



**Focalisation in the translation/rewriting  
of narrative texts: A.P. Brink's  
*Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele***

**J.L. Kruger**



**Focalisation in the translation/rewriting  
of narrative texts: A.P. Brink's  
*Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele***

**Jan Louis Kruger  
Hons. B.A., M.A. (English)**

**Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the  
degree Philosophiae Doctor in the School of Languages of the  
Vaal Triangle Campus of the Potchefstroom University for  
Christian Higher Education**

**Promoter: Prof. M.M. Verhoef  
Co-promoter: Dr. M.J. Wenzel  
Assistant promoter: Prof. A.L. Combrink**

**Vanderbijlpark  
2001**

---

---

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to the following people, who each contributed significantly to this study in one way or another:

- Haidee for her love and support as well as her various inputs under tremendous pressure.
- Prof. Marlene Verhoef for her support and encouragement as promoter, colleague and friend.
- Dr. Marita Wenzel for providing expert guidance at very short notice.
- Prof. Annette Combrink for her guidance and as well as for introducing me to the field of translation studies.
- The National Research Foundation for financial assistance. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at are not necessarily to be attributed to the National Research Foundation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
1.1 Contextualisation .....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem .....	6
1.3 Aims .....	8
1.4 Hypotheses .....	8
1.5 Method .....	9
1.6 Envisaged contribution of the study .....	12
<b>2. JACQUES DERRIDA AND TRANSLATION</b> .....	14
2.1 Introduction .....	14
2.2 Deconstruction and translation theory .....	14
2.3 <i>Différance</i> .....	17
2.4 Equivalence, status and untranslatability .....	20
2.4.1 Equivalence .....	20
2.4.2 "Original" and translation: towards a contract .....	26
2.4.3 Translation and the unnameable, untranslatable .....	32
2.5 Gaps and traces .....	36
2.6 Conclusion: translating outwards – deconstruction and the desire for meaning .....	37
<b>3. THE THEORY OF NARRATIVE: <i>IMPOSTULATION</i> AND FOCALISATION</b> .....	40
3.1 Introduction .....	40
3.2 Towards a definition of <i>impostulation</i> .....	43
3.2.1 An etymology of <i>impostulation</i> (Tulloch, 1993) .....	44
3.2.2 <i>Impostulation</i> defined .....	46
3.2.3 Monika Fludernik's natural narratology (1996) .....	49
3.3 Focalisation .....	50
3.3.1 Mimesis and personification .....	50
3.3.2 Telling versus seeing .....	53
3.3.2.1 Narrative levels: diegesis versus extradiegesis .....	54
3.3.2.2 "Who sees?" versus "Who speaks?" – terminological confusion .....	56
3.3.3 Focalisation as relationship of mediation or mediacy .....	61

---

3.3.4 Focalisation as access to consciousness .....	64
3.3.5 Focalisation as interpretive strategy .....	66
3.4 Focalisation and narrativity: impostulation .....	69
3.5 Impostulation and <i>différance</i> : the absence of presence.....	70
3.6 Impostulation and deixis.....	71
3.7 Markers of impostulation: Deixis, subjectivity and characterisation .....	74
3.8 Conclusion and working definitions.....	79
4. ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON: <i>IMAGININGS OF SAND/SANDKASTELE</i> .....	85
4.1 Introduction.....	85
4.1.1 The impostulatory structure of <i>Imaginations of     sand/Sandkastele</i> .....	90
Table 1: Overall impostulatory structure of <i>Imaginations of     sand/Sandkastele</i>	94
Table 2: Levels of impostulation in <i>Imaginations of     sand/Sandkastele</i>	96
4.2 Levels of impostulation in <i>Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele</i> ..	98
4.2.1 Frame impostulation .....	98
4.2.1.1 <i>Direct impostulated narrative</i>	99
Table 3: Frame impostulation: direct impostulated narrative (narrative present)	99
4.2.1.1.1 Introduction	99
4.2.1.1.2 Macrotextual analysis	102
4.2.1.1.3 Microtextual analysis	112
4.2.1.1.4 Comparison: parallel texts and translation	132
4.2.1.1.5 Conclusion	146
4.2.1.2 <i>Metatextual impostulated narrative</i>	149
Table 4: Frame impostulation: metatextual impostulated narrative	149
4.2.1.2.1 Introduction	149
4.2.1.2.2 Macrotextual analysis	150
4.2.1.2.3 Microtextual analysis	152
4.2.1.2.4 Comparison: parallel texts and translation	154
4.2.1.2.5 Conclusion	157

4.2.2 <b>Embedded impostulation</b> .....	158
4.2.2.1 <b><i>Retrospective direct impostulated narrative</i></b>	160
Table 5: Embedded narrative – retrospective direct impostulated narrative	160
4.2.2.1.1 Introduction	160
4.2.2.1.2 Macrotextual analysis	160
4.2.2.1.3 Microtextual analysis	161
4.2.2.1.4 Comparison: parallel texts and translation	175
4.2.2.1.5 Conclusion 201	188
4.2.2.2 <b><i>Quoted dialogue/Impostulated direct speech</i></b>	190
Table 6: Quoted dialogue/Impostulated direct speech	190
4.2.2.2.1 Introduction	190
4.2.2.2.2 Macrotextual analysis	191
4.2.2.2.3 Microtextual analysis	193
4.2.2.2.4 Comparison: parallel texts and translation	201
4.2.2.2.5 Conclusion	209
4.2.2.3 <b><i>Introduced impostulated direct narrative</i></b>	210
Table 7 Introduced impostulated direct narrative	210
4.2.2.3.1 Introduction	210
4.2.2.3.2 Macrotextual analysis	213
Table 8 Introduction to introduced impostulated direct narrative	213
4.2.2.3.3 Microtextual analysis	217
4.2.2.3.4 Comparison: parallel texts and translation	227
4.2.2.3.5 Conclusion	238
<b>4.3 Conclusion</b> .....	240
4.3.1 Introduction.....	240
4.3.2 Focalisation in Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele.....	242
<b>5. CONCLUSION AND AVENUES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH</b> .....	246
5.1 Introduction.....	246
5.2 Translation theory and deconstruction .....	246
5.3 Impostulation, focalisation and the narrative origo.....	247
5.4 Towards a model for the translation of narrative fiction .....	249
5.4.1 Deictic markers.....	250

5.4.2	Markers of subjective impostulation .....	251
5.4.3	Markers of characterisation .....	253
5.5	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	253
5.6	<b>Avenues for further research</b> .....	254
6.	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	255
<b>ADDENDA: TRANSLATIONS (JLK)</b> .....		262
	<b>Addendum 1: Direct impostulated narrative</b> .....	262
	<b>Addendum 2: Metatextual impostulated narrative</b> .....	270
	<b>Addendum 3: Retrospective direct impostulated narrative</b> .....	271
	<b>Addendum 4: Impostulated direct speech</b> .....	280
	<b>Addendum 5: Introduced impostulated direct narrative</b> .....	292

I believe I can say that if I love the word, it is only in the body of its idiomatic singularity, that is, where a passion for translation comes to lick it as a flame or an amorous tongue might: approaching as closely as possible while refusing at the last moment to threaten or to reduce, to consume or to consummate, leaving the other body intact but not without causing the other to appear – on the very brink of this refusal or withdrawal – and after having aroused or excited a desire for the idiom, for the unique body of the other, in the flame's flicker or through a tongue's caress (Derrida, 2001:175).

---



---

## Abstract

Narrative fiction presents translators with a particular challenge due to the subtle shifts in focalisation complicated by factors such as embedded narratives and hypothetical focalisation. Furthermore, the gaps and traces that arise from the (often) covert nature of shifts in focalisation necessitate meticulous analyses. In this study the role of focalisation in the translation of narrative texts is therefore investigated in terms of the various markers that foreground aspects related to focalisation.

The theoretical position of this study is informed by Derrida's notion of the play of the trace evident in *différance*. It is shown that *différance* offers a productive potential rather than an obstacle or barrier to translation; translation does not fix the same meaning, but creates new avenues for further difference. In other words, translation activates hidden traces, ensuring the survival of the original text at the same time that the translation issues forth from it. The relationship between source text and target text is further regarded not as a hierarchical relationship, but as a contract in which the texts rely on each other without one having final priority over the other. The two texts involved in this contract are therefore regarded as constantly becoming in a symbiotic relationship of rewriting.

In order to address the gaps and traces in narrative texts, focalisation is redefined as an "impostulatory" technique (a term coined to address the proprietary relationships in and surrounding narrative texts). The most important implication of this redefinition is that focalisation always proceeds through the only narrative origo in a narrative text, from which and through which and into which the narrative is actualised or activated or narrativised from an extratextual position by author and reader.

A.P. Brink's parallel texts, *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, are then used in illustration of the above theoretical concepts. In particular, the novel is analysed in terms of deictic, subjective and characterising markers of focalisation. The two texts are also compared to each other, as well as to my

own translation based on the analysis of these markers. These analyses and comparisons indicate that focalisation indeed plays an important role in the translation of narrative texts, particularly in relation to microtextual shifts that impact on the macrotext. On the basis of these findings, a model is proposed for the translation of narrative texts based on a view of focalisation as impostulatory technique evident primarily in markers of subjectivity, but also incorporating the more overt markers of deixis and the markers of characterisation.

## Opsomming

Verhalende tekste stel 'n besondere uitdaging aan vertalers vanweë die subtiele verskuiwings in fokalisasie, wat verder gekompliseer word deur faktore soos ingebedde narratiewe en hipotetiese fokalisasie. Hiermee saam noodsaak the gapings en spore wat voortspruit uit die (dikwels) verskuilde aard van verskuiwings in fokalisasie, noukeurige analises. In hierdie studie word die rol van fokalisasie in die vertaling van verhalende tekste gevolglik ondersoek met betrekking tot die verskillende merkers wat aspekte rakende fokalisasie op die voorgrond plaas.

Die studie neem Derrida se konsep van die spel van die spoor wat voortvloei uit *différance* as teoretiese uitgangspunt. Daar word aangetoon dat différance 'n produktiewe potensiaal bied eerder as 'n hindernis of struikelblok vir die vertaling. Vertaling maak nie dieselfde betekenis vas nie, maar skep nuwe geleenthede vir verdere verskil. Met ander woorde, vertaling aktiveer verskuilde spore, en in die proses verseker dit die oorlewing van die oorspronklike teks terwyl die vertaling terselfdertyd daaruit voortspruit. Die verhouding tussen bronteks en doelteks word verder nie as 'n hiërgiese verhouding beskou nie, maar eerder as 'n kontrak waarin die tekste op mekaar aangewese is sonder dat een van die tekste finale prioriteit oor die ander geniet. Die twee tekste betrokke by hierdie kontrak word dus beskou as voortdurend wordend in 'n simbiotiese verhouding van herskrywing.

In 'n poging om die gapings en spore in verhalende tekste te verdiskonteer, word fokalisasie geherdefinieer as 'n tegniek van impostulasie ('n term geskep om die verhoudings van eienaarskap binne en rondom verhalende tekste aan te spreek). Die belangrikste implikasie van hierdie herdefinisie is dat fokalisasie altyd plaasvind deur middel van die enigste narratiewe origo in die verhalende teks – waaruit, waardeur en waarin die narratief geaktiveer of verwerklik of vertellend gemaak word vanuit 'n eksterne posisie deur beide outeur en leser.

A.P. Brink se parallele tekste, *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, word gevolglik gebruik ter illustrasie van die bogenoemde teoretiese konsepte. Veral word die roman geanaliseer met betrekking tot deiktiese, subjektiewe en karakteriserende merkers van fokalisasie. Die twee tekste word ook met mekaar vergelyk, asook met my eie vertaling, op grond van hierdie merkers. Hierdie analises en vergelykings dui daarop dat fokalisasie wel 'n belangrike rol speel in die vertaling van verhalende tekste, in die besonder met betrekking tot mikrotekstuele verskuiwings wat die makroteks beïnvloed. Op grond van hierdie bevindinge word 'n model voorgestel vir die vertaling van verhalende tekste. Hierdie model is gegrond op 'n beskouing van fokalisasie as impostulêre tegniek wat veral sigbaar is in merkers van subjektiwiteit, maar ook in die meer ooglopende merkers van deiksis en karakterisering.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Contextualisation

Translators of narrative texts are faced by a number of problems, not least of which is their position in terms of the proprietary relations in and around a text. In this regard May (1994:34) remarks that "translators, trapped in an ill-defined limbo between text and author, routinely skew the various claims on the words of a literary text, favoring the author, or implied author, at the expense of the internal voices, particularly that of the narrator". Focalisation as (often covert) element of narration is evidently a central concern here, as it intensifies (and sometimes obscures) the proprietary struggles within a text.

In a statement that links up with that of May, Van Leuven-Zwart (1986:191) posits the view that the way in which a narrative text is translated will result in changes in viewpoint. In a discussion of the role of the narrative function in literary translation, she comments:

Een lineaire of een structurele methode van vertalen, een "objektieve" of een "subjektieve" interpretatie, een brontekst- of een doelttekstgerichte strategie, deze factoren zijn alle, in min of meerdere mate, verantwoordelijk voor de overeenkomsten en verschillen tussen de vertellersfunctie zoals die in de brontekst en in de vertaling tot stand wordt gebracht. (Van Leuven-Zwart, 1986:192 )

Whatever one's definition of concepts such as "focalisation", "focuser", "narrative perspective", and so forth, it will have to be conceded that the translation of the narrative function will have a definite impact on the relationship between source and target texts. In the words of Van Leuven-Zwart (1986:191), "een verandering in standpunt of houding betekent een verandering in het verhaal dat wordt verteld en in de effecten ervan op de lezer".

The above views would seem to suggest that the translation of narrative texts does impact on the way in which the narrative will be read and in which the reader will activate the narrative function. Due to the convergence of narrative theory and translation theory in such an investigation, an interdisciplinary approach becomes not only advisable, but inevitable.

---

According to Snell-Hornby (1990:98), "the theory of translation is not merely part of Applied Linguistics, as the linguistic school of 'translation science' still tends to see it, nor is it part of Comparative Literature, as literary translation studies still tends to be treated". In her opinion, the insights, concepts and methods of neighbouring disciplines can (and should) be utilised in the study of translation. In the translation of narrative texts, an interdisciplinary approach will be equally important, combining elements derived from formalism, structuralism and poststructuralism with recent developments in translation theory.

The synthesis of theories in an interdisciplinary approach is, however, complicated by the perpetual flux of contemporary theories. Focalisation theory is a case in point. Jahn (1996:241) emphasises this point when he states that:

In general, focalization theory addresses the options and ranges of orientational restrictions of narrative presentation. Gerard Genette first associated focalization with a "focal character" and the questions *who sees?* and *who perceives?* Following Mieke Bal, however, many narratologists now believe that focalization covers a much wider scope than either vision or perception and that the narrator is a potential "focalizer," too. First-generation narratologists like Genette and Seymour Chatman view this expanded scope with considerable scepticism, and despite such convincing recent applications as William Edmiston's *Hindsight and Insight*, **focalization theory at present is caught in a dilemma of conflicting approaches** (my emphasis).

Although this view presents a number of problems, as will be pointed out in Chapter 3, it does call attention to the disarray in focalisation theory since the 1990s. When one considers the translation of narrative texts, it stands to reason that these conflicting approaches to focalisation theory will impact significantly on the analysis, description and application of translation strategies or practices to deal with narrative complexity.

In the above article, Jahn (1996:250) makes a comment that is, to my mind, central to the relationship between focalisation and translation, namely that "[m]ainstream focalization theory with its ready answers to *who speaks?* and *who sees?* largely denies narrators [perhaps rather authors] and readers their share as well as their power of imaginary perception". Since the translator plays a dual role in being both reader and writer, his or her imaginative perception is of the utmost importance, a fact of which any translation theory has to take cognisance.

Before the role of the translator can be addressed in more detail, however, the question of translatability has to be considered. Just as translation theory is concerned with questions of translatability versus untranslatability (i.e. the possibility or impossibility of the translation of an "original" – operating on the basis of a hierarchy that privileges the "original" above its translation), the theory of literature developing from the philosophies of Heidegger, Wittgenstein, Derrida and their adherents, as well as Lacanian psychoanalysis, gave rise to what Rimmon-Kenan (1996:8) calls the dichotomy of the "possibility versus the impossibility of representation". The dichotomy in translation theory is further problematised by the fact that in translation, language refers to language itself, and not to things – with the result that a translation becomes a representation of a representation in an infinite chain of signification. In the words of Gentzler (1993:147), "the translated text becomes a translation of another earlier translation and translated words, although viewed by deconstructionists as 'material' signifiers, represent nothing but other words representing nothing but still other words representing".

Therefore, in view of Rimmon-Kenan's (1996:8) statement quoted above, translation theory has to concern itself with the possibility or impossibility of the translation of an "original" subject to the possibility or impossibility of representation. And just as what is untranslatable in Derrida's theory is the only thing to translate (Derrida, 1992:258), what is impossible to represent is the only thing to represent, since what is possible to represent does not require representation – or, to misappropriate Derrida even further, what must be represented of that which is possible to represent can only be that which is impossible to represent. Focalisation, to my mind, would seem to constitute just such an impossibility of representation in that it is constantly involved in imaginary perception.

Just like focalisation theory, translation theory has been characterised over the past decades by a number of crises and debates. According to Jay (1997:412), translation theory "has undergone a fundamental shift in which the traditional value of fidelity has given way, first to a deconstructive critique ... and secondly to a reconceptualization of the phenomenon of translation, one that linked it to a range of

cultural activities – interpretation, critical writing". Similarly, May (1994:42) asserts that "recent theory and ... translation practice have begun to assert a new role for the translator ... theorists have come to see translation as a locus for the celebration of difference". The present study will therefore adopt this "celebration of difference" as informing principle in investigating, describing and applying aspects related to focalisation in the translation of A.P. Brink's parallel texts, *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*.

Any attempt to approach translation theory after the advent of deconstruction has to relinquish a number of "safe" and seemingly solid conceptions. In the words of Kaisa Koskinen (1994:446), "by denying the existence of *Truth, Origin and Center*, deconstruction deprives us of the comfortable fallacy of living in a simple and understandable world. We lose security, but we gain endless possibilities, the unlimited play of meanings". This entails that the conventional notion of equivalence also becomes suspect, as we are compelled to consider a notion such as untranslatability (which, although not introduced by deconstructionists, forms an important part of their perspective on translation). Since equivalence, in one form or another, forms the basis of practically all theories of translation, and since it remains inescapable in the practice of translation at certain levels, the significance of the deconstructionist contribution to the field with regard to this concept is an area that needs to be investigated. Although an investigation of the relationship between equivalence and deconstruction will not be one of the aims of the study, it remains an important consideration in terms of the basis for the translation-theoretical position assumed in this study.

Sapire (1995:69) points out that translation is essentially a rewriting of an original text, and that all rewritings reflect some ideology and poetics that cause it to manipulate literature for a certain function in a particular society in a given way. In spite of this, according to Sapire (1995:71), the translation norm in literary translation is mostly still a norm of remaining true to the source text, due to the long prescriptive tradition. This reveals a definite conflict between translation theory and practice. In terms of the translation of narrative texts, this rift between theory and practice involves both translation theory and narrative theory.



Lefevere (1992:6) asks readers to imagine the translation of literature as taking place not in a vacuum in which two languages meet, but rather in the context of all the traditions of the two literatures. Literary translators mediate between literary traditions, and they do so with some goal in mind, other than the goal of "making the original available" in a neutral, objective way. Similarly, Newmark (1988:10) states that "the translator should produce a different type of translation of the same text for a different type of audience". The active role of the translator therefore renders him or her an integral part of the creative process, incorporating aspects of both reception in the role of reader and production in the role of translator/rewriter. Notions such as deixis therefore become particularly significant in that the deictic elements perceived by the translator as reader will undoubtedly impact on the deictic elements instilled in the translation/rewriting<sup>1</sup>.

Deixis, according to Levinson (1983:54), "generally concerns the ways in which languages encode or grammaticalize features of the **context of utterance of speech events**, and thus also concerns ways in which the interpretation of utterances depends on the **analysis of that context of utterance**" (my emphasis). This not only underlines the importance of deixis in the analysis of the source text in terms of focalisation, but also in the process of translation. Hence, Tolliver (1990:270) states that "consideration of deictic elements in an utterance can help determine the **deictic center**, in the case of an examination of **perspective**, and that this would illuminate what entity is responsible for a given utterance and so throw some light on **narrative distance**" (my emphases).

The integration of narratology and translation theory consequently becomes increasingly important in moving towards a model for the translation of narrative texts, an integration in which analysis is central. According to Gerard Genette (1980:215), "[a] narrative situation is ... a complex whole within which analysis ... cannot *differentiate* except by ripping apart a tight web of connections among the narrating act, its protagonist, its spatio-temporal determinations, its relationship to the other narrating situations involved in the same narrative". Although this is

---

<sup>1</sup> Since all translation is essentially rewriting, the terms will often be used in combination.

undoubtedly an integral part of any reading of narrative, the synthetic process of (re)creating a narrative web of connections has to be investigated, since that is essentially what the translator of narrative texts is required to do.

According to Van der Voort (1991:67), the descriptive instruments developed by narratology allow every constituent in the translation process to be analysed separately, both in the source text and in the target text. He continues to state that "we have to distinguish between analyses of whole texts and analyses of textual parts in their relation to the whole". In this respect, his theory moves away from formal equivalence to an emphasis on "translational interpretation".

Van Leuven-Zwart (1986:193) also comments on the importance of analysis in the translation of narrative texts. In her opinion, in order to arrive at conclusions concerning the correspondences and differences in the role of the narrative function, the level of words and sentences should be the starting point and become the building blocks for the larger meaningful units and wholes. Evidently, differences between source text and translation at the level of words and sentences will impact on differences in the larger wholes.

This approach to textual analysis indicates a need for a theory that is both macrostructural in working with elements of a text "in relation to the whole", and microtextual in order to arrive at workable tools to be applied in the translation of a narrative text. These tools would then also constitute what could be loosely termed a model, in the sense that it would provide a set of guidelines that could find general application in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts.

## **1.2 Statement of the problem**

In summary, and synthesising the issues discussed in the previous section, it would seem that an interdisciplinary approach to the translation of narrative texts could contribute substantially to the field; not only in providing a wider scope in terms of equivalence between source and target texts, but also (in the case of focalisation theory) in providing both analytic and synthetic tools that would allow a translation to deal with textual stances and the gaps and traces that exist in and between texts.

In the words of Paul Jay (1997:408), our assumption that translation “refers to the accurate transcription of words from one language into another” causes us to forget “that it carries with it a strong sense of changing, transforming, or altering one thing into another (and that it is also intimately connected with the act of interpretation)”. The role of focalisation in the translation of narrative texts would therefore seem to offer a provocative and intriguing aspect of literary translation, also in the analysis of the narrative structure of the source text. The study of focalisation could further provide useful insights into the text as a whole with a view to facilitating the translation process. In this the integration of theories such as focalisation theory and translation theory is of the utmost importance.

Against this background, a number of questions can be formulated for this investigation. Firstly, what is the role of focalisation in the shifts that occur in the process of translation/rewriting and particularly between parallel texts such as *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*?

Another question that could be posed is whether an analysis of the markers of focalisation (as *impostulatory*<sup>2</sup> technique) can provide a point of departure for the translation/rewriting of a narrative text such as A.P. Brink's *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*. This question involves the interaction between translation and analysis in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts. More specifically, it concerns the importance of the analysis of microtextual markers of focalisation as a foundation for the translation/rewriting of narrative texts.

Finally, the question arises whether a model can be derived from such an analysis for general application in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts. This question concerns the validity and usefulness of a microtextual analysis in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts.

---

<sup>2</sup> I will use the noun *impostulation*, the adjective *impostulatory* and verb *to impostulate*, as well as the concept of the *narrative origo* in italics until the term has been defined more clearly. I hope to introduce the terms as a “simplification” of narratological concepts in section 3.2.

### 1.3 Aims

The aims of this study, derived from the questions outlined above, and posited on the general problem statement, are firstly to determine what role focalisation plays in the shifts that occur in the process of translation/rewriting and particularly between parallel texts such as *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*. In other words, the study will aim to determine the impact of focalisation on the macrotextual elements of narrative texts that are in a relationship of translation/rewriting.

Secondly, I aim to establish whether the analysis of the markers of focalisation could provide a point of departure for the translation/rewriting of a narrative text such as A.P. Brink's *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, and by extension for the translation of narrative texts in general. This aim, unlike the first aim, therefore mainly concerns the microtextual level of narrative texts.

The study will finally aim to determine whether a model can be derived from such an analysis for general application in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts. Such a model will of necessity be preliminary and will have to be tested against other translations.

### 1.4 Hypotheses

From the preceding argumentation, a number of hypotheses are proposed for this study. The first hypothesis is that focalisation not only has a significant influence on the shifts between texts that are in a relationship of translation/rewriting, but that focalisation theory can provide a number of tools that will facilitate the analysis of parallel texts as well as texts and their translations. Such an analysis should be useful in addressing the covert shifts in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts.

I further hypothesise that the tools provided by focalisation theory will provide a valuable point of departure for the translation/rewriting of narrative texts, as well as for the analysis of parallel texts such as *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*.

My final hypothesis is that it should be possible to work towards a model from this

process of analysis and translation/rewriting, which could find general application in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts.

## 1.5 Method

The process by which one text in the contract of translation is transformed into the other and in which these two texts influence each other, is subject to a number of variables. These variables have to be taken into account when devising a model for the translation of narrative texts that would ensure that as many nuances and interpretations as possible are taken into consideration. Focalisation provides a point of departure for such a model in that the *narrative origo* established through focalisation determines the narration.

In order to achieve the aims of this study, the first step will be an investigation of current theories on translation and focalisation. This will be followed by an analysis of the parallel texts (*Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*) before selected passages from the different impostulatory levels of the texts will be translated. These translations will then provide a basis for comparison in the analysis of the shifts that occur between the two parallel texts. This will finally result in the formulation of a model that could find more general application in the translation of narrative texts, incorporating those aspects of the above process that prove to be most viable and meaningful. In all of this the role of focalisation as *impostulatory* technique will be central. The following paragraphs expand on the particulars of this method by dealing with each step in detail.

In order to provide a theoretical basis for the study, recent developments in translation theory will be investigated in **Chapter 2**, with an emphasis on the contribution of deconstruction, and particularly Derrida and his notion of *différance*, to the discipline. The focus in this chapter will be on the relationship between the texts involved in a contract of translation, as well as on the role of gaps and traces resulting from *différance* in both texts in such a contract.

Subsequently, developments in narratology and focalisation theory will be investigated in **Chapter 3**. In this chapter the theory of focalisation as *impostulatory*

technique will be presented. The main purpose of this chapter will be to define the parameters of focalisation and the levels of *impostulation*, as well as to identify the orientational markers of focalisation (including markers of deixis, subjectivity and characterisation from and into the *narrative origo* that determine the interpretation of a narrative text). These markers will be described in an attempt to provide tools to address the issue of gaps and traces in the process of translation/rewriting. The notion of one *narrative origo* will further be defined as a central concept in the interpretive and presentational dimensions of *impostulation*.

**Chapter 4** will involve an analysis of Brink's parallel texts, *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*, on the basis of the theory expounded in Chapters 2 and 3. The chapter will commence with an analysis of the *impostulatory* structure of the novel. The rest of the analysis will proceed in terms of the levels of *impostulation* identified in this preliminary analysis. Each level of *impostulation* will first be analysed on a macrotextual level before key passages from one of the two parallel texts will be analysed on a microtextual level in terms of the markers identified in Chapter 3. The primary aim of this microtextual analysis will be to identify those markers of focalisation in which shifts in focalisation as well as gaps and traces surrounding focalisation can be said to exist.

At this point I would like to comment on a structural aspect related to this chapter, which I will explain in more detail in the introduction to Chapter 4. Due to the contention in this study that the microtextual analysis of aspects related to focalisation forms an important foundation for the macrotextual translation of narrative texts, *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele* is analysed intensively on both macrotextual and microtextual levels in this chapter, as explained above. Although this analysis is structured according to levels of *impostulation*, as will be identified in Chapter 3, there is a large degree of overlap between these levels, and they are selected mainly to provide some structure to the analysis of this particular novel. Therefore, these levels should not be regarded as fixed levels in the sense that structuralist levels (e.g. intradiegetic, extradiegetic, homodiegetic, etc.) are fixed categories. This is important primarily with a view to the extrapolation of principles of

analysis for application to narrative texts in general. The inevitable result of this methodology is that Chapter 4 is substantially longer than the other chapters. I have decided, however, not to subdivide the chapter, since I believe that such a division into separate analytical chapters will create the impression that the different levels are in some way fixed. This would further detract from the integrity of the model that will be presented in Chapter 5. I will, nonetheless, attempt to retain a rhythm in the text by means of the structure of Chapter 4.

The analysis in Chapter 4 will constitute a combined linguistic and literary approach in that I will, like Van der Voort (1991:67), move from the macrostructure to the microstructure. In other words, I will work with the text as a whole by determining the elements on the microstructural level that determine the macrostructure. The insights regarding focalisation gained from the microtextual analysis will then be used in the translation of the selected passages (provided in the addendum) from *Imaginations of sand* and *Sandkastele* alternately, without reference to the other parallel text.

Finally, a comparison will be made between the two parallel texts in order to identify shifts in focalisation between the two texts. To provide a further basis for comparison, the two texts will also be compared to my own translation of the selected passages. The results of this comparison will be evaluated to determine the causes for the differences and to establish whether the emphasis on focalisation as *impostulatory* technique could in fact facilitate the translation/rewriting of narrative texts.

The parallel status of *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele* will be explained in more detail in Chapter 4. At this stage it should suffice to say that the two texts were created in a symbiotic relationship, with the result that neither can be regarded as source for the other. For purposes of consistency, however, they will be referred to as *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele* throughout.

The two texts were selected for three reasons. Firstly, the narrative complexity arising from the use of a frame narrator, as well as from the complex relation between this frame and the embedded narrative, makes it possible to investigate various aspects related to focalisation. Secondly, both texts were produced by the same author who was not inhibited by the constraints usually facing translators (i.e. who had creative licence). Finally, the symbiotic relationship between the texts fits in with the move away from the conventional hierarchical perspective on translation.

It has to be stated at the outset that this study does not aim to discuss Brink's oeuvre as such and that these parallel texts are merely used as texts against which to test the theoretical component of the study. Even though the texts will be analysed in detail, the analysis will be done primarily to illustrate the theoretical notions discussed in Chapters 2 and 3.

In **Chapter 5** the findings arrived at in the previous chapters will be used to devise a possible model for the translation of narrative texts. The main aim of this is to establish a general provisional model that will in principle be useful in the translation/rewriting of a variety of narrative texts. The section will also provide conclusions on the relevance and role of focalisation as *impostulatory* technique in the translation of narrative texts.

## **1.6 Envisaged contribution of the study**

This study hopes to contribute to the field of translation studies by developing a possible model for the translation/rewriting of narrative texts in which the application of focalisation as *impostulatory* technique will play a central role. This model will provide a way to account for covert traces in narrative texts related to focalisation which surface in elements such as deixis, subjectivity and characterisation in a more comprehensive manner. In essence it would therefore provide a structured way to deal with the variables that play a role in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts. The study should also contribute to the debate on narrative theory with the introduction of the concept of *impostulation*. Although the study of A.P. Brink's



fiction is not a central aim of this study, the study could contribute indirectly to the field of contemporary South African fiction.

## 2. JACQUES DERRIDA AND TRANSLATION

### 2.1 Introduction

It is not the aim of this study to provide a comprehensive overview of translation theory across the ages, nor does it propose to sketch the contemporary scene in translation theory (a discipline which has become known as Translation Studies at most universities and other institutions involved in research on translation and the training of translators). Over the past decade a number of texts attempting such ambitious projects<sup>3</sup> have appeared, and the field is still proliferating.

The aim of this chapter is more specifically to devise a theoretical framework for the translation/rewriting of narrative texts in terms of the (often covert) elements of focalisation. This framework, together with the framework of *impostulation* that will be presented in Chapter 3, will form the basis for the analysis of A.P. Brink's parallel texts, *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele* in Chapter 4. Due to the undeniable impact that the work of Jacques Derrida has had on the discipline of translation studies, particularly in terms of the notion of *différance*, his views on translation will inform the theoretical framework in this chapter.

### 2.2 Deconstruction and translation theory

Deconstruction renders a number of "safe" and seemingly solid conceptions associated with translation theory less certain. In the words of Koskinen (1994:446), "by denying the existence of *Truth, Origin and Center*, deconstruction deprives us of the comfortable fallacy of living in a simple and understandable world. We lose security, but we gain endless possibilities, the unlimited play of meanings". What has to be determined, however, is whether deconstruction actually contributes to the practice of translation. Does its questioning of conventional notions (such as equivalence and faithfulness) not cause its insights to be so devastatingly relativist that the practising translator cannot afford to pay it more than a passing and slightly

---

<sup>3</sup> Just two of the most notable among these are Gentzler's *Contemporary translation theories* (1993), and Robinson's *What is translation? – Centrifugal theories, critical interventions* (1997). Venuti's *The translation studies reader* (2000) similarly provides an overview of the development of translation theory in the twentieth century, illustrated by a collection of key texts.

amused glance before returning to the serious task at hand? In the words of Pym (1999), philosophers (and by implication theorists like Derrida) “have no time for the rubbish that most of us have to improve when we translate”.

Furthermore, if deconstruction and Derrida's insights in particular are shown to be useful only in the translation of literary texts and texts that rely heavily on nuances, wordplay and other traces (such as advertising texts), can their application in “general” translation theory be justified at all? If this were the case, the present endeavour itself would be futile or at the very least irrelevant to the discipline of translation theory, which, in my opinion, should always attempt to work towards the general practice of translation. However, if we regard deconstruction and its practices not to be directives towards plurality but rather a powerful analytical tool, a way of reading and writing with a more astute awareness, we might be able to look also at other applications of its premises. After all, good translators are in the first instance good readers.

Deconstruction obviously affects conventional notions such as equivalence and faithfulness (see section 2.4.1 below), which are rendered powerless the moment we question notions such as “truth”, “origin” and “centre”. Put simply, deconstruction removes equivalence from the *skopos* (see Vermeer, 1989) or purpose of translation. From the perspective of deconstruction, the aim of translation is no longer reducible to creating a target text that is equivalent to the source text (regardless of which aspects are considered important in terms of equivalence). Rather, translation becomes more focused on the complex set of relations between the two texts, without awarding a primary status to either and without claiming the ability to gauge the exact meaning beneath the surface structure of the source text or to encode it in the surface structure of the target text. On the contrary, what becomes important also includes everything that is not evidenced in the surface structure of a text, which includes all aspects that are activated in the writing or rewriting of the text (therefore also in its reading and translation).

Deconstruction directly affects the way we look at traditional translation theory by challenging it to “expand its borders, encouraging it to consider its own limitations, psychology, unconscious restraints, and the implications of its rhetoric” (Gentzler,

1993:153). The century-old debates on binary oppositions (such as faithful/free, formal/dynamic, form/content, original/translation, equivalent/non-equivalent, source-text emphasis/target-text emphasis, etc.) are rendered futile by questioning the concept of logocentrism. Likewise, the deconstructionist view of translation as a **symbiotic relationship** between two texts that rely on each other for survival, questions the status of the "original" previously held to be sacrosanct. However, deconstruction does not necessarily deny the existence of the terms in these binary oppositions, but questions the discontinuity between them as well as the privileging of the first term in the opposition.

Consequently, the dynamics between texts will be investigated in this study without an attempt to render a verdict on the "correctness" of the translation. In other words, the study will move away from a hierarchical perspective on texts and rather address the impact of both microtextual and macrotextual shifts that occur in translation, and then particularly in the translation of narrative texts. The shifts that will be analysed in this study will include microtextual shifts related to **deixis**, **subjectivity** and **characterisation**.

Jacques Derrida's contribution to translation theory lies primarily in his reclaiming of the power of the word and everything it has the potential to signify: "At the beginning of translation is the word. Nothing is less innocent, pleonastic and natural. nothing is more historical than this proposition, even if it seems too obvious" (Derrida, 2001:180). The importance of the word is particularly evident in his notion of *différance*, which is central to deconstruction, and which will also be shown in this study to impact on the role of focalisation as *impostulatory* technique<sup>4</sup> in the translation of narrative texts. Therefore, before the implications of the questioning of hierarchical oppositions for translation theory can be investigated more fully, we have to take a closer look at the nuances contained in the term *différance*.

---

<sup>4</sup> Focalisation will be defined more fully in Chapter 3 as one of the primary techniques of impostulation on the basis of its relation to general orientational aspects, which makes impostulation from and through and into the *narrative origo* possible.

## 2.3 *Différance*

What is written as *différance*, then, will be the playing movement that “produces” – by means of something that is not simply an activity – these differences, these effects of difference. This does not mean that the *différance* that produces differences is somehow before them, in a simple and unmodified – in-different – present. *Différance* is the non-full, non-simple, structured and differentiating origin of differences. Thus the name “origin” no longer suits it. (Derrida, 1982:11.)

Derrida's perspectives on translation are closely related to his definition of *différance*. The process by which *différance* is approached becomes the process by which words and translation are approached; not in terms of what these words and processes signify, but in terms of what they activate or “produce” by means of “the playing movement” through both temporal and spatial dimensions. In this regard Gertzler (1993:146) calls attention to Derrida's suggestion that “deconstruction and translation are inexorably interconnected, intimating that in the process of translation, that elusive impossible presence he refers to as *différance*, may, to the highest degree possible, be visible”. He bases this on Derrida's statement that, “[i]n the limits to which it is possible or at least *appears* possible, translation practises the difference between signified and signifier” (Derrida, 1981:21). Therefore, the very activity of translation cannot be separated from this difference between signifier and signified.

In 1968 Derrida defined *différance* in an address before the Société Française de Philosophie, subsequently published in *Margins of philosophy* (1982). He began the address with the sentence, “I will speak, therefore, of a letter” (Derrida, 1982:3). This already signals that the significance of *différance* is situated in one letter that erases the trace of what would otherwise have been a “word” or a “concept” but which Derrida (1982:7) insists is neither.

*Différance* is based on the French verb *différer* (from the Latin verb *differre*). This verb has two distinct meanings in French which are represented by two separate words in English, namely *to differ* and *to defer*.<sup>5</sup> The first and more common sense of the verb brought to *différance*, namely *to differ*, is related to a **spatial horizon** or

---

<sup>5</sup> The fact that the dual meaning in French is therefore untranslatable in English emphasises exactly what *différance* attempts to capture, namely that which cannot be named.

**spacing**, which implies "to be not identical, to be other, discernible, etc." and also refers both to different things and differences of opinion (Derrida, 1982:8). The second sense of the verb, namely *to defer*, is in turn related to a **temporal horizon** or **temporisation** by which term Derrida (1982:8) summarises concepts such as "the action of putting off until later, of taking into account, of taking account of time and of the forces of an operation that implies an economical calculation, a detour, a delay, a relay, a reserve, a representation". It also implies "to temporize, to take recourse, consciously or unconsciously, in the temporal and temporizing mediation of a detour that suspends the accomplishment or fulfillment of 'desire' or 'will,' and equally effects this suspension in a mode that annuls or tempers its own effect" (Derrida, 1982:8).

Therefore, Gentzler's (1993:158-9) statement that *différance* refers "not to what is there (language), but what is not there, and thus calls into question any ontological approach that attempts to determine a notion of Being based on presence" sums up the significance of this not-word, not-concept for translation. Translation now becomes a transformation of potential instead of a passive transfer of meaning or ontological presence. *Différance* is not – it contains its own death in the trace of spatial difference (it can never "be" present), as well as its sur-vival in the trace of temporal deferral (it is always "becoming" present). This is evidenced in the tension between the written and the spoken in the "voice" of *différance*.

The absence of presence is emphasised by the fact that Derrida writes *différance* instead of *différence*, thereby making a deliberate yet inaudible mistake that "foregrounds" its graphic presentation and activates the unheard in the form of a sound which does not exist. It constitutes a silent error that disappears as it is spoken, leaving a trace that can never be present. As Derrida (1982:9) points out, "the ending *-ance* remains undecided *between* the active and the passive" and hence:

that which lets itself be designated *différance* is neither simply active nor simply passive, announcing or rather recalling something like the middle voice, saying an operation that is not an operation, an operation that cannot be conceived either as passion or as action of a subject or an object, or on the basis of the categories of agent or patient, neither on the basis of nor moving toward any of these *terms*.

This, according to Gertzler (1993:159), defers the traditional notion of reference in “delaying its being subsumed within the discourse in which it occurs – not allowing it to be passed over, subsumed, understood and thus silenced”. Reference becomes extremely important here in that the “middle voice”, as well as the notion of something that is absent, transcends the “here and now” but also the “there and then”, creating a space that is simultaneously impossible to ignore and impossible to account for.<sup>6</sup> Although the formalist concept of defamiliarisation or *Verfremdung* is still present in the term (involving as it does the abstract recreation and revoicing of silenced modes), the unnameable also creates a palimpsest that affects/effects presence through absence. *Différance* hints at presence without providing that which would make it possible to inscribe or infer presence.

Begam (1992:876) points out that *différance* moves “along two essentially opposed trajectories of meaning: on the one hand, it gestures towards presence or self-identity ... on the other hand, it gestures toward absence or difference ... This means that to think *différance* is to think what is simultaneously same and other, what is simultaneously itself and its opposite”. Or, in the words of Derrida (1982:9), “the sign represents the presence in its absence. It takes the place of the present ... The sign, in this sense, is deferred presence”. This aspect of *différance* is of particular importance to translation theory, since it touches on the essence of translation and the relation between “original” and “translation”. Since translation deals with a representation of this representation of the sign, presence remains deferred in the translating text or rewriting just as it is deferred in the “original”. After all, translation also deals with the traces left by the presence, but always in absence and never with a fixed meaning that can be transferred between languages (as traditional theories would have it).

According to Koskinen (1994:447), *différance* also means that “meanings are based on differences and on their relations to other signs, and that meanings are always delayed, they are never completely present. The meaning of the sign depends on what it is not, so the meanings are always already absent”. And as Derrida

---

<sup>6</sup> Much like *impostulation*, as will be explained in the next chapter.

(1982:11) says, *différance* is therefore “no longer simply a concept, but rather the possibility of conceptuality, of a conceptual process and system in general”.

Apart from the fact that the repetition of signs in translations therefore leaves traces in these signs, this calls into question any notion of metaphysical and fixed meaning that would privilege an “original” above a translation. This will be illustrated in the investigation of the role of focalisation and *impostulation* in the shifts between the two parallel texts, A.P. Brink’s *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*. The traces that are left in these two texts as translations/rewritings of each other, make it difficult and irrelevant to distinguish between “original” and translation. Even more than in other texts that are in a relationship of translation or rewriting, or that form part of a translation contract, Brink’s parallel texts are in a symbiotic relationship, created simply by virtue of the existence of this parallel status.

Derrida (1982:25-26) deconstructs *différance* as follows:

There is no essence of *différance*; it is that which not only could never be appropriated in the *as such* of its name or its appearing, but also that which threatens the authority of the *as such* in general, of the presence of the thing itself in its essence. That there is not a proper essence of *différance* at this point, implies that there is neither a Being nor truth of the play of writing such as it engages *différance*.

In these words the full impact of *différance* becomes evident. It remains indefinable because of a continual differing and deferring and at the same time it posits that there can be no such thing as Being precisely because of the play of the trace. In approaching translation or translation theory we therefore have to take cognisance of the unnameable. However, as will be shown in the following section, this very fact not only makes translation as rewriting possible, but also renders it essential as process if not as product.

## 2.4 Equivalence, status and untranslatability

### 2.4.1 Equivalence

The history of translation theory can in fact be imagined as a set of changing relationships between the relative autonomy of the translated text, or the translator’s actions, and two other concepts: **equivalence** and **function**. (Venuti, 2000:5; my emphases.)



Translation theory over the centuries has been concerned primarily with interlingual translation (in Jakobson's sense; 1959:114), in other words the translation of a text from one linguistic system into another. It is therefore no surprise that some notion of equivalence informs most translation theories up to the 1980s, and still does in many ways. Gentzler (1993:144) distinguishes between various forms of equivalence with different emphases, for example the notions of **linguistic structural/dynamic equivalence**<sup>7</sup> in the "science" of translation, **corresponding literary function** in early Translation Studies<sup>8</sup>, and **similar formal correlation governed by social acceptability in the target culture** in polysystem theory and the Translation Studies of the eighties<sup>9</sup>. Venuti (2000:5) similarly lists a number of terms that have been associated with equivalence, namely "'accuracy,' 'adequacy,' 'correctness,' 'correspondence,' 'fidelity,' or 'identity'; [equivalence] is a variable notion of how the translation is connected to the foreign text". In short, according to Pym (2000), debates over equivalence "concern beliefs that some aspect of a source-text unit can equal some aspect of a target-text unit". Indeed, Derrida himself states that "to make legitimate use of the word *translation* ... in the rigorous sense conferred on it over several centuries by a long and complex history in a given cultural situation ... the translation must be *quantitatively* equivalent to the original" (Derrida, 2001:180).

However, the history of the notion of equivalence has been rather turbulent, especially in the twentieth century. In a brief delineation of the history of the term, Pym (2000) points out that the use of equivalence in the 1970s to legitimate the field of Translation Studies in the academic world (by people such as Werner Koller), was soon replaced by other approaches in the 1980s that rendered the term practically useless. The "historico-descriptivism" of Toury in turn saw equivalence as "something automatically produced by all ostensible translations no matter what their linguistic or aesthetic quality" (Pym, 2000). Vermeer's "target-side functionalism" (his skopos theory) saw equivalence as "only one of many goals that a translator could

---

<sup>7</sup> See Nida's distinction between formal and dynamic equivalence in *Towards a science of translating* (1964).

<sup>8</sup> See Holmes's *The name and nature of Translation Studies* (1972) and Holmes *et al.*, *Literature and translation* (1978).

<sup>9</sup> See Bassnett's *Translation Studies* (1980).

set out to attain, since a translator could serve a range of communicative purposes” (Pym, 2000). Mainly on the basis of these developments in the field, people like Snell-Hornby (1986; 1988) started to reject the term, if not necessarily the basic notion of equivalence.

After describing the critiques of equivalence-based prescriptivism that prevailed in the 1980s, Pym (2000) comments that these critiques “mostly failed to understand the logic of the previous paradigm”. The remainder of Pym's argument is devoted to a reclaiming of equivalence by viewing the translator as an “equivalence producer” exploiting the gap between “translation as a social practice (equivalence as a necessary and functional illusion) and translation as actualization of prior correspondences” or linguistic equivalence. In support of his own position, namely that “equivalence defines translation”, he cites Ernst-August Gutt, Albrecht Neubert and Ubaldo Stecconi. All four these authors seem to hold a position that could loosely be interpreted as functionalist,<sup>10</sup> which renders them useful in the paradigm of prescriptive translation theory.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, Pym claims that these four voices affirm “the social existence of translation” (2000) without becoming prescriptive. Whether this return to equivalence “as a necessary and functional illusion” is all that different from Vermeer's skopos or Derrida's interpretative strategies in *différance*,<sup>12</sup> however, is debatable.

The above-mentioned theories and paradigms, including those of the functionalist group, claim to deal with translation primarily as interlingual translation, thereby

---

<sup>10</sup> Gutt applies relevance theory to translation (formulated in his *Translation and relevance: Cognition and context* (1991). Neubert already defined an invariant of comparison in 1986, and later returns to the concept when he defines equivalence as “a functional concept that can be attributed to a particular translational situation” (quoted in Pym, 2000). Stecconi similarly views equivalence as “the unique intertextual relation that only translations (...) are expected to show” (quoted in Pym, 2000). Pym (2000) also refers to his *Translation and text transfer* (1992), where he states that “equivalence defines translation” and a later text in which he identifies “non-relativist and non-linguistic ‘equivalence beliefs’ as part of the way translations are received as translations”.

<sup>11</sup> The functionalist position of these theorists is not exactly new, however. The group has much in common with House (1977) with her notion of functional equivalence, and Newmark (1977) with his communicative equivalence, which is also decidedly functionalist.

<sup>12</sup> Pym (1999) also takes issue with Derrida's ideas in an article in which he questions the usefulness of deconstruction as a general theory of translation. These ideas will be discussed in section 2.4.3.

legitimising their use of the term “equivalence”. However, we cannot afford to view translation in this restrictive manner, in spite of Pym’s (2000) call to do so by not being afraid to “distinguish translation from non-translation”. Even if translation is functionalist in purpose, the categories of intralingual translation and even intersemiotic translation are activated to some degree, precisely also in the interest of translation’s social existence. This is even more expressly true when we deal with texts that rely heavily on gaps, silences and traces such as political, philosophical, and advertising texts and obviously also literary texts. In the translation of narrative fiction, for example, the gaps and traces created through *impostulation* and *impostulatory* techniques, such as focalisation require us to look beyond equivalence and interlingual translation. We also have to focus on those interpretative elements of intralingual translation as well as the imaginative elements inherent in intersemiotic translation that exist in both source and target text or, perhaps more appropriately, in both texts that form the contract of translation as rewriting.

The development of equivalence as a term to describe the relation between source and target text makes perfect sense if we regard translation as some form of transfer between two languages. However, Derrida’s contribution to the field calls the very notion of transfer into question. The deconstructionist view that signifier and signified are linked, with the result that you cannot change the one without affecting the other, has a significant impact on translation (Koskinen, 1994:448). No longer can translation be viewed as the transfer of a stable signified between two languages. Derrida’s preference for the term “regulated transformation” over that of “translation” (Gentzler, 1993:168) is significant here, in that it draws attention to the fact that equivalence as the transfer of “pure signifieds” between two languages is impossible. Or, in Derrida’s words, we have to substitute for the notion of translation “a notion of *transformation* of one language by another, of one text by another” (Derrida, 1981:21; see Derrida, 1982:14) – not a transfer of one language into another or one text into another.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Although this transformation is particularly evident in parallel texts like Brink’s *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, which stand in a symbiotic relation to each other, it holds true for all translation simply on the basis of the fact that both texts share an active relationship of rewriting.

In a critique of deconstruction as a useful theory of translation, Pym (1999) calls attention to this deconstructionist suspicion of translation as the transfer of social meaning. From Pym's functionalist perspective, however, meaning transfer is "an assumption – certainly a social illusion – operative in the use of translations as translations". He continues to state that "users have to believe in meaning transfer, but most translators are quite likely to accept deconstructionist arguments about the instability of their sources" (Pym, 1999). From this and other comments it is clear that Pym regards the users of translation to be distinct from translators, in that translators have to be aware of the plurality of meanings contained in the source text (what he calls "professionally retained internal knowledge"), whereas readers have to believe in "socially operative external illusions". In fact, he calls this the "deconstructionist insult" which results from the confusion of the above distinction, and proceeds to argue that this renders deconstruction unable to contribute meaningfully to the practice of translation and to the creation of "efficient, formal or final purposes" (Pym, 1999).

This discontinuity between two exclusive categories (reader and translator) remains problematic. What Pym fails to acknowledge adequately is that the reader is not merely a passive receiver of a translation, but inevitably becomes an active participant in translation as rewriting.<sup>14</sup>

I would contend that Derrida's project is not aimed at removing purpose from translation. Instead, he merely suggests that the play of the trace in the source text remains a play of the trace in the target text (if not the same trace), and therefore cannot be fixed in a stable signifier. After all, it is impossible to limit or predict the interpretation of a translation by different readers. Furthermore, deconstruction is not only concerned with the analysis of the source text and original meaning, as Pym proclaims, but is also a useful tool for the interpretation of the target text or translation.

---

<sup>14</sup> Although Pym does not deny reader participation, his claim that the reader or user has to believe in the illusion of meaning transfer, oversimplifies the role of the reader to a large extent.

The central problem here is that Pym's argument does not sufficiently take into account that Derrida and proponents of deconstruction are not necessarily prescriptive. Rather, according to Venuti (1992:7), "poststructuralist textuality redefines the notion of equivalence in translation by assuming from the outset that the differential plurality in every text precludes a simple correspondence of meaning". Plurality as contained in Derrida's *différance* is not a directive, nor is it relativistic *per se*. Deconstruction merely requires the translator to be aware of the possibility of plurality and to take into account that the reader also participates in and contributes to this plurality. This makes deconstruction particularly useful in dealing with gaps and traces that exist in both texts in the translation contract, such as those created through *impostulation* (as well as focalisation as *impostulatory* technique) in narrative texts.

Koskinen (1994:451) calls attention to the fact that, because the reader participates in the writing of the text, and is limited by, among other things, historical and personal contexts, "every reading is by force a misreading". Similarly, all translations are mistranslations: "The demands for faithfulness cannot be fulfilled. There is no use calling for fidelity, because the text is not faithful to itself."<sup>15</sup> Most importantly, "similarity and difference are not independent qualities but only become meaningful in comparisons" (Koskinen, 1994:451).

Derrida's notion of *différance* and his pre-occupation with the word have an even more profound impact on translation when we consider translation relevance. In an elaborate argument on the relevance of translation, *What is a "relevant" translation?* (2001), Derrida describes recent "so-called literal translation" as:

a kind of translating that is not *word-to-word*, certainly, or *word-for-word*, but nonetheless stays as close as possible to the equivalence of "one word *by* one word" and thereby respects verbal quantity as a quantity of words, each of which is an irreducible body, the indivisible unity of an acoustic form that incorporates or signifies the indivisible unity of a meaning or concept. (Derrida, 2001:181.)

Against this background he continues to emphasise the precarious position of the very notion of translation:

---

<sup>15</sup> This aspect will be illustrated in the parallel reading of Brink's *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*.

This is why, whenever several words occur in one or the same acoustic or graphic form, whenever a *homophonic* or *homonymic effect* occurs, translation in the strict, traditional, and dominant sense of the term<sup>16</sup> encounters an insurmountable limit – and the beginning of its end, the figure of its ruin ... A homonym or homophone is never translatable word-to-word. It is necessary either to resign oneself to losing the effect, the economy, the strategy (and this loss can be enormous) or to add a gloss ... Wherever the unity of the word is threatened or put into question, it is not only the operation of translation that finds itself compromised; it is also the concept, the definition, and the very axiomatics, the idea of translation that must be reconsidered. (Derrida, 2001:181.)

This rather extensive quote raises a number of issues that are central to an understanding of Derrida's concern with the word. The above passage emphasises that so-called literal translation deals with words that are significant as words on the basis of their bodies and acoustic form and that each word in turn incorporates and signifies the "indivisible unity of a meaning or concept". In Derrida's view, relevant translation as the transfer of an intact signifier is impossible. According to Venuti (2001:171), "the fact is that any translating replaces the signifiers constituting the foreign text with another signifying chain, trying to fix a signified that can be no more than an interpretation according to the intelligibilities and interests of the receiving language and culture". Words are therefore not merely incidental signifiers but bring with them a plethora of connotations and voices that are at the same time impossible to translate and essential to translate: "At every moment, translation is as necessary as it is impossible." (Derrida, 2001:183.)

Derrida's conception of relevance is directly linked to his notion of translation as economy between property and quantity, as will be shown in section 2.4.3. What therefore renders equivalence suspect in a Derridean approach is not the fact of a relation obtaining between an "original" or source text unit and a translation or target text unit, but rather the status of "original" versus translation.

#### 2.4.2 "Original" and translation: towards a contract

Translation augments and modifies the original, which, insofar as it is living on, **never ceases to be transformed and to grow**. It modifies the original even as it also modifies the translating language. This process – transforming the original as well as

---

<sup>16</sup> In other words, as "*transaction* and as *transfer*" (Derrida, 2001:176).

the translation – is the **translation contract** between the **original** and the **translating text**. (Derrida, 1985b:122; my emphases.)

Translation deals with an “original” and a translation insofar as a cont(r)act (i.e. a contract forged by the contact and subsequent continual rewriting) exists between two texts.<sup>17</sup> However, the contract resulting from the contact between the two texts should not be viewed as a dichotomy between two binary opposites, but rather as a continuation, a relationship of mutual transformation, a symbiosis. In describing this cont(r)act, it is nevertheless important to define the relationship that obtains. Translation is more than the mere transformation of an “original”. In Derrida’s view, the process of translation transforms both “original” and translation and thereby ensures the survival of the “original”. However, on the basis of this contract, the boundaries between “original” and translation are obscured as the survival of the “original” becomes intertwined with the survival of the translation. Through the translating text, the translation becomes an “original” itself, in the process also ensuring the survival of language. The palimpsest of the “original” in the body of the translation becomes a play of movement that also engenders a palimpsest in the “original”, ensuring a contract through contact in which a symbiosis is established.

