The paths of narratology and translation studies have not crossed for a long time, and few experts in both fields have pondered over how the translation process can affect the narrative structure, i.e. what kind of shifts can occur and what interventions are or can be made in this regard by translators. When Mieke Bal cites the opening passage of Lady with Lapdog by Chekhov as an example of “ambiguous focalization,” she indirectly assumes that the translated version in no way deviates from the short story’s original narrative in terms of its construction.\(^1\) Strikingly, analogous examples can be found in other works in narratology by such prominent theoreticians as Franz K. Stanzel, Gérard Genette, and Käte Hamburger,\(^2\) which distinctly shows a general pattern rather than a confined phenomenon.

The question regarding this blind spot in translation studies, or the lack of narratologically-oriented research, has only recently been addressed by experts in the fields. A pioneering work on the subject was the 2014 issue of Language and Literature on “Narration and Translation,” which offered some plausible explanations behind this state of affairs but also brought into focus the potential contact points between the two areas.\(^3\) In the opening essay of the volume the authors reflect on the history of scholarly interest in translation, pointing out

\(^1\) Mieke Bal, De theorie van vertellen en verhalen: inleiding in de narratologie (Muiderberg: Coutinho, 1978), 114.


\(^3\) Narration and Translation. Special issue of Language and Literature 23, no. 3 (2014).
that its early linguistic orientation was later fiercely denounced for its restrictiveness, thus leading to the so-called cultural turn in translation studies. As a result, since the late 1970s, it is argued, “translation studies have drawn on models and methods from various relevant disciplines other than linguistics,” while “the textual level” has been left beyond the scope of research. This focus on the external aspects of translations rather than on the texts themselves has also halted narratological investigations.

Without citing empirical evidence but rather stating it as a reasonable assumption, let us also state that equivalence in terms of principal narrative techniques is easy to achieve probably in all natural languages due their common and universal features. This, of course, should be addressed in detail and studied by linguists, although with high probability we can assume that the general structural aspects of the narrative are not severely affected by the process of translation, except for in cases when the translator strives for a form of adaptation. If he or she seeks to represent the original as truthfully and adequately as possible, no matter how obsolete this may sound today, the translation should not have a major impact on aspects “strictly pertaining to the narrated.” Such an observation was put forward by Gerald Prince, who wrote that “some fundamental narrative features other than voice, such as the order of presentation of events [...] are hardly affected by translation, if at all.” Similar yet contrasting remarks were made by David Lodge, who argued that “some of the meaning attributed to a narrative will remain constant when it is translated from one natural language to another, [...] such as the writer’s choice of narrative point of view, or the treatment of time,” as they belong to the deep structure of the text. Academics have effectively proved, however, that the translation does indeed affect some elements of the narrative structure, including time and place rendering, narrational gendering, or focalisation, due to various shifts resulting from the semantic and syntactic choices made by the translator as well as grammatical nonequivalences between the source and target languages.

This essay will look into Edgar Allan Poe’s *The Cask of Amontillado* and some of its respective translations into Polish. The purpose is to analyse how certain markers of the literary point of view are subject to shifts in the process of translation from English into Polish. By doing so, the aim is to make a modest contribution to narratologically-oriented research on literary translation. The limited scope of the paper does not allow to outline a comprehensive history
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of the concept of *point of view* in literary studies, as a thorough investigation into the subject would require much more space due to the vastness of the theories and models. It is, however, methodologically valid to draw a rough sketch of the term’s use and to systematise how the issue of “point of view in translation” has been studied so far.

