

JADWIGA LINDE-USIEKNIIEWICZ  
Katedra Językoznawstwa Ogólnego,  
Wschodnioazjatyckiego Porównawczego i Bałtystyki  
Uniwersytet Warszawski

PAULINA NALEWAJKO  
Katedra Iberystyki  
Szkoła Wyższa Psychologii Społecznej, Warszawa

DIRECT SPEECH TURNS  
AND NARRATIVE CLUES IN LITERARY PROSE:  
GABRIEL GARCÍA MÁRQUEZ'S SHORT STORY  
*BUEN VIAJE, SEÑOR PRESIDENTE*  
AND ITS POLISH TRANSLATION

**Keywords:** Gabriel García Márquez, direct speech framing expressions, addressee, interpersonal situation, focalization

**Słowa kluczowe:** Gabriel García Márquez, dialog, komentarz narracyjny, adresat, sytuacja międzyosobowa, focalizacja

## 1. Introduction

As the title of this section of the journal suggests, the papers presented are expected to show 'philological benefits' which, for the purpose of this paper, we decided to interpret as advantages brought by philology to the study of literary texts. However, we would like the term 'philology' itself to be understood here in accordance with the Continental tradition, i.e. not as the study of Classical Languages, but as the study of modern languages and literatures.

Contemporary academia tends to perceive the study of language as a separate field from the study of literature and has coined specific terms for each: linguistics and literary studies. In particular the move towards generative linguistics has contributed to the widening of the gap, since literary texts, indeed all kinds of texts, are seen only as a manifestation of E-language, considered just an epiphenomenon, of no interest to true linguistics. Another factor that has made the split

possible has been the advance of technologies that allow non-generative linguists to work with recorded spontaneous texts as their data, though in fairness most language corpora do include literary texts as well. Nevertheless, the technologies adopted for corpus searches do not favour using literary sources.

The breach between literary studies and linguistics is nevertheless not absolute, and there are many overlapping areas of research, most notably in the fields of pragmatics, theoretical poetics and translation studies. Thus, pragmatics can be successfully applied to the study of literary dialogues, the concepts behind cognitive linguistics are employed within the field of cognitive poetics, and translation studies no longer focus exclusively on linguistics proper but instead incorporate literary or cultural approaches. The results of such cross-overs bring about novel solutions and innovative theoretical frameworks. Yet some of the instantiations of these approaches are not free from minor fallacies: some linguistics-oriented research which takes literary texts as the source of their data tend to treat them as if they represented spontaneous speech, while in fact whatever appears in such texts, including the direct speech of the protagonists, has been intentionally put there by the author. At the same time close reading techniques tend to overlook at least some grammatical features of the texts.

In this paper we will try to show, in a specific case-study, that close reading focusing on the syntactic features of certain parts of narrative texts may either disclose unexpected layers of meaning in the text, or at the very least explicitly show the narrative technique by which certain recognized effects are produced. We will also discuss how in certain instances these effects, dependent on the structural features of the source text language, may or may not appear in a translation, or, rather, how the technique adopted by the translator to compensate for this loss may produce additional effects, absent in the original.

The text in question is Gabriel García Márquez's short story, *Buen viaje, señor presidente*, and its Polish translation. Our analysis will largely focus on the dialogic parts of the story. In our previous work (briefly presented below) we concentrated on the impact of dialogue framing expressions on the interpretation of direct speech turns in both the original<sup>1</sup> and the English translation<sup>2</sup>, with little attention being paid to the intricate relationship between larger narrative parts and the dialogic turns themselves. In this paper we would like to

---

<sup>1</sup> Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz et Paulina Nalewajko, "Siguiendo las pistas de un autor travieso. La enmarcación de los diálogos en *Buen viaje, señor presidente* de Gabriel García Márquez – estudio interdisciplinario", *Itinerarios Revista de estudios lingüísticos, literarios, históricos y antropológicos*, 17 (2013): 87-104.

<sup>2</sup> Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz et Paulina Nalewajko, "The impact of direct speech framing expressions on the narrative: a contrastive case study of Gabriel García Márquez's *Buen viaje, señor presidente* and its English translation", *Cognitive Studies*, 14 (2014): 101-120.

broaden our investigation and show how our linguistic findings mesh with certain aspects of literary analysis. The results will serve as the basis for a discussion of certain features of the Polish translation. Due to a lack of space we will concentrate mostly on the initial part of the story, though the analysis we propose could be performed on the complete text.

We have organized the paper into 5 sections, with the “Introduction” as section one. Section 2 briefly presents the plot of the story; section 3 contains a summary of our previous analyses of the impact of direct speech framing expressions on the interpretation of the dialogic turns in the original; section 4 discusses how the dialogue contributes to an understanding of the interpersonal situation between the protagonists (4.1.) and presents a hypothesis that suggests the way dialogic turns are framed constitutes a partial clue to the focalization in the story (4.2.). In section 5 we discuss the Polish translation of the dialogues and their framing expressions and show that due to the translation strategies, presumably used to compensate for the absence of parallel syntactic structures in Polish (i.e. the use of indirect object pronouns in framing expressions), this results in a subtle shift in the interpersonal situation from the original story. In the final section we present our conclusions and further arguments for including syntactic analysis in close reading techniques.

## 2. The Literary Material

*Buen viaje, señor presidente* was published in 1992, in the fourth volume of García Márquez’s short stories, *Doce cuentos peregrinos*<sup>3</sup>. The volume is exceptional within the entire body of the author’s literary work, both for personal and literary reasons, although we will not address these issues here<sup>4</sup>. The story itself has three protagonists, all emigrants from the Caribbean, who are living in Geneva. One is the president in exile (whose name is never mentioned), and the others are a married couple, Homero Rey de la Casa, an ambulance driver, and his wife, Lázara.