Consequently, the violent oppositions or dichotomies that exist in translation theory and require deconstruction, such as word-for-word versus free translation, theory versus practice and “original” versus translated text are all overturned. Furthermore, what Koskinen (1994:446) identifies as the most paralyzing dichotomy, namely the hierarchical opposition that privileges the “original” and its author above the translation and translator, is rendered powerless and obsolete by this contract.

The deconstruction of this dichotomy could be related to Derrida’s criticism of phonocentrism, which privileges speech over writing since it operates on a view of immediate presence: “unlike writing, which is hopelessly mediated, speech is linked to the apparent moment and place of presence and for this reason has had priority over writing” (Sarup, 1993:36). Derrida also relates phonocentrism to logocentrism (i.e. based on metaphysical notions of essence, truth, meaning, etc.), which is the

---

<sup>17</sup> This contract is related to Jakobson’s (1959:114) distinction between intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic translation, although a certain continuity obtains between the categories.

principle behind all binary oppositions, also those related to translation. When these notions are considered it becomes clear that the view that an "original" has priority over a translation is also premised on metaphysical notions of original meaning and of truth. These notions inform Nida's (1964) idea of the deep structure or kernel, Neubert's (1986) invariant of comparison and Toury's ideal "*tertium comparationis*" (Gentzler, 1993:131), to name but a few.

When we question this hierarchy, the notion of an "original" being inherently untouchable (in that its sanctity will be affected by any rewriting, which will simply violate this sacred text in one way or another), is no longer sustainable. Because any reading of a text changes it and each change triggers subsequent changes, just as any initial choice in a translation influences and determines the rest of the translation (see Holmes, 1973-1974 and Neubert, 1986). Furthermore, the endless chain of signification (as signified becomes signifier *ad infinitum*), renders any attempt at closure futile and "meaning-less". Just as there is no transcendental signified for the deconstructionist, there are also "no extralinguistic meanings" (Koskinen, 1994:447). This obviously complicates the process of translation as well as the analysis and description of translations infinitely.

However, the influence of deconstruction on translation does not necessarily have to be regarded as an assault on the integrity of the "original". In the words of Van den Broeck (1988:267), "deconstruction is not an act of destruction, but an act of displacement". The *différance* that is translation, or that we approach in translation, creates the possibility to approach the hidden, unnamed or unnameable properties in a text without attempting to silence them. This possibility is created through a process of instilling through the translating text a number of gaps or traces that become hidden, unnamed or unnameable without necessarily corresponding with what was hidden, unnamed or unnameable in the "original", but which are informed by the "original" and in turn inform the "original". Just as it is impossible to translate all aspects of any given signifier between the two language systems involved in the translation contract, it is impossible to translate all aspects of the gaps and traces, and new gaps and traces originate in this process just as new chains of signification originate.



But what does this actually mean for translation practice? Does *différance* render equivalence obsolete in translation? We could perhaps argue that the impossibility of translation – which suggests the impossibility of equivalence – also depends on the possibility of translation and therefore of equivalence for its very existence. Since any theory informed by a notion of equivalence, irrespective of the emphasis, has to distinguish fairly rigidly “between original texts and their translations, distinctions which determine subsequent claims about the nature of translation” (Gentzler, 1993:144)<sup>18</sup>, equivalence as a transfer between “original” and translation has to be questioned. In this lies the problem of equivalence. In a deconstructionist perspective on translation, equivalence can no longer be regarded as a norm for translation practice, but rather becomes a disappearing trace. Nevertheless, it remains a trace and to the extent that its potential remains, it remains relevant for translation.

If Derrida’s contribution to translation theory is to have any significance for translation practice, the impact of the trace has to be determined – of the spatial and temporal dimensions contained in *différance*. The key to an application of Derrida’s theory has to be sought in the process rather than in the product of translation, and this process has to move beyond a hierarchical opposition of “original” and translation.

Deconstruction radically changes this hierarchy by posing a number of questions that subvert conventional theories. Questioning the primacy of the “original” on the one hand, and more specifically the separate existence of “original” and translation on the other, changes the face of translation entirely, since the “original” and its translation are now regarded to be in a symbiotic relationship. In this regard, Gentzler (1993:146-7) calls attention to Derrida’s view that

what does exist, are different chains of signification – including the “original” and its translations in a symbiotic relationship – mutually supplementing each other, defining

---

<sup>18</sup> Here it is important to note that to Derrida, as to Benjamin, the translation does proceed from the original, but not from its life as much as from its survival. Also, translation is not a fragment of the original, but like the original a fragment of a larger language (Gentzler, 1993:164-5).

and redefining a phantasm<sup>19</sup> of sameness, which has never existed nor will exist as something fixed, graspable, known, or understood. This phantasm, produced by a desire for some essence or unity, represses the possibility that whatever may be there is always in motion, in flux, "at play", escaping in the very process of trying to define it, talk about it, or make it present.<sup>20</sup>

Ironically, although Pym (1999) questions the usefulness of deconstruction for translation practice, Derrida's "phantasm of sameness" is not that far removed from Pym's (2000) identification of the gap between equivalence as "necessary and functional illusion" and linguistic equivalence. However, Pym regards this illusion as something that the translator has to negotiate and produce for the translation user, whereas Derrida could be seen to regard the phantasm as a product of the desire for unity which merely **represses** the elusive nature of the trace. Therefore, Pym's more functionalist approach can benefit substantially from a recognition and awareness of the operation of *différance*. The advantage of a deconstructionist approach to the translation of narrative fiction can be found in this awareness, which also provides a means to approach the elusive nature of narrative *impostulation*.

In terms of the role of the "original", Bannet (1993:586) expresses the opinion that the translation must pay its debt to the "original", not only by taking its directives from the "original", but also by being a moment in the growth of the "original". Bannet then states that "this does not mean that original and translation resemble each other or that the translation may not depart from the original, for the translation has only to **touch on the original at a few fugitive and 'infinitely small points of sense'** ... the translation adds to the original by freeing itself from the original and taking its own course" (Bannet, 1993:586; my emphases). This refers to Benjamin's notion that a translation touches the original at an infinitely small point of meaning (Benjamin, 1992:81). However, Derrida (1985a:189) reacts to Benjamin's statement with the questions: "What can an infinitely small point of meaning be? What is the measure to evaluate it?" According to Derrida (1985a:188):

If the translator neither restitutes nor copies an original, it is because the original lives on and transforms itself. The translation will truly be a moment in the growth of the

---

<sup>19</sup> See Derrida (1985a). Derrida's notion of *phantasm* is discussed in more detail in section 2.6.

<sup>20</sup> Brink's position as both author and rewriter/translator is important here. He avoids the concept of an original that was translated, stating: "Inderdaad is daar geen enkele 'bronteks' vir Sandkastele/Imaginings nie, aangesien elk op verskillende momente in die proses daardie rol vervul het." (Brink, 2000.)

original, which will complete itself *in* enlarging itself ... And if the original calls for a complement, it is because at the origin it was not there without fault, full, complete, total, identical to itself.<sup>21</sup>

A logical result of the shift from metaphysical and fixed meaning to gaps and traces that cannot be named and therefore silenced or contained, is that the text is "created anew in every reading and no ownership can be declared" (Koskinen, 1994:448). This dethrones the author and renders the hierarchical opposition between source and target text, or "original" and translation, obsolete.

If we accept this view of texts, the Renaissance metaphor of translation as footprint of the "original" (Koskinen, 1994:449) can also be revised substantially. Indeed, Derrida also refers to traces or tracks, but in a vastly different and extended sense. Any text now becomes a footprint that contains in it traces of the past and future, but that can never be pinned to an "essence" or "fixed meaning". "It is because of *différance*," Derrida (1982:13) maintains,

that the movement of signification is possible only if each so-called "present" element, each element appearing on the scene of presence, is related to something other than itself, thereby keeping within itself the **mark of its past element**, and already letting itself be vitiated by the **mark of its relation to the future element**, this trace being related no less to what is called the future than to what is called the past, and constituting what is called the present by means of this very **relation to what it is not**: what it absolutely is not, not even a past or a future as a modified present (my emphases).

Furthermore, Derrida (1982:21) cautions that "the concept of the trace is incompatible with the concept of retention of the becoming-past of what has been present. One cannot think the trace – and therefore, *différance* – on the basis of the present, or the presence of the present". The very act of translation therefore (re)activates the play of the trace and by definition creates further plays in relation to the past-become-future through the present, but never in the present, of translation. Therein lies untranslatability in translatability – untranslatability because there is no fixed meaning to begin with and because it is also impossible to transform the *différance* from one system into another in fixed form. Yet this also contains

---

<sup>21</sup> According to Venuti (1992:7), this means that "the original is itself a translation, an incomplete process of translating a signifying chain into a univocal signified, and this process is both displayed and further complicated when it is translated by another signifying chain in a different language".

translatability and the life of translation as process of trace and *différance*. The very untranslatability provides the tension which makes translation necessary as curative process (see Bannet, 1993) – always approaching the potential of the unattainable.

This changes the hierarchical difference between “original” and translation in that, although the translation issues forth from the “original”, it does so because the “original” is indebted to the translation for its survival. The translation is therefore not a footprint left by the “original”, but a different set of footprints with a similar relation to past, present and future – in other words different from and at the same time similar to the “original” in that it has the same impulse. According to Venuti (1992:7), the poststructuralist concept of textuality compromises the originality of the foreign text in such a way that “neither the foreign text nor the translation is an original semantic unity; both are derivative and heterogeneous”. In neither text can the “meaning” be final, for each reading is part of the process of creation that postpones or defers meaning in its creation of another set of gaps and traces.

In the words of Koskinen (1994:450),

translation includes the idea of repetition, but just as signs when repeated are never similar [and therefore change or are modified with every reading], translations can never be identical replicas. *Différance* takes part in every repetition. Translation is not the *same* text as the source text, but it is not a *different* text either. It deconstructs the opposition between difference and sameness.

Inevitably, this deconstruction raises questions about translatability. If signs do not even remain the same in repetition and in intralingual transformations, how can translation begin to claim to be able to name? How can the very notion of *différance* not result in untranslatability?

### 2.4.3 Translation and the unnameable, untranslatable

A text lives only if it lives on, and it lives *on* only if it is *at once* translatable *and* untranslatable ... Totally translatable, it disappears as a text, as writing, as a body of language. Totally untranslatable, even within what is believed to be one language, it dies immediately. (Derrida, 1979:102.)

As a matter of fact, I don't believe that anything can ever be untranslatable – or, moreover, translatable. (Derrida, 2001:178.)

When Derrida states that nothing is untranslatable and also that nothing is translatable, he refers to a concept of translation based on “the condition of a certain *economy* that relates the translatable to the untranslatable, not as the same to the other, but as same to same or other to other” (Derrida, 2001:178). This economy further signifies both property (in the sense of what is proper or appropriate) and quantity (in other words calculable quantity). A relevant translation, according to Derrida (2001:179), is therefore “a translation whose economy, in these two senses, is the best possible, the most appropriating and the most appropriate possible”.

He explains this further as an “economy of in-betweenness” in which “any given translation, whether the best or the worst, actually stands between the two, between absolute relevance, the most appropriate, adequate, univocal transparency, and the most aberrant and opaque irrelevance” (Derrida, 2001:179). What Derrida’s “economy” therefore seems to signify, is that anything is translatable if the translator is not limited in terms of quantity<sup>22</sup>, but that the law of “quantity” renders it impossible to translate fully in terms of the law of “property”. In translation an economy is therefore essential and will always be situated somewhere between absolute relevance and absolute irrelevance.

If we leave Derrida at this point of the argument, it would seem that he does indeed pronounce translation, in the conventional use of the term, to be impossible. Yet, this does not mean that his ideas are only meaningful in the ambit of (philosophical) interpretation and useless for translation practice and application, as Pym (1999) argues in his *Doubts about deconstruction as a general theory of translation*. Untranslatability in Derrida’s use of the term does not imply that translators should not translate. It simply implies that it is impossible to produce the plurality of the source text in a translation while obeying the law of quantity.

---

<sup>22</sup> This aspect is illustrated in his article, *What is a “relevant” translation?* (2001), where he provides an elaborate and eloquent justification for his choice of the French verb “*relève*” to translate the English verb “seasons” in *The Merchant of Venice*.

---

According to Gentzler (1993:146), Derrida's thought (in contrast to traditional theories of translation) is informed by "the assumption that there is *no* kernel or deep structure, nothing that we may ever discern – let alone represent, translate, or found a theory on". Rather, the basis for his theory is non-identity, non-presence, unrepresentability. Therefore, "what remains *untranslatable* is at bottom the only thing to *translate*, the only thing *translatable*. What must be translated of that which is translatable can only be the untranslatable" (Derrida, 1992:257-8).

Gentzler (1993:147) calls attention to the fact that the "subject of translation theory has traditionally involved some concept of determinable meaning that can be transferred to another system of signification. Deconstruction questions [this] ...". Ultimately,

deconstruction resists systems of categorization which **separate "source" from "target" text or "language" from "meaning"**, denies the existence of **underlying forms independent of language**, and **questions theoretical assumptions which presume originary beings** ... In translation, what is visible is **language referring not to things, but to language itself**. Thus the chain of signification is one of infinite regress – the translated text becomes a translation of another earlier translation and translated words, although viewed by deconstructionists as "material" signifiers, represent nothing but other words representing nothing but still other words representing (Gentzler, 1993:147; my emphases).

Commenting on the consequence of the notion of untranslatability for translation, Bannet (1993:580-1) states:

After De Man, we might be tempted to stop here: the translator, per definition, fails. The translator can never do what the original text did. Any translation is always second in relation to the original ... But after Derrida, it becomes apparent that ... the failure of translation and the wandering, errance, and exile of language envelop two possibilities, one lethal, the other curative.

In Bannet's view, De Man develops the lethal possibility and Derrida the curative in their respective treatments of Benjamin's *Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers* (1972). De Man interprets Benjamin "lethally", as saying that the task and the duty of the translator are to give up and that translations do not relate to the life of the "original", but to its death. This results in a view that "translation is the resistance to translation; and the wandering, the erring of metaphors, the resistance to metaphor" (Bannet, 1993:582-4). In contrast, "Derrida explores the curative possibility enveloped in the wandering, errance, and exile of language and in the inevitable failure of translation". Therefore, according to Bannet, Derrida interprets Benjamin

as saying that “the duty of the translator is the duty of an inheritor, the debt that of a survivor, and the responsibility that of an agent of survival” who has to ensure the survival and living on of the “original”<sup>23</sup> (Bannet, 1993:585). Indeed, Derrida (1985a:179) states that “[t]here is life at the moment when ‘sur-vival’ (spirit, history, works) exceeds biological life and death”. This is precisely where the curative force of *différance* lies. Because *différance* implies that meaning is always postponed and can never be present, the potential lives on in the trace, also constituted in translation.

Thus, according to Bannet (1993:585), in Derrida’s translation of Benjamin, “the relation between original and translation is based not on resemblance, but on difference. The alliance ... between original and translation ... depends on the difference of two parties or two texts that can only be joined through their differences”. These differences complete them and in their completion they are both changed.

Concerning translation, Gentzler (1993:159) says that Derrida suggests one should not look at the original message or its codification, “but the multiple forms and interconnections through which it must pass in order to speak, to refer at all”, a process which entails what he terms “a play of traces” (Derrida, 1982:15). By extension, according to Gentzler (1993:160), “one could also project a translation theory aimed at protecting differences, reinvigorating language with lost etymological resonances, thereby opening up new avenues of thought”.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Referring to the title of Benjamin’s essay, Derrida (1985a:175) remarks that it “also says, from its first word, the task (*Aufgabe*), the mission to which one is destined (always by the other), the commitment, the duty, the debt, the responsibility. Already at stake is a law, an injunction for which the translator has to be responsible. He *must* also acquit himself, and of something that implies perhaps a fault, a fall, an error and perhaps a crime.”

<sup>24</sup> See Venuti’s (2000) notion of “foreignizing”, Lewis’s (1985) notion of abusive translation (derived from Derrida) , and Berman’s (1985) trial of the foreign. In each of these authors’ work the impact of the play of the trace on translation can be seen in some or other form

Untranslatability is therefore intimately connected to the cont(r)act between the translation and the “original”, a contract through the contact between two texts that are always **becoming** in a symbiotic relationship of rewriting. This relationship to a large extent depends on the creative power contained in the play of the trace.

## 2.5 Gaps and traces

A translation is never quite “faithful”, always somewhat “free”, it never establishes an identity, always a **lack** and a **supplement**, and it can never be a transparent representation, only an interpretive transformation that **exposes** multiple and divided meanings, equally multiple and divided. (Venuti, 1992:8; my emphases.)

Through the inevitable existence of gaps and traces in any text, translation exposes, uncovers, but also establishes lacks and supplements. Derrida's project, according to Gentzler (1993:160), “is one of trying to unveil ... a play of covered-up but subconsciously discernible traces without referring to some sort of deep underlying meaning”. In the parallel texts investigated in this study, this play will be shown in the shifts that occur between the two texts in terms of markers of focalisation.

It is important to note that Derrida does not deny the importance of the truth of Being. In fact, he regards the passage through the truth of Being as remaining an “incessant necessity” (Derrida, 1982:22). However, it remains a “passage through”, leading Derrida (1982:23) to define the trace further by stating: “Always differing and deferring, the trace is never as it is in the presentation of itself.<sup>25</sup> It erases itself in presenting itself, muffles itself in resonating, inscribing its pyramid in *différance*.” Gentzler (1993:160-1) comments on this by stating that

Derrida's “play of the trace” belongs not to a translation which carries identifiable meaning across boundaries, but to a movement along an absent road, one that has disseminated or evaporated, of a voice which tells but cannot be captured, an echo disappearing as it is heard. It is a bearing via “a notion of motion” which is more conveyed by the movement of Heidegger's prose and Derrida's rhetorical inventions rather than that which they are trying to literally express.

Translation therefore no longer fixes the same meaning, but creates new avenues for further difference. The focus of such a redefinition shifts away from “meaning”,

---

<sup>25</sup> In this as well as in the rest of Derrida's explication of trace, we have to bear in mind that “trace” is both verb and noun, and at the same time neither, just as it is neither active nor passive, yet both.



since Derrida maintains that the play has no meaning.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, focalisation as *impostulatory* technique could be seen as a play of perspectives that has no deeper meaning but unveils traces of potential. In this manner, focalisation can be viewed as a tool to achieve a crossing over – not grasping, but providing a moving vehicle.

Therefore, Derrida's "theory" of translation,

is not a theory in a traditional sense – it is not prescriptive nor does it propose a better model of transporting. Instead it suggests that one thinks less in terms of copying or reproducing and more in terms of how languages relate to each other. Marks, traces, affinities with other languages are present simultaneously with the presentation of whatever the text purports to be about (Gentzler, 1993:166-167).

## 2.6 Conclusion: translating outwards – deconstruction and the desire for meaning

Translation is writing; that is, it is not translation only in the sense of transcription. It is a productive writing called forth by the original text. (Derrida, 1985b:153.)

Derrida's contribution to translation theory goes beyond the obvious implications of *différance*. To a significant extent, Derrida could be said to reclaim the productive potential of translation that emerges from his emphasis on the play of the trace. Calling translation "a productive writing" imbues it with the power to activate hidden traces, ensuring the survival of the "original" at the same time as the translation issues from it.

However, Derrida contrasts the necessity for translation (contained in the "calling forth" of the translation by the "original") to the desire for an intact kernel. In this vein he says that "the desire or the *phantasm* of the intact kernel is irreducible – despite the fact that *there is no* intact kernel" (Derrida, 1985a:115). Because there is no intact kernel, this desire can never be satisfied, yet it remains and produces the tension that makes translation productive. The unattainable nature of translation as well as the opposing necessity for translation therefore produces a vortex that ensures the life of the "original" in its transformation by the translation – a process that necessarily proceeds outward.

---

<sup>26</sup> Elaborating on the evasive nature of the trace, Derrida (1982:24) calls it "not a presence but the simulacrum of a presence that dislocates itself, displaces itself, it properly has no site – erasure belongs to its structure".

---

With regard to the theory of translation, deconstruction forces us to break with conventional logocentric approaches to translation that are necessarily directed inward, towards the source text and some metaphysical notion of meaning. Instead it becomes imperative to direct our thinking and translation theory as well as practice outward, in the spirit of Cicero's notions of *explicare*, *reddere*, and *exprimere imitando*, which are identified by Robinson (1997:184-185) as providing a decidedly outward impetus. *Explicare*, for example, "is to explicate, of course, to expound, to interpret, but specifically in the conflicted sense of both 'ordering' and 'setting free', both 'making plain' and 'spreading out'" (Robinson, 1997:186). Even in taking us back to Cicero, and in deconstructing his terms, Robinson therefore confirms the necessary condition of opposition, difference and tension contained in translation. For, as Derrida (1992:258) suggests, it is specifically that which is untranslatable which calls for translation; and, "a translation never succeeds in the pure and absolute sense of the term. Rather, a translation succeeds in promising success, in promising reconciliation" (Derrida, 1985b:123).

Therefore, *différance* becomes not an obstacle or barrier to translation, but specifically that which, in making something untranslatable, creates the need for translation. For just as conflict is a condition for change, the fact that a text is at once translatable and untranslatable allows for its survival – because the terms are not binary oppositions but become conditions for the existence of each other. Nothing can be wholly untranslatable or wholly translatable. The translatability is premised on what is untranslatable and vice versa. It is in the gaps arising from this conflict that the traces that generate meaning emerge – perhaps not a closed meaning, but the possibility and promise of as well as a yearning for meaning.

This dynamic quality of Derrida's thoughts on translation makes it possible to project a theory of translation that invites translators and readers alike to engage in the play of the trace. Although such a theory is concerned with the word and the love for the word, it also leaves "the other body intact but not without causing the other to appear" (Derrida, 2001:175).

Just as Derrida's work suggests "that translation theory might be the best 'field of study' to begin to explore these unheard traces, these possibilities that are covered up as we speak" (Gentzler, 1993:168), a focus on focalisation in the translation of narrative fiction could provide a way to explore similar traces that are covered up as the narrator is made to speak. Derrida's views will therefore also play an important role in the subsequent chapter.

### 3. THE THEORY OF NARRATIVE: *IMPOSTULATION* AND FOCALISATION

#### 3.1 Introduction

It has been said often before: narratology ... is not in the best of states. Its wildly positivistic claims have been proved untenable, its categories have been challenged, and, most devastatingly, its goals have lost their relevance ... Can narratology, with its tendency to system-building, survive deconstruction, that systematic underminer of systems? Can the formalism inherent in narratology survive historicism, or feminism and other socially-oriented theories, which challenge its textual closure? (Bal, 1992:293.)

In contemporary approaches to narrative, the textual closure of structuralist narratology has indeed become untenable as neatly-defined systems crumble before the onslaught of various attacks, primarily that of deconstruction. This, however, does not negate the persistence of these systems and dichotomies that continue to provide the basis for many new developments. Contested they may be, but invariably the categories surface in new guises. After all, questioning the validity of formalist and structuralist categories does not negate them, but merely subverts them, deconstructs them.

In order to determine the role of focalisation in the shifts that occur in the process of translation/rewriting, as well as to establish whether the analysis of the gaps and traces contained in focalisation could provide a point of departure for the translation/rewriting of a narrative text such as A.P. Brink's *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, a redefinition of existing theories may be required. In such a redefinition, those aspects related to focalisation and to narrative that impact on (or complicates) translation/rewriting have to be accounted for. Therefore, I will attempt in this chapter to demarcate the narratological concepts that will be used in the subsequent chapter. This will be done in order to arrive at a model for the translation/rewriting of narrative texts based on an integration of the theory of translation presented in Chapter 2 and the theory of focalisation that will be presented in this chapter.

The challenges facing the study of narrative in the twenty-first century have a lot in common with the challenges facing the study of translation. Just as mainstream

translation theory continues to be plagued by questions of translatability versus untranslatability<sup>27</sup>, the theory of literature developing from the philosophies of Heidegger, Wittgenstein, Derrida and their adherents, as well as from Lacanian psychoanalysis, gives rise to what Rimmon-Kenan (1996:8) calls the dichotomy of the “possibility versus the impossibility of representation”.

This notion will be central in terms of the aims of this study. I propose to argue that *impostulation* (and particularly focalisation as *impostulatory* technique) in narrative constitutes just such an impossibility of representation, and hence impacts significantly on the translation of narrative fiction.

This is the case since *impostulation* is constantly involved in imaginary experience through focalisation at a (often unstable) mediating position on and between different postulated and projected spaces. These spaces, although appearing to be similar to the narrative levels of narratology, are cognitive spaces and not structural levels that appear in the text. Rimmon-Kenan (1996:133) sums up the phenomenon of narrative levels (derived from Genette) as one of

embedding, subordination, relations of containing/contained, or outside/inside, between the act of narration and the events narrated, as well as between various stories told in one text. The highest, or outermost, level is the one concerned with the narration of the events (or *diegesis*) and is therefore called *extradiegetic*. Immediately subordinate to the extradiegetic level is the *diegetic* level it narrates, that is, the events themselves. Events may include speech acts of narration, whether oral or written. Stories told by characters belonging to the diegetic level constitute a second-degree narrative, a *metadiegetic* level. Within this level additional stories may create a *meta-metadiegetic* level, and so on ad infinitum (at least in principle).

I propose to question the dichotomy inherent in this view of narrative levels by suggesting that *impostulation* implies not only that a continuity exists between narrative spaces, but also that essentially there is only one deictic centre, in the *narrative origo*, which is approached through *impostulation*. This *narrative origo* also

---

<sup>27</sup> In other words, the possibility or impossibility of the translation of an original – operating on the basis of a hierarchy that privileges the original above its translation (see Chapter 2).

---

serves as something like a screen onto which different spaces are projected, although they therefore remain contained in the single *narrative origo* as deictic centre.

My notion of *impostulation* largely corresponds with Fludernik's (1996) theory of natural narratology as well as Vimala Herman's (1999) application of mental space theory to narrative, which will be discussed in more detail below. Furthermore, it incorporates Derridean *différance* and the play of the trace, which were discussed extensively in Chapter 2. In order to arrive at the theoretical framework for this study, however, the development of narratological theories also has to be traced. The conventional perspectives on narrative levels will therefore be explored in order to determine their impact on focalisation within the paradigm of *impostulation*. This will also incorporate a discussion of the relations involved in conventional views that are based on the distinction between narrative levels. *Impostulation* will be shown to postulate similar relations cognitively.

Against this background it may therefore be useful to arrive at a conception of narrative in terms of mental spaces and deixis that may shed some light on the mechanics of narrative without succumbing to the temptation to create ever more complicated classifications of narrative situations and levels. According to Vimala Herman (1999:523):

Mental spaces can be projected, changed, and tracked as **dynamic and continuous activity** in discourse. Elements and partial structure from input spaces can be blended into new, original, and creatively constructed spaces. Blending processes are particularly valuable in helping us analyze the creative transformation in deictic scenarios that occur when **deictic centres are imaginatively projected and transposed** in discourse (my emphases).

Viewing narrative as the projection of mental spaces may be a step in the right direction, since it breaks with the paradigm of conventional narratology primarily in making narrative a cognitive activity and not a matter of representation. I will, however, also argue that there is essentially only one deictic centre in narrative, namely the *narrative origo*, which is not only the point from which the *impostulation* of events, characters, dialogue and cognition originates, but also through and into which these *impostulations* occur.

This view is largely supported by Wybenga (1985) when he contests the view that deictic centres can be projected and that these “projectible” deictic centres provide points from which references are made and through which references are implicitly oriented. He therefore argues in favour of a redefinition of the concept deictic centre:

Hierdie standpunte is in wese teenstrydig. Indien daar na 'n sentrum verwys kan word, of indien die sentrum geprojekteer kan word, kan dit nie meer die punt wees waaruit verwysings gemaak word nie. Daardie punt het dan verskuif ... **die deiktiese sentrum [is] nie 'n tekstuele element nie maar 'n kontekstuele element wat as a priori van enige diskoers anvaar word ... Alle sake wat in die teks ongenoem gelaat word, word deur die deiktiese sentrum georiënteer en daaruit verstaan.** (Wybenga, 1985:209, 211; my emphasis.)

The first important aspect touched upon in this passage, and that can be related to the concept of a *narrative origo* to replace the concept of deictic centre, is that the deictic centre (or *narrative origo*) is not a textual element but a contextual element that informs any discourse. This ties in neatly with my theory of *impostulation*, as will become clear in the rest of this chapter. The second important aspect, raised in the last sentence of the above quotation, emphasises that everything left unnamed or unmentioned in the text is oriented through and understood from the deictic centre. This is particularly significant in the context of this study, as it addresses the gaps and traces related to focalisation as orientational device, which produce the shifts and nuances in focalisation that are so difficult to discern and to translate.

Due to the very character of narrative, the gaps surrounding narration in *impostulation* gain great importance in the translation of narrative fiction. Therefore, any changes in this aspect that might appear in a translation have the potential to alter the impact of the text on the reader, precisely because meaning is forever changing. However, before addressing this aspect further, the concept of *impostulation* has to be defined briefly.

### 3.2 Towards a definition of *impostulation*

*Impostulation* can be defined in a preliminary manner as a term that describes that aspect of narrative through which events, experiences, thoughts, dialogue, and characters are both imposed and postulated in the text by author and reader (and then also by the translator as author and reader). The notion of *impostulation* further

presupposes that all narrative by definition “characterises” a persona as *origo*, although an identifiable narrator need not necessarily be *impostulated*. Even when an identifiable narrator is *impostulated* (as is the case with Kristien as first-person narrator in *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*), this narrator is never the *narrative origo*. The *narrative origo* is always *impostulated* as a stance actively imposed by the reader and author from the outside and is combined with a postulated narrative stance in the text. It is therefore neither active nor passive and at the same time both active and passive.

### 3.2.1 An etymology of *impostulation* (Tulloch, 1993)

The verb form, ***impostulate***, is not merely a combination of **im-** (in, on, into, towards, within) + **postulate**, but is also related to the verbs **to impose**, **and to posture** as well as the nouns **impost**, **impostor**, **posture** and **imposture**.

**Postulate** is both a verb and a noun. It is derived from the Latin *postulare postulat-* which means **to demand**. The transitive verb **to postulate** means:

- to assume as a necessary condition, especially as a basis for reasoning; take for granted;
- to claim.

The noun, **postulate**, means:

- a thing postulated;
- a fundamental prerequisite or condition (Tulloch, 1993:1187).

The sense brought to *impostulation* by “postulate” therefore provides a fundamental prerequisite for the activation of the narrative by both author and reader.

**To impose** is derived from the Latin *imponere imposit-* which is to **inflict** or **deceive**: **im** (in, on, into, towards, within) + **ponere posit-** (place). The following senses of the word are relevant to the definition of *impostulation*:

- require (a tax, duty, charge, or obligation) to be paid or undertaken (by a person etc.) [in other words *impostulation* obliges the reader to undertake the duty of postulating the *narrative origo*, as an active participant];
- demand the attention or commitment of [a person – the reader]; take advantage of [assigning to the reader the added tasks of attention and commitment];



- exert influence by an impressive character or appearance (impress, make an impression on, have or exert an influence on) [again stressing the active role in and influence of the reader on the narrative];
- practice deception (dissimulate, dissemble, feign, disguise, camouflage, cover up, conceal, misrepresent, fake, counterfeit, pretend, deceive) [in that both author and reader participate in a contract of agreed-upon deception, related to the conventional notion of the “willing suspension of disbelief”].

The noun **impostor** refers to a person who assumes a false character or pretends to be someone else [thereby stressing the fact that impostulation involves the taking on of different roles and that the reader and author pretend to be narrator, character, spectator, narratee].

### **Impost** is

- a tax, duty, or tribute;
- a weight carried by a horse in a handicap race; or
- the upper course of a pillar, carrying an arch (Tulloch, 1993:753).

This emphasises the important role of impostulation in carrying the “arch” of the narrative as well as the “handicap” of previous experience of narrative that influences both the author’s and the reader’s ability to narrativise<sup>28</sup>.

Furthermore, **imposture** is the act or an instance of fraudulent deception [and as such can again be related to the notion of “willing suspension of disbelief”] from late Latin *impostura* (Tulloch, 1993:754). It is made up of *im-* (in, on, into, towards, within) + *posture*. **Posture** is derived from the same stem as impose namely *ponere posit-* meaning place. It is both noun and verb. As a noun it means:

- the relative position of parts, especially of the body;
- a mental or spiritual attitude or condition (attitude, stance, position, feeling, sentiment, outlook, (point of) view, viewpoint, orientation, disposition, frame of mind, mood).

As an intransitive verb it means:

- to assume a mental or physical attitude, especially for effect.

---

<sup>28</sup> Narrativisation, according to Fludernik (1996:46), is an interpretive process. In other words, it “characterizes a process of interpretation by means of which texts come to be perceived as *narratives*” (Fludernik, 1996:313).

As a transitive verb it means:

- to pose (a person) (Tulloch, 1993:1187).

The meaning brought to *impostulation* by the basis **posture** as both noun and verb can therefore be related to the orientational aspect of the term in terms of the *narrative origo* – the reader has to take on various mental and spiritual attitudes and also postulate or mentally enact spatial and temporal dimensions in a posture that is the *narrative origo*.

I propose to retain a number of the above traces found in the term *impostulation* in its definition, although the term will not signify any one of the above exclusively. As primarily a conjunction of impose and postulate, with the emphasis on postulate, the Latin forms, *imponere imposit-* and *postulare postulat-* bring with them the connotations of inflicting, deceiving and demanding. *Impostulation* could therefore be seen to inflict a demand on the reader that is based on imaginary deception through which a *narrative origo* is created.

The *narrative origo* is defined as the deictic centre that is a vortex from which and through which and into which characters, events, mental activity, perspective and narrative voice are *impostulated* both interpretively and presentationally.

### 3.2.2 *Impostulation* defined

Taking the above into account, *impostulation* can now be defined as a **narrative strategy** through which a **condition or demand** is imposed on the reader to **participate** in the **imaginary projection** that is narrative. In this it is **intrusive** in the sense that it takes advantage of the **frame of real-life storytelling**, presuming on the reader's ability to **narrativise** while making an **impression** on the reader through the characterisation of a *narrative origo*, in a form of **deception** and **pretence**. *Impostulation* also carries the "arch" of the narrative through the **posturing** of a **mental or spiritual attitude**.

Furthermore, *impostulation* will be regarded not as a narrative technique through which access is gained to the story level, but rather as the **technique** by means of

which different **narrative attitudes, experiences, angles, memories, mental activities or cognition, perspectives, voices, emotions** as well as **characters and events** are **projected imaginatively in and onto the *narrative origo*** in an elaborate **dramatisation** and series of **impersonations**. **Focalisation** is then regarded as a **function of *impostulation*** beside narration. As *impostulatory technique*, focalisation is an **orientational** and **creative vortex** through which the *narrative origo* is *impostulated*.

The notion of **presence or the absence of presence** is central to *impostulation*, which deals very much with traces of the past and future and produces a play that is neither a present nor a modified present. The notion of a deictic centre is therefore also regarded not as a fixed point but as a **trace** that always approaches and never reaches – a **vortex** in Ezra Pound's sense of the word, "from which and through which and into which ideas are constantly rushing" (quoted in Zach, 1991:237).

The evasive nature of *différance* is contained in focalisation as traces of perspective and experience, as well as in *impostulation*, which "is not" and at the same time "is everything" in narrative – that without which narrative would be silent. It imposes, postulates, postulates an impostor, poses and so forth, but is never more than a trace either spatially or temporally. "The signified concept", says Derrida (1982:11), "is never present in and of itself, in a sufficient presence that would refer only to itself." Therefore, the narrator is never present in and of itself and exists only in the trace of *impostulation*. And, like any other concept, *impostulation* is "inscribed in a chain or in a system within which it refers to the other, to other concepts, by means of the systematic play of differences" (Derrida, 1982:11) through postulation, imposing, posing, and so forth, to (mis)appropriate Derrida even further.

It is important to note I do not equate focalisation with *impostulation*. Focalisation rather functions as an *impostulatory technique*, not unlike Fludernik's (1996) concept of **narrativisation**.

*Impostulation* therefore includes a number of aspects namely:

- **postulated attitudes, angles, emotions – also through posture;**

- **imposing** of these on characters;
- creation of **imaginary** perception.

Focalisation is an act of **imposture** and the narrative instance becomes an **impostor**. It therefore implies that the reader **impersonates** the narrator or any character in the narration or reflection of events with the inevitable use of **dramatisation** and **masks**, also in what Fludernik (1996:346) calls the illusionistic projection of characters' perceptions.

From the above definitions it becomes clear that *impostulation* can also be related to the idea of virtual reality, although this may cause some confusion. The metaphoric element from virtual reality that could be used most meaningfully is the idea that the reader becomes a part of the virtual world in an interactive manner. However, the perspective in virtual reality remains with the person donning the goggles and gloves and is therefore more fixed than in impostulation, which constitutes a very sophisticated form of virtual reality where the participants (reader and author) assume various positions and roles.

In terms of *impostulation*, Fludernik's (1996:341) statement that "the dramatis personae of narratology ... are anthropomorphized props attached to the frames employed in the process of narrativization" gains particular significance. It simultaneously emphasises the interpretive and the presentational dimensions of techniques of *impostulation*. In the interpretive dimension, the reader imbues a text with significance by means of imaginary perception and experientiality (also narrativisation), whereas in the presentational dimension, *impostulation* presents a dramatisation of a range of experiences – not least of which the reader's personal experiences – through postulation, impersonation and imposture. In this process, focalisation plays a significant role.

*Impostulation* therefore has two dimensions, which render focalisation a function of both reader and author as real-life *impostulators*. These dimensions of *impostulation* are:

- an **interpretive dimension** through which the reader/author imbues a text with significance by means of imaginary perception and experientiality (also narrativisation);

- a **presentational dimension** by means of which the narrative dramatises a range of experiences – not least of which personal experiences – through postulation, impersonation, imposture, and so forth.

Since a number of potentially confusing connotations have been accumulated by the term “focalisation” since its introduction by Genette, it has to be determined to what extent focalisation as *impostulatory technique* can be utilised as a critical tool in dealing with the complexities inherent in narrative texts.

### 3.2.3 Monika Fludernik’s natural narratology (1996)

Fludernik’s theory of natural narratology (1996:43), based on a view of narrative as experientiality, is extremely significant in terms of the aims of this study. The model operates on four levels, with the axiomatic natural parameters of real-life experience as the most basic experiential and cognitive level:

- Level I:** Parameters of real-life experience.
- Level II:** Four viewpoints available as explanatory schemas of access to the story:
  - **telling** (real-world “script”) – (which can be expanded to incorporate **reflecting**);
  - **viewing** (real-world schema of perception);
  - **experiencing** (access to one’s own narrativisable experience);
  - **action/acting** (“what” not “how” of narrative experience).
- Level III:** Well-known naturally recurring storytelling situations (genres/frames/conventions):
  - knowledge about storytelling situations and its structure;
  - understanding of performed narrative and ability to distinguish between different kinds or types of stories.
- Level IV:** Interpretive abilities by which people link unknown and unfamiliar material with familiar material to make it familiar or readable (narrativisation):
  - narrativisation is that process of naturalisation which enables readers to re-cognise as narrative those kinds of texts that appear to be non-narrative according to either the natural parameters of I and II or the cultural parameters of III (Fludernik, 1996:43-46).

Focalisation, if regarded as that aspect of narrative that creates the **parameters** within which the narrative is created, can be related to all four “viewpoints” under Fludernik’s Level II. As an impostulatory device, focalisation is therefore primarily concerned with the impostulation of “explanatory schemas of access to the story” (Fludernik, 1996:43-44). It must be noted that these “viewpoints” are not all connected to perception, but rather specify the sensory and cognitive parameters for the narrative. However, to view focalisation as an *impostulatory* device means that

Fludernik's other three levels also have an impact on these parameters although they relate more to the extratextual or metatextual aspects. These aspects are also directly linked to socio-historical and ideological variables and influences, which all impact on the contextual parameters of the narrative origo.

### 3.3 Focalisation

#### 3.3.1 Mimesis and personification

Like many terms that have their origin in structuralist narratology, focalisation has been defined and categorised to a point of near uselessness. And as the debates continue to appear from time to time, the term (like the term "equivalence" in translation theory) is variously discarded, resuscitated in new guises, and refined. However, since Gerard Genette first introduced the term in his *Narrative discourse* (1980:186) to address the confusion between "Who sees?" and "Who speaks?", it has become such a pervasive presence that it is hard to ignore in any study of narrative. Since I also regard focalisation to be a key impostulatory technique, albeit in a narrative paradigm that breaks with conventional notions of distinct narrative levels, I will attempt to re-approximate it for the purposes of this study.

One of the main points of discord in focalisation theory over the past decades has been the notion of mimesis and the personification of narrative instances, primarily that of the narrator. Whereas some theories personify narrative instances (evident in the theories of Genette, Bal and Rimmon-Kenan – the latter two even extending the personification to a point where an agent of focalisation or focaliser is constituted), others insist on the depersonification of the narrative instances (e.g. Chatman and Nelles).

Fludernik (1996:47) identifies the reason for the recurrent personalisations of the narrative function (i.e. personification), "which regularly result in the ontology of a 'narrator' [as the fact that it] can be traced to the schema of the **typical storytelling situation**" (my emphasis). She continues to state that "the persistence of this preconceived notion that *somebody* must be telling the story seems to derive from the frame conception of storytelling rather than from any necessary textual evidence" (Fludernik, 1996:47).

Fludernik's position is supported by Jahn (1996:258), who remarks that Elrud Ibsch anticipated a "cognitive turn" in narratology by stating that the strict depersonification of narrative instances "may be as naive and counterproductive as was the habit of investing them with a life of their own". Jahn (1996:258) continues to state that in spite of the fact that the narrator is obviously invented by the author, "pragmatic meaning construction remains very firmly predicated on the assumption of an addresser observing the maxims of cooperation in human communication". This indeed forms the basis of Fludernik's theory of natural narratology, which analyses literary narrative "against the foil of naturally occurring forms of storytelling" (Fludernik, 1996:14). The parameters of impostulation operate on the condition that the reader (primarily in the interpretive dimension) and the author (primarily in the presentational dimension) impostulate not only the situation of "naturally occurring forms of storytelling", but also the participants in this situation as well as the characters and events.

Similarly, Fludernik's conception of mimesis treats it less as imitation than as "the **artificial and illusionary projection** of a semiotic structure which the reader recuperates in terms of a fictional reality" (Fludernik, 1996:35; my emphases). This clearly reflects the impact and persistence of reception aesthetics in contemporary theory in that the emphasis moves away from the analytic description of textual strategies and techniques towards the active involvement and role of the reader. This shift goes beyond the mere postulation of a communicative situation as the basis of narrative fiction; it emphasises interpretive strategies employed by readers and obviously also has a significant influence on translation theory since the translator is firstly a reader. My notion of impostulation fits in with Fludernik's view of mimesis in that it deals with narrative as an imposed and postulated illusionary projection, which, like an impost, carries the arch of the narrative and the narrative origo.

In this view of mimesis, narrative levels have to be redefined rather radically since they are mere illusionary projections and should not be regarded as discontinuous categories. Fludernik (1996:341) points out that Genette's distinction between the

extradiegetic, intradiegetic and metadiegetic levels of narrative has been important in two areas of the analysis of narrative texts: it helps to describe the tale within the tale (or the embedded narrative) as well as the frame narrative. Fludernik's main problem with the distinction is that both Genette and Bal have used the concept of extradiegesis to discredit the existential continuity between the first-person narrator as agent on the extradiegetic level and as character on the diegetic level. She offers the opinion that, in accordance with Stanzel, a continuity does obtain.<sup>29</sup>

She therefore seems to imply that the resulting uneasy relationship between the narrator as personified agent and as character in both Genette and Bal's theories creates a problem in terms of mimetic consistency. For Fludernik (1996), narrative engenders a mimetic illusion (what she terms "narrativity"<sup>30</sup>). This seemingly simplistic emphasis obviates a number of problems that surface in many structuralist models of narratology, and approaches the fundamental premise of my approach to the concept of focalisation in this study, namely that focalisation is little more than an impostulatory narrative technique (interpretive as well as presentational). In this conception of impostulation, there is a definite illusionary narrative function based on real-life experientiality. One may therefore say that the imaginary projection of a narrative origo as well as characters and events are impostulated by the reader and should therefore not be confused with pre-existent personified modes.

The problems surrounding personification of the narrator as well as mimesis are also related to the dichotomy between discourse and story levels (or extradiegesis and diegesis). In order to address this dichotomy, the personification of the narrator in

---

<sup>29</sup> In this regard, Fludernik (1996:337-8) points out that "Genette's distinction between homodiegesis and heterodiegesis, ... crucially depends on the identity or non-identity of fictional and narrational agents. The same applies to Stanzel, except that he contrasts the *fictional worlds* of the teller and the character, respectively". Unlike Genette, therefore, Stanzel proposes "a contiguity, which allows for permeability between the past and the present, and therefore between the story-world and that of narration, whereas Genette's dichotomy reflects the logical irreconcilability between, on the one hand, the text as signifier and enunciation and, on the other hand, the story as signified".

<sup>30</sup> According to Fludernik (1996:26), narrativity is "a function of narrative texts and centres on experientiality of an anthropomorphic nature". In other words, narrativity is defined as "mediated human experientiality" (Fludernik, 1996:36), or "the establishment of the mimetic illusion" (Fludernik, 1996:372). Furthermore, it implies that no teller is necessary.



conventional theories in terms of the actions of telling (narrating) and seeing (focalisation) has to be investigated.

### 3.3.2 Telling versus seeing

In general, focalization theory addresses the options and ranges of orientational restrictions of narrative presentation. (Jahn, 1996:241.)<sup>31</sup>

Focalisation theory is indeed a matter of orientational restrictions, as appears from most definitions of the term, which describe focalisation as degrees of access to the minds of characters. It is therefore also a matter of relationships among various power relations in and around a text as well as between perspective and narration. The seemingly straightforward nature of the term<sup>32</sup> is belied by the various conflicting opinions on exactly what qualities the term should be endowed with and exactly where the term fits into the complex structure of relations in a narrative text, particularly in terms of the distinction between "telling" and "seeing" on different narrative levels. I would contend that the confusion is due mainly to the fact that the reader does not **gain access to the minds of characters**, but **impostulates various activities** including memory, experience, mental activity, perspective and events, all from and into and through the narrative origo as creative vortex. These impostulations are premised on the relationship between the presentational and interpretive dimensions of impostulation and also concerns the macrotextual creation or projection of a narrative origo. As such, the **microtextual presentational elements** evident in **markers** related to **characterisation, subjectivity** and **deixis** provide the "raw" material the reader has to engage with in various degrees in order to sustain the narrative origo **interpretively**.

---

<sup>31</sup> Jahn (1996) provides a meticulous deconstruction of Genette's theory of focalisation as well as an overview and critique of the contributions of Bal, Rimmon-Kenan, Chatman, Nelles and others in his article, *Windows of focalization: deconstructing and reconstructing a narratological concept*.

<sup>32</sup> According to Chatman (1986:198-9), "one might assume on first encountering the term that 'focalization' meant something like 'the narrator's identification with and self-limitation to the perceptions (etc.) of one or a limited group of characters' and that 'focalize through' meant 'to use a character as medium through which to transmit data about the fictional world to the narratee'".

### 3.3.2.1 Narrative levels: diegesis versus extradiegesis

The distinction between the levels of story (diegetic) and discourse (extradiegetic) in narrative fiction is as central to our understanding of Genette's definition of focalisation as it is to the various elaborations thereof.<sup>33</sup> Cohn (1990:777) goes as far as to call it the single most fundamental conceptual tool for the formalist-structuralist approach to narrative and states that "to question the distinction's validity is to question the validity of this approach itself". However, regarding focalisation as an impostulatory technique renders this distinction suspect.

According to Fludernik (1996:334), the story vs. discourse opposition seems to be based on a realist understanding of narration "in which the concept of 'live now, tell later' inevitably splits experiential and narrational processes". This discontinuity between the two narrative levels is questioned by Fludernik as well as Stanzel. Fludernik's criticism is primarily based on her idea that not plot, but experientiality is an essential component of narrative. Furthermore, impostulation implies that the distinction between diegesis and extradiegesis becomes problematic primarily because imaginative projection negates the discontinuity and collapses the levels into an imposed and postulated space or narrative origo that approximates a single deictic centre in narrative.<sup>34</sup>

I also agree with Fludernik that to assume a discontinuity between the two levels is a fundamental mistake that impacts on the conception of aspects such as focalisation at a basic level. To ignore the continuity that exists has serious implications also for the translation of narrative texts due to the resulting distortions of relationships in the text.

---

<sup>33</sup> According to Cohn (1990:777), Chatman's *story* corresponds with Russian Formalism's and Bal's *fabula*, Barthes's *functions + actions*, Genette's and Rimmon-Kenan's *story*, Prince's *narrated*, and Bal's *fabula*. Chatman's *discourse*, on the other hand, corresponds roughly with Russian Formalism's *sjuzet*, Barthes's *narration*, Genette's *narrative + narrating*, Prince's *narrating*, Rimmon-Kenan's *text + narration*, and Bal's *story + text*.

<sup>34</sup> In William Faulkner's *As I lay dying* (1990) as well as in A.P. Brink's *A chain of voices* (1982a), for example, the apparent plurality of centres as each chapter presents a different character's first-person narration, is belied by the fact that there is one predominant perspective, Darl and Galant respectively. Furthermore, all these perspectives are united in one narrative origo that contains elements of each perspective, yet is interpreted and presented as a centre throughout the novel.

Genette's types of narrative also have a direct bearing on the concept of focalisation. He distinguishes between heterodiegetic narratives (where the narrator is absent from the story she tells) and homodiegetic narratives (where the narrator is present as character in the story she tells) with the special variety of autodiegetic narratives in which the narrator is also the protagonist (Genette, 1980:244-245). In *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, Kristien would therefore be an intradiegetic-autodiegetic narrator in the frame narrative and an exradiegetic-heterodiegetic narrator of Ouma Kristina's narrative. The significance of this for the focalisation is that the predominant mode of focalisation in the frame narrative is that of internal focalisation, and that in the framed narrative, external focalisation. What emerges, however, is that there are a number of exceptions where we encounter free focalisation, a mode normally excluded from the level of homodiegetic narration.

The above problems identified in Brink's novels are by no means isolated incidents but tend to plague any sustained analysis of narrative texts. Impostulation may hold the key to addressing these problems in that all the carefully defined categories based on the distinction between diegetic and extradiegetic converge in the narrative origo. Impostulatory levels are therefore not distinguished in the same manner as narrative levels, but rather refer to the relation between the narrative origo and the narrative present (or, in the case of retrospective narrative, the narrative past; in other words the predominant narrative time) – therefore in terms of temporal aspects.

In terms of the traditional narratological categories of internal versus external focalisation, David Herman (1994a:234) expresses the opinion that "the study of hypothetically focalized narratives shows that ... we should situate what we call internal and external focalization amid an array of epistemic modalities, instead of viewing internal and external focalization as fixed parameters determining what we can and ought to say about narrative mood". This fits in with a move away from an approach based on binary oppositions towards an approach that is more concerned with the dynamic relationship between modalities as well as the role of the reader. Furthermore, impostulation implies that all focalisation is hypothetical to begin with, in being postulated and activated by both author and reader.

Like David Herman's (1994a) emphasis on hypothetical focalisations, Fludernik's focus on reflectoral narratives, cannot be described sufficiently by means of traditional theories based on the dichotomy between diegesis and extradiegesis. Commenting on the diachronic aspects of narrative, Fludernik (1996:48) states that :

from the all-knowing narrator who interferes less and less with the fictional personae it is a brief step towards a textual model that visualizes narrative as directly presenting characters' consciousness. Telling can be dispensed with, readers simply orient themselves to a position within the fictional world ... Figural or reflectoral narrative allows them, instead, to experience the fictional world from within, as if looking out at it from the protagonist's consciousness. Such a reading experience is structured in terms of the natural frame of EXPERIENCING, which includes the experiences of perception, sentiment and cognition. Real-life parameters are transcended.

This is possible precisely because the dichotomy between reader and narrator is lifted, allowing the reader to participate in the impostulation. However, this does not only apply to reflectoral narrative although it is most obvious there. Any narrative requires the reader to enter into the imaginative projection and to impersonate characters as well as to postulate and impose everything Fludernik sees as part of the experiencing frame. The above perspectives therefore also prepare the way for a reconceptualisation of the distinction between perception and narration.

### 3.3.2.2 "Who sees?" versus "Who speaks?" – terminological confusion

The dichotomy inherent in diegesis versus extradiegesis, not only in the structuralist paradigm but also in many subsequent developments in narrative theory, gives rise to a confusing array of concepts where only the narrator can tell the story on the discourse level and only the character (also the narrator as character) can see events on the story level. As Fludernik (1996:337) points out, this dichotomy underlies much of the terminology that deals with fictional agents (characters versus narrators, reflectors versus tellers), "story *world* cannot be conceived of without agents or fictional personae of one kind or another situated within a specific time and space".

In terms of Fludernik's model of natural narratology, focalisation is situated on Level II (viewpoints available as explanatory schemas of access to the story) where telling (together with reflecting) is only one of four schemas of access to the story; one of

four viewpoints next to viewing, experiencing and action/acting. Of course, even a fictional narrative that exploits or employs the real-world scenario of a narrational act does so only in order to create a frame for the presentation and interpretation of events, characters and states of mind. The frame therefore remains impostulatory, little more than a technique. Even in cases where this frame is not explicitly present in the narrative, the reader imposes it in a process of naturalisation/narrativisation<sup>35</sup>. I would therefore suggest that many of the apparent complexities of narrative form can be explained by means of impostulation as interpretive and presentational technique through which a narrative origo is impostulated.

The real-world model of experientiality presented in Fludernik's natural narratology is nothing more than a metaphorical construct for the interpretive and presentational dimensions of impostulation as applied by author and reader. The same applies to different viewpoints, voices, moods, and so forth. It is all an elaborate act in which various roles are impostulated in the narrative origo, and readers (as well as authors) participate in the imaginary spectacle of narrative by becoming part of the narrative origo. However, before exploring this aspect further, Genette's conceptualisation of focalisation has to be investigated in more detail.

Genette (1980:189) takes up the more abstract term of focalisation to avoid the too specifically visual connotations of the terms "vision", "field" and "point of view". He further identifies three main types of narrative (non-focalised narrative, or narrative with zero focalisation; narrative with internal focalisation – fixed, variable or multiple;

---

<sup>35</sup> Obtained from Jonathan Culler's *naturalisation*, "[n]arrativization is that process of naturalization which enables readers to re-cognize as narrative those kinds of texts that appear to be non-narrative according to either the natural parameters of I and II or the cultural parameters of III ... naturalization and narrativization are interpretive processes" (Fludernik, 1996:46). In other words, it "characterizes a process of interpretation by means of which texts come to be perceived as *narratives*" (Fludernik, 1996:313). Finally, Fludernik explains it as implying that readers, in the process of narrativisation, "engage in reading such texts as manifesting experientiality, and they therefore construct these texts in terms of their alignment with experiential cognitive parameters". Impostulation goes further than both narrativisation and naturalisation in that it also refers to all narrative texts and not only those who appear to be "non-narrative". All narrative texts have to be re-cognised.

and narrative with external focalisation).<sup>36</sup> Even in this classification it is important to note Nelles's view (1990:372) that "it is best to consider that focalization is always variable over the course of a narrative and that classification as one of Genette's three types is to be viewed as denoting that focalization which is predominant". This is echoed by Fludernik's (1996:334) concept of "macro-focalization", or the focalisation of an entire text.<sup>37</sup> Focalisation as impostulatory technique of necessity presumes a macro-impostulation that generates the narrative origo.

