

Translating Free Indirect Discourse: two Spanish versions of Jane Austen's *Persuasion*

Victòria Alsina

Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, Spain

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the use of free indirect discourse (FID) to convey the narrator's attitude and its treatment in translation. FID is a powerful literary device which is often relayed as other modes of discourse in translation. As a result, the effects of FID in the source text are lost in the target text. In this paper, a passage containing a long and complex instance of FID in Jane Austen's *Persuasion* (1817) is examined and compared with two of its Spanish translations. It is concluded that the omission of FID in the target text, which involves the loss of the attitudes expressed by it in the source text, is due not only to linguistic differences between the two languages involved but also to differences in their literary traditions.

KEYWORDS: criticism, free indirect discourse, irony, Jane Austen, narrator, point of view, polyphony, Spanish literary translations, voice.

Introduction

Stylistic devices are very often used to convey the speaker's or the writer's opinion about what is being said. For example, the choice of words used to refer to people or things, the mode of discourse used, or the way sentences are structured may reflect the author's – or the narrator's – feelings towards the events s/he is relating. In translation this can be a source of difficulties, as differences in linguistic structure as well as in stylistic and literary conventions between source and target language often result in different devices being used to achieve the same function or to convey the same meaning in the two languages.

It is therefore interesting to study how translators have transferred the function and/or meaning of significant elements of style into the target language. This paper concentrates on free indirect discourse (FID), which, by combining character's and narrator's voices in the same utterance, provides the reader with several points of view, and in doing so manages to convey the narrator's attitude to what is being related without making it explicit. I will analyze how two translators have transferred into Spanish a long and complex instance of FID in Jane Austen's *Persuasion* (1817), her last completed novel and the one in which this technique is most developed (Page 1972: 127).

The translation of FID has been the object of a number of studies, many of which are devoted to one pair of languages and primarily deal with the translation of point of view.¹ Taken together, these studies provide evidence for the following two hypotheses: firstly, FID is an unstable mode of discourse which is often translated as other modes of discourse; and

¹ Levenston and Sonnenschein (1986) deal with the pairs Hebrew-English and Hebrew-French; Poncharal (1998) deals with English-French; Rouhainen (2000) deals with English-Finnish; Gallagher (2001) compares the problems posed by FID in Latin, French, English and German; Jonasson (2001) deals with French-Swedish; Taivalkoski-Shilov (2003) deals with French-German; Zaro (2006) deals with English-Spanish; Bosseaux (2007) with English-French; Alsina (2008a and 2008b) with English-Spanish and English-Catalan; Czennia (2004) gives a general overview of the translation of FID drawing on different studies based on the pairs French-German, English-German, French-English and Russian-German.

secondly, shifts in translation when dealing with FID often affect the way point of view is expressed. In this paper, I propose to try to verify these observations by analysing new data, and also to relate my specific findings to general tendencies in translation. In order to do this, I will first describe FID in relation to other modes of discourse into which it is often translated, and explain its functions. I will then summarize the main problems translators have encountered with FID, and explain how they have dealt with them and what the result has been. In my case-study, I will first explain Jane Austen's use of FID, drawing my examples from her novels *Northanger Abbey* (1817) and *Persuasion* (1817), and then I will analyse how two Spanish translators rendered a specific passage from Austen's *Persuasion* which contains several instances of FID. I will try to draw some conclusions as to the causes and consequences of the translators' choices to retain and/or omit FID in their target texts.

Free Indirect Discourse

Since FID was first identified, and named *style indirect libre*, by the Swiss linguist Charles Bally in 1912, it has been the object of a great number of studies, and at present there is a very abundant literature devoted to it.² To describe it briefly, FID is one of several possible types of reported discourse (or speech and thought presentation). From a narratological perspective with regard to the degree of narrator intervention in the narrative, it can be considered a hybrid between indirect discourse, in which both voice and point of view proceed from the narrator, and direct discourse, in which voice and point of view proceed from a character. Here, I am following Abbott's definition of *voice* as "the sensibility through which we hear the narrative, even when we are reading silently. Voice is very closely associated with focalization, the sensibility through which we see the characters and events in the story" (2002: 197, emphases in the original). In this paper the distinction between voice and focalization is also made, but the term *point of view* will be used instead of *focalization*.³

Free indirect discourse is one of several types of narrative mode which can be distinguished on a scale between pure narrative (or narrative report of action) and pure dialogue (or free direct discourse).⁴ Leech and Short (1981: 25) give the following three examples to illustrate this type of reported discourse:⁵

² For FID in English, see Pascal (1977), Cohn (1978), McHale (1978), Banfield (1982), Leech and Short (1986 334-6; 342-50), and Fludemik (1993, 1995). The theoretical history of FID in German and French is summarized in Pascal (1977: 1-30). Literature on FID in Spanish is less abundant, but several works can be mentioned: Verdín Díaz (1970), Tacca (1986), Maldonado (1991) and Reyes (1984). FID in Jane Austen has been examined in many studies, the three most influential ones being Finch and Bowen (1990), Thompson (1994) and Gunn (2004).

³ Authors dealing with narrative theory tend to object to the use of *point of view* because it is often used to express two different concepts (*voice* and *focalization*) as if they were interchangeable (cf. Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 73; Toolan 2001: 60), but as long as the conceptual distinction between the two is maintained, I can see no objection to the term *point of view*, which has a long tradition in stylistics and narrative theory, and is still very much in use.

⁴ This sequence has been variously classified by different authors. Leech and Short (1981), for example, distinguish between five types of discourse, four of which are reported discourse, whereas McHale (1978) proposes seven types.

⁵ Termed *speech presentation* by Leech and Short. In this paper *discourse* will be used instead of Leech and Short's terms *speech* and *thought*. Although speech and thought presentation do indeed follow slightly different patterns, they are sufficiently similar for the term *discourse* to be applied to both, as Toolan, for example, does (2001: 125), while distinguishing between *speech* and *thought* when relevant. The terms used in this paper will therefore be: *narrative report of discourse acts*, *indirect discourse* (ID), *free indirect discourse* (FID), *direct discourse* (DD) and *free direct discourse*.

He would return there to see her again the following day.
He would return there to see her again tomorrow.
He would come back there to see her again tomorrow.

The same statement rendered in indirect and direct discourse (ID and DD) would be:

ID: He said that he would return there to see her the following day.
DD: He said: 'I'll come back here to see you again tomorrow.'

