



Uroš Mozetič

University of Ljubljana
Faculty of Arts, English Department

Narrative Perspective and Focalisation in Translating Fictional Narratives

Summary

The main objective of this paper is to present the complex processes of the shifting of narrative perspective (point-of-view) and focus in translating English prose texts into Slovene. For that purpose, a narratological discourse analysis of James Joyce's story 'Eveline' (*Dubliners*) is introduced, drawing on K. M. van Leuven-Zwart's comparative and descriptive model. The model, which has been expanded by three additional categories – narrative mode, narrative perspective, and focalisation –, brings to the forefront the cause-and-effect relationship between the micro- and macrostructural shifts on the one hand, and the shifts in narrative perspective and focalisation on the other. The results obtained show that the model is empirically verifiable and repeatable. This means that it can also be used with other integral translations, particularly if translation shifts are subtle enough and/or consistent with the translator's dominant strategy and norm.

Pripovedno glediščenje in žariščenje pri prevajanju proznih besedil

Povzetek

Razprava prinaša nekaj novih pogledov na problem glediščenja in žariščenja pri prevajanju proznih besedil. Za opisovanje in vrednotenje tovrstnih premikov smo se oprli na primerjalni in opisni model K. M. van Leuven-Zwart, ki smo ga razširili s tremi naratološkimi kategorijami, in sicer s pripovednim načinom, gledišč(enj)em in žarišč(enj)em. Na ta način smo skušali pojasniti vzročno in posledično razmerje med mikro- in makroskstrukturnimi spremembami ter premiki v raziskovanih kategorijah. Tako prirejen model, ki smo ga preizkusili na primeru Joyceove zgodbe 'Evelina' (*Ljudje iz Dublina*), se je izkazal kot empirično zanesljiv in preverljiv, kar pomeni, da je uporaben tudi pri drugih celostnih (integralnih) prevodnih besedilih. Njegova zanesljivost pa je odvisna od stopnje pretanjenosti in/ali doslednosti prevodnih premikov v skladu s prevajalčevo prevladujočo strategijo in normo.

The Shifting of Narrative Perspective and Focalisation in Translating Fictional Texts

1. Introduction

Among the many unresolved issues in the field of translation studies is also the one pertaining to the question of who sees/speaks in the source and in the target text. Any tackling of the problem of narrative perspective and voice in translation process inevitably brings into play a long list of complementary disciplines such as narratology, literary stylistics, text linguistics, and a few other, somewhat more circumstantially related critical practices like literary pragmatics, to name but one. Ever since the publication of the pioneer research into narrative perspective and voice in translation conducted by Levenston and Sonnenschein in 1986, translation studies have seemed to be neglecting this problem, at the same time giving priority to (cross/inter) cultural studies and literary comparative enquiry as well as various forms of political discourse. The (original) text *per se* has thus, at least in the eye of a translator, acquired the status of an entity inseparable from its wider determining context, with its linguistic and stylistic constituency pushed to the background of investigation. However irrefutable such positioning of the text may be, the fact remains that without thorough examination of individual textual components by themselves and in relation to each other within the framework of the same text, it is virtually impossible to make the text play along with what literary pragmatists pursue, namely the (in)communicability of the text with (in/out) proper *contextualization*.¹

Our principal objective will be to prove that there is, after all, such a thing as immanent communicability of the text, dependent solely on its internal structuration and vital drawing on the given textual premises, but which, if observed from a distance and in relation to a wider context, may configure in a way which is essentially different and also more productive since the aim of exploring literature should not simply be in terms of how literature can affect our lives but rather the other way round (somewhat along the lines of Wallace Stevens' dictum expressed in his *Adagia*, namely that "life is a reflection of literature"). To this effect, I intend to go, firstly, into the original text of James Joyce's *Dubliners*², in order to extrapolate the prevailing narrative strategies with respect to narrative perspective and focalisation and their rendering in the Slovene translation. Secondly, the results obtained

¹ "[L]iterary pragmatics takes for granted that no account of communication in general will be complete without an account of literature and its contextualization, and that no account of literature will be complete without an account of its use of the communicative resources generally available" (Sell 1991, xiv).

² The main reason for selecting this text was motivated by the fact that, in *Dubliners*, Joyce combines the characteristic features of both traditional (realist) and modernist modes of writing, which makes possible the observance of the shifting of narrative perspective and focalisation across a wide range of narrative techniques used by the author to manipulate the narrator and the character. The Dublin texts are often regarded as a special type of realist-modernist short story, breaking with – yet at the same time establishing – a completely new relationship with the conventional mode of narrating (cf. Parrinder 1990, 41). Unlike Joyce's later writings, notably *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, where the narrator's/auctorial voice promptly withdraws in order to leave the stage more or less entirely to

from the comparative analysis of the selected segments from both the source and target texts on the micro-structural level will be compared with the effects that take place on the macro-structural level. I expect that the employment of the comparative–descriptive method for analysing shifts in narrative perspective and focalisation will provide adequate insight into those textual conditions that significantly govern the realisation of these two categories in the original as well as translated narrative.

