narrating is implied in narrative.

Structuralist narratology was the first large-scale attempt to combine all aspects of narrative analysis in a convenient system. The model resulting from the combination of the three levels allowed readers and critics to link all the central aspects of a narrative text, seeing, for instance, how characterization connects with the setting or the method of narration and the perspective from which events are perceived. This lead to better insights into the formal organization of the text, and that is why this first conception of narratology provided an indispensable legacy to later paradigms. Around the 1980s and 1990s, the field was dominated by two major trends: an enlargement of narratology's scope beyond literary narrative and the importing of concepts and theories from other disciplines, a process that mirrored the general shift from structuralist to poststructuralist methodologies that was taking place in the humanities at that time (MEISTER, 2019). The post-

structuralist, or post-classical narratology, discussed the application of the theory of narrative to other types of media, to cognitive sciences, gender studies, anthropology and so on.

In this dissertation, I will primarily employ structuralist classifications and definitions, mainly because I find them more operational for my purpose: to endow translators with a general knowledge of narratological tools that can be used to read and interpret, and therefore to translate, narrative texts, without blurring their distinctive polyphony. I will start by outlining Patrick O'Neill's (1994) approach to narrative and narrative theory, which employs certain structuralist notions while at the same time adding a new layer of textuality to tackle what he calls the "ventriloquism effect", namely the "inherently constitutive characteristic of all narrative discourse (...) that it essentially operates by disguising the point of origin of its discursive voice" (p. 58). For O'Neill, no narrative voice, no matter how ostensibly objective, is not undivided, simply because all narrative discourse in intrinsically compound discourse.

He proposes a narrative theory that reads every narrative in terms of its embeddedness, which is not a technique that is sometimes employed for particular effects, but the central structural characteristic of the genre. The reader also plays an important role in O'Neill's vision of narratology, since he sees the genre also as a communicative system, which implies an addressee. From that, he operates with a four term model, involving the four narrative levels of story, text, narration and textuality.

The term "story" refers to the deepest level of the narrative, the "what happens", a series of events that are caused or experienced by actors and also, as any deep structure, an abstract construct that the reader has to derive from the concrete text. The text is the "how", the way the story is told, the arrangement of the discourse in terms of time, space and characters; narration involves the concrete sentences and words offered to the reader, the way in which these events are worded, focusing on the narrating voice, answering the question "Who is speaking?".

The fourth term, textuality, is O'Neills attempt to broader the concepts of structural narratology, adding a sense of context, of a text that is not a finished product, but a process, a "text as play" (p. 24). This inclusion of the level of textuality allows us to focus on the essentially interactive nature of the narrative transaction and on the significance not only of authorial but also of readerly intentionality, which will be essential when discussing the role of these narrative tools for the reader/translator.

To summarize,

> (a) story is a series of narrated events reconstructed from the text, and therefore an abstraction; b) text is a concrete and unchanging product, the

words upon the page and nothing else, the (inferred) result of decisions made on the level of narration, and its primary interest for the investigator lies in its difference from the story; c) narration is a multilevelled intratextual process, the (inferred) cause of the words upon the page, reconstructed (like story) from the text; (d) textuality is likewise a process, the interactive process of the text's production by an author and its reception by readers (O'NEILL, 1994, p. 24).

As we can see, the theoretical aspects that challenge the translation process of the genre arise in the levels of narration and textuality; there lies the bulk of Bakhtin's polyphony, or O'Neill's ventriloquism effect. Although the effects and the conduction of a narrative text rely heavily on aspects like chronology, character construction, sequence of events and characterization of space, these are much less likely to be significantly altered by the translation. The question of narration, on the other hand, actually demands other kind of thoughtfulness from the translator; being the most "superficial" level, it is, obviously, *always* altered when transposed from one language to another. The problem is that these alterations in the narration tend to cause the effect of homogenization (discussed in the first chapter), possibly erasing or conflating the diverse voices that form this instance of the discourse. The translator, then, needs to be able to recognize what kind of "games" are being played in the narration, to use O'Neill's term; for instance, when the narrator tries to pass the words of other characters as his own, or when he tries to undermine the authority of the narrative by giving conflicting accounts of the same event.

The question of whose voice the reader "hears" when reading a novel or short story might initially seem to be so easy as to rule out any further discussion. But narratology has shown that the answer to this apparently simple question involves a complex net of intratextual relations, the constitution of narrators and the deductions of the readers.

For Bal (2009), the first question we should ask when analysing a narrative text is: what is the identity and the status of the narrative agent? Since we only have access to the other levels and aspects of the narrative through the voice of the narrating agent, the characteristics of narration define most of the other elements of the narrative; the "who is speaking?" question advances most of the challenges the translator will face. The identity of the narrator depends of their relation to what is being narrated - according to the Bal, "when in a text the narrator never refers explicitly to itself as a character" (p. 21) we have an External Narrator (EN), but when the "I" in a text can be identified with a character, we speak of a Character-Narrator (CN). Notice that Bal, along with many other current narratologists, rejects the classical distinction between first and third person narrator; Genette (1983), to give another example, classifies narrators as Extradiegetic and Homodiegetic.

These classifications already suggest the degree to which narrators can differ among themselves, and also the degree to which the authority of some of those narrators can vary, depending on their position in the hierarchy of narrative levels. But narrators also have further options as to how they may operate. They can present themselves more evidently, drawing the reader's attention to their presence in the narrative, stating clearly their opinions about the events. Or they can behave more covertly, remaining in the background, never drawing attention to themselves.

The narrator's degree of involvement in the narrative defines, for most readers, his objectivity and reliability, one of the features of narration that I will be exploring in the next sections, since it creates particular challenges for the process of translation. An External Narrator, removed from the diegesis they evoke, "is instinctively credited by the reader with complete narrative authority and therefore complete objectivity" (O'NEILL, 1994, p. 62); on the other hand, the narration of a CN is potentially always questionable, since it appears to be the least objective.

The inherent dividness of narratives is also present in another crucial aspect of the genre: focalization. Although most translators have some sort of knowledge about narrators, albeit unconscious, the aspect of focalization requires a more explicit narratological proficiency to be understood and analysed. If the concept of narrator poses the question "who is speaking", focalization asks "who is seeing?" or "who is experiencing?". This concept is one of the major contributions of structuralist narratology to the study of the genre, and it can be broadly understood as the point-of-view from which the narrative is being told, or "the relation between

that which is focalized – the characters, actions, and objects offered to the reader – and the focalizer, the agent who perceives and who therefore determines what is presented to the reader" (HERMAN & VERVAECK, 2005, p. 70).

Bal says that focalization is "the most important, most penetrating, and most subtle means of manipulation (2009, p. 147) available to the narrative text. The focalizer, just as the narrator, can be internal or external, but since internality and externality can be changed constantly throughout the text, and much more subtle than changes in narratorial perspective, the potential for the ventriloquism effect, or polyphony, is abundantly evident. Every kind of focalization employed implies a different vision, and therefore a different reading.

However, the most apparent example of what O'Neill (1994) calls the ventriloquism effect can be found in the "representation in a narrative text, by its narrator, of what is said (or thought) by its characters" (p. 59), which can happen in three different ways: the narrator can simply report the utterance of a character as a narrative event ("Mrs. Dalloway said she would buy the flowers herself"), telling rather than showing, using the maximal diegetic option; the narrator can report

exactly what the character "actually" said ("Mrs. Dalloway said: 'I'll buy the flowers myself'"), showing rather than telling, employing the mimetic option; and, more interestingly, the narrator can use both their words and the character's ("And then, thought Clarissa Dalloway, what a morning - fresh as if issued to children on a beach"), and then we have an overtly compound discourse, where one frequently can't tell what words belong to the narrator and what words belong to the character. This form of speech representation is commonly known as free indirect discourse and, as a technical tool at the disposal of the narrator, it allows an external narrator to explore an internal point-of-view, or a CN to explore his/her experiencing-self, in contrast to his/her narrating-self.

Free indirect discourse is one of the most important examples of text interference, and I will explore this technique in the next session, along with the other forms of compound discourse in narrative I've already mentioned - the narrator and its (un)reliability and the aspect of focalization. Among the elements that conduct the narrative discourse and cause its effects, they are the ones which can subsidize translational thinking in the most productive ways, allowing us to rethink translation questions and challenges and providing translators with analytic and operational tools.

2.1 The narrator

To produce translations that are diegetically adequate, and to avoid homogenizing the characteristic polyphony of the narrative text, the reader/translator can begin by constructing an image of the most important aspect of any narrative: its narrator. As I will demonstrate in this section, the theory of narrative provides the translator with many tools for this analytical endeavor. I think is important to remember that, while most of this interpreting, analysing, constructing and reconstructing may be done in an unconscious level, we are dealing here with the development of an expert reader - the literary translator - who, therefore, can always benefit from yet another exegetical tool.

There are many definitions for the term "narrator". Margolin (2012) says that it "designates the inner-textual highest-level speech position from which the current narrative discourse as a whole originates and from which references to the entities, actions and events (...) are being made" (p. 1). For Bal (2009), the narrator is "that agent which utters the (linguistic or other) signs which constitute the text" (p. 18). According to Genette (1983, p. 186), the narrator is the speaker or voice in the narrative discourse, the agent who establishes communicative contact with an addressee, who decides what is to be told and how (from what point-of-view, in what sequence). The term "narrator" can also be replaced by denominations such as "discursive function", "source of narrative transmission", "voice", "teller", "narrating instance", "narrating agent", etc.

Simply, the narrator is the agent who serves as the answer to Genette's original question "Who speaks?". In a more sophisticated manner, a narrator is a function projected into the text by the reader, who manifests itself linguistically and occupies the communicative role of a sender or sayer of one or more utterances. Because of this central role in the narrative structure, the narrating agent is the first aspect to be studied when describing and interpreting a narrative text.

According to Margolin (2012), the notion of "narrator" has been characterized in terms of three different theoretical frameworks: rhetoric, narratology and cognitive sciences. The rhetoric approach started with Plato, who was the first to assert the difference between narrative and drama based on the difference between mimesis and diegesis, namely, in the absence or presence of a mediating instance between character speech and the readers. More recently in the rhetoric approach, Benveniste's text linguistics treats narrative as a communicative event, therefore seeing the narrator as a "subject of enunciation". Cognitive narratology, on the other hand, sees narrated world and the narrator not as inherent parts of the text, but as something the reader constructs in his/her mind, combining textual data and general cognitive categories possessed by these readers. But here I will, of course, explore the narratological approach, which defines the narrator as I have mentioned above: through its status as the originator of the narrative speeches.

One of the first forms to characterize the narrator is to define the narrative levels present in the texts, an analytic notion whose purpose is to describe the relations among the plurality of narrating instances within a narrative, and more specifically the vertical relations between them. According to traditional structuralist narratology, a narrative text must be capable of being seen as representing one or more utterances coming from one or more agents. Secondly, it should be possible to demarcate these utterances and assign them to its distincts originators. Finally, the reader should be able to determine the hierarchical relations between these utterances, asking such questions as who can quote who, who is embedded in who, so as to identify a single, highest level originator, a global narrating voice which, prototypically, is *the* narrator of the text, a unified voice that produces the discourse we are reading. These divisions and hierarchies may seem a little obvious or unproductive, as it is apparent that readers define which is the global-narrating-voice and who are the actors in a narrative semi-intuitively all the time. But as I will show later, the notion of narrative levels is extremely important when we are dealing with speech representation, specially with free indirect discourse, which is one of the major sources of polyphony in narrative[2]. In short, we have a global narrator in the first level, and then second-level narrators and/or characters.

---

2   There are, of course, narratives without a single, unifying narrative voice, but I won't be discussing those cases here for practical reasons. For more information on these types of narration, see Richardson (2006).

Another step towards individuating the narrator is figuring out the degree of their involvement in what is narrated. At "degree zero", we have an impersonal mode of narration, associated with an anonymous voice, announcing, for example, "once upon a time there was…"; Genette (1983) called this narrator *heterodiegetic*. At the other end, we have the perceptible, personal mode of narration, where an overt narrator says things like "In my younger and more vulnerable years, my father gave me some advice…" - then we have an *homodiegetic* narrator. Obviously, there are myriad intermediate stances in this sliding scale from marginal to central involvement; the greater the number and diversity of textual elements available to us, the greater the resultant image of the narrating agent. A marked narrator, for example, usually will produce utterances that go beyond the mere reporting of individual facts, use the first person pronoun, the present tense, deitics of time and place such as "now" and "here, address an inscribed narratee and have a strong personal mind-style of narration. They can also refer more to the narration than to the events being narrated, creating a self-referential or meta-narrative.

Once a certain amount of characterizing information has been collected from the text, the reader can attempt to draw an image of the narrator. Although several narratologists advise against seeing the narrator as a *person*, it is somewhat inevitable to attribute certain human-like aspects to it since readers and translators are trying to construct their form and function in a narrative; some textual analysis can be rendered much more fruitful if we search for aspects like "degree and kind(s) of knowledge possessed, reliability, relations to various components of the speech act performed; articulateness; attitude towards the narrated, projected teller role" (MARGOLIN, 2019, p. 19) when describing the narrating agent. Again, it all boils down to what our goal is when analysing a text - I find that, for the purposes of translating narrative, this sort of tools can be bring about insightful results.

When it comes to the knowledge a narrator may have about a character, it can be confined to what can be garnered from sense impressions, or to the direct access to their "minds". Traditionally, character-narrators only have access to their own thoughts, judging other characters by what they say and show; external-narrators, on the other hand, can be omniscient - they are familiar with every thought and feeling, know everything about past and future, are present in locations where characters are supposedly alone, while also knowing what happened in several places at the same time. This kind of knowledge may endow the narrator with unquestionable authority and reliability, since he/she appears objective. In addition, the more "voices" the narrator has access to, the more polyphonic their discourse will be, since they will have to "quote" these voices throughout the narrative.

The narrating agent can also be judged by its articulateness, especially the stylistic choices

that characterize the teller's discourse as sophisticated, abstract, complex, detached, involved, emotional, rational, etc. This is related to his/her attitude towards what is being narrated, as manifested in the way characters and events are represented (neutral vs judgmental, sympathetic vs detached, curious vs unconcerned, and so on). Of course the drawing of such inferences is not an exact science; these qualifications cannot be classified systematically, but they form a crucial part of the narrator's image the reader/translator may sketch, since these judgments of the narrator as refined or uncultivated, for example, will have a decisive influence on their assessment of the narrator's reliability and, ultimately, on how this agent will be reconstructed in the target-text.

Finally, in terms of translation, the most challenging narratorial aspects certainly are speech representation, the means by which a narrator depicts a character's thoughts and speech acts, and (un)reliability, a perspectival hypothesis that readers form as sense-makers, trying to explain and eliminates tensions and other infelicities the work may show by attributing them to a source of transmission . These two elements will be discussed separately in the next sections.

2.1.1 Speech Representation

Writers have always sought to present the inner life, the mental and emotional activities and responses of their characters, and for this purpose have used direct and indirect means. The direct are the "actual" words a character uses in speech or writing, represented through quotations or by an introductory verb of speech or thought, like "said", "told", "believed", "assumed", "reflected", etc. Direct discourse (DD) is conventionally understood to replicate exactly what the quoted character is supposed to have said or thought, preserving, for instance, expressive elements of the original utterance, misspellings, accents, etc.

"Has she been good, Nanny?"
"She's been a little sweet all the afternoon", whispered Nanny. "We went to the park and I sat down on a chair and took her out of the pram and a big dog came along and put its head on my knee and she clutched its ear, tugged it. Oh, you should have seen her". (MANSFIELD, 2006).

The indirect includes the description of events and behaviour, of the environment a character constructs around him, as well as a descriptive account of what he/she said, thought or felt. In indirect discourse (ID), the narrator is much more evidently in control. Here, person, tense, and deixis are adjusted to conform to those of the narrator. Types and degrees of paraphrase and summary vary widely in this form of speech representation, from instances that appear quite faithful

to the original utterance, through instances that preserve only its content to those that minimally acknowledge that a speech event took place.

> *"but Aunt Kate had said that plain roast goose without any apple sauce had always been good enough for her"* (JOYCE, 2001).

> *"Mrs Malins, who had been silent all through the supper, said that her son was going down to Mount Melleray in a week or so"* (JOYCE, 2001).

> *"He thought of how she who lay beside him had locked in her heart for so many years that image of her lover's eyes when he had told her that he did not wish to live"* (JOYCE, 2001).

The third possibility for speech representation is called free indirect discourse, where the "voices" of narrator and character are much harder to distinguish. FID handles person and tense as ID would, but it treats deixis as DD would, reflecting the character's rather than the narrator's position, and also tolerates many of the expressive elements characteristic of direct quotation.

> *How strong the jonquils smelled in the warm room. Too strong? Oh, no. And yet, as though overcome, she flung down on a couch and pressed her hands to her eyes* (MANSFIELD, 2006).

> *Bertha knew that he was repenting his rudeness - she let him go. What a boy he was in some ways - so impulsive - so simple* (MANSFIELD, 2006).

Free indirect discourse is, therefore, the most problematic and, no doubt for that very reason, still the most widely discussed form for representing speech, thought, and perception. To further complicate matters, many instances of FID entirely lack the form's defining features so that, taken out of context, they appear indistinguishable from pure narrator speech. The foundation for the theoretical approach to speech representation, and the source for many of the conceptual difficulties that continue to surround it, can be traced back to the ancient world. Plato, in Republic III, distinguishes between situations in which the poet speaks in his own voice and those in which the poet mimics a character's voice. FID, however, though already present in ancient Greek and Latin literature and in biblical narrative, would not be identified until the last decades of the 19th century (MCHALE, 2019).