---

<sup>3</sup> All the examples used in this article come from the narrative studied, i.e. the original: Gabriel García Márquez’s, *Doce cuentos peregrinos* (Barcelona: Debolsillo, 2007). The English translations throughout the paper come from Gabriel García Márquez’s, *Strange Pilgrims*, trans. Edith Grossman (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), with structural glosses added in square brackets when appropriate. The Polish version comes from Gabriel García Márquez’s, *Dwanaście opowiadań tułaczyh*, trans. Carlos Marrodán Casas (Warszawa: Muza, 2007), with structural glosses added in square brackets when appropriate. Page numbers refer to the editions cited.

<sup>4</sup> They are amply discussed by the author himself in the *Prologue* to the volume; some of the critics consider the *Prologue* as yet another short story in the collection, making the total number of stories thirteen, despite the number twelve being featured in the title.

In the first part of the story we meet the president, though we discover his former political function only when Homero addresses him by his title. We learn that the president suffers from a serious, possibly fatal, disease. In fact, it is the search for a diagnosis and cure that brought him to Switzerland from Martinique. The prognosis is poor (which the reader learns from an internal monologue by the protagonist). Indeed, the diagnosis and the doctor's recommendations lead the president to take stock of his life. His musings are interrupted when the president comes face to face with a man who seems to have been following him for some time. The president invites the other man to lunch, presumably to find out his intentions. During a long conversation, which is the key moment in this part of the narrative, we learn about the former and present situation of both men. The encounter ends with Homero inviting the president to his house for dinner.

The story has a third-person narration, with the narrator seeming extra-diegetic, and in the initial part of the story summarized above it is the president who acts as the focalizer. However, there are subtle shifts in focalization, particularly between the hospital introspections and the description of the walk from the hospital to the garden and later on to the café.

By contrast, in the later part of the narrative, which starts with the passage that identifies the narrator as being extra-diegetic, it is Homero and his wife who act as the focalizers. We learn about their intentions towards the president, which leads us to re-interpret the previous dialogue between the head-of-state-in-exile and Homero. Homero had been shadowing the president neither as an agent of his political enemies nor (as he claims at one point) in an act of political hero-worship. Like the other ambulance drivers, he has an understanding with funeral parlours and insurance companies, which pay him for bringing in new customers. Nevertheless, during dinner at Homero and Lázara's house, the president wins the couple over, and as the story unfolds, they end up sharing their meagre savings with him to pay for his hospital treatment, and most likely his return to the Caribbean, as well. The story ends with a scene in which the couple receive a letter from the president, telling them that he plans to return to his country and head a revolutionary movement. Since certain episodes between the dinner scene and the presidential return to the Caribbean reveal the president as not entirely truthful, it is clear that it is in fact Homero and his wife who are eventually cheated.

Yet, it was not the intricate plot, even though it is crucial in understanding the complex interpersonal situation between the protagonists, and by the same token, the communicative situations in which the dialogues occur, that lead us to choose this story for our study. The narrative has certain outstanding formal features that distinguishes it from all other García Márquez's narratives.

The short story, less than 9,000 words long, contains as many as 140 dialogic turns. This is very unusual for García Márquez's prose. He repeatedly declared that he avoids using dialogue because it seems artificial in writing, as spoken Spanish and written Spanish have a tendency to differ significantly<sup>5</sup>.

### 3. Dialogues and Dialogue Framing Expressions (Previous Analyses)

Within the story it is not only the number of dialogic turns that is surprising, but also the way they are framed. It is generally recognized that dialogue framing expressions are part of the narrative rather than indirect speech, and they play an important role both in the narrative and in the way the dialogic turn should be interpreted.

As pointed out by Głowiński<sup>6</sup>, framing expressions serve to embed the direct speech passages in the narrative, which they otherwise interrupt<sup>7</sup>. In addition, they are the means by which the narrator's voice controls the apparent, albeit illusory, independence of the protagonists' voices<sup>8</sup>. They also act as syntactic support for nominals identifying who is speaking and may inform the reader about the speaker's attitude, mental state, tone and other phenomena related to what is being said<sup>9</sup>.

Yet, when we observe direct speech framing expressions in the narrative we realize that the framing verb of choice is *dijo* 'said', which is the most generic speech verb available. Moreover, it often appears without an overt subject. However, it is used in a way that is somewhat rare in narrative prose,

<sup>5</sup> Plinio Apuleyo Mendoza et Gabriel García Márquez, *El olor de la guayaba* (Barcelona: Mondadori, 1994), 43-44.

<sup>6</sup> Michał Głowiński, "Dialog w powieści", in *Narracje literackie i nieliterackie* (Kraków: Universitas, 1997), 39-53.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 44-51.

<sup>8</sup> Głowiński, "Dialog w powieści", 44-51. Vide Monika Fludernik, *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction. The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness* (London: Routledge, 1993), 453, quoted in Brian McHale, *Speech Representation*, accessed November 9, 2012, [http://hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/index.php/Speech\\_Representation](http://hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/index.php/Speech_Representation).