The Levenston and Sonnenschein study appears to be more significant in its breaking new ground and drawing attention to transformations of specific narrative aspects which occur during a translation process than in its resolving the problems dealt with. The conclusions drawn by the authors are to a large extent hindered by a failure in the methodology employed: first, the question of who speaks and who sees in a fictional narrative is too easily dismissed by a general attribution of speech activity to the narrator except in the case of direct speech, where the speaking is performed by the character (1986, 49). Second, there is a bit of confusion in the taxonomy for observation of shifts in narrative perspective as proposed by the authors (*ibid.*, 53–4): the four categories – *register-restricted vocabulary items, collocations and clichés, word order, and free indirect speech* – do not in fact operate on the same level, in that the first three fall within the domain of the fourth one, which in turn cannot possibly serve as a criterion for studying narrative perspective and focalisation because it is the product rather than the source of special linguistic and stylistic devices dictated by a given perceptive, psychological, or ideological activity on the part of the narrator/character.

The fact that the identity of the speaker/seer in a stretch of narrative is an intriguingly complex matter is supported by the long history of narratological endeavours³ to adequately explain what, or better still, who is behind it all when we come across, for instance, the following situation (Joyce 1967, 200):

- (1) Besides they were dreadfully afraid that Freddie Malins might turn up screwed. They would not wish for worlds that any of Mary Jane's pupils should see him under the influence.

/Underlined by U. M., as in all subsequent quotes./

– because it seems virtually impossible to determine the exact proportion of auctorial/character presence in a text which resorts to such unpredictable shifts in register as exemplified above. What is at stake here, of course, concerns as much the teller as it does the observer. Whether these two can be identified as one person or two is the point under discussion. The excerpt from *The Dead* is presented entirely in the so-called free indirect speech, which is in itself so

³ Especially since the publication of G. Genette's seminal work, *Narrative Discourse* 1980, which formally introduced the differentiation between the teller and the observer as well as between point of view and focalisation, scholars have perpetually concerned themselves with textual circumstances which generate various degrees or levels of speech/view presentation in a narrative text (cf., for example, S. Chatman's dichotomous narrative model comprising perceptual vs. conceptual point of view 1978; M. Bal's concept of first, second- etc. degree of focalisation 1983;

Although Short's model is highly instrumental in setting formal criteria for pursuing discourse analysis of any fictional narrative, it does not answer all the questions related to narrative perspective and focalisation, especially the one concerning the function of teller/observer in the case of free indirect discourse.

The many conflicting aspects and functions of free indirect discourse have, therefore, been on the agenda ever since its first occurrence as a separate issue in theoretical discourse. Even today, one would sooner fall into the intricate web of inadequate or disparate theories about free indirect discourse than come across a simple, albeit simplifying and lucid extrapolation of its concrete effectuality. One only has to refer to the most comprehensive English grammar, the chapter on *Reporting the language of others*: "Free indirect speech is used extensively to report speech or (particularly in fiction) the stream of thought ... Free direct speech is also used in fiction writing to represent a person's stream of thought" (Quirk et al. 1994, 1020–33). However, there have been a few attempts in the past decade at clarifying the terminological confusion regarding various forms of representing the mental processing of characters taking place in the fictional narrative, notably the one made by K. Wales: "... and I shall therefore here take 'interior monologue' as the blanket term for what is essentially free direct thought and for different kinds of thought processes. 'Stream of consciousness', as with Humphrey (1954) is therefore reserved for the general representation of thought-processes by a variety of means, including (free) direct thought, (free) indirect thought, narrative report, etc" (Wales 1992, 75). An overlapping of stream of consciousness and interior monologue can thus be found with Fowler (1989b, 127–46), where both categories are treated as techniques of realising the same point of view. Such treatment may be disputed on the grounds that stream of consciousness and interior monologue should, strictly speaking, be seen more as psychological categories, literarily contextualised, than as linguistic-stylistic techniques. They are, after all, the effect of certain textual procedures, rather than their cause. Moreover, their psychological nature is manifested in their representing a concrete mental state/activity of a fictional character.

The representation of the psychological dynamics within characters is no doubt crucially dependent on the way(s) of representing the characters' speech/thought activity. However, I believe that a translator's adequate rendering of the relationships between individual protagonists in the fictional world has to, first and foremost, take account of the medium of conveying narrative information. Here I am referring to the so-called *filter*, as defined by S. Chatman (1990) and extensively commented upon by T. Sasaki⁵, along with the other two central categories replacing the traditional concept of narrative perspective, i.e. *slant* and

⁵ "Slant" refers to the narrator's attitudes and other mental nuances appropriate to the report function of discourse (e.g. there is an ironic 'slant' here). 'Filter' denotes the mental activity experienced by characters in the story world. (Narrative information may be 'filtered' through Tom, and when the inner world of his mind is described he becomes the 'filter', or he is 'infiltrated'.) 'Interest-focus' is related to the character in whose interest the reader is invited to read the narrative..." (Sasaki 1994, 126). The author finds a number of theories (e.g. G. Genette's concept of *focalisation*, 1983; M. Bal's development of the notions *focaliser* and *focalised* 1983; R. Fowler's tripartite model of point of view 1989, derived from B. Uspensky 1973) inadequate in terms of failing to incorporate the *interest-focus* as the

interest-focus. The latter, interestingly, resembles Halliday's interpersonal function of language (1973) since in both cases the locutor/narrator's interfering with the speech act is motivated by their endeavour to establish a link between the sender and the receiver of the message. The interpersonal function, moreover, significantly ties in with the distance between the reader and the narrated characters, in which case it may still be justifiable to maintain the distinction between free indirect speech and free indirect thought, which is in accordance with the Short model discussed above: with the former, the distance between the reader and the character tends to shorten, whereas with the latter, insisting on the reader's more active engagement in the mental activity of the character, the effect seems to be the opposite (cf. also note 3).