Therefore, regarding focalisation as an impostulatory technique changes its role somewhat. It is now related to the narrative origo, which remains in the impostulation and a function of impostulation. Focalisation is no longer concerned with visual perspective, but becomes an orientational and creative vortex through which the reader/author impostulates the narrative. Jahn (1996:261) states that the foregrounding of the role of imaginary perception may prove to be "the cornerstone for a revised, and revitalized, theory of focalization, one that accepts narrating and focalizing as mutually dependent activities and that accords the reader a place in its framework". This comment is particularly relevant here, even though it still regards narrating and focalising as separate activities. Impostulation does indeed foreground the role of imaginary perception, but makes no fundamental distinction between narrating and focalising, since both activities are postulated and imposed in the narrative origo in which the reader participates. Both are impostulatory techniques.

---

<sup>35</sup>

These are defined as follows by Genette (1980:189-90):

- A. **Nonfocalisation/zero-focalisation** ("vision from behind"): events are presented from a wholly unrestricted or omniscient point of view.
- B. **Internal focalisation** ("vision with"): presentation of events restricted to the point of view of one or more focal characters:
  - 1. **fixed**: focalisation restricted to a single focal character;
  - 2. **variable**: focalisation alternates between several focal characters;
  - 3. **multiple**: presentation of the same event(s) as seen through several focal characters.
- C. **External focalisation** ("vision from without"): presentation restricted to behaviourist report and outside views.

<sup>37</sup>

Hence, Fludernik (1996:334) states that "[t]he only really important issue is that of the consistent or inconsistent rendering of the entire story by means of a particular slant or filter – which, as Bal points out, is a function that needs to be situated on the discourse level – the same level as chronological arrangement".

To return to Genette's focalisation for a moment, Chatman (1986:192) points out that "by opting for a single term, Genette has ignored the conflict among the senses inherent in such terms as [vision, field and] 'point of view' and simply transferred it to 'focalization'". This is a valid point, in spite of Genette's later redefinitions in his *Nouveau discours du récit* (1983) in which he defends the term by first changing "Who sees?" to "Who perceives?" and later modifying it further to "Where is the focus of perception?" (Genette, 1983:64). Jahn (1996:260-1) argues that "the same principle that allows us to hear what the narrator says will also allow us to see (if only imaginatively) what the narrator describes and what the reflector perceives". I would argue that the reader does not so much "hear" and "see", but rather impostulates both the telling and the perceiving. Hence the reader has an even more active role. In impostulation, the reader can no longer be regarded as a mere recipient, spectator or narratee, but indeed actualises the narrative through active participation in impostulation. Therefore, narrative concerns the reader's experientiality as actualised through impostulation. The reader becomes the narrator, the actor, the experiencer – or at least imaginatively activates these roles.

Rimmon-Kenan's (1983:71) extension of the implied visual sense of focalisation to include cognitive, emotive and ideological orientation therefore becomes more apt since impostulation (and focalisation as impostulatory technique) implies the imaginary imposing and postulation of much more than just the visual. However, Chatman (1986:192) maintains that "Genette has always seemed to mean more by *focalisation* than the mere power of sight. He obviously refers to the whole spectrum of perception", or all the senses. The point of contention Chatman raises here is whether Genette actually intended it to refer also to mental activity such as cognition, and to functions other than the mental.

Indeed, Nelles (1990:366) remarks that it is clear from Genette's later writings that his concept is related to the sense of sight only metaphorically. Jahn's (1996:244) statement that "[c]learly, the concept of perception cannot possibly be stretched to subsume so much", would therefore seem to indicate that the choice of the term "focalisation" with its obvious visual connotations is problematic, rather than the fact that the **notion** seems to require the inclusion of cognitive, mental and ideological

elements. As soon as the emphasis changes to imaginary projection, the narrative origo created through impostulation provides a vortex that is not limited by the metaphorical notions of speaking and seeing, even though it deals with the impostulation of both.

According to Jahn (1996:245) "Who speaks?" initially seems unproblematic if used in a generic sense to cover both speaking and writing. However, this conflation obscures a narratologically relevant distinction. Jahn (1996:245) further questions the choice of the term on the basis of the fact that there are a number of "readily available alternatives, such as telling, relating, recounting, and narrating", and that Genette wants it to include some discourses that are neither oral nor written, such as interior monologue: "An interior monologue's basic activity, however, is thinking, and thinking – unlike narrating – is imperceptible and therefore nonpragmatic and noncommunicative (not to mention the fact that thinking is one of the defining activities not of narration but of focalization)" (Jahn, 1996:245). Again, impostulation removes the need to define speaking and thinking as distinct narrative elements, since mental activity like thought is also impostulated in both the interpretive and presentational dimensions of impostulation.

In terms of the aspect of voice, Fludernik (1996:334) states that it is "clearly separable from that of focalisation if one regards voice as the linguistically generated **illusion** of a voice factor which can be defined empirically by a complex set of interrelated textual and contextual features and is corroborated by a mimetic reading of the text that stimulates this projection of a speaker or reflector function" (my emphasis).<sup>38</sup> However, the illusion of a voice factor is impostulated in the narrative origo where it is no longer related to narration, but directly to an impostulated effect.

---

<sup>38</sup> The major problem that Fludernik (1996:334) has with the category of focalisation or point of view (also mood or mode), is its intermingling with the factor of voice: "On the one hand voice and focalisation are two entirely different issues – according to Bal and Genette – (*who sees* vs. *who speaks*). On the other hand, that neat distinction proves intuitively incorrect whenever one looks at the voice factor outside the narrator's language."

As impostulations, both focalisation and voice are indeed outside the narrator's language and become aspects of the narrative origo impostulated interpretively and presentationally.



According to Vimala Herman (1999:540), “[m]eaning in reading ... is not the product of language alone. The projected and creatively constructed, imaginative scenarios required by deictic usages also bespeak the mediating, cognitive work of the *mind*’. Ultimately impostulation as interpretive and presentational strategy is a relationship of mediation. This relationship will now be explored in more detail before the cognitive aspect of impostulation is addressed more fully.

### 3.3.3 Focalisation as relationship of mediation or mediacy

In the various discussions on focalisation there seems at least to be consensus on the fact that it involves some form of relationship.<sup>39</sup> In Genette’s conception of the term it falls under the category of modalities or the mood of the narrative and as such operates at the level of connection between the levels of story and narrative (Genette, 1980:31-2). Bal (1985:100) similarly views focalisation as a relationship, namely one “between the vision and that which is ‘seen’, perceived”. Later she adds to this by defining it as the relationship “between the ‘vision’, the agent that sees, and that which is seen” (Bal, 1985:104) – thus identifying two poles (namely the subject and object of focalisation) that must be looked at separately. She therefore identifies an additional agent, namely a focaliser, which is taken up by Rimmon-Kenan (1983), but has met with criticism from many others.<sup>40</sup>

According to Nelles (1990:372), Bal’s “focalizer” seems to occupy “a theoretical middle ground between the narrator and the actor, or character”. Nelles (1990:373) identifies the main problem caused by the role of the focaliser to be that it assigns “the selection of events and techniques and the presentation of events by means of techniques to the same agent”, thereby replacing the traditional narratological agent

---

<sup>39</sup> This is already evident from Genette’s emphasis on the importance of relationships in narrative discourse, namely between a discourse and the events that it recounts, and between the same discourse and the act that produces it (Genette, 1980:27). To clarify these relationships, he proposes the following terms: **story** for the signified or narrative content; **narrative/text** for the signifier, statement, discourse or narrative text itself; and **narrating** for the producing narrative action and, by extension, the whole of the real or fictional situation in which that action takes place.

<sup>40</sup> Chatman (1986:199-200), for example, points out that “ambiguity was born in Bal’s use of the term to refer to the character (who is used as a device for focalizing) and not the narrator. But, the term focalizer can also mean the agent, the one who focalizes. Bal therefore seems to confuse focalization with narrative instance”. See also Genette (1980:73) and Nelles (1990:368) as well as Jahn (1996:244-5).

of implied author. However, any angle that becomes apparent in a narrative is also impostulated and as such becomes both presentational and interpretive. Furthermore, the relationship that does obtain may be signalled through deictic markers, but is actualised in impostulation and has nothing to do with either selection or presentation **by** any agent but rather **through** agents.

Chatman (1986:200), in criticising Genette's choice of the term "focalisation", also identifies a relationship, stating that seeing or filtering or whatever term we choose,

is a **relationship of mediation** between the act of narration and the events of the story. There can be only one such mediation at a time: the point of view can shift from character to character, but it is unnecessary and misleading to think of it as multiplying itself in layers. Nor does it make sense to attribute such mediation to the narrator himself (my emphasis).

The final part of this statement seems to be a response to Rimmon-Kenan's (1983:71) definition of focalisation, namely that "the story is presented in the text through the mediation of some 'prism', 'perspective', 'angle of vision', verbalised by the narrator though not necessarily his". What appears from Rimmon-Kenan's and Chatman's use of the notion of mediation is that focalisation can be viewed as a **process** that is instrumental in the **transfer** or **interpretation** of the fictional world with all its characters and events to the **telling** or **narrating** of this world.

Nelles (1990:368) summarises Genette's notion of focalisation as a **relation** between the **narrator's report** and the **character's thoughts**, to which the narrator either has **no access**, or has **access and is limited to**, or has **access but is not limited to**. The narrator can then decide to tell the story or part of the story neutrally or "from" or "through" a character. In the framework of impostulation this should then be reformulated as follows: the author and reader actualise and dramatise the story – both presentationally and interpretively – neutrally or "from" or "through" a character.

Nelles (1990:366) claims that Genette's theory has been misinterpreted and that the relation stands central without requiring a "relator" or a "relatee".<sup>41</sup> He ascribes the confusion surrounding this aspect to the fact that Genette's theory postulates an implicit agent who sees, as well as to the unfortunate choice of a visual metaphor. According to Nelles (1990:366), Genette's interest "was in describing two aspects of narrating, not two agents". This emphasises Genette's view that focalisation involves orientational restrictions and that the narrator "chooses" the degree of access to a character's mind. Apart from the fact that Genette's theory is based on a real-life scenario of storytelling in a communication model, where the fictionality of the narrator is disregarded, the above also lends weight to the notion of focalisation as impostulatory technique. Through impostulation, varying degrees of involvement as well as deictic positions are imposed and postulated as well as dramatised through narrativity or mediated human experientiality.

It could also be stated that focalisation as impostulatory technique is a process in the active interpretive and presentational impostulation not only of events and characters, but also of perspectives and thoughts, cognition and emotion. As impostulatory technique, focalisation refers to the relationship between the narrative origo and the impostulation of events, characters, attitudes, cognition and so forth. It also retains the aspect of mood, although in an altered sense. In this context it refers to the mood imposed and postulated in the narrative origo rather than to the modalities conveyed by the narrator and by characters.

This can once again be related to Fludernik's notion of natural narratology, which is based on a very specific definition of narrative that is thematically identified as the presentation of experientiality. Therefore, "one can now claim that all narrative is

---

<sup>41</sup> Nelles (1990:366) ascribes the confusion surrounding this aspect to the fact that Genette's theory postulates an implicit agent who sees, as well as to the unfortunate choice of a visual metaphor. Rather, "his interest was in describing two aspects of narrating, not two agents".

built on the mediating function of consciousness" (Fludernik, 1996:49).<sup>42</sup> Through the mediating force of focalisation as impostulatory technique, a relationship is imposed between the narrative origo and the narrative itself in terms of experientiality. As impostulatory technique, focalisation therefore affords a way to utilise and access consciousness in a number of dramatising and postulatory ways that produce acts of imaginary perception and impersonation all aimed at establishing narrativity.<sup>43</sup>

### 3.3.4 Focalisation as access to consciousness

Chatman (1996:196-8) identifies four narrative functions that should be distinguished when we look at (what was previously indiscriminately named by) terms such as "point of view", "vision", "perspective" and "focalisation". These narrative functions are centre, filter, slant, and interest focus.<sup>44</sup> Filter is defined as "that function where a character is used as 'screen', 'filter', mirror' or 'reflector' of events, settings and other characters. Here the narrator chooses to tell the story neutrally or 'from' or 'through' the consciousness of a character. It follows that only characters can be filters because they reside in the constructed diegetic world".<sup>45</sup> What we must bear in mind, however, is that characters are filters only by proxy because this filtering is still a function of the impostulation from, through and into the narrative origo.

---

<sup>42</sup> According to Fludernik (1996:49), narrative modes are therefore all "resolved" or mediated on the basis of cognitive categories that can be identified as categories of human consciousness, namely **teller-mode narrative** (narrator's consciousness), **figural or reflectorial narrative** (protagonist's consciousness), and **neutral narrative** (consciousness in a surrogate figure, the reader).

The four levels of Fludernik's cognitive model are therefore the **operative reader-oriented side** of that deep-structural **mediation of narrative** which employs consciousness as its cognitive structure.

<sup>43</sup> Just as a translation is informed by the "original" but at the same time becomes a second "original" or at least an autonomous text, the reader's impostulation of the narrative is autonomous even though it is informed by the author's impostulation. The difference in involvement is simply one of degree. Both author and reader impostulate from real-life and imaginary cues or "markers" although the reader is "conducted" firstly by the cues provided by the author.

<sup>44</sup> Unfortunately, according to Jahn (1996:256), "filter and slant are ill-suited to capture the distinction between literal and nonliteral seeing".

<sup>45</sup> This is probably what Bal (1992:307) refers to when she remarks that Chatman's article remains trapped in an inavowable realistic fallacy.

Fludernik (1996:345-6) identifies a crucial point touched upon by Chatman's distinction between **slant** and **filter**, which provides a corrective to the standard conceptualisations of focalisation:

Perception centrally correlates with **perceptual consciousness**, and narratorial descriptions *either* invoke an **evaluative frame of mind** on the part of the narrator (*slant*), which has nothing to do with perception, *or* they **illusionistically project a character's perceptions**, and then are definitely relatable to a **consciousness factor** of what is traditionally termed internal focalization (my emphasis).

It should be clear by now that the interpretive and presentational dimensions of impostulation provide the necessary parameters to account for these aspects of focalisation. In order for perceptual consciousness as well as the evaluative frame of mind or the illusionistic projection of a character's perceptions of narratorial descriptions to be impostulated in and from and through the narrative origo, there must be a combination of interpretive and presentational involvement on the part of the reader.

At this point it might be useful to look more carefully at Fludernik's model of natural narratology, and specifically at her second level, namely the four viewpoints available as explanatory schemas of access to the story. In this model, Fludernik (1996:43-44) identifies all four schemas as being related to narrative mediation or narrativity:

- **Telling** (real-world "script") – (can be expanded to incorporate **reflecting** – mental activities outside utterance that turn the act of telling into a process of recollection and self-reflective introspection; therefore, reflecting projects reflecting consciousness in process of rumination).
- **Viewing** (real-world schema of perception).
- **Experiencing** (access to one's own narrativisable experience).
- **Action/acting** ("what" not "how" of narrative experience).

From these four schemas it becomes evident that access to the story (in this case related to experientiality and the reader's re-cognising and recuperation of a character's consciousness) is largely determined by cognitive frames. In my definition of the term, focalisation encompasses all four of the above schemas and not merely that of viewing. It does so by virtue of the fact that, as impostulatory technique (and particularly in the combination of presentational and interpretive dimensions), it becomes an integral part of the narration, dramatising and re-enacting all elements of the "diegesis" from and into and through the narrative origo.

---

Since the interpretive dimension of impostulation is central to the application of the theory to the translation of narrative texts, this dimension, which provides the reader with the means to recuperate the story impostulated by the author, has to be investigated more closely.

### 3.3.5 Focalisation as interpretive strategy

Fludernik (1996:345) points out that “the extensive debate on focalization has really demonstrated that the category is an interpretive one and *not* exclusively a textual category”. She continues to say that “the person who ‘sees’ is the reader, but *à travers* the linguistic medium, and not in terms of *visual perception*.” As has become abundantly clear in developments in the theory of narrative over the past decades, the reading process or the interpretive aspects of narrative texts cannot be ignored in any study of narrative. After all, studying narrative texts implies reading them, and therefore the interpretation has to move beyond mere textual categories and compartmentalisation. Jahn (1996:256) goes even further in his criticism of structuralist approaches to narrative when he states that “mainstream focalization theory with its ready answers to *who speaks?* and *who sees?* largely denies narrators [authors?] and readers their share as well as their power of imaginary perception”.

According to Fludernik (1996:340), since realistic frames, which include the distinction between tellers (narrators) and agents (characters), are only secondary analytic categories, it becomes essential to put the interpretive framework first, and to have stories and discourses, tellers and agents operate on a secondary level as instantiations of such interpretive strategies. Impostulation provides exactly such an interpretive strategy, although I would further contend that the instantiation of narrators and characters is part of the presentational dimension of impostulation and that the reader is actively involved in this, albeit on a different level than the author.

Attempts to create a typology of narrators have shown that there is no clear-cut distinction between different types of narrators or even between levels of access to knowledge or minds. This can be ascribed to the fact that narrators are functions of

impostulation and as such are imposed and postulated on a continuous basis, in a dynamic manner by authors and readers. The more closely one analyses the narrative situation by means of actual examples, the more complex these layers become, which renders much of the theory surrounding focalisation unwieldy. It would therefore seem appropriate to approach the narrative situation and focalisation from a simplified position and view shifts in perspective and access as manipulatory and dramatic rather than central to the flow of the narrative.

Whether we accept Chatman's term "filter" or adhere to Genette's "focalisation" (with Bal and Rimmon-Kenan's modifications and contradictions), those aspects related to cognition and ideology that appear in a text are impossible to pin to narrators or characters exclusively. In the case of *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*, we ever be sure whether the "slant" provided by Kristine actually belongs to the narrator, or to the character of Ouma Kristina, or to Brink, or to his culture or ideology or belief system or even wife, for that matter? Furthermore, we cannot ignore the role of the reader in the impostulation of Kristien. What is important is that there **is** such a slant, there **are** such filtering aspects that establish creative gaps or traces in which author and reader and critic and translator all participate, and which are therefore central to the process of translation and interpretation as such.

What I therefore intend to concern myself with in this study is a view of focalisation that does not attempt to go into the subtle categories proposed by Genette, Bal, Rimmon-Kenan, Chatman and a host of others. As my main objective is directed towards the establishment of guidelines for the translation of the gaps and traces related to focalisation, I shall attempt to define the (often) covert markers in a text that reveal attitudinal, mental, ideological and sensory angles or emphases that belong to author/translator/culture/reader or that is impostulated in characters and narrators. The primary concern will not be the classification of categories: rather the aim is to identify the effect of these gaps and traces and the treatment thereof in translation/rewriting. It is furthermore my contention that focalisation as an impostulatory device, with an emphasis on macrofocalisation, will provide an invaluable interpretive strategy for the translation of narrative texts.

Fludernik (1996:313) defines narrative texts as “first and foremost, texts that are *read* narratively, whatever their formal make-up, although the fact that they are read in a narrative manner may be largely determined by formal and, particularly, contextual factors”. This statement lends further weight to her suggestion to shift the emphasis to interpretation, which eschews the typological problems of texts containing the illusionist effect of the teller’s absence. In her own words, “since the change to a different frame – that of reading from within the (deictic centre of the) fiction – prepares the way towards a cognition of narrative experientiality *in actu* and avoids the necessity of laborious typological gymnastics” (Fludernik, 1996:340).

In Fludernik’s approach, as well as in my concept of impostulation, the emphasis is therefore no longer on the textual categories created so meticulously in mainstream narratology, but rather on those receptional processes by means of which the reader and translator interpret the narrative or create narrativity (mimetic illusion) in the process of narrativisation.

In an argument on the relationship between story and history, Brink (1998b:39) makes a statement that can be related to this interpretive dimension of impostulation:

Even when a story tacitly narrates an event “based on reality” it is infused with, and transformed by, the notoriously unreliable complex of private motivations, hidden agendas, prejudices, suspicions, biographical quirks, chips on the shoulder, and conditionings that constitute the idiosyncratic, individual mind.

Although this statement is intended as a comment on the role of stories in reimagining the past in post-apartheid narrative in South Africa, and in other words refers more specifically to the presentational dimension of impostulation, it emphasises a number of variables that also influence the interpretive dimension of impostulation. In the activation of narrative by author/reader and reader/author and therefore also translator as reader and author, these variables also constitute the silences inherent in any narrative.

Before moving on to the markers of focalisation as they will be used in the analysis of Brink’s parallel texts, the relation between narrativity and impostulation has to be defined more clearly, since this aspect is central to my definition of impostulation.



### 3.4 Focalisation and narrativity: impostulation

David Herman (1994a:231) states that ways of focalising a story can be “re-described as the narrative presentation of **propositional attitudes**, i.e., modes of focalization encode into narrative form various kinds of **epistemic stances** that can be **adopted** towards what is being represented in a narrative” (my emphases). His view on varieties of focalisation is particularly significant in this regard in that he emphasises the intentional properties of hypothetical focalisation, which will necessarily impact on the translation of narrative fiction and that involves matters of representation:

Focalization itself can be re-described as the narrative transcription of attitudes of seeing, believing, speculating etc. anchored in particular contexts, frames, or worlds. By the same token, **differently focalized narrative representations will not be interchangeable, substitutable, without changes in the meaning of the narrative or narratives in question.** (Herman, 1994a:235; my emphasis.)

This is an extremely important statement in the context of this study, since it emphasises the impact of changes or shifts in focalisation. However, it has to be kept in mind that the “propositional attitudes” and “epistemic stances” David Herman (1994a:231) identifies as being encoded into narrative through modes of focalisation, primarily function on a macrotextual level in the form of macrofocalisation. Furthermore, these “propositional attitudes” and “epistemic stances” are not only encoded through focalisation as impostulatory technique, but are also decoded because of its interpretive dimension.

According to Fludernik (1996:334), microfocalisation does not qualify as focalisation proper but is merely a “small-scale management of the plot function”. Fludernik therefore challenges the notion of various focalisations in a text, suggesting instead that, in terms of natural narratology, they involve “a shift in the receptional frame from the frames of TELLING or ACTION-orientation to the parameters of VIEWING and EXPERIENCING, accompanied by a reduced involvement with traditional ACTION and storytelling parameters and an **added emphasis on the presentation of consciousness**” (Fludernik, 1996:335; my emphasis). This approximates the notion of focalisation as impostulatory technique through which narrativity is created and interpreted on a receptional level.

Narrativity, according to Fludernik (1996:38) "is based on the attempt to portray human experientiality in exemplary fashion. However, in our real-life experience human experientiality consists of that which eludes our immediate grasp, it is something non-objective, non-definable precisely on account of its holistic gestalt-perceptual shape". This would account for the inevitable gaps and traces that appear in focalisation, as the impostulatory nature of this aspect of narrative makes any objective rendering impossible, and in the process creates an interpretive aspect that retains the creative filling in of traces that never quite surface, never disappear.

### 3.5 Impostulation and *différance*: the absence of presence

It is because of *différance* that the movement of signification is possible only if each so-called "present" element, each element appearing on the scene of presence, is related to something other than itself, thereby keeping within itself the mark of its past element, and already letting itself be vitiated by the mark of its relation to the future element, this trace being related no less to what is called the future than to what is called the past, and constituting what is called the present by means of this very relation to what it is not: what it absolutely is not, not even a past or a future as a modified present. (Derrida, 1982:13.)

This notion of presence or the absence of presence is central not only to translation (as pointed out in the previous chapter), but also to impostulation, which deals particularly with traces of impostulated past and future and produces a play which is neither a present nor "a future as a modified present". The notion of a deictic centre is therefore also problematised since it becomes merely a trace of what it is not while constituting a point of convergence without conveying – a vortex as narrative origo.

In terms of this study and its hypotheses, it could be postulated that focalisation as an impostulatory technique in narrative fiction constitutes a "play of traces", a "play of covered-up traces" or tracks (see section 2.5). The attempted unveiling of these traces does not involve reference to some form of "deep underlying meaning", but both contains the memory and points in the direction of the narrative, narration, narrator, author, or reader. Focalisation (as impostulatory device) is neither a "substance" in the form of a visual perspective or stance nor in the form of a voice. It contains within it the trace of the "voice" of the narrator, the memories and perceptions of characters, readers, rewriters, narrators, and so forth, without naming

anything specific and thus being fixed and silenced – it constantly erases itself in the act of its own disclosure.

The narrative origo as presence that is imposed and postulated through impostulation can also be described in terms of Derrida's notion of *différance*.

Derrida (1982:16) states:

... one comes to posit a presence – and specifically consciousness, the being beside itself of consciousness – no longer as the absolutely central form of Being but as a “determination” and as an “effect”. A determination or an effect within a system which is no longer that of presence but of *différance*, a system that no longer tolerates the opposition of activity and passivity, nor that of cause and effect, or of indetermination and determination, etc.

Similarly, the narrative origo as a narrative consciousness is no longer a central form of “Being” in the narrator, but rather a determination and an effect of impostulation. Through impostulation an imaginary presence is postulated and imposed in the narrative by author and reader (as well as translator) that allows the trace to trace through a process that relies neither on presence nor on absence.

The presentational and interpretive dimensions of impostulation therefore create a narrative origo that can be conceived of as a projected imaginary space and described as a frame or mental space. This provides a tool to address the problems resulting from the traditional dichotomy between telling and seeing as well as between diegesis and extradiegesis or story and discourse. The impostulation of the narrative origo as projected mental space is achieved largely by means of deixis, which will be shown to be instrumental in impostulation.

### **3.6 Impostulation and deixis**

Mental spaces can be projected, changed, and tracked as dynamic and continuous activity in discourse. Elements and partial structure from input spaces can be blended into new, original, and creatively constructed spaces. Blending processes are particularly valuable in helping us analyze the creative transformation in deictic scenarios that occur when deictic centres are imaginatively *projected* and *transposed* in discourse. (Herman, 1999:523.)

Vimala Herman's (1999) above description of the blending processes that allow the construction of new spaces from input spaces has much in common with frame theory and can also be utilised in the description of impostulation. However, the

narrative origo is not only the primary space, but also the vortex that allows the illusion of projection without requiring other spaces to be projected outwards. According to Jahn (1997:442), **frame** is understood as a “cognitive model that is selected and used (and sometimes discarded) in the process of reading a narrative text”. This also links up with Fludernik’s (1996) concept of narrativisation as well as with Vimala Herman’s (1999) mental space theory although it is by definition impossible to discard the cognitive model of the narrative origo.

I propose to utilise Vimala Herman’s (1999) notions formulated for the description of the epistolary genre but to extend it to narrative genres in general. I further postulate that projection and transposition do not necessarily take place from parent space to child spaces, but that child spaces are merely facets brought into being in the parent space of the narrative origo.

According to Vimala Herman (1999:523), deictic projections “require the displacement of the origo and its spatiotemporal coordinates into other imagined or remembered centers”. Furthermore, memory and imagination are “mentally constructed” and the mind has a “mediating power ... in our understanding of deictic usages”. In order to appropriate the notion of narrative origo in impostulation, however, deictic projection will refer not to the projection to other deictic centres but only to projection in the narrative origo. Deixis will therefore also be regarded as the positioning of impostulated modes, but always from the centre of the narrative origo, even if that origo can only be approached in the traces left by impostulation.

Vimala Herman (1999:524-5) refers to Bühler’s (1982) elaboration of deixis in which he defines a *deixis am phantasma* kind or “imagination-oriented deixis” which involves “projection of deictic centers and the origo and its coordinates into absent or imagined contexts”. Here there are three types of centres. The first type is described as “the mountain comes to Mohammed”, because imagined objects come into the speaker’s perceptual context as if present in it, but to the mind’s eye. However, I would argue that the narrative origo here still remains the primary origo through which impostulation takes place. The “imagined objects” are nothing but traces and gaps that are posited in a dynamic dramatisation, which both reader and

author interpret and imbue with significance. I further postulate that the narrative origo may in certain cases be very closely related to an identifiable narrator but that it is never limited to this agent, since it remains an impostulation. In a narrative text the reader may therefore impose and postulate a narrative voice or a train of thought (in the case of reflector-mode narrative) in the narrative origo. This obscures the distinction between reader and narrative function (or narrator in cases where an identifiable narrator can be postulated), since the reader impostulates the narrative function in a blended space that is the narrative origo. The reader is lured into the cognitive space created through the narrative function and subsequently engages in the narration not as mere spectator but as partner in impostulation.

Bühler's second type of imagination-oriented deixis is called "Mohammed goes to the mountain" (Herman,1999:524-5). In this case, "the speaker is transposed in the imagination to the geographical place of what is being imagined, one has this present before the mind's eye from a determinate point of view, which may be given and at which is found the self's own position in the imagined scene". This type, as well as the third type, namely Bühler's "intermediate case" where "both Mohammed and the mountain stay where they are, but the object is perceived from the current context" (Herman,1999:525), therefore fall away or are subsumed under impostulation.

The narrator remains an impostulatory device through which both reader and author impose and postulate the narrating of events, actions and objects, just as focalisation is an impostulatory device through which orientation, emotion, characterisation and thought are invoked. What happens, in my opinion, is that the projection is nothing more than an impostulation in which the centre remains with the narrative function, which becomes the origo of all things in an acting out of thoughts, dialogue and so forth.

Vimala Herman (1999:525-6) further says that "deictic projection creates possibilities to transfer the "I-you-here-now structure of the deictic center ... in imagination into other centers while retaining its intersubjective, corporeal qualities as 'present' and 'face-to-face'". Essentially this is not that far removed from impostulation, with the

one significant difference that impostulation remains inseparable from the narrative origo. In other words, there are no other centres – instead of the projection outwards of other centres, impostulation provides a way to interpret and present the narrative in much the same way that a director would interpret and present a play through actors. However, all these functions are fulfilled in the impostulator (i.e. reader and author).

As stated in section 3.3.2, the **microtextual presentational elements** evident in **markers** related to **characterisation**, **subjectivity** and **deixis** provide the “raw” **material** the reader has to engage with in various degrees in order to sustain the narrative origo **interpretively**. In order to make the concepts of impostulation and focalisation as impostulatory technique useful for the translation of narrative texts, those aspects that signal both the presentational and interpretive dimensions of impostulation have to be considered.

### **3.7 Markers of impostulation: deixis, subjectivity and characterisation**

The deictic features of language are those which orientate or anchor utterances in the context of space (here vs. there; this vs. that) or of time (now vs. then), relative to the speaker's point of view ... The deictic elements of language are the principal means by which statements are focalized. (Bradford, 1997:61.)

The elements of deixis identified by Bradford in the above passage also apply to focalisation as impostulatory technique. The narrative origo provides the context (of space, time and point of view) for impostulation and similarly, the focalisation is foregrounded through markers of deixis. However, care must be taken not to ascribe these deictic elements to positions or agents within the text, but to recognise the impostulatory dimension through which they are imposed and activated from outside the text.

Deixis is important in the analysis of focalisation in narrative in that “the meaning of deictic expressions changes with the utterer of an utterance and with his or her position in space and time” (Herman, 1994b:378). Since focalisation is intrinsically linked with the impostulated spatial and temporal as well as emotional, psychological

and cognitive position of the utterance, deictic markers will play an important role in the interpretation of narrative in terms of impostulatory techniques.

However, since deictic markers primarily provide the orientational dimensions related to the narrative origo, and since focalisation as impostulatory technique also characterises the narrative origo, as well as impostulating degrees of subjectivity in the narrative origo, markers of characterisation and subjectivity also have to be considered.

David Herman's (1994a:231) views on hypothetical focalisation provide meaningful insights in this regard. Hypothetical focalisation to him is the **marker** of a peculiar **epistemic modality** in narrative discourse in which "the *expressed world* counterfactualizes or virtualizes the *reference world* of the text". I would contend that all focalisation is hypothetical in the sense that we deal with a constructed world that can be accessed only by means of conjecture, postulation, enactment and so forth, which indeed counterfactualises and virtualises the reference world of a text. All perceptual, mental or psychological aspects of access are merely traces that act on the reader's suspension of disbelief and that therefore have the express purpose of sustaining the impostulation through "lying" or acting or impersonating or manipulating. If one takes such a view, the discourse level collapses into the story level or vice versa, and the two levels are therefore no longer binary oppositions but exist in symbiosis. The fact that markers of focalisation (deictic, characterising and subjective) both provide and produce such access therefore becomes significant.

Of course, the markers that I will primarily be concerned with for the purposes of this study are not markers of epistemic modality alone, but also markers in the linguistic surface structure of the text that provide traces of impostulation and more specifically of focalisation as impostulatory technique. Therefore, markers of deixis, subjectivity and characterisation will be the primary concern as they provide an indication of the access, mediation and relationships that are impostulated. These

markers will further be analysed as “traces”<sup>46</sup> and “gaps” left by focalisation that cannot be named and therefore silenced, but that nevertheless pose a number of problems for the translator of narrative texts.

However, focalisation can never be reduced simply to these microstructural markers, just as no translation can focus exclusively on the microtext. Cognitive parameters, according to Fludernik (1996:315), “become operative on two levels: on the macrostructural level, on which an encompassing frame is established in the course of reading; and on the microstructural level of linguistic surface structure, where specific signals can be argued to correlate with cognitively salient discourse points and therefore to textualize the structure projected by the larger narrative frame”. These two levels are closely linked.

Fludernik (1996:333-334) refers to Uspensky (1973) and Volosinov (1986) who note that it is precisely the linguistic signals of characters’ language that alert the reader to the fact that the characters “see”. These signals likewise provide cues for the impostulation of sight as well as voice and mental activity in the narrative origo.

Various critics have identified markers of focalisation or viewpoint. Short (1996:264-279), for example, identifies the following linguistic indicators of viewpoint:

1. schema-oriented language (individual perspective within a certain code and conventions and expectations);
2. value-laden expressions;
3. given versus new information;
4. indicators of a particular character’s thoughts or perceptions;
5. deixis;
6. “social” deixis;
7. the sequencing and organisation of actions and events to indicate viewpoint;
8. ideological viewpoint.

These markers are clearly not limited to the visual aspects of point of view. Of these indicators, those of deixis and given versus new information are probably the most

---

<sup>46</sup> I refer here to Derrida’s notion of trace (related to the notions of “track” and “gap” etc., but particularly to his notion of *différance*), even though Genette (1980:28) also refers to the “traces, signs or indices that we can pick up and interpret”. Genette’s use of traces is obviously far removed from Derrida’s, particularly in the structuralist focus on the linguistic surface structure of the text.



obvious, along with indicators of thought and perception. Most of the other indicators or markers would, to my mind, constitute **traces** in the narrative that are not always easy, or even possible, to identify because they function on an implicit level. Nevertheless, these markers play a significant role in the way the text will be interpreted.

May (1994:34-5) identifies the following indicators of the narrator's personal involvement in a story (personal involvement here seems to refer to any of the internal voices in the text and would thus be closely related to focalisation):

- the use of markedly colloquial language;
- deictic expressions that locate the narrator in time and space;
- parentheticals or interjections that call attention to the telling or express value judgements.

According to May (1994:35), although these indicators are readily translatable, translators rarely incorporate them in their translations. May therefore emphasises those indicators which force themselves on the reader. However, she does not include the less apparent markers that complicate the task of the translator even further.

Levenston and Sonnenschein (1986:53-54) identify four categories of textual features an author may exploit to indicate focalisation, namely:

- register-restricted vocabulary items;
- collocations and clichés;
- word order;
- free indirect speech.

Jahn (1996:254) lists a number of specific textual features of what he terms "focalization windows". To him, a "focalization window" is typically "anchored in a 'deictic center,' or Banfieldian SELF", and orients deictic expressions, including:

- verbs like "come" and "go";
- spatial, temporal, and modal adverbs;
- denominations;
- expressive constructions, and so on.

Narratorial focalisation typically uses descriptive imagery while reflector-mode focalisation is usually cast in a "mind style" comprising:

- referentless pronouns;
- the familiarising article;
- minimised narratorial perceptibility;
- *in actu* presentation, and so on.

Deixis is clearly an important dimension of discourse markers in most of the above.

David Herman (1994b:387) identifies the following types or dimensions of deixis:

- spatial deixis ("The dog stood over there");
- temporal deixis ("After that I got really bored");
- person deixis ("She's smarter than I am");
- social deixis (for example, in English I would use a different term of address according to my social position relative to the addressee [I would say Mr President but the Attorney General might say Bill]; other languages encode social distinctions through their personal-pronoun systems [familiar *tu* and *du* versus formal *vous* and *Sie* in French and German, respectively]);
- discourse deixis (encoding references to portions of the discourse in which the utterance is located – such as "as I just said", or "as will become clearer in a moment"; portions of the unfolding discourse in which the utterance [including the text-referring expression] is located).

Herman (1994b:388) further identifies the idea of participant roles as grounding the "distinction between first-person and second-person pronouns, on the one hand, and third-person pronouns, on the other hand" in traditional conceptions of person deixis. In this conception, the first-person and second-person pronouns designate participants in a current discourse situation whereas third-person pronouns designate elements of the (extralinguistic) context of the discourse.

In particular:

The nonparticipant forms signal that the referent is neither the current animator nor the current receiver, but some third party(s). Whereas the Spkr and Adr forms encode that the referent they identify is identical to some participant in the current identical field of interaction, the nonparticipant forms signal a disjunction between coparticipants and the referent(s). (Herman, 1994b:388-9.)

The bearing of this on focalisation will become evident in the analysis in Chapter 4.

It should therefore be clear that although there are a number of techniques an author may employ to indicate focalisation, these markers are only the tip of the iceberg and even so, they involve aspects of culture and language which have traditionally haunted translators. The most significant point seems to be that there

will always be gaps or traces which cannot be filled and which create a myriad of possibilities for the translator.

I would also argue that impostulation functions within cognitive parameters and that what Fludernik (1996:315) calls the macrostructural encompassing frame, is where the narrative origo is established through impostulation. The different markers of impostulation, however, are situated on the microstructural level. Because these two levels are closely linked, the markers found on the microstructural level in the linguistic surface structure of the text will establish the macrostructural narrative origo and will also be influenced and made to cohere by the frame provided by it.

### **3.8 Conclusion and working definitions**

In order to apply the above theory of focalisation as impostulatory technique in achieving the aims of this study, it remains important not to conceive of impostulation as a fixed and stable concept that can be categorised in the way structuralist concepts are categorised. Impostulation is largely a matter of gaps and traces (or aspects that are impossible to represent) that remain elusive manifestations of narrative functions, processes and agents. Nonetheless, the productive gaps surrounding the terms create rather than limit possibilities, without having to become relativistic.

For the purposes of this study, **impostulation** can therefore be defined as a narrative strategy that involves both author and reader as active participants in the actualisation and activation of the narrative through imaginary projection from, through and into a **narrative origo**. Impostulation is thus the technique by means of which different narrative attitudes, experiences, angles, emotions and cognition, as well as characters and events (the entire narrative), are projected imaginatively in and onto the narrative origo in an elaborate dramatisation and series of impersonations.

**Focalisation** is a function of impostulation beside narration. As impostulatory technique, focalisation is an orientational and creative device through which the vortex of the narrative origo is impostulated.

The problems presented by focalisation in the translation of a narrative text can largely be ascribed to the fact that it constitutes an impostulatory trace, and as such defies representation and continually erases itself in the act of disclosure. Nonetheless, impostulation as interpretive and presentational device provides a way to approximate the silences in narrative. This opens up creative dimensions that make translation a form of impostulation similar to reading and writing.

In order to implement the insights provided by viewing focalisation as an impostulatory technique, the markers of focalisation in narrative texts have to be described more closely. This should make it possible to determine the role of focalisation in the shifts that occur in the process of translation/rewriting. Since one of the aims of this study is to establish whether the analysis of the markers of focalisation could provide a point of departure for the translation/rewriting of a narrative text such as A.P. Brink's *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, it now becomes important to identify these markers. The markers will be illustrated and applied to translation in the analysis of Brink's parallel texts, but for the moment the categories below are identified.

### **Deictic markers**

Deictic markers are instrumental in the impostulation of the orientational aspects of the narrative origo. As such, the following types of deictic markers represent the more overt markers of focalisation as impostulatory technique.

- Markers of **temporal deixis**: evident in temporal adverbs "now" and "then", as well as verb tenses.
- Markers of **spatial deixis** can be identified in verbs like "come" and "go", as well as spatial adverbs such as "here" and "there").
- Markers of **person deixis** present clear indications of the position from which focalisation is used to impostulated the relationship between the narrative function and the events, emotions, and so forth contained in the narration. These include "I", "me", "we", "us", "you", "he", "she", "they", "one", and so forth.

- Markers of **social deixis** are less overt than the first three types of deictic markers, but are nevertheless, among others, evident in register, language variation, slang, profanities and curses.
- Markers of **discourse deixis** are extremely important in the context of this study as they often result in gaps and traces in the language of the narrative. Examples of such markers include modal adverbs, conditionals, references to portions of the discourse in which the utterance is located, markers of voice such as interjections, and directions for the impostulation of an utterance. In other words, markers of textuality<sup>47</sup>.

### **Markers of subjective impostulation**

These markers foreground the focalisation by means of the (presentational and interpretive impostulation of subjective slants impostulated presentationally as well as interpretively. For the purposes of this study, three types of markers of subjective impostulation are identified.

- Markers of **subjectivity** are evident in straightforward subjectivity and impostulated access to the thoughts of character (adjectives and adverbs). They often foreground the focalisation through value-laden expressions. These markers therefore indicate **subjectivity from the narrative origo**.
- Markers of **self-reflexivity** impostulate focalisation through the narrative instance and into the narrative origo (in other words narrator's self-awareness). They contain elements of metatextuality and are at times confessional in nature. These markers are further evident in conditionals that draw attention to the impostulated voice. They are therefore more closely related to the narrative origo and often contain elements of satire and irony. These markers therefore indicate **subjectivity into the narrative origo**.
- Markers of **announced subjectivity** are related to an unreliable narrator. The focalisation is primarily marked by means of subjectivity accompanied by phrases such as "she thought", "they imagined", and so forth. In other words, these

---

<sup>47</sup> I realise I may be stretching the meaning of deixis here, but for the purposes of this study, discourse markers will also be included in this category. *The Concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics* (1997) defines discourse markers as "any of a variety of units whose function is within a larger discourse rather than an individual sentence or clause: e.g. 'but then' in 'But then he might be late' or 'well' in 'Well what if he is?'".

markers indicate announced impostulated access to the thoughts of characters. They are more closely related to the impostulated characters and marks **subjectivity through the narrative origo**.

### **Markers of characterisation**

The focalisation in a narrative text is also foregrounded by means of the strategies of characterisation. Markers of characterisation provide information through which the various characters in the narrative can be impostulated from, into and through the narrative origo. These fall into the groups below.

- **Indirect characterisation into the narrative origo** where the impostulated narrative instance is characterised through dialogue, vocabulary, objects, setting, and so forth.
- **Indirect characterisation from the narrative origo** provides characterisation of characters other than those involved in the narrative origo through dialogue, vocabulary, objects, setting, observation, and so forth.
- **Direct characterisation into the narrative origo** again characterise the impostulated narrative instance, but through direct description.
- **Direct characterisation from the narrative origo** provides direct descriptions of characters other than those involved in the narrative origo at a particular moment in time.

These markers provide the orientational as well as the presentational and interpretive dimensions of focalisation as impostulatory technique. As microtextual markers that impact on the macrotext, these markers will necessarily impact on all impostulatory levels, as will become clear in Chapter 4. Although these levels are not intended as inflexible categories (it will become clear that they often overlap), the following paragraphs present working definitions for the basic levels that will be utilised in the analyses in Chapter 4. The definition of the levels will also provide the basis on which to devise the model for general application in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts that will be presented in the final chapter.

**Direct impostulated narrative** can be defined as narrative impostulated within the parameters of real-life experientiality related to naturally occurring storytelling

situations (also including the epistolary and diary modes). This level of impostulation is anchored in the predominant time of the narrative. On the one hand, this could be the narrative present – when the narrator is impostulated as “telling” the story as it unfolds (as in William Faulkner’s *As I lay dying* (1990) or the frame narrative in *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*). On the other hand the predominant time could be the narrative past in retrospective narration – when the narrator reflects on past events (such as the frame narrator in Joseph Conrad’s *Lord Jim* [1994] or *Heart of darkness* [1989]). This level of impostulation creates the illusion of a narrator narrating a story either to a particular imaginary audience, or to an unspecified audience or reader, without necessarily addressing the reader directly.

**Metatextual<sup>48</sup> impostulated narrative** can be defined as narrative in which the narrator is impostulated as departing from the predominant narrative time and the imaginary world created in it. The narrator either addresses the reader directly, or reflects inward rather than on the events and characters in the predominant narrative time. The emphasis in metatextual impostulated narrative is therefore not on the content of the narrative that is impostulated, but on the impostulation itself, or on the organisation of the narrative.

**Retrospective direct impostulated narrative** is simply retrospective narrative impostulated from the narrative origo, in other words dealing with events preceding the predominant narrative time. Although it may therefore appear to be very close to direct impostulated narrative that is narrated retrospectively, the difference is that it is preceded by another time level (either the narrative present as in *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele* or the narrative past as in the frame narrative in Conrad’s [1989] *Heart of darkness*). This level of impostulation therefore refers to an embedded narration or framed narrative, such as Ouma Kristina’s narrative in *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele* or Marlow’s narrative in *Lord Jim* or *Heart of darkness*.

---

<sup>48</sup> The term “metatextual” in this study refers to what is also described as “metafictional”. It indicates statements that emphasise the narrative process, and, more importantly, that provide information on aspects not directly related to the events in the narrative and the predominant narrative time (the narrative present in *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*).

**Impostulated direct speech** is defined as a sustained section of quoted dialogue contained in either the direct impostulated narrative of the frame or the retrospective direct impostulated narrative of the embedded narrative. It is therefore anchored in the predominant time of each level. Examples of this level of impostulation include Ouma Kristina's quoted narrative in *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele* or Stein's quoted narrative in Conrad's (1994) *Lord Jim*.

**Introduced impostulated direct narrative** is similar to impostulated direct speech, except that, after an introduction in the form of impostulated direct speech, the quotation marks are omitted. This creates the illusion that the narrative is impostulated directly instead of being mediated through the frame and presented as dialogue. In the case of *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, the illusion is therefore created that Ouma Kristina's voice "disappears" or merges with the voice of Kristien.

It should be clear that there is substantial correspondence and overlap between these levels. Nevertheless, they are introduced here as categories simply to distinguish between sustained sections in a text. It is important to bear in mind that all these levels are impostulated through, from and into one central narrative origo that is simply awarded different slants by the orientational nuances.

Having attempted to define the different levels of impostulation that will be used in the subsequent chapter, as well as the markers of focalisation that inform these distinctions, the study will now proceed with the analysis of *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*.



## 4. ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON: *IMAGININGS OF SAND/SANDKASTELE*<sup>49</sup>

### 4.1 Introduction

In this chapter the workings of impostulation will be investigated by means of an analysis of key passages from *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, as well as a comparison of these two texts to each other and to my own translation<sup>50</sup> of specific sections from the two texts. This will be done primarily to determine the significance of focalisation as impostulatory technique in the translation of narrative fiction (in other words, as evaluation and synthesis of the theoretical basis provided in Chapters 2 and 3). As pointed out in section 3.1, the gaps surrounding narration in impostulation gain great importance in the translation of narrative fiction. Therefore, any changes in this aspect that might appear in a translation at the microtextual level have the potential to alter the macrotextual interpretation of the text.

The titles of *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele* already provide an illustration of the role of *différance* in translation. "Imaginations of sand" literally means something like "verbeeldings van sand" or "verbeeldingsvlugte van sand" in Afrikaans, whereas "sandkastele" are "castles of sand" or "sand castles" in English. The translation/rewriting "imaginations of sand" for "sandkastele", or vice versa, illustrates the very notion of untranslatability. In the same way that the proper name "Peter" is not the translation for the French "Pierre" (see Derrida, 1985a:173), "imaginations of sand" is not the translation for "sandkastele". In the first place, "sandkastele" refers to the extremely temporary structures built at the seaside, which becomes relevant in terms of the emphasis in the novel on the transitory nature of life. The term "sandkastele" further contains the trace "lugkastele" which is something like "daydreaming" and as such not that far removed from "imaginations". However, in the context of the novel it also refers to "verekastele", the elaborate houses built by

---

<sup>49</sup> The abbreviation SK will be used for *Sandkastele* (Brink, 1995), and IS for *Imaginations of sand* (Brink, 1997).

<sup>50</sup> Due to the author's insistence that neither text can be regarded as "source" for the other, it was decided to translate the sections identified for microtextual analysis from both texts alternately, to provide some basis of comparison. The microtextual analyses inform my translations, which were done without reference to the other parallel text. The main aim here was apply the knowledge gained from the microtextual analysis in terms of focalisation.

---

ostrich farmers in the vicinity of Oudtshoorn after the boom of the ostrich feather industry in the 1920s, such as the gothic “castle” of the novel. Therefore, the translation of the title of the novel may on some levels be viewed as a translation in the “proper” interlingual sense (Jakobson) as well as in the figurative sense (see Derrida, 1985:174), but as Derrida says, “one would engage upon a course that would quickly reveal how [Jakobson’s] reassuring tripartition can be problematic”.

The theoretical basis provided in Chapters 2 and 3 will be applied to Brink’s parallel texts. In this analysis and comparison, the parallel status of the two texts will be maintained (i.e. neither will be assumed to have the status of “original”, or rather, both will be regarded as “originals”), although I will alternate between the two texts to facilitate the discussion. Since one of the aims of the study is to determine whether a model can be derived from such an analysis for general application in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts, these analyses and comparison will provide a continual evaluation and synthesis of the theoretical foundation of the study.

The discussion will proceed in terms of the levels of impostulation identified in Chapter 3. Each section will commence with a general macrotextual analysis of the impostulatory level in the novel, followed by a microtextual analysis of the markers of impostulation (markers of deixis, subjectivity and characterisation in relation to the narrative origo) in selected passages from these levels. Since this is not an extensive corpus study but rather a study of more generally marked sense units, the entire text will not be analysed in this fashion. It was decided to select the first and last chapters from each level for detailed analysis of markers of impostulation. Due to the fact that the levels of **metatextual impostulation**, **retrospective direct impostulated narrative** and **impostulated direct speech** consist of only one, two and four chapters respectively, it was unnecessary to make a selection and in each case the entire level was analysed. The selection of chapters from the beginning and end of the **direct impostulated narrative** of the frame makes it possible to discuss the development of the narrative origo. The same reason applies to the selection of the first and last of the (her)stories on the level of **introduced impostulated direct narrative** (those concerning Petronella and Lottie). To provide further structure to the analysis, the markers of impostulation in the first chapter(s) of

each level will be examined in *Imaginings of sand* and those in the last chapter(s) in *Sandkastele*.

After analysing the markers of impostulation in these chapters, they will be compared to those in the parallel text (in order to identify shifts as well as the impact of shifts). The markers will also be compared to those in my translation. These comparisons will be done mainly in order to test the framework provided in Chapters 2 and 3 for the translation of narrative texts in terms of focalisation as impostulatory technique. By comparing the markers of focalisation in these three texts, and by identifying the shifts that occur in this regard, it may be possible to establish whether the analysis of the markers of focalisation can provide a point of departure for the translation/rewriting of a narrative text such as A.P. Brink's *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*. The analyses in combination with the comparison should then make it possible to arrive at a model for general application in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts (this will be done in the final chapter).

As motivation for the need for such an intensive analysis, the following passage from *Imaginings of sand* will be discussed briefly as an indication of the complexities in the narrative style of the novel that have to be addressed in translation:

Sometimes her voice fades away altogether. I cannot even be sure that what she says is what I write. And what I hear her whisper merges with what I remember, or seem to remember, from earlier times when she told previous stories. Yet I have the impression that our communication is not dependent on something as extraneous as a voice. There is a more immediate insinuation of what she says into my consciousness; she articulates my writing hand. (IS:97.)

These words of the frame narrator in Brink's *Imaginings of sand* could be interpreted in a number of ways. In the first place they might simply be applied as a rhetorical device introduced by the author to facilitate the narration by eliminating intrusive quotation marks and inconsistent switches between the telling and writing modes. As such it creates a momentum that is not constantly broken by markers such as "she said" or "I asked". This awards the narrative origo the license to reformulate, intrude and interpret the stories told by Ouma Kristina from a "silent" position in the text, which foregrounds the narrative itself.

More importantly, however, the passage provides a clear illustration of the operation of impostulation. As Ouma Kristina comes to “speak” through Kristien’s “writing down” of the narrative<sup>51</sup>, the narrative origo takes on qualities of both these characters. In the process of actualising the narrative in the interpretative dimension, the reader is therefore required by the contract of impostulation to impostulate a narratee who becomes narrator or at least writer, while actively participating in the construction of the narrative. What the reader impostulates is therefore the voice of Kristien informed by Ouma Kristina’s narrative focalised through Kristien. In this impostulation the words, but also the gestures, attitudes, cynicism, irony and so forth of characters are dramatised into and through and from the narrative origo in *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, which is created around the projection and characterisation of a narrative origo behind the façade of the first-person narrator, Kristien.

It should be evident that the merging of two voices in the narrative origo in the above passage makes it difficult to discern the proprietary relationships in and around the text. There are fewer straightforward markers that identify words as belonging to the author (in the form of authorial intrusion), narrator, a particular character, or culture, ideology, and so forth. As a result it also becomes difficult to judge whether the traces of irony to be found in the text at these points were intended by the author.<sup>52</sup>

Nevertheless, the contract of impostulation requires the reader to activate and blend all these textual aspects with personal and extratextual features that all become part of the narrative origo from, through and into which the narrative is impostulated.

---

<sup>51</sup> The reference here, as in a number of other places in the novel, to the writing process seems to suggest that the narrative we are reading is written down by Kristien.

<sup>52</sup> This type of dilemma can be seen clearly in Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of darkness* (1899), for example, where distance is created through the introduction of the frame narrator through which Marlow’s narration is mediated. The dilemma is even more prominent in his *Lord Jim* (1899) where an “omniscient” narrator, a number of embedded narratives, and epistolary narration (in the last part of the novel) are impostulated, complicating the construction of the narrative origo. Virginia Woolf’s *To the lighthouse* (1927) and *Jacob’s room* (1922) impostulate even more complicated narrative origos as the “boundaries” between the different characters and focalisation through them are less evident.

Brink denies having translated (in the traditional sense) from one language and text into another language and text, stressing that the two texts came into being in a symbiotic relationship where the writing of the one constantly influenced the (re)writing of the other (Brink, 2000). Still, these two texts do offer a parallel "corpus" and as such an analysis of the shifts between them in terms of focalisation in particular and impostulation in general could provide useful information in the context of this study. In an interview during 1996, Brink (in Basbanes, 1996) made the following statement on the relationship between his parallel texts: "Sometimes the differences are a matter of nuance or punctuation, but other times there are whole episodes in one book that are not in the other, because they don't quite work in one, but they are absolutely necessary in the other." Although these reasons provided by Brink are undoubtedly true on a conscious level, it remains to be seen whether they also apply to other, perhaps more subtle differences, such as shifts in focalisation between the two texts.

The fact that both these texts can be regarded as source texts (continually replacing and re-placing each other as source text) implies that they can both be regarded as "autonomous" texts, which renders the differences between the impostulation of the narrative origo in the two texts particularly interesting. It could further be argued that it becomes irrelevant whether they can be labelled translations in the conventional sense of the word. What does remain relevant, is the fact that there is a relationship between the two texts, even if this is not a relationship of master to slave or prior to subsequent, original to translation. The point I would like to make is that musings on the relationship of "original" to "translation" or "source" to "target" text become less significant if we assume the stance adopted by Derrida in viewing "original" and "translation" as depending on each other. However, since the two texts can be regarded as rewritings of each other (almost in an intratextual manner), a study of the dynamics of the gaps and traces revealed in a comparison would still be significant for a study on literary translation precisely because of the macrotextual impact of the microtextual shifts.

In addition, even when there are no visible shifts on the microtextual level, there are differences on the macrotextual level as a result of shifts in the impostulated

narrative origo. Before proceeding with the analysis of the shifts at the different levels of the novel, the structure of the novel will now be analysed in more detail.

#### **4.1.1 The impostulatory structure of *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele***

Although the main concern of this study is not to analyse the narrative composition of the novel in detail, but rather to comment on the significance of subtle shifts in focalisation for the process of translation/rewriting, it is important to establish the macrotextual parameters within which these shifts occur. This is also important in providing the basis for an extrapolation of principles that can be applied in the translation of narrative texts in general.