**Point of view – a brief history of the term**

*Point of view (POV)* as a term in literary studies has attracted much scholarly attention since the beginning of the twentieth century, when Henry James elaborated on the concept in a series of prefaces to his novels. However, as Kristin Morrison pointed out, contrary to common views, James frequently used *point of view* not as a critical term but in the sense of mental view, philosophy, attitude, or opinion. It was the writer’s follower Percy Lubbock who, drawing on remarks made by James, proposed a coherent theory of *point of view* and defined the term as the relation in which “the narrator stands towards the story he unfolds,” introducing an opposition between *telling* and *showing*. Lubbock’s typology, comprising four points of view, was later reformulated by Norman Friedman, who distinguished eight types and added new criteria, e.g. the consistency and/or change of using a given *POV*. Point of view was also a central concept in the classic *Rhetoric of Fiction* by Wayne C. Booth, where it was used as an umbrella term pertaining to what others have called *voice* and the character’s perspective. In the broader metaphorical sense, *point of view* was understood not only as an “angle of vision,” but also as a linguistic representation of the mental self/selves – as in the so-called *Fowler-Uspensky model* which identifies the ideological, temporal, spatial, and psychological planes of *point of view*. Chatman, on the other hand, proposed a terminological distinction between the point of view of the narrator (*slant*) and the point of view of the character (*filter*).
As use of the term proved to be highly inconsistent, other rival concepts began to appear. In his *Theorie des Erzählens*, Stanzel wrote that although *point of view* is “a concise term, it is by no means clear in its application.”\(^{17}\) The theorist himself introduced *Inneperspektive* (internal perspective) and *Außenperspektive* (external perspective)\(^{18}\) as well as *Erzählerfigur* (narrator) and *Reflektorfigur* (reflector).\(^{19}\) *Point of view* was replaced by the term *focalization* by Genette, who argued that the term was not sufficiently accurate and did not include the distinction between the story’s voice (narrator) and the perspectives (focalisations) as being potentially employed in the narrative. Although Genette called his theory a “reformulation”\(^ {20}\) and a “general presentation of the standard idea of ‘point of view,’”\(^ {21}\) his conception of narrative structures differed fundamentally from preceding approaches due to the above opposition. Bal, on the other hand, distanced herself from earlier typologies of “narrative points of view” by arguing that they were unclear in the sense that “they do not make a distinction between [...] the vision through which the elements are presented and [...] the identity of the voice that is verbalizing the vision,” or, in other words, “those who see and those who speak.”\(^ {22}\)

Meanwhile, *point of view* started being examined through a linguistic and stylistic lens, with theorists focusing on smaller-scale indicators of *POV* rather than on devising universal taxonomies of narration or focalisation types. Working within the critical linguistics and stylistics approach, Paul Simpson argued that “point of view refers generally to the psychological perspective through which a story is told. It encompasses the narrative framework which a writer employs [...] and accounts for the basic viewing position which is adopted in a story.”\(^ {23}\) Despite the broad definition he proposed, the aim was to reformulate the *Fowler-Uspensky model* while introducing “a modal grammar” of the study of *point of view* in narrative fiction. Simpson focused on such aspects of literary discourse pertaining to *point of view* as spatial and temporal deixis as well as modality and transitivity.\(^ {24}\) An extensive typology of the linguistic indicators of *viewpoint* was proposed by Mick Short, whose checklist included value-laden language, given versus new information, and deixis, among
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others. Short also made a distinction between *discoursal* (the relationship between the implied author or the teller and the fiction) and *fictional* (the viewpoint of a character within the story) *point of view*. The taxonomies proposed by Short and Simpson were later used by McIntyre, who examined the notion of *POV* in drama by analysing the smaller-scale linguistic indicators of *point of view*. A recent linguistic definition was proposed by Alain Rabatel, who characterised *literary point of view* within the framework of “an enunciative approach, in terms of the linguistic means with which a subject envisages an object.”

**Point of View in translation**

The new approaches in studies on *point of view*, founded on linguistic criteria, have contributed to paving the way for recent analyses of *POV* indicators in literary translations. It should be noted, however, that the issue of *point of view in translation* can relate to an array of phenomena that require a systemic arrangement, taking into account the research done so far. The following approaches have been developed and adopted to examine the subject:

1) Narratological – here *point of view* is conceptualised within the framework of narratology, linguistics, and/or stylistics and is used more or less synonymously with *perspective*, covering the physical and psychological aspects of perception. Its primary focus is on those facets of narrative that concern the use of personal pronouns and articles, time, and space markers (e.g. narrative tense, deixis), linguistic modality, and narrative styles, particularly free indirect discourse. The other branch of this approach examines the discursive presence of the translator (the translator’s voice or the translator’s point of view), thus providing a revision of narratological models of literary communication and adding to them the implied translator element.

2) Cognitivist – drawing on Langacker’s model of Cognitive Grammar, point of view is defined here in the context of viewpoint (understood as a combination of “the position from which a scene is viewed,” and the “orientation of the viewer”), and used interchangeably with focalization. Although the aspects of narrative it investigates are similar to the narratological approach, the primary focus is on the opposition between “the subject and object of perception,” while the emphasis is put on mental processes and states.

Elżbieta Tabakowska, for example, when looking into Polish translations of Alice in Wonderland, examines such aspects of point of view as reference, epistemic modals, and iconicity, among others.