According to Sternberg (1982), progress in understanding speech and consciousness

representation has been hampered by fundamental confusion about the concept of mimesis: on the one hand, we have mimesis in the sense of the author's speaking in a character's voice rather than his own; on the other hand, mimesis in the sense of faithful reproduction of what we take to be reality. Much of the discussion around speech representation assumes that mimesis in the sense of speaking for the character should correlate with mimesis in the sense of faithfulness of reproduction, leading to the idea that DD should be the most "faithful" to reality, and ID the least. Instead, Sternberg argues that some instances of direct discourse are deliberately stylized and un-mimetic, and that some instances of ID or FID can be more imitative of "real" speech than DD often is. Nonetheless, my focus will be on free indirect discourse, since most of the times it will represent the biggest challenge to the literary translator, due to its intrinsic polyphonic essence.

Free indirect discourse was pervasive in the 19th-century novel, from Austen to Zola, James and beyond (GALINDO, 2009); it was then that scholars begin to identify this "new" form, calling it *"erlebte Rede"*, *"verschleierte Rede"*, "style indirect libre", "narrated monologue", "represented speech and thought" or "combined discourse. The question of the "mixed voices" was present from the beginning, and is peculiarly illustrated by the famous trial of Flaubert, accused of immorality be the French government because of the "adulterous, marriage-undermining language in *Madame Bovary"* (TOOLAN, 2006, p. 264), a clear confusion between author, narrator and character speech provoked by the use of FID.

Throughout the 20th century, what had initially been perceived as a rather local and specialized phenomenon limited to third-person literary narratives was increasingly expanded by scholarly research on the topic, being identified in first-person, second-person, and present-tense contexts as well as in non-literary prose and oral narrative. Above all, FID has come to be recognized as the defining feature of the narrative genre,

> The concrete manifestation, in terms of tools, of what Bakhtin himself already pointed as the novel's greatest transformative potential: its ability (or its necessity) to make voices coexist, in a type of register and of literary intervention where, at its limit, it won't be possible anymore to determine who owns which discourse, while, at the same time, keeping ideological independence, or the autonomy of each place of enunciation (GALINDO, 2009, p. 114, my translation)

There are many approaches to the complexities of FID; one of the first integral theories about it is Pascal's (1977) dual-voice hypothesis, based on the peculiar linguistic combination of proximal deictics with past tense verbs and third-person reference which we find in free indirect style, which can be felt by readers as an empathetic alignment with the character's point of view or

as ironic distancing from it. Pascal had a very rigid idea of what actually constituted free indirect discourse, which led his theory to have a paradoxical nature: while he proposed a vision of FID as a mix of voices, he censured the technique as flawed every time dual-voicing became more prominent (SOTIROVA, 2011).

His most resolute critic was Ann Banfield (1982), who describes linguistically all the features of free indirect discourse to rule out precisely what Pascal can not come to terms with: the voice of the narrator. She suggest a grammar of narrative to backup her claim that free indirect style is the verbal exponent of the character's psyche, unmediated and direct; her thesis calls for a monologic reading of FID. Banfield's model has also been criticized, especially because of her entirely too complex sintatic model for analysis and for her constructed examples, which don't come from real narratives.

Directly engaging with Banfield's approach is Monika Fludernik's five-hundred-page *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction*, which basically rewrites the linguistic of reported speech and consciousness, drawing on the entire history of the topic from Plato onwards and marking a decisive shift towards a more linguistic analysis of the subject. The author claims that there are no linguistic markers representing two different voices in a narrative, as Pascal said, but only an *effect* of dual-voices created by the interpretation of the reader. Fludernik shifts

> the focus of analysis from formal description to reader-oriented interpretative strategies. Frame theory provides Fludernik with a useful tool for the analysis: the process of interpretation of subjectivity depends no longer on the grammar of sentences of free indirect style, but on the overall narrative strategy adopted in each work (SOTIROVA, 2011, p. 42).

She mentions that FID can serve as very meaningful narrative tool, with several functions:

> the illusion of an immediate presentation of characters' consciousness without too much loss of the narrative's superior powers (a narratological account) to the frequently mentioned ironic uses of free indirect discourse, and including more metaphorical statements (....) the detailed portrayal of characters' sentiments and feelings and thoughts. (...) free indirect discourse additionally allows their representation in the mode of thinking and speaking most appropriate to those characters. In particular, free indirect discourse can effectively outline a character's mental situation, his or her emotional upheaval, and follow the train of thoughts and emotions through their turmoil to a possible resolution (FLUDERNIK, 1993, p. 76).

Fludernik (1993) mentions, though, that the best analysis of FID do not allow

generalizations, since it will always rely on a reader's interpretive strategies. In the end, her model remains just as monologic as Banfield's, a vision that obviously goes against Bakhtin's interpretation of FID as the ideal location of polyphony and heteroglossia in a narrative. The single vs. dual voice debate does not have an unquestionable winner; indeed, since the early identification of the style in 1912, there is still no theoretical consensus on its interpretation. Here I choose to expand a little more the Bakhtinian "dual-voice hypothesis", as to explain the formal qualities of FID and his *dialogic* framework, since I've been postulating from the start that the main characteristic of every narrative text is its polyphony.

Language, according to Bakhtin, is essentially social or dialogic. The words we use come to us already imprinted with meanings, intentions and accents of others, and any utterance we make is directed towards some real or hypothetical Other. Literature provides illuminating representation of how this works in practice, especially prose and narrative. That's because the 'canonised' genres - epic, tragedy, and lyric - are what Bakhtin calls 'monologic': they seek to establish a single style, a single voice, with which to express a single world view. Prose literature, in contrast, is dialogic or polyphonic, an orchestration of diverse discourses extracted both from writing and oral speech.

What intrigues Bakhtin is not simply the fact that different characters and narrators can express their view points in conversational exchanges but that linguistically their voices can be woven together into a single syntactic construction, a single sentence, the "formal speaker" of which might not coincide with its "evoked speaker", creating a sense of double-voiced discourse.

In the author's hierarchy of discourse varieties there are several modes of narration included under double-voiced discourse: stylization, skaz, parody, "alien discourse", etc. Bakhtin divides them according to their persuasive power; thus, "stylization" and "parody", for example are grouped under a more passive type of double voicing because the *other* discourse embedded in these forms is sharply differentiated from the discourse of the narrator, making their subordinate status to the narrator immediately felt.

> The main thrust behind the distinction is the difference in degree of independence given to the character as a separate personality, distinguished from the author, with his or her own emotional, ideological and existential position, and consequently the degree of independence of the character's language (SOTIROVA, 2011, p. 12).

In the passages with a more active type of double-voicedness, the discourse of the narrator does not contrast so markedly with the words of the character, therefore there is no hierarchy implied. Bakhtin calls this amalgamation of voices a *hybrid construction* (1981, p. 304), the perfect example of dialogicity because of its rich possibilities for weakening the boundaries between

reporting and reported speech.

> A hybrid construction is an utterance that belongs, by its grammatical (syntactic) and compositional markers, to a single speaker, but that actually contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two styles, two "languages," two semantic and axiological belief systems (BAKHTIN, 1981, p. 304).

Bakhtin includes under linguistic hybrids two forms of discourse representation: zones of the characters and quasi-direct discourse. The zones of the characters he describes as the borrowing of character idiom in to the language of narration; *quasi-direct discourse* is a peculiar blend of the discourses of character and narrator, what we are calling here FID - whole utterances which are syntactically indistinguishable from the narration (third-person pronouns + past tense), but which are lexically and semantically expressive of the character's point of view, personal language, emotions, thoughts. Free indirect discourse is, thus, the most hybrid form of representation, because it fuses syntactically and semantically the discourse of the narrator with that of the character.

But how do we, translators, detect this subtle form of discourse representation, so as not to uniform the double-voicedness without realizing it? Bal (2009) explains FID through the notion of emotive or personal language use: "the use of language which aims at self-expression of the speaker with regard to that about which it speaks" (p. 48). This concept creates two language situations, a personal and an impersonal one - in the personal language situation, the narrator is involved with its object of narration, and his/her discourse intrudes the language of the characters, but not in direct quotation, but in a mixture of narrative levels, which Bal calls *text interference.*

She makes a list of "signs" to indicate the differences between personal and impersonal language situations.

	Personal	Impersonal
Personal Pronouns	I/you	He/she
Grammatical Person	First and second person	Third person
Tense	Not all past tenses	All past tenses
Deixis	This, these, here, there, today, tomorrow	That, those, in that place, that day, the day after
Emotive words and aspects	Oh!, Ah!	(absent)
Connotative words and aspects	Please	(absent)
Modal verbs and adverbs which indicate uncertainty	Perhaps	(absent)

Adapted from Bal, 2009, p. 52

When the signs of a personal language situation described above refer to the language situation of the narrator, we are dealing with an overt, perceptible narrator. When the signals refer to the situation of the characters, and a clear change of narrative level has been indicated by means of declarative verbs, quotations marks or dashes, we speak of a "personal language situation of the second level" (p. 52). When, however, we have personal language signs referring to a character, but with no change in narrative level, free indirect discourse happens - "signals of the personal language of the actor and of the (im)personal situation of the narrator cross, without explicit reference to this" (p. 54).

We can see some of these characteristics in the excerpt below, taken from Katherine Mansfield's *Bliss*, which will be analysed in the next chapter:

Harry had such a zest for life. Oh, how she appreciated it in him. And his passion for fighting - for seeking in everything that came up against him another test of his power and his courage - that, too, she understood. Even when it made him just occasionally, to other people, who didn't know him well, a little ridiculous perhaps…. (Mansfield, 2006, p.7 5)

"Oh" and "perhaps" can indicate the personal language situation of the character Bertha, while other signals, like the past tense, "that" and the use of "she" suggest the impersonal language of the narrator. But because the phenomenon of text interference (the hybrid construction of Bakhtin) is so subtle, it is not always clear whether we have FID or pure narrator text - to help us distinguish from these two forms, Bal (2009) proposes three positive indications that there is indeed representation of a character's voice.

> 1. The signals of a personal language situation, referring to an actor; 2. A strikingly personal style, attributable to an actor; 3. More details about what has been said than is necessary for the course of the fabula (BAL, 2009, p. 55).

Although the analysis and detection of FID are not an exact science, I find Bal's narratological approach to it very direct and operational, a method that can actually be applied when one is translating narratives that contain intricate uses of this hybrid form. The use of free indirect discourse is also related to another aspect of discursive refraction: (un)reliability, which will be discussed in the next section.

2.1.2 The (un)reliability of the narrator

The concept of unreliability was proposed by Wayne Booth in his 1961 *Rhetoric of Fiction;* he was concerned with intentionally encoded unreliability, that is, when a narrator misreports, misinterprets or misevaluates events in the narrative on purpose, as a rhetorical device written by the author. He discusses this in relation to the aspect of the implied author and to that of narrative distance, claiming that a narrator is "reliable when he speaks for or acts in accordance with the norms of the work (which is to say the implied author's norms), unreliable when he does not" (BOOTH, 1961, p. 158 apud SHEN, 2019, p. 2).

As a significant feature of every aspect of narration, from the interlocutors in dialogue scenes to the overall narrator to the author himself, (un)reliability has become a key concept in narratological investigations, since it is at the center of narrativity itself, having many consequences for the whats and whys of a narrative. Unfortunately, the problem of (un)reliability is "as i-ll defined as it is important" (YACOBI, 1981, p. 113 apud STERNBERG; YACOBI, 2015, p. 328), with the field still divided between two groups: the first one treats (un)reliability as a textual property encoded by the implied author for the implied reader to decode, adopting a rhetorical approach, while the second group favors a cognitivist approach, focusing on the interpretative process and regarding (un)reliability as being dependent on actual readers.

According to Shen (2019), most narrative theorists still follow Booth's definition and approach, having updated or extended his theory on subject - like Phelan (2005 apud SHEN, 2019), who identified six types of (un)reliability, based on the roles the narrator can perform, and Cohn's (2000, apud SHEN, 2019) distinction between "unreliable narration" and "discordant narration". In this rhetorical approach, there are many causes to unreliability, going from a contradiction between the narrator's discourse and the story events, gaps between the true outcome of events and the narrator's earlier reports, clashes between characters and the narrator, and between narrator and implied author. Chatman (1978 apud SHEN, 2019) mentions cupidity, cretinism, gullibility and innocence as factors for unreliability, while Rimmon-Kenan (1983 apud SHEN, 2019), identifies three mains sources: limited knowledge, personal involvement and problematic value-scheme.

Cognitivist authors, on the other hand, propose a reader-oriented approach, which sees (un)reliability as a textual incongruity, a part of narrative's polyphonical weaving. For Sternberg & Yacobi (2015), the leading names of this paradigm, the first problem with the question of (un)reliability is that its current definitions are still inadequate or circular, lacking coherence. Citing definitions on the subject from 1961 to 2012, they conclude that "as circular definitions go, each of these amounts of course to saying in different words that an unreliable narrator is a narrator who is unreliable" (2015, p. 330). Another problem are the polarizing orientations contained in most

definitions, which end up mixing up the already mentioned different approaches to the question, that of readerly or authorial judgment.

The third issue for the authors is

> The inapplicability that runs through the otherwise incompatible definitions here. Though not circular, like the variety exemplified above, they are all unoperational, the next worst vacuous thing. For example, how will any reader, one of "us" or "competent," determine whether "the narrator shares the same values as the author"? Or "when" do "we gain a sense that the [focal] consciousness . . . is unable or unwilling to understand . . . " (STERNBERG; YACOBI, 2015, p. 333).

The first target of Sternberg and Yacobi's critical review of the (un)reliability issue is, of course, Booth and his famous definition: "I have called the narrator reliable when he speaks for or acts in accordance with the norms of the work (which is to say, the implied author's norms), unreliable when he does not" (1961, p. 158). According to this explanation, unreliability lies between two participants in the narrative act. One is the narrator, who must be reliable or unreliable; the other is the implied author, by reference to whose values the narrator counts as (un)reliable. The implied author (IA), though, is a controversial concept. Booth's definition entails an IA with opinions, ideas, thoughts, maybe even a voice, but by all standards, a narrating IA is a contradiction in terms - the only "person" that "speaks" in a narrative is the narrator. Thus, Booth often links the IA with the narrator, so that the two become equivalent and interchangeable, which, of course, makes his definition of unreliability problematic.

> The last thing one would expect, or can tolerate, is therefore the incongruity or two-mindedness of finding these two narrative participants (transmitters, communicators) so frequently and variously mixed up, interchanged, shifting or even sharing roles, elsewhere in The Rhetoric of Fiction and since. Moreover, these confusions show there in the treatment, not only of works and writers but also of concepts, arguments, and other matters of theory. (STERNBERG; YACOBI, 2015, p. 345).

If, according to Chatman (1978), the IA is a participant that "can tell us nothing" (p. 148) in the narrative act, absent from actually taking place in the narrative transaction, how can he/she exposes his/her "norms" and manipulate the reader? From the very outset, thus, the rhetorical approach undermines the author/narrator polarity by treating the author as an overt discourser, our own immediate communicational partner, consequently threatening the very definition of (un)reliability.

S&Y continue their discussion criticizing several other aspects of Booth's theory: the lack of consistency regarding the reliability of the author (Booth's real author can also be unreliable, undermining the idea of the author as source, reference point, to all the other incongruities in the text); the conflation between narrators and focalizers, different types of mediators which, therefore, create different types of unreliability; the conflation between narrating-I and experiencing-I (Booth's famous definitions says "when he [the narrator] speaks or acts", but a narrator doesn't act, only narrates); and, lastly, it's lack of operational force, the worst thing about his conception, according to the authors.

> In plain language, the definition as given is inapplicable to narrative discourse, because its key terms and relations cannot be mapped on or matched with that discourse, so as to establish who's who and what's what in it. How to get at "the implied author," at "the implied author's norms," and at the narrator's concord or discord with both? (STERNBERG; YACOBI, 2015, p. 394).

In short, Booth's definition does not work because an implied author is a construction that we make from the narrative discourse, not some extratextual, hypothetical version of the real author. Therefore, we cannot locate the implied author's norms outside the narrator discourse, rendering the whole "IA *versus* narrator" idea illogical. The implied author, silent, mediated, has no "perceptions and expressions" to be contrasted with the narrator's, so there is nothing there for the reader to correlate.

For S&Y's constructivist approach then, (un)reliability can only be seen as an interpretative strategy for the resolution of textual tensions, incongruities, discordances, polyphonies.

> unreliability is a perspectival hypothesis that we readers (...) form as sense-makers, especially under the pressure or threat of ill-constructed discourse. It is 'an inference that explains and eliminates tensions, incongruities, contradictions and other infelicities the work may show by attributing them to a source of transmission' (Yacobi: 1981: 119), whether narrator or informant. (STERNBERG; YACOBI, 2015, p. 402).

The authors theorize (un)reliability within a wider framework called "integration", a variety of sense-making mechanisms common to all forms of discourse that happen because of our wishes for coherence, order. They describe five integration mechanisms that have a close bearing on reliability judgments: the genetic, the generic, the functional, the existential and the perspectival. The genetic mechanism "explains oddities and incoherences in terms of the causal factors that produced the text and left their mark on it", like "a typo or Freudian slip and a censored or badly

edited text" (STERNBERG; YACOBI, 2015, p. 404), or in the case of a book left unfinished by the author because of his death.