The narrative complexity of Brink's *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele* contributes to a contemporary perspective on a history of South Africa. This perspective serves both to comment on the build-up to the historical 1994 general elections in South Africa as experienced by the frame narrator, Kristien, and to provide an unconventional history (very clearly intended as a herstory<sup>53</sup>) of South Africa through the perspective of her grandmother, Ouma Kristina.<sup>54</sup> At the same time, the impostulatory levels present a number of examples of different modes of impostulation in narrative texts, that, although not fixed categories of impostulation, will serve to provide some structure to the analysis in this chapter.

*Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele* can be divided into two primary impostulatory levels. The first level of impostulation is Kristien's frame narrative, which seems to be a more or less conventional first-person narrative in the narrative present that constitutes roughly two thirds of the novel. This level presents a narrative of history-in-the-making in the frame narrative and deals with the events leading up to the 1994 elections as seen through the eyes of Kristien, the frame narrator. The second

---

<sup>53</sup> For this reason, the term "herstory" will be used throughout to refer to the rewriting of history from a female perspective. The term "(her)story" or "(her)stories" will refer to the individual stories about the women included in Ouma Kristina's herstory.

<sup>54</sup> This is supported by Wenzel (2001:4) in her statement that "by moving away from realism, [Brink] explores the boundaries of fiction, myth and history in his latest novels by creating a type of meta-history".

main level of impostulation is embedded in this frame and contains the impostulation of a series of (her)stories and her-itage still anchored in the narrative present by virtue of the link to the frame. This level of impostulation includes modes such as conventional first-person retrospective narration (in Kristien's own story), omniscient or third-person narration (in Ouma Kristina's introduced narrative), and second-person narration (in the quoted dialogue).

The second, framed narrative level treats history primarily as text in which Ouma Kristina's "story-spinning intermingles the intimacies of family romance with the intricacies of history" (Hopkinson, 1996:45). Plummer (1996) similarly calls attention to the trend in Brink's later novels to "view of history as fabrication, as he has come to embrace the historiographical theory of Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault and Hayden White. The "story" of history is not found embedded in the events, but is made by the historian, and superimposed on to them retrospectively".

Brink (1996b:20) views history, "even in the more traditional sense of the word, [to be] not only composed of texts (written and otherwise), but ... also strung together from silences". In this novel he achieves a subversion of a patriarchal view of history by presenting us with Ouma Kristina's matriarchal perspective, a perspective normally silenced by the patriarchal perspective. In Brink's (1996b:22) own words,

the compulsively narrating grandmother, mouthpiece of a long line of silent and/or silenced women in South African history, no longer relies on 'evidence' or "references" of any kind: her narratives are their own *raison d'être* and derive from the individual's need to insert her/himself, through storytelling, within the larger contexts of space and (historical) continuity.

However, Ouma Kristina's herstory is not simply a subversion of the history constructed from a male perspective. Brink (1998b:33) points out that simply to "replace a patriarchic discourse with a matriarchic approach still respects the patterns and the model that informed the original narrative ... The past cannot be corrected by bringing to it the procedures and mechanics and mind-sets that originally produced our very perception of the past". In *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele*, Brink attempts to escape this conceptual "trap" primarily through the self-conscious awareness of language and the imperfections of memory impostulated in the narrative origo. This self-conscious narration largely depends

on, and also marks, the focalisation in the novel. Since focalisation can be viewed as a central impostulatory technique through which the reader imbues the text with narrativity, the variable focalisation in the novel contributes greatly towards exposing these silences and traces. Consequently, this aspect of the text has to be treated with particular care by the translator.

The **frame impostulation** or **direct impostulated narrative** (anchored in the narrative present) moves along a chronological line in the period prior to the 1994 general elections in South Africa. It begins with Kristien's return from self-imposed exile with the purpose of rescuing Ouma Kristina's (her)stories for posterity, as well as to rediscover a sense of identity. It concludes with the funeral of Kristien's sister Anna and her family, as well as Kristien's decision not to return to London. In this frame the narrative origo is impostulated around Kristien as a disillusioned, cynical liberal who rediscovers her identity and heritage through the events in this frame. In this frame, Kristien as primary impostulatory agent is characterised through a number of deictic and subjective markers as well as by means of various backflashes (analepses) to her childhood and incidents in her social and political development, including key incidents from her period of self-imposed exile in London. This frame chronology is further interrupted by a number of metatextual markers as well as one episode of sustained metatextual impostulated narrative, Chapter 4 of Part 1. Through these metatextual markers, an intimate relationship is impostulated between the narrator and the reader, also by means of deixis and subjectivity.

The unconventional journey through Ouma Kristina's (her)stories likewise impostulates the narrative origo and forms the **second level of impostulation**, providing an (at times magical-realist) impostulation of Kristien's maternal lineage. It spans a chronology from Kamma/Maria (or Maria-Kamma) in the early colonial history of South Africa in the eighteenth century up to the narrative present of the frame impostulation. This impostulated level can be divided into three further levels in order to facilitate a discussion of the shifts in focalisation within the embedded level. Two of these are brief (her)stories (two and four chapters respectively), of Kristien and Ouma Kristina themselves, that take the form of **quoted dialogue** or



**impostulated direct speech** (in the case of Ouma Kristina's (her)story) and **retrospective direct impostulated narrative** (in the case of Kristien's own (her)story). The remainder of the framed impostulation takes the form of **introduced impostulated direct narrative** (where the voices of Kristien and Ouma Kristina blend in varying degrees) and deals with the herstory of Kristien's forebears. Against the background of the theory of impostulation in this study, these levels should not, however, be regarded as distinct and mutually exclusive. A continuity obtains between the different levels that is supported by the fact that each level is activated through the impostulated narrative origo in both the presentational and interpretative dimensions of impostulation.

Table 1 shows the overall structure of the narrative in terms of the different levels of impostulation whereas Table 2 presents this structure graphically:

Table 1: Overall impostulatory structure of *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*

Part, Chapter	Frame [Frame impostulation]				(Her)stories [Embedded impostulation]						
	Direct impostulated narrative – narrative present		Metatextual impostulated narrative		Retrospective direct impostulated narrative		Introduced impostulated direct narrative		Quoted dialogue/ impostulated direct speech		
	SK	IS	SK	IS	SK	IS	SK	IS	SK	IS	
I, 1-3 <sup>55</sup>	(15-30) <sup>56</sup>	(3-15)									
I, 4			(31)	(16)							
I, 5-18	(32-88)	(16-61)									
II, 1-7	(91-116)	(65-85)									
II, 8									(116-130): Kristina [7]*	(85-95): Kristina [7]	
II, 9	(130-131)	(97)									
II, 10 II, 11							(131-139): Petronella [5]; (139-143): Ragel [6]	(97-105): Petronella [5]; (105-108): Rachel [6]			
II, 12-14									(143-153): Kristina [7]	(108-116): Kristina [7]	
II, 15							(153-164): Louisa [8]	(116-125): Louisa [8]			
II, 16	(164-166)	(125-126)									
III, 1	(169-180)	(129-136)									
III, 2					(181-189): Kristien [9]	(136-143): Kristien [9]					

<sup>55</sup> In the rest of this study, the uppercase Roman numeral will refer to the relevant part in *Imaginings of Sand/Sandkastele*, and the numbers following these will refer to the chapters in this part.

<sup>56</sup> The numbers in round brackets refer to the page numbers. The numbers in square brackets refer to the chronological position of the woman in Kristien's lineage.

III, 3-4	(189-197)	(143-149)								
III, 5					(197-206): Kristien [9]	(149-157): Kristien [9]				
III, 6-10	(206-227)	(157-174)								
III, 11-17							(227-252): Kamma/ Maria [1]	(174-193): Kamma/ Maria [1]		
IV, 1-2	(255-266)	(197-206)								
IV, 3-6							(266-282): Samuel [3]	(206-219): Samuel [3]		
IV, 7-11	(283-295)	(219-229)								
V, 1-7	(299-345)	(233-270)								
V, 8-12							(345-374): Wilhelmina [4]	(270-294): Wilhelmina [4]		
V, 13	(374-376)	(294-295)								
VI, 1	(379-382)	(299-301)								
VI, 2-3										
VI, 4-6	(390-413)	(308-326)								
VII, 1-8	(417-446)	(329-351)					(382-390) Lottie [2]	(301-308): Lottie [2]		

Table 2: Levels of impostulation in *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*

	I: 1-3	I: 4	I: 5-18	II: 1-7	II: 8	II: 9	II: 10-11	II: 12-14	II: 15	II: 16	III: 1	III: 2	III: 3-4	III: 5	III: 6-10	III: 11-17	IV: 1-2	IV: 3-6	IV: 7-11	V: 1-7	V: 8-12	V: 13	VI: 1	VI: 2-3	VI: 4-6	VII: 1-8	
<b>F R A M E</b>																											
Direct impostulated narrative																											
Metatextual impostulated narrative																											
Retrospective direct impostulated narrative																											
Introduced impostulated direct narrative																											
Impostulated direct speech																											

Chapters from these sections were selected for translation and comparison.

Table 1 and Table 2 illustrate the fact that the bulk of the narrative consists of the frame impostulation, mostly in the form of direct impostulated narrative from the narrative present, with the only sustained exception being Chapter 4 of Part I, which consists of a brief stretch of metatextual impostulated narrative. The embedded level, or (her)stories, consists mainly of introduced impostulated direct narrative in which the lives of the women in Kristien's lineage are impostulated, with two chapters of retrospective direct impostulated narrative in which Kristien's (her)story is impostulated, and two sections of quoted dialogue or impostulated direct speech in which Ouma Kristina's (her)story is impostulated.

However, this merely provides a general outline of the structure of impostulation in the novel, which, like most narrative texts, cannot be classified this neatly. The mode of impostulation referred to in the classification provides a macrotextual analysis or an indication of dominant modes of impostulation that are often interspersed with other modes.

## 4.2 Levels of impostulation in *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*

### 4.2.1 Frame impostulation

The frame impostulation is the predominant impostulatory level in *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*. In terms of the general aim of this study to investigate the role of focalisation in the translation of narrative texts, this level is particularly significant since it is most clearly related to the parameters of real-life experientiality and storytelling (see Fludernik, 1996). Obviously, markers in second-person and third-person narratives will differ from those in this kind of first-person narrative, but I nonetheless argue that the basic framework of impostulation will remain the same. Impostulation after all implies that the extratextual figures of author and reader share the responsibility for actualising the narrative, and are therefore the only impostulators.

Consequently, the conventional distinctions between first-person, second-person and third-person narratives as well as between omniscient and limited narrators do not necessarily fall away, but at least become less significant. This is primarily the case since the narrative origo is constructed around the narrator, but the narrator is not the narrative origo. Through focalisation as impostulatory technique, the orienting frame is created by means of markers of deixis, subjectivity and characterisation (not of characters and narrators only, but ultimately of the narrative origo).

The narrative is therefore anchored in the frame impostulation, which provides a narrative origo and frame from, through and into which the narrative is actualised. In *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*, this narrative origo is impostulated around Kristien in the frame impostulation, which consists mostly of direct impostulated narrative in the narrative present, but is interspersed with metatextual impostulation that establishes a relationship of confidentiality with the reader.

#### 4.2.1.1 Direct impostulated narrative

Table 3: Frame impostulation: direct impostulated narrative (narrative present)<sup>57</sup>

Part, Chapter	SK	IS
I, 1-3	pp. 15-30	pp. 3-15
I, 5-18	pp. 33-88	pp. 16-61
II, 1-7	pp. 91-116	pp. 65-85
II, 9	pp. 130-131	p. 97
II, 16	pp. 164-166	pp. 125-126
III, 1	pp. 169-180	pp. 129-136
III, 3-4	pp. 189-197	pp. 143-149
III, 6-10	pp. 206-227	pp. 157-174
IV, 1-2	pp. 255-266	pp. 197-206
IV, 7-11	pp. 283-295	pp. 219-229
V, 1-7	pp. 299-345	pp. 233-270
V, 13	pp. 374-376	pp. 294-295
VI, 1	pp. 379-382	pp. 299-301
VI, 4-6	pp. 390-413	pp. 308-326
VII, 1-8	pp. 417-446	pp. 329-351

##### 4.2.1.1.1 Introduction

The focalisation at this level of the impostulation is of central significance to the translation of the novel since any shifts that occur on this level in terms of focalisation will impact on the impostulation from, through and into the narrative origo (see 3.1). As mentioned in 3.2.2, impostulation is premised on the relationship between the presentational and interpretive dimensions of impostulation and also concerns the macrotextual creation or projection of a narrative origo.

At a macrotextual level, the narrative origo functions across all levels of impostulation and therefore any microtextual shifts in the frame will also impact on the macrotextual impostulation of the narrative origo for the embedded levels. For example, if the narrative origo is here impostulated as more formal in one text, the focalisation often presents more distance between the events and the origo from, through and into which they are impostulated, a distance that will also influence the

---

<sup>57</sup> Although only the first and last sections of each level were selected for microtextual analysis, Table 3 to Table 7 provide the page references for each level of impostulation for purposes of reference.

---

distance in the embedded stories. For the purpose of extrapolating from the analysis of the various markers of focalisation to a general theory for the translation of narrative texts, the impostulatory level has to be defined more clearly.

As indicated in section 3.8, direct impostulated narrative can be defined as narrative impostulated within the parameters of real-life experientiality related to naturally occurring storytelling situations (also including the epistolary and diary modes, traces of which can be found in the novel). As such the impostulation at this level in the novel is related to a narrative present (Kristien's experiences in the week before and directly after the 1994 elections) linked to a particular chronology that is interrupted by and interspersed with analepses as well as by moments of metatextuality in which cognitive frames are activated. However, the markers of metatextual impostulation could also point to an impostulated actual present, hinting at a narrative situation where the narrator is impostulated as reflecting retrospectively on the events of the frame narration. It is essential for the translation of the text to identify the points at which these subtle shifts occur in order not to detract from the complexities of the text in the translation – even if the nature of the complexities evinced in gaps and traces cannot be reproduced fully or in the same manner.

According to Mauranen (2000), "metatextual expressions are seen as a category that can at least in principle **be separated from the propositional content of the text**, and their characteristic functions are to **organise the ongoing text and guide the reader's interpretation**" (my emphases). This therefore emphasises the interpretive dimension of metatextual impostulation. The presentational dimension of metatextual impostulation, as well as its relation to discourse markers, is emphasised in Traugott's (1995:6) statement that discourse markers "allow speakers to **display their evaluation not of the content of what is said, but of the way it is put together**, in other words, they do metatextual work" (my emphasis).

Since any further categorisation and theorising on when exactly the narrative is to be impostulated in relation to the narrative present or predominant time of narration would contribute little to this study, these markers will be tagged as markers of



metatextual impostulation in which a personal relationship between Kristien and the reader is impostulated (through a confidential tone).<sup>58</sup>

In *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele* the direct impostulated narrative consists of the chronology of events that starts with Kristien in the plane some hours after taking off from Heathrow and progresses up to Kristien's final meeting with the late Ouma Kristina in the family graveyard. This frame provides the backdrop for the second level of embedded or framed impostulation as well as for the narrative origo from, through and into which the rest of the novel is impostulated. The narrative origo constructed around the character of Kristien as first-person impostulatory device or first-person narrator, depends largely on the impostulatory technique of focalisation (evident primarily in markers of subjectivity and deixis). The impostulation of this origo is, in turn, central to the projection of the framed impostulations since it provides the frame within which each event and character is impostulated. The frame provided by the narrative origo therefore takes on a distinctive "personality" not only as a result of the focalisation indicated by markers of subjectivity and deixis (i.e. sensory-cognitive orientation), but also of the (consequent) characterisation.

Furthermore, the framed or embedded narration also informs the frame narration. The markers of time, space, person and discourse deixis are fairly straightforward and provide the parameters for the imaginary projections within which the characters and events are impostulated.

The markers of subjectivity through which the ideological, emotional and cognitive dimensions of the origo are impostulated further support these deictic markers. Markers of social deixis in this frame also play a pivotal role in terms of the impostulation of the "personality" of the narrative origo, particularly in establishing the register and idiosyncrasies of the narration. Before the markers of focalisation at this level of impostulation are investigated, the level will now be analysed macrotextually in order to provide the basis for the microtextual analyses.

---

<sup>58</sup> Markers of metatextual impostulation will therefore be defined as all those markers that draw attention to the organisation of the utterance rather than the content of the utterance. In other words, these markers draw attention to the structuring of the discourse from a position outside the narrative present in the case of the frame impostulation in this novel.

#### 4.2.1.1.2 Macrotextual analysis

The frame narrator, Kristien, is first impostulated in Part I ("The return/Die terugkoms") as contemplating the reasons for her sudden return to South Africa, which she had left eleven years earlier for London (in self-imposed exile). From the very first page Kristien is impostulated as disillusioned, self-ironical and assertive. Although interspersed with brief retrospective and metatextual episodes (including the brief metatextual impostulated narrative in I:4), this frame predominantly constitutes direct impostulated narrative.

The extensive foundation in the frame characterises Kristien as narrator, as well as her perspective on (and experience of) the socio-political context, her family, and recent history. Kristien's characterisation also contributes to the characterisation of the narrative origo, which further includes various extratextual aspects (also those contributed by the reader in the form of prior knowledge, experience and ideology). Primarily, the narrative origo is impostulated as subjective yet detached from the immediate context of the narrative present, although Kristien is impostulated as gradually growing towards a closer involvement.

Structurally, the frame consists of large sections of direct impostulated narrative in the beginning (the first 25 chapters from I:1 to II:7, excluding I:4), middle (five chapters from III:6 to III:10 and 12 chapters from IV:7 to V:7) and end (11 chapters from VI:4 to VII:8) of the novel. All of these sections are anchored in the narrative present. The rest of the frame consists of brief spells (between one and two chapters at a time) in between the different (her)stories in the imbedded impostulation, where the frame moves to the background and merely serves to link the individual stories and sustain the momentum of the macrotext. This structure applies to both texts and will be discussed in more detail in the subsequent paragraphs.

In the first stretch of direct impostulated narrative, the focalisation is centred mainly on Kristien's encounter with the country of her youth, after the distancing experience of 11 years of self-imposed exile. As a result, the focalisation includes not only the impostulation of the narrative present, but also that of the various aspects that

impact on this impostulation, such as memories, emotions, rationalisations and various sensory-cognitive inputs.

The impostulation commences with Kristien on the plane, contemplating the reasons for her return. The events during this flight provide an anchor in the narrative present as Kristien's memories of the distant and more recent past are impostulated. In the very first chapter her relationship with her parents is introduced, along with vivid recollections of Ouma Kristina and her house on the farm in the Karoo. Chapter 2 impostulates a fairly sustained analepsis concerning Kristien's memories of the farm and the house as well as Ouma Kristina. These memories provide an overview spanning the period from her first memories of the house, through her childhood, to the day she saw it for the last time before leaving. Only in the final lines does the impostulation return to the narrative present on the plane with: "And here I am on my way back to her. But will she still be there? And what has remained of the house itself?" (IS:11); "En hier is ek nou op pad terug. Maar sal sy ooit nog daar wees? En wat sou oorgebly het van die huis?" (SK:25). This chapter therefore not only impostulates the importance of this house to the narrative that is to follow, but also the trepidation with which the narrator regards it.

Chapter 3 sees another shift in time, to the more recent past – the phone call from Anna bringing news of the attack on Ouma Kristina and a brief retrospective impostulation of the life with Michael that Kristien leaves behind when she returns to South Africa. This analepsis provides the motivation for and background to her return. During this episode there is also a brief prolepsis to (and metatextual impostulation of) the deaths that are to follow: "(If I were to have known what I was heading for – not that single death but so many; and my role and responsibility in all of it – would I have pressed on regardless? It seems inconceivable. And yet – )" (IS:14-15). This type of metatextual impostulated narrative clearly moves outside of the narrative present and as such outside of the frame of direct impostulated narrative. Other seemingly similar impostulations, such as "Unfinished business. God, how much of it have I accumulated in my life. But I have to face it. I'm a big girl now" (IS:15) are once again part of the level of direct impostulated narrative in

---

the narrative present. These subtle differences in focalisation are easily confused and present an example of the difficulties facing the translator.

Interestingly, the above prolepsis is not present in SK. This omission impacts subtly on the impostulation of the narrative origo in that this particular deictic relationship with a marker of metatextual impostulation becomes a silence and remains exclusively in the narrative present in SK. The second example above occurs as follows in SK: "Onafgehandelde sake. Storie van my lewe. Maar dis tyd dat ek dit in die oë staar. Ek is mos nou mooi groot." (SK:31.) The shift from "God, how much of it have I accumulated in my life" to "Storie van my lewe", likewise impacts on the impostulation of the narrative origo, creating a similar effect, yet with a distinctly different social register. As will be shown below, these markers of social deixis differ in the two texts, resulting in the impostulation of different narrative origos, which, in turn, emphasise the macrotextual differences between the two texts.

After the brief metatextual chapter (I:4), which we will return to in section 4.2.1.2, Chapter 5 returns to the narrative present with Kristien's arrival at the airport outside George where she is met by Anna. The rest of this first section of direct impostulated narrative in the narrative present (the 21 chapters up to II:7) impostulates Kristien's arrival and experiences of the country she left 11 years ago and the focalisation of everything that has changed and everything that has remained disconcertingly the same. Apart from impostulating the setting, characters and context in general, this initial section sets up the parameters for the impostulation of Ouma Kristina's narratives about Kristien's lineage.

As the first embedded impostulation is approached, the scene is prepared through the impostulation of the house as pervasive presence, filled with memories and history, but also with the presence of the wounded stranger in the basement. The stranger serves as a reminder of the unpleasant socio-political "reality" outside the house, while at the same time emphasising Kristien's uneasy relationship with this country.

In terms of chronology, the herstory of Kristien's lineage is impostulated starting with Ouma Kristina and her mother, Rachel/Ragel (II:8; II:12-14; II:11), the latter's mother Petronella (II:10), and Kristien's mother Louisa (II:15), before turning to Kristien (III:2; III:5) – in other words, the more recent members of the lineage. After the first venture into herstory with the quoted dialogue or impostulated direct speech of Ouma Kristina (where her own (her)story is begun together with that of her mother, the mysterious Rachel/Ragel – see 4.2.2.2), the impostulation returns to the narrative present in II:9. Here the house is again impostulated as something approaching a character in this (her)story. This brief interlude brings the narrative back to the narrative present and impostulates Kristien's subjective perspectives and emotions through a focalisation of her awareness of the sounds of the old house. It also serves as the introductory part of the next (her)story concerning Petronella and Rachel/Ragel, which is impostulated at the level of introduced impostulated direct narrative (see 4.2.2.3).

Following the introduced impostulated direct narrative in which Louisa's (her)story is presented, the narrative surfaces again in the narrative present and the impostulated "reality" outside Ouma Kristina's stories. The last chapter of Part II provides a summary and mental stocktaking as Kristien's response to these fantastical tales is impostulated, reinforcing the impostulation of the narrative origo:

- ... but what used to be stories has suddenly begun to **coalesce into** a history, hers, ours, mine ... the exaggerations of a mind on the threshold of death, or a vision of some **deeper darker** truth? Does it matter, does it make any difference? I have listened to her, I have written it all down, I've appropriated it, claimed it as my own. And the stories, history, mingle with the stream of events that has **carried** me through the past day ... And what am I doing here, **in the midst of it all**, drawn into a vortex of a history I'd prefer to deny? (IS:125).
- ... maar alles wat vroeër pure storie was, nou **ingeweef in** 'n geskiedenis, hare, ons s'n, myne ... die oordrywings van 'n gemoed op die drumpel van die dood, of dalk die visioen van 'n **groter** waarheid? Maak dit saak? Maak dit verskil? Ek het na haar **gesit en** luister, ek het dit neergeskryf, ek het my dit alles toegeëien, nou is dit myne. Al die stories vermeng met die stroom gebeurtenisse wat my deur die afgelope dag **meegesleur** het ... En wat soek ek hier, **betrek by dit alles**, ingesleep in die kolk van 'n geskiedenis wat ek liever sou ontken? (SK:165-6).

This passage (in both texts) provides markers of focalisation that serve to impostulate the narrative origo with an acute awareness of the tension between fact

and fiction, between story and history<sup>59</sup> and of a sense of estrangement. In spite of the fact that the two passages seem to be at least functionally equivalent, a closer investigation of markers of focalisation reveals subtle shifts that not only alter the characterisation of the narrative origo, but impact on the macrotext. The narrative origo in both texts is here impostulated in the narrative present (through the use of temporal deixis), which evidently follows on the writing down of Ouma Kristina's stories. However, the more specific "ek het na haar gesit en luister" in SK is also a marker of spatial deixis different from the "I have listened to her" in IS, resulting in a stronger contrast between the recent past and narrative present in the prior.

Also, Ouma Kristina's stories in IS "begin to coalesce into a history" whereas those in SK are "nou ingeweef in 'n geskiedenis" (now/closely woven into a history). The difference is more than that between active and passive, but impacts directly on the macrofocalisation. The fact that "nou" can be interpreted as either the temporal deixis contained in *now* or the subjective *closely* further emphasises the gaps and traces in the text that (will) affect translation.

Likewise, the difference between the markers of subjectivity in "some deeper darker truth" and "'n groter waarheid" [a bigger truth] is not only one of degree, but renders the focalisation in IS more gloomy than that in SK, providing as it does a bigger gap between exaggeration and truth. On the other hand, in IS the events "carried" Kristien through the previous day whereas she was "meegesleur" [swept along] by the events in SK. The above two examples combine to impostulate a slightly stronger emphasis on the stories in IS and on the events of the recent past in SK.

The return to the narrative present continues in III:1 with the impostulation of the narrative origo as Kristien and Anna are characterised in turn, with the focalisation of Anna modified through the impostulation of Kristien's response to the newly discovered complexities in her sister. This is juxtaposed with Kristien's characterisation, which becomes the next (her)story in retrospective direct

---

<sup>59</sup> According to Plummer (1996), "[e]ver since Brink put down his avant-garde *Sestiger* palette and turned his eye to real political events in *Looking on Darkness* in 1973, there has been a tension within his conception of history – corresponding to the ambiguity of the very word – between history as an invented story and history as actual events."

impostulated narrative in III:2 and III:5 (see 4.2.2.1). This (her)story is once again interrupted by a return to the narrative present and the unfolding of the events on the farm as well as the impostulation of Kristien's further experience of and response to the country that has changed so much since her youth. Whereas the first of these two retrospective episodes impostulates the build-up to Kristien's self-imposed exile, the second impostulates her experiences in London.

The next five chapters (III:6-10) return to the narrative present once again and impostulate the building tension of a country on the brink of historic socio-political change before building up to Ouma Kristina's next series of (her)stories. As Kristien is increasingly drawn into the present conflict, the narrative origo is also impostulated in less objective terms. The most obvious difference between the two parallel texts in this section of the novel is the impostulation of Trui. The strong culturally marked language variety (or social deixis) in SK becomes much more neutral in IS, also impacting on the characterisation of Kristien in response to Trui. As a result the historical power relations between races in South Africa is impostulated as less pronounced in IS.

Also in terms of focalisation, this section provides a number of markers that result in the impostulation of a different narrative origo in each text. Just one example of this is the marker of subjectivity in SK, namely: "(*'Loeloeraai?*' het die **Boerebimbo** agter die toonbank gevra. 'Nee, jammer, **dame**. Maar ons het 'n mooi boek oor **Bybelraaisels**.)'" (SK:224.) In IS we find: "(*'Lulu who?*' the **assistant** had asked. 'No, sorry, **Miss**, but we do have a nice book on **leopards**.)'" (IS:171.) Not only is the value-laden "Boerebimbo" in SK a more neutral "assistant" in IS, but the "mooi boek oor Bybelraaisels" (which provides indirect characterisation from the narrative origo concerning this Afrikaner) is simply "a nice book on leopards", which is once again more neutral and devoid of any specific social markers.

The rest of the novel alternates between only two levels of impostulation: the direct impostulated narrative in the narrative present, and introduced impostulated direct narrative where Ouma Kristina's tales about the herstory of their family are impostulated. Whereas the stories in the first half of the novel deal with the more

recent women in the lineage, those in the second half go further back in history, starting with the first woman, Kamma/Maria, followed by the third, Samuel, the fourth, Wilhelmina, and concluding with the second, Lottie (see 4.2.2.3).

In this second half of the novel the narrative structure seems to settle into a pattern as the frame narrative starts building towards the climax and *denouement*. In Parts IV, V and VI the last three (her)stories are framed by the first and last chapters in the narrative present before Ouma Kristina's death at the end of Part VI.

Part IV begins with the following words, marking the impostulation of a metatextual awareness informing the narrative origo:

- Adrift in the present. Thoughts on waking: how disconcerting to discover that there is nothing real about the present, that it can be grasped only after it has already slid into the past. From moment to moment it eludes me. I write: I get up, I look through the window, the shadows of clouds move across the landscape. But what I ought by rights to be writing is: I write that I get up, look through the window; I write that the shadows of clouds move across the landscape, and even as I write it is no more. Sooner or later I shall write: Ouma is dying – but she will already be dead. I write: Today we'll have to bring the coffin down ... (IS:197).
- Verdwaal in die hede. Gedagtes met die wakker word: hoe onthutsend om te ontdek dat daar niks werkliks omtrent die hede is nie, dat mens dit eers beetkry nadat dit reeds verby is. Van oomblik tot oomblik ontwyk dit my. Ek skryf: Ek staan op, ek kyk deur die venster, die skaduwees van wolke beweeg oor die veld. Maar wat ek na regte behoort te skryf, is: Ek skryf dat ek opstaan, dat ek deur die venster kyk, dat daar skaduwees van wolke oor die landskap skuif; en selfs terwyl ek skryf, bestaan dit nie meer nie. Vroeër of later sal ek skrywe: Ouma is aan die doodgaan, maar dan sal sy reeds dood wees. Ek skryf: Vandag moet ons die doodskis van die solder af bring ... (SK:255).

This metatextual awareness that draws attention to the writing process, which is separate from the narration, is of course still part of the narrative present and not quite on the level of metatextual impostulated narrative as in I:4. The narrative levels here become particularly complicated and could be presented as something like: Brink **writes** Kristien to **say** what she **is writing** and that she **should be writing** that she **is writing what she is writing**. In terms of impostulation, however, the author/reader simply impostulates a particular state of mind/awareness in a character/narrator. This state of mind or metatextual awareness is a focalisation



marked by deictic as well as subjective markers that serve to impostulate the narrative origo from, through and into which the narration is actualised.

The very first sentence, which is marked subjectively, already provides a difference in focalisation. Although both sentences impostulate a sense of being lost in the present moment, the "verdwaal" (lost) of SK does not impostulate the same sense as the "adrift" in IS. Both senses are accompanied by an overwhelming helplessness, but the metaphorical content of "adrift" emphasises the fluid and unknowable, anchorless nature of the experience of the present moment, whereas "verdwaal" has a metaphorical content that emphasises the complexity of the experience of the present moment. After all, being adrift leaves one with little option other than waiting, whereas being lost still means that one keeps on actively searching for landmarks, with at least the option of moving into the unknown. It should be evident that this minor shift between the two texts provides a different angle to the focalisation.

Here in the central section of the novel, Kristien's sense of existential anguish is still impostulated as very acute, as she searches not only for meaning in her life, but also for a sense of reality. Her encounters with various ghosts from the past are impostulated in juxtaposition to the ghosts in Ouma Kristina's (her)stories. Somehow the memories of her childhood, young adulthood and exile become intertwined with the narrative present in her encounters with Casper/Kasper and Sandile as well as her increasing involvement with the socio-political present. As Ouma Kristina's penultimate (her)story is approached, Kristien seems to be moving towards a sense of identity at the same time that the events in the frame narrative steer towards a climax – in fact, the very fabric of Ouma Kristina's stories is intended to provide Kristien with a sense of identity. According to Wenzel (2001:6), "Ouma senses Kristien's confusion, her lack of direction and historical awareness. She wants to leave her granddaughter with a legacy of hope and the only way she can do that is to give her back her 'memory'".

Ouma Kristina's two final (her)stories are only interrupted by two brief chapters in which the narrative present is impostulated and in which the historical climax of the

elections is approached. The relatively short final (her)story (that of Lottie) concludes the herstory of Kristien's lineage before the parallel plot of the elections draws to a close with Kristien in the booth:

- Almost without noticing it the booth has become very crowded. We're all here together, ... Mother; Ouma ...; Rachel ...; Petronella ...; Wilhelmina ...; Samuel ...; Lottie ...; Kamma ... And a host of others, shadows whose names I don't even know, but who are here. Here is my cross. Kristien Müller her mark. And damn the rest (IS:314).
- Amper ongemerk het die stembokkie propvol geword. Hier is ons almal bymekaar, ... Ons: Ma en haar stem; Ouma ...; Ragel ...; Petronella ...; Wilhelmina ...; Samuel ...; Lottie ...; Kamma ... En baie, baie ander, 'n ontelbare menigte, skaduwees wie se name ek nie eens ken nie, maar wat hier by my is. Hier is my kruisie. Kristien Muller haar merk. En te moer met die res (SK:398).

This symbolic moment impostulates Kristien's moment of truth in the narrative present as Ouma Kristina's (her)stories all come together. Once again the social deixis in the last sentence impostulate a difference in register between the narrative origos in the two texts, with SK impostulating a coarser narrator than IS.

The rest of the novel after Ouma Kristina's final (her)story remains in the mode of direct impostulated narrative in the narrative present. Ouma Kristina's death at the end of Part VI is impostulated as a logical conclusion and everything but an end. In Part VII the need for the (her)stories has passed and all that remains is the final impostulation of the narrative present as Kristien's coming to terms with her role and identity is impostulated amid the aftermath of the tragedy. The single pervading presence of the historic elections slips to the background.

The focalisation in this section mirrors the rediscovery of Kristien's identity through Ouma Kristina's herstory. The disillusionment and cynicism that are so obvious in the impostulation in the first five parts of the novel and that start to diminish in Part VI, are replaced by an impostulated confidence, peace, sense of belonging and maturity. The narrative origo impostulated in the final chapters retains a sense of irony, but without the bitterness evident in the first chapters. The penultimate chapter ends with the following episode:

- Casper's brother, the one who joined me in church, comes back to me to offer me an arm. He must think I am too overcome by grief to follow the others. But

there is no need to offend him, and to explain will take too long. I accept his arm (IS:350).

- Kasper se broer, die een wat in die kerk voor by ons kom sit het, kom terug om my sy arm aan te bied. Hy dink seker ek is te oorstelp van hartseer om agterna te kom. Maar ek wil hom nie aanstoot gee nie; en om te verduidelik, sal veels te lank duur. Ek neem sy arm (SK:445).

The markers of subjectivity in this direct impostulated narrative in the narrative present impostulate the change in Kristien, but could also mark a persistent patronising tone and as such an ironic impostulation. In this chapter as well as in the final chapter, which consists of a magical realist episode where Kristien has her final conversation with the departed Ouma Kristina, a sense of optimism is impostulated in Kristien in spite of the daunting task that lies ahead.

The level of direct impostulated narrative (the frame impostulation), therefore mainly presents the focalisation through Kristien of South African history, but the impostulation of this focalisation from, through and into the narrative origo also relies on the reader's prior knowledge, experience and perceptions. It also includes Brink's attempt to impostulate a politically correct focalisation of history from a female perspective, giving a voice to those who have been denied a voice in the patriarchal history of the country. However, the fact that Brink necessarily approximates this from his own male perspective, creates a number of gaps and traces surrounding the narrative origo that complicates the task of the translator.

In terms of the frame impostulation, the translator therefore has to remain aware of the macrotextual elements related to focalisation in order to address the complexities of the narrative. This does not only have to be done for purposes of consistency in the translation, but also in order to avoid reducing the various aspects of focalisation inherent in the impostulation. This metatextual background, however, has to be matched continuously with the microtextual markers of focalisation and impostulation in general.

In the following paragraphs, the markers of impostulation (markers of deixis, subjectivity and characterisation as well as other markers of focalisation) in the parallel text will therefore be analysed in more detail at a microtextual level. In order

to do this without becoming too repetitive, only four chapters will be analysed in this fashion. Part I: Chapter 1 and 5 will be analysed in IS and Part VII: Chapters 7 to 8 in SK. After this analysis, the focalisation in the two parallel texts will be compared with each other as well as with my translation (based on the microtextual analysis).

#### **4.2.1.1.3 Microtextual analysis**

##### **Part I: Chapter 1**

This chapter is extremely important on both macrotextual and microtextual levels. In terms of the macrotext, that part of the narrative origo related to Kristien that determines the focalisation through her is introduced. Both the temporal and spatial orientation and the cognitive orientation (concerning the reasons for and response to the return) are impostulated against the background of the events in the claustrophobic setting in the narrative present. The juxtaposition of the static and the dynamic is captured in the image of Kristien "squeezed between two bulging businessmen" (IS:3) while she is "[h]urling through the night" (IS:4) in the plane, and becomes a metaphor for her state of mind. On the one hand she is trapped between conflicting emotions in a crisis of identity, as well as between the past and the present, while on the other hand Ouma Kristina's pending death "hurls [her] headlong home" (IS:4), almost involuntarily, but as a force she cannot resist.

At the microtextual level, this temporal-spatial and cognitive orientation is marked by means of markers of deixis, subjectivity and characterisation. The focalisation in this chapter is predominantly impostulated through Kristien, although the narrative shifts continually between the narrative present, metatextual present, recent past in relation to the narrative present, and past or more distant past in relation to the narrative present. There are also moments of hypothetical focalisation impostulated through other characters (although focalisation still primarily takes place through Kristien in the narrative present). This high frequency of shifts in focalisation primarily serves the purpose of foregrounding the characterisation of the narrative origo and can be related to the juxtaposition referred to above. These shifts further serve to impostulate the various orientations of the narrative origo.

The impostulation is plunged into the narrative present with "*A big girl now*" (IS:3), which becomes a refrain in the novel as Kristien's journey of self-discovery is presented. Here the phrase is impostulated in the narrative present as an as yet meaningless string of words. The first sentence marks the focalisation through Kristien in terms of deixis with temporal ("from the moment" and "took off"), spatial ("plane" and "from Heathrow") and person ("my") deixis.

The subsequent phrase, "The great return" (IS:3), is likewise marked as self-reflexive focalisation through Kristien, but this time metatextually in relation to the narrative present. This marker largely consists of gaps and traces impostulated precisely through a lack of deictic markers, which renders the phrase outside of the narrative present with a sense of self-irony being impostulated in the narrative origo.

This sense of self-irony persists in the next marked sentence where markers of self-reflexivity are combined with markers of subjectivity in the adjective "tumultuous", verbs "slinking", "held out" and adverb "unyielding". In turn, the self-irony provides a marker of indirect characterisation into the narrative origo, which could be impostulated as ironical and disillusioned.

"Then this phone call" (IS:3) impostulates focalisation into the recent past, with the marker of discourse deixis ("Then this") orienting the focalisation towards an undisclosed phone call that postpones the disclosure of the content of the call, creating a gap the reader cannot yet fill.

The markers of subjectivity in "assigned to a narrow fate on the plane, squeezed between two bulging businessmen" (IS:3) impostulate the orientation of the narrative origo by means of focalisation that contributes to the sense of being trapped, not only physically on the plane, but also emotionally and psychologically. The markers of subjectivity in the description of the actions of the two men ("suggesting moistly", "feigning sleep" and "attempts to slide his hand") again impostulate this narrative present against which background Kristien's contemplation on the reason for her return is impostulated.

The self-reflexivity in "it dawns on me that I am actually on my way home. Or **whatever is now to pass for home**", momentarily removes the narrative from the narrative present in metatextual focalisation. The same applies to the markers of subjectivity in the statements that "Ouma Kristina is, has always been, different", "Thank God Ouma's practical sense prevailed" and "he retreated in disgust and pretended I hadn't happened" which provides a moment of hypothetical focalisation related to Ludwig, Kristien's father (IS:3). These markers of subjectivity in turn act as markers of characterisation (both direct and indirect from the narrative origo). In these markers a number of things are impostulated, such as Kristien's relationship with her grandmother (the "different" seems to be impostulated as positive in this first mention of her name) as well as with her father (which is markedly less positive).

"I became no-nonsense Kristien" is marked as self-reflexivity that provides direct characterisation into the narrative origo. This quality focalised through Kristien is developed throughout the novel in the metatextual moments as well as in the metatextual I:4. Another example is the metatextual and self-reflexive "Death has this way ... of concentrating the mind". The focalisation of the past contained in the brackets in this metatextual statement provides markers of subjectivity: "(in the narrow attic above Gough Square where I went with Michael, the insipid light spilled on the floor like too-weak tea, on the day we became lovers)" (IS:3-4). In this analepsis there are a number of markers that impact on the focalisation. First of all there are the markers of temporal deixis ("went" and "on the day we became lovers"), spatial deixis ("above Gough Square") and person deixis ("with Michael"). Furthermore, the subjective markers ("insipid" and "like too-weak tea") impostulate cognitive orientation that again impacts on the impostulation of the narrative origo in impostulating a tendency towards poetic and figurative language.

The self-reflexivity evident in "But it isn't death as such that hurls me headlong home" is supported by the markers of temporal, spatial, person and discourse deixis ("But" and the h-alliteration). These microtextual markers support the macrotextual conflict in Kristien, who is impostulated as trying to figure out why she cannot resist the force that draws her home. This conflict is supported by the question "Then why succumb, now, to Ouma?" (IS:4) which is intensified by the impostulated knowledge

that she merely accepted the inevitability of her parents' deaths and that this looming death cannot be accepted as such. The phrase "Not 'hardening my heart'" marks the focalisation through Kristien of her family's attitude. This is evident in the use of quotation marks which foregrounds this misappropriated Biblical sentiment. These markers of self-reflexivity also serve as indirect characterisation into the narrative origo in that Kristien is impostulated as going against the norm in her responses to her parents' deaths, and now the pending death of Ouma Kristina (regarded by Anna with the same lack of involvement as Kristien regarded the former deaths).

The self-reflexivity that marks Kristien's cognitive and emotional response to and conflict with her parents and Ouma Kristina is continued in the next marked segments. Here the focalisation continues to deal with her response to her return: "Coming at a time when everything is supposed to be returning to whatever in that remote place is regarded as normal? ... a possibly fatal choice?" (IS:4.) Although still anchored in the narrative present, these segments have a metatextual quality and again impact on the impostulation of the narrative origo, foregrounding the trepidation with which Kristien returns. The words "supposed to be", "whatever ... is regarded as normal" and "possibly" all mark not only the self-reflexivity, but also a subjective orientation from and characterisation of the narrative origo. Kristien's emotional distance from her destination is impostulated in "that remote place", again emphasising her inner conflict as she is "hurtled" towards Ouma Kristina and the place and events that will shape the rest of the novel, a place to which she swore never to return.

Metatextual statements such as "It is the kind of experience that provokes memory" (IS:4) and "The loss of innocence" (IS:4) together with the earlier "Death has this way ... of concentrating the mind" (IS:3-4) also impostulate the characterisation of the narrative origo. Through the technique of focalisation in these markers of metatextuality, Kristien is characterised in this chapter as prone to philosophical statements, impostulating a narrator (and therefore also a quality in the narrative origo) that takes herself very seriously in spite of the self-ironical undertones. Another example is the metatextual "How easily eleven years can be peeled from one, a shift stripped smoothly from an unresisting body, leaving me naked,

approaching death." (IS:4.) The markers of self-reflexivity once again impostulate the narrative origo in focalisation through Kristien, who is impostulated here as slightly morose and very much under the impression of the transience of life.

The "two bulging businessmen" (IS:3) Kristien has to deal with provide the impostulation with a sordid and superficial anchor in the narrative present that is in stark contrast with the inner conflict and reflection that informs most of the rest of the chapter. In this focalisation through Kristien as liberated female voice, South African men are characterised (although of course impostulated also by the male author) as shallow, conceited, and licentious. This juxtaposition between their superficial invasions of her privacy and her calm and collected response therefore emphasises the reflexive nature of the focalisation through Kristien. After the initial moist suggestion in her ear by one of the two, the rest of the episode is presented as follows:

- Fending off the encroaching hand from my right thigh as I become aware of another on my left, moving with Tarquin's ravishing strides towards his design ...
- The two male hands, resolute, mindless, are converging across my separate thighs: the predator on my left adorned with a carbuncle of a ring, the other sprouting small tufts of black bristles between stubby joints ...
- These little piggies going to the market ...
- ... in what they must interpret as the sign of ultimate surrender (I am female flesh, I may be invaded)
- I count three before the message reaches the two sets of intertwined fingers which then withdraw in unseemly haste. One of my neighbours hisses venomously in my ear. "Bitch" is, as far as I can make out, the word used. Afterwards I am allowed to rest in peace (IS:4).

These segments, which constitute the narrative present (marked by means of temporal deixis in the use of the present tense), display a high frequency of markers of subjectivity and announced subjectivity. Furthermore, there are a number of traces of hypothetical focalisation. As a result the impostulation is highly subjective and characterises the narrative origo by means of focalisation through Kristien.

Brink seems to be impostulating a confident and liberated woman who can hold her own against obnoxious men (an impostulation that is central to the narrative origo in the rest of the novel and to the rewriting of a patriarchal history as a herstory). However, Kristien's way of outwitting and humiliating the two men can also be



interpreted as an almost too obvious attempt by a male author to speak out on behalf of women.<sup>60</sup>

The same applies to the impostulation of the episodes concerning menstruation (Kristien's account of her first period in this chapter as well as Ouma Kristina's hoarding of the evidence of her menstruation over the years). As an exclusively female experience, it becomes a central metaphor in the rewriting of history in the novel from a female perspective. In the following episode, which consists of an analepsis to Kristien's childhood (marked in terms of temporal and spatial as well as person deixis), her relationship with Ouma Kristina is impostulated:

- I was not yet thirteen – when I ran indoors ... to raise my dress and show Ouma my soaked panties, the only grown-up I would ever dare to share it with: "Ouma Kristina! I'm bleeding inside, am I going to die?" Calmly, efficiently, she took charge.
- ... withdrew with me into her own bedroom, sacrosanct to all but me, to "fit me out" in bouts of giggles interspersed with solemn and amazing confidences. *You're a big girl now* (IS:4-5).

Apart from the self-reflexive "I would ever dare to share it with", the markers in this segment are mostly markers of subjectivity as the focalisation is impostulated retrospectively through Kristien. These markers of subjectivity are also markers of indirect characterisation both into the narrative origo (i.e. regarding Kristien and her relationship with Ouma Kristina – which is central to the novel's macro-impostulation) and from the narrative origo (in terms of Ouma Kristina's imposing character). This episode therefore provides the basis for the relationship that forms part of the reason for Kristien's return and which also impostulates the combined role of these two women in the narrative origo for the (her)stories.

The final words above, "You're a big girl now", take up the refrain introduced in the first words of the novel and as such present a marker of discourse deixis that provides a context for the statement. The fact that these words, like the first, are in

---

<sup>60</sup> I am all too aware of the irony in this statement, being made by a male on another male's attempt to speak out on behalf of women. Nevertheless, the significance of this irony is that it emphasises the presence of various gaps and traces (not only those related to gender) in any text, which have to be taken into account in translation. Plummer (1996), another male, likewise deconstructs Brink's feminist agenda when he says that, "coupled with the feminist message of this novel are depictions of women that are anything but feminist".

italics, and not in inverted commas to indicate quoted dialogue, further renders them metatextual. Although they can be impostulated as being uttered by Ouma Kristina after "fitting Kristien out", that context is made less obvious as the utterance becomes part of the narrative present, impostulated through Kristien rather than Ouma Kristina.

The above episode in this chapter is preceded by:

I escape to memories of Ouma, to **memories of memories** ... "How come you remember so much?" I asked her once, years ago, interrupting the flood of stories. She merely smiled, her mouth a deeper fold among so many others (even when I was a small girl she was already incalculably old). And said, "I am a very ordinary person in most respects, Kristien." A lie, and she knew it as well as I. "But in one respect I know I am extraordinary. My memory. You're right. I have an amazing memory. At times I even surprise myself. I can remember things that never happened." (IS:4.)

The self-reflexivity in the first sentence is anchored in the narrative present although it signals both the analepsis that is to follow and an element of metatextuality. The remainder of the passage presents the analeptic episode (marked subjectively) which impostulates the importance of memory and Ouma Kristina's unconventional take on memory. This is an important characterisation from the narrative origo that informs all the subsequent (her)stories and in particular the tension between story and history, fact and fiction.

Another important aspect concerning the menstruation episode, is the focalisation through Kristien of the painting depicting a "naked man gazing untroubled at the spectator" (IS:5). This image becomes inseparable from Kristien's memories of that day. The bracketed exclamation, "(Mother, for God's sake, you should put that thing away, the children are growing up)" (IS:5) could be impostulated as Louisa's words, remembered by Kristien (hinted at in the markers of person deixis, "Mother," "you" and "the children"). The words also serve to characterise Ouma Kristina (her rebellious nature) and Louisa (her contrasting conservatism). The fact that the words are not explicitly attributed to Louisa creates a gap, which has to be filled through impostulation and which could just as well be impostulated as hypothetical focalisation through Kristien, which would render it announced subjectivity.

The rest of the analepsis (again marked by means of temporal and spatial deixis), presents the focalisation through Kristien (evident in markers of subjectivity such as “towering incongruous house”, “like a mirage”, “provocative” and “mystery of my bleeding”). The painting is also imbued with life in her impostulated memory through the personification marked by “witnessing”, which introduces another hypothetical perspective on the events:

On that afternoon amid the clutter of her shaded room deep inside the towering incongruous house that sat like a mirage on the white, hot plains, somehow the provocative picture on her dressing table witnessing the mystery of my bleeding became involved with my feeling for her; and if the riddle remained it was not because the naked man had no name or history but because *she* chose to keep the secret (IS:5).

In this retrospective narration, Ouma Kristina’s enigmatic and unconventional character is impostulated through markers of self-reflexivity, but also subjectivity and announced subjectivity (“if ... not because ... but because *she* chose ...”). This characterisation from the narrative origo continues in the self-reflexivity of the more metatextual statement: “Her stories always resolved everything, without disturbing the miraculous nature of the world. Which is why I could never have enough of them.” (IS:5.)

Apart from the first sentence and the episode involving the two businessmen, the narrative in this chapter is also anchored deictically in the narrative present by the isolated “Hurling through the night, Africa invisible below but omnipresent” and “Now; here” (IS:4). The self-reflexivity of these words further impostulates Kristien’s awareness of her physical position in time and space as well as the conflicting emotions she experiences.

The final two paragraphs of the chapter are also impostulated in the narrative present (marked by temporal deixis in the use of the present tense), but take the form of a hypothetical address to Ouma Kristina (marked by person deixis in the use of the second-person pronoun):

– Ouma Kristina, tell me about ... If it won't senselessly prolong your agony, please stay alive until I'm home. I'm on my way back, after these many years. I haven't forgotten, you'll see. I'll listen to every single story you wish to tell me: don't let them die with you. I'm coming home, to whatever remains of that improbable castle in the desert. I'm coming, you'll see. I am a big girl now (IS:5).

The markers of self-reflexivity in this passage complete the introduction to and motivation for Kristien's return and also impostulate the importance of the (her)stories in terms of Kristien's self-discovery.

The first chapter therefore provides a number of essential markers at the microtextual level that establish the impostulation of the narrative origo in the predominantly self-reflexive focalisation through Kristien. In terms of focalisation, it remains important to keep in mind that this chapter, like the two subsequent chapters that consist predominantly of retrospective impostulation, is anchored in the narrative present. Therefore, the markers of retrospective and metatextual focalisation still form part of the impostulation of the narrative present and Kristien's state of mind as she is approaching the uncertain future events in South Africa.

### **Part I: Chapter 5**

After the analepses in I:2 and I:3 and the metatextual I:4, this chapter continues the exposition of the first chapter in the narrative present. The predominant self-reflexive impostulation in the first chapter is replaced in this chapter by predominant subjectivity and announced subjectivity.

The first sentence once again provides a number of deictic markers to locate the focalisation in terms of time, space and person: "Anna is there to meet me at the pretentious little airport outside George." (IS:16.) In this chapter the focalisation through Kristien is again heavily marked in terms of subjectivity, already obvious in the subjective "pretentious little airport" in the opening sentence.

After this deictic orientation, the narrative turns to the recent past with an account of the last part of Kristien's journey and concluding the sub-plot concerning the businessmen:

In Johannesburg I was swiftly deserted by my two surly companions. One was swept up in the crowd; the other, the textile man with the ring, Mr Tarquin, I happened to see again as we emerged from Customs and he stepped into the enthusiastic collective embrace of a woman and two teenage daughters. I could not restrain myself from sidling up to him and taking him by the arm. "Thanks again," I said. "For everything." I patted his hand. "Do keep in touch. You've got my number." I walked off with my scruffy suitcase, followed by their silence (IS:16).

This passage continues the indirect characterisation into the narrative origo as Kristien is impostulated as confident, strong and not above mischief. The disempowerment of the men also reinforces the female assertiveness that becomes the foundation for Ouma Kristina's (her)stories as well as Kristien's self-discovery. The focalisation through Kristien is evident in the markers of subjectivity (the modifiers "swiftly", "surlly", "scruffy" and "enthusiastic") as well as self-reflexivity (in "I could not restrain myself" and "followed by their silence"). These markers reveal Kristien's orientation towards the other characters as well as her self-awareness.

The impostulation of Kristien's experiences at the anything but glamorous airport in Johannesburg is likewise indicated by markers of subjectivity in modifiers such as "dingy", "haphazardly and intermittently", "inattentive", "presumably" and "mercifully". The self-reflexivity evident in the metatextual marker in "– the persistence of memory –" (IS:17) again serves to impostulate Kristien's tendency towards self-irony that characterises the narrative origo. Since this sense of self-irony establishes Kristien's role in the narrative origo, particularly also in the introduced impostulated direct narrative where it becomes difficult to distinguish between her voice and that of Ouma Kristina, this characterisation is extremely important for the translation of the novel.

Unlike the first chapter, the impostulation in this chapter is mostly situated directly in the narrative present as Kristien's rediscovery of her family and the country she grew up in is impostulated. The return to the narrative present after the brief analepsis to the recent past is clearly marked in the deixis in "And here I am, here she is" (IS:17).

The focalisation of Anna through Kristien is clearly marked in the following passage:

At first I do not even recognise her and walk right past her ... Can eleven years make such a difference? This tired, shapeless person surrounded by what seems like innumerable children: is this the sister once held up to me as the model of all I should but never possibly could be? (IS:17.)

The markers of subjectivity, self-reflexivity and even announced subjectivity all contribute to the impostulation of the distance between the two sisters. As such the markers also contribute towards the characterisation (both direct and indirect) of Anna from the narrative origo. Kristien's reaction to Anna and her children is also

impostulated by means of markers of subjectivity in “wetly kisses me”, “swarming brood” and “to be pummelled and mauled and drooled upon”. The focalisation is further evident in the gaps and traces surrounding the metatextual “ever since what happened in London I’m intimidated by children” (IS:17), which also provides markers of direct characterisation into the narrative origo. The gaps and traces produced by this statement also become important in the impostulation of Kristien’s relationship with her sister as well as in her pervading sense of guilt.

In the impostulation of Kristien’s first interactions with her sister after so many years, the narrative origo is characterised repeatedly through markers of self-reflexivity and announced subjectivity impostulating a narrator aware of the subjective nature of her perceptions. Some examples are:

- I **could not restrain myself** from sidling up to him ...
- ... **but whether I should read envy or disparagement** into her voice is **difficult to tell** (IS:17)
- I say, **as neutrally as possible** (IS:17).
- Look at you now, I **feel like saying; but I cannot hurt her so** (IS:18).
- ... with **what I take to be** a touch of resentment (IS:18).
- “You look good too,” I say **perfunctorily** (IS:18).
- I **restrain myself to say as neutrally as possible** (IS:18).
- ... as I’d **rather hoped she would** (IS:19).
- “Ouma isn’t dead yet,” I **interrupt her with a flash of anger** (IS:19).
- ... **not to offend her, merely to remind** her (IS:19).
- I **stop** to let the memory find its way (IS:19).
- I **stopped, contrite** (IS:19).<sup>61</sup>

In all these examples Kristien is impostulated as self-aware in her narration, marking the narration as unreliable. The fact that most of these markers contain elements of self-reflexivity in relation to the narrative origo has the result that the narrative origo is characterised indirectly in terms of Kristien’s emotional qualities, foregrounding the focalisation further. The announced subjectivity also marks the indirect characterisation of Anna from the narrative origo in the focalisation through Kristien.

