

**JANE AUSTEN’S FREE INDIRECT DISCOURSE IN BULGARIAN
TRANSLATION:
*SENSE AND SENSIBILITY AND EMMA***

Vitana Kostadinova
Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv

This essay discusses the Bulgarian translations of free indirect discourse in Jane Austen’s *Sense and Sensibility* and *Emma*. The author’s use of hybrid FID, with quotation marks but in the third person, seems to be often transfigured by the translators. *Re-narration* is frequently the technique of choice to render FID in Bulgarian, which means a loss of the immediate access to the character’s consciousness.

Key words: free indirect discourse (FID); point of view; translation; Jane Austen; *Sense and Sensibility*; *Emma*

In 1957 Ian Watt acknowledged Jane Austen’s contribution to the development of the novel in giving us “not only editorial comment, but much of Defoe’s and Richardson’s psychological closeness to the subjective world of the characters”: this she achieved by varying her narrative point of view, he concluded (Watt 1957: 297). Her signature technique involved a “character whose consciousness is tacitly accorded a privileged status, and whose mental life is rendered more completely than that of the other characters” (297). Drawing upon similar observations, some twenty years later Roy Pascal would announce that “Jane Austen’s novels supply the preconditions one might consider necessary for the unhampered emergence of free indirect speech” (Pascal 1977: 45). The latter term has been very much debated; it is sometimes referred to as “free indirect style” or “free indirect discourse” and has been associated with single voice theories and dual voice theories. In the theoretical overview of her book, *D. H. Lawrence and Narrative Viewpoint*, Violeta Sotirova explains that “the proponents of dual voice theories claim that the style conflates two voices, often difficult to tell apart: the voice of the narrator and the voice of the character”, whereas “the proponents of single voice theories ... insist that there is no linguistic evidence for the fusion of narrator’s and character’s voices in sentences of *free indirect style*”

(Sotirova 2011: 1). Sotirova uses *viewpoint* and *free indirect style* synonymously in her analysis but this essay takes into account Paul Simpson's definition according to which there are four categories of point of view: *spatial*, *temporal*, *psychological*, and *ideological* (11-12). It is the psychological point of view that has a lot to do with Jane Austen's free indirect discourse:

Psychological point of view refers to the ways in which narrative events are mediated through the consciousness of the "teller" of the story. It will encompass the means by which a fictional world is slanted in a particular way or the means by which narrators construct, in linguistic terms, their own view of the story they tell. Psychological point of view extends from authorial omniscience to a single character's perhaps restricted version of "reality." (Simpson 1993: 11-12)

Jane Austen's use of shifts in the narrative point of view, quite innovative in the early nineteenth century, has not gone unnoticed and features in a number of studies. What is under-researched is what happens to the technique when the original text is translated into a foreign language. This owes to the established "common assumption that the narratological structure of a text is not affected by the translation process" (Bosseaux 2007: 17). Charlotte Bosseaux has dedicated a book-length study to the problem, balancing narratology against the credo that "all meanings in a text are ultimately expressed through language and may thus be modified in translation" (qtd. in Bosseaux 2007: 17). Bosseaux's monograph makes observations and comments on the French translations of Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* and *The Waves* and draws the conclusion that "because the fictional universe represented in a text rests on linguistic manifestations which are integral parts of the original, the non-translation and non-repetition of microstructural elements in the translations proved to have consequences on the *feel* of the translated text" (228, emphasis added). Bosseaux is influenced by Paul Simpson's claim that the connection between point of view and linguistic expression is irrefutable; in the latter's opinion "much of the 'feel' of a text is attributable to the type of point of view it exhibits" (Simpson 1993: 46).

Prompted by changes in the "feel" of the translated texts of Jane Austen's novels, this essay discusses examples of free indirect discourse (FID) in *Sense and Sensibility*, in *Emma*, and in their Bulgarian versions. The two novels were translated into Bulgarian in 1995 by Anna Elchinova and Nadezhda Rozova, respectively. The analytical focus is on the types of FID used by the author and on the translators' choices when rendering it

into Bulgarian. In this connection, tense forms and modality are considered, and the asymmetry between the two languages is kept in mind. Thus, literary and linguistic observations go hand in hand even if linguistics is more of an auxiliary in this research. The essay derives a list of distinctive features that appear significant with reference to FID, checking them against the findings of other scholars on the topic, which is a combination of Holmes's two approaches to studying translation: the descriptive method of distinctive features and the repertory method of looking for specific examples of required features negotiated in advance (Holmes 1988: 89). With regard to translating FID into Bulgarian, however, there is no tradition to rely on, and the current analysis is not entirely innocent of making intuitive steps forward.