<sup>9</sup> Margarita Suñer, "The Syntax of Direct Quotes With Special Reference to Spanish and English", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18 (2000): 572; Lea Sawicki, *Towards Narrative Grammar of Polish* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2008), 155-156; Igor Aleksandrowič Mel'čuk, *Dependency Syntax: Theory and Practice* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1988), 339-356; Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz, *From Conflict Through Compromise to Collaboration. Semantics, Syntax and Information Structure in Natural Languages* (Warsaw: Faculty of Polish, 2012), 186-197.

i.e. with the addressee being made known though the use of an indirect object pronoun:

- *Esas flores no son de Dios, señor – le dijo, disgustada –. Son del ayuntamiento* [p. 17].  
“Those flowers don’t belong to God, Monsieur,” [lit. to-him  $\emptyset$  said, vexed] “They’re city property” [p. 6].
- *Su dolor está aquí – le dijo* [p. 16].  
“Your pain is here,” he said [lit. to-him  $\emptyset$  said] [p. 4].
- *No podríamos decirlo con certeza – le dijo* [p. 17].  
“We could not say with certainty,” [lit. to-him  $\emptyset$  said] [p. 5].
- *Caray – le dijo –: ¡Qué buen nombre!* [p. 20].  
“Damn,” [lit. to-him  $\emptyset$  said]. “What a fine name!” [p. 9].
- *No me dirá que es médico –le dijo el Presidente* [p. 20].  
“Don’t tell me you’re a doctor, [lit. You will not tell me you are a doctor]” [lit. to-him  $\emptyset$  said the President] [p. 8].

In our two previous studies of the story we argued that the appearance of pronouns referring to an addressee forces the reader either to go back to an earlier part of the story to verify to whom the protagonist is talking or to constantly bear in mind who is talking to whom. In particular, if the addressee is only identified by a pronoun, and the speaker is identified only contextually, through the null subject, the cognitive effort of keeping track of who is talking to whom is much greater than it would otherwise be<sup>10</sup>. In addition, such explicit dative pronouns constitute, in Relevance Theory terms, ostensive stimuli, which by the same token, presuppose their own relevance to the audience<sup>11</sup>. This means that they have to be processed, even if the cognitive effort is considerable. We argued that in fact the way the dialogues are framed imposes on the readers the feeling they are observing a virtual tennis match in which they are following the ball with their eyes, and each dialogic turn may significantly alter the score.

Thus, the verbal exchanges can be seen as a kind of duel, and the impression of two duelists is already present in the narrative passage in which the two protagonists eye each other up during their first encounter:

<sup>10</sup> Barbara Dancygier et Lieven Vandelanotte, “Judging distances: mental spaces, distance, and viewpoint in literary discourse”, in *Cognitive Poetics. Goals, Gains and Gaps*, ed. Geert Brône and Jeroen Vandaele (Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009), 353.

<sup>11</sup> Deirdre Wilson et Dan Sperber, “Relevance theory”, in *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, ed. Laurence Horn et Gergory Ward (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 611.

[...] *sintió que alguien lo miraba. Entonces pasó la página con un gesto casual, miró por encima de los lentes, y vio al hombre pálido y sin afeitar, con una gorra deportiva y una chaqueta de cordero volteado, que apartó la mirada al instante para no tropezar con la suya. [...] Entonces miró el relojito de oro que llevaba colgado de una leontina en el bolsillo del chaleco [...]. Por último pagó la cuenta con una propina estúpida, cogió el bastón y el sombrero en la percha, y salió a la calle sin mirar al hombre que lo miraba. Se alejó con su andar festivo, bordeando los canteros de flores despedazadas por el viento, y se creyó liberado del hechizo. Pero de pronto sintió los pasos detrás de los suyos, se detuvo al doblar la esquina, y dio media vuelta. El hombre que lo seguía tuvo que pararse en seco para no tropezar con él, y lo miró sobrecogido, a menos de dos palmos de sus ojos* [p. 19, emphasis ours].

[...] he sensed someone looking at him. He turned the page with a casual gesture, then glanced over the top of his glasses and saw the pale, unshaven man in a sports cap and a jacket lined with sheepskin, who looked away at once so their eyes would not meet. [...] Then he looked at the small gold watch and chain that he carried in his vest pocket [...]. At last he paid the bill, left a miser's tip, collected his cane and hat from the rack, and walked out to the street without looking at the man who was looking at him. He moved away with his festive walk, stepping around the beds of flowers devastated by the wind, and thought he was free of the spell. But then he heard [lit. felt] steps behind him and came to a halt when he rounded the corner, making a partial turn. The man following him had to stop short to avoid a collision, and his startled eyes looked at him from just a few inches away [p. 7-8].

The tension between the protagonists, created by the syntactic features of the framing expressions, lead us to realize that the dialogic turns in themselves should be read as a part of that duel<sup>12</sup>.

Thus when the president, once he is acknowledged by Homero as such, says: "Tell the people who pay you not to get their hopes up," and follows it with "My health is perfect." Homero replies "Nobody knows it better than me," which could be considered polite agreement, yet he goes on to say "I work in the hospital" [p. 8] in blatant contravention of Grice's cooperation principle<sup>13</sup>. The remark either infringes the quantity maxim, as it does not contribute to the conversation, or the relevance maxim. Since we know that the president has just received bad news regarding his health, Homero is in fact challenging the lie. Next we can observe another sequence in which the rules of linguistic politeness are overtly broken by each character in turn. Since the narrator's voice describes Homero's voice and behaviour as "raw," i.e. uneducated, the president's "Don't tell me you're a doctor" is no longer an expression of mere surprise, but an obvious insult. Homero does not allow himself to be insulted and explains he is an ambulance driver, to which the president replies "I am sorry" [p. 8]. The framing expression following the apology shows that the president is convinced

<sup>12</sup> Linde-Usiekniewicz et Nalewajko, "Siguiendo las pistas de un autor travieso". The following paragraph paraphrases part of this work.