---

<sup>61</sup> The deictic inconsistency in the last two examples above (“stop” in the first and “stopped” in the second) presents a slight problem since both markers seem to refer to the narrative present. This inconsistency could, however, probably be regarded as a *bona fide* error and need not complicate the analysis unnecessarily.

The high frequency of markers of subjectivity as well as self-reflexivity in the chapter, particularly in relation to the dialogue between Kristien and Anna, emphasises the difference between the two sisters as well as the focalisation through Kristien. Just some of these markers are:

- ... she darts a **calculating** look at my hand (IS:17).
- Anna **makes no attempt at all** to impose even **the semblance of discipline** on their **tumultuous** ranks; it is **clear that she has given up** (IS:17).
- ... she **blushes briefly, grates the gears, then explains emphatically** (IS:18).
- ... **but attacking Anna is like pummelling a pillow** (IS:19).
- ... she says **impulsively, a brief brightness** in her voice (IS:19).

These markers create a strongly subjective focalisation as Kristien is impostulated as attempting to come to terms with her conflicting emotions towards her sister. This conflict is evident in, for example, "the recollection brings a **new warmth of sympathy** for my sister, **but it is tinged with anger** too ...". In her self-discovery, Kristien is impostulated as constantly trying to come to terms with those aspects in her sister that remind her either of herself, or of the situation she tried to escape when she went into self-imposed exile.

This chapter evidently serves to provide a basis for the relationship between Kristien and her sister while at the same time characterising both, mainly through social deixis evident in the language used, as in Kristien's description of the dresses Anna used to wear with "necklines practically down to her clitoris" and her comment, "I cramped your style ... I suppose I was a real pest.". It is also evident in Anna's dialogue, for example her perspective on the socio-political situation: "I tell you, the whole country is in a mess" and her attempt to compliment Kristien with "You look so – smart" (IS:18).

Other markers of characterisation into the narrative origo include Kristien's "as always putting my foot in it" (IS:18), which impostulates her as rather less careful in what she says, although the markers of self-reflexivity seem to contradict this. The contrast between the two sisters as well as the conflict between the direct characterisation into the narrative origo (Kristien's perception of herself) and the indirect characterisation into the narrative origo (what is revealed about Kristien through her words and actions) contribute to the impostulation of the narrative origo.

This becomes important in the impostulation of the (her)stories where the narrative origo is complicated by the merging of Ouma Kristina and Kristien, which in turn presents problems for the translator. In other words, bearing these macrotextual elements of the focalisation in mind could assist in addressing the microtextual elements in translation.

The impostulation of the trip from the airport (first the mountains and then the plains beyond) at the end of this chapter turns away from the cognitive and emotional markers related to Kristien's relationship with her sister. Here the focalisation through Kristien involves physical experience of the landscape and the emotional impact it has on the narrator. In this passage the narrator's self-awareness is less self-ironical. For a moment the socio-political situation and the conflict between Kristien and her sister shift to the background and the landscape is foregrounded:

- The town falls away behind us as we enter the dark mountains. There is a sharp fragrance of pine. I turn down the window; a gust from the sea, far below, comes washing over us.
- It has been many years since I last drove along this pass, but it all comes back as forcefully as that reminder from the sea. The sensation, not of following the contours of the mountains, but of moving right into them, enfolded by their moist immediacy, the rich darkness of their colours, the many greens, the blacks and browns and near-reds, the intimation of secret bird and animal life, clusters of virgin forest in deep folds, glimpses of thin white cataracts.
- Already I anticipate the next stage. This I will never get used to: the suddenness with which the mountains drop back as one is thrust out on the high plateau beyond. I almost gasp as the high light breaks over us, with a ferocity my eyes are no longer used to. Nothing gentle or attenuated here: all is brutally immediate (IS:19-20).

The markers of subjectivity together with markers of temporal and spatial deixis provide focalisation based on sensory experiences that become intertwined with memories. Through this, the narrative origo is further characterised as Kristien is impostulated as being acutely aware of her surroundings and the impact they have on her in spite of her long absence.

After this focalisation the impostulation takes on a metatextual quality with "And we, too, become part of this ancient writing, a story whispered among the others in the wind ... A space in which mirage becomes a condition and a starting point (IS:20). This, along with the subsequent focus on Ouma Kristina and the importance of the landscape to her and other women in their lineage, not only emphasise the



importance of story and the tension between fact and fiction, but also provide an important key to the narrative origo that will be the centre of the (her)stories to follow: "This has always been Ouma Kristina's landscape. If one looks hard, and for long enough, they will appear, **I know ...**" (IS:20.) These and similar examples create a narrative origo through which the conflict between fact and fiction is impostulated.

Anna's response to Kristien's relating of one of Ouma Kristina's enigmatic stories, "A rather stupid question I must say" (IS:20), clearly reveals more about her through indirect characterisation from the narrative origo than it does about Ouma Kristina's stories. This is reinforced in the last lines of the chapter:

"Is that it?"

"What more do you want?"

"Really Kristien." She stops. "We're here." (IS:21.)

In this chapter the narrative origo in IS therefore takes on a number of qualities through the impostulation of focalisation through Kristien; qualities that create a number of gaps and traces and that impact significantly on the translation of the text. These microtextual gaps and traces, after all, contribute to the impostulation of the narrative origo on a macrotextual level with the result that the subtleties in focalisation have to be accounted for in translation. Kristien is, for example, impostulated in a slightly different light here than in the first chapter where she was impostulated mainly as self-ironical, disillusioned and filled with trepidation. Here the complexities in terms of her relationship with Anna, combined with her experience of the landscape, contribute to the characterisation of the narrative origo in terms of conflicting emotions as she is impostulated as struggling to come to terms with her surroundings and the events that are unfolding. To ignore this change in the narrative origo, or to remain oblivious of it, would create the danger of losing the complexities in the narrative in translation.

## **Part VII: Chapter 7**

As indicated above in the macrotextual analysis of the frame, the need for the (her)stories has passed in Part VII and therefore the final part of the narrative remains in the recent past and narrative present without any major interruptions.

The focalisation also mirrors the rediscovery of Kristien's identity – mainly through Ouma Kristina's preceding (her)stories but also very forcefully in Anna's family murder. Kristien is further impostulated as having attained a sense of identity and peace as well as a better understanding of her role amid the turmoil of the events in the country, particularly after the death of her family (she is now the only remaining member of her family and also the last of the female line).

In VII:2 this self-discovery becomes evident as Kristien finally (on discovering the horrible scene of the multiple murder) understands the riddle she told Anna on the day of her return:

- A woman came from the desert of death to ask, "Do you know what I've come to tell you?" The answer, I now knew, was neither yes nor no. The only possible answer was before me, inside me. It was silence. I think I thought: This is the inevitable consequence of Ouma's stories ... nothing, nothing is innocent (IS:332).
- 'n Vrou het uit die woestyn van die dood gekom om te vra: "Weet julle wat ek julle kom vertel het?" Die antwoord, dit het ek nou uiteindelik gesnap was nóg ja nóg nee. Die enigste denkbare antwoord was hier voor my, binne-in my. Dit was stilte. Ek dink ek het gedink: Dit is die onvermydelike konsekwensie van Ouma se stories ... niks, niks is onskuldig nie (SK:421).

The role of silence in the narrative mirrors the importance of silences in any text, any narrative or translation/rewriting. These silences form an important part of impostulation and as such of all narrative texts. The self-reflexivity that predominates in the final part of the novel as Kristien comes to a sense of identity is also evident in the above example in the statement "I think I thought"/"Ek dink ek het gedink". In these final chapters Kristien is impostulated as less convinced of the fact that she is control, yet, for that very reason, more in touch with herself.

In VII:2 the self-reflexivity of the narrator is also emphasised in the following words:

- En nou, 'n week later, is dit byna onmoontlik om te onthou wat ek gedink het. Wat ek ook al mag probeer sê, **sal waarskynlik** die leegte van daardie nag **deurmekaar laat loop** met die verwarring wat agterna gekom het (SK:421).
- It is almost impossible, now, a week later, to recall my thoughts; whatever I try to say about it **may be confusing** the blankness of that night with the jumble that came afterwards (IS:332).

Here, awareness is once again impostulated in Kristien that her narration is unreliable and wholly subject to what she remembers. The difference in markers of self-reflexive impostulation between “sal waarkynlik” [will probably] and “may be” [mag] is also that the self-reflexivity in SK more clearly questions the reliability of Kristien’s memory in the narration of the events.

The markers of impostulation in the two final chapters provide a clear indication of the change in the narrative origo. These chapters will now be analysed in SK, on the one hand since that text was taken as the source for my translation, and on the other hand to provide a basis for comparison between the parallel texts.

VII:7 returns to the narrative present after the analepsis to the recent past and events in the week preceding the funeral (in other words since the elections and murders, significantly, on the same day). As in I:5 above, the focalisation is again located through deictic markers (spatial, temporal and person) in the first sentence: “Sam Ndzuta staan aan my linkerhand by Ouma se graf” (SK:441), linking up with the first paragraph of the first chapter of Part VII.

Although the chapter is anchored in the narrative present, the narrative, as in the first chapter, contains a number of metatextual markers that remove it from the narrative present briefly. In this chapter, the markers of subjectivity predominantly point to announced subjectivity and self-reflexivity and less to subjectivity. In fact, the only overt markers of subjectivity relate to the magical realist birds at the funeral:

- Bo-oor ons hang 'n **skynbaar** roerlose wolk van voëls en werp 'n skaduwee oor die hele plaas (SK:441).
- Die voëls begin wegbreek uit die wolk wat hulle gevorm het. In 'n **groot brander van geluid** kies hulle koers in alle windrigtings, kom weer terug, duik laag oor ons af, voer **verstommende** kantelduike uit tot op die rand van die grafte. swiep dan weer boontoe, 'n **asembenemende show**. Die meeste mense staan so en afkyk ... dat hulle dit **oënskynlik** nie eens gewaar nie (SK:443-4).

In these markers of subjectivity, Kristien’s isolation from the rest of the people at the funeral is foregrounded. As in the beginning in the hospital, the birds have significance only to Kristien and this focalisation provides the impostulation with a supernatural element that transcends the surface reality of the funeral. The clear markers of subjectivity also foreground the focalisation as Kristien’s captivation by

the performance of the birds is impostulated, in contrast to the horror she has already come to terms with.

At the same time, the juxtaposition of the birds with the eight open graves emphasises the surreal nature of the funeral, also evident in the markers of self-reflexivity that provide a metatextual focalisation: "Agt grafte. Die kop kan dit nie vat nie. Dis soos 'n wolkekrabber: as dit by 'n sekere hoogte verbysteek, het dit niks meer vir die verbeelding te sê nie." (SK:441.) In these markers the narrative origo from, through and into which the events surrounding the funeral are impostulated is awarded a sense of disbelief but also a sense of acceptance as Kristien moves towards understanding the role she has to play.

This chapter has a particularly high frequency of markers of announced subjectivity. Although these markers are generally easier to identify than markers of self-reflexivity and also markers that indicate metatextual focalisation, the net result of the high concentration of these markers is that the narrative origo is defined more clearly. The first passage in which the markers of announced subjectivity are predominant, relates to the difference between Sam's perspective on the funeral and those of the (mostly) white funeralgoers. Here the focalisation is complicated as a result of a hypothetical quality (announced impostulated access to the minds of characters) where Kristien's postulated perspective on the different responses to the family murder is impostulated:

**Ek mag verdwaas wees** deur die blote omvang daarvan, **maar vir Sam** is dit niks nuuts nie ... **Maar vir dié in vandag se skare** het daardie ander begrafnis **anderkant die greep van die geskiedenis verbygegaan. Dit was mos swartes** wat daarby gemoeid was. Afgemaai deur die polisie, deur die "**veiligheidsmagte**"; so nie, was dit slagoffers van black on black violence. Vir hulle is **vandag s'n anders**. Dis 'n **inbuig op die self**. Ek **wonder** of Sam dit sal verstaan en of dit vir hom weer 'n kwessie sal wees van white on white? **Sou** hy beseft dat hy self ook hierby betrokke is? Of **sal** hy reken dat dit hom nie regtig raak nie, soos wat ons vroeër by ons eie **skrikwekkende medepligtigheid** verbygekyk het? (SK:441-2).

In this passage the markers of impostulation also present characterisation from the narrative origo of Sam as representative of revolutionary blacks, and of the whites at the funeral. Evidently the hypothetical nature of the focalisation also provides characterisation into the narrative origo, presenting Kristien as politically aware and somehow in a position to mediate between the two extremes, in spite of the fact that

she includes herself in the group of whites (“**ons eie** skrikwekkende medepligtigheid”) and that she is so obviously critical of the white perspective.

The second passage marked predominantly in terms of announced subjectivity, but also in terms of self-reflexivity, is the analepsis to the recent past when Kristien’s telephone conversation with Michael is impostulated:

**Ek wou nie wreed wees nie; ek weet nie eintlik wát ek bedoel het nie. Ek het maar net gesê** wat daar by my opgekom het: **dat ek nie weet nie, dat ek niks meer omtrent myself kon voorspel nie** ... **Ek dink** ons was albei ewe desperaat om *deur* te kom, mekaar aan te raak, net om weer te weet daar *is* iemand anderkant, ’n hand om aan te raak, ’n skouer om op te huil ... Ons vroeëre reaksies lyk **hiervandaan pateties, selfs obseen** ... **Dit was ’n skok toe ek my dit hoor sê.** Dit was **nie iets** wat ek **deurdink** of **besluit** het nie. **Skielik** was die woorde net daar; en **die oomblik toe ek dit sê, het ek geweet dit is waar.** Dit is **ál waarvan ek seker was**, noudat dit tussen ons gesê is ... **Dit het geklink of hy ’n knie** in die wind gekry het. Vir ’n rukkie was dit **vir my moeilik** om die woorde uit te spreek; maar hulle **moes** gesê word ... **Ek het goed geweet: dis niks so simplisties of afgesaag as** die behoefte om ’n “uitdaging” te aanvaar nie; dit was ook nie om enigiets te “bewys” nie (SK:442-443).

Here the announced subjectivity and self-reflexivity with which Kristien’s memory of the conversation is impostulated emphasise the unreliability of the narrator, but more significantly, indicate the narrator’s impostulated self-awareness and realisation that a gulf has opened up between her and Michael (similar to the gulf that existed between her and Anna when she arrived in the country). This increased self-awareness in the narrative origo also impostulates a development in the narrator from initial disillusionment and cynicism to a sense of belonging and purpose.

The self-awareness evident in the markers of self-reflexivity continues in the metatextual focalisation through Kristien of the meaning of not only the deaths, but also Ouma Kristina’s stories:

En hier waar ek **tussen die grafte staan** ... **weet ek opnuut** dat dit die **regte** besluit is ... Ek het **hierdie plek** gekies: **nie** omdat ek hier gebore is en dit as my **fate** sien om hier te bly nie; **maar** omdat ek weggegaan het, en teruggekom het, en nou uit **vrye keuse** hier is ... En **dié een sal ek nie onteien nie.** **Dis myne** ... **Ja. Ondanks** alles. **Ten spyte van** alles. Dit is **my plek dié** ... Ek het lankal nie meer die jeug se **passionate** geloof in my vermoë om die wêreld te verander nie; maar ek weet ook dat dit verander **kan** word, en dat ek daarby betrokke **wil wees** ... **Veels te lank** het het al die vroue van my stam, van alle stamme, een-een bly seerkry, probeer deurbyt, in die klein bietjie **space** wat die **magtige** manlike heersers van die wêreld aan hulle **toegestaan** het ... Ek verstaan daardie woede: **liewe Here, hoe goed verstaan ek dit nie. Wat ek wil aanpak... Ek wil met ander saamwerk** ...

**Ek weet** dat die hede – hierdie klein vierkantjie vol grafte – **minder werklik is as die moontlike**. Daar is bakens, **points of no return**, wat nie die einde van hoop aandui nie maar die begin (SK:443-445).

As this metatextual focalisation of Kristien's cognitive and emotional response builds to a crescendo of oratory proportions (one could almost hear the applause from the wings), Kristien's character development is impostulated in her growth to acceptance, renewed commitment and optimism. In this chapter the metatextual component develops to such an extent that the plot involving the socio-historical "reality" of the narrative present, as well as Ouma Kristina's (her)stories, is practically drowned out by Brink's impostulation of not only a positive voice in the aftermath of the 1994 elections but also a voice for the empowerment of women in all societies.

The remaining markers of subjectivity again involve a degree of announced impostulated access to the minds of characters, but more specifically announced subjectivity as the focalisation of the undertaker and Casper/Kasper's brother are impostulated through Kristien in the narrative present:

- ... terwyl al die kiste gelyktydig begin sak – tot die **skaars bedekte tevredenheid** van die ondernemer, vir wie dit nie net 'n teken **moet wees** van goedkeuring van Bowe nie, maar **waarskynlik** 'n waarborg vir toekomstige sukses – ... (SK:443).
- Kasper se broer ... kom terug om my sy arm aan te bied. Hy dink **seker** ek is **te oorstelp** van hartseer **om** agterna te kom. **Maar ek wil** hom **nie** aanstoot gee nie; en om te verduidelik, sal veels te lank duur. Ek neem sy arm (SK:445).

In both cases the focalisation impostulated through Kristien indicates a subjectivity that characterises the narrative origo in the gaps and traces surrounding what is narrated. In the case of the undertaker, the focalisation provides a moment of comic relief while simultaneously taking a swipe at the undertaker as representative of Afrikaner men. In the case of Kasper's brother, the focalisation impostulates a similar critique of his male patronising behaviour while also indicating the growth in Kristien as she takes his arm in order not to insult the misguided male.

In terms of deixis, only one type of marker stands out in this chapter, namely markers of social deixis. These markers include "die kop kan dit nie vat nie", "asembenemende show", "in die klein bietjie space ...", all impostulating a narrator

who maintains a fairly relaxed and informal register, a quality that could be associated with her rebellious nature.

### Part VII: Chapter 8

The final chapter of the novel continues the magical realist impostulation contained in some of the (her)stories and in the image of the birds in the frame impostulation. Unlike the previous chapter, however, the impostulation remains in the narrative present apart from the metatextual quality signalled by some of the markers of self-reflexivity.

The magical realist quality of the chapter is evident in the markers of subjectivity and person and spatial deixis in the second sentence (and of course in the fact that Ouma Kristina has already passed away): "**Ouma Kristina** gee 'n yl skynsel af, **nie genoeg** om by te sien nie, **maar darem** om aan te dui **waar sy sit**." (SK:445.) This sets the scene for the focalisation through Kristien of this final conversation with Ouma Kristina and the impostulation of a sense of closure. In terms of Fludernik's (1996) notion of narrativisation, this magical realist impostulation can be interpreted as an imaginary incident projected through Kristien as she reflects on the events that brought her to this nocturnal meeting in the graveyard.

From the markers of self-reflexivity in the metatextual "'n Enkele dood was **dan tóg nie genoeg nie; Oscar Wilde het dit reg gehad**" (SK:445), Kristien's perspective on the multiple deaths is evident. She has come to terms with the horror and in this final conversation with Ouma Kristina she is impostulated as finally understanding the significance of her life and the role she has to play. Her journey of self-discovery is complete: "**Môre** sal ons met die groot skoonmaak moet begin. **Dink aan die toekoms**." (SK:445.) After all, "Die dooies is doodstil. Hulle is nou op my aangewese." Kristien not only has to ensure the survival of the (her)stories, but also has to make sure that the lives of her ancestors meant something.

Before the conversation is impostulated, the focalisation through Kristien of the atmosphere in the graveyard takes on an intensity that complements the spiritual nature of this meeting:

Ek het my op die pou se plek op die muur tuisgemaak. 'n Paar volstruise het op 'n ry teen die naaste draad kom staan, **verspote donker gedaantes** in die nag. By die hek **klikker** 'n paar mahems **vertroulik**. Tussen die bome deur is die paleis **gitswart**. Daar is 'n paar uile in die buurt, en af en toe hoor mens die **vaak gekwetter** van voëls wat **half wakker word** in hul slaap (SK:445).

Kristien's acute awareness of her surroundings is indicated here in the markers of subjectivity that, somehow, also signal a sense of peace.

The self-reflexivity and announced subjectivity in the remaining markers in the conversation again impostulate Kristien's self-awareness as well as the unreliability of the narrator, resulting in the gaps and traces surrounding the narrative:

"Nee!" sê ek **driftig** ... "Totdat daar eendag weer 'n olifant kom en die storie wegblaas?" vra ek, **effens moedswillig** ... **Ek kan nie** haar gesig sien nie, **maar dit lyk tog of sy glimlag** (SK:446).

In this final impostulated meeting Kristien has grown to such a degree of maturity that the words from the refrain by Kristien (started in the very first words of the novel) now conclude the narrative as Ouma Kristina utters them for the first time: "'Omdat jy nou mooi groot is, Kristien.'" (SK:446.)

The final two chapters therefore complete the frame impostulation with a strong emphasis on markers of self-reflexivity as well as announced subjectivity. Consequently, the self-awareness evident in the first chapters where Kristien grapples with her feelings of guilt and tries to justify her return to herself, while hiding her sense of being adrift behind a façade of bravado, is replaced by a self-awareness focusing on her newly-discovered sense of identity. As a result the focalisation through Kristien attains a heavily marked presence in the narrative origo as all the preceding events and (her)stories fall into place. The focalisation in these final chapters therefore impostulates a narrative origo in which not only the (her)stories play a role, but also the events in the frame.

#### 4.2.1.1.4 Comparison: parallel texts and translation

This section aims to analyse the differences that exist between the three texts in terms of the markers of focalisation. The analysis will determine whether these shifts impact on the impostulation in each text to such an extent that the



impostulation of the narrative origo changes, since such changes can be said to impact on the macro-impostulation of each text.

It is to be expected that the impostulation of the narrative origo in IS will differ from that in SK because of the inherent and unavoidable differences that exist between any two languages. Another contributing factor here is that the author, although very proficient in English, is an Afrikaans mother-tongue speaker, which could account for most of the shifts in register between the two texts. However, the differences that arise because of the different language systems remain as important as other differences in impostulation and will therefore be analysed in the same manner.

What also has to be determined in this comparison, is whether those elements pertaining to focalisation identified in the macrotextual and microtextual analyses, are reflected in my translation on the one hand, and in the parallel text on the other.

### Part I: Chapter 1

The very first sentence of the novel already provides a subtle shift in focalisation. Apart from the idiomatic difference between “*A big girl now*” (IS), “*Jy’s mos nou mooi groot*” (SK) and “*Jy’s nou mooi groot*” (JLK)<sup>62</sup>, the sentence structure of the rest of the sentence marks different emphases:

	IS	JLK	SK
(1)	<i>A big girl now</i> , the <b>stupid</b> phrase <b>careering through my head</b> from the moment the plane took off from Heathrow.	<i>Jy’s nou mooi groot</i> . om die een of ander rede <b>maal</b> die <b>simpel</b> frase <b>in my kop</b> al vandat die vliegtuig in Heathrow opgestyg het.	<i>Jy’s mos nou mooi groot</i> : die <b>stupid</b> reël <b>draai</b> nou al <b>in my kop</b> vandat die vliegtuig by Heathrow opgestyg het.

Whereas the two Afrikaans texts seem to focalise an emphasis on the **fact that** the phrase has been haunting the narrator since the plane took off, IS seems to focalise an emphasis on the **phrase itself** as the phrase that has been haunting the narrator since the plane took off. Although all three texts contain markers of self-reflexive

<sup>62</sup> In order to facilitate the comparison, the following measures are introduced:

- The abbreviation JLK refers to my translation of either of the two parallel texts. IS refers to *Imaginings of sand* (1997) and SK to *Sandkastele* (1995).
- The words in boldface in the comparative tables indicate the location of the differences between the three texts.

impostulation, the significance of the phrase itself is therefore foregrounded in IS, and further marked by the lack of person deixis in the phrase. The contrast between “careering through my head” in IS and “maal [al] ... in my kop” in JLK as well as “draai nou al in my kop” in SK also emphasises the impact of the phrase more in IS than in the two other texts.

Although the phrase is revealed as belonging to Ouma Kristina later in the chapter in all three texts, in IS it could at this stage just as well mark focalisation through Kristien (“[I am] a big girl now”), emphasising the sentiment harboured by her and the conflicts of identity with which she returns. Due to the lack of markers of deixis in IS, the phrase therefore has a stronger metatextual quality than in JLK and SK where the “Jy’s” clearly marks it as a second-person utterance. This shift consequently impacts on the impostulation of the narrative origo in that IS impostulates consistent self-reflexivity whereas JLK and SK also impostulate an external (second-person) perspective.

Although the markers of self-reflexivity in IS are mostly also present in JLK and SK, as can be seen in (2)-(6) below, there are a number of important shifts:

	IS	JLK	SK
(2)	But it isn't death as such that <b>hurls me headlong home</b> .	Maar dis nie die dood as sulks wat my <b>holderstebolder huiswaarts sleur</b> nie	Maar dis nie dood as sodanig wat my vandag <b>huis toe bring</b> nie.
(3)	Not “hardening my heart”, merely accepting inevitability.	Nie met 'n “verharde hart” nie, bloot die onafwendbare aanvaar.	Nie deur my hart te verhard <b>soos hulle dit sou gestel het</b> nie; ek het eenvoudig die onvermydelike gevolge van my besluit aanvaar.
(4)	Or is it the fact that she wasn't, when Anna's call came, dead, but dying, <b>which left me with a choice, a possibly fatal choice?</b>	Of is dit die feit dat sy nie, toe Anna se oproep gekom het, dood was nie, maar sterwend, <b>wat my met 'n keuse gelaat het – miskien selfs 'n noodlottige keuse?</b>	Of is dit omdat Anna se oproep gekom het toe Ouma nog nie dood was nie, net sterwend, <b>wat teen wil en dank op my gewete ingewerk het?</b>
(5)	These little piggies going to the market.	<b>Twee</b> klein varkies gaan na die mark.	Klein varkies op pad mark toe.
(6)	... and if the riddle remained it was not <b>because</b> the naked man had no name or history <b>but because she chose</b> to keep the secret.	... en as dit 'n raaisel <b>gebly het was dit nie omdat</b> die kaal man nie 'n naam of geskiedenis gehad het nie, <b>maar omdat sy verkies het</b> om dit geheim te hou.	-

In (2), the sense of irony contained in the markers of self-reflexivity in IS (“hurls me headlong home”) and JLK (“holderstebolder huiswaarts sleur”), is not present in SK where the alliteration and awareness of the speed and inevitability of the return merely becomes “huis toe bring”. The same applies to (5) where the nursery-rhyme rhythm in IS and JLK becomes more neutral in SK. The above examples provide a clear illustration of the impact of the gaps and traces surrounding focalisation in narrative texts that have to be accounted for in one way or another.

The fact that SK is more explicitly marked in terms of focalisation in (3) (with “soos hulle dit sou gestel het nie” instead of the use of quotation marks to indicate hypothetical focalisation as in IS and JLK) retains the self-reflexivity while impostulating a more specific focalisation in this text.

The self-reflexivity in (4), although present in all three texts, also contains a difference in terms of focalisation between IS and JLK on the one hand and SK on the other. In SK the focalisation through Kristien is marked in terms of her conscience and the inevitability of her return, whereas the focalisation in IS and JLK does not impostulate the sense of inevitability but rather the fact that she is now faced with a choice. Furthermore, the focalisation impostulates the sense of trepidation with which she returns rather than the role of her conscience as in SK.

The most obvious difference between the texts in terms of self-reflexivity is present in (6) where SK does not contain the hypothetical focalisation through Kristien of Ouma Kristina’s decision not to elaborate on the identity of the naked man in the portrait. This has the effect of omitting an important impostulation of Ouma Kristina’s characterisation. On the whole, it would therefore appear that the focalisation through Kristien in SK is marked less clearly in terms of self-reflexivity than in IS and JLK. As a result, the sense of self-awareness is more evident in these two texts, thereby also indicating a stronger sense of self-irony.

Another clear example of a shift in focalisation that impacts directly on the impostulation of the narrative origo is present in (7) below where the narrative present on the plane is impostulated rather differently in SK than in IS and JLK:

	IS	JLK	SK
(7)	Only after I've already been <b>assigned to a narrow fate on the plane</b> , squeezed between two bulging businessman ... <b>both drinking steadily</b> ...	Eers nadat ek reeds <b>tot 'n eng lot op die vliegtuig gevonniss</b> is, ingedruk tussen twee lywige sakemanne ... <b>beide fluks aan die suip</b> ...	Eers toe ek <b>my sit op die vliegtuig kry</b> , ingedruk tussen twee lywige sakemanne ... <b>al twee nonstop aan die drink</b> ...

The fact that the sense of being trapped on the plane, signalled by the markers of subjectivity in IS and JLK, is not present to the same extent in SK, renders the focalisation more neutral. This is further supported by the use of the active “ek my sit ... kry” in contrast to the passive, although more subjective, “assigned” and “gevonnis” in the two other texts.

The last part of the above example is marked less clearly as subjective in IS (“drinking steadily”) than the “**fluks aan die suip**” in JLK and “**nonstop aan die drink**” in SK, marked also by means of social deixis. As in much of the rest of the novel, these markers of social deixis through the use of English words and more colloquial language impostulate a less formal narrative origo in the characterisation of the narrator, thereby also impacting on the focalisation.

Examples (8)-(13) are such instances where the markers of social deixis in particularly SK (but also in JLK in (8), (12) and (13)), render the register less formal and as a result impact on the focalisation through the narrative origo:

	IS	JLK	SK
(8)	Ouma Kristina is, has always been, <b>different</b> .	Ouma Kristina is <b>anners</b> ; was dit nog altyd.	Ouma Kristina was nog altyd <b>aweregs</b> .
(9)	I became a <b>no-nonsense</b> Kristien.)	... en ek het 'n <b>common</b> Kristien geword.)	... en met dié is ek nou <b>plainweg</b> Kristien.
(10)	"I am a very <b>ordinary</b> person in most respects, Kristien."	" <b>Ek is eintlik maar 'n doodgewone</b> mens, Kristien."	" <b>Kyk, ek mag 'n baie ordinêre</b> mens wees, Kristien" ...
(11)	... (I'd <b>checked</b> on them, before, over dinner ...	... (het ek vroeër, tydens ete, <b>vastgestel</b> ...	... (ek het etenstyd al <b>gecheck</b> ...
(12)	One of my neighbours <b>hisses venomously</b> in my ear. " <b>Bitch</b> " is, as far as I can make out, the word hissed.	Een van die twee <b>fluister venynig</b> in my oor. " <b>Bitch</b> ," sover ek kan uitmaak.	Een van my bure <b>spoeg 'n skeldwoord</b> in my oor. " <b>Bitch</b> ," dink ek, is wat hy sê.
(13)	Her stories always resolved everything, without disturbing the <b>miraculous</b> nature of the world.	<b>Haar</b> stories het altyd alles <b>opgelos</b> , sonder om die <b>magic</b> van die wêreld te versteur.	Daar was niks wat sy nie met 'n storie kon oplos nie, dog sonder om die <b>magic</b> van die wêreld te versteur.

These markers not only change the register from a more formal register in IS to a less formal register in SK and at times in JLK, but also impact on the characterisation through the narrative origo. In (8), (10) and (13) Ouma Kristina is impostulated as someone who had a tremendous impact on Kristien through her unconventional and eccentric perspective on life. The less formal impostulation resulting from the social deixis in SK (in (8), (10) and (13)) and JLK (in (8) and (13)) results in the impostulation of a more relaxed and intimate relationship between Kristien and Ouma Kristina in the Afrikaans texts while also impostulating a more down-to-earth narrator.

In (9) and (11), Kristien is impostulated as perceptive and, like Ouma Kristina, unpretentious, again more clearly emphasised in SK than in IS, whereas (12) impostulates Kristien's companion as well as the focalisation through her. As a result of the social deixis, however, these qualities are emphasised more clearly in the Afrikaans texts (although JLK at times tends to have a more formal register than SK).

Like the use of "Bitch" in the two Afrikaans texts, the more explicit "die mile-high club te join" in SK, in contrast to the "decamp to a toilet" in IS and "badkamer toe moet gaan" in JLK, impacts on the impostulation of the narrative origo by making the focalisation of the intention of the character more evident. This is supported by the social deixis. This characterisation is continued in (14) and (15) where there are again a number of differences between the impostulation in the three texts:

	IS	JLK	SK
(14)	<b>Fending off the encroaching hand from my right thigh as I become aware of another on my left, moving with Tarquin's ravishing strides towards his design ...</b>	Terwyl ek die <b>verkennende</b> hand van my regterbeen <b>weer en terselfdertyd bewus word</b> van 'n ander op my linkerbeen <b>wat met Tarquinius se verowerende strede in die rigting van sy doelwit beweeg ...</b>	Ek probeer die <b>bewegende</b> hand op my regterbeen in <b>bedwang hou</b> , maar <b>word terselfdertyd bewus</b> van 'n tweede op my linkerknie <b>Michael, wat 'n aanhaling vir elke okkasie het, sou ongetwyfeld iets te sê gehad het oor Tarquin's ravishing strides.</b>
(15)	The two male hands, <b>resolute, mindless</b> , are converging across my separate thighs: the <b>predator</b> on my left ...	Die twee manshande skuif <b>vasberade, onwillekeurig</b> nader oor my onderskeie bene: die <b>jagter</b> aan my linkerhand ...	<b>Vasberade, domonnosel</b> , sluip die twee manshande oor my dye nader: <b>die een</b> links ...

Concerning (14), the “encroaching hand” in IS is more forceful than the “verkennende hand” in JLK and decidedly more so than the “bewegende hand” in SK, providing a difference in focalisation that reflects a greater awareness of the infringement of this action in IS. The reference to Tarquin, on the other hand, shifts from being a marker of subjectivity in IS and JLK to a marker of metatextual impostulation and hypothetical focalisation in SK where it is hypothetically ascribed to Michael, providing characterisation from the narrative origo that also impostulates their relationship. Also in (15) the use of “predator” in IS and “jagter” in JLK renders the focalisation more subjective than “die een” in SK. On the whole, the focalisation of this episode in the narrative present is therefore impostulated as more threatening in IS and JLK than in SK. This could also be interpreted as impostulating Kristien as less self-aware and perhaps even less vulnerable in SK than in the other two texts.

There are only minor differences between the focalisation of Ouma Kristina's house in the three texts in (16) and (17) below, but these differences nonetheless impact on the narrative origo with the focalisation in IS more clearly marked as Kristien's memory of the house as a small girl with words such as “towering” and “improbable”:

	IS	JLK	SK
(16)	On that afternoon amid the clutter of her shaded room deep inside the <b>towering incongruous house</b> that sat like a mirage on the white, hot plains ...	Daardie middag, in haar oorvol, halfdonker kamer diep binne die <b>onsamehangende kasarm</b> , soos 'n lugspieëling op die wit, warm vlaktes ...	Daardie middag, tussen die wonderlike rommel van haar halfdonker kamer diep in die binneste van die <b>ongelooflike huis</b> wat soos 'n lugspieëling op die vlakte staan.
(17)	I'm coming home, to whatever remains of that <b>improbable castle</b> in the desert. I'm coming, you'll see. <b>I am a big girl now.</b>	Ek kom huis toe, terug na wat ookal oorgebly het van daardie <b>onwaarskynlike kasteel</b> in die woestyn. Ek kom, Ouma sal sien. Ek's nou mooi groot.	Ek kom huis toe, terug na wat ook al oorgebly het van daardie <b>onmoontlike kasteel</b> in die woestyn. Ek kom terug. Ouma sal sien.

Furthermore, the fact that the refrain from the beginning of the novel is not repeated in SK whereas it is impostulated as focalisation through Kristien of herself against the background of the memories in the chapter and the return in IS and JLK, renders the focalisation in SK less self-reflexive and therefore omits an important aspect of the impostulation of the narrative origo.

In the first chapter it would therefore appear that the focalisation in IS and JLK is marked more clearly in terms of self-reflexivity and subjective impostulation than in

SK, where the focalisation is more neutral. This results in the impostulation of a more self-aware and self-ironical narrative origo in IS and JLK. On the other hand, the social deixis in SK and JLK provides a stronger indication of the focalisation through Kristien, impostulating a less formal narrative origo than in IS and contributing significantly to the characterisation into the narrative origo. It should already be clear that these differences on the microtextual level in terms of focalisation, impact on the macrotextual impostulation of the narrative origo.

### Part I: Chapter 5

In this chapter the markers of social deixis, as in the first chapter, also impact on the narrative origo, and as such also involve focalisation. In (1) to (3) below, shifts occur between the texts in spite of the fact that the Afrikaans texts use exactly the same words as IS:

	IS	JLK	SK
(1)	– the persistence of memory –	– wat mens ook nie alles onthou nie –	– the persistence of memory –
(2)	“You look so – <b>smart</b> ”	“Jy lyk so – <b>smart</b> .”	“En jy lyk so <b>smart</b> .”
(3)	I love a good <b>fight</b> ;	Ek hou van 'n goeie <b>fight</b> .	Ek hou van 'n lekker <b>fight</b> .

The metatextual (1), although self-reflexive in all three texts, demonstrates a shift concerning the characterisation of the narrative origo. The phrase “the persistence of memory” in SK is, for example, much more pretentious than in IS and both impostulate a narrative origo that is more self-ironical than that in JLK in which the phrase becomes “wat mens ook nie alles onthou nie”. In turn, the fact that “smart” and “fight” are used in all three texts in (2) and (3), also marks a shift in register resulting from the use of the English terms in the two Afrikaans texts, thereby impostulating a less formal origo. In addition, the use of the dash in IS and JLK in (2) indicates an impostulated hesitation in Anna's words that could be construed as Kristien's awareness of Anna's awkward attempt at flattery, thus marking the focalisation more clearly than in SK.

The markers of subjectivity concerning the focalisation of Anna and her children through Kristien in examples (4) to (7) also display a number of shifts that could be said to impact on the focalisation:

	IS	JLK	SK
(4)	This <b>tired, shapeless person</b> surrounded by <b>what seems like innumerable children</b> ...	Hierdie <b>moeë, vormlose vrou</b> omring van 'n <b>swetterjoel kinders</b> ...	Dié <b>wasgoedsak</b> voor my, omring deur 'n <b>heerskaar kinders</b> ...
(5)	She engulfs me, wetly kisses me, then hands me over to her <b>swarming brood</b> to be pummelled and <b>mauled</b> and <b>drooled upon</b> .	Sy oorweldig my in haar arms, gee my 'n nat soen, en oorhandig my dan aan haar <b>gebroedsel</b> om deur hulle beklim, <b>bekrap</b> en <b>bespoeg</b> te word.	Sy oorval my, besmeer my met nat soene, <b>verdrink my in snot en trane</b> , lewer my dan oor aan haar <b>werpsel</b> wat <b>soos hondjies oor my klouter</b> en <b>kwyl</b> en <b>slobber</b> .
(6)	She seems <b>bedraggled</b> and <b>confused</b> , her <b>make-up</b> has been applied half-heartedly, her clothes are nondescript a predilection for dresses and blouses <b>with necklines practically down to her clitoris</b> .	Sy lyk <b>verwaarloos</b> en <b>verstrooid</b> ; haar <b>grimering</b> is halfhartig aangesit, haar klere is <b>vaal</b> ... 'n voorkeur vir rokke en bloesies <b>met halse so laag dat mens omtrent tot by haar koekie kon sien</b> .	Sy lyk <b>konfoes</b> en <b>onversorg</b> , haar <b>make-up</b> is bra halfhartig aangebring, haar klere lyk <b>sommerso</b> , vormloos gedrapeer oor 'n onversorgde lyf ... voorliefde vir rokke en bloese <b>met necklines wat tot amper op haar klitoris plunge</b> .
(7)	... only the youngest, an <b>unpleasant</b> little boy ...	Net die jongste, 'n <b>onaangename</b> klein seuntjie	... net die jongste 'n <b>befokte</b> klein seuntjie

In these examples, the focalisation in SK is influenced by the impostulation of the narrative origo as much less formal and at times more coarse than in particularly IS. This is marked in (4) by the use of “wasgoedsak” in stead of “tired, shapeless” or “moeë, vormlose”, which also renders the focalisation more judgmental. In (5) by “verdrink my in snot en trane” which does not appear in either of the other two texts. It is also marked by the metaphoric description of the children as “haar werpsel wat soos hondjies oor my klouter en kwyl en slobber” which is made more explicit by the simile and consequently marks Kristien's sense of dislike more clearly than in IS and JLK.

In (6) and (7) it is again clear that SK impostulates a less formal and more abrasive narrative origo in the use of words such as “konfoes”, “sommerso”, and “necklines wat tot amper op haar klitoris plunge” as well as “befokte”, which mark a stronger degree of subjectivity. This emphasises the orientational aspect of the focalisation through Kristien.

The shift in (8) presents quite a different impostulation of the relationship between Kristien and Anna when they were young, indicating a difference in focalisation that emphasises the distance between the two sisters:



	IS	JLK	SK
(8)	"I cramped your style."	"Ek het jou aan bande gelê."	"Ek was veels te jonk vir jou."

In IS and JLK this retrospective focalisation focuses on the fact that Kristien perceives herself as having been a nuisance to Anna, whereas SK renders this memory as that she was too young for Anna to be able to relate to her. This also impacts on the impostulation of their current relationship in that the memory in SK could be said to be a more objective reason for the distance.

One final shift in this chapter that will be discussed here concerns Kristien's description of their journey through the mountain and may very well be regarded as incidental, if a shift at all. However, since even the most subtle of shifts tend to impact on the focalisation, it remains important:

	IS	JLK	SK
(9)	The sensation, not of following the contours of the mountains, but of moving right into them, enfolded by <b>their</b> moist immediacy ... the intimation of secret bird and animal life, clusters of virgin forest in deep folds, glimpses of thin white cataracts.	Die sensasie, nie soseer dat mens langs die kontoere van <b>die berge</b> ry nie, maar dat mens reguit in hulle inry, omhul deur <b>hulle</b> klam teenwoordigheid ... die <b>suggestie</b> van 'n geheime voël- en dierelewe, kolle ongekonde woud in diep voue, vlugtige blikke op smal wit watervalle.	Die <b>gevoel</b> dat mens nie die kontoere van die hange volg nie, maar binne-in die berg in ry, toegevou in <b>sy</b> klam onmiddellikheid ... die <b>suggestie</b> van 'n verborge voël- en dierelewe, ruigtes oerbos in diep voue, <b>glimpe</b> van dun wit watervalle.

In the midst of a description of the (markedly female) sensuality of the mountain, the possessive pronoun "sy" in SK could either be interpreted as being impersonal, in which case it would fulfil a similar function as the possessive plural "their" in IS and "hulle" in JLK, but it may just as well be interpreted as the masculine personal possessive pronoun. If read as such, the focalisation in SK could be regarded as an irony that supports the macrotextual undermining of patriarchal attitudes in society. It is irrelevant whether the intended meaning is impersonal because the trace of the masculine would still remain. Derrida's *différance* can therefore be seen to operate here (see 2.3), as an activation through a playing movement of this double interpretation. The macrofocalisation is unavoidably influenced by this trace, regardless of the very subtle nature of the difference.

---

On the whole it would therefore appear that the subtle differences in focalisation that occur between the three texts do impact on the impostulation of the narrative origo and as such on the direct impostulated narrative. In an analysis of IS as source text, SK as parallel text and JLK as target text, the differences seem to point towards similar impostulation of the narrative origo in SK and JLK on the basis of particularly markers of social deixis, resulting in a less formal and more abrasive narrative origo than in IS. This could be ascribed mainly to the fact that these two texts share the socio-cultural elements of Afrikaans.<sup>63</sup> On the other hand, JLK seems to be closer to IS in terms of other markers of subjectivity that impact on the degree of self-consciousness and self-reflexivity of the impostulated narrator in these two texts. The similarity between IS and JLK in this instance can be ascribed to the fact that JLK takes its cue more specifically from the microtextual markers in IS.

As a result of these differences, the initial impostulation and characterisation of Kristien as part of the narrative origo, impostulates a possibly more rebellious narrator in SK, hiding her vulnerability behind a coarse façade, whereas in IS a more self-conscious narrator is impostulated hiding behind the façade of a more formal language. As a result, it would appear that a larger distance is impostulated between the reader and the narrative origo in the English text.

### **Part VII: Chapter 7**

The last two chapters of the novel will now be analysed with SK as source text, IS as parallel text and, of course, JLK as target text. As was mentioned in 4.2.1.1.3, the focalisation in these final chapters mirrors the rediscovery of Kristien's identity, as she is impostulated to have attained a sense of identity and peace as well as a better understanding of her role in the country. What has to be investigated here is whether the differences in terms of the narrative origo, resulting in differences in focalisation between the texts, are as pronounced as in the first part.

---

<sup>63</sup> Brink (1983:114) acknowledges the impact of language on his (re)writing of his parallel texts by stating that the translation involved both rethinking and re-feeling his texts "in the framework of a new language".

The impostulation of the funeral in VII:7 provides a strong emphasis on focalisation through Kristien in markers of cognitive and sensory experiences rather than predominantly in memories as in the first part. Some of the most evident differences between the focalisation in the three texts occur in the following passages:

	SK	JLK	IS
(1)	Maar vir dié in vandag se skare het daardie ander begrafnisse anderkant die greep van die geskiedenis verbygegaan.	But to those in today's crowd those other funerals passed by outside the ambits of history.	Yet to the whites in today's crowd those other funerals took place beyond the reach of history.
(2)	Ek wonder of Sam dit sal verstaan ... Sou hy beseef dat hy self ook hierby betrokke is? Of sal hy reken dat dit hom nie regtig raak nie, soos wat ons vroeër by ons eie skrikwekkende medepligtigheid verbygekyk het?	I wonder whether Sam would understand it ... Would he realise that he is involved in this himself? Or would he think that it doesn't really concern him, in the same way that we ignored our own terrible complicity in the past?	I wonder whether Sam understands it ... Would he realise that he, too, is involved in this or would he repeat our past mistake of believing we could remain beyond it, of misreading our own terrible complicity
(3)	... tot die skaars bedekte tevredenheid van die ondernemer, vir wie dit nie net 'n teken moet wees van goedkeuring van Bowe nie, maar waarskynlik 'n waarborg vir toekomstige sukses ...	... to the barely-disguised satisfaction of the undertaker, to whom it must be not only a sign of approval from Above, but probably a guarantee for future success ...	... to the barely restrained satisfaction of the undertaker who must see in <b>this feat</b> a sign of divine approval, and no doubt of excellent business in the future ...

The difference between black and white perspectives on the funeral is more clearly emphasised in IS in the first example through specific reference to "the whites", instead of "dié" in SK and "those" in JLK. Although implied in these two texts, it impostulates the focalisation of this polarisation more clearly in IS. Similarly, the hypothetical focalisation in (3), where Kristien's subjective perception on the undertaker is impostulated, is foregrounded in IS through the more explicit "this feat" in contrast to the more general "dit" and "it" in SK and JLK.

In (2), this polarisation is impostulated closer to Kristien in all three texts in terms of focalisation when she includes herself in the apathetic white camp in contrast to Sandile's black perspective. However, this aspect of the focalisation through the narrative origo becomes more pronounced in IS, firstly due to the use of the hypothetical conditional in SK and JLK ("of Sam dit **sal verstaan**" and "whether Sam **would understand** it") in contrast to the hypothetical ("whether Sam understands it") in IS. It is further emphasised by the subtle difference arising from the addition of "or would he repeat our past mistake" in IS, which does not appear in the two other

texts, rendering Kristien's acceptance of her complicity in the past more evident in IS. In both these examples, the focalisation through Kristien is therefore foregrounded more clearly in IS, altering the impostulation of the growth in Kristien.

The self-reflexivity in (4) presents another difference in focalisation:

	SK	JLK	IS
(4)	Maar wat gebeur wanneer daar nie meer 'n horison oorbly waar mens <b>verby kan trek</b> nie?	But what happens when there are no more horizons <b>to trek beyond?</b>	But what happens when there is no further horizon <b>beyond which one can run away?</b>

In IS the words by Wilhelmina, namely that "If it is God's will we shall stay here; and if it isn't then we'll pack our things and trek away." (IS:348.) are appropriated by Kristien and applied to her present situation with the emphasis on running away, whereas SK and JLK present the words in a more neutral way as "trek", creating a gap that can also be filled to signify exploration and not necessarily flight. This shift therefore presents a difference in focalisation through Kristien of her current situation, while the Kristien of IS more clearly involves a focalisation informed by her self-imposed exile (which could be interpreted as running away) rather than the focalisation in SK and JLK informed by the herstory of her forebears and their role in the Great Trek as part of the Boer nation.

Apart from the social deixis in (5) in the use of the English terms ("passionate" and "space"), which impostulates a less formal narrative origo in SK than in IS and JLK, the focalisation of the fate of women all over the world is impostulated more forcefully in IS:

	SK	JLK	IS
(5)	Ek het lankal nie meer die jeug se <b>passionate geloof</b> in my vermoë om die wêreld te verander nie; maar ek weet ook dat dit verander <i>kan</i> word, en dat ek daarby betrokke wil wees. Veels te lank het het al die vroue van my stam, van alle stamme, <b>een-een bly seerkry, probeer deurbyt</b> , in die klein bietjie space wat die magtige manlike heersers van die wêreld aan hulle toegestaan het.	I've long since lost the <b>passionate conviction</b> I held in my youth that I could change the world; but I also know that it <i>can</i> be changed, and that I want to be a part of that change. For much too long the women of my tribe, of all tribes, <b>have been hurt one by one, have tried to hang on</b> , in the little bit of space the powerful male rulers of the world allowed them.	I no longer have the <b>wild faith</b> of youth in my ability to change the world; but I also know that it <i>can</i> be changed, and that I want to be involved in it. For too long the women of my tribe, of all tribes, <b>have been forced to suffer and to rebel</b> in the small private space allotted them by the powerful males who rule the world;

In IS the focalisation is marked by the subjectivity of this fate which is described as having been “forced to suffer and to rebel” rather than the more neutral “een-een bly seerkry, probeer deurbyt” in SK or “have been hurt one by one, have tried to hang on” in JLK. This has the effect of changing the focalisation from a perspective that foregrounds the individual suffering and endurance of women to one that foregrounds the oppression (at the hand of the male oppressor) to which women were subjected, and against which they were compelled to rebel. Therefore, the addition of the single word “forced” in IS, activates traces not contained in the two other texts. In (6), the same effect arises from the trace surrounding the word “riddled”, which immediately activates a focalisation more conscious of the violence resulting in these graves:

	SK	JLK	IS
(6)	Ek weet dat die hede – hierdie klein vierkantjie <b>vol grafte</b> – minder werklik is as die moontlike.	I know that the present – this small square <b>filled with graves</b> – is less real than the possible.	I know that the present – this small square <b>riddled with graves</b> – is less real than the possible.

The focalisation through Kristien of the telephone conversation between Michael and her in (7), in turn impostulates a stronger or less vulnerable narrative origo in IS than that in SK and JLK:

	SK	JLK	IS
(7)	Ek dink ons was albei ewe desperaat om <i>deur</i> te kom, mekaar aan te raak, <b>net om weer te weet daar is iemand anderkant, 'n hand om aan te raak, 'n skouer om op te huil.</b>	I think we were equally desperate to connect, to touch each other, <b>simply to know there is someone at the other end, a hand to touch, a shoulder to cry on.</b>	Perhaps we were both <b>equally desperate about getting through, about feeling in touch, if only to persuade ourselves that there were hands out there to be clasped, and held.</b>

The desperation Kristien perceives in both their voices for a hand to touch (i.e. gentle intimacy) and a shoulder to cry on (i.e. comfort and safety, physical proximity) in SK and JLK, is replaced in IS by a desperation for feeling connected as opposed to alienated, and for hands to clasp and hold. Consequently, the focalisation in IS impostulates an emphasis on the need for spiritual comfort rather than the physical comfort impostulated through the focalisation in the two other texts.

## Part VII: Chapter 8

In the brief final chapter there are very few significant shifts in focalisation apart from the focalisation evident in markers of social deixis in the dialogue between Kristien

and Ouma Kristina, in which the narrative origo is once again impostulated as less formal in SK than in IS or JLK.

Although there is a difference in focalisation in the sentence below with IS presenting the focalisation through Kristien of Ouma Kristina's smile as "an idea" in contrast to "dit lyk tog of" in SK and "she does appear to" in JLK, this difference can hardly be said to impact on the macrofocalisation or macrotext:

	SK	JLK	IS
	Ek kan nie haar gesig sien nie, maar dit lyk tog of sy glimlag.	I can't see her face, but she does appear to be smiling.	I cannot see her face, but I have an idea she is smiling.

#### 4.2.1.1.5 Conclusion

A number of subtle shifts can therefore be identified at this level (direct impostulated narrative), resulting in differences between the focalisation in the three texts (in spite of the fact that the types of markers of focalisation seldom differ). The most obvious differences between the three texts in terms of the microtextual markers of focalisation, relate to the degree of subjectivity on the one hand, and the register on the other.

These differences in focalisation at the microtextual level in turn impact on the macrotextual focalisation, not only in terms of consistency, but particularly regarding the impostulation of the narrative origo. This seems to indicate that focalisation is indeed an important consideration in the translation of narrative texts. The gaps and traces surrounding impostulation and focalisation in particular, clearly have an impact on the macrofocalisation of the text, influencing the manner in which the narrative as such will be impostulated.

Before summarising the most important of these differences, it is important to note that the frequency of the differences in focalisation (at this level) seems to decrease towards the end of the novel (as is evident in the comparison of the two last chapters with the two chapters from the first part). This, however, should come as no surprise since focalisation has been shown to be an important impostulatory technique which contributes towards the realisation of the narrative origo. It is therefore to be expected that the impostulation of the qualities of the narrative origo will display a

higher concentration of markers (of subjectivity, characterisation and deixis) in the exposition of the text than in the *denouement* where the origo has already been established.

The main differences in focalisation between the texts seem to originate in relation to the degree of self-awareness and self-irony impostulated around the narrative origo. In the chapters from Part I these differences in focalisation impostulate a narrative origo that is slightly more self-aware in IS and noticeably less formal in SK. This becomes evident in differences in social deixis in the impostulation of focalisation through Kristien of other characters (the two businessmen in I:1 and Anna in I:5) as well as the focalisation through her of her memories of Ouma Kristina and the house/palace/castle on Sinai and her parents. These differences in focalisation in turn result in the impostulation of differences between the narrative origos. The translation (JLK) of these chapters results in a text that shares some of the self-awareness of IS (as a result of a closer proximity to that text), as well as some of the informality of SK in the social deixis (as a result of the shared code of Afrikaans), although it could be said to be more neutral as a result.

The differences in focalisation in the last two chapters of the novel display similar discrepancies in terms of the formality and self-awareness of the narrative origo, although there are far fewer differences than in the first chapters (as discussed above). The relatively few markers of social deixis in the frame have a much higher frequency in SK (mostly in the form of loan words from English – that mostly also relate to indirect characterisation into the narrative origo) than in IS.

The focalisation through Kristien therefore seems to be predominantly marked more neutrally in SK than in IS due to the fact that the subjective element of the focalisation is marked more clearly in the latter. As a result, the narrative origo in the frame is impostulated as more self-aware and self-ironical in IS than in SK. In the first two chapters where IS was taken as source for JLK, this emphasis on the self-awareness in the narrative origo is also more evident in JLK than in SK. In the last chapters where SK was used as source for JLK, the focalisation in JLK is more neutral than in IS.