In Jane Austen's case, FID encompasses both free indirect thought and free indirect speech; unlike direct speech, it offers a third-person narrative and makes use of the past tense; unlike indirect speech, it bridges the gap between now and then or here and there with the help of *deictic* markers, and gives access to the consciousness of the character, preserving their patterns of expression; it is "the style in which the perspectives of narrator and character jostle for prominence" (Bray 2003:109). Graphically, Austen distinguishes between FID indicated by quotation marks and free indirect speech or thought woven into the narrator's discourse. In a wider literary context, the former practice is unusual; actually, twentieth century scholars seem to think that FID ought to be free from quotation marks. Jan Fergus, however, remarks: "Not discussed by most critics is a hybrid form employed not only by Austen ..., in which the quotation marks are placed around the altered third-person past-tense language as if it represented reported speech" (Fergus 2016: 546). This "hybrid form" persists through Austen's novels and here is an early example from *Sense and Sensibility*: "Yes, he would give them three thousand pounds: it would be liberal and handsome! It would be enough to make them completely easy. Three thousand pounds! he could spare so considerable a sum with little inconvenience" (*S&S*, Vol. I, Chapter 1).¹ This is Mr John Dashwood contemplating the promise he had given to his father's last request. The use of FID in this case illustrates Gunn's point that "FID functions in Austen's novels as a filtered representation of subjectivity, inflected throughout by the narrator's irony and her moral sensibility as reflected in her language elsewhere" (Gunn 2004: 41). Anna Elchinova chose

¹ *S&S* is an abbreviation for *Sense and Sensibility*. Due to the numerous English-language editions of Jane Austen's novels, the references to their original texts quote the chapter, whereas the references to the Bulgarian translations specify the page number in the editions listed in the bibliography.

to retain the quotation marks and the third-person narrative in the translation of this passage into Bulgarian, transposing the past-tense “would” into the Bulgarian equivalent of “will” and adding conditional mood forms: “Да, ще им даде три хиляди лири, това би било един красив и щедър жест! Ще бъде достатъчно да живеят спокойно. Три хиляди лири! Би могъл да отдели такава щедра сума без всякакви притеснения” (Austen 2008: 10). The Bulgarian language does not require a strict sequence of tenses; thus, the temporal characteristics of the text (in what is known as semi-direct speech in Bulgarian) usually preserve the orientation that would have been expressed in direct speech; this said, transposition of tenses is also used in some cases (cf. Nitsolova 1984: 103). Elchinova’s choice in this instance preserves the “fusion of narratorial and subjective modes” (Pascal 1977: 31) that readers would detect in the original. On other occasions, however, she has opted for a different technique of rendering the hybrid FID. Here comes an example:

Sir John could not have thought it possible. “A man of whom he had always had such reason to think well! Such a good-natured fellow! He did not believe there was a bolder rider in England! It was an unaccountable business. He wished him at the devil with all his heart. He would not speak another word to him, meet him where he might, for all the world! No, not if it were to be by the side of Barton covert, and they were kept waiting for two hours together. Such a scoundrel of a fellow! such a deceitful dog! It was only the last time they met that he had offered him one of Folly’s puppies! and this was the end of it!” (S&S, Vol. II, Chapter 10)

The context makes it clear that this is Sir John’s indignant response to Willoughby’s behaviour *communicated* to Elinor. That is, if the previous instance was of free indirect thought, this is now free indirect speech. The Bulgarian language has a grammatical category for reporting other people’s words (*re-narration*) and the translator has resorted to it in this case as in others of the same kind:

Сър Джон просто не допускал такова нещо, имал всички основания да мисли само хубави работи за Уилъби! Ама такъв добър човек бил! Пък и едва ли в Англия имало *по-храбър* ездач от него! Сър Джон просто не можел да си обясни тази работа. От дън душа му пожелавал да върви по дяволите. Където и да го срещне, за нищо на света нямало да му продума дори! Ако ще да стоят два часа един до друг в бартънските гъсталаци по време на лов, пак нямало да му проговори! Какъв негодник излязъл! Мръсно куче! А пък последния път като се видели, Уилъби дори му предложил едно от кутретата на Фоли! Не искал да го вижда повече, край! (Austen 2008: 264, emphasis added)