3) Combined narratological and cognitivist – this approach incorporates tools devised by narratology and cognitive linguistics. A notable example is an essay by the translation studies scholar Tamara Brzostowska-Tereszkiewicz, in which the term sensory focalization is applied, defined as narrative techniques that serve to produce a set of sensory perception effects. She develops a typology of potential “interventions” made by the translator in terms of sensory focalization, i.e. replacement of the focaliser, shift in stimulus modality, replacing sensory stimuli by hallucinations, and transforming active perception into a passive one.

It is worth noting that point of view is a contact term for cognitive linguistics/poetics and narratology. Also, according to Tabakowska, who is a proponent of cognitivist translation studies, in cognitivism the adequacy of translation is defined as the equivalence between “specific records of the way of seeing things.”
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Translating the point of view in Edgar Allan Poe’s The Cask of Amontillado

The abundance of theories of literary point of view can lead to confusion and make the formulation of even a provisional definition a challenging task. The conceptualisation of the term is nevertheless crucial in order to study the markers of point of view as they manifest themselves in literary translations. Thus this essay will, in principle, follow Simpson in his linguistically-oriented conception of point of view, understood as “the basic viewing position which is adopted in a story”\(^{36}\) and that can be realised through an array of linguistic indicators.

The Cask of Amontillado has been subjected to a considerable amount of speculation among literary scholars due to the unreliable homodiegetic narrator and the mysterious “you” – the phantom addressee of the story among the short story’s other aspects. Through the perspective of the main protagonist, namely Montresor, readers learn about the vengeance that the hero has wreaked on his acquaintance Fortunato. It is this perspective, i.e. the perspective of Montresor, or the fictional point of view, as Short names it, that will be examined in this essay. The focus will be on the following set of indicators of **POV**: modality, time markers, and transitivity. The idea behind this is to examine the linguistic indicators of point of view (pertaining to the character’s perspective) at their sentence level and to demonstrate how the translator’s choices can, in extreme cases, also affect the narrated story.

There have been at least eight translations of The Cask of Amontillado into Polish, while four of them will be compared in this essay, arranged in chronological order – the first two have been branded as classical and were done by Leśmian (a)\(^{37}\) and Wyrzykowski (b),\(^{38}\) and the two recent ones are by Studniarz (c)\(^{39}\) and Szulc (d)\(^{40}\) (the respective pages will be given in brackets along with the back translations).
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Modality

As Simpson points out, one of the functions of modal expressions is to convey “a speaker’s attitude towards what they are saying,” which “extends to their attitude towards the situation or event described by a sentence.” One of the four principal modality systems in English that the academic distinguishes is deontic modality – “the modal system of ‘duty’, [...] concerned with a speaker’s attitude to the degree of obligation attaching to the performance of certain actions.” One of the verbs belonging to the deontic system is “must,” which is an auxiliary verb that conveys the highest degree of obligation and has no specific tense designation.

There are four instances when the auxiliary verb “must” is used in The Cask of Amontillado, but let us examine the two that bear considerable importance to the story’s plot. The first-person narrator, who is both the protagonist and the teller of the story, proclaims at the beginning of the text his desire for revenge on Fortunato:

*I must* not only punish but punish with impunity.42

The sentence was translated into Polish as follows:

a. *Winienem był* nie tylko ukarać, lecz ukarać bezkarnie [I needed not only to punish but to punish with impunity]. (Leśmian, 11)

b. *Chodziło mi o to*, by nie tylko ukarać, lecz ukarać bezkarnie [My point was not only to punish but to punish with impunity]. (Wyrzykowski, 11)

c. *Muszę* nie tylko ukarać winowajcę, ale także zrobić to całkowicie bezkarnie [I must not only punish the culprit but do it with complete impunity]. (Studniarz, 144)

d. *Musiałem* nie tylko wymierzyć karę, ale i samemu jej uniknąć. [I had to not only impose punishment but avoid it myself]. (Szulc, 47)

First, three of the four translations shift the time of the utterance to the past, thus ignoring the possibility of the subject’s temporal duality. Making the statement in the past tense suggests a simpler psychological constitution of the narrator and, as a result, of the narrative itself, thus producing a stronger hint at the story’s plot than in the original. It implies that at the very beginning Montresor simply confesses to his deeds and through the use of past tense he distances himself from his previous actions, using it persuasively as a means of defence.