FID, as we can see, differs from both DD and ID because it (generally) omits the reporting verb which indicates the shift from narrative to reporting. Its other features are shared either with ID or with DD: personal pronouns and tenses are the narrator's, as in ID; other deictics (mainly expressions of time and place) tend to be the character's, but it is possible, and not unusual, for them to be the narrator's, as can be seen in the examples above; register⁶ and word order (when there is a difference between DD and ID) are the character's, as in DD. Register is an important feature: whereas DD is clearly demarcated by punctuation marks, FID blends into the text without any visible division from the narrator's discourse. This makes it difficult for the reader to identify FID, and s/he must rely on the context and such stylistic indicators (Bosseaux 2007: 66)⁷ as word order and register, or on world-view (Fowler 1982: 215).⁸ Although it is true that there can be, and often is, an accumulation of stylistic indicators signalling that a passage is written in FID (Levenston and Sonnenschein 1986: 58), in some cases register is the only indication that there has been a voice shift.

The effect of FID is to provide the narrative with what has been called polyphony (Bakhtin 1981): it allows the reader to be placed directly in contact with the characters' words or thoughts while the narrator still retains some degree of control over what is being reported, so that the reader is given the narrator's point of view and the character's voice at the same time.⁹ It allows the author to make use of the qualities both of DD (vividness and 'direct' presence of the characters) and of ID (concision and a certain degree of narrator detachment). As a result, a more complete picture of the character is given; as Thompson expresses it, "[i]t is this technique that enables the novelist to represent both the nature of character and its position in social space, producing an impression of a totality" (1994: 283). Finally, this double view on narrated events provides the author with great ironic possibilities. This is especially relevant when dealing with the attitude expressed in the text, as one of the main functions of irony is to express criticism.

However, it should be borne in mind that there are countless instances of reported discourse in literature which cannot clearly be ascribed to one or another of these categories as they

⁶ *Register* is used in the sense of 'variety of language related to a level of formality', as defined by the online *Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar* (Chalker and Weiner 1988, viewed on 1 May 2011 from Universitat Pompeu Fabra at <http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t28.e1266>). The usual situation is that the character's register is less formal than that of the narrator, but that is not always the case. In some cases there may be no difference between character and narrator register, or a character may even use a more formal register than the narrator.

⁷ Bosseaux also uses the more general term *indicator* (2007: 57, 63, 66, 67).

⁸ Fowler uses the term *world-view* with the meaning of 'a general system of viewing the world conceptually', a concept borrowed from Uspensky (1973).

⁹ Banfield (1982) has argued against this hypothesis, called the *dual-voice hypothesis*, claiming that such double voicedness is impossible, and that FID is a strictly literary device. McHale (1983), Toolan (1988), Neumann (1992), Simpson (1993: 35-8), and Thompson (1994) all provide arguments against Banfield's theory.

display features of several different types.¹⁰ Example 4 which is given below in the section ‘Analyses of different translations’ exemplifies such an instance. Since the aim of this paper is to study the cases in which the author has used the contrast between the narrator’s and a character’s voice with some intention (ironic and ultimately critical, or else sympathetic), I will focus on the presence of contrasting voices in the text and especially its narratological effect. Such a contrast, as well as its effect, is perceptible with different varieties of FID, whether prototypical or not. I will therefore make use of Neumann’s flexible definition of this technique, which she found convenient when studying FID in Samuel Richardson’s novel *Sir Charles Grandison* (1754):

I suggest we define FID as any sentence containing words not explicitly attributed as quotation (or at least not as quotation from a specified source) but likely to originate with a character rather than with the narrator, or with some character other than the quoting character (1992: 114).

This definition of FID will be useful when analyzing Austen’s extremely versatile and subtle use of this important narrative device.

Translating Free Indirect Discourse

Although the studies devoted to the translation of FID are considerably fewer and more recent than those devoted to ID, there is a certain amount of studies wholly or partly centred on this subject and focusing on many different pairs of languages,¹¹ which allows me to draw from them some general conclusions on the subject.

A number of similarities and dissimilarities can be observed in the way FID functions in different languages. As to the similarities, the effect of uniting the qualities of DD and ID mentioned in the previous section seems to be shared by all languages. As Gallagher (2001: 210) has pointed out, in whatever language this mode of discourse is used, it has three advantages over ID: it allows a large number of subordinate sentences to depend on a single verb without heaviness or obscurity; it allows DD to be preserved in the midst of ID; and, in contrast to ID, it is a productive and highly pliable literary device.

These important similarities, which relate to the general function of FID, make it seem as if the most effective way to preserve its function in the source text is by translating it also as FID in the target text. However, FID also differs in many points from one language to another, which often makes it difficult for the translator to preserve it. Dissimilarities may arise from discrepancies in the linguistic structure of the languages involved or from discrepancies in cultural and genre conventions concerning the use of FID. An example of the first kind is demonstrated by Rouhainen (2000), who shows how the difference between the English and Finnish third-person pronoun, namely the fact that in English it is marked for gender and in Finnish it is not, is often dealt with by means of strategies (such as rendering a pronoun as a proper name or as a noun) which result in a shift of viewpoint from a character to the narrator. One of Rouhainen’s examples is taken from a short story by Ernest Hemingway: “After the armistice they agreed **he** should go home to get a job so they might be

¹⁰ This is especially the case with Austen, of whom Page says: “One need look no further than the novels of Jane Austen to discover that the four existing categories provide a very unsatisfactory framework for the discussion of speech presentation” (1972: 123-4). (The four categories referred to are direct speech, indirect speech, free direct speech and free indirect speech. *Speech*, and not *discourse*, is used, because at this point Page is analyzing dialogues, that is to say spoken words, and not reported thoughts or words written in letters.)

¹¹ See note 1.

married” (Hemingway 1955 [1924]: 142), which, back-translated from its Finnish translation, reads: “After the armistice they agreed that **the man** would travel home to get a good job, so that they might be married” (Hemingway 1991: 159). As Rouhainen explains, “Whereas the source text conveys the impression that we are hearing the voice of the character ‘he’ reflecting on a past love-affair, in the target text it seems we are being told about the narrator’s observations of ‘the man’.” (2000: 110)

An example of discrepancy in genre conventions between two languages is provided by Gallagher (2001: 235-7), who quotes an excerpt from a 1970 German article published in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (an influential daily German newspaper) dealing with a political campaign, in which three kinds of reported speech are found: indirect discourse, narrative report of discourse acts (*interpretation reformulée*) and FID. He then examines its 1971 French translation and finds that the ID and narrative report of discourse acts are maintained in it, but that the FID is rendered as pure narrative preceded by the formula *toujours selon eux* (*also according to them*). Gallagher explains the translator’s choice as conforming to French usage in writing. Furthermore, he claims that if this text were to be translated into English, the FID would have to be rendered as ID in order to avoid the ambiguity which FID would create. His conclusion is that FID is commonly used in German newspapers and rarely in English newspapers, whereas it is a purely literary device in French.