Every translator of a fictional text, before embarking on the translation of their text, has to consider all the relevant discourse parameters, i.e. general linguistic and stylistic features as well as idiosyncratic peculiarities which make possible the realisation of the textual potentiality as to who sees and who speaks in the narrative. Our research, drawn on the theoretical and practical results of the contrastive analysis of the selected English prose texts and their corresponding Slovene translations, has revealed significant deviations especially on the axis narrator – narratee. This is largely due to the translators' inaccurate determination of the narrative mode(s) used, resulting in the displacement of the roles of the seer/speaker designated by the author of the original text. We can observe the greatest number of shifts in translation in those instances where the text either develops simultaneously on different narrative levels or where there is a comparatively weak signalling of shifting from one level to another, sometimes even within a single sentence or clause. Such narrative manipulation enables the author to introduce a variety of perspectives on the same issue and “juxtapose two sets of values, to imply a critique of the character's views without the direct judgement which an external perspective would produce” (Fowler 1989b, 138). What ensues from the interplay of two or more different views might be called a kind of hybrid perspective, the realisation of which is left entirely to the reader. The case of bringing together the author's (objective) and the character's (subjective) perspective, which happens to be the most frequent situation produced by free indirect discourse, gives rise to the emergence of the so-called *double voice*, within which one set of values, beliefs, etc. is involved in implicit dialogue with another (ibid., 140.) The concept of *double voice* seems to be a plausible suggestion as to who really speaks in free indirect discourse, even though it significantly departs from the traditional notion, conceived already by Genette (1972), according to which the narrator is always the speaker, except in direct speech, where the speaking is performed by the characters. What Genette's theory fails to take into account is that, particularly in free indirect discourse, the author attempts to imitate the speech of the character by using the kind of lexis, grammar, and other structural and stylistic peculiarities pertaining to the typical speech and emotive behaviour of that character, but presented in the auctorial past tense and third person singular (cf. Brinton 1980, 363). The interaction between the voice of the author/narrator and that of the character can best be illustrated by

quoting a passage from one of the *Dubliners* stories, ‘Clay’ (Joyce 1967, 112–3), in which Maria’s own description of her self-perception in the mirror is juxtaposed with that of the author/narrator:

- (2) She changed her blouse too and, as she stood before the mirror, she thought of how she used to dress on Sunday morning when she was a young girl; and she looked with quaint affection at the diminutive body which she had so often adorned. In spite of its years she found it a nice tidy little body.

The contrast between the part underlined (the exact words that Maria would use in the first-person singular discourse) and the preceding description is striking enough to create the so-called *narrative irony* and thus maintain the distance between the author/narrator and the character (cf. Short 1991, 71–2).

The problem which also ties in with the immanent features of free indirect discourse is *double imagery*. In his study of Joyce’s *Ulysses*, S. Benstock, in contrast to the traditional identification of narrative participants in terms of speakers, chooses to juxtapose contextual subjects and their idiosyncratic mental patterning, personal tone, attitude, modulation, etc. which he sees as concomitant with their respective verbal manifestations (1980, 266–7). The critic’s attempt to go behind the working of free indirect discourse ultimately brings him to the correlation between double voice and double perspective, when, on the basis of his close analysis of the opening sentence in the novel, he realises that there have to be two different observers of Buck Mulligan since the adjectives *stately* and *plump* are not only incompatible in the denotative and connotative sense, but also mutually exclusive (Joyce 1987, 3):

- (3) Stately, plump Buck Mulligan came from the stairhead ...

The example is at the same time perfectly illustrative of M. Bakhtin’s notion of *heteroglossia*, that is “another’s speech in another’s language”.⁶ This can be said of any discourse which “has a twofold direction – it is directed both toward the referential object of speech, as in ordinary discourse, and toward another’s discourse, toward someone else’s speech” (Bakhtin in Fludernik 1993, 325).

What is of particular interest here is that it is possible to come across *double-voiced discourse* in a very limited stretch of language, sometimes even within a single phrase, which must inevitably present a special difficulty for a translator of any text structured according to the principle of the polyphony of voices and perspectives.