In the above sentence the point of view of the hero’s earlier incarnation could be adopted, pointing to a shift in the character’s perspective to a particular
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point in time. If we assume that that is the case, then only in the translation by Studniarz is equivalence in terms of the point of view of the focalised character achieved. Second, there is definitely a strong reason behind using the word “must” by Monstresor, i.e. it refers to the motives behind his actions, which is the absolute requirement he imposes on himself in order to seek retribution against Fortunato.

Before Montresor discloses the details of the circumstances of his meeting with Fortunato, he emphasises his perspective: *It must be understood* that (neither by word nor deed had I given Fortunato cause to doubt my good will). (309)

a. *Niechże będzie wiadomo, że* [Let it be known that]. (11)
b. *Nietrudno się dorozumieć, iż* [It is not hard to figure out that]. (11)
c. *Zrozumiałe, że* [It is understandable that]. (144)
d. *Trzeba wam wiedzieć* [You should know that]. (47)

In the above example the use of the verb “must” seems to have yet another function – it gives an idea about the personality of the speaker in the short story who endeavors to persuade his “listener” to fully approve the self-image that Montresor projects. Neither of the above translations retains the protagonist’s obsession with the way he is perceived by his addressee(s). The translators’ decisions to use expressions that do not belong to the equivalent modality system in Polish can also have an effect on how Montresor’s personality is interpreted.

**Temporal point of view**

According to Simpson, “temporal deixis [...] concerns the ways in which the time of the events referred to in an utterance interacts with the time of the utterance itself.” The dominant temporal point of view in *The Cask of Amontillado*’s narrator differs from the time of narration. Only at the end of the story do we learn that the hero’s older self (the mystery is revealed by Montresor half a century after the murder took place) looks retrospectively on his younger self.

The temporal aspects of the character’s points of view are also construed in the story through the use of the second-person perspective. Montresor begins his tale by addressing someone who is apparently familiar: *You, who so well know* the nature of my soul, will not suppose, however, that I gave utterance to a threat. (309)
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Different explanations were provided by scholars as regards the potential addressee of the story. According to Walter Stepp, through the address Montresor acts as “he were performing before some ultimate audience.”44 Others, however, have pointed to the fact that the story shares the characteristics of a confession, as it is told half a century later and is addressed to a confidant, possibly a priest, while the action is set in Italy, home to the centre of Catholicism, namely the Vatican. On the other hand, according to Richard P. Benton, “the narratee is most likely a woman, very likely [Montresor’s] mistress, who has been his intimate companion.”45 In the original version the mystery remains unsolved, as the English “you” can refer both to the plural and the singular. In Polish, however, the translator has to make a choice between the singular “ty” and the plural “wy.” The Polish translators have offered the following solutions:

a. Wy wszkaże, którzy dobrze znacie mój character [You (plural), however, who well know my character]. (11)

b. Zbyt dobrze znacie naturę mej duszy [You (plural) know too well the nature of my soul]. (11)

c. Ty, który tak dobrze poznajesz naturę mojej duszy [You (singular) who so well got to know the nature of my soul]. (144)

d. Wy, którzy znacie tajniki mej duszy [You (plural) who now the secrets of my soul]. (47)

In the translations that utilise the plural form of “you” in Polish it is assumed that the second-person perspective is a specific rhetorical device that is employed to address some imaginary audience (possibly the implied reader figure). As the use of “wy” points to a literary convention, the choice of the singular form leaves more room for interpretation to the reader, and supposedly more closely reflects the makeup of the story, which is an admission of one’s sins that might be either private or public. Only Studniarz’s translation interprets the story as a form of confession, even though it is not clear who the confidant listening to Montresor’s revelation is. In both cases the representation of the point of view of the character becomes somewhat affected by the translation process. Also, the subjectivity of the one who “knows the nature” of Montresor’s soul is different, depending on the choice between the singular and the plural “you” in Polish.


Transitivity

Simpson utilises the term “transitivity” in the sense of the way of representing meaning and experience through language. Looking into the transitivity system makes it possible, he argues, to deduct “how speakers encode in language their mental picture of reality and how they account for their experience of the world around them.”46 While modality, according to Simpson, “is an important part of the interpersonal function of language,” transitivity “is part of its ideational function,” which is performed through the expression of processes. Each such process can potentially include three major elements, namely the process itself, the participants, and the circumstances. Transitivity is also realised through agency and causation, or, in other words, through the different “roles” that can be attached to specific linguistic items within a clause.47 Let us now examine an instance where the depiction of a semantic process as expressed by a clause is shifted in the translation process.