In addition to the discrepancies indicated, another source of difficulties which conditions the translation of FID has been pointed out by Alsina (2008a, 2008b) working with the language pairs English-Spanish and English-Catalan. Focusing on features signalling spoken language within FID (e.g. register, idiolect, and modalizers), I come to the conclusion that such features are often one of the main ways of indicating FID, and that the tendency to neutralise them in translation makes FID difficult or impossible to be perceived in the target text. This can be seen in Example 1 from Jane Austen’s *Northanger Abbey* (her earliest completed novel, although not published until 1817, it relates the heroine Catherine’s trip to Bath, where she meets and falls in love with a young man; more importantly, it satirizes Gothic novels, which were very popular at the time) and its 1991 Catalan translation (Alsina 2008a: 185-188) (I have italicized the passages in FID in all the examples that follow):

Example 1:

[Catherine] rose to take leave, and was then most agreeably surprised by General Tilney’s asking her if she would do his daughter the honour of dining and spending the rest of the day with her. [...] *Catherine was greatly obliged; but it was quite out of her power. Mr. and Mrs. Allen would expect her back every moment.* (Austen 1972: 118)

Example 1a:

S’alçà per anar-se’n, i va tenir una agradable sorpresa quan el general Tilney li preguntà si no els faria l’honor de quedar-se a dinar amb ells i passar la resta del dia amb la seva filla. [...] La Catherine estigué molt agraïda; però aquella era una cosa que escapava a la seva voluntat. El senyor i la senyora Allen esperaven que tornés en qualsevol moment. (Austen 1991: 99)

My back-translation of Example 1a:

She rose to leave, and had an agreeable surprise when General Tilney asked her if she would do them the honour of staying to dine with them and spending the rest of the day with his daughter. [...] Catherine was very grateful; but that was something which was beyond her will. Mr. and Mrs. Allen expected her to return at any moment.

In English, the second sentence is perceived as being Catherine's words reported in FID only because of the typically (19th-century) oral expressions used in it (*was greatly obliged; it was quite out of her power; would expect her back every moment*). In the Catalan text the equivalent expressions are much less marked for orality, as I have tried to show in the back-translation, with the result that the sentence no longer seems to proceed from the character, but from the narrator.

Probably because of the difficulties caused by these different types of discrepancies, researchers have consistently found that, in spite of its important function in many novels, FID is very often translated as other forms of discourse: Poncharal (1998, quoted by Bosseaux 2007: 64), Rouhainen (2000), Taivalkovski-Shilov (2003, quoted by Bosseaux 2007: 64), Zaro (2006) and Alsina (2008a; 2008b) all report that FID tends to be translated as DD or ID as well as other forms of discourse; as Bosseaux expresses it: "[free indirect discourse] is a mixed form of discourse and several studies have revealed that there is an enunciative homogenisation in translation" (2007: 67). The degree of homogenisation undergone by translations may depend on other factors as well: Zaro (2006) and Alsina (2008a, 2008b), comparing different translations, have concluded that this tendency greatly varies from one translator to another, and Zaro (2006) has found that in Spanish it is considerably more marked in earlier than in later translations.

Jane Austen's style and her use of FID

One of the outstanding traits of Jane Austen's writing is the great control she has over her material, notably language (Lodge 1966; Page 1972). One of the features of her style that has received a great deal of attention is the way in which she combines different modes of discourse in order to present her narrative from varying – and often diverging – points of view, and especially the way she developed FID, which is one of her most widely recognized contributions to English literary prose. According to Finch and Bowen, "[t]he development in Austen's hands of free indirect style marks a crucial moment in the history of novelistic technique" (1990: 3). As Thompson expresses it, "[l]iterary historians tracing the development of novelistic technique uniformly conclude that Austen was the first great English novelist to master this technique of narrated monologue [FID]" (1994: 293).¹²

Austen, like other writers, used FID to achieve several literary effects. Among the most important of these are: concision, ironic criticism of the events she is narrating or the characters taking part in them – she exposes character failings such as hypocrisy, shallowness or self-deceit by setting a character's words alongside the narrator's more detached report, or simply by letting a character's words speak for themselves – and empathy for a character's (usually the heroine's) feelings. Ironic criticism is usually created by means of free indirect *speech* (either written or spoken words), whereas empathy is generally achieved with free indirect *thought*. Two instances of this can be seen in Examples 2 and 3 below. Both functions can, in fact, be explained in fundamentally the same way: they are accomplished by diminishing narrator intervention and thus putting the reader into closer contact with a character's words or thoughts. If the words in question manifest qualities such as selfishness or stupidity, the feelings (towards the character) conveyed by the author and aroused in the reader are disapproval or criticism; if they manifest more likeable qualities, the feelings conveyed are sympathy or approval. These functions can be seen in two examples from

¹² See also Booth (1961), Lodge (1966) and Page (1972).

Austen's novels. The first one, again from *Northanger Abbey*, contains a conversation between Catherine, the heroine, and Maria, a minor character:

Example 2:

Catherine took the opportunity of asking the other for some particulars of their yesterday's party. Maria desired no greater pleasure than to speak of it; and Catherine immediately learnt that *it had been altogether the most delightful scheme in the world, that nobody could imagine how charming it had been, and that it had been more delightful than anybody could conceive.* (Austen 1972: 130)

The italicized words appear to be in FID, except for the two instances of *it had been*, which might be attributed either to the narrator or to the character (Maria), thus providing the transition between the two voices.¹³ However, it seems clear that the rest of the italicized words originate with Maria rather than the narrator in spite of the fact that the sentence in which they are included starts with the narrator's voice. The shift in register from literary written discourse to spoken language, as well as the character's idiolect and world-view, are obvious. In this case FID is used with a critical intention: Maria's words, full of clichés, exaggerations and repetitions, and empty of any real content, speak for themselves and serve to convey her stupidity, shallowness, and even insincerity. By giving the narrative in FID, Austen does not only convey to her readers that the narrator thinks Maria vacuous and unintelligent, she also allows them to perceive this for themselves.

Example 3 is from Jane Austen's novel *Persuasion*. It relates the feelings and thoughts of the heroine, Anne Elliot, on the day that Kellynch Hall, her family's home for generations, is to be let to strangers. (I have subdivided the passage and numbered each subdivision in order to make the analysis clearer.)