The generic mechanism occurs when the reader tries to integrate inconsistencies by relying on certain discourse types, that is, genres, that can accommodate the problem. The reader thus invokes the canons and tropes of the genre, like the happy endings in comedies or the sad endings in tragedies, for example, to justify any tension found along the narrative. If I'm reading a suspense story, I know the narrator will purposely withhold important information until the very end, because those are the genre's expectations, therefore I "integrate" informational gaps or inconsistencies through the generic mechanism.

In the functional mechanism, the guidelines to integration are the work's aesthetic, thematic and persuasive goals. S&Y give the example of Kafka's Metamorphosis, where "most readers are not content to provide an existential rationale for its 'unrealistic' world, but go on to associate it with symbolic, thematic, and rhetorical functions" (2015, p. 408).

The existential mechanism, in its turn, assimilates incongruities to the "unusual (e. G., supernatural) ontology posited by the text" (STERNBERG; YACOBI, 2015, p. 408), differing from all the previous ones on the base of its mimetic operation. All the other mechanisms are assimilable by reference to extrafictional principles: the troubles of genesis, the characteristics of a specific genre, the functions of the discourse. Here, however, the integrating pattern is always fictional, referring incongruities to the fictive world, typically to canons of probability that deviate from those of reality, as in fairy tales or ghost stories. A reader who encounters a strange object can thus assimilate it to the peculiarity of the story-world in question - "this reality permits the existence of ghosts" -, while additionally joining together the existential and the functional mechanisms - "this reality permits ghosts in order to enable supernatural turns in human affairs".

Finally, the question of unreliability lies within the perspectival mechanism, which explains incongruities in the discourse by attributing them to the narrator or focalizer through whose perspective the represented world is taken to be refracted, reconstructing that agent as unreliable (as opposed to the other mechanisms, who construct a reliable mediator). There are, of course, several factors and variables within this mechanism. S&Y give some examples, like the distinctive reliability judgements between narrators with an explicit narratee and narrators without one, the latter tending to be more objective, since they are not talking to anyone in particular, and therefore more reliable; the diversity of the objects that provoke reliability judgements, aesthetic, discoursive, or moral; the magnitude of the discourse segment that is subjected to our judgements, that may extend from a single sentence to the whole text; metacommentaries about the narrator's sanity, like in Poe's *Tell-Tale Heart*, and dissimilarities between the perceptions of the narrating-I and the

experiencing-I.

Moreover, there is also the question of unreliability dynamics, which can be characterized by disclosure or development:

> In the one case, the reader's judgment of the mediator changes along the narrative sequence, owing to the delayed emergence, behind time, of new information. In the other case, the change occurs to or within the mediator during the process of mediation itself: the narrator thereby becomes more reliable, or less, from that point onward. While the first case involves the dynamics of reading, the second doubles as a dynamics of speaking/writing/thinking within the represented world: a mediation plot (STERNBERG; YACOBI, 2015, p. 419).

The process of integration through the perspectival mechanism may be erratic throughout the text, with readers changing their minds about the reliability of the narrator/focalizer everytime new information asks for retrospective review and a reconstruction of the story or the narration. The processes of integration, as sense-making strategies, make the reader aware of their interpretative choices along the text, be it between judging a narrator as reliable or unreliable, between reading something as literal or metaphorical.

As a reader, the translator obviously procedes like this when translating a narrative, making interpretative decisions consciously or unconsciously, perspectivizing the narrative's inconsistencies by explaining them by reference to some unreliable narrator (or integrating them through the other methods). The translator, however, is another mediator - between author and final reader - and, ideally, should not present his/her final, closed interpretative choices in the finished translation product, instead leaving every interpretative door open so the final reader can decide which one(s) to close.

Evidently, this is no easy task. Integration mechanisms, by their very nature, call for the resolution of unharminouns elements, albeit unconsciously. But as I've been stressing, knowing how and why these refracted-discourse games are played within narrative, translators are endowed with analytical resources that help them identify these incongruous textual relations and avoid unnecessary homogenization of voices, perspectives, interpretation possibilities.

Unfortunately, unreliability is not as "detectable" as free indirect discourse, mostly because, as S&Y define it, it is not an inherent narrative feature, but a readerly sense-making mechanism. Nevertheless, the authors propose a "typology of unreliable discourse", consisting of eight aspects that can help us characterize unreliability to further analyse it. They are:

. its target (e.g., narrator, reflector, diarist, other informant);

. its trigger (e.g., discrepancy, inconsistency, hyperbole, absence, suppression, redundancy, misrepresentation, misgeneralization, misinference, misevaluation, mispatterning)

. its cause (e.g., ignorance, incompetence, insanity, trauma, forgetfulness, untruthfulness, design to misdirect or manipulate or shock or trap or instruct or play with the reader);

. its magnitude (e.g., primary narration as against local quotation);

. its degree (from mild to sharp irony);

. its basis or axis (informational, ideological, psychological, aesthetic);

. its dynamics (temporary vs. permanent, increasing vs. decreasing, suspenseful, surprising, or curiosity-driven);

. or its motivation (fictional or functional, mimetic or poetic, rhetorical, communicative).

(STERNBERG; YACOBI, 2015, p. 458)

With that in mind, we see that the question of (un)reliability is another major source of discoursive refraction inside the narrative, since it can be felt as an effect of discordant voices inside the text - author vs. narrator, narrator vs. character, narrating-I vs. experiencing-I, etc. By mapping and describing the possible origins of unreliability judgements, the translator once again can avoid arbitrary homogenization, respecting the "shapeless polylogic" that constitutes the narrative text.

2.2 Focalization

The disruptive potential of what I've been calling narrative's polyphony, involving the inherent dividedness of the narrative *voice* actualized in the aspects mentioned above, is closely paralleled by what narratology calls *focalization*, which involves the inherent dividedness of the narration *vision*. Focalization, as Bal (2009, p. 145) writes, is "the most important, most penetrating, and most subtle means of manipulation" available to the narrative text, and therefore one of the biggest challenges for the translator, especially because this notion is not as widespread as that of narration, not as studied outside the field of narratology.

The term, like so many others, was introduced by Genette, in order to dispel "a regrettable

confusion" surrounding the distinction "between the question *Who is the character whose point of view orients the narrative perspective? And the very different question *Who is the narrator? - or, more simply, the question *Who sees?* and the question *Who speaks?*" (1983, p. 186). Whenever events are presented, they are always presented from a certain vision; a point of view is chosen, a certain angle. In a narrative, the events have to be recounted by some voice (the narrator), but also through some point of view. Focalization is, then, "the relation between the vision and that which is 'seen', perceived" (BAL, 2009, p. 145).

The question of focalization is also crucial for the theory of narrative because it gave a different status to this agent that sees, which, till then, had been confused with the narrator. This fundamental distinction emerges very clearly in Henry James' *What Maisie Knew* (2003)*, for example, which is narrated by a external-narrator but focalized by the character Maisie, a little girl:

Maisie didn't know what people meant, but she knew very soon all the names of all the sisters; she could say them off better than she could say the multiplication-table. She privately wondered moreover, though she never asked, about the awful poverty, of which her companion also never spoke. Food at any rate came up by mysterious laws; Miss Overmore never, like Moddle, had on an apron, and when she ate she held her fork with her little finger curled out. The child, who watched her at many moments, watched her particularly at that one. "I think you're lovely," she often said to her; even mamma, who was lovely too, had not such a pretty way with the fork.

Here Maisie is the perceived center of consciousness, which means the reader experiences the events in the narrative through her point of view, but more than that, there's a restriction of narrative information in relation to the experience of her character, creating an effect of puzzlement, since such a young child does not understand many of the things that are happening around her. This difference between the childish vision of the events and our interpretations of them, as adult readers, is what gives the narrative its special effect.

It is important to recognize, then, that the focalizer is not a "person", not even an agent in the sense the narrator is, but rather a chosen point from which the narrative is being presented at any given moment. Bal (2009) distinguishes two points or origin for focalization: external (EF) and internal (IF, or CF, for character-focalizer). An internal focalizer is a point of focalization that lies with a character in the narrative, as in the previous example of *What Maisie Knew*, while an EF is when an anonymous PoV, outside the fabula, functions as the focalizer. Focalization does not need to be constant throughout the text: on the contrary, it varies from EF to IF to EF again in most narratives.

Each kind of focalization has its separate implications and consequences for the kind of reading we feel appropriate. The reader is not surprised when, for example, an EF is assigned a bird's-eye view in terms of space and time, but we expect a CF to be naturally confined to a limited spatial perspective and retrospective temporal vision. The reader also accepts when an EF has unrestricted knowledge, but assumes that a CF has limited knowledge, like any "normal" person. As in the case of narrative voice, the reader tends to read the norms of IF as subjective, questionable, and those of EF as authoritative and objective. But since externality and internality are interchangeable, the textual potential for manipulation here is evident. If the first chapter of a novel is focalized by a certain character, for example, the reader immediately assumes that he/she is the hero(ine) of the narrative, but obviously that is not always the case.

But focalization involves not only a subject of focalization, or focalizer; it also involves an object, the focalized. In a sentence like "She stood for a moment, looking at the omnibuses in Piccadilly" (WOOLF, 1996, p.10), the focalizer is "she", Clarissa Dalloway, and the omnibuses are the focalized, the objects of her attention. This combination of a focalizer and a focalized object can be constant to a large rate, or it can vary considerably. The analysis of these combinations, fixed or loose, matters because the image the reader receive of the various objects in the narrative is determined by who is looking at it, experiencing it. In the same way, the image a focalizer presents of an object says something about the focalizer itself.

Bal (2009) says that, when we discuss focalization, there are three relevant questions: "1. What does the character focalize: what is it aimed at? 2. How does it do this: with what attitude does it view things? 3. Who focalizes it: whose focalized object is it?" (p. 153). Characters can focalize any kind of object, setting, event or other characters, and, of course, different characters can focalize the same thing with different attitudes, since there is no such a thing as an objective perspective. If several characters present the same event through different perspectives, we have an element of suspense in the narrative, since the reader will inevitably try to assess what "truly" happened. Focalization is then deeply linked with (un)reliability: the more perceptible a focalizer becomes, the more easily graspable as a character, the more the reader will in turn feel authorized to question its vision.

Bal also points out that it is important to distinguish between perceptible (p) and non-perceptible (np) focalized objects. An NP object is something that is only visible inside the "mind" of a character - dreams, thoughts, feelings -, and, according to the classical rules of the narrative genre, it can only be focalized by an external focalizer, and not by another character. This distinction is meaningful because it gives us an insight into the power structure between characters. When in a conflict situation one character is allowed to focalize NP objects while the other is not,

the first character has an advantage in the conflict, since it can give the reader access into its feelings and thoughts, while the other party cannot communicate anything. This inequality is obvious in novels and short stories narrated in first-person, but it can also happen in other narrative situations, more subtly. The point is to keep sight of the difference between spoken and unspoken words. Spoken words are audible to other characters, and thus perceptible when the focalization lies with someone else. Unspoken words, no matter how extensive, are not detectable by other characters. If the thoughts of one character are placed between sections of dialogue, many times the reader does not realize how much less the interlocutor knows than they do, thus creating possibilities for suspense and/or surprise.

The theory of focalization presented by Bal also distinguishes three possible levels of focalization: simple, when there is only a single focalizer involved; compound, when there is more than one focalizer involved, as when a character-focalizer perspective is embedded in an external-focalizer encompassing vision; and complex focalization, in cases where the focalization is essentially ambiguous or indeterminate. The author says that this classification is useful if we wish to answer the question "Who allows who to watch whom?" when analysing a narrative, but not so useful when the interpretation is only concerned with the relationship between focalizer and focalized.

O'Neill (1994), however, shows that both the simple and the compound forms "demonstrate a pronounced tendency to slide systematically and irresistibly towards the complex" (p. 90). Single focalization is, in principle, limited to narrator-focalizers, and it is rarely encountered in texts of more than a few sentences, since it is very hard to have an entire narrative told from just one perspective. Even if we have a character-narrator (a "first person" narrator), some events will be focalized by the experiencing-I, while others will be focalized by the narrating-I. Compound focalization would seem to be the norm then, considering that the narrator always has a particular "vision" of the narrative world it projects, therefore always being a focalizer; consequently, focalization by a character has to be contained within an enveloping narrator focalization. But compound focalization can only happen if the reader is able to identify which object is being focalized by the CF and which object is being focalized by the EF, and that is not always the case. Focalization need not be clearly identifiable and frequently is not, leading to the complex kind, where there is either too much or too little information for us to make a definite decision as to the location of the focalizer.

The more ambiguous the focalization, of course, the more scope there is for interpretation, and, consequently, the greater the challenge for the translator.

If complex or indeterminate focalization (...) is in principle the only kind of focalization we encounter as readers, then the narrative terrain is, in principle, always strewn with potential unadvertised detours and misleading signposts" (O'NEILL, 1994, p. 100).

O'Neill says that readers will establish the most appropriate focalization by choosing whichever particular reading seems most authorized by the overall context involved, and that context, in turn, is established by the reader's notion of interpretative relevance. Here we could invoke Sternberg and Yacobi integrative mechanisms from the last section: if we are reading a detective novel, for example, our generic expectations remind us that a localizable rather than an indeterminate focalization is far more likely, and so we tend to understand ambiguous information as belonging to major characters or central points of the narrative. If, on the contrary, we are dealing with self-reflexive, parodic fiction, the reader might tend to read everything as being focalized by an external-focalizer, calling attention to the discourse itself, not the characters or the story.

This is why focalization is so crucial to one of the most important elements of narrativity: suspense (even so that Bal (2009) discusses suspense under the section about focalization). The author of a detective novel counts on the reader to make these harsh interpretations of incongruous elements, because the effects of the narrative depends on the reader not knowing certain things until the very end of the story. And, clearly, this is also why knowledge about what focalization is and how it happens is unquestionably vital for the translator - it requires a very conscious reader to localize these points of complex focalization and even more awareness as not to make them into *simple* focalization in the product of translation, closing some possibilities of interpretation and weakening the effect of suspense.

3. NARRATION MEETS TRANSLATION: THE CASE OF KATHERINE MANSFIELD'S BLISS

In the first chapter of this dissertation, I said that one of my goals was to demonstrate the usefulness of narrative's analytic resources, showing that they can assist the reader/translator in identifying unsuspected relations between all the components of a narrative text, and that, to accomplish this, we needed to have a description of the elements of a narrative and their function. In the second chapter, I presented the concept of polyphony, a central aspect of all narrative discourse that can be actualized into at least three structures: free indirect discourse, (un)reliability and focalization. The notion of polyphony and its ramifications are one of the biggest challenges for the translator of narratives, since this discursive refraction can lead to translational issues that call for knowledge beyond dictionaries, denotation, syntactic or lexical equivalence.

This final chapter illustrates how we can turn concepts of narrative theory into those operational reading/translating tools. I chose Katherine Mansfield's *Bliss* mainly because of one of its translations into Portuguese: the one by the Brazilian poet, literary critic and translator Ana Cristina César. Her annotated translation was completed in 1981, part of her M. A. in Literary Translation at the University of Essex, and published in 1999 in the compilation "Escritos da Inglaterra", organized by her mother after César's premature death. "O Conto Bliss Anotado" is a detailed and deep analysis of Mansfield's work, the short-story *Bliss* and César's own processes and strategies as a translator. Even though she does not explicitly mentions narratology, her whole translation method is based on a distinction of the two voices that oscillate in the construction of the story, making it a good example of how the identification of polyphonical aspects can be the first step towards a translation that does not homogenize or erase the shapelessness, the ambiguity that characterizes the narrative genre. Even though the comparison between original and translation would be enough, by also using Julieta Cupertino's 1991 translation of the same story, we can further contrast the distinct effects that both these translations present given their opposing styles and strategies.

For didactic reasons, the chapter is divided in the same sections as the previous one: FID, (un)reliability and focalization. In reality, the three aspects are very closely linked; we can perceive shifts in focalization because of the use of FID, which, in its turn, generates feelings of unreliability,

and so on - which makes sense, since I'm proposing they all derive from the same general aspect, that is, polyphony.

But before we start, I feel like I should clarify that this is not a right-or-wrong, prescriptive model for literary translation, not least because when we look at a narrative text as a site of polyphony, the traditional measures of "fidelity" and "authority" do not make much sense. Nonetheless, a translation is, by its very definition, a product of resignification and derivation, and I believe that we cannot thoroughly analyse one without measuring it against its source (or against another translation). The question that remains is which tools we'll use for this measuring. In this sense, O'Neill (1994) proposes three criteria for the assessment of translations that are based not on models of fidelity, but on the inherent multiplicity of voices that constitutes all narratives: 1) Inclusiveness: any translation should capture a maximum of the information present in the text interpreted; 2) Persuasiveness: any translation should be able to persuade the reader that this choice of word, tone, interpretation, etc, is the most adequate one; in other words, the translation needs to convince whoever is analysing it of the credibility of its strategies and decisions; 3) Suggestiveness: any translation should call to mind, by thought or association, the greatest number of possible interpretations. This criteria complements "inclusiveness" and is related to the efficacy of an interpretation, the power to lead to new discoveries and continued comprehension of the narrative.

In short, I believe that, even though it is impossible to *not* close some interpretative doors when translating, that does not mean that the translator shouldn't strive to keep as many of them open as possible. Knowledge about narratological structures can help us achieve that, or, at the very least, it lets us know that the doors are there.