The Bulgarian translation of the excerpt is dominated by the re-narrator of Sir John's opinions, possibly Elinor, but to whom she may be speaking remains a mystery. Still, the reader can hear Sir John's agitated voice and some of his characteristic phraseology. Sir John's first comment on Willoughby appears earlier in the novel, in direct speech, and amounts to "As good a kind of fellow as ever lived, I assure you. A very decent shot, and there is not a bolder rider in England" (S&S, Vol. I, Chapter 9); the subsequent echo of this introductory characterisation should be obvious, except that in the Bulgarian version the adjectives differ, "Най-доброто момче на света, уверявам ви. Много свестен, симпатяга, а и в цяла Англия няма *по-смел* ездач от него" (Austen 2008: 59, emphasis added). In the example from Vol. II, Chapter 10, rendering FID by means of re-narration works against the fusion of voices: it is no longer "an *imitation* of figural speech or thought, in which the narrator echoes or mimics the idiom of the character" (Gunn 2004: 37).

Re-narration is a Bulgarian language modal category expressive of the speaker's attitude (1) towards the utterance about the action and (2) towards the relationship between the utterance about the action and reality. To put it differently, re-narration helps in signifying whether the evaluation of the speaker is primary (his/ her own) or secondary (re-narrative), whether it is objective or subjective. It builds on two differential features, i.e. on two oppositions: non-re-narration – re-narration and non-subjectivity – subjectivity. The first opposition shows whether the speaker refers to somebody else's information or relies on his/ her own information; the second opposition has to do with the speaker's evaluation of the utterance's correspondence to reality. (cf. Vasseva 1995: 7)²

The re-narrative forms are liberally used by others as a translation technique for rendering FID in Bulgarian, notably by Nadezhda Rozova in her translation of *Emma*. In this novel Jane Austen's mastery of FID is indisputable, often weaving together the voices of more than one character together with the narrator's voice. Here is a scene in which Emma is in conversation with Harriet, who is telling her about Mr Martin and towards the end of the account we can hear Mrs Martin speaking to Harriet speaking to Emma:

² For in-depth analysis of re-narration in Bulgarian, see Gerdzhikov's research on the topic (e.g. Герджиков, Г. *Преизказването на глаголното действие в българския език*, София, 1984), and Kutsarov's study of the category (e.g. Куцаров, Иван. *Преизказването в българския език*, София, 1984).

Emma encouraged her talkativeness ... With this inspiriting notion, her questions increased in number and meaning; and she particularly led Harriet to talk more of Mr. Martin, – and there was evidently no dislike to it. Harriet was very ready to speak of the share he had had in their moonlight walks and merry evening games; and dwelt a good deal upon his being so very good-humoured and obliging. “He had gone three miles round one day, in order to bring her some walnuts, because she had said how fond she was of them – and in every thing else he was so very obliging! He had his shepherd’s son into the parlour one night on purpose to sing to her. She was very fond of singing. He could sing a little himself. She believed he was very clever, and understood every thing. He had a very fine flock; and while she was with them, he had been bid more for his wool than any body in the country. She believed every body spoke well of him. His mother and sisters were very fond of him. Mrs. Martin had told her one day, (and there was a blush as she said it,) that it was impossible for any body to be a better son; and therefore she was sure whenever he married he would make a good husband. Not that she wanted him to marry. She was in no hurry at all.” “Well done, Mrs. Martin!” thought Emma. “You know what you are about.” (*Emma*, Vol. I, Chapter 4)

The wider context establishes the narrator’s presence and makes Emma’s point of view the filter through which readers perceive Harriet’s story. Nevertheless, within such a frame, Harriet’s voice is loud and clear: her emotional investment and sincerity are quite obvious. The translation transforms all this:

Ема насърчаваше бърливостта на приятелката си ... Вдъхновена от предположението си, Ема започна да разпитва по-настойчиво и подробно и нарочно насочваше Хариет да говори повече за мистър Мартин, което очевидно не ѝ беше неприятно. Хариет с готовност разправяше за участието му в техните разходки на лунна светлина и във веселите вечери и постоянно повтаряше, че той е изключително добър и внимателен. Веднъж *обикалял* три мили околоръст, за да ѝ донесе орехи, понеже тя *казала*, че много ги обича. Пък и за всичко друго *бил* толкова услужлив! Една вечер пък *довел* в салона сина на овчаря и го *накарал* да ѝ попее. Тя много *обичала* песните. Самият той *пеел* по малко. Хариет смяташе, че Мартин е много умен и разбира от всичко. *Имал* чудесно стадо и докато *гостувала* на семейството, вълната от неговите стада се *продавала* най-скъпо в областта. Тя мислеше, че всички го харесват. Майка му и сестрите му много го *обичали*. Веднъж мисис Мартин ѝ *казала* (тук Хариет се изчерви), че едва ли ще се намери по-добър син от нейния, затова била сигурна, че когато се ожени, от него ще излезе добър съпруг. Не че искала той да се ожени, не, съвсем не бързала. „Браво на вас [sic], мисис Мартин – помисли си Ема, – право в целта.“ (Austen 2009: 26-27, emphasis added)

Once again, the re-narrative reflex of a Bulgarian-language speaker has kicked in and the translator has opted for the grammatical forms associated with this grammatical category. Semantically, there should be different planes of re-narration here: on the one hand we have what Harriet herself was told by Mr Martin and later Mrs Martin about their own actions or feelings, so she had to take their word for it – thus, on these occasions, it is perfectly natural for Harriet’s voice to be associated with the re-narrative forms in the Bulgarian translation; on the other hand, however, she also recounts details of what she has witnessed and when this is rendered in re-narrative forms, i.e. Mr Martin *was said to have had* his shepherd’s son into the parlour, we are persuaded to think that she is no longer the speaker; for all we know it must be Emma relating what she heard from Harriet. This gives Emma a position even more dominating than in the original as she is now in control of her protégé’s voice.

That this is not a consistent re-interpretation on the part of the translator becomes evident with another example, in which Emma’s conversation with Mr Elton is partly rendered with the help of FID. In the original, the author has signposted the heroine’s voice with the help of quotation marks: “If he would be so good as to read to them, it would be a kindness indeed! It would amuse away the difficulties of her part, and lessen the irksomeness of Miss Smith’s” (*Emma*, Vol. I, Chapter 6). The Bulgarian version ignores the quotation marks; it begins with an introductory verb calling attention to the narrator, and the reader is further prevented from slipping into Emma’s point of view because the second sentence makes use of the re-narrative form, which emphasises the fact that a different voice is relating Miss Woodhouse’s words: “Каза му, че ще е наистина мило от негова страна, ако е така добър да им почете на глас. Това *щяло* да я отвлече от трудностите на заниманието и да намали притеснението на мис Смит” (Austen 2009: 43-44, emphasis added). It remains uncertain whose voice this is and the effect is certainly not the effect of FID.

The use of the re-narrative forms in Bulgarian is not limited to the hybrid FID but extends to the translations of FID proper. In an excerpt on Harriet’s visit to the Martins, we have Emma’s presence framing the story but the details are provided by her friend; no quotation marks are used, which adds ambiguity to the text; the dominating feature here is the use of the past perfect tense:

[...] but at last Emma collected from her enough to understand the sort of meeting, and the sort of pain it was creating. She had seen only Mrs. Martin and

the two girls. They had received her doubtfully, if not coolly; and nothing beyond the merest common-place had been talked almost all the time – till just at last, when Mrs. Martin's saying, all of a sudden, that she thought Miss Smith was grown, had brought on a more interesting subject, and a warmer manner. In that very room she had been measured last September, with her two friends. There were the pencilled marks and memorandums on the wainscot by the window. He had done it. They all seemed to remember the day, the hour, the party, the occasion – to feel the same consciousness, the same regrets – to be ready to return to the same good understanding; and they were just growing again like themselves, (Harriet, as Emma must suspect, as ready as the best of them to be cordial and happy,) when the carriage re-appeared, and all was over. The style of the visit, and the shortness of it, were then felt to be decisive. Fourteen minutes to be given to those with whom she had thankfully passed six weeks not six months ago! Emma could not but picture it all, and feel how justly they might resent, how naturally Harriet must suffer. (*Emma*, Vol. II, Chapter 5)