Example 3:

(1) Michaelmas came; and now Anne's heart must be in Kellynch again. (2) *A beloved home made over to others; all the precious rooms and furniture, groves, and prospects, beginning to own other eyes and other limbs!* (3) She could not think of much else on the 29th of September. (Austen 1985: 74)

The passage in FID with Anne's thoughts (the whole of subdivision 2) is enclosed between two passages, subdivisions 1 and 3, which convey the narrator's voice. Here there is no difference in register between the voice of the character and that of the narrator. What points the reader to realize that the phrases in subdivision 2 hold Anne's voice are the emotional elements in them. Emotionally-charged words like "beloved" or "precious" as well as the use of exclamatory phrases indicate Anne's voice; equally, the insistence on the concept of "other(s)" to refer to people outside Anne's family makes it clear that this passage conveys her thoughts; and finally the curious personification of her home surely expresses Anne's world-view. As to the function of the FID in this case, it serves to convey the empathy which the narrator feels for the heroine's sadness.

To sum up, Austen makes use of the polyphony provided by FID with several functions, namely to express criticism or sympathy without foregoing the concision attainable with indirect discourse, but with considerably more vividness and character presence. This is done

¹³ I am indebted to one of my two anonymous reviewers for pointing out this interesting ambiguity.

by interweaving the narrator's voice with that of one or several characters, the distinguishing features of which are register, deixis, tense and word order.

Analysis of FID in the source and two target texts

In previous studies,¹⁴ I have found that, when dealing with Austen's use of FID, translators have tended to reduce the diversity of voices and to neutralize features not belonging to the language of the narrator (not only features belonging to spoken language, but also idiosyncratic or very formal ones, as can be seen in Alsina 2008a). I now propose to examine the way in which the different features of FID have been treated in two Spanish translations of *Persuasion* separated by almost 80 years. The time gap between the two target texts is a factor which will need to be taken into account. I have chosen this novel because it is the most highly developed of Austen's works as regards subtlety and sophistication in the use of linguistic and stylistic resources, notably FID. As Norman Page says, "it is *Persuasion* that offers the fullest and most important use of free indirect speech in Jane Austen's work, and represents a remarkable and fascinating step towards technical experimentation at the end of the novelist's life" (1972: 127).¹⁵ As will be shown, its translation is proportionately complex.

So far, ten translations of *Persuasion* into (peninsular) Spanish have been published.¹⁶ These can be divided into two groups according to whether they belong to an earlier period in which Spain was culturally relatively isolated, or a later, more modern and culturally open, period. The first group comprises the first six versions, published between 1919 and 1958, of which the latter five are really plagiarised versions (although of differing degrees) of the 1919 translation (Crespo Allué 1981: 454). The second group includes the remaining four translations, published from 1996 onwards. The two versions analyzed here are the 1919 version by Manuel Ortega y Gasset (1885-1965),¹⁷ the first translation ever to be made of one of Austen's novels into Spanish, and the one published in 1996, nearly 80 years later, by Francisco Torres Oliver (b. 1935), an experienced and well-known translator.¹⁸ Owing to time and space constraints, I have decided to focus on the comparison of two translations. I was especially interested in comparing one of the earlier translations with one of the later ones,

¹⁴ As well as the translations studied in this paper, other translations of Jane Austen's works analyzed in Alsina 2008a and 2008b are *Mansfield Park* (translated into Spanish by Miguel Martín, 1995, and by Francisco Torres, 1995; and into Catalan by M. Dolors Ventós, 1986), *Pride and Prejudice* (translated into Catalan, by Eulàlia Preses, 1985), *Persuasion* (translated into Catalan, by Jordi Arbonès, 1988), *Northanger Abbey* (translated into Catalan by Jordi Arbonès, 1991) and *Sense and Sensibility* (translated into Catalan by Xavier Pàmies, 2004).

¹⁵ Other modes of reporting speech and thought, such as narrative report of discourse acts, DD and ID, also have a significant role in this work which, like her other novels, sometimes seems close to a play. However, the modes of speech and thought presentation found in *Persuasion* are especially varied and finely nuanced.

¹⁶ Published in 1919 (Madrid: Calpe; translator Manuel Ortega y Gasset), 1945 (Barcelona: Bruguera; translator Juan Ruiz de Larios), 1945 (Barcelona: Surco; translator M.L.M.), 1947 (Barcelona: *Revista literaria de Montenegro*, Bagaña Hnos. S.L; translator unacknowledged), 1948 (Madrid: *Revista literaria. Novelas y cuentos*; translator unacknowledged), 1958 (Barcelona: Juventud; translation by the publishers), 1996 (Barcelona: Alba; translator Francisco Torres Oliver), 1998 (Barcelona: Andrés Bello, DL; translators I. De la C. and C.G.), 2003 (Madrid: Cátedra; translator Juan Jesús Zaro) and 2004 (Barcelona: RBA; translator José Fernández Z.).

¹⁷ Manuel Ortega y Gasset should not be confused with his better-known brother, the philosopher José Ortega y Gasset, author of the treatise *The misery and the splendor of translation* (1937). Manuel Ortega, who was an engineer, translated a number of 19th-century English works into Spanish: among others, Dickens' *The Cricket of the Hearth* and *The Pickwick Papers*, Thackeray's *Lovel the Widower*, Scott's *Rob Roy*, Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* and Hughes' *Tom Brown's Schooldays*.

¹⁸ Francisco Torres has translated, from the 1970s onwards, a great number of books, mainly novels, from English into Spanish; including, among many others, works by Dickens, Defoe, D.H. Lawrence, Horace Walpole, H.P. Lovecraft, Nabokov, Bierce, Isak Dinesen, Mary Shelley and Edith Wharton.

and I thought that the first of each period was the least likely to be influenced by previous translations.

I will examine one long example in order to illustrate how Austen's use of FID in *Persuasion* has been treated in the two translations, and how the narrator's attitude conveyed by FID has been affected by the translators' different treatments. In the chosen passage, four voices intervene, all perceived from the heroine Anne Elliot's point of view, with the result that the reader participates in the heroine's feelings; the features by which the several voices can be distinguished are, most prominently, modality, but also register and, in a relatively unusual case of *free indirect writing* (Toolan 2001: 137), spelling. In this example we are told about Anne Elliot's feelings as she hears Captain Wentworth mentioned; she had been engaged to him eight years earlier and still loves him although they have not met since. In the passage, he is mentioned by different members of the Musgrove family, relatives of Anne, who know nothing about the earlier engagement and have not met Captain Wentworth, but who have realised that one of the Musgrove sons, Dick, who died at twenty, had served under him (Again, I have subdivided the passage and numbered each of the subdivisions in order to maintain a clear analysis.).