⁶ Bakhtin maintains that *double-voiced discourse* “serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author. In such discourse there are two voices, two meanings and two expressions. And all the while these two voices are dialogically interrelated, they – as it were – know about each other (just as two exchanges in a dialogue know of each other and are structured in this mutual knowledge of each other); it is as if they actually hold a con-

The postulation of double-voiced discourse logically entails the existence of something which I would like to term *double-viewed discourse*. As the excerpt (2) demonstrates, the free indirect discourse mode depends for its effect on the simultaneous speaking as well as seeing on the part of the narrator and character involved. Consequently, two distinctive perspectives and their verbal manifestations can be emphasised to the point of presenting the reader with a set of values, beliefs, and worldviews, which are contrasting enough to motivate him/her to form an idiosyncratic opinion of the fictional world. Notwithstanding the seemingly even polarisation of the control of the speech/view activity between the narrator and character in the case of free indirect discourse, as suggested by the Short cline and many other exponents, there is reason to believe that the narrator, in spite of all, has a decisive advantage over the character in that s/he not only sees what the character sees, but s/he also sees the character himself. On this score, I tend to side with van Leuven-Zwart's contention that "the narrator is always a focalizer, i.e. telling a story implies seeing the events, actions and characters which are its constituent parts... Although it is not possible to tell a story without focalizing, it is possible to focalize without telling a story: a character may very well focalize without reporting what he sees" (1989, 176). Accordingly, the narrator's and the character's respective focalisation, when the latter's does not involve narrating, actually occur on separate levels, and should therefore be understood in hierarchical order. As this calls for a more differentiated and precise denomination of their functions, it seems appropriate to define focalisation as the process in which the point of view of the character is realised on the level of story. The term narrative perspective, however, ought to be reserved for that position on the level of discourse from which the narrator observes, comments on and qualifies the narrative. The main purpose of such delineation of perspective and focalisation is to provide some clarification, however arbitrary or even simplifying, of the perpetual issue concerning free indirect discourse, especially in terms of its perplexing nature of *double-voicedness* and *double-viewedness*, as discussed above.

In the following narratological discourse analysis of a selected segment of the Dublin story "Eveline" the function of narrative perspective and focalisation have been attributed with respect to a given narrative mode: in the case of narrative report of action (NRA), narrative perspective (NP) and focalisation (FO) have been granted entirely to the narrator (NR). In narrative report of discourse act (NRDA)⁷ and indirect discourse (ID), NP goes to NR, whereas FO remains in the domain of the character (CH). In the case of free indirect discourse (FID), NP becomes shared by NR and CH – indicated as (:), with FO being entirely on the part of CH. In direct discourse (DD) and free direct discourse (FDD), both NP and FO have been allocated to CH. In the attempt to create a solid and verifiable system for observing and measuring individual shifts in narrative perspective and focalisation in translation against the original propositional content, van Leuven-Zwart's comparative and descriptive model (1989, 151–81; 1990, 69–95)

⁷ Our concept of NRDA covers not only the narrative report of speech acts as defined by Leech and Short (1992, 323–33) and the narrative report of thought acts (*ibid.*, 337–41), but also various forms of the representation of perception (Brinton 1980, 363). Represented perception, however, due to its proximity to the grammatical and mimetic position between indirect and direct discourse, comes in the domain of free indirect discourse.

has seemed particularly appropriate as it examines every translation on two levels: first on the microstructural and then on the macrostructural level. The microstructural level comprises shifts within the realm of sentence, clause, and phrase. Consequently, this type of shift has been assigned to one of the following categories: semantic (SEM), stylistic (STY), syntactic-semantic (SYN-SEM), syntactic-stylistic (SYN-STY), and syntactic-pragmatic (SYN-PRAG). All those segments which do not display a sufficient amount of comparability with the original on the basis of any of the above categories have been assigned to a special category called mutation (MUT). As the term itself suggests, mutation comprises shifts resulting from deletion, addition or radical changes of meaning of the source-text items. All the relevant microstructural shifts have further been analysed and described on the macrostructural level in view of the three functions of language: ideational (IDEAT), textual (TEXT), and interpersonal (INTERP) (Halliday 1973). Every change on the macrostructural level, caused by a certain microstructural shift, has been observed both, first on the story and then on the discourse level, whereby the latter has been regarded as superior to the former. However, it has to be pointed out that those microstructural shifts which have little or absolutely no bearing on the macrostructural level have not been taken into consideration since they do not contribute to the understanding of the translator's interpretive strategies and methods.

The overall taxonomy of the pertinent shifts in translation have been achieved with the appropriation of the van Leuven-Zwart model, expanded by three additional categories: narrative mode (NM), narrative perspective (NP), and focalisation (FO). The newly designed model has thus brought to the forefront the cause-and-effect relationship between the micro- and macrostructural changes on the one hand, and the changes in narrative perspective and focalisation on the other. Its application to the narratological discourse analysis of the Dublin story 'Eveline' has shown that the model is empirically verifiable and repeatable. This means that it can also be used with other integral translations.