<sup>13</sup> Herbert Paul Grice, "Logic and conversation", in *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3, Speech Acts*, ed. Peter Cole et Jerry L. Morgan (New York: Academic Press, 1975), 41-58.

of his mistake, but we are not told if the mistake was in fact wrongly assuming that Homero was an agent of the president's enemies or attacking Homero verbally. He follows it with: "That's a hard job" [p. 8], which is a polite phatic turn only when spoken by a social superior<sup>14</sup>. Thus, the president imposes his social rank on Homero, emphasizing his social superiority. Here Homero answers: "Not as hard as yours, Señor"<sup>15</sup> [p. 8]. By replying to a phatic remark as if it were representational in character, he violates the rules of polite phatic exchange, and therefore indirectly challenges the president's right to address him as his social inferior. Something similar occurs in the subsequent turns. When the president asks Homero where he is from, the driver answers: "The Caribbean" [p. 8], which again violates the Gricean quantity principle, since (the reader knows that) the president already knows this from the way Homero speaks (Homero's speech has been described as that of a raw Caribbean). Homero's answer can be seen as a refusal to cooperate and a challenge to the presidential right to interrogate him. Further evidence for the second reading comes from the following "The same as you" [p. 9].

In the same vein, defiance can be seen in Homero's initial refusal to have lunch with the president ("I never have lunch", p. 9) and, when he finally agrees, in his apparently solicitous remarks about the president having drunk coffee which, as he says, has been forbidden to him, as have other rich foods. ("In fact, I'm not allowed to eat anything". "You're not allowed to have coffee either", said Homero. "But you drink it anyway". "You found that out?" said the President. "But today was just an exception on an exceptional day" [p. 10]). The last exchange also reminds the reader that Homero has been following the president and that the latter is aware of it.

A similar exchange, apparently courteous, yet laden with threatening overtones occurs when Homero invites the president to dinner. Here again the offer to collect the president from his lodgings can be read as a rejection of his proposal to come on his own; Homero's previous confidences about having followed the president for a couple of months are confirmed by his knowing the address (which is not prestigious) and again when the fatuous presidential joke about Homero even knowing his shoe size is capped by the latter. In the event, it is Homero, and not the president, who has the final say in the exchange.

---

<sup>14</sup> John Laver, "Communicative functions of phatic communion", in *Communication in Face to Face Interaction*, ed. Adam Kendon, Richard M. Harris et Mary Ritchie Key (Berlin: Mouton, 1975), 215-238.

<sup>15</sup> For an analysis of the use of Spanish forms of address in English translations, vide Linde-Usiekniewicz et Nalewajko, "The impact of direct speech framing expressions".



## 4. Extending the Analysis

Our previous analyses, as presented above, focused on the presence of dative pronouns as a source of the tension that can be read into the narrative, with the other elements of the narrative used pre-theoretically as additional evidence of that tension. In this section we would like to present another feature of the narrative: the interpersonal situation within the story as shown by the narrative parts.

### 4.1. Interpersonal Situation within the Story and its Formal Correlates

The issue of the interpersonal situation between protagonists has been addressed, amongst others, by Chojnacki<sup>16</sup>. Though his analysis concerns novels, and not short stories, we feel that his findings can be applied to shorter narratives as well.

Chojnacki rightly points out that the most common relations are these of superiority/inferiority or equality (partnership). These relations depend on the character's social position but also on mental and psychological factors. Moreover, the factors may be independent of each other, and the social hierarchy may not be mirrored by the emotional or intellectual dependence. These factors, though belonging to the content of the narrative, may be reflected in its formal features. In addition, the relations are not static<sup>17</sup>.

When Chojnacki's framework is applied to the protagonists of our story it shows that there are several factors that suggest the president's superiority: he is a former head of state, a state of which Homero is a citizen, albeit in exile; his former power and presumed wealth; his education; his refinement, grooming and brilliance. Yet, as the story develops, we learn that the appurtenances of the previous office are spurious, as it turns out that the president's circumstances are as reduced as those of Homero and his wife. The president has no money to pay for his treatment and his alleged family heirlooms are nothing but fakes.

The initial position of Homero is harder to ascertain, because the reader only becomes acquainted with him the moment the president notices him and for a long time sees him only as he is focalized by the president. Thus, in the initial encounter the president's position may be viewed as being superior: he catches the other in the act of shadowing him and submits him to a cross-examination. Nevertheless, as the first dialogue develops the president (and the reader) realizes that this simple, uneducated and apparently timid man has completely

<sup>16</sup> Antoni Chojnacki, "Sytuacja międzysobowa w powieści – struktura, funkcje, znaczenie", in *Dialog w literaturze*, ed. Eugeniusz Czaplejewicz et Edward Kasperski (Warsaw: Polish Scientific Publishers PWN, 1978), 103-116.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 115-116.

invaded his privacy. Homero's knowledge gives him the power that shifts the balance between the two protagonists in Homero's favour. This is further confirmed not only when Homero takes the initiative and invites the president to his home, but also when he reveals the extent of his intimate knowledge of the president's circumstances (emblematic shoe-size included).

This is how the relationship and its shift are portrayed at the content level. Yet on the formal level, and specifically in terms of the framing expressions, something else happens. The sensation of witnessing a passage at arms is heightened by the symmetrical use of the verb *dijo* 'said', which frames almost all the direct speech fragments uttered by either protagonist, irrespective of whether the turns are in fact questions or replies to questions. Thus the narrator abdicates the right to comment upon or interpret the direct speech passages, and the readers have to arrive at the hostile interpretation of the turns on their own.