Example 4:

(1) To hear them talking so much of Captain Wentworth, repeating his name so often, puzzling over past years, and at last ascertaining that *it might, that it probably would, turn out to be the very same Captain Wentworth whom they recollected meeting, once or twice, after their coming back from Clifton – a very fine young man – but they could not say whether it was seven or eight years ago*, was a new sort of trial to Anne's nerves. (2) She found, however, that it was one to which she must inure herself. (3) *Since he actually was expected in the country, she must teach herself to be insensible on such points*. (4) And not only did it appear that he was expected, and speedily, but the Musgroves, in their warm gratitude for the kindness he had shewn *poor Dick*, and very high respect for his character, stamped as it was by *poor Dick's* having been six months under his care, and mentioning him in strong, though not perfectly well-spelt praise, as “*a fine dashing fellow, only two perticular about the schoolmaster*,” were bent on introducing themselves, and seeking his acquaintance, as soon as they could hear of his arrival. (Austen 1985: 59-60)

The passage is narrated from Anne's point of view as she hears Captain Wentworth spoken of by different people and learns that she may meet him again soon. However, without ever departing from this character's point of view, we also hear several other voices, including the narrator's: subdivision 1 begins and ends with the narrator's voice explaining the Musgroves' conversation in narrative report of discourse acts (focusing on their effect on Anne's feelings), but it contains words spoken, it seems, by different unspecified members of the Musgrove family as they try to recall, between them, details about Captain Wentworth. These words are in FID: the use of modal words (“it might”, “it probably would”), the juxtaposed sentences, and the typically oral vague expressions (“once or twice”, “seven or eight years ago”) indicate that there has been a shift from the narrator's voice to informal spoken language. The deictic expressions (“coming back from Clifton”, “seven or eight years ago”), which are the characters', also indicate that FID is being used. The words are not attributed to any one member of the family, but should be understood as having been spoken at different points in a conversation or in different conversations, or maybe as statements on which there was a general agreement.

The two following subdivisions 2 and 3 give us Anne's response to this news, possibly from two slightly shifting points of view. While in subdivision 2 the narrator explains in narrative report of discourse acts the situation faced by the heroine, in subdivision 3 the viewpoint seems to shift towards Anne, whose thoughts are expressed. Although there is no unequivocal linguistic indication that her thoughts are reported in FID – since there is no perceptible change of register between the narrator and the heroine – the use of modalizers such as the adverb *actually* or the modal verb *must*, the content and the point of view they express suggest as much.

In subdivision 4, the Musgroves' intentions regarding Captain Wentworth are related, again in narrative report of discourse acts as well as from Anne's point of view. Furthermore, the words that Dick Musgrove wrote about the captain are inserted in FID and between quotation marks (still usual with FID in Austen's time), with the spelling mistakes he must have made and in a voice which clearly belongs to an immature and not very well-educated young man. It should be noted that in this last part, although related in the narrator's voice (aside from the quotation from Dick's letter), Dick Musgrove is referred to as "poor Dick", which is the way his family refers to him and not the narrator, who earlier in the narrative revealed that she has little sympathy for this character. Therefore, subdivision 4 also contains a faint element of FID conveying the Musgroves' voices although the main voice is the narrator's.

In short, in Example 4 we recognise a succession of different voices and points of view blending almost imperceptibly into one another and often overlapping. The effect of this is to encourage the reader to participate in the heroine's consciousness and to make her/him understand and even share in what she feels and thinks. This is achieved through modality, sentence structure, deixis and tense, but mainly, I think, by means of subtle linguistic variations, which unerringly capture the ways language is used by different people in various situations. A summary of the modes of discourse used in this passage is the following (listed according to my four subdivisions):

1. Narrative report of discourse acts (the Musgroves' conversation) – FID (the Musgroves' words, not rendered literally) – Narrative report of discourse acts (Anne's feelings)
2. Narrative report of discourse acts (Anne's feelings / thoughts)
3. FID (Anne's thoughts)
4. Narrative report of discourse acts (the Musgroves' words) – FID (Dick Musgrove's written words) – Narrative report of discourse acts (the Musgroves' words)

In each case of narrative report of discourse acts, different characters' words or thoughts are rendered in the narrator's voice (with the inclusion, in subdivision 4, of some elements originating in characters' voices), whereas the passages of FID provide a shift to a character's voice. The effect of the different instances of FID in this passage is to make the reader feel all of the following: sympathy for Anne Elliot, whose inner turmoil and delicacy are made prominent, liking for the Musgroves, who are presented as ordinary and basically good-natured people, and amusement at Dick Musgrove, who is portrayed as a lazy dunce in the fleeting glance we catch of him through his writing.

Ortega y Gasset, 1919

I will now turn to the two Spanish translations and examine how Example 4 has been rendered into Spanish. The first Spanish translation of this passage is the 1919 version by Ortega y Gasset. I will discuss the different subdivisions (numbered as subdivisions 1-4 corresponding to my analysis of the English source text) separately for the sake of greater clarity:

Example 4a: Subdivision 1:

(1) Tanto oír hablar del capitán Wentworth, escuchar su nombre tantas veces mientras recordaban los años pasados, para venir a asegurar que tenía que ser aquél, que probablemente fuese el mismo capitán Wentworth a quien habían visto una o dos veces a su regreso de Clifton – era muy bien parecido, pero no podían precisar si habían pasado ocho o diez años desde aquello –, tenía que poner a prueba otra vez los nervios de Anne. (Austen 1919: 59-60)

My back-translation of 4a Subdivision 1:

(1) To hear [them] talk so much about Captain Wentworth, to hear his name so often while they remembered past years, and ended up declaring that it had to be him, that it probably was the same Captain Wentworth whom they had seen once or twice on his return from Clifton – he was very good-looking; but they could not say for certain whether eight or ten years had passed since then –, must be a renewed trial to Anne's nerves.

The first FID fragment, found inserted in subdivision 1, is much less distinct than it is in the original, because there is no discernable change of voice and it is therefore not so easily identified as spoken language: *era muy bien parecido, pero no podían precisar* [he was very good-looking, but they could not say for certain] is by no means informal, but neutral; and the characters' deictic expression *seven or eight years ago* has become the anaphoric *aquello* in *habían pasado ocho o diez años desde aquello* [eight or ten years had passed since then] (with the curious shift from *seven or eight years* to *eight or ten years*). It is true that there are modalizers (*tenía que ser* [it had to be], *probablemente* [probably]), and a certain degree of typically oral vagueness is retained, but in general the passage is barely recognizable as reflecting the Musgroves' voices.