3.1 A little bit about Katherine Mansfield and *Bliss*

Katherine Mansfield was the pen name used for Kathleen Beauchamp Murry. Born in October 1888, in Wellington, New Zealand, she was one of six children. Her mother was a housewife and her father a successful entrepreneur at W. M. Bannatyne and Company and a member of the board of the Bank of New Zealand. At age 10, Katherine and her sisters went to Wellington Girl's High School, and there she wrote one of her first stories, "Enna Blake" (JONES, 2010).

In 1903, Mansfield went to London with her family and stayed there until 1906 with two of her sisters, studying at Queen's College. There she got acquainted with many works and writers that would later influence her style, especially Oscar Wilde. A number of Mansfield's works were

published in the Queen's College Magazine, most of them already showing her interest in the themes of womanhood. She had to go back to New Zealand two years later, but finding her social life there extremely dull, she decided to settle in London permanently.

Mansfield left for Great Britain in 1908. According to Meyers (1978), her first years there were somewhat erratic, and Mansfield herself described them as being characterized by "destruction" in her diaries. She was not able to support herself financially, got pregnant, engaged and then left her husband. Her mother decided to intervene and put Katherine in a facility in German. This was the scenario for her first compilation of short-stories, "In a German Pension", published in 1911.

In December 1911, Mansfield met Oxford student John Middleton Murry, who she would later marry. In the following years, they became close friends with many writers, including D. H Lawrence and his wife Frieda. By 1917, she was connected with the Bloomsbury group: Virginia Woolf, T.S Eliot, Aldous Huxley, and Bertrand Russell, among other prominent names.

In 1917, she was diagnosed with an inflammation in the lungs. She moved to France on medical suggestion, where she completed some of her most notable stories, including *Bliss*. Her situation did not improve, however, and in 1918 she had the first of many bleedings in her lungs. Back in Britain, she dedicated herself to book reviews, while her disease progressed on to tuberculosis.

After publishing *Bliss and Other Stories,* Mansfield moved to Switzerland and then again to France, where she met James Joyce and wrote *The Fly*, which reflects her disease, her disappointment with her family and husband, and her aversion of the war. In critical health, concluded her last story, *The Canary,* which takes place in her native New Zealand. She died in January 9, 1923, at the young age of 35, leaving behind several unfinished stories and an enormous number of diaries and letters, later compiled and published by her husband.

Although she was influenced by a myriad of writers that came and went into her life, Mansfield created a whole new style of short fiction. For such, she is regarded as a seminal writer in British modernism. Her stories often focus on moments of crisis which cover a short period of time, approximately a day, in which the central character passes from a stage of innocence to personal and social awareness (Jones, 2010). Perhaps as a mirror of her own life, her stories refuse traditional conclusions, invert narrative expectations, being driven more by feeling then by plot.

Bliss (first published in The English Review in 1920 and later in the collection *Bliss and Other Stories*, 1922), the short-story I will be discussing in this section, is about a young, newly-married woman named Bertha Young, who experiences feelings of elation and joy throughout a day before realizing that her husband is cheating on her with one of her friends. It is one of Mansfield's

most controversial pieces.

> Criticism of it was first voiced by the writer's friends and contemporaries. John Middleton Murry found its 'mix' of satire and lyricism unsatisfactory; Virginia Woolf condemned it as the superficial product of an uninteresting mind; and T. S. Eliot, though affecting tolerance, damned it as being '[without] moral and social ramification', as 'handl[ing] perfectly [its] *minimum* material', and as being what he would call 'feminine'. Later critics have found the work incoherent, usually because of its employment of an 'unreliable' narrator, or cruel, on the account of the fate that it metes out to the heroine (DUNBAR, 1988, p. 143).

The story starts with Bertha coming back home after going shopping for the dinner she is planning to have later that evening. She receives her guests for dinner - the Knights, an older, eccentric couple; Eddie Warren, an aspiring poet; and Pearl Fulton, a mysterious woman for whom Bertha had "fallen in love with (...), as she always did fall in love with beautiful women who had something strange about them" (MANSFIELD, 2006, p. 72)

Bertha sets everything ready for dinner and then looks at the pear tree in her garden, which is described as being in "full, richest bloom" and "perfect". She sees the tree as a symbol of her own life, and starts thinking about how she has everything, the perfect house, daughter, husband.

The guests start to arrive, but Pearl Fulton is late. Harry, Bertha's husband, makes fun of her, showing some kind of disdain. Fulton finally arrives, and they have dinner. During it, Bertha feels a connection to this woman she is "in love with", thinking that she is the only one who understands how she's feeling, her bliss. After dinner is over, they both go to the balcony to look at the pear tree. Again, Bertha seems hypnotized by it, "caught in that circle of unearthly light", her and Pearl connecting perfectly with each other. Her feelings of bliss grow stronger, and for the first time in her life she feels that she desires her husband.

The guests start to leave, first Mr. and Mrs. Knight, and then Eddie Warren and Pearl decide they'll share a taxi. She goes to the hall to grab her coat, and Harry follows her. Bertha stays talking with Warren by the fire, but when she heads toward the hall she sees Harry holding Pearl and saying "I adore you", while she touches his face. Harry whispers "tomorrow", and she answers with a "Yes".

Fulton goes up to Bertha to say goodbye, holding her hand; she stops for a moment, compliments Bertha's pear tree, and then leaves with Eddie Warren. Harry, unaware of what her wife had just witnessed, says he'll "shut up shop". Bertha runs to her garden windows and looks at the pear tree, which is "as lovely as ever and as full of flower and as still".

Mansfield's work is basically formed by short stories like this, with carefully crafted language and women characters who go through some sort of revelation. She writes in her diaries about *Miss Brill*:

> It's a very queer thing how *craft* comes into writing. I mean down to details. Par example. In Miss Brill I chose not only the length of every sentence, but even the sound of every sentence - I chose the rise and fall of every paragraph to fit her - and to fit her on that day at that very moment. After I'd written it I read it aloud - numbers of times - just as one would *play over* a musical composition, trying to get it nearer and nearer to the expression of Miss Brill - until it fitted her. (O'SULLIVAN; SCOTT, 1996, p. 165).

Mansfield claims, in her journals, that she intents to write in a "special prose", a mix of prose and poetry. This refusal to accept any sort of label is present in many other passages of her diaries and letters. Like her contemporary Virginia Woolf, Mansfield rejected the notion of a stable or fixed identity, and instead explored and problematized the notion of the multiple self and its expression in literature, more specifically in the short-story, an apt form for experimentation because of its own potential for fragmentation, disruption and multiplicity.

Mansfield's development of her own particular free indirect discourse form of writing, linking it to literary impressionism, ushered her to the position as one of the most important early exponents of the modernist short story. Her techniques include the use of symbolism, literary impressionism and humour; themes incorporate violence, war, death, childbirth, relationships - especially marriage, together with feminist and sexual issues (KIMBER, 2014). Critics also call attention to her use of voices:

> In those short fictions, as in some other, the epiphanic moment involves the perception of a voice - human, physical, sometimes beyond words - always concretizing an effect of individuation while drawing the reader into a process of revelation. And yet most of Mansfield's critics have insisted (...) on the ironic distance always lurking beneath the masks of authenticity, self-spontaneity and voice-performance, so that the question of whether 'voice' in Mansfield's fictions can in fact be considered as the privileged location of the subject's presence, still remains unanswered (BESNAULT-LEVITA, p. 90, 2011)

Here in Brazil, Mansfield's work arrived by the hands of Erico Veríssimo, who translated the compilation *Bliss and Other Stories* with the title *Felicidade e Outros Contos* in 1940, with good reception. Mansfield influenced many Brazilian authors, including Clarice Lispector (she mentions

buying one of Mansfield's books at 15 in her confessional book "Aprendendo a Viver"), and of course Ana Cristina César.

3.2 Free Indirect Discourse - "A two-toned fiction"

César's translation of *Bliss* is made up by an introduction and 80 footnotes, detailing her analysis, interpretation and strategic choices that substantiated the text's transition from English to Portuguese. I chose to use her text as an example on how to translate considering narratological structures and tools because in her commentaries we see clearly that she had a considerable knowledge of narrative structures, narrator aspects and speech representation techniques, knowledge that, in my opinion, she successfully employed in her translation of *Bliss*.

The first thing César notices in her analysis is that her footnotes are unevenly distributed throughout the story, concentrated only in certain pages. By linking these pages where the notes tend to show up more with the narrative content, she realizes that they concentrate in the central parts of the story, the moments of Bertha's bliss.

> If we ask ourselves about the reasons that prompt the footnotes to concentrate in certain moments of the story, we conclude that the technical commentary is unconsciously led by centrifugal literary points, that is, by the *content*. The translator is more involved (personally and professionally) in the excerpts where the story is intensified, feeling, therefore, a greater necessity to explain it (CÉSAR, 1999, p. 292, my translation)

After that, César realized that these points where the footnotes concentrated followed an almost symmetric distribution - they were dictated by the "movement" of the story, which expands and contracts according to Bertha's feelings, like a sine wave. She says that the variations in *Bliss* are not oriented by external factors or by the classic alternance between "showing" and "telling"; instead, "the story's narrative structure seems to me to be basically dictated and organized by the *tone*, that is in perpetual (and symmetric) oscillation. This oscillation originates the structure and its regularity" (CÉSAR, 1999, p. 292, my translation).

César claims that this "two-tone fiction" process is performed by a feat of the narration called "selective omniscience", but she's actually talking about focalization: the story is narrated by a "third person" but focalized by the thoughts and experiences of just one character. The narrator limits its point-of-view and restricts the amount of information it gives to the reader, so that the reader feels like the events of the story are being filtered through that character alone. Still, the perception of "two tones" happens mostly due to another aspect: the free indirect discourse.

Bliss is narrated by an external narrator and focalized by Bertha. But this narrator is not an impersonal one. We can see it already in the first three paragraphs, a tension between the "voice" of the narrator and that of the character - a mix of what Bal (2009) calls personal [underlined] and impersonal [bold] language situation in her theory about FID explored in the last chapter.

> Although **Bertha Young** was thirty **she** still had moments like <u>this</u> when she wanted to run instead of walk, to take dancing steps on and off the pavement, to bowl a hoop, to throw something up in the air and catch it again, or to stand still and laugh at - nothing - at nothing, simply.
> What can <u>you</u> do if <u>you</u> are thirty and, turning the corner of your own street, you are overcome, suddenly, by a feeling of bliss - <u>absolute bliss!</u> - as though <u>you'd</u> suddenly swallowed a bright piece of **that** late afternoon sun and it burned in your bosom, sending out a little shower of sparks into every particle, into every finger and toe?
> <u>Oh</u>, is there no way you can express it without being "drunk and disorderly"? <u>How idiotic civilisation is!</u> Why be given a body if <u>you</u> have to keep it shut up in a case like a rare, rare fiddle? (MANSFIELD, 2006, p. 69, my emphasis)

César mentions that the reader gradually has to embrace this counterbalance between the two different voices, and that he/she should be able to notice, after a careful reading, when Bertha's words "infiltrate" the words of the narrator, that is, when FID happens: "signals of the personal language of the actor and of the (im)personal situation of the narrator cross, without explicit reference to this" (BAL, 2009, p. 54). This kind of textual interference happens throughout the short-story, therefore a potential translator would have to, ideally, identify the particular signs of Bertha's personal language in order to reproduce this hybrid discourse in the target-text without homogenization and without fracturing this "two-tone" strategy that structures the narrative.

César, our actual translator, says that Bertha's voice is less articulate and more naive, while the narrator knows how to express itself more easily, with more sophistication. She claims that the narrative discourse in *Bliss* assumes two basic forms, that alternate themselves regularly. The first is FID, where the narrator "speaks" with words only Bertha could use, and then we have "lack of articulation", "constant questions and exclamations", the "clear manifestation of prejudices and judgements" (p. 294). In the second form, where the narrative is still focalized by Bertha, the narrator uses its own words to describe the character's actions, thoughts and words. In the first case, there is a feeling of irony between the narrator and Bertha, as if it were mocking her inability to communicate. In the second case, especially when the narrator is trying to represent Bertha's moments of bliss, there is "respect and recognition" (p. 294) and the use of an almost poetic language.

As previously stated, these two narrative situations - the distant, ironic FID and poetic, pure narrator speech - alternate themselves regularly, giving the story its structure, even though the narrator is always external and the focalization is mainly through Bertha. The boundaries between the two situations are not always clear, still "the translator should be aware of the existence of the tension, trying to, perhaps, understand why this happens" (CÉSAR, 1999, p. 296, my translation).

César, in my opinion, was able to identify Bertha's personal language - lack of articulation, repetitions, questions and exclamations - and to produce a translation that is conscious of this oscillation between the two voices that creates the free indirect discourse, careful not to homogenize them into one single discourse. As an example, I'm going to compare some excerpts of César's translation with Julieta Cupertino's (1991), showing the different translational strategies adopted by them to deal with the challenges of FID.

Mansfield (2006, p. 69)	César (1999, p. 310)	Cupertino (1991, p. 1)
Although Bertha Young was thirty she still had moments like this when she wanted to run instead of walk, to take dancing steps on and off the pavement, to bowl a hoop, to throw something up in the air and catch it again, or to stand still and laugh at – nothing – at nothing, simply.	Apesar dos seus trinta anos, Bertha Young ainda tinha desses momentos em que ela queria correr em vez de caminhar, ensaiar passos de dança subindo e descendo da calçada, sair rolando um aro pela rua, jogar qualquer coisa para o alto e agarrar outra vez em pleno ar, ou apenas ficar quieta e simplesmente rir - rir - à-toa.	Embora Bertha Young já tivesse trinta anos, ainda havia momentos como aquele em que ela queria correr, ao invés de caminhar, executar passos de dança subindo e descendo da calçada, rolar um aro, atirar alguma coisa para cima e apanhá-la novamente, ou ficar quieta e rir de nada: rir, simplesmente.

Table 2 – Comparison between original and translations I

Here, in the first paragraph of the text, we can already see the major characteristics of Bertha's "voice" in the narrative discourse: the use of repetitions and dashes. Both translators chose to maintain the repetition, although they both transferred it from "nothing" to "rir". As for the ponctuation, César kept the dashes em her target-text, while Cupertino chose to use a colon. The question of ponctuation may seem trivial when considered against other aspects of the text, but Berman mentions ponctuation, "that most meaningful and changeable element in a prose text" (2000, p. 288), in the first of his deforming tendencies: rationalization, the tendency to recompose sentences and their sequences according to a certain idea of discursive order. The dash is not the most common punctuation mark in Brazilian Portuguese, and any style guide can tell us that repetitions are to be avoid at all costs, so it does not come as a surprise that some unmindful

translator would try to "smooth" the characteristics of Bertha's voice so it looks more fluent in the target-language.

Alan (2011) compares this first paragraph with six translations to Portuguese, showing that four of them alter the original punctuation, replacing the dashes with commas or ellipses. She justifies the alterations by saying that they are necessary so that the passage can be grammatically correct, an example of Berman's rationalization: in order to follow some sense of "order" in the target-language, the translator modifies the source-structure.

But as we can see, a "grammatically correct" text comes at the expense of a "narratively incorrect" one, or at least a homogenized text that erases the possibility of interpreting certain passages as FID. In Portuguese, the colon usually precedes an explanation, a development of ideas; the dash, conversely, demonstrates a relation of apposition between the preceding and the following element (MAGALHÃES; MELO, 2017). So, while the use of the dashes create a repetition of meaning - a syntactic structure that is compatible with Bertha's inarticulate voice -, the use of a colon proposes an explanation, something that does not correspond with the character's speech.

The same erasure of FID through the rationalization of punctuation can be seen in the passage below:

Mansfield (2006, p. 73)	César (1999, p. 311)	Cupertino (1991, p. 3)
"..and again she didn't know how to express it – what to do with it."	"... e novamente ela não sabia como exprimir aquilo – o que fazer daquilo."	"... Bertha não sabia como expressar essa sensação, nem o que fazer com ela."

Table 3 - Comparison between original and translations II

Here, by switching the dashes for the combination of a comma and the conjunction "nem", Cupertino also modifies the representation of Bertha's personal language, since the "marking of an apposition through the use of dashes grants more drama and informality to the text, while the use of commas suggest a planned insertion" (MAGALHÃES; MELHO, 2017, p. 312, my translation). As I've been stressing, there is nothing planned in Bertha's voice; the use of dashes marks her confusion when trying to find the right words to express her feelings, whereas the employment of the comma, followed by the word "nem", creates a relation of coordination between the two sentences that removes the marks that shows the interference of a character's voice. Therefore, if in the source-text there is a clear use of free indirect discourse, in the target-text that possibility is homogenized, resulting in a passage that could be read as pure narrator speech.

The second aspect of Bertha's personal voice are the repetitions. According to César, they represent Bertha's disoriented state of mind, her emotions, expressing her waves of bliss like they are indescribable. There are sixteen repetitions in Mansfield's text; all of them are reproduced by César in her target-text (although she says that "every iteration required a different solution"), while five of them are altered by Cupertino.

Mansfield (2006, p. 72)	César (1999, p. 313)	Cupertino (1191, p. 4)
she surprised herself by hugging it to her, passionately, passionately.	surpreendeu-se retendo-a contra o corpo e abraçando-a com paixão – com paixão.	ela se surpreendeu apertando-a contra si apaixonadamente.