It could be inferred that the sequence of events and the sensitivity come from Harriet, whereas the judgments and the conclusions are Emma's, though there might be alternative interpretations. The competing voices of the two characters and the underlying presence of the narrator fuel uncertainty and perpetuate instability, complicating Bray's paradigm:

Rather than a “fusion” of the narrator's and the character's voices in free indirect discourse then, perhaps it would be more accurate to speak of a balance of two perspectives in ambiguous passages of narrative, which can sometimes be resolved one way or another by subsequent linguistic cues. In other cases, the ambiguity may never be resolved and both points of view may remain in play. (Bray 2007: 48)

With Jane Austen we often hear three and sometimes four voices. In this particular case, the past-perfect-tense forms relegate the experience to a past before the crucial event of Miss Smith's return to the carriage and mark her reception by the Martins as remote as being measured last September. When the Bulgarian translation makes use of the re-narrative forms, it highlights Emma's appropriation of Harriet's story but also assigns to the latter the analysis of the former:

Най-сетне Ема изкопчи достатъчно, за да проумее характера на болката, която срещата бе причинила на приятелката ѝ. Беше видяла само мисис Мартин и двете момичета. Приели я резервирано, даже хладно, и през цялото време разговаряли за обичайните ежедневни дреболии. Едва накрая се появила по-интересна тема и се завърнало по-топлото отношение, когато мисис Мартин отбелязала, че Хариет се е източила. През септември се била

мерела заедно с двете си приятелки, а знаците, отбелязани с молив, и паметните бележки още си стояли на рамките на прозореца в съседната стая. Той ги бил направил. Изглежда, всички помнели този ден, точния час, повода и компанията. Изпитвали еднакви чувства и сякаш били готови да възобновят старото приятелство помежду си. Тъкмо започнали отново да се държат както преди (Ема подозираше, че Хариет е била готова да откликне с най-голяма сърдечност и радост от трите), каретата отново се появила и всичко свършило. Начинът, по който било извършено посещението, и продължителността му се оказали решаващи. Да отдели петнадесет минути на хората, с които само преди половин година е прекарала шест благодатни седмици. *Но Ема не можеше да разбере всичко това и не виждаше причина за справедливото им възмущение и за терзанията на Хариет.* (Austen 2009: 167, emphasis added)

Perhaps it all comes from misinterpreting “Emma could not but...” at the end of the excerpt – Austen’s sentence is the ultimate hint that the scene is re-created in Emma’s consciousness out of the fragments she has been provided with; the translator, however, did not recognize her as the “mastermind” of Highbury – thus, the Bulgarian account sounds as if Harriet has voiced her indignation at her friend. I cannot emphasize enough the fact that throughout the novel Miss Smith is never indignant, but with its misrepresentation of meaning, the Bulgarian translation gives readers a false impression of her character. At the same time, the re-narrative forms keep Emma in the spotlight for she is the one to render Harriet’s experience...

The examples reveal that there is a problem with using the re-narrative forms to render FID in Bulgarian: re-narrative forms mean that the immediate access to the consciousness and the voice of the speaker in the original is manifestly mediated by a story-teller in the translation, and this is particularly confusing when no one but the narrator is in a position to render the character’s words or thoughts as in the example of Mr Woodhouse and his family leaving the Westons’ Christmas party prematurely because of the snow:

The carriages came: and Mr. Woodhouse, always the first object on such occasions, was carefully attended to his own by Mr. Knightley and Mr. Weston; but not all that either could say could prevent some renewal of alarm at the sight of the snow which had actually fallen, and the discovery of a much darker night than he had been prepared for. “He was afraid they should have a very bad drive. He was afraid poor Isabella would not like it. And there would be poor Emma in the carriage behind. He did not know what they had best do. They must keep as much together as they could;” and James was talked to, and given a charge to go very slow and wait for the other carriage. (*Emma*, Vol. I, Chapter 15)

Каретите пристигнаха и мистър Удхаус, когото в такива случаи винаги настаняваха първи, бе придружен до своята карета от мистър Найтли и мистър Уестън. Нито един от двамата обаче не можа да предотврати възвръщането на тревогата му при вида на натрупания сняг и при откритието, че нощта е много по-тъмна, отколкото бе очаквал. *Боял се*, че им предстои тежко пътуване. *Страхувал се*, че то няма да хареса на горката Изабела. *Тревожеше се* и за горката Ема в задната карета! Няма да се представя как ще е най-добре да постъпят. Каретите трябвало да се движат много плътно една зад друга. С Джеймс вече били говорили. Указанията били да кара бавно и да изчаква втората карета. (Austen 2009: 117, emphasis added)