The next two subdivisions read as follows:

Example 4a: Subdivisions (2) and (3):

(2) No obstante, ésta comprendió que era necesario que se acostumbrase a ello.
(3) Desde el momento en que se esperaba al capitán en la comarca, Anne debía dominar su sensibilidad en este punto; (Austen 1919: 60)

My back-translation of 4a Subdivisions 2 and 3:

(2) Nevertheless, she understood that it was necessary [for her] to get used to it.
(3) Since the Captain was expected in the county, Anne must control her sensibility on such a point;

In subdivision 3, the use of the name *Anne* as the subject – as opposed to the third-person pronoun, or an elliptic subject, which would be the equivalent in Spanish of the English “she” – turns the sentence from the original FID into narrative report of discourse acts, since it is not possible in FID to use a proper name for referring to the character whose words or

thoughts are being reported. In the Spanish version, this sentence is then clearly perceived as following the narrator's explanations in subdivision 2 with no change of voice.

The translation of subdivision 4 is the following:

Example 4a: Subdivision 4:

(4) y no era sólo que se lo esperaba, y muy pronto, sino que, además, los Musgrove, en su ferviente gratitud hacia aquel hombre por el cariño que había demostrado por el desgraciado joven, e influidos por el elevado concepto que tenían de su valía, concepto que refrendaba el hecho de haber permanecido bajo su mando el pobre Dick, quien en sus cartas lo alababa presentándolo como "*un bravo y afable compañero*" que lo trataba como a un camarada de colegio, estaban dispuestos a visitar a Wentworth y solicitar su amistad tan pronto como se enterasen de su llegada. (Austen 1919: 60)

My back-translation of 4a: Subdivision 4:

(4) And not only was he expected, and very soon, but the Musgroves, in their warm gratitude for the kindness he had shown the unfortunate young man, and influenced by the very high opinion they had of his worth, an opinion stamped as it was by poor Dick's having been six months under his command, and praising him in his letters as "*a courageous and affable companion*" who treated him like a schoolfellow, were determined to visit Wentworth and seek his friendship as soon as they heard of his arrival.

The mentioning of "poor Dick", conveying the Musgroves' voices, has been retained in the translation of this passage. As for Dick Musgrove's words in the letter to his parents, in spite of the quotation marks which indicate that they are reported speech, all idiosyncratic features have disappeared from them, including the spelling mistakes. Instead, the translator uses completely neutral language. Furthermore, since the translator has also changed part of the meaning ("*a fine dashing fellow, only two perticular about the schoolmaster*" has become "*a courageous and affable companion*"!), Dick's personality, which these lines conveyed clearly and satirically in the original, is not apparent here.

The summary of the modes of discourse found in Ortega y Gasset's translation from 1919 is the following (again listed according to subdivision):

1. Narrative report of discourse acts (the Musgroves' conversation) – Narrative report of discourse acts / FID? (the Musgroves' words, not rendered literally) – Narrative report of action (Anne's feelings)
2. Narrative report of discourse acts (Anne's feelings / thoughts)
3. Narrative report of discourse acts (Anne's feelings)
4. Narrative report of discourse acts (the Musgroves' conversation) – FID? (Dick Musgrove's written words) – Narrative report of discourse acts (the Musgroves' conversation)

Comparing this summary with the one given above of the English original, it can be seen that of the three FID fragments in the original one has shifted into narrative report of discourse acts and the other two have lost most of their distinctive features and so have become difficult to recognize. The result is a general shift of point of view from the characters to the narrator: the translated passage retains a vague echo of the Musgroves' voices trying to remember

things about the Captain, but Anne's and Dick Musgrove's voices have disappeared, so that from the symphony of voices in the original we have passed to a text in which the rather detached narrator's voice is dominant. As a result, the feelings elicited in the source text for the various characters are much more muted, if not absent.

Francisco Torres, 1996

Turning to my second Spanish translation, namely Francisco Torres' version from 1996, I will also analyse it according to the subdivisions applied in the original so as to keep the analysis clear and easily accessible.

Example 4b: Subdivision 1:

(1) Oírles hablar tanto del capitán Wentworth y repetir su nombre tantas veces, dilucidando sobre años pasados, oírlos llegar a la conclusión de que *tal vez, de que muy probablemente, se trataba del mismo capitán Wentworth al que recordaban haber visto una o dos veces a su regreso de Clifton – un hombre apuesto; aunque no sabían decir si hacía de aquello siete años u ocho* –, fue una especie de nueva prueba de nervios para Anne. (Austen 1996: 63) ('muy probablemente' is in italics in the original)

My back-translation of 4b: Subdivision 1:

(1) To hear them talk so much of Captain Wentworth and mention his name so often, musing over past years, to hear them reach the conclusion that it maybe, that it very probably was the same Captain Wentworth whom they remembered having seen once or twice after his return from Clifton – a good-looking man; although they could not say whether it was seven or eight years since then –, was a kind of renewed trial to Anne's nerves.

The first FID fragment is almost as distinct as it is in the English version. Although the characters' deictic expression *seven or eight years ago* has, as in 4a (Ortega y Gasset's version), changed to the anaphoric expression (*hacía de aquello* [*since then*]), it retains the modalizers and the vagueness of the original. Furthermore, word order (*hacía de aquello siete u ocho años* [*it was seven or eight years since then*]) and word choice (*un hombre apuesto* [*a good-looking man*], *no sabían decir* [*they could not say*]) are not incompatible with spoken language, so the voice shift from the narrator, who begins the sentence, to the Musgroves is perceptible.

Example 4b: Subdivisions 2 and 3:

(2) Comprendió, sin embargo, que era una prueba a la que debía acostumbrarse.
(3) Puesto que le esperaban aquí, debía aprender a insensibilizarse en esa cuestión. (Austen 1996: 63)

My back-translation of 4b: Subdivisions 2 and 3:

(2) She understood, however, that it was a trial which she must get used to. (3) Since he was expected here, [she] must learn to become insensible on this question.

Subdivision 2 shifts back to the narrator, and 3 (unlike what happened in example 4a) is compatible with FID because of the elliptic subject referring to Anne, the character whose thoughts are being reported. The use of the deictic *aquí* [*here*] confirms that it is FID.

Example 4b: Subdivision 4:

(4) Y no sólo parecía que se le esperaba, y pronto, sino que los Musgrove, agradecidos por la amabilidad que había mostrado con el pobre Dick, y movidos por un gran respeto a su carácter, reflejado como estaba en el hecho de haber tenido al pobre Dick seis meses bajo su cuidado, dijeron de él encendidas aunque no muy bien expresadas alabanzas, como que era “*un tipo estupendo, aunque algo especial para maestro*”, y que estaban dispuestos a hacerse presentar a él, y buscar su amistad, tan pronto como se enteraran de su llegada. (Austen 1996: 63)

My back-translation of 4b: Subdivision 4:

(4) And not only did it seem he was expected, and soon, but the Musgroves, grateful for the kindness he had shown poor Dick, and influenced by a very high respect for his character, which was reflected by poor Dick's having been six months under his care, talked of him with warm although not very well-spelled praise as “a wonderful fellow, but a bit special for a schoolteacher”, and [said] they were determined to be introduced to him and seek his friendship as soon as they learnt of his arrival.