3. Narratological discourse analysis of 'Eveline' (excerpt, Joyce 1967, 37-8):

A SOURCE TEXT B TARGET TEXT	MICROSTRUCTURAL SHIFTS	MACROSTRUCTURAL SHIFTS	NM	NP	FO
		DISCOURSE STORY			
1A She sat at the window / watching the evening invade the <u>avenue</u> (1).			NRA / NRDA	NR	NR/CH
1B Sedela je ob oknu / in opazovala večer, ki je vdiral v <u>ulico</u> (1).	(1) SEM (generalisation)	(1) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP	NRA / NRDA	NR	NR/CH
2A Her head <u>was leaned</u> (1) against the window curtains / and in her nostrils <u>was</u> (2) the <u>odour</u> (3) of dusty cretonne.			NRA / NRDA	NR	NR/CH
2B Glavo je <u>prislonila</u> (1) k zavesam / in v nosnicah <u>ji je bil</u> (2) <u>vonj</u> (3) prašnega kretona.	(1) SYNT-SEM (active voice) (2) SEM (intensive elem.) (3) STY (register)	(1) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP (2) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP (3) INTERP INTERP	FID	NR : CH	CH
3A She was tired.			NRDA (FID?)	NR (NR : CH?)	CH
3B Bila je utrujena.	/	/ /	NRDA (FID?)	NR (NR : CH?)	CH

A SOURCE TEXT B TARGET TEXT	MICROSTRUCTURAL SHIFTS	MACROSTRUCTURAL SHIFTS	NM	NP	FO
		DISCOURSE STORY			
4A Few people <u>passed</u> (1).			FID	NR : CH	CH
4B Malo ljudi <u>je hodilo</u> (1) mimo.	(1)SYNT-SEM (verb of duration)	(1) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP	NRDA	NR	CH
5A <u>The man out of the last house</u> (1) <u>passed</u> (2) on his way home;			FID	NR : CH	CH
5B Domov grede <u>je prišel</u> mimo (2) <u>mož iz hiše na vogalu</u> (1);	(1) SYN-PRAG (thematisation) (2) STY (syntagmatic elem. - iteration)	(1) TEXT, INTERP INTERP	NRDA	NR	CH
6A she heard his footsteps clacking along the concrete pavement and afterwards crunching on the cinder path before the new red houses.			NRDA	NR	CH
6B <u>slišala je, kako mu klopočejo stopinje po trdem tlaku, in potlej, kako mu škripljejo po ugaskih na stezi pred novimi rdečimi hišami.</u>	/	/ /	NRDA	NR	CH
7A <u>One time</u> (1) there <u>used to be</u> (2) a field there in which they used to play <u>every evening</u> (3) with other people's children.			FID	NR : CH	CH
7B <u>Svoje dni</u> (1) <u>je bilo</u> (2) tam polje in <u>slednji večer</u> (3) so se igrali z otroki drugih ljudi.	(1) STY (archaic elem.) (2) STY (syntagmatic elem. - iteration) (3) STY (register)	(1) INTERP INTERP (2) TEXT, INTERP INTERP (3) INTERP INTERP	NRA	NR	NR
8A <u>Then</u> (1) a man from Belfast bought the field and built houses in it – not like their <u>little brown houses</u> (2) but bright brick houses with shining roofs.			FID	NR : CH	CH
8B <u>Kasneje</u> (1) je kupil to polje nekdo iz Belfasta in sezidal na njem hiše – ne <u>majhnih rjavih hiš</u> (2), kakor so njihove, temveč svetle opečne hiše z lesketavimi strehami.	(1) SEM (aspectuality) (2) SEM (expressiveness)	(1) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP (2) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP	NRA	NR	NR
9A The children of the <u>avenue</u> (1) <u>used to</u> (2) play together in that field – the Devines, the Waters, the Dunns, little Keogh the cripple, she and her <u>brothers and sisters</u> (3).			FID	NR : CH	CH
9B Otroci iz <u>ulice</u> (1) so se <u>po navadi</u> (2) skupaj igrali na tem polju – Devinovi, Waterjevi, Dunnovi, mali pohabljeni Keogh, ona in <u>njena brata in sestre</u> (3).	(1) SEM (generalisation) (2) STY (syntagmatic elem. - iteration) (3) SYN-SEM (number)	(1) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP (2) TEXT, INTERP INTERP (3) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP	NRA	NR	NR
10A Ernest, however, never played: he was too grown up.			FID	NR : CH	CH
10B Ernest se kajpada nikoli ni igral, bil je že preveč odrasel.	/	/ /	FID	NR : CH	CH
11A Her father <u>used often to</u> (1) <u>hunt them in out of the field</u> (2) with his blackthorn stick;			FID	NR : CH	CH
11B Oče <u>ih je dostikrat</u> (1) <u>preganjal s polja</u> (2), grozeč jim z glogovo palico;	(1) STY (syntagmatic elem. - iteration) (2) SEM (phraseological elem.)	(1) TEXT, INTERP INTERP (2) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP	NRA	NR	NR
12A but usually little Keogh <u>used to</u> (1) <u>keep nix</u> (2) and call out when he saw her father coming.			FID	NR : CH	CH
12B a <u>po navadi</u> (1) <u>je stal</u> mali Keogh <u>na straži</u> (2) in je zavpil, če je videl, da se bliža njen oče.	(1) STY (syntagmatic elem. - iteration) (2) STY (dialectal elem.)	(1) TEXT, INTERP INTERP (2) INTERP INTERP	NRA	NR	NR
13A Still they seemed to have been rather happy then.			FID	NR : CH	CH
13B Vendar so bili tisti čas menda zelo srečni.	/	/ /	FID	NR : CH	CH
14A Her father was not so bad <u>then</u> (1); <u>and besides</u> (2), her mother was alive.			FID	NR : CH	CH
14B Njen oče <u>navsezadnje</u> (1) ni bil tako napak; <u>in vrhu vsega</u> (2) je še živela mati.	(1) MUT (radical change of meaning) (2) STY (archaic elem.)	(1) IDEAT, INTERP INTERP (2) INTERP INTERP	FID	NR : CH	CH