Our claim concerning the double-edged nature of the direct speech turns can be seen as a special instance of what Czapplejewicz<sup>18</sup> considers the "bipolar nature of a dialogic turn"<sup>19</sup>, meaning that along the linguistic dimension each turn is oriented towards other turns present in the universe of the dialogue. According to Czapplejewicz this orientation is complex; it occurs on many planes and depends on numerous factors, yet it can be reduced to a typology of paired, i.e. opposing orientations: a) development vs. opposition; b) opening vs. closing c) continuation vs. anticipation. This binary character results from the fact that each dialogic turn is in fact both a question and a reply<sup>20</sup>, and Czapplejewicz uses the terms 'questioning' and 'replying' in the double sense they actually possess. Questioning in his analysis not only refers to putting forward a question or several questions, but also to questioning, i.e. challenging a previous statement. Hence, replying is not only providing answers, as in the question-solving process discussed earlier in his work, but also coming up with rejoinders, which while being responses to earlier challenges, constitute new challenges in their own right<sup>21</sup>. This is what actually happens in the dialogues we have been discussing. Moreover, we have demonstrated that in our material the same turn may at one level constitute a development or positive contribution and at another level an opposition<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> Eugeniusz Czapplejewicz, "Wprowadzenie do pragmatycznej teorii dialogu", in *Dialog w literaturze*, ed. Eugeniusz Czapplejewicz et Edward Kasperski (Warsaw: Polish Scientific Publishers PWN, 1978), 11-48.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 33-34.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 42-44.

<sup>22</sup> This two-pronged character of the dialogue can be seen as having a somehow similar effect as one aspect of the dialogues in Dostoyevsky's work, as first noted by Bakhtin (Michaił Bachtin, "Problemy twórczości Dostojewskiego", in *Ja – inny. Wokół Bachtina. Antologia*, vol. 1, ed. Danuta Ulicka (Kraków: Universitas, 2009), 282-298). Yet, in Dostoyevsky the protagonists are given two separate voices: the official one and the inner one, and the major dialogic tension occurs when the

## 4.2. Other Effects of Datives in Framing Expressions: Focalization Effects

In section 2 we mentioned that while in the first part of the story the narrative's focalization is that of the president, in the latter parts it shifts to Lázara and Homero: in some instances they act as a joint focalizer, whereas in others the focalization moves between the two of them. In this section we would like to argue that the use of dative pronouns, besides creating the effect of tension, may have certain focalization effects.

First of all, it should be noted an analysis of focalization oftentimes considers it as akin to visual perception<sup>23</sup> and representing the point of view of given protagonists. However, events and situations in a narrative can be focalized through a description of sounds that translates into who hears what. Generally speaking, again, aural focalization is more easily perceived in the narrative parts in which sounds are described or presented in detail. Yet, the way speech is presented in the narrative can also offer clues as to who acts as the focalizer.

Our contention is that when a direct speech turn is framed by a 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject and speech verb construction, such fragments may not substantially alter the focalization. This would be the case in most instances when *dijo* is used in the story. However, if the addressee is explicitly mentioned in the form of a 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun, it would suggest that the direct speech passage is presented as not being perceived or recollected by the addressee, but as described by somebody else. The addressee is, therefore, somehow excluded as a potential focalizer. In *Buen viaje, señor presidente* however, the *le dijo* syntax can be found in several different situations.

The most obvious is in the first dialogue between the president and Homero. In all the instances in which the dative is used, it refers to Homero, which strengthens our claim that for this part of the story the focalization is with the president.

---

official voice of one protagonist responds to the inner voice of the other. By contrast, in the story studied here the tension is created at least in part, by the ambiguity between two possible readings of overt dialogic turns, rather than between the external and internal voices of the protagonists. Moreover, even if we draw a parallel between the two voices Dostoyevsky gives to his protagonists and the overt dialogue between the president and Homero on the one hand, and Homero's true intentions as represented in the passage in which he first discusses the president with his wife on the other, in the overt dialogue there is no discernable instance in which either of the protagonists replies to anything but what is being overtly said. Indeed, within the dialogue neither protagonist is presented as having any insight into the true intentions of the other.

<sup>23</sup> Vide Micke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985); David Herman, "Beyond Voice and Vision: Cognitive Grammar and Focalization Theory", in *Point of View, Perspective, and Focalization. Modeling Mediation in Narrative*, ed. Peter Hühn, Wolf Schmid et Jörg Schönert (Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 119-142; José Sanders et Gisela Redeker, "Perspective and the Representation of Speech and Thought in Narrative Discourse", in *Spaces, Worlds, and Grammar*, ed. Gilles Fauconnier et Eve Sweetser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 290-319.

Another instance occurs in the restaurant scene when the restaurant owner asks Homero if the president is an acting president. Here again *le* in *le preguntó* ‘lit. (he) him asked’ refers to the ambulance driver. However, in the initial part of the narrative we observe three instances in which the dative refers to the president: two in the hospital scene, first, when the doctor explains to the president where the disease is located and second, when he explains that they cannot predict what the chances of recovery are. Yet, since the hospital scene is presented as part of the president’s internal musings on previous events, it does not constitute a departure from the general focalization at this stage. Moreover, in this scene direct speech plays a minor role, and is overwhelmed by the indirect discourse and internal monologue presented as free indirect speech. Another instance of the use of the dative is when the flower-vendor rebukes the president upon seeing him pick a daisy from a flower-bed (instead of buying from her). Here the focalization for an instant shifts from the president to the flower-vendor: however, showing the president to be not as noble a character as he may seem has to come through a third person.

Interestingly, in the following parts of the story the addressee is seldom mentioned in a framing expression: once when we are told retrospectively about Homero and his wife’s plans to swindle the president; once when Homero reports to his wife what he has learned about the president. The two other instances correspond to focalization shifts between Homero and Lázara in the dinner scene, and are consistent with other pointers to the shifts present in the narrative.

## 5. The Polish Translation

*Doce cuentos peregrinos* was translated into Polish by Carlos Marrodán Casas, one of the most distinguished translators of Spanish-language prose in Poland. Yet, our impression is that with *Buen viaje, señor presidente* he met a considerable challenge.