---

As illustrated above, the direct impostulated narrative is anchored in the narrative present. In other words, the impostulation at this level proceeds along a chronological line from the moment Kristien is on the plane after taking off from Heathrow, until she has her final rendezvous with Ouma Kristina after the latter's death. However, this chronology is constantly broken by analepses as well as metatextual moments in which the impostulatory metatextual present is invoked and it appears as if Kristien is addressing the reader directly. In other words, in these moments it seems as if the narrative is and has to be impostulated outside of the narrative time. The relevance of this for translation is that the translator as impostulator has to be constantly aware of the shifts indicated by markers of deixis in the text that signal these metatextual units. If not, the translation could easily disregard some of these important gaps and traces and become bogged down in the impostulation of the narrative present. In order to investigate the impact of this metatextual element of the narrative, the next section will analyse the one sustained stretch of metatextual impostulated narrative in I:4.



#### 4.2.1.2 Metatextual impostulated narrative

Table 4: Frame impostulation: metatextual impostulated narrative

Part, Chapter	SK	IS
I, 4	p. 31	p. 16

##### 4.2.1.2.1 Introduction

Chapter 4 of Part I, although very brief, is one of the most significant chapters in the novel in terms of the impostulation of the narrative origo. The metatextual impostulated narrative of a narrator addressing her reader directly, establishes a closer relationship between the reader and the narrative origo. The chapter is also a rhetorical device or disclaimer to motivate the differences in register between IS and SK. The fact that the narrator emphasises that she is not a mother-tongue speaker of English therefore provides an explanation for the possibly more stilted and formal impostulation in IS.

As metatextual episode, this chapter does not refer to the “propositional content” of the narrative, but rather serves to “organise the ongoing text and guide the reader’s interpretation” (Mauranen, 2000). It also impostulates Kristien as displaying not “the content of what is said, but of the way it is put together” (Traugott, 1995:6). Furthermore, the metatextual nature of the impostulation in this chapter adds a level to the impostulation. This added level is outside of the narrative present in the direct impostulated narrative of the frame on the one hand, and the (historical) past of the embedded (her)stories on the other. The temporal deixis here rather refers to a metatextual time of impostulation in which Kristien is impostulated by Brink as **writing** the narrative. This will be discussed in more detail below.

By way of introduction it should suffice to note that the metatextual level creates a textual frame for the direct impostulated narrative. This textual frame is mostly a covert presence, largely due to the illusion of a narrative present created by the temporal deixis in the direct impostulated narrative. However, this metatextual level effectively impostulates a metatextual present that is somehow preceded by the

narrative present without becoming (or being marked with temporal deixis as) a future to which the narrative present is a past.

#### 4.2.1.2.2 Macrotextual analysis

This metatextual chapter is by no means the only occurrence of metatextual impostulation in the novel. In fact, the concern with the textuality of fiction is an important aspect in Brink's fiction in general as well as in his views on fiction. In his 1998 book, *The novel: Language and narrative from Cervantes to Calvino*, he explains his primary focus as the way in which "a particular view and concept of language is demonstrated implicitly or explicitly in the text" (Brink, 1998a:16). In another text published in the same year, he states: "... story involves an awareness and an implicit or explicit acknowledgement of its own process of narrativisation: every narrative text, I should venture to say, is per definition also a metanarrative" (Brink, 1998b: 38). In the metatextual elements in this novel, language and an awareness of language is also a constant concern, both implicitly and explicitly.

The metatextual impostulation is a constant undercurrent that runs underneath all the other levels of impostulation in this novel; a palimpsest leaving an impression on the impostulation in the frame as well as embedded level. Most of these metatextual passages (like the ones discussed in the section on direct impostulated narrative) are rendered metatextual simply because of a lack of markers of temporal and spatial deixis and a tendency towards the philosophical in the narrative origo that remove these passages from the narrative present and the propositional content. Alternatively, they are rendered metatextual precisely because of temporal and spatial deixis that are impossible in the frame of the narrative present (i.e. analepsis). One such example is the analepsis in I:3 where Kristien refers to the deaths at the end of the novel, knowledge she cannot logically possess at this stage in the narrative present:

(If I were to have known in that instant what I was heading for – not that single death but so many; and my role and responsibility in all of it – would I have pressed on regardless? It seems inconceivable. And yet – ) (IS:14-15).

The temporal deixis in this passage marks the fact that the focalisation through the narrative origo is retrospective, even though the passage occurs in the narrative present (presumably therefore recorded by Kristien in writing). As mentioned in

4.2.1.1, this passage does not appear in SK, creating a gap that impacts significantly on the impostulation, foregrounding the metatextual frame much more in IS. The discourse markers also support this.

Another example is found at the beginning of Part IV where Kristien is impostulated as reflecting on the act of writing:

Adrift in the present. Thoughts on waking: how disconcerting to discover that there is nothing real about the present, that it can be grasped only after it has already slid into the past. From moment to moment it eludes me. I write: I get up, I look through the window, the shadows of clouds move across the landscape. But what I ought by rights to be writing is: I write that I get up, look through the window; I write that the shadows of clouds move across the landscape, and even as I write it is no more. Sooner or later I shall write: Ouma is dying – but she will already be dead. I write: Today we'll have to bring the coffin down... (IS:197 – see 4.2.1.1.2 for a detailed analysis of this passage).

Although this passage is anchored in the narrative present of the direct impostulated narrative as Kristien's "thoughts on waking", it becomes intertwined with the (framing) metatextual level. This is compounded by the fact that, after the deictic anchoring in the narrative present with the reference to Kristien waking up after a long night by Ouma Kristina's bedside, the illusion is impostulated that Kristien is writing the novel (i.e. *in loco* Brinkus) while she is experiencing the narrative present.

This ambiguity between the reliability of memorised facts and the imperfection of memory is also evident in *Kennis van die aand* (1973)/*Looking on darkness* (1974), where the narrator, like Kristien through Ouma Kristina, is attempting to reconstruct his own history. Brink (1996b:20) regards this ambiguity as remaining "vested in the role of the narrator, rather than the perception of history as such". He then adds:

... – except if the interposition of the narrator between reader and story is to be read as a demonstration of the opacity of language, which presents language not as an access toward history but as a displacement of it– i.e., language not as a transparent sheet of glass but as a stained-glass window (which still requires the light from the "real" world to bring it to life, but which focuses the attention on its intrinsic colours and patterns).

In IS/SK, Kristien is impostulated as just such an interposition between reader and story, and as a result, her self-awareness draws attention to the opacity of language and the focus on the "intrinsic patterns and colours" of her history rather than a lucid

---

perspective on it. This opacity is of course intensified by the fact that the focalisation of history occurs also through Ouma Kristina and the other women in the lineage.

At the end of the above passage from the novel the metatextual impostulated narrative merges with the direct impostulated narrative with one brief return to the metatextual awareness of the writing process in the subsequent paragraph:

(I prefer not to think of tomorrow yet, in case, as has happened so often, I'm disappointed. **So I shall write down Sandile's name, but not dwell on it**) (IS:197 – my emphasis)

Although this is evidently part of the metatextual framing impostulation, the focalisation through Kristien of the resolve not to dwell on the writing down of Sandile's name is marked as focalisation within the narrative present (primarily since she is subsequently impostulated as making peace with the memory of Sandile, which she has clearly not yet done here). As in the previous paragraph, the illusion is therefore impostulated that Kristien is not only the narrator, but also the author at the time of narration (an illusion that is not, however, sustained). Both these examples serve the purpose of forcing the reader to become actively involved in the impostulation as the boundaries between impostulatory levels become less clear.

In the only chapter in the novel devoted entirely to metatextual impostulated narrative, Part I Chapter 4, the impostulation departs from the direct impostulated narrative in the narrative present on the plane. In this chapter, Kristien is impostulated as addressing the reader directly (much like a character in a film who turns and speaks directly into the camera). This creates the illusion that the reader is the narratee, impostulating a confidential tone as well as a personal relationship between Kristien and the reader. As in the other examples, this chapter seems to interrupt the narrative present with the impostulation of an "actual" metatextual present tense subsequent to the narrative present in the rest of the frame.

#### **4.2.1.2.3 Microtextual analysis**

The importance of this chapter for the impostulation of the narrative origo is evident in the high concentration of markers of subjective impostulation. Hardly anything in the chapter can be regarded as merely incidental or neutral and most of the sense units are marked in terms of subjective perspective.

The deictic markers in the first sentence of this chapter in IS very clearly indicate the metatextual status of the impostulation: "If **you** [person] **are to spend** [temporal] a few more hundred **pages** [discourse/spatial] with **me** I [person] suppose I [person] should have gone all out **from the beginning** [temporal/discourse] to make a better impression." (IS:16.) The three most prominent aspects of the deixis are the markers of person, temporal and discourse deixis. First of all the second person is used, indicating that there is a specific addressee (the reader). Secondly, the utterance is directed at the time of reading, or "textual present" with further reference to the "textual future" ("are to spend") and "textual past" ("from the beginning"). Finally, the fact that the narrative refers to "a few more hundred pages" provides a marker of discourse deixis that impostulates the writing and reading of the novel, once again impostulating Kristien not only as narrator, but also as author.

The deictic reference to the man on the plane in brackets, "(Perhaps that **was** what the man **on the plane said**, 'Witch'?[sic]), indicates that this metatextual impostulated narrative provides retrospective focalisation of the events on the plane. This further emphasises the tension between the metatextual "actual" present and the narrative present.

The intimate or confidential tone is also foregrounded by the markers of self-reflexive impostulation through Kristien's hypothesis of the reader's possible response to what has been written/read up to this point in the text (marked by the conditionals): "You may already have taken a dislike in me." (IS:16.) This is further emphasised by the final warning, "So be warned. You'll have to take me as I am" (IS:16).

The rest of this chapter in IS provides direct characterisation into the narrative origo, mainly in terms of focalisation through Kristien of her qualities and of the language of the narrative. The focalisation is predominantly marked by a combination of markers of subjectivity and markers of self-reflexivity. Kristien is impostulated as describing herself as follows:

I am in many respects not a pleasant person. I can be nasty, prejudiced, petulant, vindictive, unreliable, you name it. My father undoubtedly thought of me as a witch.

...

---

So be warned. You'll have to take me as I am. Also, I'm left-handed (IS:16).

Some of these qualities have already been illustrated in the first three chapters through indirect characterisation in the way she responds to her memories and the two businessmen. Even so, the reader has to take into account that Kristien's narration should be considered biased and even unreliable, also in this description of herself, which impacts significantly on the impostulation of the narrative origo. Primarily, however, this metatextual impostulated narrative foregrounds the self-awareness and self-irony of the narration.

Concerning the language of the narrative, IS contains a direct reference to the register of language used from the narrative origo:

One learns to deal with many things; others return to haunt you, or take revenge on you at unguarded moments. It is all the more difficult to cope if one tries, as I am doing, to work through it in **what remains something of a strange language**. At the same time it offers the kind of **distance** useful for the soul-searchings I'm **indulging in**. During my years in London I became **quite fluent in English**, of course; I've been told that I have a "**flair**". But **it can never be my native tongue**. And I have **delusions of grandiloquence**. I tend to say "impetuous" when "wilful" would do, or "proceed" rather than a simple "go". (IS:16.)

As with Kristien's qualities presented in this manner, this reference to the language of the narrative, evident in markers of self-reflexive impostulation, foregrounds the self-awareness and self-irony of the narrative origo. This is already contained in the term "delusions of grandiloquence".

In this chapter the microtextual markers of focalisation, pointing mainly into the narrative origo from a metatextual perspective, therefore serve as basis for the impostulation of the narrative origo on the macrotextual level. It also presents a momentary interlude from the progression of the narrative present, before Kristien's arrival at the airport is impostulated in the subsequent chapter. The comparison of this chapter with the parallel chapter from SK indicates that this impostulation of the narrative origo is central in terms of the difference between the two texts.

#### 4.2.1.2.4 Comparison: parallel texts and translation

The frequency of significant shifts in this brief chapter is relatively higher than in the four chapters of direct impostulated narrative discussed in 4.2.1.1. Although not all

these shifts relate directly to focalisation, they do have an important impact on the impostulation of the narrative origo in the texts and as such also impact on the focalisation (which proceeds from the narrative origo).

Although the deictic markers in the first two sentences, (1) and (2) below, as well as in the second last sentence, (3) below, are roughly similar in the three texts, there is a difference in register signalled by the social deixis in the use of the formal “u” in SK:

	IS	JLK	SK
(1)	If <b>you</b> are to spend a few more hundred pages with me. I suppose I should have gone all out from the beginning to make a better impression.	As <b>jy</b> nog 'n paar honderd bladsye saam met my gaan deurbring, moes ek seker harder probeer het om van die begin af 'n beter indruk te maak.	As <b>u</b> nog 'n paar honderd bladsye in my geselskap gaan deurbring, moes ek seker van die begin af probeer het om 'n beter indruk te skep.
(2)	<b>You</b> may already have taken a dislike to me.	Miskien het <b>jy</b> al klaar 'n <b>gly</b> in my gevang.	Dalk het <b>u</b> al klaar 'n <b>skyt</b> in my gevang.
(3)	<b>So be warned.</b> You'll have to take me as I am.	<b>So wees gewaarsku.</b> <b>Jy</b> sal my maar moet vat soos ek is.	<b>Warts and all,</b> hier kom ek. Vat my asseblief maar soos ek is.

The fact that modern English does not make a distinction in terms of formal address in the second person pronoun any longer, does not negate the gap in focalisation through Kristien activated by the use of the formal address in SK. This is accentuated by the contrast in SK between this formal address and the use of informal vocabulary such as “skyt” and “Warts and all”. As a result, the narrative origo in SK is impostulated as less formal, in spite of the use of the more formal form of address. In contrast, the use of the less formal “jy” in JLK impostulates a more intimate relationship between Kristien and the reader, lending the narrative origo a more confidential tone than the more neutral “you” in IS or the more formal “u” in SK.

Another difference between the texts is that the warning to the reader in IS and JLK is replaced in SK by a straightforward statement: “Warts and all, hier kom ek”, which impostulates a more direct narrative origo in SK. Although this example does not relate directly to focalisation, it does impact on the narrative origo and therefore also on the impostulated focalisation of the reader through Kristien. This will inevitably have an impact on the translation of either text.

Example (4) below provides another subtle shift in the reference to Kristien's father in the first part and a less subtle shift in the characterisation from the narrative origo:

	IS	JLK	SK
(4)	My father <b>undoubtedly thought of me</b> as a witch.... That is, <b>if he</b> ever took the time to reflect on me.	My pa het <b>verseker aan my gedink</b> as 'n heks... Dis te <b>sê as hy ooit die moeite gedoen het om oor my na te dink</b> .	Pa het <b>my eenkeer</b> vir 'n heks <b>uitgeskel</b> ... -

The possessive "My" followed by the noun "father" and "pa" in IS and JLK is replaced in SK by the proper noun "Pa". This subtle shift impostulates a difference in the relationship between Kristien and the reader (through the use of person deixis) with SK impostulating either a self-address, or the addressing of someone who shares a similar reference to her father. Another difference here is signalled by the fact that IS and JLK present hypothetical focalisation through Kristien of her father's attitude towards her (augmented by the conditional in the last part of the example which does not appear in SK), whereas SK presents retrospective focalisation through Kristien of a particular incident. This impostulates a different degree of subjectivity and therefore a pronounced difference in focalisation that again impacts on the narrative origo.

The most significant difference between the three texts, however, concerns the reference in IS to the impact of English as a second language on the language of the narrative in (5) to (7):

	IS	JLK	SK
(5)	It is all the more difficult to cope <b>if one tries</b> , as I <b>am doing</b> , to work through it in <b>what remains something of a strange language</b> . At the same time it offers the kind of distance useful for the <b>soul-searchings I'm indulging in</b> .	Dis selfs nog moeiliker om daarmee te cope <b>as mens</b> , soos ek nou doen. <b>probeer om dit te verwerk deur die gebrokenheid van taal</b> . Tog gee taal mens 'n soort afstand wat handig is <b>as jy jou inlaat vir sulke soul-searchings soos wat ek hier doen</b> .	Maar jy kan ook nie altyd toehou nie.
(6)	<b>During my years in London</b> I became quite fluent in English, <b>of course</b> ; I've been <b>told</b> I have a 'flair'.	<b>Mense het nog altyd gesê</b> ek het 'n slag met woorde, maar <b>mens kan nooit heeltemal in woorde uitdruk wat jy eintlik bedoel nie</b> .	-
(7)	I have <b>delusions of grandiloquence</b> . I tend to say ...	En dan is ek ook nog geneig om <b>meegvoer te raak deur woorde en selfs hoogdrawend te raak</b> .	-



Although the difference is less pronounced in JLK than in SK where it is simply omitted (for obvious reasons), the shift to the opacity of language (as a medium through which to attempt working through experience) still changes the focalisation significantly. On a macrotextual level, JLK therefore emphasises Kristien's awareness of the opacity of language that forms an important part of the impostulation of the narrative origo in the rest of the novel (see, for example, 4.2.1.1.2, 4.2.1.2.2, 4.2.2.3.3). The fact that the role of language is omitted entirely from SK creates a gap in terms of the focalisation that impacts on the impostulation of the narrative origo in spite of the logical reason for the omission.

The reference to the fact that Kristien is left-handed in (8), which is clearly a marker of self-awareness and self-irony, is consequently rendered less significant in SK as it presents a juxtaposition only with the qualities listed earlier and not with an awareness of language, an awareness that is central in all three texts.

	IS	JLK	SK
(8)	Also, I'm left-handed.	En dan's ek boonop links ook.	Boonop eet en skryf ek links.

#### 4.2.1.2.5 Conclusion

In this chapter it would therefore appear that the narrative origo in each text is established in no uncertain terms through the use of a metatextual intermission from the flow of the narrative present. Although this can be identified in all three texts, the shifts in focalisation through Kristien concerning her father, her relationship to the reader as well as her relationship to the language of the narrative, impostulates three distinct narrative origos in the three texts. The difference in narrative origo that is also established in the direct impostulated narrative of the frame has a direct impact on the level of (her)stories framed by this level. The impact is evident, for example, in the nature of the intermingling of Ouma Kristina and Kristien in the narrative origo, but also in the retrospective direct impostulation where the focalisation through Kristien of her youth is affected by the narrative origo established in Part I Chapter 4.

#### 4.2.2 Embedded impostulation

The most obvious distinction between the frame impostulation and the embedded impostulation in this novel can be related to temporal deixis. Whereas the frame impostulation is predominantly anchored in the narrative present, the embedded impostulation departs from the narrative present in the retrospective impostulation. The bulk of the herstory is contained in this level of impostulation as not only the past of the two narrators, Kristien and Ouma Kristina, is impostulated, but also that of the other seven women in their lineage. This also provides the structure for the different aspects of the embedded narration.

On the one hand the (her)stories related to Kristien and Ouma Kristina are at the levels of **retrospective direct impostulated narrative** (Kristien's narration of events from her past) and **impostulated direct speech** (Ouma Kristina's narration of events from her past) respectively. In both these cases the emphasis is on the direct link between the impostulated "voice" and the focalisation. On the other hand, the (her)stories concerning the rest of the lineage, or the more distant forebears, are presented as **introduced impostulated direct narrative**, where the narrative origo consists of a combination of Kristien and Ouma Kristina. At this (introduced) level of the impostulation the narrative also assumes the appearance of omniscience or unlimited access to the impostulated characters which makes the focalisation more complicated as a result of the various shifts in focalisation. This seemingly complicated situation will hopefully become clearer in the subsequent analysis of the level.

The differences between the three levels of embedded impostulation indeed seem to originate primarily in differences in focalisation. Whereas the retrospective direct impostulated narrative of Kristien's past mainly provides focalisation through Kristien of two particular stages in her life, and the impostulated direct speech mainly provides focalisation through Ouma Kristina of her early life, the focalisation in the introduced impostulated direct narrative seems to proceed through a less clearly identifiable persona in the narrative origo. The narrative origo therefore assumes qualities of both narrators further diluted or dispersed in the traces provided by hypothetical focalisation through the characters "created" by Ouma Kristina.

At this second level of impostulation, the rewriting of history from Ouma Kristina's perspective takes the centre stage.<sup>64</sup> This herstory, like history in general, becomes an extended metaphor. In a discussion of the way South African fiction began to interrogate history, Brink (1996b:19) uses the example of Etienne Leroux's *Magersfontein, o Magersfontein* (1976; English 1983) in which "all sense of identity is dissipated in the endless postponements and distancings of Derridean *différance*, and the very notion of 'historical origins,' of an ur-text, of a reality behind the textualising processes of a self-inventing narrative is left open-ended". In IS/SK these Derridean postponement and distancings are also evident in Ouma Kristina's herstory. Hayden White's comment on the metaphoric nature of history therefore also applies to this novel: "The historical narrative does not image the things it indicates; it calls to mind images of the things it indicates, in the same way that a metaphor does." (quoted in Brink, 1996b:19.) Ouma Kristina's rewriting of history as herstory is likewise more concerned with the engendering of identity and with empowering than with the historical "facts".

Brink (1998b:40-41) attempts to explain Ouma Kristina's (her)stories or "inventions" or imaginings as follows:

It seems to me that in situations such as this what matters are not the specifics of the inventions (a woman changed into a tree, etc.) but the fact that they are resorted to at a given moment in an individual's life, or at a specific historical juncture: in this case, an old woman weaving her web of tales on the eve of the 1994 elections, speaking from the inside of a tribe in which women have always been forced by men into specific roles, against which only certain kinds of rebellion were possible at certain historical moments ... History may remain an enigma ... but it is only through story that the nature and context of each specific enigma can be approached.

Although this passage applies particularly to the (her)stories narrated by Ouma Kristina, it is also relevant to Kristien's own (her)story in which she is impostulated as attempting to approach the enigma of her own place in history.

---

<sup>64</sup> In an interview with Elnadi and Rifaat (1993:5), Brink stated: "In forthcoming novels I shall be trying to get more and more of an imaginative grasp on reality, to invent history."

#### 4.2.2.1 Retrospective direct impostulated narrative

Table 5: Embedded narrative – retrospective direct impostulated narrative

Part, Chapter	Character	SK	IS
III, 2	Kristien	pp. 181-189	pp. 136-143
III, 5	Kristien	pp. 197-206	pp. 149-157

##### 4.2.2.1.1 Introduction

Retrospective direct impostulated narrative is simply retrospective narrative impostulated from the narrative origo, in other words dealing with events prior to the narrative present. It would therefore include conventional categories such as first and third-person retrospective narration. In IS/SK this involves a section in the narration where the history of Kristien prior to her return is impostulated. The first chapter (III:2) deals primarily with the events that led to her self-imposed exile and the second (III:5) with the initial events in London. The temporal deixis here points to the past focussed around these experiences and provides a sustained impostulated perspective from the narrative origo. Of course there are numerous analepses that impostulate memories triggered by events in the impostulated narrative present of the narrative origo, but these two periods present sustained analepsis or retrospective impostulation and hence they are informed by the qualities of impostulation retrospective to (and not anchored in) the impostulated narrative present.

##### 4.2.2.1.2 Macrotextual analysis

Whereas the first part of the frame impostulation deals with Kristien's contemplation on the reasons for her return, these two embedded chapters provide an overview of the reasons for her departure from the country into self-imposed exile, as well as her life in London. The retrospective element in these two chapters does not so much focus on Kristien's general background, but rather on her self-awareness and the aspects from the past that brought her to her current disillusioned state of mind in the narrative present.

The first part of this sustained retrospective direct impostulated narrative (III:2) presents a strong characterisation into the narrative origo in terms of Kristien's early

childhood, through her political awakening at university and building up to her leaving the country after a brush with the security forces. By means of a series of approximately seven key incidents, “a series of small shifts” (IS:136), Kristien’s rebellious qualities and her problematic relationship with her father, as well as her sense of alienation and conscious isolation from the Afrikaner culture she grew up in, are impostulated. On the one hand this chapter emphasises the difference between Kristien and Anna. In Anna’s own words, “But of course I’m not interesting enough, I have no story. I was born, and did my best to please everyone. and experimented a bit at varsity, and then met and married Casper.” (IS:130.) On the other hand, it impostulates Kristien as a worthy member of the lineage of unconventional women Ouma Kristina sketches with the (her)stories.

The second part of the sustained retrospective direct impostulated narrative (III:5) presents Kristien’s isolation in London against the background of a series of intimate relationships including her marriage to JC and the abortion, her first true love, Sandile, and finally Michael, her current lover. In this chapter her political motivation for leaving South Africa is also deconstructed as her commitment to the Struggle starts waning as soon as her father dies. This chapter is important on a macrotextual level since it impostulates her disillusionment as well as the background to the void she finds herself in (in the narrative present), thereby impostulating a context for her journey of self-discovery through Ouma Kristina’s stories.

The focalisation through Kristien of these events in her past therefore provides a key to the impostulation of the narrative origo as well as the focalisation of the frame narrative and Ouma Kristina’s embedded narrative. The strong self-ironical quality most evident in the metatextual level is less obvious here although the narrative origo is still impostulated as extremely self-aware and self-reflexive.

#### **4.2.2.1.3 Microtextual analysis**

##### **Part III: Chapter 2**

The preceding chapter (III:1) presents the motivation for this self-reflexive chapter in which Kristien is impostulated as contemplating her past. The estrangement

between the two sisters is clear from Anna's remark, "I know so little about you" (IS:130). Kristien's alienation from her sister and the events around her is further impostulated in her self-reflexive awareness of her lack of identity and commitment:

I soap my body, sponge it off, more vigorously perhaps than necessary. It isn't only to resist the shock of the cold water, but to try and work up some indignation about Anna's news. Why does it continue to sound so remote, as if nothing really concerns me? I'm not involved ... Yet how can I feel so untouched by it? ... So why am I not outraged, why do I feel no urgency, not even anger, or anguish, or fear – as if I'm still ten thousand kilometers away? Can one really lose touch so totally? ... Am I so out of touch that I'm not even sure about my own reactions anymore? (IS:131-2).

Ek shampoo my hare en spoel my kop af; ek smeer my seep en spons my af, driftiger as wat nodig is. Nie net om die skok van die koue water te help weerstaan nie, maar om 'n bietjie verontwaardiging oor Anna se nuus te probeer opwerk. Hoe is dit moontlik dat alles so ver van my verwyder voel, asof dit my eintlik glad nie raak nie? Ek is nie self betrokke nie ... Hoe kan dit my so koud laat? ... En tog is ek nie verontwaardig of woedend of bang nie – asof ek nog altyd tienduuisend kilometer hiervandaan is. Kan mens regtig so onaangeraak bly lewe? ... Is ek so uit voeling dat ek nie eens meer my eie reaksies kan verklaar nie? (SK:172).

As if prompted by this to self-exploration, III:2 opens with Kristien's metatextual and self-reflexive statement, "There was no Damascus experience for me, no great leap for mankind (or womankind for that matter), only a series of small shifts, each insignificant in its own right, but each making possible the next." (IS:136.) Although this section could just as well have remained anchored in the narrative present in a continuation of the conversation between Kristien and Anna, the fact that it takes the form of a retrospective narrative renders it outside the narrative present and lends it a stronger metatextual flavour. This has the effect of emphasising the focalisation through Kristien and also places it in a closer proximity to Ouma Kristina's (her)stories.

After this metatextual introduction, the narrative proceeds with an overview of the key incidents that brought her to the decision to leave. The first incident impostulated through Kristien concerns her stealing "a tiny ceramic figurine of a rooster" (IS:137). This incident is marked clearly as self-reflexive through the use of the term "I remember", which draws attention to the focalisation. The impostulation of this event foregrounds Kristien's rebellious nature from a very young age, "fighting against the idea of being the dutiful daughter" (IS:137). The metatextual "That kind

of thing" impostulates a self-reflexive awareness of the guilt that also accompanied these acts of rebellion against societal norms.

The second incident provides markers of temporal and spatial as well as discourse deixis that refer to a much later event in London. Clearly this incident is aimed at illustrating that Kristien's rebellion against authority is not limited to the isolated incident in her youth, but that it is almost a compulsive tendency. This is enhanced by the fact that, as in the previous incident, the focalisation is marked self-reflexively with the phrase "When I was already in London I **remember** once walking ..." (IS:137). The metatextual "See what I mean?" (IS:137) likewise provides a rhetorical tone to this self-reflexive impostulation in which an intimate relationship is impostulated with the reader. In both these phrases, the markers of discourse deixis foreground the focalisation through Kristien of this relationship with the reader.

After these two specific incidents, Kristien's headstrong and independent nature is further stressed in the reference to her general behaviour during her childhood:

As child, in the games we played, I always wanted to be the robber, not the cop; or the knight, not the sweet little lady waiting to be rescued; the one who fought the monsters and sometimes won and sometimes lost, not the one who had to be saved (IS:137).

In all these cases, the focalisation is evident in the markers of subjectivity, markers that stress the subjective perspective on the past. Through the focalisation, attention is also drawn to the self-conscious characterisation into the narrative origo that impacts on all the levels of the narrative.

Having established her headstrong nature, Kristien's rebellion against the patriarchal society she grew up in is impostulated:

Even at high school I was beginning to have doubts about my female fate: not only the idea of getting married, but that having a husband and children should be the be-all and end-all of my life ... As though the fascination of seeing male desires focused on yourself could blind you to what was in it for *you*. To me the idea was repulsive (IS:137).

This self-reflexivity also presents direct characterisation into the origo as Kristien is presented as questioning all constrictive norms. The fact that Kristien is

---

impostulated as reflecting on these emotions in retrospect also foregrounds the unreliability of the narration.

The emancipated qualities in Kristien's youth are also emphasised in the third incident, which provides focalisation of the chauvinist world she grew up in. As the event at her father's friend's house is recounted, Kristien reflects on her impression of the woman who sits outside crying after being sent out by her bullying husband:

Except **it was so awful** seeing the woman sitting there on the swing crying **but pretending not to**. I went over and pressed myself against her where she sat, and **decided** to tell her my "secret" to make her feel better – which was that when I grew up I'd never have children – but that made her cry even more (IS:138).

The focalisation here is clearly impostulated as being through Kristien as a young girl with her naïve attempt at consoling the woman. The subjectivity of the woman's mood also provides evidence of focalisation through Kristien. In the process Kristien is self-reflexively characterised (indirect characterisation into the narrative origo) as acutely observant, a quality that constantly informs the narrative.

Following these fairly general incidents, the narrative turns to the period just before Kristien's self-imposed exile, namely the period she spent at university when she was free from the restrictive environment of her home for the first time. This period is impostulated as the most important in terms of her development with the aid of markers of self-reflexivity:

In one sense university improved my life, but in another it made it worse. It was an improvement, because for the first time I **was tasting a kind of freedom**. But it was worse, because I **knew** a moment of decision was approaching (IS:138).

The conflicting emotions presented in the focalisation through Kristien draw attention to her political awakening, or at least her retrospective perspective on the significance of this period. In the fourth incident concerning another altercation with her father, the reason for this impending moment of decision is impostulated. Here the focalisation is marked particularly strongly in terms of subjectivity as her father's attitudes are impostulated:

There were always arguments with Father – about **not working hard enough**, or **taking 'useless' subjects**, or **reading the wrong books**, or **turning my back on 'my people'**, or **wearing the wrong clothes**. **Jesus**, there was one argument that went on for days, simply because I'd put on **what Father regarded** as a see-through



blouse ... A girl who flaunts her nipples, **he maintained**, is making herself cheap by blatantly announcing her general availability (IS:138).

The hypothetical component inscribed in the focalisation in this passage serves the dual purpose of indirectly characterising both Kristien as headstrong and independent and her father as conservative and chauvinistic.

In the fifth incident concerning the hunting trip to Namibia, the narrative mainly impostulates all those qualities in the culture Kristien grew up in against which she rebelled:

Before sunrise every day the men drove off with their guns in their **bakkies** while the **womenfolk** stayed behind to work. And work they did ... **only through slaving away** could they justify their existence. In the very **biltong** they cut, in the marinades they made and the miles of sausage they stuffed, **I could see** the system itself going about its inexorable business. After a few days **I couldn't stand it anymore** ... **Perhaps** an awareness was already beginning to dawn that a time would come **when I wouldn't take it any more**. There was no future for me in this **fucked** land. Even then it wasn't easy to take a decision that meant a total uprooting (IS:139).

The markers of subjectivity as well as of self-reflexivity in this passage serve to highlight the focalisation through Kristien of her sense of alienation and isolation in a society representing everything she came to detest. The sense of isolation is further emphasised through the person deixis as Kristien is clearly impostulated as distancing herself from the "womenfolk". The metatextual "perhaps an awareness was already beginning to dawn..." also enhances the self-reflexive tone of the impostulation.

This metatextual element which emphasises the self-reflexivity in the narrative origo becomes even more pronounced in the last part of the chapter and particularly in the two final incidents. For example, the self-reflexivity in Kristien's reason for becoming involved in leftist politics clearly steps outside of the retrospective narrative: "At least part of my motivation must have been the knowledge of just how much it would irk Father." (IS:140.) This confession (marked as announced subjectivity) becomes a strong theme in the novel as Kristien is impostulated as becoming increasingly aware of the role her rebellion against her father played in her involvement in the Struggle.

The penultimate incident involving the police pursuit disrupting their party also displays metatextual qualities. The incident is introduced with: "Inasmuch as decisions can ever be pinpointed in time and space I recall a party..." (IS:140.) The self-reflexivity here marks the self-awareness of the narrative, drawing attention to the imperfect nature of memory. Nonetheless, this incident is presented as foil for the incidents involving her father in order to impostulate at least some degree of sincerity in Kristien's actions.

A strong sense of self-irony characterises the rest of the impostulation of this incident:

- The conversation prompted by God knows what, was, **as befitted a group of students** carried away by a **reckless overestimation of their own intellectual faculties**, the human condition, **nothing less**.
- ... and **of course a thoroughly disinfected and sterilised Marx**. In the midst of all this **half-baked erudition** there was a sudden irruption into our **cosily sequestered world** ...
- ... broken into the **comfortable little enclave** in which I'd been brought up.
- **Perhaps** my reaction was **ineffectual**, and **sentimental**, and certainly **embarrassingly 'white'** (IS:140).

The focalisation of this incident is clearly impostulated through Kristien in the narrative or metatextual present and not Kristien as a young student, as can be seen in the markers of subjectivity and self-reflexivity as well as the markers of discourse deixis. This has the effect of impostulating a narrative origo that has a healthy sense of cynicism that informs the impostulation of the entire frame narrative.

The behaviour of the police in hot pursuit of the black man is similarly marked as focalisation through Kristien. The metatextual "bang-bang you're dead" (IS:140) impostulates a subjective perspective on the police to whom this pursuit is little more than a game. Similarly, the focalisation on the manner in which they pursue the black man reveals the subjective perspective from a position more than a decade after the event, impacting on the reliability of the narration. This incident has a profound impact on Kristien's political awakening as becomes evident in the focalisation through her in the following passage:

But **to me it was another shift, as if** the whole submerged other half – four-fifths – of life in South Africa had suddenly, forcibly, broken into the **comfortable little enclave** in which I'd been brought up. **Perhaps** my reaction was **ineffectual**, and **sentimental**, and certainly **embarrassingly 'white'**. But having been brought, for

**one shocking instant**, face to face with that secret dark segment of life in this country **on which everything else is predicated**, I couldn't just **blithely return** to the **bliss** of my **habitual ignorance** (IS:141).

The metatextual awareness (also signalled by the discourse deixis) and markers of self-reflexivity point to the fact that the incident as such is less important than the resulting characterisation into the narrative origo. In other words, the content is less important than the organisation of the discourse.

The account of Kristien's subsequent involvement in leftist political activities on campus likewise characterises the narrative origo through markers of subjectivity coupled with markers of self-reflexivity. The focalisation through Kristien of this period reinforces the impostulation of her revolt against everything her father stood for and the obvious satisfaction she gleaned from the knowledge:

- ... it did **provide me with some sense** of becoming a part of larger issues, of a movement running diametrically against **what Father had always so passionately described as 'our people's struggle for recognition'**...
- The most remarkable – and **gratifying** – discovery was that, however cautious and tentative our position was in real terms, within the context of campus life it **was regarded** as very dangerous indeed.
- What was particularly **frowned upon** was my relationship, in my honours year, with Eric Olivier, who **was regarded as something of an oddball** at Stellenbosch:
- My behaviour **was termed unacceptable for an Afrikaner, particularly reprehensible** in a young woman ... People were warned against associating with me. **It was great** (IS:141-2)

The markers of subjectivity in these examples display a particularly strong emphasis on appearances and impressions, indicating the biased focalisation through Kristien. Aspects like these are extremely important in the translation of narrative texts as they determine the interpretive dimension of impostulation the reader/translator has to engage with in order to activate the macrotextual presentational dimension of focalisation as impostulatory technique.

The impostulation of this last part of Kristien's life in South Africa before leaving for England is further characterised by a high frequency of markers of self-reflexivity. These markers contribute towards direct characterisation into the narrative origo, primarily in connection with her relationships with men. The focalisation in this section of the chapter is mostly through Kristien as student although there are a few

---

shifts to focalisation through Kristien in the narrative or metatextual present. These shifts are mostly evident in the temporal deixis (the tenses used) in the impostulation as is evident in the following: "If the great consuming passion in which I **confess I still secretly believed** had not yet come my way, I **felt sure** it was just a matter of time." (IS:142.) This sentence also serves as a link with the second part of this retrospective direct impostulated narrative in III:5 where her personal relationships become a stronger focus than her political motivations.

The final incident impostulated in this chapter (the visit of the two men trying to persuade her to become an informant) also provides the final motivation for Kristien to leave everything against which she has started to build resentment. The markers of self-reflexivity and subjectivity in this incident provide a circular structure to the chapter as Kristien is again impostulated as headstrong and independent, just as she used to be when she stole objects from classmates in primary school. This is evident in her reaction to their proposal: "I'm afraid I laughed outright at their proposal ... I refused to accord them the satisfaction of seeing me shaken." (IS:142-3.)

As a result of all these small shifts presented in the seven central incidents in the chapter, Kristien's ultimate decision to leave the country is impostulated as no surprise. Given the characterisation into the narrative origo in this chapter as well as the focalisation on the different relationships (with her father, the Afrikaner culture and the Afrikaner establishment), her decision to leave is the only logical conclusion: "... it did not even have to be taken, by that time it seemed ready-made within me ..." (IS:143).

This elaborate exposition of all the factors contributing to the decision, however, also presents focalisation through Kristien that could be interpreted as resulting from a compulsion to defend her decision. She is impostulated as feeling the need to justify her actions, lest they be interpreted as something like cowardice or impulsiveness or whimsy. Consequently, Kristien's struggle to rediscover a commitment she has long since lost (possibly with the death of her father when the need to rebel fell away), as

well as a well-hidden sense of insecurity and being adrift, are impostulated into the narrative origo.

Although the predominant markers in this chapter seem to be markers of self-reflexivity, the focalisation also becomes apparent in a high frequency of markers of subjectivity that indicates a biased perspective on these events from the past, as well as in markers of announced subjectivity that indicate a metatextual awareness of bias. Consequently, this chapter also provides a high frequency of (mostly) indirect characterisation into the narrative origo in Kristien's emotional and cognitive response to these memories, as well as density of (mostly) indirect characterisation from the narrative origo in the prejudiced focalisation of her father, Afrikaner culture and the Afrikaner establishment.

### **Part III: Chapter 5**

After a brief return to the narrative present in III:3-4, in which the complicated socio-political reality of the period before the elections is impostulated, Kristien's narrative at the level of retrospective direct impostulated narrative is resumed in this chapter. As the narration gets closer to the narrative present, it assumes a stronger sense of self-awareness as Kristien is impostulated as reflecting on the events in exile that contributed to her current state of alienation from her sense of self, but also from her commitment to the Struggle. Although only two significant events are recounted in this chapter (the abortion after the marriage – largely of convenience – with JC and the affair with Sandile), each incident is impostulated in much more detail than the "series of shifts" in III:2.

The self-ironical undertone and the attempt at self-justification that informs the account of her early history are again present in this chapter as the focus shifts away from the justification for Kristien's leaving the country and to a justification for her waning sense of commitment to the Struggle and the accompanying loss of a sense of purpose and identity. Consequently, the two incidents in this chapter are of a more personal nature, impostulating an awareness of her vulnerabilities.

The self-irony in the narrative is already evident in the first sentence: “Die eerste paar maande in Londen was ek op ’n high, gedryf deur die kompulsie om dit te laat “werk”, om “hulle te wys”, om my in te werp (**soos ek roekeloos geglo het**) in die geskiedenis; bo alles om aan myself te bewys dat ek kon slaag.” (SK:197.) Apart from the obvious markers of temporal and spatial deixis, the markers of self-reflexivity, in the use of quotation marks and brackets, further mark the focalisation through Kristien of her former naïve attitudes and motivations.

Unlike in the previous retrospective chapter analysed in IS, this chapter in SK has a particularly high frequency of markers of social deixis, primarily in the use of English words or terms. In fact, whereas these markers only occur occasionally in the final chapters of the novel in SK (analysed in 4.2.1.1), the frequency with which they occur in this chapter almost equals the frequency of markers of self-reflexivity. Some of the examples are:

- ... was ek **op ’n high** ... (SK:197).
- ... daar was ’n **slegte vibe** ... (SK:197).
- ’n **shady** prokureur wat nie veel beter as ’n **confidence trickster** uitgedraai het nie... (SK:198).
- Dit het **odd jobbies** opgelewer... ’n rukkie was ek selfs **editing assistant** vir ’n paar **low-budget** Derde Wêreld **dokkies** (SK:198).
- en die hele ding het iets van ’n **vicious circle** geword (SK:199).
- Wat **tougher** was ... (SK:201).
- ... vroulike **instability** ... (SK:201).
- ... ’n **balls-up** ... (SK:201).
- ’n **Affair** ... ’n **one-night-stand** ... (SK:202).
- As dit nie te **corny** klink nie (SK:204).
- totdat ook dit mettertyd **uitgefade** het – behalwe ...in skielike **precious** oomblikke... (SK:205).
- Die **issues** was werklik, dringend, duidelik (SK:205).
- ... ’n bietjie **shaky**, ... **niks specials** nie (SK:206).

The social deixis in these markers actively contributes towards the indirect characterisation into the narrative origo as Kristien is impostulated as a rebel, also in her use of language, going against the accepted norms of a pure Afrikaans language (die Taal). The informal tone these markers award the narrative, further contributes towards the impostulation of Kristien as down to earth. However, this element of the impostulation also provides the biggest problem in terms of the characterisation into the narrative origo, since the informal tone comes across as slightly superficial due to the fact that it is not maintained consistently in the rest of

SK. As the novel progresses, the language in SK tends to get more formal, creating the impression that the use of such a high frequency of markers of social deixis in this predominantly self-reflexive chapter may also be part of Kristien's elaborate self-justification at this level of the narrative<sup>65</sup>.

The use of markers of social deixis related to the use of more colloquial language similarly impostulates a more informal narrative origo:

- maar dit was beter as 'n **skop onder die gat** (SK:198).
- ... een **ongoddelike** mooi somernaweek ... en **daar sit ek toe met die gebakte peer** (SK:199).
- Maar wat my 'n **gatkrimp** gegee het ... (SK:201).
- Daarom het ek hom op 'n dag... aangesê om te **fokof** (SK:201).
- Onvoorwaardelik, vraagloos, uitbundig, **gat-oor-kop** (SK:202).
- En selfs toe die **nattigheid** my tref, soos ouma Kristina dit sou stel... (SK:203).
- die donkerste en **kakste** van my lewe (SK:205).

These deictic markers play a significant role in terms of the focalisation, marking, as they do, the subjective impressions of this period in Kristien's life. The use of informal language and (at times) crude terms also presents a juxtaposition to the serious nature of the events and the strong impact they made on Kristien. Therefore, the language also reinforces the sense of self-irony that characterises the focalisation at this level of the narration, as Kristien's attempt to understate her emotions is impostulated.

The first of the two significant incidents in this chapter is introduced with the following metatextual marker of discourse deixis: "En nou die huwelik." (SK:198.) This brief statement immediately foregrounds the significance of the event in the organisation of the narrative as the narrative starts building towards the abortion already hinted at in the first part of the novel.

The self-reflexivity in the subsequent sentence again underscores the tone of self-irony and self-justification informing most of the focalisation in this chapter: "**Ek is bevrees** daar was maar min glamour by betrokke." (SK:198.) As Kristien's reflection

---

<sup>65</sup> This inconsistency in the use of social deixis can also be seen in Brink's more recent *Duiwelskloof* (1998c)/*Devil's Valley* (1998d), where the language of the narrator, Flip Lochner, likewise changes from an initial informal (and fairly coarse) language to a more formal register towards the end of the novel.

on the marriage is impostulated, this aspect is constantly reinforced, as can be seen in the announced subjectivity in the following passage:

Jean-Claude Thompson was sy naam, JC vir sy vriende, 'n naam wat hy aan 'n doting Franse ma te danke gehad het. Dit was **dalk** ook dié konneksie wat sy vaardigheid as 'n lover bepaal het, veral op die orale gebied; en **dit mag iets bygedra het tot my besluit. Nie dat dit heeltemal so ligtelik geneem is as wat dit nou klink nie**; maar die vernaamste oorweging was tog dat 'n huwelik die kortpad na 'n werkpermit was (SK:199).

The metatextual quality of the narration in this passage emphasises the retrospective perspective on the events as well as the self-awareness impostulated in Kristien in terms of the unreliability and bias of her memories. The impostulation of this event is clearly self-justificatory as can also be seen in the following:

**Ek probeer om dit so nugter moontlik te vertel. Miskien** is ek nog altyd bang ek kan die emosie nie hanteer nie. **Maar miskien** is dit gewoon 'n renons in melodrama... Ek het nie destyds 'n scene gemaak nie, altans nie in die openbaar nie; **ek wil ook nie nou nie** (SK:199-200).

The impostulation of Kristien's memories concerning the pregnancy (including the conception and abortion) and the subsequent divorce is again marked as self-reflexive. This stresses the self-aware focalisation through Kristien. The abortion itself is bracketed by the framing juxtaposition between the conception and divorce, marked by the description of the weather:

- Ek en JC is albei onvoorbereid gevang toe ons **een ongoddelike mooi somernaweek** in 'n grasveld naby Stowe-on-Wye deur die lus oorval is. JC het sy reputasie eer aangedoen – en daar sit ek toe met die gebakte peer (SK:199).
- Daarom het ek hom op 'n dag... aangesê om te fokof. En op 'n **besonder mooi dag in September** is ons geskei (SK:201).

The focalisation through Kristien of the weather also serves to enhance the self-ironical tone of the narration.

Instead of focussing on the abortion itself, the narration turns to the emotional emptiness Kristien experiences after the “kort onpersoonlike besoek aan die kliniek” (SK:200). In this reaction, the first signs of Kristien's loss of a sense of identity are impostulated in the self-reflexivity of the following example.

- Waaraan ek *nou* behoefte gehad het, was die nabyheid van 'n suster.
- Dit alles kon ek verwerk. Wat tougher was, was daardie eensaam nagte
- Die soort sentimentaliteit wat ek nooit in myself sou verwag het nie (SK:200-201).



The intensely personal nature of the event also has the effect of overshadowing Kristien's half-hearted attempt at remaining committed to the Struggle. Her only motivation at this stage is impostulated as the continuing rebellion against her father evident in the self-reflexive statement: "Die belangrikste bevrediging was die wete dat ek met elke ding wat ek doen, 'n byl inlê teen die wortels van my pa se boom".

The second significant event during this period, namely the affair with Sandile, is likewise more focused on the emotional impact than on the almost incidental context of the anti-Apartheid activities they are involved in. The importance of this relationship as focalised through Kristien is marked self-reflexively in the following passage:

Die enigste brander op die stillerige oppervlak van my lewe die afgelope jare was Sandile Hlati. Vir een keer in my lewe – **tot dusver die enigste keer, hoewel ek my die reg voorbehou om weer verras te word** – het ek 'n man behoorlik liefgehad. Onvoorwaardelik, vraagloos, uitbundig, gat-oor-kop (SK:202).

The metatextual element in the above example further serves to emphasise the self-aware quality of the narrative, as is the case in the following: "Hy was beautiful. **Maar ek sal my inhou.**" (SK:203.) This metatextual impostulation of the relationship with Sandile takes on an almost narcissist quality in Kristien's description of him (direct characterisation from the narrative origo), which reminds strongly of the metatextual impostulated narrative in 1:4 which provides direct characterisation into the narrative origo:

- Daarby was hy ook 'n doodgewone mens, **goddank: met ander woorde** hy kon koppig wees, bedonnerd, snaaks, pedanties, bedruk; hy kon oorreegeer
- Hy was passionate, Hy was versot op my voete. Hy was links. nes ek (SK 203).

Evidently, the links between them are focalised as much more significant than the fact that they were both left-handed. Through the retrospective direct impostulated narrative of Sandile and their relationship, the focalisation through Kristien reveals the profound impact this relationship (that could never be) had on her, and the role it played in bringing her to a sense of alienation from herself. The exact duration of the relationship in the self-reflexive statement, "Dit het vyf maande, sewentien dae

en dertien uur geduur" (SK:204), underscores the importance of the relationship as well as the fact that it was merely a moment in her history.<sup>66</sup>

The precision in this memory, like the precise recollection of the weather in the context of her relationship with JC, is in stark contrast to the vague memories of most of the other incidents in this retrospective impostulation. Consequently, the focalisation through Kristien becomes particularly vivid. In the description of the moment she realised that the relationship was over, the full extent of the emotional impact is impostulated:

Vir die eerste keer ... het ek werklik gevoel hoe dit is as mens se baarmoeder saamtrek; en dit was veel erger as 'n bloot fisieke pyn. Terselfdertyd het ek ongelooflik afgetrokke gevoel... met in my binneste 'n helder sekerheid oor wat my te doen staan (SK:204).

This clarity echoes the clarity concerning her decision to leave the country in III:2, yet the inevitable juxtaposition rather marks the end of her commitment to the Struggle in real terms, described in the following passage:

Ek het vir die ANC bly werk ... maar stadigaan het die geesdrif afgeneem. Sonder dat ek dit so beplan het of wou hê, het 'n tyd vir bestekopname aangebreek. Nie dat ek enige probleem gehad het met die strugle nie: inteendeel. Die issues was werklik, dringend, duidelik. Maar dalk was dit deel van die probleem. In die konteks van die Britse politiek, waar alles – op die oppervlak altans – so boring en voorspelbaar was, het my geesdrif begin versand... ek was besig met hanteerbare vroulike sake, in die mans se skaduwee (SK:205).

The impostulation of this self-scrutiny also impostulates the self-irony in the knowledge that although her involvement in the Struggle and self-imposed exile were in the first place the result of her revolt against the patriarchal attitudes of her father, she now once again found herself in the shadow of men. The focalisation of this process of self-criticism further impostulates the disillusionment in the narrative origo culminating in the crisis of identity impostulated at the end of this chapter:

Het ek 'n verraaier geword? Nouliks. Ek het eenvoudig nie meer die energie, die blote lus, gehad om aan te hou glo en hoop nie; anders as diegene wat hulle lewe aan die strugle toegewy het, is ek suutjies op 'n sandbank uitgespoel en daar agtergelaat, 'n bietjie tam in die knieë, 'n bietjie shaky, 'n bietjie sinies, 'n bietjie skuldig, niks specials nie. (SK:206.)

---

<sup>65</sup> Although this is as specific as "‘n uur en twintig minute voor ek en Michael die eerste keer liefde gemaak het" (SK:16) in the first chapter of the SK, the focus is here not on Kristien's meticulous eye for detail in some memories, but rather on the profound effect of the event.

The almost defeated Kristien impostulated here in the narrative origo is far removed from the headstrong and independent Kristien in the narrative origo in most of the frame as well as at the metatextual level.

The final sentence of the chapter brings the narration back to the context of the narrative present: "Nee, ek reis glad nie so lig nie, Anna". This forces the impostulation back to the conversation between the two sisters in III:1, although it is evident that these two chapters are not part of the narrative present but rather a sustained retrospective direct impostulated narrative.

The predominance of markers of self-reflexivity in this chapter emphasises the self-awareness of the narrative focalised through Kristien. This is supported by the high frequency of markers of social deixis. Together these two types of markers contribute to the indirect characterisation into the narrative that provides an important background to both the rest of the frame impostulation and Ouma Kristina's embedded herstory.

#### **4.2.2.1.4 Comparison: parallel texts and translation**

Since this level of the embedded impostulation deals with Kristien's (her)story (divided into the two periods discussed above), it is to be expected that the high frequency of markers of self-reflexive impostulation will be closely related to the characterisation into the narrative origo. Any shifts in focalisation between the parallel texts will therefore impact directly on the impostulation of the narrative origo on the macrotextual level.

### **Part III, Chapter 2**

The first difference in focalisation between the three texts relates to the metatextual level, in other words where the affective distance between the impostulated narrator (i.e. also narrative origo) and the reader is changed through deictic markers and markers of self-reflexivity. The discourse deixis present in most of these examples relates to the impostulation of the series of shifts identified by Kristien as resulting in her decision to leave the country. Examples of this metatextual impostulation are given in (1) to (6) below:

	IS	JLK	SK
(1)	Once, I remember, I stole a tiny ceramic figurine of a rooster ...	Soos die keer toe ek 'n klein keramiekbeeldjie van 'n hoenderhaan gesteel het ...	Eénkeer, onthou ek, het ek 'n klein porseleinhoenderhaantjie gesteel ...
(2)	When I was already in London I remember once walking...	Toe ek alreeds in Londen was, was daar die keer wat ek ...	En so het dit aangehou. In Londen het ek een aand ..

In all three the texts the reference to the first incident in (1) is indicated by means of indefinite temporal deixis (“once”, “die keer” and “Eenkeer”). However, the slight shift in terms of the discourse deixis from “I remember” in IS and “onthou ek” in SK to “soos die keer” in JLK results in a stronger emphasis in the latter on the link between this incident and the series of shifts impostulated in the chapter. In (2), this emphasis on the line of reasoning is sustained in JLK with the repetition of “die keer” and it also appears in SK with “En so het dit aangehou” whereas IS again only refers to the fact that this is a memory. Although this is certainly a very minor shift, the impact on focalisation is that the incidents are impostulated from a more cohesive line of reasoning in SK and JLK than in IS where they are presented as more isolated examples. On the other hand, the fact that IS refers to the fact that these are memories in both examples, and SK in (1) (with “onthou ek”) foregrounds that part of the focalisation related to memory, lending it a stronger sense of announced subjectivity.

Although the discourse deixis referring to the line of reasoning is equally evident in all three texts in (3), the more explicit person deixis “jy” in SK in (4) emphasises the metatextual nature of the utterance as the reader is addressed directly:

	IS	JLK	SK
(3)	That kind of thing.	Sulke goed.	Dié klas van ding.
(4)	See what I mean?	Sien wat ek bedoel?	Verstaan jy wat ek bedoel?

As a result, the self-justification impostulated in the narrative is also emphasised which changes the context of the utterance slightly, even if the rhetorical questions in IS and JLK also imply the link impostulated between the narrator and the reader. In isolation, this added emphasis on the metatextual in SK may not have a significant impact, but in (5) and (6) this emphasis is supported:

	IS	JLK	SK
(5)	... but it was not without irony, because Stellenbosch was their own alma mater they enthusiastically supported the move ...	... maar dit was nie sonder 'n tikkie ironie nie, aangesien Stellenbosch hulle eie alma mater was. Gevolglik het hulle my skuif entoesiasies ondersteun ...	... maar dit was nogal ironies ook, want Stellenbosch was mos hulle alma mater gewees, met die gevolg dat hulle my nogal geesdriftig ondersteun het. <b>Mens kan ook wragtig nie wen nie.</b>
(6)	Towards the end of my university career - ...	Teen die einde van my universiteitsloopbaan ...	<b>Anyway</b> , hier teen die einde van my universiteitsloopbaan

The self-reflexive use of discourse deixis in “Mens kan ook wragtig nie wen nie” and “Anyway” in SK does not appear in either of the two other texts, with the result that the context of utterance as well as the metatextual impostulation of the focalisation is much more prominent in SK.