A SOURCE TEXT B TARGET TEXT	MICROSTRUCTURAL SHIFTS	MACROSTRUCTURAL SHIFTS	NM	NP	FO
		DISCOURSE STORY			
15A That was a long time ago; she and <u>her brothers and sisters</u> (1) were all grown up;			FID	NR : CH	CH
15B Tega je bilo že dolgo; ona in <u>brata in sestre</u> (1) so vsi že odrasli;	(1) SYN-SEM (number)	(1) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP	FID	NR : CH	CH
16A <u>her</u> mother (1) <u>was</u> (2) dead.			FID	NR : CH	CH
16B mati (1) <u>je</u> (2) mrtva.	(1) MUT (deletion) (2) SYN-SEM (tense)	(1) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP (2) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP	FDD	CH	CH
17A Tizzie Dunn was dead, too, and the Waters <u>had gone back</u> (1) to <u>England</u> (2).			FID	NR : CH	CH
17B Tizzie Dunn je tudi umrla, in Waterjevi <u>so se vrnili</u> (1) <u>na Angleško</u> (2).	(1) SYN-SEM (tense) (2) STY (archaic elem.)	(1) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP (2) INTERP INTERP	FDD	CH	CH
18A Everything changes.			FDD	CH	CH
18B Vse se spreminja.	/	/ /	FDD	CH	CH
19A Now <u>she was going to go away</u> (1) like the others, to leave <u>her home</u> (2).			FID	NR : CH	CH
19B Zdaj je <u>ona na tem, da pojde proč</u> (1) kakor ostali, da zapusti <u>dom</u> (2).	(1) SYN-SEM (tense) (2) MUT (deletion)	(1) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP (2) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP	FID	NR : CH	CH
20A Home!			FDD	CH	CH
20B Dom!	/	/ /	FDD (FID?)	CH (NR:CH?)	CH (CH?)
21A She looked around the room, reviewing all <u>its</u> (1) familiar objects which she <u>had dusted</u> (2) <u>once a week</u> (3) for so many years,			NRDA	NR	CH
21B Ozrla se je po sobi, znova pregledala vse <u>te</u> (1) znane predmete, s katerih <u>je</u> toliko let <u>vsak teden</u> (3) ometala (2) prah,	(1) SYN-PRAG (deictic elem.) (2) SYN-SEM (tense) (3) SEM (intensive elem.)	(1) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP (2) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP (3) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP	FID	NR:CH	CH
22A <u>wondering</u> (1) where on earth all the dust came from.			FID		
22B in pri tem <u>vsekdar</u> premišljevala (1), od kod se neki jemlje ves ta prah	(1) MUT (addition)	(1) IDEAT, INTERP, IDEAT, INTERP	FID	NR: CH	CH
23A <u>Perhaps</u> (1) she would <u>never see</u> (2) again those familiar objects / from which she <u>had never dreamed</u> (3) of being divided.			FID/NRDA	NR	CH
23B <u>Morebiti</u> (1) nikdar več <u>ne bo videla</u> (2) teh znanih reči, od katerih še v sanjah <u>ni mislila</u> (3), da bi se kdaj ločila.	(1) STY (register) (2) SYN-SEM (tense) (3) SYN-SEM (tense)	(1) INTERP INTERP (2) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP (3) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP	FID	NR : CH	CH
24A And yet during all <u>those</u> (1) years she <u>had never found out</u> (2) the name of the priest whose <u>yellowing</u> (3) photograph hung on the wall above the broken harmonium beside the coloured prints of the promises made to Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque.			NRDA	NR	CH
24B In vendar v vseh <u>teh</u> (1) letih <u>nikdar ni izvedela</u> (2), kako se piše duhovnik, čigar <u>porumenela</u> (3) fotografija je visela na steni nad polomljenim harmonijem zraven barvnega tiska z obeti, danimi blaženi Margareti Mariji Alakok.	(1) SYN-PRAG (deictic elem.) (2) SYN-SEM (tense) (3) SEM (intensive elem.)	(1) TEXT, INTERP INTERP (2) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP (3) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP	FID	NR: CH	CH
25A He had been a school friend of her (1) <u>father</u> (2).			NRA	NR	NR
25B Bil je <u>očetov</u> (1) <u>sošolec</u> (2).	(1) MUT (deletion) (2) SYN-PRAG (thematization)	(1) IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP (2) TEXT, INTERP INTERP	FID	NR: CH	CH
27A – He is in Melbourne now.			PD	CH	CH
27B “Zdaj je v Melbournu.”	/	/ /	PD	CH	CH