Table 4 – Comparison between original and translations III

Mansfield (2006, p. 79)	César (1999, p. 321)	Cupertino (1991, p. 10)
But now - ardently! ardently! The word ached in her ardent body! Was this what the feeling of bliss had been leading up to?	Mas agora - ardentemente! ardentemente! A palavra doía no seu corpo ardente! Era para aí que a levava toda aquela sensação de êxtase?	Mas agora - era com desejo! Com tesão! A palavra doía em seu corpo em brasa. Era a isso que seu sentimento de felicidade tinha levado?

Table 5 - Comparison between original and translations IV

In the excerpt of Table 3, the repetition of "passionately" is the sole mark of the possibility of free indirect discourse. Therefore, Cupertino's translation eliminates the possibility of seeing this passage as an amalgamation of narrator and character's discourse. If we remember that *Bliss'* narrative structure consists in the altercation between narrator voice and character voice, we see that a systematic erasure of these repetitions, in the name of "clarity" or "style", for example, could mean a significant loss in signifying processes inside the narrative.

Cupertino's alteration in Table 4 can also lead to a loss in FID, even though the possibility of text interference could still be maintained by the use of the dash and exclamation points. The words "desejo" and "tesão", nouns chosen by the translator to replace the repetition of the adverb "ardently", are, however, too concrete in meaning for Bertha's lack of articulation and confusion about her feelings, altering another aspect of her personal language. Her feeling of bliss becomes too explicitly sexual, something that is never referred to in the source-text; Bertha feels it physically, but does not understand the nature of it, as we can see in this very passage. This leads to Berman's (2000) tendency of clarification, or, "where the original has no problem moving in the indefinite, our literary language tends to impose the definite" (p. 289).

It is possible to notice, then, that erasing discourse marks as simple as dashes and iterations, that are many times seen as merely stylistic resources unrelated to the story level, can create a significant removal from the original speech representation, mitigating or completely removing some voices that operate in the source-text through the use of FID. What we can see in Cupertino's text is a series of deforming tendencies analyzed by Berman (rationalization, clarification, the destruction of underlying networks of signification), tendencies that, ultimately, homogenize Mansfield's polyphonic writing, recomposing sentences in order to rephrase them according to some idea of grammatical coherence, overlooking the shapeless polylogic that constitutes the central issue of narrative prose.

César (1999), on the other hand, is aware that narrative in *Bliss* is structured exactly by an ambiguity, a game of approximation and distancing between narrator and character, that manifests itself in the distinctive forms of speech representation and narration. When the narrator employs terms and syntactical structures that could only be used by Bertha, this amalgamation draws attention to the distance between the two voices - one eloquent, one inarticulate -, generating a layer of irony (and unreliability, as we will see in the next section). This narrator is also distant when it limits itself to an objective description and representations of words and events, like in the final moments of the story. Approximation happens when the narrator tries to communicate Bertha's moments of bliss; here there is no irony, but consideration, represented by the use of an almost lyrical, emotive tone.

The existence of such nuances and subtleties are revealed more clearly to the reader/translator when he/she looks at the text through the lens of narrative theory, employing certain tools narratology offers us to identify and preserve free indirect discourse in the target-text. But analysing the characteristics of narrative voice, the use of FID and its consequences, the relation between narrator and object of narration, we can also uncover other aspects that are fundamental to the interpretation of the narrative in question.

3.3 (Un)reliability - "In what moment do we start to doubt, in Bliss?"

As I've shown in the previous section, the narrative structure of *Bliss* is completely built upon an oscillation of voices: we have the voice of Bertha, the main character, inarticulate, repetitive, too emotional; and we have the voice of the narrator, either objective when trying to simply describe actions and events, or poetic and lyrical when trying to represent Bertha's feeling of bliss. Bertha's personal language is mainly represented through free indirect discourse - a technique where the language of the narrator and that of the character intertwine without explicit reference to

it, creating what Bal (2009) calls textual interference. César (1999) claimed that the employment of FID results in an effect of irony - everytime it reports Bertha's words and thoughts in that manner, the narrator draws a parallel between its fluency and her inarticulateness, making it seem like it is mocking her for her inability to find words. This becomes even clearer once the reader knows the end of the story and discovers that Bertha's feeling of bliss was very disconnected from reality.

But can we characterize this narrator as anything other than "ironic"? According to Murphy (2017), unreliability is a central theme in many of Mansfield's stories, since they never really finish with an unknotting, being circular compositions instead, always leaving the reader unsure about the truthfulness of the narrator. He proposes that "the absence of a clear modulation back and forth between objective narrative and the viewpoint of the central character" in Mansfield's short stories "creates a strong sense of unreliability" (p. 68). In other words, the author claims that the use of free indirect discourse in *Bliss* makes it unclear for the reader to identify who is speaking and, in turn, this reader feels like he/she cannot trust the narrating agent.

Returning to the definition of the concept proposed in the previous chapter, (un)reliability can be seen as an interpretative strategy for the resolution of textual tensions, incongruities, discordances and polyphonies. According to the cognitive hypothesis of Sternberg and Yacobi (2015),

> unreliability is a perspectival hypothesis that we readers (...) form as sense-makers, especially under the pressure or threat of ill-constructed discourse. It is 'an inference that explains and eliminates tensions, incongruities, contradictions and other infelicities the work may show by attributing them to a source of transmission' (Yacobi 1981: 119), whether narrator or informant (p. 402).

Judging by this definition, I think we can affirm that at least some readers will distrust *Bliss*' narrator - although she does not mention "unreliability" explicitly, César's (1999) whole interpretation of the short story is based on the "continuously present tension" (p. 295) between the two voices. But if *Bliss* is a narrative built on tension, and (un)reliability is a mechanism for eliminating tensions, this aspect will certainly entail some difficulties for the translator. As a reader, my tendency is to clarify, resolve the incongruities of the text, construct a logical narrative in my head; but as a translator, my task is to keep the contradictions, to identify and reproduce the oscillations of the narrator, because they are what constitutes this particular story, and because the final reader should be able to experience the formulation of the hypothesis of unreliability to account for the incongruities of the text. That is why it is so important to recognize the possibility of an unreliable narrator: the translator needs to consciously counteract the tendency to resolve the

inconsistencies in the discourse.

In the same way that the reader/translator can examine FID, we could start by characterizing this unreliable discourse, making it easier to identify when and where it happens. We could start by using S&Y's typology of unreliable discourse (target, trigger, cause, magnitude, degree, basis, dynamics, motivation): the target is the external narrator (as opposed to the focalizer), this agent that we can only characterize by looking at how it dramatizes the story and the characters in it; the trigger to thinking this narrator can be unreliable is the tone the narrator chose to report the story, suppressing a clear distinguishment between its language and Bertha's speech (to use S&Y's terms, we could say there is a form of misrepresentation); regarding magnitude, the unreliability lies in the primary narration; regarding degree, we have a sharp irony directed towards the minor characters (Bertha's husband and the other dinner guests) and an oscillation between sharp and no irony when it comes to the central character; the dynamic is again oscillating, with the "unreliability" appearing and disappearing according to Bertha's bliss; the motivation is functional and, finally, the cause could be a "design to misdirect or manipulate" (p. 458)

The trigger, that is, what in the texts makes us think that the narrator is unreliable, and the cause for this unreliability, are the most important aspects here. As Murphy (2017) puts it, what leads us to a sense of unreliability is the "strategic suppression of the distinction between the voice of the narrator and that of the central character" (p. 67). This suppression happens mostly because of free indirect discourse, defined as a form of text interference. Therefore, maintaining FID - and especially its nuances - in the target-text is crucial not only for avoiding homogenization but for keeping open the possibility of seeing the discourse as unreliable.

Mansfield (2006, p. 76)	César (1999, p. 319)	Cupertino (1991, p. 7)
Oh, why did she feel so tender towards the whole world tonight? **Everything was good - was right**. All that happened seemed to fill again her brimming cup of bliss. And still, in the back of her mind, there was the pear tree. It would be silver now, in the light of **poor dear** Eddie's moon, silver as Miss Fulton, who sat there turning a tangerine in her slender fingers that were so pale a light seemed to come from	Por que sentia tanta ternura pelo mundo inteiro nessa noite? **Tudo estava tão bom - e certo**. Tudo o que acontecia parecia encher outra vez até a borda a taça transbordante do seu êxtase. E no fundo da sua mente ainda havia a árvore, que devia estar toda prateada agora, à luz da lua do **pobre Eddie querido**, prateada como Miss Fulton, que estava ali sentada virando uma tangerina nos seus dedos finos e	**Ah!** O que fazia com que ela se sentisse tão terna com todo mundo, hoje? **Tudo era bom, tudo estava certo**. Tudo o que acontecia parecia encher de novo até a borda sua taça de felicidade. E havia ainda, no fundo de sua mente, a pereira. Ela estaria prateada, agora, sob a luz da lua do **pobre Eddie**, prateada como Pearl Fulton, que lá estava, sentada, fazendo girar uma tangerina com seus dedos finos

them.	tão pálidos que pareciam emanar uma luz.	e tão pálidos que um raio de luz parecia sair deles.
What she simply couldn't make out **- what was miraculous -** was how she should have guessed Miss Fulton's mood **so exactly and so instantly**. For she never doubted for a moment that she was right, **and yet what had she to go on?** Less than nothing.	O que era simplesmente incompreensível **- e mágico -** era como ela havia sido capaz de adivinhar tão **perfeitamente e instantaneamente** o estado de espírito de Miss Fulton. Nem por um momento ela duvidara de que sabia, **e no entanto o que havia de concreto?** Menos que nada	O que, na verdade, não podia compreender, **o que era miraculoso**, era como percebera o estado de espírito de Pearl Fulton **de modo tão rápido e exato**. Porque ela não tinha a menor dúvida de estar certa e, **no entanto, em que podia se basear?** Menos que nada.

Table 6 – Comparison between original and translations V

As I described in the previous section, FID happens in *Bliss* when we have a subtle combination between the voice of the narrator and the voice of Bertha. The narrator's voice is often poetic, trying to describe Bertha's feelings since she cannot do it on her own. Bertha's voice, on the other hand, is characterized by a lack of articulation that is represented through questions, dashes, repetitions and an overall childishness.

The first paragraph we see in Table 5 starts with the interjection "Oh", an explicit sign of a personal language situation (if we remember Bal's explanation from Chapter 2). César decided to omit it and Cupertino changed it to a more grammatical"Ah". César's omission may cut the possibility of instantly seeing the sentence as FID, but her tone here is much more casual, much more alike to what Bertha's voice would sound like in Portuguese, than Cupertino's. In the second sentence there are two other signs of FID, the dash and the repetition. César keeps the dash, but loses the repetition. Cupertino does the opposite, replacing the dash with a comma, but keeping the repetition (although changing it from "was" to "tudo"). In the third sentence we see the use of a metaphor, which could mean that we're dealing with pure narrator discourse. In this case, there's a change in tone - the translation needs to be more articulate and lyrical, leaving Bertha's language behind. César seemed to sense this, employing terms like "outra vez" and "transbordante".

The same fluctuation happens in the second paragraph - we see a mark of Bertha's voice, like "poor dear Eddie" followed by a more expressive image, as in "so pale a light seemed to come from them". Again, we can see César's effort to compose two different voices, reinforcing both the character's naive speech ("pobre Eddie querido") and the narrator's eloquent voice ("emanar").

In the third paragraph, we have a reinforcement of Bertha's personal language, starting with the dash/repetition formula, followed by another iteration (so -ly, so -ly) and finishing with a

question. César keeps the dash, but omits the repetition of "what", which somehow diminishes the feeling of inarticulateness. Cupertino maintains the repetition ("o que", "o que"), but adds several commas to the passage, also weakening the characteristics of Bertha's voice. In the second sentence, César does not repeat the parallelism of the original (so -ly, so -ly), but the sequence of two adverbs ending in -mente, something fairly unusual for written Portuguese, gives the translation the intensivess of the source-passage. Cupertino, on the other hand, completely omits any sign of the character's voice by using the formal expression "de modo tão rápido e exato". The translators also diverge in the tone of the question that finishes the paragraph, with César opting for a more informal style and Cupertino again employing a grammatically correct formulation.

Overall, the difference between the two voices seems to be more prominent in César's text. She makes it clear, in her notes about the translation, that she consciously tried to devise two different languages, and the caution she had not to exaggerate the discrepancies between them. Cupertino appears to not have the same attention, keeping most of the discourse in the same type of voice, although, since I don't have access to her translation process, there's no way to affirm this with certainty. I can affirm, however, that César was aware of the reasons why Mansfield conceived a narrating agent with this "ventriloquist" capacity and the effects the double-voicedness entails for unreliability.

Returning to S&Y's typology, the cause for the cause for suspecting the reliability of the narrator in Bliss could be a "design to misdirect or manipulate" (p. 458). César (1999) definitely was aware of this deceiving intention in the narrative[3]: in "Note 6" of Bliss' translation, she talks about the ambiguous relation of the narrator towards Bertha, which treats the character sometimes with sincerity, sometimes with irony - she writes that it was a challenge to find the right words to keep the nuances of these two approaches in her translation. To back up her analysis, she mentions an essay by Isherwood (1966) which states that Mansfield is "two writers in one": writer A is intuitive, a poet, while writer B is critical and satirical. When these two collaborate, the reader is, at first, amazed; but then, as the story goes, they start to wonder if something is wrong. César finishes her "Note 6" with the following question: "In what moment do we start to doubt, in Bliss?" (p. 329, my translation).

Murphy (2017) highlights the following passage where the narrator draws attention to the indeterminacy of what happened in the story:

Mansfield (2006, p. 77)	César (1999, p. 319)	Cupertino (1991, p. 8)

---

3   Although she misplaces it, attributing it to the author and not to the narrator.

And the two women stood side by side looking at the slender flowering tree. Although it was so still it seemed, like the flame of a candle, to stretch up, to point, to quiver in the bright air, to grow taller and taller as they gazed - almost to touch the rim of the round, silver moon.	E as duas mulheres se deixaram ficar ali, lado a lado, olhando para a esguia árvore em flor. Embora imóvel, a árvore parecia estender-se para cima, subir, tremer no ar brilhante como a chama de uma vela, e crescer, crescer mais alto diante delas - quase tocar a borda da lua cheia prateada.	E as duas mulheres permaneceram de pé, uma ao lado da outra, olhando para a esguia árvore florida. Embora o ambiente estivesse tão tranquilo, a pereira parecia a chama de uma vela a alongar-se, apontar para o alto, tremer no ar brilhante, tornando-se cada vez mais alta enquanto elas olhavam, até quase tocar os bordos prateados da lua redonda.
How long did they stand there? Both, as it were, caught in that circle of unearthly light, understanding each other perfectly, creatures of another world, and wondering what they were to do in this one with all this blissful treasure that burned in their bosoms and dropped, in silver flowers, from their hair and hands?	Por quanto tempo elas ficaram ali? Era como se as duas estivessem presas naquele círculo de luz extraterrena, entendendo-se uma à outra perfeitamente, criaturas de um outro mundo, perguntando-se o que fazer neste mundo com todo aquele tesouro sublime que queimava dentro do peito e se derramava em flores prateadas pelos seus cabelos e mãos?	Quanto tempo elas ficaram ali? Ambas como que presas àquele círculo de luz sobrenatural, compreendendo-se perfeitamente uma à outra, criaturas de um outro mundo, e perguntando-se o que iriam fazer neste mundo com todo aquele tesouro de felicidade que queimava em seus peitos e caía, como flores de prata, de seus cabelos e mãos?
For ever? – for a moment? And did Miss Fulton murmur: "Yes. Just that." Or did Bertha dream it?	Para sempre - ou por um segundo? E Miss Fulton murmurara mesmo "Sim, exatamente *isso*" ou Bertha havia sonhado?	Para sempre? Por um momento? E Pear Fulton pareceu ter murmurado: "Sim, isso mesmo". Ou Bertha sonhara isso?

Table 7 – Comparison between original and translations VI

This is one of the passages where the narrator tries to deal with Bertha's bliss with sincerity, rendering her perceptions and thoughts in a lyrical, poetic tone. But because of the constant oscillation between this approach and the ironic one, and also because of the questions asked in the end, the reader can wonder if this exchange actually happened more or less as narrated or if the narrative is mimicking what Bertha *wished* to have happened. It is a moment where the reader/translator can ask themselves, "Who is speaking?", "Did this really happen?". Of course, the

translator should not answer these doubts, but produce a target-text that leaves the final reader with the same questioning feeling.

In her note about this excerpt, César (1999) says:

> Bertha is under the intoxicating feelings of her bliss (...) Therefore, the translation is almost "free", in order to create a strong paragraph, since it is very important to reproduce the emotional character of the rhythm. Even if the images are not all that original, the impact of the passage must be secured, at least, by the syntax (p. 349, my translation).

Note that her preoccupation with "syntax" comes from the fact that this is an important part of the *story*. Bertha is experiencing her bliss, so it is important that the discourse reproduces her emotional state with precision, since this is one of the few moments where the narrator seems to care about her enough as to not mock her sentiments. "Seems", of course - as I already mentioned, the cause for this two-tone fiction, the reason for the employment of this polyphonical narrator, is to create suspense, ambiguity. That's the importance of identifying the two voices in Bliss and representing them as distinct, but with the delicate refinement that their differentiation is almost always ambiguous.

If we analyse Bliss from the perspective of unreliability, we can see that FID allows the narrator to *seem* to accept Bertha's voice, while, at the same time, constantly pointing out the insufficiency of that voice. When the reader realizes this masquerade, he/she may no longer trust the narrator to correctly represent or dramatize the actions of the narrative, judging the narrator unreliable.