At the end of the story, before placing the last brick and finally entombing Fortunato alive, Montresor calls the victim’s name but he hears no reply. The teller “thrust[s] a torch inside” the niche though the opening and recounts: There came forth in return only a jingling of the bells. (317)
The Polish translators have offered the following choices:

a. I w ten sposób nie dał mi żadnej odpowiedzi, prócz chyba szczęku brzękadeł
   [And in this way he did not give me any reply, except for maybe a jingling of the bells]. (32)
b. Odpowiedziało mi tylko brzęczenie dzwonków [Only a jingling of the bells was the reply given to me]. (32)
c. W odpowiedzi rozległo się jedynie brzęczenie dzwonczków [In reply, only a jingling of the bells reverberated]. (151)
d. (Cisnąłem pochodnię przez otwór) i w odpowiedzi usłyszałem tylko brzęczenie dzwonków [I pitched a torch through the opening and in reply I only heard a jingling of the bells]. (54)

Two of the above translations (by Leśmian and by Szulc) add new actors to the represented process, respectively, as both Montresor and Fortunato become its participants, contrary to the original clause. It is worth noting that in the original fragment the perception is “externalized” in the sense that the senser48 is not grammatically present within the clause. This adds to the story’s atmosphere by representing the troubled mental state of the protagonist. As pointed out by Leonard W. Engel, “although Montresor is obviously fascinated by the

46 Paul Simpson, Language, Ideology and Point of View, 82.
47 Ibid.
48 See ibid., 84–85.
deadly enclosure, and uses it with satisfaction in walling up Fortunato, he also experiences moments of horror while within it.” Therefore, adding other participants to the represented process somewhat affects that feel of the scene. First, it makes it more realistic and conventional, i.e. the last episode of the deadly act ends with an apparently regular question, a signal for which a specific response is expected (from a concrete person). Only the version by Studniarz tries to capture the gruesomeness of the situation, focusing on the horror itself rather than the perpetrator’s subjectivity. Only in this translation is the reader’s focus on the here and now of the crime, while in the remaining three versions a surplus of information is added to the memories of the villain.

Conclusions

The examined examples illustrate how grammatical differences between the source language and the target language along with the translator’s choices can, in specific cases, affect the perspective from which the story is told. We can state with high probability that this will be even more so when the two languages differ substantially in terms of grammatical categories and features. This short analysis also illustrates that looking into equivalence in terms of literary point of view should include a study of an array of linguistic markers. Besides those examined in the essay, such an analysis could include spatial deixis, value-laden expressions, grammatical genders, and referentiality (e.g. determiners).

A study of Polish translations of The Cask of Amontillado pertains yet to another element in the narratological models of literary communication. An analysis of point of view in translation can also indicate how the translator interprets and relates to the experimental and unconventional narrative techniques employed in a story. Studying the concept in such a context may shed more light both on the text’s narrative structure as well as on decisions made in this regard by the translator.

The major methodological doubt behind studying point of view in translation is the question of its importance in a given story and its respective translations. Those academics who have studied the concept, drawing on linguistics, stylistics, and cognitivism, have argued that narrative POV “is the very essence of a story’s style, what gives it its ‘feel’ and ‘colour’.” This was the issue addressed by Charlotte Bosseuax, who utilised computer-assisted research to determine the frequency of translational shifts and its effect on the story’s feel. An alternative would be a detailed linguistically-oriented research of point of view by taking
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into account the whole set of its facets. If one agrees with the argument on POVs significance as put forward by various scholars, then this analysis provides solid evidence for some crucial differences in terms of style between the original story by Poe and its Polish translations.

**Summary**

The article examines the notion of point of view (POV) in translation by drawing on examples from selected Polish translations of Edgar Allan Poe’s *The Cask of Amontillado*. First, the paper deals with the question of narratologically-oriented research in translation studies and outlines a short history of the concept of point of view with an overview of definitions proposed by literary scholars. It is argued that recent linguistic analyses of point of view have contributed to examining the notion of POVs in literary translations. The article also systematises different research approaches that have been developed to study “point of view in translation.” Finally, the paper follows the linguistically-oriented conception of point of view in order to examine translation shifts with regard to the linguistic indicators of POVs, including time markers and modality, based on examples from Polish translations of Poe’s short story.