Obviously, the use of dative pronouns in framing expressions could not be replicated in the Polish text. In fact, the dative appears in the Polish translation only once, when the doctor shows the president his x-rays and points to the place where the disease is located: “– Tu jest pański ból – powiedział **mu** [lit. (he) said to-him, emphasis ours]” [p. 13]. Here the Polish dative construction is most apt: the turn is made to resemble indirect speech or free indirect speech, in spite of the typography<sup>24</sup>. In all other instances the dative is suppressed.

<sup>24</sup> Our intuition that datives tend to appear in indirect speech constructions, and not in framing expressions, is further confirmed by the examples presented in Jolanta Chojak’s *Semantyka i składnia czasowników oznaczających reakcje słowne* (Warsaw: Warsaw University Press, 2006), 114-127.

Pronominal subjects are also obligatorily dropped in Polish<sup>25</sup>. Because of this the to-ing and fro-ing imposed on the reader by the Spanish original, and in consequence the sensation of tension, is attenuated in the Polish translation. Our contention is that it is the very presence of the tension introduced by the framing expressions that colours the direct speech turns themselves and leads to their being interpreted not as polite (as they appear at first glance), but challenging.

Yet another feature of the Polish translation is that the verb *dijo* 'said' is not uniformly translated as *powiedział(a)*. In the fragment studied it is rendered six times as *rzekł*: on three separate occasions the speakers are the doctor, the restaurant owner and Homero respectively, whereas in the remaining three instances the speaker is the president. It should be noted that Homero's only turn framed with *rzekł* is that in which he pronounces an apparently lofty statement:

– *W każdym razie pańska śmierć nie byłaby daremna – rzekł Homero. – Są ludzie gotowi oddać należną część godności, której jest pan przykładem* [p. 21].

"In any case, you will not have died in vain," said Homero. "Someone will restore you to your rightful place as a great example of honor" [p. 13].

The only difference between *powiedzieć* and *rzec* is stylistic: the latter is marked as belonging to a formal register<sup>26</sup>, and accordingly has a honorific function<sup>27</sup>. The referent of the subject of the verb is thus presented as a social superior. The fact that this verb is used to describe the president's speech further enhances his social status.

The translation of *dijo* is not limited to *rzekł*, but uses other speech verbs. In several instances *odpowiedział* 'answered', or *odparł* 'replied', are employed:

– *Nikt tego nie wie lepiej ode mnie – odpowiedział mężczyzna przytłoczony ciężarem dostojęstwa, jakie spadło na niego. – Pracuję w szpitalu. Wymowa i melodyka, nawet nieśmiałość, zdradzały prostego mieszkańca Karaibów.*  
– *Nie powie mi pan, że jest pan lekarzem – odparł prezydent* [p. 16-17].

"Nobody knows that better than me," said the man, crushed by the weight of dignity that had fallen upon him. "I work at the hospital."

His diction and cadence, and even his timidity, were raw Caribbean.

"Don't tell me you're a doctor," said the President [p. 8].

<sup>25</sup> In Linde-Usiekiewicz et Nalewajko, *The impact of direct speech framing expressions* we argued that the English translation maintains the impression of a verbal duel through the obligatory use of subject pronouns and the interplay between framing expressions with pronouns and expressions with a full nominal, in which quotative inversion is applied.

<sup>26</sup> Vide respective entries in Stanisław Dubisz, ed., *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego* (Warsaw: Polish Scientific Publishers PWN, 2003).

<sup>27</sup> Romuald Huszcza, *Honoryfikatywność. Gramatyka – pragmatyka – typologia* (Warsaw: Polish Scientific Publishers PWN, 2006), 151-156.

*W żadnym szpitalu na świecie nie ma tajemnic dla kierowcy karetki – odpowiedział Homero* [p. 21].

“There are no secrets for an ambulance driver in any hospital anywhere in the world”, said Homero [p. 12].

*Prawie – odrzekł Homero. – Towarzyszyłem panu podczas kampanii na południu jako dowódca brygad studenckich* [p. 19].

“Almost,” said Homero. “I was with you for the whole southern campaign as a leader of the university brigades” [p. 11].

*– Kto może to wiedzieć lepiej niż pan? – odrzekł Homero. – To prawdziwy cud, że po wojskowym zamachu stanu obaj jesteśmy tutaj, gotowi zjeść pół wołu. Nie wszyscy mieli tyle szczęścia* [p. 19].

“You know that better than anybody,” said Homero. “After the military coup, the miracle is that we’re both here, ready to eat half a cow. Not many were as lucky” [p. 11].

In all these instances first of all the bipolar character of each turn, discussed earlier, is obviated. Moreover, since it is Homero’s turns that are framed as replies, the initiative of the Polish version of the exchange lies with the president. The symmetry is lost and so is the passage at arms effect we observed in the original<sup>28</sup>.

Curiously, the only instances where the president’s turns are presented as replies come at the very end of the conversation, when Homero invites the president to his house. However, they follow Homero’s turns, and the verb *dijo* has been replaced with *zapytał* ‘asked’ (intriguingly, in the expression framing the presidential leave-taking turn the original *concluyó* ‘concluded’ is rendered as *powiedział*). In addition, several of the following turns are presented as replies with *odparł* replacing the original *dijo*:

*– Miło mi było pana poznać – powiedział, żegnając się z Homerem. – Nie mam wyznaczonej daty operacji, nawet nie wiem, czy w ogóle się na nią zdecyduję. Ale jeśli wszystko pójdzie dobrze, spotkamy się ponownie.*

*– A dlaczego nie wcześniej? – zapytał Homero. – Łázara, moja żona, gotuje dla bogaczy. Nikt lepiej od niej nie robi ryżu z krewetkami i byłoby nam miło, gdybyśmy mogli gościć pana u siebie któregoś wieczoru.*