Emma is not around to echo her father's worries and the other two participants in the scene are not in a prominent position to re-narrate Mr Woodhouse's words. The translation is further flawed by the inconsistency of his being afraid in a re-narrative form and the reference to Emma in a witness-mode past-tense form. To add insult to injury, the translator has incorporated the narrator's remark (which comes immediately after the FID) into the re-narrative mode of the translation, leaving readers utterly perplexed as to the logic of it all.

A rather different sort of example comes with Mr Elton's confession of his feelings for Emma when they find themselves tête-à-tête in the other carriage:

To restrain him as much as might be, by her own manners, she was immediately preparing to speak with exquisite calmness and gravity of the weather and the night; but scarcely had she begun, scarcely had they passed the sweep-gate and joined the other carriage, than she found her subject cut up – her hand seized – her attention demanded, and Mr. Elton actually making violent love to her: availing himself of the precious opportunity, declaring sentiments which must be already well known, hoping – fearing – adoring – ready to die if she refused him; but flattering himself that his ardent attachment and unequalled love and unexampled passion could not fail of having some effect, and in short, very much resolved on being seriously accepted as soon as possible. It really was so. Without scruple – without apology – without much apparent diffidence, Mr. Elton, the lover of Harriet, was professing himself her lover. (*Emma*, Vol. I, Chapter 15)

The beginning of the paragraph is coloured by Emma's consciousness: it is her judgment of the situation that calls for speaking "with exquisite calmness and gravity of the weather and the night"; then the striking use of passive voice reinforces grammatically the semantic implication that she has been overruled and is no longer in control; the rest of the sentence is very much dominated by Mr Elton's confession, the breathlessness of his speech

rendered by dashes, and readers can reconstruct his address lurking behind the free indirect discourse. The end of the paragraph returns to Emma's perspective on the situation and its last sentence indicates her indignation at Mr Elton's temerity to so rudely defy her plans for him. This interplay of points of view is rather muffled in the translation:

За да го обуздае доколкото може със собственото си поведение, Ема възнамеряваше незабавно да заговори за времето и настоящата нощ, при това – напълно спокойно и изключително сериозно. Но едва преминали през портата и догонили първата карета, тя установи, че мистър Елтън я прекъсва, грабва ръката ѝ, настоява за вниманието ѝ и в действителност бурно я ухажва. Той се възползваше от предоставената му безценна възможност, за да ѝ разкрие чувствата си, които отдавна трябвало да ѝ бъдат известни. Беше обнадяден, тръпнещ от боязън, изпълнен с обожание, готов да умре, ако тя му откаже, но ласкаещ себе си с мисълта, че пламенната му привързаност, ненадминатата му любов и безпримерна страст не биха я оставили напълно безразлична. Накратко, той бе твърдо решил предложението му да бъде прието колкото е възможно по-скоро. Значи такава бе истината! Без никакви извинения, безскрупулно и очевидно без всякакво стеснение мистър Елтън – поклонникът на Хариет – обявяваше, че е влюбен *в нея, в Ема*. (Austen 2009: 117-118)

Neither the punctuation nor the syntax of the Bulgarian text echoes the original change of perspective. The voices of the two characters in Jane Austen's version appear transformed into the voice of the omniscient narrator in Nadezhda Rozova's translation, and only the last sentence comes close to the effect of the original. Still, referring to Emma by name at the end of the excerpt is symptomatic of how shy the Bulgarian translation is of maintaining a character's point of view without retreating to the narrator. FID maximizes the use of pronouns and avoids the name of the character whose consciousness has been tapped into – most often the first-person "I" is substituted by a "he" or a "she" because hardly anyone references themselves by name in direct speech. In other words, when it comes to translating FID, semantics is not enough and I find myself in disagreement with Brian McHale, according to whom, "[t]he decisive indices of FID ought to be not the marks of its syntactical distinctiveness, or even its traces in the surrounding context, but the signs of its mimetic character..." (McHale 1978: 269). The content of Mr Elton's speech is there, the words are faithfully rendered, but the point of view has been altered. Paul Simpson emphasizes that "the techniques of speech and thought presentation are crucially tied up with the concept of point of view" (Simpson 1993: 30). Prompted by the example above, of Mr Elton's

“making violent love” to Emma, I would argue that syntax, as a technique of discourse presentation, matters when translating FID. Monika Fludernik is not concerned with translation but nevertheless outlines “syntactic expressions of subjectivity” as signals of FID (Fludernik 2005: 231-254).