> In the work of Katherine Mansfield, there are a number of highly interesting examples of this stylistic technique, in which the distinction between an objective narrative voice and a more idiosyncratic character voice cannot be so readily drawn. In these short stories, part of the reader's aesthetic experience consists in coming to terms with the central character's misplaced confidence about herself, her judgments of other people, or her understanding of the world she inhabits. These stories are typically marked by a measure of shock or surprise near story's end, the result of the dispelling of the illusion that the colored narrative has helped to sustain throughout most of the preceding narrative (MURPHY, 2017, p. 74).

In conclusion, *Bliss*'s narrative structure is composed by an oscillation of voices, represented in the text by the use of free indirect discourse. FID produces irony, which produces a feeling of

discursive tension. This tension can lead the reader to see the narrator as an unreliable agent, that is, the reader may devise a strategy to resolve this tension by attributing it to the source of transmission. The translator, however, cannot put these "solved tensions" into the target-text; he/she has to leave the ambiguity doors open, so that the final reader can also have the possibility of interpreting the narrative in this manner. If we erase the marks of free indirect discourse, we may end up erasing the possibility of reading the narrator as a source of unreliability, which, in its turn, may weaken the effect of suspense, a central narrative aspect of *Bliss*.

3.4 Focalization - "The echo of the obsessive character of Bertha's emotions"

The oscillation of voices in Bliss is related to yet another important narrative aspect: focalization. Focalization can be defined as a selection or restriction of narrative information in relation to the experience and knowledge of a narrator, character, or other; it has to do with perspective, the point of view through which the story is told. The focalizer of a narrative is the agent whose perceptions and visions the reader follows during certain points of the story (or throughout it, as it's the case of Bliss). Understanding focalization is extremely important for translators, firstly because this aspect is not as known as those of narration and unreliability, making it easier to overlook its effects; and second because it is an element of the intermediate level of narrative, the story (in Bal's terms).

When we are translating, changes in the text/discourse, the most superficial level, are obviously inevitable, since translating requires creating a new text in another language. Modifications in aspects of the story level, like sequential ordering, characters, space and focalization are more rare, but they could have significant consequences. Obviously, since these aspects are not entirely language-based, they are more difficult to modify - Galindo (2009) says that factors like "the order of the narrated events" are "unlikely to be altered by a translation and rarely will depend on it to arrive intact to the final reader (p. 106, my translation); Britto (2010) claims that it is "obvious" that the elements we necessarily have to reconstruct in the target-language are aspects like "the story (...) with a particular set of characters, a plot with several stages" (n. P., my translation), implying that we don't have to pay much attention to these aspects, that they will sort of automatically transpose themselves untouched to the target-text.

But focalization is also an aspect of the level of the story, and it is not so easily translated, as I will try to show in this section. As I mentioned in the last chapter, until Genette coined the term "focalization" in 1983, there was no theoretical difference between the agent who "sees" the narrative and the agent who "speaks" it. With the development of narratology as a discipline, it

became clear that these are two completely distinct narrative aspects, and that a productive analysis needs to consider the effects produced by the similarities and contrast between narration and focalization. *Bliss* is one example of a text that relies heavily on the distinction between narrator and focalizer for its effects: the suspense of the short-story comes from the clash between the narrator's omniscient reporting and the limited vision of the character-focalizer. Consequently, the effects of the translation will also rely on this subtle play between "who sees" and "who speaks".

The perceived center of consciousness in *Bliss* is clearly Bertha, since the reader experiences all the events in the narrative through her point of view. The reader does not have any access to the other character's thoughts and feelings, and even when the narrator detaches itself a little bit from Bertha's voice, the reader is still connected to her vision - everything that happens, every person and every object that is introduced to the story, is focalized through her perceptions.

> There were tangerines and apples stained with strawberry pink. Some yellow pears, smooth as silk, some white grapes covered with a silver bloom and a big cluster of purple ones. These last she had bought to tone in with the new dining-room carpet. Yes, that did sound rather far-fetched and absurd, but it was really why she had bought them" (MANSFIELD, 2006, p. 70)

If we recall Bal's (2009) theory on focalization from the last chapter, she proposes three relevant questions to analyze this aspect: "1. What does the character focalize: what is it aimed at? 2. How does it do this: with what attitude does it view things? 3. Who focalizes it: whose focalized object is it?" (p. 153). Bertha is a character-focalizer with a limited spatial perspective, retrospective temporal vision, and a limited knowledge about what is going to happen to her and the people around her. As I've mentioned, virtually everything in the story is focalized by Bertha - her own feelings, the nanny, her daughter, her house, the pear tree, her husband, the dinner guests, etc. This means that we don't have an objective description of almost anything. Everything the reader sees is colored by Bertha's opinions of it, and her opinions are colored by her feelings of bliss. She views things in a naive, childish sort of way; in the first paragraph the reader already knows that she wants to "bowl a hoop" and "laugh at nothing". She is optimistic about her life, loving her child, wanting her husband, and not suspecting a thing about the affair between him and Miss Fulton.

This unchangeable, constant internal focalization is crucial to the element of surprise at the end of the narrative. The reader is only surprised to find out that she is being cheated on because Bertha herself had absolutely no clue about it, being immersed in her feelings of bliss. The narrator, however, is aware of the wistful closure of the story, as we can see in the brief anticipations that happen throughout the narrative ("and what would happen after that she could not imagine", "a

trifle too unaware") and by the way it ironically reports Bertha's words and feelings. This contrast between Bertha's naive focalization and the narrator's ironic reporting of the events creates the effect of suspense: there is a sense that something is about to happen, even though the reader does not know what it is.

> Suspense arises from rival scenarios about the future: from the discrepancy between what the telling lets us readers know about the happening (e.g., a conflict) at any moment and what still lies ahead, ambiguous because yet unresolved in the world (STERNBERG, 2003, p. 327).

This effect of suspense caused by limited focalization is especially noticeable in the passages where Bertha talks about Miss Fulton. Along the story, she seems to believe that they are sharing an intimate, meaningful connection. In these sections, the narrator is less ironic in its reportings - perhaps trying to disguise the fact that it knows about the ending and that Bertha is incredibly mistaken about her feelings for Pearl Fulton, perhaps trying to make the reader believe that the women are indeed in affinity with each other.

Mansfield (2006, p. 75)	César (1999, p. 304)	Cupertino (1991, p. 7)
But Bertha knew, suddenly, as if the longest, most intimate look had passed between them - as if they had said to each other: "You, too?" - that Pearl Fulton, stirring the beautiful red soup in the grey plate, was feeling just what she was feeling.	Mas Bertha sabia, subitamente, como se elas tivessem trocado o olhar mais longo e mais íntimo - como se elas tivessem dito uma para a outra: "Você, também?" - que Pearl Fulton, ao mexer a bela sopa vermelha no prato cinza, estava sentindo exatamente o que ela estava sentindo.	Mas Bertha soube, de repente, como se o mais longo, o mais íntimo olhar tivesse sido trocado entre elas, como se tivessem dito uma à outra "Você também?", que Pearl, ao mexer a bela sopa vermelha em seu prato cinza, sentia exatamente o que ela estava sentindo.

Table 8 – Comparison between original and translations VII

This excerpt expresses the narrow character of Bertha's illusion - in the previous sentence, the narrator states that Fulton did not look at Bertha, but even so she still thinks that they are sharing some special connection. Since we experience every event through Bertha's emotions, the reader will probably believe, in a first reading, that this link between the two women is real, and not only in Bertha's mind. But, in a second reading, we can clearly see that the interweaving between Bertha's focalization and the external-narrator reporting also gives away, albeit very subtly, that

what the main character is seeing and feeling does not correspond to "reality".

But since focalization is a story aspect (it belongs to the intermediate level of the narrative), and the only material we have for investigation is the text before us, we have to go back to free indirect discourse to analyse the challenges the aspect of focalization creates to the translator. If we remember Bal's (2009) definition of FID, she claims that in this mode of speech representation we have signals of the personal language situation of the actor and of the (im)personal language situation of the narrator crossing without explicit reference to it. But we could also say that in FID we have the narrator's discourse presented through the character's focalization - free indirect discourse enhances the presence of polyphony in the text as it implies shifts in perspective between the characters' subjective vision and the report of the narrator's language.

In the table above, we have very tenuous signs of Bertha's personal language - one dash and one repetition ("was feeling just what she was feeling"). But these are also the only hints we have to say that it is being focalized by Bertha. César keeps these subtle marks, but Cupertino erases them, minimizing the polyphonic game played between limited focalization and omniscient narration. It also curious to notice that César made two translation notes for this passage. In the first one, she explains why she translated "knew" as "sabia": "the use of the 'pretérito imperfeito' leads to a less sudden and more subtle movement, in Bertha's perspective (like she knew all along about this)" (1999, p. 344, my translation). In the second note, the translator justifies the syntactic changes made saying she was searching for a "more intense parallelism" (p. 344). These translational strategies may seem merely stylistic, but as César herself mentions in the introduction to her translation, they are deeply related to the meaningful moments of the *story level* (the content). Her notes concentrate in the points of Bertha's bliss, and in these points the entanglement between the different voices and perspectives becomes so subtle that it is almost indistinguishable; consequently, it is harder for the translator to produce a target-text that does not homogenize these delicate discrepancies.

When we reach the ending of the story, with Bertha finding out about her husband's infidelity, there's no need for suspense anymore. The narrator withdraws itself, leaving behind its ironic/poetic reportings and FID, now merely describing what is happening, briefly and without comments. The reader realizes that Bertha, through whose eyes the entire story is told, has been a particularly bad guide. Her understanding of Miss Fulton is far from "perfect," and her reading of her husband's behavior was particularly wrong.

Mansfield (2006, p. 79)	César (1999, p. 322)	Cupertino (1991, p. 10)
And she saw… Harry with Miss Fulton's coat in his arms and	E ela viu… Harry com o casaco de Miss Fulton nos braços e	E viu. . . Harry com o agasalho de Pearl Fulton nos braços e

Miss Fulton with her back turned to him and her head bent. He tossed the coat away, put his hand on her shoulders and turned her violently to him. His lips said: "I adore you", and Miss Fulton laid her moonbean fingers on his cheeks and smiled her sleepy smile. Harry's nostrils quivered; his lips curled back in a hideous grin while he whispered: "To-morrow", and with her eyelids Miss Fulton said: "Yes".	Miss Fulton de costas para ele, a cabeça inclinada para o lado. Harry afastou bruscamente o casaco, pôs as mãos nos ombros dela e a virou com violência. Seus lábios diziam: "Eu te adoro", e Miss Fulton pousou seus dedos cor de luar no rosto dele e sorriu seu sorriso sonolento. As narinas de Harry tremeram; seus lábios se crisparam num esgar horrível ao sussurrarem: "Amanhã", e com um bater de olhos Miss Fulton disse: "Sim".	esta, de costas para ele, com a cabeça inclinada. Ele atirou o casaco para um lado, colocou as mãos nos ombros dela, e virou-a com violência para ele. Seus lábios diziam: "eu te adoro", e Pearl pousou os dedos finos sobre o rosto dele e sorriu aquele seu sorriso sonolento. As narinas de Harry tremiam; os lábios ficaram repuxados para trás, numa crispação horrível, enquanto ele sussurrava: "amanhã" — e, piscando os olhos, Pearl disse: "sim"

Table 9 – Comparison between original and translations VIII

Here the FID is practically gone, but the focalization still lies with Bertha. The expressions "moonbean fingers", "bent head" and "sleepy smile" are all repeated motifs, words Bertha had previously used to describe Miss Fulton when she was still under the spell of her bliss. Even though she is realizing that what they were actually sharing was her husband, she still sees this mysterious woman in a positive light; Harry, on the other hand, is described as having a "hideous grin".

This small paragraph contains four notes in César's annotated translation. The first one is about the use of "bruscamente", used to describe "precisely" (p. 352) the meaning of "toss away". In the second note, about verb tense, the translator says that "the use of the 'imperfeito' immerses the scene in some type of different level of time" (p. 352). The third one justifies the translation of "while he whispered" for "ao sussurrarem" as a way to avoid repeating the subject "ele". And the fourth note claims that "com um bater de olhos" and "num esgar horrível" were "carefully chosen, and the tone is slightly more literary than the original form" (p. 352).

In the very last moments of the story, we see the final echo of Bertha's bliss, now transformed into something else entirely. With Miss Fulton's farewell words echoing in Bertha's mind ("Your lovely pear tree"), she runs to the window and cries, "Oh, what is going to happen now?". The story thus seems to close with a question that propels suspense again, a question that calls for a further narrative. The final one-sentence paragraph, "But the pear tree was as lovely as ever and as full of flower and as still", appears to reprise once again Bertha's voice with its repetition. But it also hints at the fact that we've been reading the story naively - the pear tree was not a symbol of Bertha's feelings, but of Pearl's. Bliss remains - not Bertha's but Miss Fulton's.

Mansfield (2006, p. 80)	César (1999, p. 322)	Cupertino (1991, p. 11)
"Your lovely pear tree - pear tree - pear tree!"	"Sua árvore linda - linda - linda!"	"Sua linda pereira...".
Bertha simply ran over to the long windows.	E Bertha apenas correu para as longas janelas dando para o jardim.	Bertha correu para as janelas largas do jardim.
"Oh what is going to happen next?", she cried.	"E agora, o que vai acontecer?" exclamou.	"Deus! O que vai acontecer agora?"
But the pear tree was as lovely as ever and as full of flower and as still.	Mas a árvore continuava tão bela e florida e imóvel como sempre.	Mas a pereira estava tão linda como sempre, tão imóvel e florida como sempre.

Table 10 – Comparison between original and translations IX

I find it interesting to notice the significant amount of changes both translators made in these final sentences. César transformed the "pear tree" into a simple "árvore"[4], and chose to repeat the adjective instead of the noun; Cupertino chose not to repeat it at all. Both added that the long windows overlooked the garden, something that was not present in the original.

Cupertino chose to translate the interjection "Oh" with "Deus", adding a theme that had not appeared so far in the story. César inverted the syntax of the last sentence, while Cupertino again includes words, repeating "como sempre".

César writes a lengthy note about the translation of "Your lovely pear tree - pear tree - pear tree!". She calls her translation strategy an "interference", saying that she "thought a lot about it before making a decision" (p. 353, my translation).

> In Bliss, however, the iterations are not a realistic artifice, something to provide the characters speech with more verisimilitude. They emphasize discursive moments where the narrator's words represent an effort to transmit emotions, like they were filtered directly from the characters consciousness. (...) This uncontrollable feeling can be expressed through a simple repetition of words (CÉSAR, 1999, p. 353, my translation).

---

4   She justifies her choice by saying that "pereira" is not an "harmonious" word, suggesting different images in Portuguese than it does in English. Instead she chose "árvore", a word that is "strong and beautiful by nature" (p.339). César mentions that she analysed the whole story carefully and decided that this change would not hurt any of the author's intentions.

Again, the translator notices the meaningful play between focalization and narration when she says that the narrator struggles to transmit emotions that come directly from Bertha's mind. But she is also aware that this last repetition is different from all the other ones: it is the only triple repetition and the only one where the repeated term is a noun - "what echoes incessantly in Bertha's mind is the existence of a pear tree, the only thing that's left" (p. 354).

Her translation, however, goes against this analysis, repeating the adjective "linda" instead. She says that there's nothing "rational" about her decision, that is purely "emotional", mentioning that the phoneme /i/ in "linda" sounds similar to phoneme in "tree". She concludes the note claiming that "my desire was to make the reader realize this effect, the intensity of the echo resonating in Bertha's mind" (p. 354, my translation).

The fact that, after her consistent analysis of the importance of Bertha's voice, César makes such a radical change in a passage that not only is in direct discourse but also represents the culmination of the character's feelings basically because it would "sound better" shows, in my opinion, the pervasive presence of Berman's (1985) deforming tendencies, the desire to clarify, expand, rationalize, smooth the shapelessness that constitutes the narrative text.

Berman says that "every translator is inescapably exposed to this play of forces, even if he (or she) is animated by another aim. More: these unconscious forces form part of the translator's *being,* determining the *desire* to translate" (1985, p. 286). I believe César's inability to rationally explain her translational decisions, her appeal to her "emotions" in this last note she writes, is a good example of what Berman is trying to show in his "Translation and the trials of the foreign".

As César's note demonstrates, even the most experient translator can still fall for the trap of choosing certain words because they "sound better" in the target-language, at the expense of altering or erasing important narrative aspects. If she or he wants to construct a translation that respects and transmits narrative's polyphony, ambiguity, refraction, assemblage, the translator needs not only to be constantly aware of these features, she/he needs tools that help them pay attention to where they operate, how they are formed, through what channels they are realized and which effects they lead to. This is what I hope to contribute to by reinforcing the usefulness of narratology to literary translators.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In this thesis, I sketched a few possible intersections between Narratology and Translation Studies, an instrumental approach that employs concepts like narration, focalization and reliability as reading/interpreting tools that help the translator tackle narrative's inherent polyphony as it manifests itself mainly through free indirect discourse, a mode of speech representation that allows different voices to merge and glide through narrative's linguistic fabric.

The first chapter was directed by the question: why have studies on literary translation rarely dealt with narratological issues, given that narrative as a genre occupies a key position in our social, cultural and artistic systems? I found out that many discussions on translated narrative are still guided by poetic standards, even in the works of celebrated scholars like Britto (2016) and Bassnett (2002). This happens because poetry itself is more established as a literary genre – it is easier for a critic or translator to perform a formal analysis of poetry that links its formal aspects to the semantic progression of the text, since these instruments and criteria, like metric, rhythm and rhyme, are traditionally well established. But research into narratological issues has thus been relatively rare in translation studies, since the discipline was, first, too preoccupied with formalist questions and, later, mainly focused on extratextual matters, leaving little room for explorations about the particularities of the narrative genre. Consequently, in order to propose some type of discourse on how to translate narrative, or what differs the translation of narrative from other kinds of translation, one needs to, firstly, understand what "narrative" is.