<sup>28</sup> A similar phenomenon, i.e. a less specific framing expression being translated as a more specific one, and by the same token, imposing an interpretation absent in the original text has been noted by Joanna Górniewicz, “L’image de la rose dans les douze traductions polonaises de *Petit Prince* d’Antoine de Saint-Exupéry”, in *Le Petit Prince et les amis au pays des traductions. Études dédiées à Urszula Dąmbska-Prokop*, ed. Joanna Górniewicz, Iwona Piechnik et Marcela Świątkowska (Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2012), 128-147. She observes that the French framing expression *fit* ‘lit. did’ is rendered as: *westchnął*, ‘sighed’, *zachnął się* ‘bridled’, *powiedział* ‘said’ and *wykrzyknął* ‘exclaimed’ in different translations, each of them pointing to a particular reaction of the Little Prince upon learning that his Rose was not unique.

- *Nie wolno mi jeść owoców morza, ale z wielką przyjemnością się skuszę* – **odpart**. – *Proszę mi tylko powiedzieć, kiedy mam przyjść.*
- *W czwartek mam wolne* – **odpart** Homero.
- *Doskonale* – *powiedział prezydent.* – *W czwartek o siódmej wieczorem jestem u państwa. Przyjdę z prawdziwą przyjemnością.*
- *Przyjadę po pana* – *powiedział Homero.* – *Hotel Dames, 14 rue de l'Industrie. Za dworcem. Zgadza się?*
- *Zgadza się* – **odpart** prezydent i wstał, czarujący jak nigdy. – *Zna pan pewnie nawet numer mojego obuwia.*
- *Oczywiście, proszę pana* – *powiedział rozbawiony Homero* [p. 22].

“It has been a pleasure,” he concluded as he took his leave of Homero. “I haven’t set a date yet for the surgery, and I haven’t even decided if I’m going to have it done or not. But if all goes well, we’ll see each other again”.

“And why not before?” said Homero. “Lazara, my wife, does cooking for rich people. Nobody makes shrimp and rice better than she does, and we’d like to invite you to our house some night soon”.

“I’m not allowed to have shellfish, but I’ll be happy to eat it”, he said. “Just tell me when”.

“Thursday is my day off,” said Homero.

“Perfect”, said the President. “Thursday at seven I’ll be at your house. It will be a pleasure”.

“I’ll come by for you”, said Homero. “Hotellerie Dames, Fourteen Rue de l’Industrie. Behind the station. Is that right?”

“That’s right”, said the President, and he stood up, more charming than ever. “It appears you even know my shoe size”.

“Of course, Señor”, said Homero with amusement [p. 13-14].

Our contention is that by adopting this strategy Marrodán was not aiming to attenuate the tension between protagonists. On the contrary, given the derivational structure of the verbs *odpowiedzieć* and *odeprzeć*, and particularly the *od-* ‘re-’ prefix present in them, which implies a kind of countermovement<sup>29</sup> he must have chosen them as a means of rendering the passage at arms character of the dialogue; the choice of the verb *odpart* over *odpowiedział* is particularly significant here: in the sense of ‘to reply’, the verb belongs to the formal register of Polish, but what is more noteworthy, its other sense refers to parrying an attack or repelling an enemy.

If our analysis is right, due to the way the Polish framing expressions control the exchange, the image is no longer that of matched contenders exchanging strokes and counterstrokes, but of the president as an attacker, with his thrusts parried by Homero. The impression of conflict was duly transferred but the interpersonal situation has been altered: the conflict is no longer one between equals<sup>30</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> Krystyna Waszakowa, “Słowotwórstwo a niektóre założenia kognitywizmu”, *Poradnik Językowy* 6 (2004): 67-80.

<sup>30</sup> Vide Ernst-August Gutt, “Translation as interlingual interpretive use”, in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London – New York: Routledge, 2000), 376-396, for a theoretical discussion of this issue.

In consequence, the underlying defiance in Homero's turns is lost. If he is seen as responding to the other's verbal cues, his remarks could be viewed as solicitous, even placating, hence defensive rather than offensive. Moreover, the way the initial conversational turns have been translated hinders, rather than facilitates, the adversarial reading. In certain instances it appears that Marrodán opted for formal equivalence over functional equivalence<sup>31</sup>, so that some of the turns do not have the same impact as they do in the original. One of these is "To szczyt moich marzeń" [p. 17] as the equivalent of "Qué más quisiera yo [p. 20] (I wish I could, p. 8)". The Spanish expression conveys regret over something which is impossible to attain, similarly to the Polish *niestety*, while the actual Polish expression used in the text may convey a state of affairs towards which the speaker is striving. Thus, it can be read as sharing a confidence with the other protagonist, which in turn gives the entire exchange a friendlier flavour. This is further enhanced by the translation of the president's "Lo siento (I am sorry)" as "Przykro mi." Here a superficial apology for an apparent error (whether attacking Homero for spying for his enemies or mistaking him for a physician) is turned into an expression of sympathy. Secondly, the politeness pattern involved in the phatic "Es un trabajo duro (That's a hard job)"<sup>32</sup>, which is translated literally as "To ciężka praca" is not very common in Polish discourse practice<sup>33</sup>. In consequence the defiance behind "– No tanto como el suyo, señor (Not as hard as yours, Señor)", translated as "Bez porównania lżejsza od pańskiej" is lost on the Polish reader.