A SOURCE TEXT B TARGET TEXT	MICROSTRUCTURAL SHIFTS	MACROSTRUCTURAL SHIFTS	NM	NP	FO
		DISCOURSE STORY			
28A She had consented to go away, / to leave her home (1).			DD/FID	NR/ NR: CH	NR/CH
28B Privolila je, da pojde proč, da zapusti dom (1)	(1) MUT (deletion)	(1)IDEAT, INTERP IDEAT, INTERP	DD	NR: CH	CH
29A Was that wise?			FID	NR: CH	CH
29B Je bilo to pametno?	/	/ /	FID	NR: CH	CH
30A She tried to weigh each side of the (1) question.			NRDA	NR	CH
30B Skušala je pretehtati to (1) vprašanje z obeh strani.	(1) SYN-PRAG (deictic elem.)	(1) TEXT, INTERP INTERP	FID	NR: CH	CH
31A In her home anyway (1) she had shelter and food;			FID	NR: CH	CH
31B Kakor že bodi (1), doma je imela streho nad glavo in preskrbo;	(1) STY (register)	(1) INTERP INTERP	NRDA	NR	CH
32A she had those whom (1) she had known (2) all her life about her.			NRDA	NR	CH
32B krog nje so bili ljudje, ki (1) jih je poznala (2) vse življenje.	(1) STY (register) (2) SYN-SEM (tense)	(1) INTERP INTERP (2) TEXT, INTERP TEXT, INTERP	FID	NR: CH	CH

3.1 Discussion:

For reasons of economy, the above presents only a short segment of the analysis of the whole of the ‘Eveline’ story which has been carried out. The comparison between the English and the Slovene ‘Eveline’ has revealed some fairly crucial differences as regards narrative perspective and focalisation: The greatest number of shifts on the microstructural level are of a stylistic nature, specifically shifts in register (23 segments), syntagmatics (8), and in the temporally-marked lexical items (7). Special emphasis has to be paid to the first and the third type of shifts since they have a direct bearing on the interpersonal function of language on the macrostructural level in the sense of conveying information on the social and temporal distance between the narrator and reader on the discourse level, and between the characters on the story level. Needless to say, the presence of these register and temporal markers manifests itself also in the manner and type of narrative perspective and focalisation.

The translation also demonstrates a growing tendency towards the neutralisation of the informal or colloquial diction of the original, which is a clear marker of the use of free indirect discourse. These segments are thus, as a rule, rendered into Slovene either through narrative report of discourse act(ivity) or narrative report of act(ivity). The consequence of such improper rendering is a greater objectivisation of narrative report and the shifting of perspective and focalisation away from the character towards the (omniscient) narrator. Unlike the reader of the original who is inclined to assume a somewhat distant and sceptical position regarding the narrative information which s/he receives from the (unreliable) character, the reader of the Slovene text is more likely to trust the seemingly objective report of the author/narrator. In this respect, the former reader is confronted with a far less traditional text in that s/he cannot rely any longer on whatever information s/he gets from the character(s) but has instead to realise the interpretive potential of the text entirely on his/her own.

The archaisation of the target language causes a reversed process, which means that now it is the character who has taken control of narrative report. It has to be pointed out that such shifting on the microstructural level always gravely affects all the three functions of language on the macrostructural level, most of all the interpersonal function. Therefore the reader of the translation is encouraged to attribute to the character Eveline features such as conventionalism, rigidity, sentimentality, and the like, contributing to the overall cultural and emotional paralysis which dominates the Dublin story.⁸ Although such attribution is not contrary to the truth, the crucial difference between the original and the translation resides in the fact that the former relativises it whereas the latter tends to make it altogether objective or absolute.

The third important shifting on the macrostructural level is of a syntagmatic nature, and concerns the use of iteration. By and large, lexical iteration happens to be a highly characteristic rhetorical device in all the Dublin stories. Its pragmatic function is directly associated with the problem of narrative perspective and focalisation in the sense that every occurrence of iteration in a short stretch of text may be seen as a marker of the minimum control of report on the part of the author/narrator. The translated text consistently ignores this figure of speech, preferring as it does to replace it with synonyms, thus relocating the focus from the character to the author/narrator. Since most of the textual segments which contain iteration apply to past time (from the point of view of the time at which the story is told), the shifting in focus is all the more crucial in that the reader does not receive information directly from the character reliving her past, but rather from the author/narrator. In this way the reader is deprived of the insight into Eveline's fatally sentimental attachment to her past, her transcription of the past into the present, which is bound to determine her imminent decision to give up the prospects of a new life.

A good deal of transformation has also been observed on the syntactic-pragmatic level. The inadequate choice of a deictic element has caused the shifting from the auctorial and objective to the more subjective report. Changes in thematisation have brought about a similar effect to that mentioned before. Changes in speech act on, account of the use of different illocution, have led to a reversed effect, as a result of the shifting from free indirect discourse to either indirect discourse or narrative report of act(ivity). The syntactic standardisation of the non-standard word order, influenced by Gaelic (cf. Hedberg 1981) in the original, realised by the substitution of indirect discourse for free indirect discourse, has contributed to a greater objectivisation of the narrative, whereby narrative perspective has been brought under the control of the author/narrator, and focalisation under that of the character. And, finally, on account of the introduction of different elements of cohesion, effected by the substitution of narrative report of act(ivity) for free indirect discourse, both narrative perspective and focalisation have been moved to the realm of author/narrator.