Considering the indicators of FID Fludernik has listed, “evaluative lexemes ... epistemic modals ... designations of others only referable to the character’s perspective ... as well as idiomatic expressions” (Fludernik 2005: 79), I would like to briefly exemplify Austen’s use of modal verbs in *Emma*. Modality does not seem to be much of an issue when it comes to translations from English into Bulgarian. The concept “refers broadly to a speaker’s attitude towards, or opinion about, the truth of a proposition expressed by a sentence [...], to their attitude towards the situation or event described by a sentence” (Simpson 1993: 47). Modal verbs go hand in hand with FID in the following excerpt, in which Mrs Weston’s consciousness dominates the narrative: “She knew that at times she *must* be missed; and *could* not think, without pain, of Emma’s losing a single pleasure, or suffering an hour’s ennui, from the want of her companionableness: but *dear Emma* was of no feeble character...” (*Emma*, Vol. I, Chapter 2, emphasis added). The use of “must” is omitted in the Bulgarian translation but the semantics of “knew” is sufficient to direct the readers towards the character’s thoughts, whereas the future tense in the subordinate clauses is a bit of a compensation for the missing modal: “Знаеше, че понякога ще им липсва и не можеше без болка да понесе мисълта, че Ема ще се лиши даже само от едно свое удоволствие или ще скучае дори час заради липсата на нейната компания. Но скъпата Ема имаше силен характер ...” (Austen 2009: 19). N. Rozova has preserved the personal perspective of “dear Emma” and with that, the awareness that we are in the character’s mind. Modal verbs go together with personalised phraseology in this other example of FID where readers are invited to see the world through the eyes of Mrs Elton:

She was a little shocked at the want of two drawing rooms, at the poor attempt at rout-cakes, and there being no ice in the Highbury card parties. Mrs. Bates, Mrs. Perry, Mrs. Goddard and others, were a good deal behind hand in knowledge of the world, but she would soon shew them how every thing *ought* to be arranged. In the course of the spring she *must* return their civilities by one *very superior* party; in which her card tables *should* be set out with their separate candles and unbroken packs *in the true style*, and more waiters engaged for the evening than their own establishment could furnish, to carry round the refreshments at exactly the *proper* hour, and in the *proper* order. (*Emma*, Vol. II, Chapter 16, emphasis added)

Mrs Elton's take on the world is the only acceptable version of it and she has simply no choice but to demonstrate this to everyone; she is superior to everyone else in the village and in this context her party would be very superior indeed, she belongs to the people of style who determine what is true and proper. The modality of the Bulgarian translation is not exactly identical to the English original but it adequately transforms Mrs Elton's point of view. What is less successful is the personalised language meant to highlight her class awareness, as well as the difference between town and countryside:

Тя беше малко изненадана, че в Хайбъри къщите нямат по два салона, че липсва вкус към гуляите и че на събиранията за игра на карти почти никъде няма лед. Мисис Бейтс, мисис Пери, мисис Годард и всички останали не познаваха светския живот толкова добре, колкото нея, но тя възнамеряваше да им покаже как *трябва* да се прави всяко нещо. През пролетта *щеше* да отвърне на любезността им с една *великолепна* забава, на която масите за карти щяха да имат отделни свещи и неразпечатани колоди карти, *както си му беше редът*, а келнерите, ангажирани за вечерта, щяха да са много повече, отколкото гостите биха могли да си позволят, за да може освежителните напитки да бъдат поднесени в *най-подходящия* момент и в *правилния* ред. (Austen 2009: 259-260, emphasis added)

Thus, even if the grammatical expression of Mrs Elton's intentions keeps the reader within her evaluation of life, the choice of words is not reminiscent of her own lexical range and blends her style with the style of the narrator, which is at odds with the character being satirised.