As in much of the novel, there is a strong difference between the Afrikaans and English texts in terms of social deixis, which impacts on the focalisation due to the impostulation of a less formal and at times more crude narrative origo in the Afrikaans. In (7) to (9) below, examples are provided:

	IS	JLK	SK
(7)	Holidays were <b>terrible</b> , except in summer when we came here to Sinai.	Vakansies was <b>terrible</b> , behalwe in die somer as ons hier na Sinai toe gekom het.	Vakansies was <b>fokken onuitstaanbaar</b> , behalwe in die somer, as ons hier na Sinai toe gekom het.
(8)	<b>Jesus</b> , there was one argument... because I'd put on what Father regarded as a <b>see-through</b> blouse	<b>Bliksem</b> , daar was een fight wat vir dae aangehou het net omdat ek 'n bloes aangetrek het wat na Pa se mening <b>see-through</b> was en my nipples gewys het, ...	Daar was een rusie wat omtrent 'n week aangehou het, net oor ek 'n bloese aangetrek het wat volgens Pa <b>see-through</b> was en wat my nipples gewys het; ...
(9)	At least part of my motivation must have been the knowledge of just how much it would <b>irk</b> Father.	Ten minste 'n gedeelte van my motivering moes gewees het dat ek geweet het hoe <b>dit Pa sou afpis</b> .	Ek dink deel van my motivering was dat ek besef het presies hoe <b>dit Pa se gathare sou grys maak</b> .

The much cruder “fokken onuitstaanbaar” in SK in (7) is in stark contrast to the less formal “terrible” in JLK (in the use of the English term) and the merely subjective “terrible” in IS. In contrast, the marker of social deixis in the profanity in IS (“Jesus”) in (8) is a coarse “Bliksem” in JLK and does not appear at all in SK, which, in this case, emphasises the metatextual impostulation and the emotional aspect of the focalisation in IS and JLK. In (9) the difference in formality is again evident as the more formal “irk” in IS is rendered the coarser “afpis” in JLK and “gathare sou grysmaak” in SK.

In (10), the shift in the focalisation of the arguments between Kristien and her father is due primarily to the fact that SK impostulates her father's criticisms and accusations more directly, as Kristien remembers them uttered by him, whereas IS and JLK present a more underplayed account with merely a list of these criticisms:

	IS	JLK	SK
(10)	There were always arguments with Father – <b>about not working hard enough, or taking 'useless' subjects, or reading the wrong books, or turning my back on 'my people', or wearing the wrong clothes.</b>	Daar was altyd fights met Pa - oor ek nie hard genoeg gewerk het nie, of "useless" vakke gevat het, of verkeerde boeke gelees het, of my rug op "my mense" gedraai het, of die verkeerde klere gedra het.	Daar was altyd rusies met Pa – ek het nie hard genoeg gewerk nie, my vakke was useless, ek het nooit die regte boeke gelees nie, ek het kwansuis my rug op "ons" mense gedraai, ek het altyd die verkeerde klere gedra.
(11)	... against what Father had always <b>so passionately described</b> as 'our people's struggle for recognition'.	... lynreg ingegaan het teen wat Pa altyd <b>so heftig beskryf het</b> as "ons volk se stryd om erkenning".	... téén wat Pa altyd so <b>hoogheilig voorgehou het</b> as "ons volk se stryd om erkenning".

As a result of the more direct impostulation of his words, the focalisation through Kristien of her father is more negative in SK. This is supported in (11) where the merely subjective "passionately described" in IS and "heftig beskryf het" in JLK is rendered more of a value judgement by the "hoogheilig voorgehou het" in SK.

The stronger emphasis on the discord between them is mirrored by the focalisation through Kristien of Afrikaner cultural stereotypes and the Afrikaner establishment in (12) to (15):

	IS	JLK	SK
(12)	... while the womenfolk stayed behind to work. <b>And work they did...</b>	... terwyl die vroumense agtergebly het om te werk. <b>En werk het hulle gewerk,</b>	... terwyl die vroue moes agterbly om te werk. <b>En jissis, het hulle gewerk.</b>
(13)	only through slaving away could they justify their existence. In the very biltong they cut, in the marinades they made and the miles of sausage they stuffed, <b>I could see the system itself going about its inexorable business.</b>	... want slegs deur hulle voordurende geswoeg kon hulle hulle bestaan regverdig. In die biltong wat hulle gesny het, in die marinades wat hulle voorberei het en in die myle wors wat hulle gestop het <b>kon ek duidelik die meedoënlose gang van die sisteem sien.</b>	Want net deur hulle af te sloof, kon hulle hulle bestaan regverdig. In die biltong wat hulle sny, in die wors wat hulle stop, in die hompe en boude wat hulle pekel, <b>kon mens die hele fokken sisteem sien rammel en roer.</b>

Kristien's contempt for the system of Afrikaner culture is impostulated through the markers of subjectivity that indicate the focalisation through Kristien.<sup>67</sup> In both examples above, the stereotypical activities of Afrikaner women in a patriarchal society are described in all three texts in terms of the way they slaved away while the men were out hunting. Kristien's contempt is marked more clearly in the Afrikaans texts in (12) with the repetition of "werk" in JLK and particularly the profanity, "jissis, het hulle gewerk" in SK. In (13) the coarse reference to "die hele fokken sisteem" is likewise focalised much more emotionally in SK than in the two other texts where the "inexorable business" (IS) and "meedoënlose gang" (JLK) are also more neutral than the "rammel en roer" in SK. As a result of the social deixis in SK, the focalisation is therefore markedly different from that in the two other texts, impostulating stronger sentiments in Kristien about the stereotype and culture as well as a more pronounced distancing from the culture as a whole.

In (14) and (15) below, the focalisation through Kristien of the men is also foregrounded in markers of subjectivity, although there is in this case less in the form of a shift:

	IS	JLK	SK
(14)	Until in the hazy afternoon the men returned, <b>an almost totemic sight</b> , carrying on their shoulders the <b>bleeding carcasses</b> of the game they'd shot.	Totdat die manne in die deinsigerige namiddag teruggekom het, <b>amper soos die Israeliete uit Kanaan</b> , met die <b>bebloede karkasse</b> van die wild wat hulle die dag geskiet het oor hulle skouers.	Totdat die manne naderhand in die stowwereige laatmiddag teruggekom het, 'n <b>amper totemiese gesig</b> , met die <b>dag se geskiete bokke</b> oor hulle skouers gedrapeer.
(15)	... <b>when I was found</b> , humiliatingly, by a search-party of men, led by father and our host, well after sunset.	... <b>toe ek gevind is</b> , tot my vernedering, deur 'n soekgeselskap van mans onder leiding van Pa en ons gasheer, lank na sononder.	... toe die laaste vernedering my oorkom en 'n soekgeselskap manne, gelei deur Pa en ons gasheer, my lank na sononder <b>kom red</b> .

In (14) the more specific "soos die Israeliete uit Kanaan" in JLK, in contrast to the "almost totemic sight" in IS and "amper totemiese gesig" in SK results in a trace of the notion of the Afrikaner nation being God's chosen people in JLK, not present in the other two texts. The contrast between "found" and "gevind" in IS and JLK on the

<sup>67</sup> The focalisation in these examples, and in many other instances in the novel, also display what Wenzel (2001:1) describes as "the continuous dialectic between the individual and society ... and the relevance of the past in the construction of a new beginning".

one hand and “kom red” in SK on the other, emphasises Kristien’s impostulated sense of humiliation in the latter as the focalisation establishes a link to the earlier characterisation into the narrative origo. This self-irony in SK therefore impostulates a stronger motivation for the ultimate decision to leave the country in SK than in the two other texts, as in the case of (12) and (13).

In contrast to the stronger emphasis on Kristien’s contempt for Afrikaner values and culture in SK, the focalisation of her political awakening at university seems more neutral in SK than in IS and JLK in examples (16) to (20):

	IS	JLK	SK
(16)	But to me it was another shift, as if the whole submerged other half – four-fifths – of life in South Africa had <b>suddenly, forcibly, broken into the comfortable little enclave in which I’d been brought up.</b>	Maar vir my was dit nog ’n verskuiwinkie. asof die hele versteekte ander helfte – vier vyfdes – van lewe in Suid-Afrika <b>skielik met geweld ingebars het in die gemaklike klein enklawetjie waarin ek grootgemaak is.</b>	Maar vir my was dit tog weer ’n verskuiwing, asof die verborge helfte – vier vyfdes – van Suid-Afrika <b>eensklaps in my bewussyn ingebreek het.</b>

The more neutral “my bewussyn” in SK does not provide the same self-aware and self-ironical focalisation as “comfortable little enclave in which I’ve been brought up” in IS nor in the similar JLK. As a result, the self-justification behind the line of reasoning in these two texts is foregrounded. In (17), the focalisation in SK is similarly more neutral with the use of “surprise” in contrast to the more subjective “most remarkable – and gratifying – discovery” in IS and “merkwaardigste – en mees bevredigende – ontdekking” in JLK:

	IS	JLK	SK
(17)	<b>The most remarkable – and gratifying – discovery</b> was that, however cautious and tentative our position was in real terms, within the context of campus life it was regarded as very dangerous indeed.	<b>Die merkwaardigste – en mees bevredigende – ontdekking</b> was dat, ongeag van hoe versigtig en tentatief ons posisie in werklikheid was, dit binne die konteks van kampuslewe beskou is as uiters gevaarlik.	<b>Die grootste surprise</b> was dat ons optrede, hoe versigtig en tentatief ook al, deur die universiteitsowerhede as ontsettend gevaarlik beskou is, potensiele dade van tereur,

A similar neutrality can be seen in (18) and (19) in SK in contrast to IS and JLK:

	IS	JLK	SK
(18)	... Eric Olivier, who was <b>regarded as something of an oddball at Stellenbosch</b>	... Eric Olivier <b>wat op Stellenbosch beskou is as ’n effe vreemd</b> ...	... Eric Olivier, <b>wat iets van ’n odd-ball op Stellenbosch was</b> ...



(19)	<b>My behaviour was termed unacceptable</b> for an Afrikaner, particularly reprehensible in a young woman.	<b>My gedrag is bestempel as onaanvaarbaar</b> vir 'n Afrikaner, en veral laakbaar in 'n jong dame.	<b>My gedrag was onaanvaarbaar</b> vir 'n jong Afrikaner, meer spesifiek in 'n jong dame.
------	--	---	---

The fact that Eric is described as having been different (“iets van 'n odd-ball ... was”) in SK as well as that Kristien’s behaviour was unacceptable (“was onaanvaarbaar”), presents a different focalisation from that in IS and JLK where the fact that these were both specific perceptions is impostulated in “regarded as/beskou is” and “termed/bestempel” in these two texts. Also in (20), the “dit was nogal nice” in SK does not impostulate the same degree of satisfaction with the situation as in IS and JLK:

	IS	JLK	SK
(20)	People were warned against associating with me. <b>It was great.</b>	<b>Mense is gewaarsku om nie met my te assosieer nie. Dit was great.</b>	Mense is gewaarsku om nie met my te assosieer nie. <b>Dit was nogal nice.</b>

Another difference in focalisation appears in Kristien’s description of the policemen pursuing the black man. As can be seen below, the hypothetical focalisation through Kristien of the awareness of the policemen marked by the subjectivity in IS and JLK is omitted in SK:

	IS	JLK	SK
(21)	<b>Quite oblivious of our presence, intent only on their furious pursuit, ...</b>	<b>Heeltemal onbewus van ons teenwoordigheid, totaal verlore in hulle agtervolging,</b>	-

In the trace left by this focalisation in IS and JLK, Kristien’s position as observer is therefore foregrounded, emphasising the impact the event had on her as well as her impostulated self-justification.

It would therefore seem that the shifts in focalisation in this chapter do impact on the impostulation of the narrative origo and on the covert attempt at self-justification for the decision to leave the country. On the one hand SK has a stronger emphasis on Kristien’s growing disgust with Afrikaner cultural stereotypes and the Afrikaner establishment, also in terms of her sour relations with her father as representative of this culture, evident in the markers of social and discourse deixis in the focalisation

of the earlier incidents. On the other hand, the focalisation of her political awakening at university (the later incidents in the series of shifts) is impostulated in more neutral terms in SK than in IS and JLK, with the result the focalisation through Kristien of the political motivation for her self-imposed exile is stronger in these two texts.

The similarities between IS and JLK could probably be ascribed largely to a closer adherence to the markers in IS as source text for the translation in JLK, although the macrotexual interpretation of these markers certainly also has an impact.

### Part III, Chapter 5

In this chapter SK is taken as source text for the translation in JLK, which could be expected to influence the impostulation in the translation in terms of social deixis. Indeed, the social deixis in this chapter is instrumental in impostulating the self-awareness in the narrative origo. The manner in which this sense of self-awareness is impostulated can be seen to differ significantly in example (1) to (6) below, particularly due to the differences in the use of social deixis:

	SK	JLK	IS
(1)	daar het ek 'n landsgenoot in exile opgetel – of hy vir my – 'n <b>shady prokureur</b> wat nie veel beter as 'n <b>confidence trickster</b> uitgedraai het nie...	There I picked up a fellow countryman in exile - or he me - a <b>shady attorney</b> who turned out to be little better than a <b>confidence trickster</b> . ...	... then picked up, or was picked up by, a compatriot in exile, a <b>louche attorney</b> who later turned out to be no more than a <b>second-hand confidence trickster</b> . ...
(2)	Dit het odd jobbies opgelewer... 'n rukkie was ek selfs editing assistant vir 'n paar low-budget Derde Wêreld <b>dokkies</b>	That provided odd jobs ... for a time I was even editing assistant for a few low-budget Third World <b>doccies</b> .	That meant odd, and mostly illegal, jobs here and there ... even acting as editing assistant for a couple of low-budget Third-World <b>documentaries</b> .
(3)	Nie te sleg nie; ook niks merkwaardigs nie; niks wat die aarde laat beweeg het nie. <b>Kwessie van making friends and influencing people.</b>	Not bad; but nothing <b>spectacular</b> either; nothing that made the earth move. <b>Simply a matter of making friends and influencing people.</b>	Not bad; not particularly good either, and certainly not earth-moving. <b>For a while it served its purpose in making friends and influencing people.</b>
(4)	Maar mettertyd het mens ook vyande opgetel, <b>en die hele ding het iets van 'n vicious circle</b> geword.	But inevitably one also made enemies in the process, <b>and the whole thing became something of a vicious circle.</b>	But in due course – in the 'medium term' as the bright and eager political analysts around me would say – it also created enemies, <b>and there was a hint of the vicious circle about the whole exercise.</b>

In (1) the use of “shady” in the Afrikaans SK is marked more heavily in terms of register than the (still informal) “shady” in the English JLK, whereas “louche” in IS raises the register significantly.<sup>68</sup> However, the addition of “second-hand” to “confidence trickster” in IS achieves a similar effect to the social deixis in the use of “confidence trickster” in SK, whereas the use of the same term in JLK is fairly neutral. In (2), the more colloquial “dokkies” in SK and “doccies” in JLK is again more formal in IS (“documentaries”).

In (3) and (4), the impostulation in IS is more neutral, on the one hand because the use of the English expressions in SK renders the register more informal, but on the other hand also because the same expressions in IS are formulated in a way that downplays the idiomatic content and emphasises the semantic content. Consequently, the focalisation is less clearly marked in IS.

In (5) and (6), this difference in social deixis can again be seen:

	SK	JLK	IS
(5)	<b>Maar wat my 'n gatkramp gegee het...</b>	<b>But what pissed me off ...</b>	<b>But what got me in my guts ...</b>
(6)	... onderwysdiploma. Nie juis 'n inspirerende of verrykende ondervinding nie, <b>maar dit was beter as 'n skop onder die gat</b> en ek het met bewonderenswaardige toewyding klas geloop.	I enrolled for my teaching diploma. Not exactly an inspiring or enriching experience, <b>but still better than a kick in the butt</b> , and I attended classes with admirable dedication.	... I registered for an education diploma. Not exactly an inspiring or enriching experience, <b>but</b> I attended lectures with commendable dedication.

The social deixis in the coarse language in SK in these two examples is more or less similar in JLK (although “pissed me off” could be argued to be slightly more base than “gatkramp gegee”). In IS, however, the language is again more formal and also less overtly marked in terms of focalisation with the more neutral “got me in the guts” in (5) whereas the entire marked segment in (6) disappears. The traces surrounding the markers of social deixis in the above examples in SK and for the most part in JLK therefore impostulate a different degree of subjectivity than the neutral or empty deixis in IS. As a result the focalisation through the narrative origo changes significantly, as does the affective distance between the narrator and the reader.

<sup>68</sup> This adjective is indicated as having restricted use in the *Reader's Digest Oxford Complete Wordfinder* (Tulloch, 1993:905).

Although the emphasis in this chapter shifts from Kristien's political awareness to her intimate relationships and more emotional perspectives, the focalisation through Kristien of her political awareness does present differences. These differences between the three texts are significant on a macrotextual level since the entire level of retrospective direct impostulated narrative is in some way or another self-justificatory. In example (7) to (9) this difference in focalisation is fairly obvious:

	SK	JLK	IS
(7)	... al kon mens reken op 'n mate van beskerming ... het jy die hele tyd geweet die Thatcher-regering, <b>kop in een mus met PW en kie, lê op loer.</b>	... even if one could bargain on a measure of protection ... you were constantly aware of <b>being watched</b> by the Thatcher government, <b>hand in glove with PW and company.</b>	... in spite of a measure of protection offered by Anti-Apartheid ... one knew all the time that the Thatcher government, <b>in cahoots as it was with the regime in South Africa, did not take a kind view of aliens in my situation.</b>
(8)	<b>Die belangrikste bevrediging</b> was die wete dat ek met elke ding wat ek doen, 'n byl inlê teen die wortels van my pa se boom.	<b>The most important benefit</b> was the knowledge that I was <b>putting an axe to my father's tree</b> with every little thing I did.	<b>Its real reward</b> lay in the knowledge that with every action I was <b>striking my little blow against everything my father represented.</b>
(9)	<b>Enigiets was beter as om teenoor my familie te moet erken dat ek 'n balls-up gemaak het...</b>	<b>Anything was better than admitting to my family that I had made a balls-up</b> of the whole overseas move.	... but I doubt that I could have faced the <b>humiliation of admitting, to my family, that the move abroad had been a failure.</b>

In (7) the main difference in focalisation concerns the contrast between "lê op loer" in SK, "being watched by" in JLK and "did not take a kind view of aliens in my situation" in IS, all referring to the focalisation through Kristien of the Thatcher government. In SK and JLK, the emphasis is on the sense of being watched, which could be interpreted as in some way validating Kristien's commitment to the Struggle, whereas the emphasis in IS is rather less overtly on her position in self-imposed exile.

The metaphoric description of Kristien's conscious rebellion against her father's very identity (in the metaphor of the tree) in SK and JLK creates more gaps and traces than the straightforward statement in IS ("everything my father represented"). Although the referential value of the three texts is therefore similar, the more figurative description in SK and JLK renders the statement more self-aware. The

same could be said of (9) where the social deixis in SK and JLK (“balls-up”) becomes a neutral “failure” in IS.

The issue of Kristien’s commitment to the Struggle in her self-justificatory narrative is again focalised differently in (10) to (12), where the focalisation in IS seems to impostulate Kristien as predominantly passive and that in SK and JLK predominantly active:

	SK	JLK	IS
(10)	<b>Nie dat ek enige probleem gehad het met die struggle nie: inteendeel.</b> Die issues was werklik, dringend, duidelik	<b>Not that I had any problems with the Struggle; quite the contrary.</b> The issues were real, urgent, obvious.	<b>There was nothing wrong with the Struggle; on the contrary.</b> Its issues were real, urgent, clear-cut.
(11)	In die konteks van die Britse politiek, waar alles – op die oppervlak altans – so boring en voorspelbaar was, <b>het my geesdrif begin versand...</b> Veel belangriker was die gevoel, ten regte of ten onregte, ... ek was besig met hanteerbare vroulike sake, in die mans se skaduwee.	In the context of British politics, where everything – on the surface at least – was so boring and predictable, <b>my enthusiasm started to wane;</b> More important, however, was the sense, rightly or wrongly, that I was ... busy with manageable women’s things, in the shadow of the men.	<b>I suppose</b> in the context of British politics, so prosaic and predictable (at least on the surface), <b>drained some of my enthusiasm,</b> ... More importantly, there was the growing feeling, right or wrong, that I was ... doing manageable womanly things, expected to toil selflessly in the shadow of the men. [more self-justificatory – distancing herself – victim]
(12)	<b>Het ek ’n verraaier geword?</b> Nouliks. Ek het eenvoudig nie meer die energie, die blote lus, gehad om aan te hou glo en hoop nie.	<b>Had I become a traitor?</b> Hardly. It was simply that I no longer had the energy, the desire, to carry on believing and hoping;	<b>Had I become a traitor to the cause?</b> Hardly. I just didn’t have enough energy left to go on hoping, believing; ...

In (10) the self-justificatory tone in SK and JLK in the use of the personal and active “nie dat ek enige probleem gehad het met die struggle nie/Not that I had any problems with the Struggle” is underplayed in IS which is more passive and less personal: “There was nothing wrong with the Struggle”. Similarly, in (11), the active “het my geesdrif begin versand/my enthusiasm started to wane” in SK and JLK becomes a passive “I suppose...drained some of my enthusiasm” in IS, which is much more non-committal.

Although the difference in focalisation between the texts is less significant in (12) and does not relate to the opposition between active and passive, the fact that the narrator in IS specifies “traitor to the cause” whereas SK and JLK have only “verraaier/traitor”, impostulates a different relationship between the narrator and

reader. This can probably be ascribed to the fact that IS was in all likelihood aimed primarily at an international audience, whereas SK obviously at a local audience that may not need the more specific reminder.

The impostulation of the personal relationships in this chapter, which develops into the central focus in the self-justification from the narrative origo for her waning commitment, also displays a number of differences in focalisation between the texts. The focalisation through Kristien of the relationship with JC, for example, presents a more detached perspective in IS than in the two other texts as becomes evident in (13) to (15):

	SK	JLK	IS
(13)	En nou die huwelik. Ek is bevrees <b>daar was maar min glamour by betrokke.</b>	<b>And then the marriage.</b> I'm afraid it was <b>far from glamorous.</b>	<b>Now the marriage.</b> I'm afraid there was <b>neither glamour nor romance</b> involved.
(14)	Ek en JC is albei onvoorbereid gevang toe ons <b>een ongoddelike mooi somernaweek</b> in 'n grasveld naby Stowe-on-Wye deur die lus oorval is. JC het sy reputasie eer aangedoen – <b>en daar sit ek toe met die gebakte peer.</b>	Both JC and myself were caught unprepared when we were overcome by lust <b>one incredibly beautiful summer's weekend</b> in a meadow near Stowe-on-Wye. JC did his reputation proud – <b>and I was left holding the baby (in a manner of speaking).</b>	Both JC and I were caught, in every sense, unprepared; the urge had overtaken <b>us one summer weekend</b> in a field of grass near Stowe-on-Wye. JC had done his reputation proud, <b>and there it was.</b>
(15)	Daarom het ek hom <b>op 'n dag</b> , net so saaklik as wat ek hom gevra het om te trou, <b>aangesê om te fokof</b> , ons is deur al die wetlike prosesse, en op 'n besonder mooi dag in September is ons geskei.	That is why, <b>one fine day</b> , I told him <b>to shove off</b> as matter-of-factly as I asked him to marry me; we went through all the legal processes, and one particularly beautiful day in September we got divorced.	So I told him, in as businesslike a manner as I'd once asked him to marry me, <b>to fuck off</b> ; and we went through the necessary legal rigmaroles, and one particularly pleasant late September day we were divorced.

In (13), the marriage is clearly impostulated as a marriage of convenience in IS with the addition of “nor romance” to the lack of glamour mentioned in SK and JLK. This impostulates a less intimate involvement in the focalisation through Kristien in IS, which is supported in (14) with the neutral “one summer weekend” in contrast to the “een ongoddelike mooi somernaweek” in SK and “one incredibly beautiful summer’s weekend” in JLK. The detailed description of the weather in the latter texts is clearly in juxtaposition with the everything-but-beautiful outcome of the relationship. This juxtaposition is further emphasised in the jocular expression “en daar sit ek toe met

die gebakte peer” in SK and “I was left holding the baby (in a manner of speaking)” in JLK, which is simply presented as “there it was” in IS.

The social deixis in (15) presents a departure from the predominantly formal narration in IS with the coarse “to fuck off” which, in this case, correlates with the “om te fokof” in SK and “to shove off” in JLK. This uncharacteristic social deixis in IS could be interpreted either as a slip in register from the narrative origo, or as a device to foreground the focalisation of the emotion.

Also in the focalisation through Kristien of the relationship with Sandile, an emotional detachment can be detected in IS in (16) and (17) below:

	SK	JLK	IS
(16)	Die enigste brander op die stillerige oppervlak van my lewe die afgelope jare was Sandile Hlati.	The only disturbance on the fairly calm surface of my life over the past few years had been Sandile Hlati.	The only exception to it all was Sandile Hlati
(17)	Hy het dit makliker gemaak deur na 'n paar maande, die donkerste en kakste van my lewe, 'n verplasing aan te vra.	He made it easier by requesting a transfer after a few months – the darkest and most shitty months of my life.	He made it easier after a few months, the blackest and most desperate few months of my life, by asking to be posted elsewhere

In (16), as in (8) above, the metaphor in SK and JLK becomes a neutral statement in IS. This changes the focalisation primarily due to the fact that the expression in IS does not bring with it the rich traces of the two other texts. It would seem that the narrator has picked up more than the British language in this stiff-upper-lip expression. This is also clear in (17) where the markers of social deixis in SK and JLK (“kakste” and “most shitty”) becomes merely a semantic equivalent in the more formal IS (“most desperate”).

In (18), the addition of “atavistic” again follows the pattern in IS of detachment in the focalisation through Kristien as the self-justification acquires a sense of blame-shifting as well:

	SK	JLK	IS
(18)	Maar ek het nog altyd, uit 'n soort outydse sin vir behoorlikheid, ...	But I've always, based on some old-fashioned notion of propriety ...	But I had always, out of an old-fashioned, perhaps atavistic, sense of propriety ...

---

In this chapter it would therefore seem that the main differences in focalisation relate to the social deixis and subjective impostulation. The high frequency of markers of social deixis in SK and JLK renders the focalisation in these two texts less formal than in IS. This in spite of the fact that JLK is the translation into English, but probably due to the closer adherence to SK as source. This could again, as in the case of the frame impostulation, signal a façade of coarseness and rebellion behind which Kristien is impostulated as hiding her vulnerability. The fact that the more formal register in IS provides a similar façade does not negate the difference in focalisation, however. This more formal register in IS is also supported by a predominantly more neutral and passive focalisation through Kristien on her political involvement as well as relationship to men.

#### **4.2.2.1.5 Conclusion**

As anticipated, the high frequency of markers of self-reflexive impostulation, as well as the shifts in focalisation at this level of the embedded impostulation does impact significantly on the characterisation into the narrative origo in the three texts. The most obvious shifts relate to Kristien's impostulated attempt at self-justification concerning her self-imposed exile and her subsequent loss of commitment to the Struggle.

Due to the characterisation of the narrative origo in IS as more formal and less emotional, the more neutral focalisation of the personal relationships involving her father, JC, Sandile as well as the Afrikaner culture in this text comes as no surprise. In turn, the emphasis on the growing disgust with the patriarchal Afrikaner culture and establishment in SK is supported by particularly markers of subjectivity in the social deixis. Therefore, the focalisation in SK impostulates a self-justificatory tone in the narrative origo based primarily on the perspective on the personal relationships. In turn, this self-justificatory tone that informs the focalisation in IS is based on the perspective on the political development in Kristien. As a result, the difference in focalisation between IS and SK impostulates differences in the narrative origo that result in a more personally disgruntled origo in SK and a more politically disgruntled origo in IS.



Furthermore, due to the more idiomatic and figurative language employed in SK, more gaps and traces exist in that text than in the more neutral IS where the emphasis is rather on the semantic content.

In each chapter, JLK seems to be closer to the text taken as source for the translation (IS in III:2 and SK in III:5) in terms of macrotextual focalisation. On the one hand this can be ascribed to a closer adherence to the source text in the translation than in the parallel text, but on the other hand, a closer adherence to markers of subjectivity that inform the focalisation could also play a significant role.

#### 4.2.2.2 Quoted dialogue/Impostulated direct speech

Table 6: Quoted dialogue/Impostulated direct speech

Part, Chapter	Character	SK	IS
II, 8	Ouma Kristina and Ragel/Rachel	pp. 116-130	pp. 85-96
II, 12-14	Ouma Kristina	pp. 143-153	pp. 108-116

##### 4.2.2.2.1 Introduction

This level of impostulated direct speech (quoted dialogue), like the level of retrospective direct impostulated narrative, is closely related to the direct impostulated narrative in the frame. Whereas the retrospective direct impostulated narrative is, however, a sustained impostulation in the narrative past from the narrative origo, this level presents impostulation in the narrative present (of the conversation between Kristien and Ouma Kristina). Due to the fact that the retrospective element of the narrative at this level is impostulated mainly as Ouma Kristina's quoted speech, the impostulation remains anchored in the narrative present throughout.

Like the retrospective direct impostulated narrative, the narrative at this level is close to the narrative origo (both that part of the narrative origo impostulated around Kristien and that part impostulated around Ouma Kristina) and is directed both into and from the narrative origo. At this level, however, the voices of Kristien and Ouma Kristina, as well as the focalisation through them, remain readily distinguishable, unlike in the introduced impostulated direct narrative that will be discussed in 4.2.2.3.

As a level consisting largely of quoted speech, this level can therefore be related to the naturally occurring storytelling situation where narrator and narratee are in interaction through conversation. The metatextual element, that forms such an important part of the frame impostulation (which impostulates an intimate relationship between the reader and the narrative origo where the reader approaches the role of narratee) is underplayed at this level, since those sections

where the narrative departs from the (her)story told by Ouma Kristina, become part of the narrative present and not the metatextual present.

#### **4.2.2.2.2 Macrotextual analysis**

Ouma Kristina's (her)story is, fittingly, the first of the (her)stories in the novel to be impostulated after the scene for these (her)stories has been set elaborately in the lengthy introductory section of the frame impostulation in the first 25 chapters. Although Ouma Kristina has already been characterised in the frame, these two chapters provide the first sustained indirect characterisation into the narrative origo related to her.

As an impostulation of Ouma Kristina's own (her)story (in other words the fairly recent past in relation to the narrative present), these two chapters consist of a high frequency of markers of subjectivity with a combination of focalisation through Kristien of the narrative present and through Ouma Kristina of the events in her life. The unreliability of the narration is enhanced by the subjective elements that mark the focalisation through Ouma Kristina as she is impostulated as evidently taking substantial liberties in presenting her memories.

Ouma Kristina's embellishment of the truth with regard to her own past ties in with Brink's (1998b:30) views on relation between fact and fiction:

The enterprise of fiction ... reaches well beyond facts: inasmuch as it is concerned with the real (whatever may be regarded as "real" in any given context) it presumes a process through which the real is not merely represented but imagined. What is aimed at is not a reproduction but an imagining.

In other words, Ouma Kristina's narrative of her own life is impostulated as being just such a conscious imagining.

The extensive use of analepsis, prolepsis and paralepsis (in relation to Ouma Kristina's embedded (her)story) complicates the narrative structure as Ouma Kristina constantly interrupts herself. Her narrative becomes something of a warped chorus to that of Kristien with moments approaching magical realism and moments of sheer fabrication that simply serve to illustrate various points to Kristien rather than creating an accurate herstory of their family. At one point Ouma Kristina says:

"There is so much to tell. All the stories. The whole history", which prompts Kristien to ask: "Stories or history". Ouma Kristina's reply, "Not much difference, is there?" (IS:88.) This provides an important element concerning the impostulation of the narrative origo, namely the tenuous relationship and conflict between fact and fiction, history and story.<sup>69</sup> This prepares the way for the impostulation of her embedded narrative. Significantly, on being reproached with "I thought you were going to tell me the truth", Ouma Kristina replies: "No. I asked you to come so I could tell you stories." (IS:114.)

The impostulation of the narrative origo in terms of the tension between story and history is supported by Brink's (1996b:22) statement that the importance in these stories is precisely situated

in the recognition of the need to storify, not in the specifics of the remedies each individual may bring to the situation. Passing beyond the intertextualities of separate documents, and relying more on images and metaphors than on the grammars of language, the grandmother reverts to pure invention—as an acknowledgement of that primal urge described by Russel Hoban in his famous dictum, "We make fiction because we ARE fiction".

The inventions and imaginings in Ouma Kristina's storification of her past, as well as that of the other women in their lineage, accentuate the importance of memory in this novel. Memory is, in fact, not only central in Ouma Kristina's rewriting of history as herstory, a process through which she asserts and creates her own identity, but also in Kristien's journey of self-discovery. In Brink's (1998b:30) own words, "[t]he individual constitutes and invents her/himself through the constant editing and re-editing of memory".<sup>70</sup>

This (her)story is particularly significant in terms of Kristien's impostulated journey of self-discovery and search for identity due to the fairly obvious parallels between Ouma Kristina's youth and attitudes towards men and those of Kristien. As will be

---

<sup>69</sup> According to Wenzel (2001:6), the past "as recounted and interpreted by Ouma, becomes a mixture of fictitious elements and factual events but it focuses mainly on the prowess, resilience and independent spirit of Kristien's female ancestors because Ouma Kristina perceives it as her self-entrusted task to restore Kristien's memory and sense of identity".

<sup>70</sup> The fact that both author and reader participate in the activation of the narrative through the narrative origo, bringing with them, among other things, also their memories, means that they, too, are editing and re-editing the impostulated memories that constitute the narrative origo.

seen in the microtextual analysis, the markers of person deixis constantly draw attention to not only the intimate relationship between Kristien and Ouma Kristina, but also to the shifts in focalisation that shape the narrative origo in this section through these parallels between the two women.

#### 4.2.2.2.3 Microtextual analysis

##### Part II, Chapter 8 (IS:85-96) Kristina and Ragel/Rachel

In contrast to the hectic events in the preceding section of the frame impostulation, this level presents a static conversation between Ouma Kristina and Kristien. This setting is impostulated with the aid of markers of temporal, spatial and person deixis in the first few sentences:

And now I'm sitting here, writing. There is a deep comfort in being here ... The house is silent, except for an occasional creaking of old timber.... In a corner of Ouma's room, when from time to time I look up, I see three owls huddled... (IS:85.)

These words emphasise the fact that, at this level as well as the level of introduced impostulated direct narrative, "Kristien acts as facilitator/scribe for her grandmother's memories that assume bizarre proportions, grotesque shapes and surreal explanations" (Wenzel, 2001:6). Apart from marking the narrative present and the act of writing, these sentences also present markers of self-reflexivity that impostulate the focalisation through Kristien of her emotions as Ouma Kristina talks, thereby characterising the narrative origo.

The narrative origo in this chapter is further characterised through Kristien's description of Ouma Kristina (direct characterisation from the narrative origo), which impostulates not only the atmosphere next to Ouma Kristina's sickbed, but also her physical condition and faint voice:

- I must write, she has said, while she speaks, a small whispery voice, like the rustling of paper, but curiously persistent. (IS:85).
- Ouma Kristina has begun to fidget so restlessly that I'm **wondering** whether she is delirious (IS:86).
- The hazy eyes flutter open, startled, before a film of resignation settles on them. (IS:86).
- ... opening her eyes again to stare at me, as if intent on not missing the slightest flicker of expression on my face (IS:87).
- An amused grin (IS:87).
- ...she resumes, still refusing to look away (IS:87).
- A deep sigh; her eyelids drooped again.... Another sudden change of tone (IS:87).

- ... her papery voice rustles in the dark, matched by the scratching of my pen as I write (IS:88).

Along with the highlighted marker of announced subjectivity, the markers of subjectivity and self-reflexivity in these examples all provide a clear indication of the focalisation through Kristien. This is mostly also supported by markers of temporal and discourse deixis, indicating the narrative present as well as the voice of Ouma Kristina, which foregrounds Kristien's voice in this first part of the chapter.

In the first part of the chapter, there are also a number of markers of metatextuality as Kristien's narrative departs from the narrative present briefly in self-reflexive (mostly retrospective) contemplation of her emotions and the setting and the significance of Ouma Kristina's storytelling. This can be seen in the following examples:

- But beyond the sheer enjoyment I derived from them **I must confess I never saw** any special significance in her jumble of stories (IS:86).
- **I remember** that gentle yellow light, the shadows on the walls, the awareness of the secret dark recesses of the house around us. **Just like tonight** (IS:87).
- **It is hard to control** the thoughts she has unleashed in me (IS:87).
- **We've always known** Ouma Kristina's inveterate outlawry, especially after old age had conferred on her a liberty even she could not have imagined earlier; **but surely** there must have been – in those times – limits (IS:87).

Although these examples are still anchored in the narrative present, evident in the markers of temporal deixis, the narrative origo involving Kristien reflects a consistently self-reflective tone that does not concern the narrative present directly, nor comments on Ouma Kristina's storytelling directly. The resulting emphasis on the focalisation through Kristien links these passages to the frame impostulation.

In most of the rest of the chapter, however, Ouma Kristina's voice is foregrounded with very few interruptions by Kristien to draw the attention away from the (her)story and the focalisation through Ouma Kristina. Most of the deictic markers in the latter part of the chapter consequently refer to the person of Ouma Kristina as narrator and Kristien as narratee.

After the metatextual elements, the narrative gradually moves away from Kristien as narrator in the narrative present, and on to Ouma Kristina as largely retrospective

first-person narrator in the narrative present (although her words are still presented in quotation marks which serve as a constant reminder of the narrative present and her voice). The specific shift is marked clearly by Kristien's words, "'Tell me.' And she does" (IS:88).

As Ouma Kristina's voice takes over, the markers of person deixis also function as markers of discourse deixis drawing attention to her voice and Kristien's role as narratee. The merging of person and discourse deixis is mostly also an indication of self-reflexivity in Ouma Kristina's narrative, marking the focalisation through her, as can be seen in the following examples:

- "So you can understand ..." (IS:88.)
- "... because as you know ..." (IS:89.)
- "I can no longer remember precisely ..." (IS:89.)
- "I won't ever forget ..." (IS:89.)
- "You know ..." (IS:89.)
- "I can still remember ..." (IS:89.)
- "You were the same... Don't think I didn't notice." (IS:89.)
- "Now you can imagine ..." (IS:89.)
- "Now can you believe it?" (IS:90.)
- "... if you ask me ..." (IS:90.)
- "As you can imagine..." (IS:90.)
- "I'm afraid..." (IS:90.)
- "You tell me" (IS:92.)
- "I can tell you ..." (IS:92.)
- "... I'll tell you more about that later..." (IS:92.)
- "I'll have you know" (IS:95.)

These markers further draw attention to the narrative present, functioning in a manner similar to the markers of metatextuality in the frame impostulation. Indeed, Ouma Kristina's metatext in this chapter is the narrative present – where Kristien addresses the reader directly in metatextual comments, Ouma Kristina addresses Kristien.

Ouma Kristina's voice is further marked by terms such as "of course", "anyway", "really", and so forth. These markers of Ouma Kristina's voice, however, contain remarkably few markers of indirect characterisation in the form of social deixis, resulting in the indirect characterisation into the narrative origo relying largely on focalisation and markers of announced subjectivity (such as "I think", "I was told", "I always thought", "perhaps", and "I realise now").

The markers of direct characterisation into the narrative origo also take on an important role in this chapter, revealing the parallels between Ouma Kristina and Kristien as can be seen in the following:

- “But in the end they gave up. They had no choice, really, as they knew by then that once I’d put my mind to something I’d cling to it like an octopus.” (IS:90.)
- “I didn’t have much truck with God, I’m afraid. ...I much preferred the Devil, he seemed a lot more interesting; and I would have changed places with Doctor Faust any time, had I known about him then.” (IS:90.)
- “Hermanus Johannes Wepener thought I was a witch. Perhaps he had good reason to.” (IS:93.)
- “Because he brings no wetness to my cunt, I told them. I wish you could have seen them.” (IS:95.)
- “I had rather beautiful legs in those days, I’ll have you know.” (IS:95.)

Like Kristien, Ouma Kristina is characterised as headstrong, independent, sometimes conceited and rebellious. The impostulation of Ouma Kristina’s rebellion against her “parents” (grandparents), just like the impostulation of Kristien’s rebellion against her parents and particularly her father, provides a number of markers of characterisation from the narrative origo, evident in the following examples:

- “You know, I was even expected to keep my shift on when I had a bath.” (IS:89.)
- “I think they needed to be reminded of their guilt every day.” (IS:90.)
- “Hermanus Johannes and Petronella became unbearably jealous and possessive of me whenever people arrived on the farm.” (IS:89.)
- “And of course only sons counted.” (IS:92.)

In all of these examples the parallels between the two women’s backgrounds are clear. Just like Ouma Kristina, Kristien was also raised in a conservative house (e.g. the incident with the see-through blouse) in which daughters were regarded as less important than sons (evident in Ludwig’s disappointment and disgust with the fact that Kristien was not a boy).

It would therefore seem that the impostulation in this chapter mainly hinges on the characterisation of the narrative origo for the (her)stories that are to follow. The focalisation through Kristien and Ouma Kristina plays an important role in this characterisation as the similarities between the two women become evident. The characterisation of Ouma Kristina in this chapter becomes an important component of the impostulation in the next section of this level in II:12 to II:14. It is significant, however, that the focalisation through Ouma Kristina of her mother, Rachel, consists largely of gaps revealed by the traces left in the cellar in the form of the paintings.



## Part II, Chapter 12-14 (SK:143-153) Kristina

In these chapters Ouma Kristina resumes her personal (her)story with an increasingly fantastical account of her life after the interruption of the introduced impostulated direct narrative in which the (her)stories of her grandmother, Petronella, and her mother, Rachel, are narrated. Whereas the previous chapter at this level deals primarily with Ouma Kristina's early youth before she eloped with Jethro, and provides a glimpse into the identity of her mother, Rachel, these chapters focus on the period she spent away from home (a parallel to Kristien's self-imposed exile). This section differs quite dramatically from the other section of quoted dialogue in that the gap between fact and fiction closes significantly. The wild adventures described here by Ouma Kristina seem to be largely a construct of her imagination.

The high frequency of markers of self-reflexivity combined with markers of person and discourse deixis in the latter part of II:8, is again evident here, marking the voice of Ouma Kristina as well as the focalisation through her. As in the previous section, Kristien's voice is marked by means of markers of subjectivity as well as self-reflexivity that again serve to characterise the narrative origo as well as presenting the focalisation through Kristien of Ouma Kristina's storytelling.

The most important aspect of the focalisation through Kristien in this section is the self-reflective impostulation of her sceptical responses to Ouma Kristina's far-fetched tale. The obvious irony in the comments that intersperse the quoted dialogue clearly marks this aspect of the focalisation:

- ... vra ek effens sarkasties (SK:144).
- ... vra ek ewe sedig (SK:144).
- ... stel ek voor sonder om 'n oog te knip (SK:146).
- ... sê ek gelate (SK:147).
- ... sê ek sarkasties (SK:151).
- ... vra ek lomp (SK:152).

These overt statements of Kristien's subjectivity anchor the impostulation in the narrative present while at the same time providing characterisation from the narrative origo in terms of the attitude with which she regards Ouma Kristina's stories. In the following equally self-reflexive examples, the focalisation through Kristien in turn provides characterisation into the narrative origo as Kristien's

responses to Ouma Kristina's (her)story are impostulated as cutting through the thin veneer of irony evident in the above examples:

- Nog effens geïrriteer, besluit ek maar om haar te **please** (SK:144).
- Ek gaap haar aan. "**Kom weer?**" (SK:148.)
- Dit duur 'n lang ruk voor ek my gedagtes weer naastenby onder beheer het. (SK:149.)
- "Ek is nie meer 'n kind nie, Ouma," sê ek, skerper as wat ek bedoel het. (SK:151.)
- Ek wend 'n poging aan om my reg te ruk. Sy lê op sterwe, maan ek my aan... (SK:151.)
- Ek tuur na haar, onseker oor my eie gevoelens. (SK:152.)
- "Wat van liefde?" vra ek lomp, terwyl ek wonder: **Jissis**, hoe **corny** kan mens raak? (SK:152.)
- Vir die eerste keer in my lewe voel ek nuuskierig oor my ma: dié koue, trotse, geheimsinnige vrou in wie ek nog altyd so 'n renons gehad het; vir wie ek so bang was. (SK:153.)

The self-awareness in these examples is further emphasised by the focalisation evident in the emotional nature of Kristien's self-reflexivity. Unlike the cynical quality informing the narrative origo in the metatextual sections of the novel and in most of the early section of the frame impostulation, the focalisation through Kristien of Ouma Kristina's stories and their conversation, as well as of her responses, impostulate a more confused narrative origo. The markers of social deixis in the highlighted words above, again contribute to the characterisation into the narrative origo while also emphasising the focalisation.

The focalisation and the characterisation from the narrative origo are also evident in the markers of subjectivity and announced subjectivity (combined with markers of person deixis) in Kristien's narrative with comments like the following:

- "Sy lê onverstoorsaar na my en kyk." (SK:144.)
- Haar oë flikker, maar of dit van geammuseerdheid of minagting is, kan ek nie mooi uitmaak nie. (SK:144.)
- "Vertel jy die storie of ek?" 'n Ergerlike knik van haar kop op die dun steeltjie. (SK:144.)
- Sy probeer klaarblyklik haar gedagtes agtermekaar kry. (SK:147.)
- Sy lê geduldig en wag, met net 'n suggestie van geamuseerdheid op haar gesig. (SK:153.)

The interpretation of non-verbal elements of their conversation forms an important part of the focalisation in these examples, emphasising both Kristien's emotional

response and her self-awareness that become central to the impostulation of her self-discovery.

As in II:8, Ouma Kristina's voice is marked not only by quotation marks, but also by a combination of markers of person deixis (referring to herself as narrator and Kristien as narratee) and discourse deixis (mostly interjections that mark the subjective angle from which the story is told). The person deixis again serves the purpose of anchoring her storytelling in the narrative present with phrases like "jy weet", "my kind", "ek sê jou", "Kristien", "as jy wil" and "weet jy".

The markers of discourse deixis are closely related to the announced subjectivity in her voice, which emphasises the storification of her history. The discourse deixis in phrases like "Maar ek het jou mos al gesê" and "ek dink ek het jou al vertel" also serves the purpose of foregrounding the relationship between Ouma Kristina and Kristien. The announced subjectivity is further evident in the high frequency of disclaimers such as "ek dink", "dink ek", "en ek skat", "bedoel ek", "belowe ek jou" that emphasise the fact that Ouma Kristina is aware of the dubious nature of memory.

In the following examples, Ouma Kristina's self-awareness can be seen in these markers of discourse deixis as well as announced subjectivity:

- "Om die waarheid te sê, die eerste man wat ons opgesit het se naam was juis Sindbad. **Natuurlik nie die** Sindbad nie, **maar ek dink** een van sy afstammeling." (SK:145.)
- "Met – **wat noem mens nou weer daardie meisiekinders?** – obeliske, en eunugs, en gesluerde dansers ..." (SK:145.)
- "Of dit nou Valhalla of Nirvana is, **of wat hulle die plek ook al in Persië noem.**" (SK:145.)
- "Nou ja, **om 'n deurmekaar storie kort te knip ...**" (SK:145.)
- "Een-en-dertig jaar tevore, **het hy ons vertel**, het Hermanus Johannes Wepener geprobeer om Dalie se dogter Lida te verlei." (SK:149.)
- "En hy't self 'n bouse gewete gehad om weg te steek, **onthou**. Op die ou ent het die twee mekaar aan die ballas beetgehad. **Dis mos maar hoe mans baklei.**" (SK:149.)

The reliability of the narration is constantly rendered suspect in the above examples as Ouma Kristina's imagination is impostulated to be taking full reign<sup>71</sup>. As a result of these markers, the conversation is constantly impostulated and the narration never turns into a sustained direct impostulated narrative. This already indicates the importance of the telling of the story rather than the content or factual accuracy in the focalisation through Ouma Kristina. In her own words: "Die hoe en waarom maak tog nie saak nie, net die storie. En dié kry nooit end nie." (SK:149), and "Nee. Ek het gesê jy moet kom dat ek jou stories kan vertel." (SK:151.)

In spite of the predominantly whimsical tone impostulated in the narration in these chapters, the focalisation at times also indicates a self-reflexivity that marks a more serious tone. One example of this is Ouma Kristina's reflection on her sensory experience of pregnancy (juxtaposed with Kristien's abortion):

"Bowendien het ek agtergekom ek hou daarvan om swanger te wees...Om my liggaam te voel ryp en swaar word soos 'n waatlemoen...dit was goddelik om op my rug te lê en te kyk hoe die melk uit my tepels drup en oor my lyf loop, onder my arms in; en as ek my opstoot op my elmboë, ... - in my verbeelding kon ek sien hoe dit oor die vloer loop, en by die deur uit, oor die veld, tot daar miere van orals af aankom...- dit was 'n soort vervulling soos wat ek nog nooit anders geken het nie." (SK:151-152.)

This passage also marks Ouma Kristina's concern with her own femininity (also evident in the reference to her almost obsession with her menstruation), while providing a juxtaposition with Kristien's abortion. In the following passage, the other side of Ouma Kristina's female identity is impostulated as she reflects on her position in a male-dominated world:

"Omdat ons nie toegelaat word om op ons eie 'n lewe te lei wat die moeite werd is nie. Nou speel ons maar saam. So lank as wat ons ons waarde en gesag van 'n man kan aflei, word ons aanvaar. Mevrouw Cornelis Basson. **Here, weet jy hoe ek teen dié naam gebaklei het?** ...Die eerste stap is altyd die moeilikste. Daarna is alles **kammakastig.**" (SK:152.)

In this passage the silent revolt that is also evident in most of the other women in their lineage is impostulated in the focalisation through Ouma Kristina; evidently also

---

<sup>71</sup> The unreliability of the narration in this novel (marked by means of discourse deixis) is confirmed by Petzold's (2000:53) comments on *The first life of Adamastor*: "Words and phrases like 'objects,' 'looking like' or 'appeared to,' combined with the reference to the strangeness of the situation make the reader aware that she or he is not to take T'kama's words literally."

intended to create a sense of identity in Kristien. Primarily, Kristien's awareness of the plight of women is impostulated as she has to carve a place for herself in a society that is still dominated by men in spite of the vastly less conservative societal norms.

At this level of the impostulation the focalisation can therefore be identified most clearly in the markers of the dialogue (the quotation marks as well as the person and discourse deixis). The markers of subjectivity, announced subjectivity and self-reflexivity further mark the focalisation through either Kristien or Ouma Kristina and her narration, or through Ouma Kristina or Kristin as narratee and the events in her past and imagination. The focalisation in turn becomes instrumental in the impostulation of the narrative origo through both direct and indirect characterisation, mainly related to Ouma Kristina.

#### 4.2.2.2.4 Comparison: parallel texts and translation

As a result of the importance of the dialogue at this level of the impostulation (as the main element creating a clear distinction between the focalisation through Ouma Kristina and that through Kristien) any shift in the markers contained in the dialogue will impact significantly on the focalisation. Consequently, the interaction between markers of person and discourse deixis on the one hand and markers of self-reflexivity and announced subjectivity presents a fragile relationship between the different focalisations.

### Part II, Chapter 8

The focalisation through Kristien of the setting, which is important in the impostulation of the narrative origo, presents the first shift in this chapter. In (1) and (2) below it can be seen that the atmosphere in the room as perceived by Kristien, as well as the relationship between her and Ouma Kristina, is focalised differently in the three texts:

	IS	JLK	SK
(1)	... I see three owls huddled on a mahogany whatnot, <b>baleful eyes staring.</b>	... sien ek ... drie uile wat op een mahonie rakstaander ingedruk sit, hulle <b>onheilspellende oë starend.</b>	... sien ek in 'n hoek van Ouma se kamer drie uile op 'n mahoniekissie, hul <b>onheilspellende geel oë starend in die halfdonker.</b>

(2)	I remember that gentle yellow light, the shadows on the walls, the awareness of the secret dark recesses of the house around us. <b>Just like tonight.</b>	Ek onthou nog die sagte geel lig, die skadu's teen die mure, die bewustheid van die geheime donker wegkruipplekke van die huis rondom ons. <b>Net soos vannag.</b>	Ek onthou die sagte, warm lig van die olielamp ... Die groot skaduwees teen die mure, die geheime donkertes van die huis om ons; <b>en die intimiteit van ons twee, die ou vrou en die jong dogtertjie, in die eksklusiewe oranjegeel omhulling van die lig. Vannag weer, by die klein flou bedlampie; ons.</b>
-----	--	--	---

In both these examples the focalisation through Kristien is more intense in SK, where Kristien is impostulated as being aware of not only the owls staring ominously, but also the ominous half-light in (1), and, more importantly, of the intimate relationship between her and Ouma Kristina. Again the quality of the light is described (impostulating a sense almost of sacredness), along with the contrast between them in age, both retrospectively and in the narrative present. This difference in focalisation results in a more self-aware narrative origo in SK, emphasising the significance of this (her)story to Kristien's sense of identity (almost spirituality).

In contrast, the focalisation through Kristien of Ouma Kristien seems to be more intense in IS and JLK as can be seen in the following examples:

	IS	JLK	SK
(3)	<b>A deep sigh; her eyelids drooped again. "I think the time as now come for my own idiots."</b> Another sudden change of tone.	<b>Sy gee 'n diep sug en haar oë val weer toe. "Ek dink die tyd het nou aangebreek vir my eie idiote."</b> Nog 'n skielike verandering in haar stemtoon.	- En opnuut met een van die gans onverwagte wendings:
(4)	... her papery voice rustles in the dark, <b>matched by the scratching of my pen as I write.</b>	... ritsel haar papierstem in die donkerte voort, <b>in pas met die gekribbel van my pen soos ek skryf.</b>	... ritsel haar stemmetjie in my oor, <b>en ek skryf meganies soos sy vertel.</b>

The reference to Ouma Kristina's idiots in (3) in IS and JLK is a repetition of a statement made in the previous paragraph, which may simply be an oversight, but which nonetheless foregrounds the mysterious identity of Rachel/Ragel. The repetition could also present the impostulation of a narrator who has become slightly delirious. The fact that SK does not contain a reference to her sigh and drooping eyelids (references to whether Ouma Kristina's eyes are open or closed abound in

all three texts), renders the focalisation in that text less specific than in IS and JLK. Furthermore, the change in the tone of Ouma Kristina's voice presented in IS and JLK indicates an unexpected change in direction in the story in SK. This emphasises the sensory dimension in the focalisation in IS and JLK in contrast to a cognitive dimension in SK. As such, the focus in SK is less on the person of Ouma Kristina, and more on the narrative.

The sensory dimension of the focalisation is again emphasised in (4) in IS and JLK with the comparison between the sound of Ouma Kristina's voice and the sound of Kristien's writing, whereas SK merely focuses on the fact that Kristien writes down Ouma Kristina's voice mechanically. This link between the voice and the writing hand becomes even more important at the level of introduced impostulation where the distinction between Ouma Kristina's voice and Kristien's interpretation thereof seems less clear.

The self-reflexivity in the metatextual element of the narration also presents a difference in focalisation resulting in differences in the narrative origo in terms of Kristien's reaction to Ouma Kristina's story, evident in (5) and (6):

	IS	JLK	SK
(5)	It is hard to control the thoughts she has unleashed in me.	Dis moeilik om die gedagtes wat sy in my losgeskud het te beheer.	Te veel gedagtes raak in my gaande.
(6)	But beyond the sheer enjoyment I derived from them I must confess I never saw any special significance in her jumble of stories	Maar benewens die pure genot wat ek uit hulle geput het moet ek bieg dat ek nooit enige diepere betekenis in haar warboel stories gesien het nie.	Maar wat die danige waarde van haar stories was, nee, daaraan het ek min erg gehad.

Although the confusion in Kristien's mind is presented in all three texts in (5), the announced subjectivity that marks the focalisation through Kristien presents a more direct link between this confusion and Ouma Kristina's story in IS and JLK than in SK. The subjective element is enhanced by the statement "It is hard to control" in IS and "Dis moeilik om ... te beheer" in JLK. This emphasises Kristien's sense of being overwhelmed by the story, unlike "Te veel" in SK, which merely emphasises the overwhelming nature of the story without the same self-reflexive emphasis. Furthermore, the description of the cause of the confusion ("she has unleashed in

me” in IS and “wat sy in my losgeskud het” in JLK) presents markers of person deixis referring to Ouma Kristina, which foregrounds the focalisation through Kristien.