For this reason, the second chapter explores questions of narration, examining what distinguishes the genre from other literary forms, especially what sets it apart from poetry. To answer this query, I turned to Bakhtin (1981), the first author to formulate a comprehensive "prosaics" – a theory of literature that privileges prose in general and the novel in particular over the poetic genre. According to Bakhtin, prose (and, for the goals of this dissertation, narrative prose) differentiates itself from other genres mostly because of its polyphony, the ways in which various languages may enter into dialogue with each other and the kind of complex interactions that such dialogue produces. In this way, narrative prose is characterized by some sort of paradox: from a formal point of view, what distinguishes it from other genres is precisely a lack of form, a lack of sistematization which results from the creation, fragmentation and reconstitution of narrative voices that gradually become more permeable and unstable inside their language cosmos.

This general aspect of polyphony is actualized inside novels and short stories mostly through free indirect discourse, a form of speech representation that is a hybrid between the voice of the narrator and the voice of a character without explicit reference to this. Free indirect discourse influences many other aspects, such as focalization (if we have two voices, we have two different points of view) and reliability (if we do not know who is speaking the utterances in a narrative, we tend to not trust the narrator). This form of speech representation challenges the translator, who has to be able to, first, recognize that there are two (or more) distinctive voices working within the text, identify their respective characteristics and reproduce them in the target-text in a way that they are not homogenized.

I proposed that narratology can help the translator with this challenge, since it offers us practical tools to analyse the use of FID and translate it reducing polyphony losses. To demonstrate the use of narratology's tools in translation, I analysed Ana Cristina César's (1991) annotated translation of *Bliss,* a short story by Katherine Mansfield. César was able to notice that Bliss's structure is entirely built on a delicate variation between the voice of the narrator and the voice of the character Bertha. She identified the distinctive traces of each of those voices and recreated them in her target-text, sometimes at the expense of "sounding good", Brazilian Portuguese grammatical rules or text's fluency. The translator was aware that erasing the subtle fluctuation of those voices, making one more or less explicit than the other, would potentially deform other narrative effects and structures, which, in turn, would implicate in a homogenization that could damage the foundation of Mansfield's narrative.

The application of Narratology to the study/practice of translation is not designed to reduce texts to definitive categories and classifications. Above all, this potential intersection of disciplines aims at instrumentalizing the reading of source texts, since the translator is not a common reader, but a reader whose goal is representative and reconstructive. The more information this reader-constructor has, the more refined the final text will be. Narratology strives to analyse and describe texts in order to elucidate complex semantic webs, demonstrating the limitation of interpretative readings that do not consider the text's formal aspects. Therefore, if it has any practical use for translators, it is certainly it's capacity to make translators aware of possible hidden elements in the narrative text, elements that can be less than obvious in a first reading, but whose existence is extremely significant. These terms - like the interjections, deitics and repetitions in *Bliss* used as an example here – are subtly interconnected with deeper aspects of the narrative, structural aspects like modes of narration and focalization that build the text and are the cause of effects like surprise and suspense, which are the core of narrativity. I hope that if narratology cannot help in the reproduction of these nuances in the target text, at least it allows them to be acknowledged. The theoretical

considerations and the critical exercise laid out in this dissertation, again, do not intent to prescribe right or wrong forms of interpretation, but to present a complementary tool to the literary translator's creativity and intuition.

Of course, what I presented so far is only a sketch – I do not intent to exhaust the possibilities that come from the collaboration between Narratology and Translation Studies here, only to enhance the dialogue between the areas. First because I only discussed aspects derived from strucuturalist Narratology; there are several other approaches within the discipline, including what Herman & Vervaeck (2005) call post-classical Narratology, a branch that encompasses anthropology, psychoanalysis, feminist studies and cognitive sciences. Moreover, only a small part of the aspects described by structuralist Narratology were covered – there are many more concepts, points-of-view and models that could be explored by translators and scholars interested in learning more about the genre and in devising theories and tools that connect both disciplines. As Bal (2009) puts it, it is impossible to speak about *a* narratology, since the object of this discipline – the text -, in all its dynamic, resists closed or systematic analysis. Therefore, not every translation can benefit from the tools suggested here, just as there is not a literary theory that can be applied to all literary texts.

Nevertheless, I believe this work can open new perspectives for the cross-disciplinary study of narration and translation, especially because I feel that both are forms of discourse that refuse a single, undivided authority. To translate a narrative is to create a narrative, since narrative's nature, as a genre, relies heavily on reenunciation, on a hybridism of voices. The specificity of translating narrative is exactly its nonspecificity, the task of reproducing something whose "production" is already multiple and unstable.

REFERENCES

ALAN, Patrícia Peter dos Santos Zachia. A **tradução da prosa poética de Katherine Mansfield em português: um estudo comparado.** Dissertation (Masters in Comparted Literature). Instituto de Letras, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, 2011.

ALVSTAD, Cecilia. **The translation pact**. Language and Literature, Volume 23, p. 270-284, 2014.

BAL, Mieke. **Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative**. Toronto: Universty of Toronto Press, 2009.

BANFIELD, Ann. **Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and representation in the language of fiction**. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

BAKHTIN, M. M. **The Dialogic Imagination**. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

BARTHES, Roland. **An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative**. New Literary History, Volume 6, Number. 2, pp. 237-272, 1975.

BASSNETT, Susan. **Translation Studies**. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

BASSNETT, Susan; LEFEVERE, Andre. **Translation/History/Culture**. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

BERMAN, Antoine. **A Tradução e a Letra ou o Albergue do Longíquo**. Translated by Marie-Helène C. Torres, Mauri Furlan e Andreia Guerini. Florianópolis: PGET/UFSC, 2000.

BERNAERTS, Lars; BLEEKER, Liesbeth de; WILDE, July de. **Narration and Translation**. Language and Literature, Vol. 23(3), 203–212. Available at http://lal.sagepub.com/content/23/3/203, 2014.

BESNAULT-LETIVA, Anne. '**-Ah, what is it? - that I heard': Voice and Affect in Katherine Mansfield's Short Fictions**. In: WILSON, Janet; KIMBER, Gerri; REID, Susan (Eds.). Katherine Mansfield and Literary Modernism. London: Continuum International, 2011.

BOASE-BEIER, Jean. **Translation and the representation of thought: The case of Herta Müller.** Language and Literature, Volume 23(3), p. 213-226, 2014.

BOSSEAUX, Charlotte Isabel Aline. **How Does it Feel: Point of View in Translation. The Case of Virginia Woolf into French.** Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007.

BOYDEN, Michael. **Voiceless Ends: Melville's Benito Cereno and the Translator in Narrative Discourse.** Language and Literature, Volume 23(3), p. 255-269, 2014.

BRITTO, Paulo Henriques. **A Tradução Literária**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2016.

CÉSAR, Ana Cristina. **Crítica e Tradução**. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1999.

CHATMAN, Seymour. **Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film**. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.

CUPERTINO, Julieta. Felicidade e Outros contos. Available at: https://letras.cabaladada.org/letras/bliss.pdf. View date: 24 Jun 2019. 1991.

DUNBAR, Pamela. **What does Bertha want? A re-reading of Bliss.** Women's Studies Journal: Auckland, N.Z. Volume 4, Ed. 2, 1988.

EAGLETON, Terry. **Literary Theory: an Introduction**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1996.

FLUDERNIK, Monika. **The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness**. London: Routledge, 1993.

GALINDO, Caetano. **Tradução e Ficção**. In: Tradução & perspectivas teóricas e práticas. AMORIM, Lauro Maia et al (orgs). São Paulo: UNESP, 2015

_____. **A Rosa is a rose is arose: avaliando traduções de Grande sertão: veredas para o inglês.** O Eixo e a Roda, Volume 25, Number 1, p. 87-108, 2016.

GENETTE, Gerárd. **Narrative Discourse: an essay in method**. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

HERMAN, Luc; VERVAECK, Bart. **Handbook of Narrative Analysis**. Lincoln e Londres: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.

HERMANS, Theo. **The translator's voice in translated narrative**. Target 8(1), p. 23–48, 1996.

ISHERWOOD, Christopher. **"Katherine Mansfield"**, in Exhumations. Londres: Methuen & Co, 1996.

JAMES, Henry. What Maisie Knew. Available at: http://www.gutenberg.org/files/7118/7118-h/7118-h.htm. Release Date: March 12, 2003

JONES, Kathleen. **Katherine Mansfield: The Story-teller.** New Zealand: Penguin, 2010.

JOYCE, James. Dubliners. Available at: http://www.gutenberg.org/files/2814/2814-h/2814-h.htm. View date: 25 May 2019. 2001.

KIMBER, Gerri. Katherine Mansfield and the art of the short story. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

LEUVEN-ZWART, Kitty M. Van. **Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities I**. Target, Volume 1, Number 2, p. 151-81, 1989.

MAGALHÃES, Célia Maria; DE MELO, Ícaro Luiz Rodrigues. **Padrões de uso dos dois pontos e reticências em traduções de Paulo Henriques Britto como traço do estilo do tradutor.** Revista de Estudos da Linguagem, Belo Horizonte, v. 25, n. 1, p. 305-332, 2017.

MANSFIELD, Katherine. **The Collected Stories of Katherine Mansfield**. London: Wordsworth, 2016.

MARGOLIN, Uri. **"Narrator"**. In: HUHN, Peter et al. (eds.): the living handbook of narratology. Hamburg: Hamburg University. URL = http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/narrator. [view date:14 Mar 2019]

McHALE, Brian. **"Speech Representation"**. In: HUHN, Peter et al. (eds.): the living handbook of narratology. Hamburg: Hamburg University. URL = http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/speech-representation. [view date:12 Feb 2019]

MEISTER, Jan Christoph: **"Narratology"**. In: HUHN, Peter et al. (eds.): the living handbook of narratology. Hamburg: Hamburg University. URL = http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/narratology. [view date:12 Feb 2019]

MEYERS, Jeffrey. **Katherine Mansfield: A Biography.** London: Hamish Hamilton, 1978.

MUNDAY, Jeremy. **Introducing Translation Studies: theories and applications**. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

MURPHY, Terence Patrick. U**nreliable Third Person Narration? The Case of Katherine Mansfield.** Journal of Literary Semantics; 46(1): 67–85, 2017.

O'NEILL, Patrick. **Fictions of Discourse: Reading Narrative Theory**. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

O'SULLIVAN, Emer. **Narratology meets translation studies, or, the voice of the translator in children's literature**. Meta, Volume 48, Number 1-2, p. 197–207, 2003.

O'SULLIVAN, Vincent; SCOTT, Margaret (eds). **The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield, 4 vols.** Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

PASCAL, Roy. **The Dual Voice: Free Indirect Speech and Its Functioning in the Nineteenth-Century European Novel**. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1977.

PYM, Antony. **Explorando as Teorias da Tradução**. Translated by Rodrigo Borges de Faveri, Claudia Borges de Faveri and Juliana Steil. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2017.

RICHARDSON, Brian. **Unnatural voices: Extreme Narration in Modern and Contemporary Fiction**. The Ohio State University Press, 2006.

SCHIAVI, Giuliana. **There is always a teller in a tale.** Target: International Journal of Translation Studies Volume 8, Number 1, p. 1–21, 1996.

SEIDINGER, Gilca Machado. **Guimarães Rosa em tradução: o texto literário e a versão alemã de Tutaméia**. São Paulo: Editora da UNESP, 2011.

SHEN, Dan. **"Unreliability"**. In: HÜHN, Peter et al. (eds.). the living handbook of narratology. Hamburg: Hamburg University. URL = http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/unreliability. [view

date:16 May 2019]

SOTIROVA, Violeta. **D. H. Lawrence and Narrative Viewpoint**. London and New York: Continuum Books, 2011.

STERNBERG, Meir; YACOBI, Tamar. **(Un)Reliability in Narrative Discourse: A Comprehensive Overview**. Poetics Today, Volume 36, Number 4, 2015.

STERNBERG, Meir. **Universals of Narrative and Their Cognitivist Fortunes (I)**. Poetics Today, Volume 24, Number 2, p. 297-395 (Article), 2003.

_____. **Telling in Time (II): Chronology, Teleology, Narrativity**. Poetics Today, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 463-541, 1992.

TOOLAN, Michael. **The 'irresponsibility' of FID**. In: TAMMI, Pekka; TOMMOLA, Hannu (eds.). FREE language INDIRECT translation DISCOURSE narratology. Tampere: Tampere UP, p. 261–78, 2006.

TOURY, Gideon. **The nature and role of norms in literary translation**. In: VENUTI, Lawrence. The translation studies reader. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

WOOLF, Virginia. **Mrs Dalloway**. London: Penguin Books, 1996.

ANNEX – *BLISS*, BY KATHERINE MANSFIELD

Although Bertha Young was thirty she still had moments like this when she wanted to run instead of walk, to take dancing steps on and off the pavement, to bowl a hoop, to throw something up in the air and catch it again, or to stand still and laugh at - nothing - at nothing, simply.

What can you do if you are thirty and, turning the corner of your own street, you are overcome, suddenly by a feeling of bliss - absolute bliss! - as though you'd suddenly swallowed a bright piece of that late afternoon sun and it burned in your bosom, sending out a little shower of sparks into every particle, into every finger and toe? ...

Oh, is there no way you can express it without being "drunk and disorderly"? How idiotic civilisation is! Why be given a body if you have to keep it shut up in a case like a rare, rare fiddle?

No, that about the fiddle is not quite what I mean," she thought, running up the steps and feeling in her bag for the key - she'd forgotten it, as usual - and rattling the letter-box. "It's not what I mean, because - Thank you, Mary" - she went into the hall. "Is nurse back?"

"Yes, M'm."

"And has the fruit come?"

"Yes, M'm. Everything's come."

"Bring the fruit up to the dining-room, will you? I'll arrange it before I go upstairs."

It was dusky in the dining-room and quite chilly. But all the same Bertha threw off her coat; she could not bear the tight clasp of it another moment, and the cold air fell on her arms.

But in her bosom there was still that bright glowing place - that shower of little sparks coming from it. It was almost unbearable. She hardly dared to breathe for fear of fanning it higher, and yet she breathed deeply, deeply. She hardly dared to look into the cold mirror - but she did look, and it gave her back a woman, radiant, with smiling, trembling lips, with big, dark eyes and an air of listening, waiting for something ... divine to happen ... that she knew must happen ... infallibly.

Mary brought in the fruit on a tray and with it a glass bowl, and a blue dish, very lovely, with a strange sheen on it as though it had been dipped in milk.

"Shall I turn on the light, M'm?"

"No, thank you. I can see quite well."

There were tangerines and apples stained with strawberry pink. Some yellow pears, smooth as silk, some white grapes covered with a silver bloom and a big cluster of purple ones. These last she had bought to tone in with the new dining-room carpet. Yes, that did sound rather far-fetched and absurd, but it was really why she had bought them. She had thought in the shop: "I must have some purple ones to bring the carpet up to the table." And it had seemed quite sense at the time.

When she had finished with them and had made two pyramids of these bright round shapes, she stood away from the table to get the effect - and it really was most curious. For the dark table seemed to melt into the dusky light and the glass dish and the blue bowl to float in the air. This, of course, in her present mood, was so incredibly beautiful ... She began to laugh.

"No, no. I'm getting hysterical." And she seized her bag and coat and ran upstairs to the nursery.

Nurse sat at a low table giving Little B her supper after her bath. The baby had on a white flannel gown and a blue woollen jacket, and her dark, fine hair was brushed up into a funny little peak. She looked up when she saw her mother and began to jump.

"Now, my lovey, eat it up like a good girl," said nurse, setting her lips in a way that Bertha knew, and that meant she had come into the nursery at another wrong moment.

"Has she been good, Nanny?"

"She's been a little sweet all the afternoon," whispered Nanny. "We went to the park and I sat down on a chair and took her out of the pram and a big dog came along and put its head on my knee and she clutched its ear, tugged it. Oh, you should have seen her."

Bertha wanted to ask if it wasn't rather dangerous to let her clutch at a strange dog's ear. But she did not dare to. She stood watching them, her hands by her side, like the poor little girl in front of the rich girl with the doll.

The baby looked up at her again, stared, and then smiled so charmingly that Bertha couldn't help crying:

"Oh, Nanny, do let me finish giving her her supper while you put the bath things away.

"Well, M'm, she oughtn't to be changed hands while she's eating," said Nanny, still whispering. "It unsettles her; it's very likely to upset her."

How absurd it was. Why have a baby if it has to be kept - not in a case like a rare, rare fiddle - but in another woman's arms?

"Oh, I must!" said she.

Very offended, Nanny handed her over.

"Now, don't excite her after her supper. You know you do, M'm. And I have such a time with her after!"

Thank heaven! Nanny went out of the room with the bath towels.

"Now I've got you to myself, my little precious," said Bertha, as the baby leaned against her.

She ate delightfully, holding up her lips for the spoon and then waving her hands. Sometimes she wouldn't let the spoon go; and sometimes, just as Bertha had filled it, she waved it away to the four winds.

When the soup was finished Bertha turned round to the fire. "You're nice - you're very nice!" said she, kissing her warm baby. "I'm fond of you. I like you."