⁸ While describing the overall atmosphere of the Dublin stories, the critics tend to refer to the word *paralysis* and the syntagm *Dublin: the paralysed city* (cf. Tindall 1959, 21; Burgess 1973, 230; Scholes 1978/79, 78; MacCabe 1978,

4. Conclusion

Our study of narrative perspective and focalisation in translating fictional texts, based on the appropriation of the van Leuven-Zwart comparative and descriptive model, shows that the results thus obtained depend for their reliability largely on the degree of the subtlety of the shifts observed. In other words, the more subtle and consistent with the translator's strategy a certain shift in narrative mode the better the results, in the sense of complying with the parameters which have a direct bearing on the model. The most problematic translation instances have proved to be those which display a conflicting tendency towards modulating the original structure on the microstructural level, thus failing to affect narrative perspective and/or focalisation where at least some alteration would be expected. For example, a translator may quite inadvertently subscribe the character's discourse to unwarranted archaism and simultaneously introduce linguistic markers typical of informal style in accordance with the original. Such incongruity may indeed be detrimental to the impression of the character's overall linguistic competence, however, it is not likely to affect the given narrative mode, leaving as it does both narrative perspective and focalisation unaltered. The main reason for this must be sought in the reader's capacity to concurrently make amends for conspicuous mistranslation.

Bibliography

- Bakhtin, M. M. 1986. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*. Ed. M. Holquist. Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bal, M. 1983. The Narrating and the Focalizing: A Theory of the Agents in Narrative. *Style* 17: 234–69.
- Benstock, S. 1980. Who Killed Cock Robin? The Sources of Free Indirect Style in *Ulysses*. *Style* 14: 259–73.
- Brinton, L. 1980. 'Represented Perception': A Study in Narrative Style. *Poetics* 9: 363–81.
- Burgess, A. 1971. A Paralyzed City. In *James Joyce: Dubliners and A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, ed. M. Beja, 24–40. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Chatman, S. 1978. *Story and Discourse*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- . 1990. *Coming to Terms. The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Fludernik, M. 1993. *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction. The linguistic representation of speech and consciousness*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. 1989a. *Linguistics & the Novel. New Accents*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 1989b. *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Genette, G. 1972. *Figures III. Discours du Récit*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- . 1980. *Narrative Discourse. An Essay in Method*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1973. *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. Explorations in Language Study. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hawthorn, J. 1994. *A Concise Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. London, New York, Melbourne, Auckland: Edward Arnold.
- Hedberg, J. 1981. Some Notes on Language and Atmosphere in *Dubliners*. *Moderna Språk* LXXV, 2: 113–32.
- Joyce, J. 1987. *Ulysses*. The corrected text (student's edition). London: Penguin.
- . 1967. *Dubliners*. The Corrected Text with an Explanatory Note by R. Scholes. London: Grafton Books.
- Leech, G. N., and M. H. Short. 1992. *Style in Fiction. A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. English Language Series. London and New York: Longman.

- Leuven-Zwart, K. M. van. 1989. Translation and Original. Similarities and Dissimilarities, I. *Target* 1: 151–81.
- . 1990. Translation and Original. Similarities and Dissimilarities, II. *Target* 2: 69–95.
- Levenston, E. A., and G. Sonnenschein. 1986. The Translation of Point-of-View in Fictional Narrative. In *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*, eds. J. House and S. Blum-Kulka, 49–59. Tübingen: Narr.
- MacCabe, C. 1978. *James Joyce & The Revolution of the Word*. Language, Discourse, Society. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press.
- McHale, B. 1978. Free Indirect Discourse: A Survey of Recent Account. *Poetics and Theory of Literature* 3: 249–87.
- Mozetič, U. 2000. *Problem pripovednega gledišča in žariščenja pri prevajanju proznih besedil*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.
- Parrinder, P. 1990. *James Joyce*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik. 1994. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Sasaki, T. 1994. Towards a systematic description of narrative 'point of view': an examination of Chatman's theory with an analysis of 'The blind man' by D. H. Lawrence. *Language and Literature* 3: 125–38.
- Scholes, R. 1978/79. Semiotic Approaches to a Fictional Text: Joyce's "Eveline". *James Joyce Quarterly* 16: 65–80.
- Sell, Roger D., ed. 1991. *Literary Pragmatics*. London: Routledge.
- Short, M. 1991. Speech presentation, the novel and the press. In *The Taming of the Text. Explorations in Language, Literature and Culture*, ed. W. V. Peer, 61–81. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tindall, W. Y. 1967. *A Reader's Guide to James Joyce*. New York: The Noonday Press.
- Wales, K. 1992. *The Language of James Joyce*. The Language of Literature. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, and London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Wright, D. G. 1983. *Characters of Joyce*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.