In subdivision 4, the FID in inverted commas reflects the informality (*un tipo estupendo* [a great type]) and spelling problems (*especial*) found in the original quite adequately, but unfortunately the translator has mistakenly understood it to convey the Musgroves' voice instead of Dick's writing, with the somewhat incoherent result that in this version this character's faulty qualities are transferred to his family.

The summary of the modes of discourse found in this second translation is the following:

1. Narrative report of discourse acts (the Musgroves' conversation) – FID (the Musgroves' words, not rendered literally) – Narrative report of action (Anne's feelings)
2. Narrative report of discourse acts (Anne's feelings / thoughts)
3. FID (Anne's feelings)
4. Narrative report of discourse acts (the Musgroves' conversation) – FID (the Musgroves' conversation) – Narrative report of discourse acts (the Musgroves' conversation)

In Torres' version from 1996, unlike the previous one by Ortega y Gasset, the FID has for the most part been retained. Torres' translation reflects the shifts in voice much more distinctly than Ortega y Gasset's does, in spite of some slight reduction in spoken-language features. The use of FID and the presence of different voices have captured the polyphony of the original very adequately, except in the case of the misunderstanding in subdivision 4. Even so, a large proportion of the criticism and sympathy conveyed by the FID in the source text are also present here.

Discussion

The examples I have analysed here allow me to make several observations concerning the translation of FID, and to reach some conclusions that relate these observations to more general tendencies in translation. The two Spanish translators have dealt with the FID in different ways: Ortega has almost completely omitted it and substituted it for narrative report of discourse acts – not DD or ID, which seems to be a more general tendency among translators, but it should be borne in mind that only a single passage has been analysed. In

contrast, Torres has made an effort to maintain the FID. This result coincides with Zaro's finding (2006: 298) that in older Spanish translations FID tends to be transferred as other forms of discourse, whereas in recent ones it tends to be maintained. The tentative explanation given by Zaro for this, that earlier translators simply did not know this mode of discourse or else were reluctant to use it, feeling it was a strange and maybe too sophisticated form for the (Spanish) novel's conventions of the time, seems to me entirely reasonable. It is certainly true that, at least in the passage we have examined, Ortega's version turns a large proportion of the FID into other modes of discourse. It seems reasonable to assume that the use of FID in literature was little recognised at the beginning of the 20th century and therefore generally not rendered in translations at the time, whereas seventy or eighty years later it has become more common. This, of course, would need to be ascertained by analyzing a larger corpus of older and modern Spanish translations. The fact that Ortega has translated the sentences in FID as narrative report of discourse acts, and not as DD or ID, is also in accordance with Bosseaux's statement (quoted above in the section 'Translating Free Indirect Discourse') that "there is an enunciative homogenisation in translation" (2007: 67) with regard to rendering FID. Ortega has fused the three FID sentences with their surrounding narrative report of discourse acts context.

A tendency clearly observed in one of the versions (4a) and only slightly in the other (4b) is a reduction of spoken-language features in comparison with the English original, with a consequent reduction in the target text of the presence of FID, in the first translation, and of the clarity with which it is perceived, in the second one. This is in accordance with Alsina (2008a, 2008b), and with my conclusion that spoken-language features, often the main indicators of FID, tend to be reduced in translation. This tendency may be due to the difficulty of reproducing (and maybe even of perceiving) the linguistic variation which signals the different voices: plausible shifts in register are always hard to achieve, especially when the shifts are fine and unobtrusive, as here. In such cases any translator runs the risk of either overemphasizing them or leaving them out altogether. I mentioned above that translators, when dealing with Austen's use of FID, have tended to reduce the diversity of voices and to neutralize features not belonging to the language of the narrator. The tendency to reduce register heterogeneity is general in translation; it has been observed that "[t]he representation of spoken language in the source text is adjusted towards the norms of written prose" (Laviosa-Braithwaite 1998: 289, on the universal rule of normalisation, here referring to Vanderauwera 1985). Nevertheless, in opposition to what has usually been observed, the second of the translations analysed preserved the spoken-language features of the original, and also the FID.

I also observed in translation 4a that the substitution of the pronoun *she* for a proper name (*Anne*) in the target text, has had the same effect as that observed in Finnish when the pronoun *he* was substituted by a noun (Rouhainen 2000): a shift from the characters' point of view towards the narrator. This shift, as in the case of Finnish, can be attributed to a linguistic difference between English and Spanish, since in English the personal pronoun is marked for gender, whereas the closest Spanish equivalent in this context, *ellipsis*, is obviously not; this fact prompts translators to make the subject explicit (by using the character's name, or else a noun such as *the man*, *his wife*, etc.).

Whatever their cause, all these shifts have one thing in common, which is that they transcend the scope of language and text, and affect the narrative structure of the text: they are linguistic shifts that change the point of view from which events are related and, as a result, the feelings or attitude of the narrator towards these events.

Concluding remarks

In this paper we have seen that FID, a powerful stylistic device shared by many languages, is often translated as other modes of discourse. This is caused by linguistic and literary discrepancies between different languages, as well as by the tendency to neutralize marked language in translation. The shift from FID to other modes of discourse usually has narratological consequences: voice and/or point of view shift from a character to the narrator, which in its turn entails a loss of polyphony and its ironical possibilities. In the example analyzed in this paper we have seen that the treatment FID receives in translations also depends on the date when they were produced. In the case of translations from English into Spanish, FID is more likely to be translated as other forms of discourse when there has been little previous contact, relatively speaking, between the two languages involved.¹⁹ This observation suggests that an interesting line of research would be to compare modern and older English-Spanish translations, as well as non-translated Spanish texts, in order to find out whether, after decades of translations, Spanish literary and stylistic conventions have been modified by the influence of English stylistic conventions, and, if so, in what way and to what extent. This may be done for other pairs of languages as well in order to find out how languages and cultures are affected by a long exposition to other languages, cultures and traditions.

Author's address

Department of Translation and Language Sciences

Pompeu Fabra University

Roc Boronat, 138

08018 Barcelona

Spain

victoria.alsina@upf.edu

Sources

Austen, Jane (1972 [1817]) *Northanger Abbey*. Penguin English Library. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Austen, Jane (1985 [1817]) *Persuasion*. Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Austen, Jane (1919) *Persuasión*. Madrid: Calpe. Translated into Spanish by Manuel Ortega y Gasset.