And indeed, she loved Little B so much - her neck as she bent forward, her exquisite toes as they shone transparent in the firelight - that all her feeling of bliss came back again, and again she didn't know how to express it - what to do with it.

"You're wanted on the telephone," said Nanny, coming back in triumph and seizing her Little B.

Down she flew. It was Harry.

"Oh, is that you, Ber? Look here. I'll be late. I'll take a taxi and come along as quickly as I can, but get dinner put back ten minutes - will you? All right?"

"Yes, perfectly. Oh, Harry!"

"Yes?"

What had she to say? She'd nothing to say. She only wanted to get in touch with him for a moment. She couldn't absurdly cry: "Hasn't it been a divine day!"

"What is it?" rapped out the little voice.

"Nothing. Entendu," said Bertha, and hung up the receiver, thinking how much more than idiotic civilisation was.

They had people coming to dinner. The Norman Knights - a very sound couple - he was about to start a theatre, and she was awfully keen on interior decoration, a young man, Eddie Warren, who had just published a little book of poems and whom everybody was asking to dine, and a "find" of Bertha's called Pearl Fulton. What Miss Fulton did, Bertha didn't know. They had met at the club and Bertha had fallen in love with her, as she always did fall in love with beautiful women who had something strange about them.

The provoking thing was that, though they had been about together and met a number of times and really talked, Bertha couldn't make her out. Up to a certain point Miss Fulton was rarely, wonderfully frank, but the certain point was there, and beyond that she would not go.

Was there anything beyond it? Harry said "No." Voted her dullish, and "cold like all blonde women, with a touch, perhaps, of anaemia of the brain." But Bertha wouldn't agree with him; not yet, at any rate.

"No, the way she has of sitting with her head a little on one side, and smiling, has something behind it, Harry, and I must find out what that something is."

"Most likely it's a good stomach," answered Harry.

He made a point of catching Bertha's heels with replies of that kind ... "liver frozen, my dear girl," or "pure flatulence," or "kidney disease," ... and so on. For some strange reason Bertha liked this,

and almost admired it in him very much.

She went into the drawing-room and lighted the fire; then, picking up the cushions, one by one, that Mary had disposed so carefully, she threw them back on to the chairs and the couches. That made all the difference; the room came alive at once. As she was about to throw the last one she surprised herself by suddenly hugging it to her, passionately, passionately. But it did not put out the fire in her bosom. Oh, on the contrary!

The windows of the drawing-room opened on to a balcony overlooking the garden. At the far end, against the wall, there was a tall, slender pear tree in fullest, richest bloom; it stood perfect, as though becalmed against the jade-green sky. Bertha couldn't help feeling, even from this distance, that it had not a single bud or a faded petal. Down below, in the garden beds, the red and yellow tulips, heavy with flowers, seemed to lean upon the dusk. A grey cat, dragging its belly, crept across the lawn, and a black one, its shadow, trailed after. The sight of them, so intent and so quick, gave Bertha a curious shiver.

"What creepy things cats are!" she stammered, and she turned away from the window and began walking up and down ...

How strong the jonquils smelled in the warm room. Too strong? Oh, no. And yet, as though overcome, she flung down on a couch and pressed her hands to her eyes.

"I'm too happy - too happy!" she murmured.

And she seemed to see on her eyelids the lovely pear tree with its wide open blossoms as a symbol of her own life.

Really - really - she had everything. She was young. Harry and she were as much in love as ever, and they got on together splendidly and were really good pals. She had an adorable baby. They didn't have to worry about money. They had this absolutely satisfactory house and garden. And friends - modern, thrilling friends, writers and painters and poets or people keen on social questions - just the kind of friends they wanted. And then there were books, and there was music, and she had found a wonderful little dressmaker, and they were going abroad in the summer, and their new cook made the most superb omelettes ...

"I'm absurd. Absurd!" She sat up; but she felt quite dizzy, quite drunk. It must have been the spring.

Yes, it was the spring. Now she was so tired she could not drag herself upstairs to dress.

A white dress, a string of jade beads, green shoes and stockings. It wasn't intentional. She had thought of this scheme hours before she stood at the drawing-room window.

Her petals rustled softly into the hall, and she kissed Mrs. Norman Knight, who was taking off the most amusing orange coat with a procession of black monkeys round the hem and up the fronts.

" ... Why! Why! Why is the middle-class so stodgy - so utterly without a sense of humour! My dear, it's only by a fluke that I am here at all - Norman being the protective fluke. For my darling monkeys so upset the train that it rose to a man and simply ate me with its eyes. Didn't laugh - wasn't amused - that I should have loved. No, just stared - and bored me through and through."   "But   the cream of it was," said Norman, pressing a large tortoiseshell-rimmed monocle into his eye, "you don't mind me telling this, Face, do you?" (In their home and among their friends they called each other Face and Mug.) "The cream of it was when she, being full fed, turned to the woman beside her and said: 'Haven't you ever seen a monkey before?'"

"Oh, yes!" Mrs. Norman Knight joined in the laughter. "Wasn't that too absolutely creamy?"

And a funnier thing still was that now her coat was off she did look like a very intelligent monkey who had even made that yellow silk dress out of scraped banana skins. And her amber ear-rings: they were like little dangling nuts.

"This is a sad, sad fall!" said Mug, pausing in front of Little B's perambulator. "When the perambulator comes into the hall--" and he waved the rest of the quotation away.

The bell rang. It was lean, pale Eddie Warren (as usual) in a state of acute distress.

"It is the right house, isn't it?" he pleaded.

"Oh, I think so - I hope so," said Bertha brightly.

"I have had such a dreadful experience with a taxi-man; he was most sinister. I couldn't get him

to stop. The more I knocked and called the faster he went. And in the moonlight this bizarre figure with the flattened head crouching over the little wheel ... "

He shuddered, taking off an immense white silk scarf. Bertha noticed that his socks were white, too - most charming.

"But how dreadful!" she cried.

"Yes, it really was," said Eddie, following her into the drawing-room. "I saw myself driving through Eternity in a timeless taxi."

He knew the Norman Knights. In fact, he was going to write a play for N.K. when the theatre scheme came off.

"Well, Warren, how's the play?" said Norman Knight, dropping his monocle and giving his eye a moment in which to rise to the surface before it was screwed down again.

And Mrs. Norman Knight: "Oh, Mr. Warren, what happy socks?"

"I am so glad you like them," said he, staring at his feet. "They seem to have got so much whiter since the moon rose." And he turned his lean sorrowful young face to Bertha. "There is a moon, you know."

She wanted to cry: "I am sure there is - often - often!"

He really was a most attractive person. But so was Face, crouched before the fire in her banana skins, and so was Mug, smoking a cigarette and saying as he flicked the ash: "Why doth the bridegroom tarry?"

"There he is, now."

Bang went the front door open and shut. Harry shouted: "Hullo, you people. Down in five minutes." And they heard him swarm up the stairs. Bertha couldn't help smiling; she knew how he loved doing things at high pressure. What, after all, did an extra five minutes matter? But he would pretend to himself that they mattered beyond measure. And then he would make a great point of coming into the drawing-room, extravagantly cool and collected.

Harry had such a zest for life. Oh, how she appreciated it in him. And his passion for fighting - for seeking in everything that came up against him another test of his power and of his courage - that, too, she understood. Even when it made him just occasionally, to other people, who didn't know him well, a little ridiculous perhaps ... For there were moments when he rushed into battle where no battle was ... She talked and laughed and positively forgot until he had come in (just as she had imagined) that Pearl Fulton had not turned up.

"I wonder if Miss Fulton has forgotten?"

"I expect so," said Harry. "Is she on the 'phone?"

"Ah! There's a taxi, now." And Bertha smiled with that little air of proprietorship that she always assumed while her women finds were new and mysterious. "She lives in taxis."

"She'll run to fat if she does," said Harry coolly, ringing the bell for dinner. "Frightful danger for blonde women."

"Harry - don't!" warned Bertha, laughing up at him.

Came another tiny moment, while they waited, laughing and talking, just a trifle too much at their ease, a trifle too unaware. And then Miss Fulton, all in silver, with a silver fillet binding her pale blonde hair, came in smiling, her head a little on one side.

"Am I late?"

"No, not at all," said Bertha. "Come along." And she took her arm and they moved into the dining-room.

What was there in the touch of that cool arm that could fan - start blazing - the fire of bliss that Bertha did not know what to do with?

Miss Fulton did not look at her; but then she seldom did look at people directly. Her heavy eyelids lay upon her eyes and the strange half-smile came and went upon her lips as though she lived by listening rather than seeing. But Bertha knew, suddenly, as if the longest, most intimate look had passed between them - as if they had said to each other: "You too?" - that Pearl Fulton, stirring the beautiful red soup in the grey plate, was feeling just what she was feeling.

And the others? Face and Mug, Eddie and Harry, their spoons rising and falling - dabbing their

lips with their napkins, crumbling bread, fiddling with the forks and glasses and talking.

"I met her at the Alpha show - the weirdest little person. She'd not only cut off her hair, but she seemed to have taken a dreadfully good snip off her legs and arms and her neck and her poor little nose as well."

"Isn't she very liee with Michael Oat?"

"The man who wrote Love in False Teeth? "

"He wants to write a play for me. One act. One man. Decides to commit suicide. Gives all the reasons why he should and why he shouldn't. And just as he has made up his mind either to do it or not to do it - curtain. Not half a bad idea."

"What's he going to call it - 'Stomach Trouble' ?"

"I think I've come across the same idea in a little French review, quite unknown in England."

No, they didn't share it. They were dears - dears - and she loved having them there, at her table, and giving them delicious food and wine. In fact, she longed to tell them how delightful they were, and what a decorative group they made, how they seemed to set one another off and how they reminded her of a play by Tchekof!

Harry was enjoying his dinner. It was part of his - well, not his nature, exactly, and certainly not his pose - his - something or other - to talk about food and to glory in his "shameless passion for the white flash of the lobster" and "the green of pistachio ices - green and cold like the eyelids of Egyptian dancers."

When he looked up at her and said: "Bertha, this is a very admirable soufflee! " she almost could have wept with child-like pleasure.

Oh, why did she feel so tender towards the whole world tonight? Everything was good - was right. All that happened seemed to fill again her brimming cup of bliss.

And still, in the back of her mind, there was the pear tree. It would be silver now, in the light of poor dear Eddie's moon, silver as Miss Fulton, who sat there turning a tangerine in her slender fingers that were so pale a light seemed to come from them.

What she simply couldn't make out - what was miraculous - was how she should have guessed Miss Fulton's mood so exactly and so instantly. For she never doubted for a moment that she was right, and yet what had she to go on? Less than nothing.

"I believe this does happen very, very rarely between women. Never between men," thought Bertha. "But while I am making the coffee in the drawing-room perhaps she will 'give a sign' "

What she meant by that she did not know, and what would happen after that she could not imagine.

While she thought like this she saw herself talking and laughing. She had to talk because of her desire to laugh.

"I must laugh or die."

But when she noticed Face's funny little habit of tucking something down the front of her bodice - as if she kept a tiny, secret hoard of nuts there, too - Bertha had to dig her nails into her hands - so as not to laugh too much.

It was over at last. And: "Come and see my new coffee machine," said Bertha.

"We only have a new coffee machine once a fortnight," said Harry. Face took her arm this time; Miss Fulton bent her head and followed after.

The fire had died down in the drawing-room to a red, flickering "nest of baby phoenixes," said Face.

"Don't turn up the light for a moment. It is so lovely." And down she crouched by the fire again. She was always cold ... "without her little red flannel jacket, of course," thought Bertha.

At that moment Miss Fulton "gave the sign."

"Have you a garden?" said the cool, sleepy voice.

This was so exquisite on her part that all Bertha could do was to obey. She crossed the room, pulled the curtains apart, and opened those long windows.

"There!" she breathed.

And the two women stood side by side looking at the slender, flowering tree. Although it was so

still it seemed, like the flame of a candle, to stretch up, to point, to quiver in the bright air, to grow taller and taller as they gazed - almost to touch the rim of the round, silver moon.

How long did they stand there? Both, as it were, caught in that circle of unearthly light, understanding each other perfectly, creatures of another world, and wondering what they were to do in this one with all this blissful treasure that burned in their bosoms and dropped, in silver flowers, from their hair and hands?

For ever - for a moment? And did Miss Fulton murmur: "Yes. Just that." Or did Bertha dream it?

Then the light was snapped on and Face made the coffee and Harry said: "My dear Mrs. Knight, don't ask me about my baby. I never see her. I shan't feel the slightest interest in her until she has a lover," and Mug took his eye out of the conservatory for a moment and then put it under glass again and Eddie Warren drank his coffee and set down the cup with a face of anguish as though he had drunk and seen the spider.

"What I want to do is to give the young men a show. I believe London is simply teeming with first-chop, unwritten plays. What I want to say to 'em is: 'Here's the theatre. Fire ahead.'"

"You know, my dear, I am going to decorate a room for the Jacob Nathans. Oh, I am so tempted to do a fried-fish scheme, with the backs of the chairs shaped like frying-pans and lovely chip potatoes embroidered all over the curtains."

"The trouble with our young writing men is that they are still too romantic. You can't put out to sea without being seasick and wanting a basin. Well, why won't they have the courage of those basins?"

"A dreadful poem about a girl who was violated by a beggar without a nose in a little wood ... "

Miss Fulton sank into the lowest, deepest chair and Harry handed round the cigarettes.

From the way he stood in front of her shaking the silver box and saying abruptly: "Egyptian? Turkish? Virginian? They're all mixed up," Bertha realised that she not only bored him; he really disliked her. And she decided from the way Miss Fulton said: "No, thank you, I won't smoke," that she felt it, too, and was hurt.

"Oh, Harry, don't dislike her. You are quite wrong about her. She's wonderful, wonderful. And, besides, how can you feel so differently about someone who means so much to me. I shall try to tell you when we are in bed tonight what has been happening. What she and I have shared."

At those last words something strange and almost terrifying darted into Bertha's mind. And this something blind and smiling whispered to her: "Soon these people will go. The house will be quiet - quiet. The lights will be out. And you and he will be alone together in the dark room - the warm bed ... "

She jumped up from her chair and ran over to the piano.

"What a pity someone does not play!" she cried. "What a pity somebody does not play."

For the first time in her life Bertha Young desired her husband. Oh, she'd loved him - she'd been in love with him, of course, in every other way, but just not in that way. And equally, of course, she'd understood that he was different. They'd discussed it so often. It had worried her dreadfully at first to find that she was so cold, but after a time it had not seemed to matter. They were so frank with each other - such good pals. That was the best of being modern.

But now - ardently! ardently! The word ached in her ardent body! Was this what that feeling of bliss had been leading up to? But then, then - "My dear," said Mrs. Norman Knight, "you know our shame. We are the victims of time and train. We live in Hampstead. It's been so nice."

"I'll come with you into the hall," said Bertha. "I loved having you. But you must not miss the last train. That's so awful, isn't it?"

"Have a whisky, Knight, before you go?" called Harry.

"No, thanks, old chap."

Bertha squeezed his hand for that as she shook it.

"Good night, good-bye," she cried from the top step, feeling that this self of hers was taking leave of them for ever.

When she got back into the drawing-room the others were on the move.

" ... Then you can come part of the way in my taxi."

"I shall be so thankful not to have to face another drive alone after my dreadful experience."

"You can get a taxi at the rank just at the end of the street. You won't have to walk more than a

few yards."

"That's a comfort. I'll go and put on my coat."

Miss Fulton moved towards the hall and Bertha was following when Harry almost pushed past.

"Let me help you."

Bertha knew that he was repenting his rudeness - she let him go. What a boy he was in some ways - so impulsive - sosimple.

And Eddie and she were left by the fire.

"I wonder if you have seen Bilks' new poem called Table d'Hote," said Eddie softly. "It's so wonderful. In the last Anthology. Have you got a copy? I'd so like to show it to you. It begins with an incredibly beautiful line: 'Why Must it Always be Tomato Soup?'"

"Yes," said Bertha. And she moved noiselessly to a table opposite the drawing-room door and Eddie glided noiselessly after her. She picked up the little book and gave it to him; they had not made a sound.

While he looked it up she turned her head towards the hall. And she saw ... Harry with Miss Fulton's coat in his arms and Miss Fulton with her back turned to him and her head bent. He tossed the coat away, put his hands on her shoulders and turned her violently to him. His lips said: "I adore you," and Miss Fulton laid her moonbeam fingers on his cheeks and smiled her sleepy smile. Harry's nostrils quivered; his lips curled back in a hideous grin while he whispered: "Tomorrow," and with her eyelids Miss Fulton said: "Yes."

"Here it is," said Eddie. "'Why Must it Always be Tomato Soup?' It's so deeply true, don't you feel? Tomato soup is so dreadfully eternal."

"If you prefer," said Harry's voice, very loud, from the hall, "I can phone you a cab to come to the door."

"Oh, no. It's not necessary," said Miss Fulton, and she came up to Bertha and gave her the slender fingers to hold.

"Good-bye. Thank you so much."

"Good-bye," said Bertha.

Miss Fulton held her hand a moment longer.

"Your lovely pear tree!" she murmured.

And then she was gone, with Eddie following, like the black cat following the grey cat.

"I'll shut up shop," said Harry, extravagantly cool and collected.

"Your lovely pear tree - pear tree - pear tree!"

Bertha simply ran over to the long windows.

"Oh, what is going to happen now?" she cried.

But the pear tree was as lovely as ever and as full of flower and as still.