Overall, the examples show that the translation of FID from English into Bulgarian is problematic in the two Austen novels. With the near obliteration of the hybrid form of FID, a particular feature of the author's technique is almost lost in translation. The inattention to the original syntax interferes with the preservation of the point of view encoded in the original text. Re-narrative forms are the preferred method of rendering FID, which torpedoes the immediacy of the reader's communion with the character – an unspecified mediator is introduced and often this brings in confusion as well as psychological distance. The misappropriation of re-narrative forms in Bulgarian translations evokes Jakobson's observation,

If some grammatical category is absent in a given language, its meaning may be translated into this language by lexical means. [...] It is more difficult to remain faithful to the original when we translate into a language provided with a certain grammatical category from a language devoid of such a category. (Jakobson 2000: 116)

On the bright side of it, re-narrative forms have the advantage of resounding two different voices, the original speaker's and the recounter's, which reinforces the multiplicity of voices in the text.

Translation, of course, has a lot to do with the translator's sensitivity to the original text: it would be impossible to render FID in the target language if one has not registered FID in the source language. Sometimes FID is about introducing a bit of ambiguity and inviting the readers to interpret the situation for themselves: a bit like what Wittgenstein labelled the "duck-rabbit" figure (Wittgenstein 1986: 194), some readers perceive the one, others perceive the other, or "we can also *see* the illustration now as one thing now as another. – So we interpret it and *see* it as we *interpret* it" (193). That is, unless the translator has already made the choice for us. The altered point of view then may lead to rather different conclusions on such topics as gender roles and distribution of authority in the fictional world of the novel.

REFERENCES

- Austen 2012:** Austen, Jane. *Emma*. Ed. George Justice. Fourth edition. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2012 [1815].
- Austen 2002:** Austen, Jane. *Sense and Sensibility*. Ed. Claudia Johnson. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002 [1811].
- Austen 2009:** Остин, Джейн. *Ема*. Прев. Надежда Розова. София: Мърлин публицейшън, 2009.
- Austen 2008:** Остин, Джейн. *Разум и чувства*. Прев. Анна Елчинова. София: Мърлин публицейшън, 2008.
- Bosseaux 2007:** Bosseaux, Charlotte. *How Does It Feel? Point of View in Translation: The Case of Virginia Woolf into French*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007.
- Bray 2007:** Bray, Joe. "The Dual Voice of Free Indirect Discourse: A Reading Experiment." *Language and Literature*, 16 (1): 37-52, Feb. 2007.
- Bray 2003:** Bray, Joe. *The Epistolary Novel: Representation of Consciousness*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Fergus 2016:** Fergus, Jan. "Pictures of Domestic Life in Country Villages': Jane Austen and the 'Realist' Novel." *The Oxford Handbook of the Eighteenth-Century Novel*. Ed. J. A. Downie. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. 536-550.
- Fludernik 2005:** Fludernik, Monika. *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The linguistic representation of speech and consciousness*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

- Gunn 2004:** Gunn, Daniel P. "Free Indirect Discourse and Narrative Authority in *Emma*." *Narrative*, 12 (1): 35-54, Jan. 2004.
- Holmes 1988:** Holmes, James. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988.
- Jakobson 2000:** Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistics Aspects of Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. L. Venuti. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. 113-118.
- McHale 1978:** McHale, Brian. "Free Indirect Discourse: a Survey of Recent Accounts." *Poetics and Theory of Literature* 3 (1): 249-287.
- Nitsolova 1984:** Ницолова, Руселина. *Прагматичен аспект на изречението в българския книжовен език*. София, 1984.
- Pascal 1977:** Pascal, Roy. *The Dual Voice: Free indirect speech and its functioning in the nineteenth-century European novel*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977.
- Simpson 1993:** Simpson, Paul. *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Sotirova 2011:** Sotirova, Violeta. *D. H. Lawrence and Narrative Point of View*. London and New York: Continuum, 2011.
- Vasseva 1995:** Васева, Иванка. „Преизказването в българския и руския език“. [Vaseva, Ivanka. Preizkazvaneto v balgarskiya I ruskiya ezik.] Прояви на междуезикова асиметрия при превод от чужд на български език 2: Преизказност. Подбудителност. София: Академично издателство „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 1995, с. 7-104.
- Watt 1957:** Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1957.
- Wittgenstein 1986:** Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Trans. G.E.M. Anscombe. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.