Austen, Jane (1991) *L'abadia de Northanger*. Barcelona: Edhasa. Translated into Catalan by Jordi Arbonès.

Austen, Jane (1995) *Mansfield Park*. Madrid: Ediciones Rialp. Translated into Spanish by Miguel Martín.

Austen, Jane (1996) *Persuasión. Sandition*. Barcelona: Alba. Translated into Spanish by Francisco Torres Oliver.

Hemingway, Ernest (1955 [1924]) "A Very Short Story", in *The Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. New York: Scribners's, 139-142.

Hemingway, Ernest (1991) "Hyvin lyhyt kertomus", tr. Kalevi Nyytäjä, in *Ensimmäiset 49 kertomusta*. Helsinki: Tammi, 158-160.

¹⁹ One of my reviewers pointed out that the fact that FID was identified in 1912 and generally recognised only much later appears to be a more important factor for the differences in the two translations. I think it may be a factor, but how important is difficult to say, because it is not easy to know how far translators are aware of theoretical developments. I think the growing contact between Spanish readers and translators and the English language and literature is a more decisive influence in this stylistic development.

References

- Abbott, H. Porter (2002) *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alsina, Victòria (2008a) 'El tratamiento del discurso indirecto libre en las traducciones españolas y catalana de *Mansfield Park* de Jane Austen', in Brumme, Jenny and Hildegard Resinger (eds.) *La oralidad fingida. Obras literarias. Descripción y traducción*. Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana / Vervuert, 69-85.
- Alsina, Victòria (2008b) *Llengua i estilística en la narrativa de Jane Austen. Les traduccions al català*. Biblioteca de Traducció i Interpretació, 13. Vic: Eumo.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1981 [1973]) *The Dialogic Imagination: four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bally, Charles (1912) 'Le style indirect libre en français moderne', *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Banfield, Ann (1982) *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. London: Routledge.
- Booth, Wayne (1961) *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bosseaux, Charlotte (2007) *How Does it Feel? Point of View in Translation*. Amsterdam/ New York: Rodopi.
- Chalker, Sylvia and Edmund Weiner (1988) *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*. Oxford University Press. Oxford Reference Online.
- Cohn, Dorrit (1978) *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Crespo Allué, María José (1981) *La problemática de las versiones españolas de Persuasion de Jane Austen. Crítica de su traducción*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- Czennia, Bärbel (2004) 'Erzählweisen in literarischer Prosa und ihre Übersetzung', in Kittel, Harald et al. (eds.) *Übersetzung / Translation / Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, vol. 1, 987-1007.
- Finch, Casey and Peter Bowen (1990) "'The Tittle-Tattle of Highbury': Gossip and the Free Indirect Style in *Emma*", *Representations* 31: 1-18.
- Fludernik, Monika (1993) *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction*. London: Routledge.
- Fludernik, Monika (1995) 'The Linguistic Illusion of Alterity: The Free Indirect as Paradigm of Discourse Representation', *Diacritics* 25 (4): 89-115.
- Fowler, Roger (1982) 'How to see through language: perspective in fiction', *Poetics* 11: 213-235.
- Gallagher, John D. (2001) 'Le discours indirect libre vu par le traducteur', in Ballard, Michel (ed.) *Oralité et traduction*. Cedex Artois: Presses Université, 209-244.
- Gunn, Daniel P. (2004) 'Free Indirect Discourse and Narrative Authority in *Emma*', *Narrative* 12 (1): 35-54.
- Jonasson, Kerstin (2001) 'Traduction et point de vue narratif', in Erikson (ed.) *Aspekter av litterär översättning från franska. Kollokvium vid Växjö universitet 11-12 maj 2000*. Växjö University Press: 69-81.
- Laviosa-Braithwaite, Sara (1998) 'Universals of Translation', in Baker, Mona (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 288-291.
- Leech, Geoffrey and Michael Short (1981) *Style in Fiction. A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Longman.
- Levenston, E. A. and Sonnenschein, G. (1986) 'The Translation of Point-of-View in Fictional Narrative', in House, Julianne and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 49-59.
- Lodge, David (1966) *The Language of Fiction*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Maldonado, Concepción (1991) *Discurso directo y discurso indirecto*. Madrid: Taurus.
- McHale, Brian (1978) 'Free indirect discourse: A survey of recent accounts', *Journal of Poetics and Literary Theory*, 3: 249-287.
- McHale, Brian (1983) 'Linguistics and poetics revisited', *Poetics Today*, 4, 1: 17-45.
- Neumann, A. W. (1992) 'Free indirect discourse in the eighteenth-century English novel: speakable or unspeakable?', in Toolan, M. (ed.) *Language, Text and Context. Essays in stylistics*. London: Routledge, 111-135.
- Page, Norman (1972) *The Language of Jane Austen*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Pascal, Roy (1977) *The Dual Voice: Free Indirect Speech and Its Functions in the Nineteenth-Century European Novel*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Poncharal, Bruno (1998) *La Représentation de Paroles au Discours Indirect Libre en Anglais et en Français*. Thèse de doctorat. Paris VII.
- Reyes, Graciela (1984) *Polifonía textual. La citación en el relato literario*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith (2002 [1983]) *Narrative Fiction*. London: Routledge.
- Rouhainen, Tarja (2000) 'Free Indirect Discourse in the Translation into Finnish. The Case of D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love*', *Target*, 12 (1): 109-126.
- Simpson, Paul (1993) *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.
- Tacca, Oscar (1986) *El estilo indirecto libre y las maneras de narrar*. Buenos Aires: Kapelusz.

- Taivalkovski-Shilov, Kriistina (2003) *La Tierce Main. Discours Rapporté, Traduction et Fielding en France au XVIIIe Siècle. Thèse de doctorat*. Université de Helsinki.
- Thompson, J. (1994) 'Jane Austen', in J. Richetti (ed) *Columbia History of the British Novel*. New York: Columbia University Press, 275-299.
- Toolan, Michael (1988) *Narrative. A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Toolan, Michael (2001 [1988]) *Narrative. A Critical Linguistic Introduction. Second edition*. London: Routledge.
- Uspensky, Boris (1973) *A Poetics of Composition*, trans. Valentina Zavarin and Susan Witting. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vanderauwera, Ria (1985) *Dutch Novels Translated into English. The Transformation of a "Minority" Literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Verdín Díaz, Guillermo (1970) 'Introducción al Estilo Indirecto Libre en Español', *Revista de Filología Española*, Anejo XCI: 1-164.
- Zaro, Juan Jesús (2006) 'Problemas de traducción del estilo indirecto libre en la novela inglesa clásica', in Elena, Pilar and Josse de Kock (eds.) *Gramática y traducción*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 279-300.