One could argue that the somewhat clumsy and rather grating nature of the Polish turns are intentional, and supposed to produce in the reader a discomfort that is a substitute for the tension present in the original. In addition, an incoherence can be observed between the form and content of the dialogic turns and the expression they frame. Though this incoherence could be intentional as yet another factor contributing to a replication of the tension in the original, and additionally providing a clue to the fact that the protagonists are not completely truthful with one another, we personally do not feel it is entirely successful.

---

<sup>31</sup> Eugene Nida, "Principle of correspondence", in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London – New York: Routledge, 2000), 126-140.

<sup>32</sup> Laver, *Phatic communion*, 224-225.

<sup>33</sup> Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz, "Językowe, międzyjęzykowe, kulturowe i międzykulturowe aspekty grzeczności", in *Grzeczność na krańcach świata*, ed. Małgorzata Marcjanik (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, 2007), 15-36.



## 6. Conclusions

If our analysis of both the original text and its translation is correct, it constitutes further evidence for the benefits of an approach which argues that dialogic turns cannot be adequately analyzed when separated from their framing expressions. In addition, not only should the meaning of the speech verbs and other lexical items used in the turns be studied, but also their syntax<sup>34</sup>.

We have shown that the syntax of the framing expressions, i.e. the appearance of indirect object pronouns, provided a clue to the hidden adversarial meaning of the direct speech passages, which otherwise could easily have been overlooked. We have also argued that this syntax may be seen as an additional focalization device.

The choice of the most generic speech verb was considered to be yet another element contributing to the portrayal of the interpersonal dynamics within the original narrative, from the initial presidential superiority to the later move towards equality between the protagonists.

The application of the same analytical tools to the Polish translation demonstrated that a different syntactic pattern, and the attempts to compensate for this, brought about several changes in the way the story develops. The verbal duel no longer occurs between well-matched adversaries, but one side attacks, while the other deflects the thrusts. Interestingly, it was when we compared the generic speech verb in Spanish with specific speech verbs in Polish that we observed that while in the original there is no incoherence between direct speech turns and framing expressions, in the Polish translation the two are at apparent odds<sup>35</sup>. In addition, the focalization effects of the syntactic pattern in the original was not rendered in the translation, as the Polish verbs used do not have this effect.

We would like to point out that it was the observation of purely syntactic phenomena that provided the starting point for our analysis, and moreover, that the analytic tools have mostly come from various linguistic theories. Thus, Czapplejewicz's indirect criticism of the linguistic approach to an analysis of literary

<sup>34</sup> For example Grażyna Borkowska, *Dialog powieściowy i jego konteksty (na podstawie twórczości Elizy Orzeszkowej)* (Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1988) discusses speech verbs used by Orzeszkowa in framing expressions, but does not mention their syntax. Sawicki, *Towards Narrative Grammar of Polish* only discusses the word order of subjects with speech verbs, while syntactic studies of quotatives (e.g. Suñer, "Syntax of Direct Quotes"; Christopher T. Collins et Phil Branigan, "Quotative Inversion", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 15 (1997): 1-41) scarcely mention the possible impact of framing clauses on direct speech itself.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. The textinterferenz approach to direct speech representation in narratives, Wolf Schmid, *Elemente der Narratologie* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), quoted in McHale, *Speech Representation*.

dialogue has been partly challenged, though, if truth be told, what Czaplejewicz must have had in mind was a different kind of linguistics<sup>36</sup>.

Finally, as far as we are aware, the dialogue and dialogue framing turns in Gabriel García Márquez's prose have not been studied, or if they have, there has been no discernible impact on the considerable body of research into his work. In all, the analysis presented here constitutes, in our opinion, an instance of philology, understood as the pairing of linguistics and literary studies, bringing certain benefits to the field of literary studies.

**Direct speech turns and narrative clues in literary prose:  
Gabriel García Márquez's short story *Buen viaje, señor presidente*  
and its Polish translation**

Streszczenie

Prozie Gabriela Garcíi Márqueza poświęcono ogromną liczbę opracowań teoretyczno-literackich i krytycznych, jednak ich większość koncentrowała się wokół zaledwie kilku zagadnień, takich jak realizm magiczny, mit i historia, itp. Tylko niewielka część badaczy zajmowała się w swoich pracach wybranymi aspektami formalnymi twórczości kolumbijskiego pisarza. W niniejszym artykule prezentujemy propozycję badania, dla którego punkt wyjścia stanowi analiza składniowa komentarza narracyjnego towarzyszącego dialogom w opowiadaniu *Buen viaje, señor presidente*. Analiza ta pozwala na dogłębne odczytanie kluczem pragmatycznym wielowarstwowych sensów replik dialogowych oraz poczynienie ustaleń na temat focalizacji. Przyjrzenie się relacjom między komentarzem narracyjnym i replikami dialogowymi w utworze umożliwi ustalenie i opisanie skomplikowanej sytuacji międzyosobowej. Zastosowanie tej samej procedury do badania tłumaczenia opowiadania na język polski pokazuje, w jaki sposób składniowe i leksykalne zmiany dokonane w komentarzu narracyjnym towarzyszącym dialogom wpływają na odczytanie replik dialogowych, a nawet na zmianę sytuacji międzyosobowej. W ten sposób staramy się zwrócić uwagę na istotność formalnych aspektów komentarza narracyjnego w analizach dialogów literackich oraz na możliwości zastosowania narzędzi stworzonych na gruncie językoznawstwa do badania utworów literackich, nawet autorów uznawanych dotąd za kanonicznych i gruntownie przeanalizowanych.

---

<sup>36</sup> Czaplejewicz, *Wprowadzenie do pragmatycznej teorii dialogu*, 21-22, 35-37. Actually, it may be argued that we have proved him right: the approaches we have used come from either pragmatic linguistics, cognitive linguistics or Relevance Theory, and these overcome the distinction between semantic, pragmatic and cognitive phenomena.