The focalisation in the novel related to Ouma Kristina’s impostulated direct speech (quoted narrative) also displays a number of differences. These differences can be seen in the markers of announced subjectivity and self-reflexivity in the following examples:

	IS	JLK	SK
(7)	“Petronella, who <b>of course</b> I then still thought of as my mother, ...”	“My ouma, Petronella – op daardie stadium het ek <b>natuurlik</b> nog gedink sy’s my ma – ”	“My ouma, Petronella, aan wie ek toe nog gedink het as my ma ...”
(8)	“ <b>It must have been</b> a frightening experience for him, I <b>realise now</b> ...”	“ <b>Dit moes</b> vir hom ’n angswekkende ervaring <b>gewees het, besef ek nou,</b> ...”	“Die arme man <b>moet</b> hom half uit sy stee geskrik <b>het.</b> ”
(9)	“And ever since, <b>if old Moishe was to be believed,</b> men and women have been telling each other stories”	“En van toe af, <b>as mens ou Moishe kan glo,</b> het mans en vrouens vir mekaar stories vertel.”	“En van toe af, <b>het ou Moishe geglo,</b> het mans en vroue hulle tyd daaraan bestee om vir mekaar stories te vertel.”

The announced subjectivity evident in the markers of discourse and person deixis in all three examples in IS and JLK (“of course”/“natuurlik”, “I realise now”/“besef ek nou”, and “if [he] was to be believed”/“as mens [hom] kon glo”), call attention to Ouma Kristina’s voice. Simultaneously, these markers impostulate her self-awareness and the focalisation through her of her memories. The fact that none of these markers of person and discourse deixis are present in SK, changes the focalisation due to the fact that the impostulation is only marked in terms of subjectivity. Therefore, Ouma Kristina’s self-awareness and self-reflexivity are underplayed in SK, changing the impostulation of the narrative origo through which these memories are focalised.

A similar difference between IS and JLK on the one hand and SK on the other appears in the following examples from Ouma Kristina’s impostulated direct speech in terms of markers of person deixis:

	IS	JLK	SK
(10)	“ <b>You were the same</b> ... Don’t think I didn’t notice.”	“ <b>Jy was net so toe jy klein was.</b> Moenie dink ek het dit nie gesien nie.”	-



(11)	"I wish this whole damned place had burned down, Kristien. I hate it."	"Ek wens die hele verdomde plek het afgebrand. Kristien. Ek haat dit."	"Die hele ou kasarm moes maar liewerster afgebrand het. Ek haat die plek, Katrien."
(12)	"You tell me how she knew that."	"Sê jy nou vir my hoe't sy dit geweet."	"Moenie vra hoe sy geweet het nie."
(13)	"The Wepeners must have been shattered," I say. "They grew old overnight. I can tell you."	"Die Wepeners was seker gebroke," sê ek. "Hulle het oornag oud geword. dit kan ek jou sê."	"Dit het die oumense omtrent gebreek toe die lappie hier aankom. Hulle het oornag oud geword."
(14)	"... - I'll tell you more about that later) ..."	"... - ek sal jou later meer daarvoor vertel) ..."	-

The markers of person deixis in IS and JLK clearly emphasise the intimate relationship between Ouma Kristina and Kristien in (10), (12), (13) and (14) as Ouma Kristina constantly makes use of the first and second person. This foregrounds their roles of narrator and narratee as well as Ouma Kristina's voice. Significantly these markers do not appear at all in SK in the case of (10), (13) or (14), and are only implied in (12). Therefore, Kristien's sense of involvement in Ouma Kristina's storytelling is not foregrounded to the same degree in SK as in the other two texts. In (13), this involvement is also clear in IS and JLK with Kristien's comment "The Wepeners must have been shattered" in IS and "Die Wepeners was seker gebroke" in JLK, whereas this comment becomes Ouma Kristina's in SK, changing the focalisation from Kristien to Ouma Kristina.

In (11) Ouma Kristina's focalisation is marked by the subjective "I wish" in IS and "Ek wens" in JLK, again absent from SK, although the use of the nickname "Katrien" in SK does emphasise the intimate relationship between them.

In (15) the difference in focalisation between the texts has quite another origin:

	IS	JLK	SK
(15)	"I didn't have much truck with God. I'm afraid ... moreover, he sounded suspiciously like a <b>sterner version</b> of Hermanus Johannes to me. I much preferred the Devil ..."	"Ek's bevrees ek wou nie veel met God te doen hê nie ... en bowendien, hy het vir my supisies baie na 'n <b>strenger weergawe</b> van Hermanus Johannes geklink. Ek het veel eerder die Duiwel verkies ..."	"Ek was nooit veel van God gepla nie ... en die Here het vir my alte veel na 'n <b>noorser uitgawe</b> van Hermanus Johannes geklink. Gee my dan enige tyd liewer die Duiwel ..."

In this example the direct characterisation of Ouma Kristina into the narrative origo produces a focalisation of Hermanus Johannes Wepener and God in all three texts.

However, whereas God is described as a “sterner version” in IS and “’n strenger weergawe” in JLK of Hermanus Johannes, He is described as “’n noorser uitgawe” of Hermanus Johannes in IS. The difference here can best be described in terms of Derrida’s notion of *différance*. According to Derrida, *différance* is “the playing movement that ‘produces’—by means of something that is not simply an activity—these differences, these effects of difference” (Derrida, 1982:11.) In this example the playing movement in “noorser” produces an effect of difference between the dictionary meaning “surly” or “grumpy” on the one hand, and a quality that can somehow be related to Norway or a Norse person<sup>72</sup>. This difference therefore activates a gap and traces in a playing movement.

Consequently, the focalisation through Ouma Kristina of God and Hermanus Johannes in SK acquires a depth in this text not captured in the other texts. This impacts primarily on the impostulation of the narrative origo. This impostulation presents another difference in the last sentence of the example where the focalisation through Ouma Kristina focuses on her retrospective characterisation in IS and JLK (“I much preferred” and “Ek het veel eerder”), and on her general characterisation, also in the narrative present, in SK (“Gee my dan enige tyd”).

Although Kristien’s self-reflexivity and awareness of the atmosphere and the intimate relationship between her and Ouma Kristina are therefore emphasised more clearly in the focalisation of the setting in SK than in IS and JLK, the rest of the focalisation through both Kristien and Ouma Kristina emphasises the subjectivity in this chapter more clearly in IS and JLK. As a result, Ouma Kristina’s voice and the non-verbal interaction between her and Kristien are impostulated more clearly in these two texts.

## **Part II, Chapter 12-14**

In these chapters the difference in focalisation between the texts can again be seen in the focalisation of Ouma Kristina through Kristien in examples (1) and (2) below:

---

<sup>72</sup> This second meaning is much less specific and could be related to the physical appearance of someone from a Nordic country, or the emotional disposition as a result of the weather.

	SK	JLK	IS
(1)	"Ek is haar enigste vlees," sê Ouma Kristina <b>nadat sy</b> weer 'n diep teug suurstof ingeasem het.	"I am her only blood," Ouma Kristina says <b>after</b> taking another deep breath of oxygen.	"I am her only flesh," says Ouma Kristina, <b>looking up at me again from</b> another deep inhalation of oxygen.
(2)	"Natuurlik het ek hom gesê," <b>antwoord sy verontwaardig.</b>	"Of course I told him," <b>she replies indignantly.</b>	"Naturally I told him."

In (1), the focalisation in IS is more focused than in SK and JLK, with a description of Ouma Kristina's glance. In (2), however, Kristien's interpretation of Ouma Kristina's reply is focalised more strongly in SK and JLK due to the absence of the marker of subjectivity and person deixis in IS.

The markers of self-reflexivity in the following two examples again emphasise the focalisation through Kristien in SK and JLK:

	SK	JLK	IS
(3)	"Ek dag Ouma gaan my die waarheid vertel," <b>sê ek verwykend.</b>	"I thought you were going to tell me the truth," <b>I reproach her.</b>	"I thought you were going to tell me the truth."
(4)	"Wat van liefde?" <b>vra ek lomp, terwyl ek wonder: Jissis, hoe corny kan mens raak?</b>	"What about love?" <b>I ask awkwardly, thinking: Jesus, how corny can you get?</b>	"What about love?" <b>I ask, thinking.</b> How corny can one get?!

In both these examples the self-awareness in the narrative origo, which foregrounds the narrative present as well as Kristien's role in the conversation and her emotional response to Ouma Kristina's story, is marked more clearly in SK and JLK with the result that the focalisation through Kristien of her responses takes on a more involved tone. Furthermore, the social deixis in the profanity in (4) provides characterisation into the narrative origo in SK and JLK that is omitted from IS.

Ouma Kristina's impostulated direct speech also presents a number of differences in focalisation in these chapters. In (5) to (8) below, the difference in markers of discourse and person deixis in the texts result in a difference in focalisation through Ouma Kristina:

	SK	JLK	IS
(5)	"Omtrent soos ek my die Nuwe Jerusalem voorgestel het, <b> jy weet</b> , die ene jaspis en robyne ..."	"Something like I imagined the New Jerusalem to be, <b>you know</b> , covered in jasper and rubies ..."	"Like the New Jerusalem. I suppose, all jasper and rubies and whatever ..."
(6)	"Oor daar mos nou 'n adder in elke Paradys is, <b>my kind.</b> "	"Because there's a snake in every Paradise, <b>my child.</b> "	"Because there's a snake in every paradise"
(7)	"Elk geval ..."	"In any case ..."	-

(8)	Nou speel ons maar saam ... Mevrou Cornelis Basson. <b>Here, weet jy hoe</b> ek teen dié naam gebaklei het?	So we play along ... Mrs. Cornelis Basson. <b>God, have you any idea how</b> I fought against that name?	So we put up a front ... Mrs. Cornelis Basson. <b>How</b> I fought and fought against that name.
-----	---	--	--

In (5), (6), and (8), the use of the second person and direct address emphasise the interaction between narrator and narratee in SK and JLK, which foregrounds both the focalisation through Ouma Kristina and the intimate relationship between them. In (8), the emotional dimension of the focalisation through Ouma Kristina is also emphasised more in SK and JLK. The markers of discourse deixis in SK and JLK in (7) again draw attention to Ouma Kristina's voice.

In contrast, the focalisation through Ouma Kristina in (9) and (10) below is more intense in IS than in the other two texts:

	SK	JLK	IS
(9)	"Die nag toe sy dood is, het sy regtig haar bes probeer, maar ek dink sy't toe al klaar nie meer woorde gehad vir wat sy wou sê nie."	"On the night of her death she really tried her best, but I suspect that by that time she no longer had the words for what she wanted to say."	<b>"But she was very weak by then, and all those years of keeping quiet about it had made it almost impossible for her to discuss it.</b> The night she died she tried, she really tried, but I think she'd lost the words for it by then."
(10)	"Toe het sy onverwags met <b>so 'n eienaardige glimlaggie</b> gesê:..."	"Suddenly she said with a <b>strange smile:</b> ..."	"And she suddenly smiled, a <b>strangely happy kind of smile,</b> and said ..."

The more elaborate description of Petronella in (9) in IS impostulates a stronger subjectivity and as such emphasises the focalisation through Ouma Kristina. Likewise, the description of Petronella's smile in (10) acquires a more subjective quality in IS than in the two other texts.

Although the differences in focalisation in these three chapters seem to be less evident than in II:8, probably due to the fact that the narrative origo for this level has already been impostulated in more detail in that chapter, they nonetheless impact on the impostulation of the narrative origo. It would appear that the markers of focalisation of Ouma Kristina through Kristien as well as Kristien's responses to Ouma Kristina's narrative is marked more clearly in SK and JLK, whereas the focalisation through Ouma Kristina is marked more clearly in IS. These differences result in the impostulation of different emphases in the interaction between Ouma

Kristina and Kristien in SK and JLK as well as in the self-reflexivity in the dialogue and frame narrative in IS.

#### 4.2.2.2.5 Conclusion

The focalisation at this level of impostulated direct speech is clearly very different from that in the direct impostulated narrative and metatextual impostulated narrative of the frame or in the retrospective direct impostulated narrative. This is primarily due to the interaction between Ouma Kristina and Kristien in the narrative present, as well as the retrospective focalisation through Ouma Kristina of her past. This focalisation can be expected to become even more predominant in the introduced impostulated direct narrative.

It proves to be more difficult to arrive at conclusions regarding the differences in focalisation on the macrotextual level at this level of impostulation. On the one hand Kristien's self-reflexivity and awareness of the atmosphere and the intimate relationship between her and Ouma Kristina are emphasised more clearly in the focalisation of the setting in SK than in IS in both sections. On the other hand, the focalisation through Kristien seems to be marked more clearly in IS in the first section and in SK in the second. Also, the focalisation through Ouma Kristina is marked more clearly in IS in both sections.

The main feature of focalisation in these chapters is the high frequency of social and discourse deixis. These markers draw attention to the voice of Ouma Kristina and impostulate an intimate relationship between narrator and narratee. The focalisation is also foregrounded by means of markers of self-reflexivity in Ouma Kristina's impostulated direct speech that indicate the self-aware nature of the narrative.

Although it would be a misrepresentation to claim that the focalisation in one text is consistently more intense or more clearly marked than in the other, the fact that the focalisation varies does affect the impostulation of the narrative origo in each text. Therefore, each text impostulates a different narrative origo, although the parallels are evident. In terms of the aims of this study, however, each of these shifts is important on the microtextual as well as macrotextual level.

#### 4.2.2.3 Introduced impostulated direct narrative

Table 7 Introduced impostulated direct narrative

Part, Chapter	Character	SK	IS
II, 10	Petronella	pp. 131-139	pp. 97-105
II, 11	Ragel/Rachel	pp. 139-143	pp. 105-108
II, 15	Louisa	pp. 153-164	pp. 116-125
III, 11-17	Kamma/Maria	pp. 227-252	pp. 174-193
IV, 3-6	Samuel	pp. 266-282	pp. 206-219
V, 8-12	Wilhelmina	pp. 345-374	pp. 270-294
VI, 2-3	Lottie	pp. 382-390	pp. 301-308

##### 4.2.2.3.1 Introduction

The level of introduced impostulated direct narrative is by far the most complicated level in terms of focalisation. Unlike in the rest of the embedded narrative, there is no stable point through which the focalisation is impostulated. In the retrospective direct impostulated narrative discussed in 4.2.2.1, the focalisation is impostulated exclusively through Kristien as her (her)story is presented. In the impostulated direct speech discussed in 4.2.2.2, the focalisation of Ouma Kristina's voice and the setting is impostulated through Kristien, whereas the focalisation of Ouma Kristina's (her)story is presented through Ouma Kristina, with the distinction clearly marked through the use of quotation marks and other markers of discourse deixis.

At this level, however, the focalisation is firstly complicated through the merging of the voices of Ouma Kristina and Kristien, made less distinguishable by the lack of quotation marks after each introduction. Secondly, the focalisation becomes particularly complicated because of Ouma Kristina's impostulated "omniscience" in the narration of events and thoughts to which she could by no stretch of the imagination be privy. Ouma Kristina's narration cannot, however, be described in terms of the conventional category of "omniscience" either. In the impostulation of

her narrative, extradiegetic, heterodiegetic “omniscience”<sup>73</sup> (e.g. unlimited access to the minds of characters) merges with intradiegetic, homodiegetic first-person narration (i.e. limited, subjective). Consequently, the impostulation requires the narrativisation of Ouma Kristina’s (her)story in terms of a combination of these categories.

Furthermore, the conjecture and hypothetical focalisation through Ouma Kristina become the impostulation through her of the (her)stories passed on to her “along the line of mothers and daughters” (IS:303), emphasising the unreliability of the narration. Because of the resulting distance impostulated between the events in these stories and the narrative present, the narrative origo as well as the focalisation through the narrative origo, become a combination of the focalisation through all of these women, although the articulation is impostulated as being through Ouma Kristina and subsequently through Kristien’s recording thereof in writing.

Kristien’s role in the focalisation is particularly evident in the ironies that echo those in the impostulated direct speech where she provides a “voice of reason” to Ouma Kristina’s fabrications. The fact that Ouma Kristina’s account of her own life is marked so clearly as unreliable therefore characterises the narrative origo in such a way that she cannot conceivably turn into a reliable narrator in these (her)stories.

Focalisation, where it parts company with visual perception, transcends the objective perceivable outer objects and actions. It also transcends the relating of memories. It approaches those things related to interpretation of actions, objects, characters through attitudes, ideology, response, in other words that require specific personal input from the reader.

These subjective elements are impostulatory by nature and are an imaginary infusion of the text through the agency of the narrator as proxy or creation of the author and reader and their culture and background.

---

<sup>73</sup> According to Rimmon-Kenan (1983:95), omniscience has the following characteristics: “familiarity, in principle, with the characters’ innermost thoughts and feelings; knowledge of past, present and future; presence in locations where characters are supposed to be unaccompanied; and knowledge of what happens in several places at the same time”.

Unlike at the level of impostulated direct speech, where Ouma Kristina's voice is a constant presence, marked by the markers of person and discourse deixis, this level of the impostulation presents a narrative that is somewhere between a voice and a written narrative or epistolary; both, and at the same time neither. On the one hand it would seem as if Kristien is more or less eliminated (or at least rendered covert) because of the lack of markers after each introduction, with the result that Ouma Kristina is impostulated as addressing the reader directly. On the other hand, Ouma Kristina's voice is not foregrounded to the same extent as in the previous level discussed, causing a "double" voice (perhaps even a double silence) to emerge in the impostulation.

Another effect of the complicated focalisation and the consequent complex narrative origo, is that any departure from the events in the (her)stories is impostulated in the metatextual present again (as is the case in the frame impostulation), and not in the narrative present (as in the impostulated direct speech).

As explained in 4.2.1.1, the frame impostulation is interspersed with these (her)stories and there is a symbiotic relationship between the frame and the framed. On the one hand the (her)stories are influenced by and even elicited by the frame impostulation and the events in the narrative present. On the other hand, the (her)stories inform the frame in providing a metanarrative to Kristien in her journey of self-discovery, as well as providing a commentary on the events in the narrative present. The introductions to each of the (her)stories presented at this level (i.e. all the (her)stories apart from those of the two narrators) provide a link to the frame impostulation and the narrative present.

Before examining the impact of these complicating factors on the focalisation and on the translation of the gaps and traces around the focalisation in the first and last of the (her)stories (that of Petronella and Lottie), the macrotextual structure of the introduced (her)stories has to be studied more carefully.



#### 4.2.2.3.2 Macrotextual analysis

**Table 8 Introduction to introduced impostulated direct narrative**

Part, Chapter	Character	Introduction	
		SK	IS
II, 10 II, 11	Petronella Ragel/ Rachel	"Nou is dit eers Petronella se beurt." Petronella, sê ouma, is aan die mond van die Umgeni gebore ... (SK:131).	"Now it is Petronella's turn." Petronella was born at the mouth of the Umgeni in Natal ... (IS:98).
II, 15	Louisa	Vir die eerste keer in my lewe voel ek nuuskierig oor my ma: dié koue, trotse, geheimsinnige vrou in wie ek nog altyd so 'n renons gehad het; vir wie ek so bang was. En ouma Kristina, dit kan ek sien, kan nie wag om my te vertel nie. Die bietjie, altans, wat sy weet (SK:153).	For the first time in my life I become curious about my mother, that cold, aloof and secret woman I'd feared and resented so much; and Ouma Kristina is prepared to tell me; the little she knows, at least (IS:116).
III, 11-17	Kamma/ Maria	Sy begin ophaal. En ek sit en skryf. Vanmiddag nadat ek by Jakob Bonthuys was, het ek 'n uur geslaap; ek is paraat (SK:229).	Slowly she moves into the telling of her story. And I write as she speaks. This afternoon, after I'd seen Jacob Bonthuys, I slept for an hour; I'm ready now (IS:175).
IV, 3-6	Samuel	"Oor wie is dit dié keer?" "Die vrou Samuel," sê sy (SK:266).	"Who is it this time?" "The woman Samuel," she says (IS:206).
V, 8-12	Wilhelmina	Ek draai die stoel skuins sodat ek die bed nie meer sien nie, en lewer my oor aan Ouma se vertelling (SK:346).	I turn the chair sideways to shut out the bed from my field of vision, and yield to the swell of Ouma's new tale (IS:271).
VI, 2-3	Lottie	Sy het na my gelê en kyk toe ek inkom: daardie besondere kyk van haar wat nie vrae stel nie en ook nie beskuldig of verwyt nie, maar net sê: <i>Hier is jy</i> . Ek het op my ou plek gaan sit. Sy het begin vertel. 'n Storie wat ek al vantevore gehoor het, in meer as een gedaante, toe dit net storie was en nog nie opgeneem is in ons geskiedenis nie. Korter as die meeste van die ander, maar net so onthutsend. Sy het vertel; ek het geskryf. En dit is wat in my verlede opgeneem is: (SK:382).	She looked at me when I came in; that special look she has, neither accusing nor questioning, simply to acknowledge that I am there; a look that makes me conscious of my own presence, a look which can be both reassuring and disconcerting. I took up my seat. She began to speak. It was a story I had heard before, in one form or another, when it had still been a story, a diversion, not yet gathered into our history. It was shorter than most of the others, but not any less disturbing. She spoke. I wrote. And the following was gathered into my past: (IS:302).

As pointed out in 4.2.1.1, the herstory of Kristien's lineage is impostulated starting with Ouma Kristina and her mother, Rachel/Ragel (II:8; II:12-14; II:11), followed by the latter's mother Petronella (II:10), and Kristien's mother Louisa (II:15), before turning to Kristien (III:2; III:5) – in other words, the more recent members of the lineage. Kristien's (her)story, as that of the last member of the lineage, is then juxtaposed with that of Kamma/Maria (III:11-17) as the first woman in the lineage

---

presented by Ouma Kristina. This is followed by the (her)stories of Samuel (IV:3-6), Wilhelmina (V:8-12) and finally Lottie (VI:2-3). In Table 7 the final part of the introduction to each (her)story is presented – after which the quotation marks disappear and the impostulated narrative through the combined origo of Ouma Kristina and Kristien commences.

The first of the introduced (her)stories (Petronella and Rachel/Ragel), concern Ouma Kristina's mother and grandmother, and are impostulated as an interjection between the two parts of Ouma Kristina's own (her)story, in order to provide more background on her life. Each of these (her)stories only takes up one relatively short chapter. In II:10 the (her)story of Petronella is presented, followed directly in II:11 by that of Ragel/Rachel without any further introduction. In these two (her)stories the focalisation can still conceivably be related to Ouma Kristina's own observations at times, but mostly it is either focalisation through Ouma Kristina of Petronella's accounts, or hypothetical impostulation through Ouma Kristina.

Ouma Kristina motivates the order of the (her)stories in this introduction with the following: "To understand something about my mother, ... you should first know more about Petronella." (IS:98.) After Petronella's (her)story (which will be analysed in detail in the microtextual analysis), the narrative moves on to Rachel/Ragel without interruption. This (her)story is the most sketchy of all the (her)stories in spite of the fact that it concerns Ouma Kristina's mother. The account ends with: "And that is all we know. Once upon a time there was a girl called Rachel; and then one day she wasn't any more." (IS:108.)

The secrecy surrounding Rachel is also evident in the next (her)story at this level, namely that about Louisa, Kristien's mother. Again, in spite of her proximity to the two narrators and to the narrative present, the details remain far more sketchy than in most of the other (her)stories. This juxtaposition again emphasises the intimate relationship and parallel between Ouma Kristina and Kristien, this time in relation to a loss of identity as a result of not having a connection with their mothers. As Ouma Kristina depends on Petronella to fulfil the role of mother, Kristien depends on Ouma

Kristina. Like the (her)stories of Rachel and Petronella, her story is presented in one brief chapter between the (her)stories of Ouma Kristina and Kristien.

As can be seen in Table 7, the introduction to this (her)story consists of one paragraph in which Ouma Kristina's eagerness to tell Kristien about her mother is impostulated in SK with "En ouma Kristina, dit kan ek sien, **kan nie wag** om my te vertel nie" (SK:153) and her willingness to tell Kristien in IS with "... and Ouma Kristina **is prepared** to tell me ..." (IS:116). Although the focalisation through Kristien of Ouma Kristina's attitude is clearly different in the two texts, the introduction in both is less elaborate and emphasises the fact that even Ouma Kristina knows very little about Louisa.

The most significant aspect of the impostulation of Louisa's (her)story, is the problematic focalisation. Firstly, unlike the other (her)stories at this level, the focalisation proceeds primarily through Kristien and not through Ouma Kristina. However, even this focalisation becomes confusing due to the markers of person deixis. In large sections of the chapter the characters are identified from an objective perspective as "Kristina", "Louisa", "Ludwig" and "Cornelis" and not as "Ouma", "mother", "father" and "grandfather" as one would expect if the focalisation were to proceed through Kristien, or "I", "your grandfather", "your father" and "your mother" as one would expect if the focalisation were to proceed through Ouma Kristina. This seems to mark a narrative origo in which neither Kristien, nor Ouma Kristina is central, but rather something like an authorial voice or an "omniscient" narrator. At other times, however, the markers of person deixis clearly mark the focalisation as proceeding through Kristien and sometimes through Ouma Kristina. What complicates the focalisation even further, is the focalisation through Louisa as a result of the information Ouma Kristina found in her diaries, and the hypothetical focalisation through Ludwig, Kristien's father.

The hypothetical focalisation is signalled as follows:

- If this were Ludwig Müller's biography, those would have been eventful years; it would have been revealing to trace the interlinking of his personal career with the larger history of the country (IS:123).

- As dit Ludwig Muller se lewensgeskiedenis was dié, dan sou dit bewoë jare gewees het; dit sou openbarend gewees het om na te gaan hoe sy persoonlike loopbaan met swaelstertvoë ingeskakel het by die lotgevalle van die land (SK:162).

This hypothetical focalisation serves to undermine and subvert the male perspective by rendering it a mere aside to the herstory. As a result of the variable and even inconsistent focalisation in this (her)story, a number of traces appear that can hardly be pinned down to specific meanings or interpretations but that nonetheless form an implicit part of the narrative that cannot be ignored or simplified without losing the regenerating power present in all shifts, traces and silences.

The impostulation of Ouma's herstory resumes, after a return to the narrative present interrupted by Kristien's own (her)story, with the (her)story of the first woman in the lineage, Kamma/Maria. Ouma Kristina motivates the position of this (her)story in her account of the herstory as follows:

- "This time we must go further back" ... "Our story is different, it doesn't run in a straight line, as you should know by now" ... "It's a useful beginning." (IS:174-175.)
- "Dié keer moet ons verder teruggaan" ... "Ons storie werk anders, dié loop nie met so 'n reguit lyn nie" ... "Net om êrens te begin, ja." (SK:227-228.)

The magical realist element in the novel is most evident in this (her)story as the story of Krotoa/Eva is appropriated in Ouma Kristina's account (acknowledged by Brink in the Author's Note)<sup>74</sup>. The focalisation is consequently influenced by the mythological element in the oral tradition as well as the apocryphal nature of the story (a style that also informs Ouma Kristina's entire herstory). According to Wenzel (2001:3), South African fiction (like Latin American fiction in the past) has recently "reverted to origins, myths, legends and history/stories to restore coherence to its fragmented society". As such, the narrative origo in this novel is also influenced by metatextual intertextuality activated in the narrativisation. The focalisation not only proceeds through Ouma Kristina (and subsequently Kristien), but also through an entire culture of storytellers. A parallel is further impostulated between Ouma Kristina and

---

<sup>74</sup> Brink (1996b:22) himself states that the concern of the narrative in Kamma/Maria's (her)story "is not the 'facts' but the patterns of already-narrativised history".

Kamma/Maria in the connection with birds as Ouma Kristina becomes starting point for the herstory just as Maria/Kamma is the starting point for the lineage.

The impostulated access to the thoughts of various characters in this (her)story is similar to the "omniscience" in most of the other (her)stories at this level. In the three final (her)stories, that of Samuel, Wilhelmina and Lottie, this aspect of the focalisation provides a continual commentary on the patriarchal society the women find themselves in as well as their unique subversions of the norms of this society. In the account of Samuel's life, the lesbian aspect provides such a subversion, and in that of Wilhelmina's life, her role in the Great Trek subverts the entire myth on which Afrikaner Nationalism was built. Lottie's (her)story in turn continues the subversion of the patriarchal attitudes inherent in colonialism (this (her)story will also be discussed in more detail in the microtextual analysis).

In each of these (her)stories, identity plays a central role, and it is in this aspect that the impact of the (her)stories on the frame impostulation is most evident. As Ouma Kristina guides Kristien through the lives of these women, her own search for identity remains a constant subtext. Therefore, the focalisation through Ouma Kristina as well as through each of the women, comes to impostulate the focalisation through Kristien of her "reality".

#### **4.2.2.3.3 Microtextual analysis**

##### **Part II: Chapter 9-10**

The introduction to the first two (her)stories presents an important impostulation of the narrative origo in Kristien's words:

Sometimes her voice fades away altogether. I cannot even be sure that what she says is what I write. And what I hear her whisper merges with what I remember, or seem to remember, from earlier times when she told similar stories. Yet I have the impression that our communication is not dependent on something as extraneous as a voice. There is a more immediate insinuation of what she says into my consciousness; she articulates my writing hand (IS:97).

As discussed in 4.1, these words are instrumental in the impostulation of the narrative origo for each of the (her)stories at this level of introduced impostulated direct narrative. Also, it draws attention to the opacity of language, "which presents

language not as an access toward history but as a displacement of it" (Brink, 1996b:20). The focalisation in this introduction is again through Kristien and emphasises the setting as well as her emotional response to Ouma Kristina's account (as in the account of her own (her)story) through the use of markers of temporal, spatial and person deixis.

This metatextual strategy of emphasising the narrative process by exposing the merging of Kristien's voice with that of Ouma Kristina is an important aspect of the impostulation of the narrative origo. Brink has used this strategy in some form or another in other novels such as *The first life of Adamastor* (1993) where "the issue of narrative truth, first raised in the introduction, is repeatedly pushed to the foreground in a move that destabilizes a naïve reading of the text, by constantly thematizing the act of telling the story" (Petzold, 2000:49)<sup>75</sup>.

Another element of the narrative origo impostulated in this introduction is related to the tension between story and history already referred to in relation to the impostulated direct speech. Kristien's self-reflexive words illustrate this tension:

I have the feeling, both unsettling and reassuring, of recovering something; not the story as such, snatched from what may or may not have been my history, but the strange urge of the real towards the unreal, as if it must find its only possible justification there (IS:97).

The link between the frame and the (her)stories is also emphasised in the markers of self-reflexivity in this passage, as it becomes clear that Ouma Kristina's often highly imaginary account of their herstory somehow has to provide a justification for Kristien's "reality". Therefore, the focalisation through Kristien of the (her)stories impostulates a constant (if covert) justificatory quality.

The narrative origo is further characterised in this introductory chapter through Kristien's description of Ouma Kristina (direct characterisation from the narrative origo), which again calls attention to Ouma Kristina's voice as well as her physical appearance. The change in focalisation, however, sets in with the switch between

---

<sup>75</sup> Although Petzold (2000:49) discusses the metafictional strategy of exposing the distinction between authorial voice and narrator, the same principle applies to this metatextual strategy.

the mode of quoted dialogue and impostulated narrative as the quotation marks fall away:

"I'll tell you about her later. Now it is Petronella's turn."

Petronella was born at the mouth of the Umgeni in Natal, a year or two after ... (IS:97).

At this point in the narrative, the distinction between the focalisation through Kristien, Ouma Kristina and characters like Petronella in Ouma Kristina's storytelling becomes less clear. The most important effect of this switch to impostulated narrative, is that the self-reflexivity characterising much of the focalisation in the impostulated direct speech as well as in the frame impostulation and retrospective impostulation, is replaced by subjectivity. This is enhanced by the fact that the narrative is no longer marked in terms of the qualities of first-person narration but acquires an element of omniscience. Much of the focalisation in this chapter impostulates the narrative origo in close proximity to the events in spite of the fact that they are so far removed from both Ouma Kristina and Kristien.

The focalisation of Petronella as a young girl on the beach is one such example:

She **used to** spend whole days on the beach ... [crocodiles] **living in dread** of Wilhelmina, they became **more trusted** child-minders than any dog ... tracing **intricate** patterns in the sand, ... watch with **fascination** as a whole day's **dedicated** work was **obliterated**; **she knew** she could always start again the following day ... staring at the **immensity** of the Indian Ocean (IS:98).

The markers of subjectivity in this passage clearly mark the focalisation through an imaginary observer that cannot be identified purely as either Ouma Kristina, or Petronella or Wilhelmina, although informed by all these perspectives.

In the following example, the focalisation does seem to proceed through Petronella, although it is also informed by Ouma Kristina's interpretation and memory:

Petronella saw a ship ... It was a **sight such as she had never beheld before**, and it was to **obsess her dreams for years to come**, even when in **old age** she began to **lose her mind**. At the same time it **seemed to her** the solution to all her mother's worries (IS:98).

In this passage, as well as in the impostulation of what passed between Petronella and Wilhelmina, the markers of person deixis support the subjectivity, although

Ouma Kristina's subjective interpretation (as well as Kristien's implied recording thereof in writing, or re-writing) remains a covert presence.

In addition to the markers of subjectivity that mark the focalisation through Petronella and Ouma Kristina/Kristien, the impostulation of Petronella's emotions are marked as focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien in the metatextual element marked by the announced subjectivity highlighted in the following example:

Petronella was inconsolable. But deep in her heart a resolve had taken root that nothing would ever eradicate again. She was, profoundly and almost fatally, in love with the sea – not an infatuation such **as one might feel** for an idea or a cause or a landscape, but a burning, urgent and almost sensual attachment (IS:99).

The satire in the narrative, evident in markers of subjectivity and announced subjectivity, also emphasise the focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien, as can be seen in the following examples:

- ... recently invaded by a group of **quite terrifying religious fundamentalists** who, **confident** that they had traversed the length of Africa, **took it to be** the Nile. **The Promised Land was near** (IS:99)
- ... and as Petronella ripened into adolescence **God appeared to become more and more enthusiastic about these increasingly urgent communions** with his maidservant. And she too, **it must be said**, appeared to derive from this intercourse **some quite extravagant and suspect physical pleasure** (IS:100).

In these examples, the subjective interpretation marks the voice of Ouma Kristina as established in the narrative origo in the impostulated direct speech. The evident scepticism with regard to any religious matters is consistent with her characterisation in II:8. The markers of discourse deixis in the second example above ("it must be said") also lends the passage a metatextual quality which further foregrounds the satire and focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien.

The markers of discourse deixis in these chapters are not as clearly connected to Ouma Kristina or Kristien as in the impostulated direct speech, again due primarily to the lack of quotation marks, yet they still indicate focalisation through them rather than through the characters in the (her)story. Some examples of these markers are given below:

- ... where, **who knows**, it **might** be possible to reclaim the family's old farms (IS:99).
- It was **really very predictable** (IS:99).
- ... there was an **understandable confusion** in Petronella's mind ... (IS:100).



- **It should be interpolated here** that ... (IS:100).
- **The only reason he deserves to be mentioned here** is that ... (IS:100).
- **This might explain why** ... Petronella mistook the wide tract of sand and dunes along the Eastern Cape coast for the Sahara or the Sinai desert or the shore of the Red Sea; **whatever the case may be**, she believed to the day of her death that she had reached Egypt (IS:102).
- **There is no point in splitting hairs**. In Africa a few thousand miles south or north isn't worth quibbling about (IS:102).
- ... but whatever the specific circumstances, **which surely are of little consequence in a story** ... (IS:102).

In addition to the markers of discourse deixis, these examples all contain markers of self-reflexivity that emphasise the storytelling as well as the focalisation. As a result, the narrative attains an element of metatextuality in these examples that thrusts the impostulation outside of the story and into a metatextual present where the distance between the reader and the narrative is reduced.

The markers of announced subjectivity, mostly accompanied by markers of person deixis, also emphasise the focalisation in this chapter, although, unlike in the impostulated direct speech, the person markers do not mark Ouma Kristina and Kristien in the first and second person, impostulating their dialogue, but rather the characters in the (her)story. The following are a few examples of the impostulated access to the minds of characters that also contain markers of announced subjectivity from the narrative origo:

- What was interesting, **as far as Petronella was concerned** ... (IS:100).
- The encyclopedia she would use for **what to her was** prophesying, while **others called it** fortune telling (IS:101)..
- ... (she was **quite confident** that a **terse** reminder of the circumstances surrounding the original exodus would suffice to persuade him to assist her ... (IS:102).
- Hermanus Johannes Wepener **assured her**, was **every bit as good, if not better, than** the land of Canaan (IS:103).
- ... she **regarded him as a traitor** to the last, **unworthy of her trust** ... (IS:104).

Although most of these examples are marked as focalisation through Petronella, the undertone of satire again reveals Ouma Kristina/Kristien's part in the focalisation.

In other parts of this chapter, however, a first-person voice does appear more clearly in the markers of person deixis, as in the following: "**My own guess** is that she **secretly suspected** they were still in Egypt, **which would explain why this farm**

was given the outlandish name of Sinai.” (IS:103.) This is one of the rare cases in the chapter where the narration marks the narrative present, not only in the use of the first person, but also in the spatial deixis (“this farm”). The unreliability of the narration is also emphasised in “My own guess”.

This postulatory tone evident in the markers of announced subjectivity can also be seen in the following examples:

- ... **but it would be misguided, I'm sure, to think her mad. I knew her too intimately**, saw too much of her real vulnerability (IS:103).
- ... nor would she have wanted to, **I suspect**, if she could ... (IS:103).
- **The story doesn't need him any more, so we'll drop him here**, yet another skeleton in yet another cupboard (IS:104).
- On the surface ... but below that veneer all hell was seething. **I suspect that...** (IS:104).
- And this, **I guess**, explains the house (IS:103).

All these examples are from the last part of the chapter, where Ouma Kristina's voice seems to surface more clearly, and the focalisation is therefore more clearly marked as proceeding through her. The metatextual quality of these markers also draws attention not only to Kristien as narratee, but specifically to the involvement of the reader due to the fact that the narrative is not impostulated as direct speech.

The final two sentences of the chapter present the focalisation through Ouma Kristina of Petronella's perception of the house:

She **never thought of it** as a house. It was her ultimate boat, her ship, her ark, to redeem her from the corrupted world; the vessel in which, one day, **when it behoved the Lord God**, she would sail forth to the sea that nightly washed the **shores of her dreams** (IS:104-105).

Although the focalisation seems to be marked as proceeding through Ouma Kristina in the person deixis, the last sentence contains a number of markers that identify the focalisation as proceeding through Petronella (albeit hypothetically).

In this chapter it would therefore appear that the focalisation is marked extensively in the subjectivity and announced subjectivity combined with markers of discourse and person deixis, as well as in moments of self-reflexivity. The most significant aspect of the focalisation, however, is the fact that the narrative origo becomes more

complicated as the focalisation proceeds through Ouma Kristina/Kristien (due to the lack of quotation marks) as well as through Petronella.

### **Part VI: Chapter 2-3**

The two main aspects of the focalisation in these two chapters are the high frequency of markers of discourse deixis, indicating focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien, and the high density of markers of subjectivity indicating focalisation through characters in the (her)story impostulated through Ouma Kristina/Kristien. Although the discourse deixis has a similar effect to that in Petronella's (her)story, the focalisation through characters (often hypothetical) is much stronger in this (her)story.

The introduction to the impostulated narrative again draws attention to the setting, but in this case, not the narrative present but the recent past as Kristien thinks back on Ouma Kristina's storytelling the previous night (marked in the temporal deixis). The effect of this is that the last (her)story is somehow rendered subservient to the events in the narrative present surrounding the elections. Also, at this stage, the herstory has achieved its goal of guiding Kristien towards self-discovery and simply has to be completed.

The impostulated narrative in these chapters consequently also flows directly from Kristien's retrospective narrative and not from impostulated direct speech as in most of the other (her)stories at this level. The focalisation through Kristien of Ouma Kristina is very similar to that in the impostulated direct speech:

Sy het na my gelê en kyk toe ek inkom: daardie besondere kyk van haar wat nie vrae stel nie en ook nie beskuldig of verwyt nie, maar net sê: *Hier is jy* (SK 382).

The markers of temporal, spatial and person deixis in this sentence impostulate the setting that serves as backdrop to the impostulated narrative while also providing characterisation of the narrative origo.

The switch from Kristien's frame narration to the impostulated narrative again draws attention to the roles of Ouma Kristina and Kristien in the subsequent impostulated narrative:

Sy het vertel; ek het geskryf. En dit is wat in my verlede opgeneem is: (SK:382).

In addition to the emphasis on the roles of telling and writing (again marking the combination of Ouma Kristina and Kristien in the narrative origo), this part of the introduction also stresses the tension between history and story in the second sentence. As in II:9, the impact of story on history is again emphasised in the “strange urge of the real towards the unreal, as if it must find its only possible justification there” (IS:97).

This is immediately taken up in the focalisation of Kamma's children:

Nadat Kamma in 'n boom verander het en deur die voëls weggedra is, het haar kinders aangebly by die stam. **Ek kan nie presies sê** hoeveel daar van hulle was nie, **seker** so 'n vier of vyf; die meeste kon **jy** nie onderskei van die ander Khoikhoi nie ... (SK:382).

The markers of person deixis in this passage impostulate an imaginary observer. However, although the first person deixis combined with the announced subjectivity would seem to indicate that the focalisation proceeds through Ouma Kristina, it is clear that this is hypothetical focalisation which serves to foreground the “urge of the real towards the unreal”. Furthermore, in this passage, the merging of the conventional categories of first-person and omniscient narration becomes clear. This sets the tone for a complicated focalisation which informs the rest of this (her)story.

A few markers of first and second-person deixis, such as “Die res weet jy” (SK:388) and “Mens vra jou af” (SK:389) also draw attention to the roles of narrator and narratee, although this aspect of the narrative is decidedly on the background in these chapters.

The discourse deixis, as already mentioned, is one of the aspects that marks the “voice” of Ouma Kristina and focalisation through her in this chapter most clearly, particularly in combination with markers of self-reflexivity, as can be seen in the following examples:

- Sy't **beslis nie** op haar pa getrek nie, **dis nou Adam ...**; **maar dalk** het sy teruggeslaan ... **Dit kan ook wees**, het party van die Khoikhoi geredeneer, dat ... (SK:382).

- **Maar waar sy dan nou ook al** haar uitheemse skoonheid vandaan gekry het, **wat saak maak, is dit:** dat die stam haar vereer het; maar dat dit mettertyd ook haar ondergang was. Of haar redding, **hang nou af van wie praat** (SK:382).
- Daar was **destyds** al hoe meer van **dié** trekkers wat die wêreld in die binneland begin mak maak het, **wat 'n ander manier is om te sê** dat hulle ... alles voor hulle uitgeroei het soos hulle **glo** die **beskawing kom versprei het** (SK:383).
- **Wat presies ... weet ons nie.** Dit **kan wees** dat hulle op 'n jagtog was, **of** op 'n verkenningstog..., **of** een van die bittereinders op soek na ...; **dit is ook moontlik dat ... Al wat regtig ter sake is,** is dat hulle **op 'n dag ...** (SK:383).
- In die begin was sy nog sonder naam: **as** sy een gehad het, **sou dit natuurlik** in die taal van die Khoikhoi gewees het, maar dié het sy nooit aan enigiemand verklap nie – **behalwe miskien** aan haar langhaardogter Samuel, later ... (SK:384).
- ... **maar as dit so was, dan** het Samuel vergeet wat dit was, **of anders** het dit verlore geraak, iewers in die lang ry van ma's en dogters ... (SK:384).

In all these examples the announced subjectivity is emphasised by the discourse deixis that constantly calls attention to the noncommittal and unreliable quality in the narration. This foregrounds the tension and interaction between story and history, but more importantly, it marks the focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien. In the last example, the role of the focalisation through the long line of women is also emphasised, complicating the focalisation even further and reinforcing the unreliability of the narration.

Other markers of discourse deixis such as "Wat gebeur het, was dit: ..." (SK:382), "... die hele ou treumare" (SK:383) and "Dit was natuurlik Bart Grobler, wie anders" (387) also draw attention to Ouma Kristina's voice combined with that of Kristien, and the self-reflexivity of these markers emphasises the focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien.

The predominant aspect of the focalisation in these chapters, however, is the subjectivity that marks the focalisation through either the Khoikhoi, or the trekkers or the Hartmans (Hermina Hartman in particular). These subjective thoughts and emotions of characters in the (her)story not only complicate the narrative origo, but specifically impacts on the reliability of the narration. In the following examples, the focalisation through the members of the Khoikhoi tribe is evident:

- ... en **voordat enigiemand in die nedersetting nog mooi kon agterkom** wat aangaan... **Alles het so skielik gebeur** dat dit **agterna gelyk het asof** 'n dwarrelwind eenvoudig uit die hemel neergedaal het en haar met hom saamgeneem het. **Nie eens die stam se beskermgees kon dit keer nie** (SK:383).

- Hulle was diep beswaard... (SK:383).

The markers of subjectivity in the following examples foreground the ideological aspects of the focalisation through the trekkers:

- Gevolglik het die **godvresende besoekers** tot die gevolgtrekking gekom ... (SK:383).
- ... die einste David Herman op die voerpunt: ... 'n magtige kommando. 'n **behoorlike kruistog** wat onderneem is om wraak te neem **op die spul booswigte** wat dit gewaag het om 'n meisie van die **meesterras** in hul midde gevange te hou (SK:384).

In these two examples the focalisation through the trekkers is particularly clear in their perspective on themselves as god-fearing people that mete out God's punishment on the heathens, a justice they are entitled to because of their superior status as the master race and the bearers of the torch of civilisation. The satire evident in this focalisation, however, also provides a trace of the focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien. This is further emphasised by the following sentence: "Dit was die storie waarmee die meisie deur die Hartmans grootgemaak is." (SK:384.)

The markers of subjectivity are also evident in the focalisation through Hermina. Significantly, Hermina is not one of the women in their lineage and cannot be regarded as a source for the narrative. Therefore, the focalisation through her also complicates the narrative origo and presents a trace of "omniscience". The apparent "omniscience" can clearly be seen in the following examples:

- Toe Hermina laat een middag veld toe is om Lottie te gaan roep. het sy dit **met haar eie twee oë gesien**: die kind had geen skaduwee nie (SK:386)
- **Dit was genoeg om 'n mens te laat arig voel, en Hermina het besluit** om die ontdekking maar liewer vir haarself te hou. Maar van die dag af het sy die meisie anders behandel: met 'n **versigtigheid**, 'n **soort bedugtheid**, asof sy moes leer saamleef ... (SK:386).
- Maar sê nou niemand verstaan nie? wou Hermina weet. Selfs dan het Lottie met 'n raaiselagtige glimlaggie geantwoord, sou dit nie eintlik saak maak nie (SK:387).

It would therefore seem that the focalisation in (her)stories at the level of introduced impostulated direct narrative is much more complicated than at the other levels of impostulation, particularly due to the various shifts in focalisation. The focalisation is mostly evident in the markers of announced subjectivity combined with markers of discourse and person deixis, as well as in markers of self-reflexivity that indicate

focalisation not only through a combination of Ouma Kristina and Kristien, but also through various characters in the (her)stories.

#### 4.2.2.3.4 Comparison: parallel texts and translation

As explained above, this level of the impostulation presents a shift from impostulated direct speech (quoted dialogue) in the introduction, which is as such clearly impostulated in the narrative present, to impostulated narrative which operates along the same lines as the direct impostulated narrative in the frame. However, the fact that the impostulation also shifts from a limited focalisation mostly through Kristien to an "omniscient" unlimited focalisation through Ouma Kristina and subsequently through Kristien (Ouma Kristina/Kristien), with the added complication of hypothetical focalisation through the long line of women, renders the shifts that occur in terms of focalisation also more complicated.

As a result of this complicated focalisation, a number of gaps and traces appear. Firstly in the uneasy mixture between the voices of and focalisation through Ouma Kristina and Kristien, and secondly in the "omniscience" where the focalisation could not logically proceed through either Ouma Kristina or Kristien, but rather takes the form of hypothetical focalisation (even impossible focalisation). Although, against the background of the theory of impostulation, the focalisation remains through the narrative origo and is never actually passed on to characters in the story, the impact of the hypothetical focalisation on the impostulation of the narrative origo renders any shifts in focalisation between the texts extremely important.

### Part II, Chapter 10

The first, perhaps understandable, shift in focalisation is related to the detailed nature of the impostulation of the geographical setting:

	IS	JLK	SK
(1)	Petronella was born at the mouth of the Umgeni in <b>Natal</b> , a year or two <b>after the Boers and the Zulus had their final, fatal encounter at Blood River...</b>	Petronella is gebore aan die mond van die Umgeni, 'n jaar of twee <b>nadat die Boere en Zoeloes hulle laaste, fatale ontmoeting by Bloedrivier gehad het</b>	Petronella, <b>sê Ouma</b> , is aan die mond van die Umgeni gebore, <b>net 'n jaar of wat na Bloedrivier...</b>

(2)	... insignificant little stream <b>that wound its way through the subtropical vegetation of the Northern Transvaal</b>	... 'n onbenullige klein stroompie <b>wat deur die subtropiese plantegroei van die Noord-Transvaal gekronkel het ...</b>	... 'n nietige waterlopie in die Noord-Transvaal ...
-----	--	--	--

Evidently, the markers of spatial and temporal deixis (in both examples) in IS and JLK present more information than in SK. Firstly, the Umgeni is specified in (1) as being located in Natal in IS, and the vegetation in the Northern Transvaal is described in (2). Secondly, in (1), more background is given to the reference to Blood River in IS and JLK. What makes the shift understandable, is the fact that IS was probably written for an international audience, whereas SK obviously for a local audience who would not require the additional information (with JLK being closer to this text in taking it as source). Nevertheless, the fact that SK impostulates prior knowledge not only of the location of the Umgeni, but more particularly about the significance of Blood River (a central event in the construction of the myth of Afrikaner Nationalism), creates a trace surrounding the event that also activates an ideological dimension in SK. This alters the focalisation by changing the narrative origo into which the focalisation is impostulated.

The main difference between this level of impostulation and the other levels, is the impostulated "omniscience" evident primarily in focalisation through the narrative origo where focalisation through characters in Ouma Kristina's (her)stories is impostulated. In this (her)story, the predominant such focalisation occurs in relation to Petronella. In examples (3) to (6) below, this impostulated focalisation through Petronella from the narrative origo, marked primarily as subjectivity, presents a number of differences between the texts. In (3) and (4), the impostulated focalisation through Petronella is more specific in IS and JLK, whereas it is marked more clearly in terms of social deixis in SK.

	IS	JLK	SK
(3)	She was, <b>profoundly and almost fatally, in love with the sea – not an infatuation such as one might feel for an idea or a cause or a landscape, but a burning, urgent and almost sensual attachment.</b>	Sy was <b>diepgrondiglik en amper fataal verlief op die see – nie 'n verliefdheid soos wat mens sal voel vir 'n idee of 'n saak of 'n landskap nie, maar 'n brandende, dringende en amper sensuele verbintenis.</b>	Sy was <b>heeltemaal verslinger op die see.</b>



(4)	God had personally <b>revealed to her, in a nightly visitation</b> , that a new Flood was immanent; and unless they were prepared they would be swept away like the <b>sinner</b> s of the Old Testament, <b>the touchstone of her devout life</b>	God het dit persoonlik aan haar <b>geopenbaar in 'n nagtelike besoek</b> , dat daar 'n nuwe sondvloed oppad was; en tensy hulle voorbereid was, sou hulle weggesleur word soos die <b>sondaars</b> van die Ou Testament, <b>die een bron waaraan sy haar toegewyde lewe gemeet het</b> .	Die Here God het persoonlik aan haar geopenbaar, toe hy weer een nag <b>oudergewoonte op haar bors kom sit het</b> , dat 'n nuwe Sondvloed voorlê: en tensy hulle betyds gereed maak, sou hulle nes die spul <b>sondaars</b> van die Ou Testament versuip.
-----	--	--	--

Although, in (3), the “profoundly and almost fatally, in love” in IS and “diepgrondiglik en amper fataal verlief” in JLK presents a similar subjectivity of Petronella’s emotion as “heeltemal verslinger” in SK, the latter also has the meaning of being infatuated with something or someone inferior or disagreeable (see HAT:1265). This renders the focalisation in SK more ironical in the traces activated through *différance*. The register in SK is also less formal than in the other two texts, impacting on the narrative origo.

The elaboration on this emotion of Petronella concerning the sea in IS and JLK renders the focalisation marked by this subjectivity more intense, contributing to the characterisation of Petronella. Since this obsession with the sea is central in the (her)story, the added emphasis in IS and JLK also impacts on the subsequent impostulation of this (her)story.

In (4), the impostulated focalisation through Petronella of the nightly visitations by God in SK (“Die Here God ... weer een nag oudergewoonte op haar bors kom sit het”), activates an image that emphasises the nature of the relationship between Petronella and God, presented more ironically here through the narrative origo. Even the use of “Here God” in stead of “God” in IS and JLK activates traces of the metanarrative of religious ideology in which the Afrikaner nation is regarded as God’s chosen people. Therefore, this difference has a significant impact on the narrative origo.

As in (3), there is an added emphasis in the subjectivity in (4), this time related to Petronella’s religious tendency (“... the Old Testament, the touchstone of her devout life” in IS and “... die Ou Testament, die een bron waaraan sy haar toegewyde lewe

gemeet het" in JLK). Although her "devout life" is also implied in the gaps and traces surrounding the image a few lines earlier in SK (as the emphasis on her emotions concerning the sea are implied in "verslinger"), the fact that it is made more explicit in IS and JLK, as well as that the Old Testament norms she clings to are emphasised, changes the narrative origo. The difference in focalisation in these two examples therefore effect changes also to the narrative origo that become significant on a macrotextual level.

In (5) and (6) the emotional aspect of the impostulated focalisation through Petronella is also emphasised more clearly in IS and JLK by means of stronger subjectivity:

	IS	JLK	SK
(5)	Petronella on her own ... <b>amounted to nothing, nothing at all.</b>	Petronella op haar eie ... <b>was niks werd nie, geheel en al niks.</b>	Op haar eie ... <b>was Petronella magteloos.</b>
(6)	Even so she wanted to be quite sure, before the knot was tied, <b>that he could be trusted in every respect to do her bidding, while offering her the security and standing she sensed she needed.</b>	Maar steeds wou sy heeltemal seker wees, voordat sy haar aan hom verbind, <b>dat hy vertrou kon word om haar bevele op elke vlak uit te voer, en haar terselfdertyd die sekuriteit en die aansien sou gee wat sy kon aanvoel sy nodig gehad het.</b>	Met dit en al wou sy eers goed seker maak <b>dat sy deur dik en dun op hom kon staatmaak.</b> -

In (5), the repetition of "nothing" in IS and "niks" in JLK presents a much stronger marker of focalisation than "magteloos" in SK. Furthermore, "amounted to nothing" and "niks werd nie" present markers of value judgement that further emphasise the subjective quality of the impostulation.

In the case of (6), SK merely presents the need Petronella felt to make sure that she could depend on Hermanus Johannes before agreeing to marry him. However, IS and JLK present this prerequisite as a need to know whether he would do her bidding, and in return provide her with security and standing "she sensed she needed". The impostulated focalisation through Petronella of her relationship with Hermanus Johannes therefore impostulates an important aspect of her characterisation for the rest of her impostulation, in particular the characteristic independent trait of the women in their lineage. This added information therefore

also impacts on the narrative origo as Ouma Kristina's (her)stories develop. this theme of independence.

Although the discourse deixis in (7) presents a difference between the texts, the allusion is perhaps more interesting in terms of focalisation:

	IS	JLK	SK
(7)	... her mother finally expired – true to form, <b>though, not with a whimper but a bang.</b>	... het haar ma uiteindelik die gees gegee – getrou aan haar natuur, <b>nie met 'n whimper nie maar met 'n bang.</b>	... is haar ma self ook daarmee heen – op haar eie onnavolgbare manier, <b>in styl, by wyse van spreke.</b>

In IS the allusion to T.S. Eliot's "The Hollow Men" activates the intertext and at the same time provides characterisation into the narrative origo, perhaps closer to Kristien than Ouma Kristina. The irony that results from this allusion further impacts on the focalisation in a different way than the more "empty" discourse deixis in SK.

The discourse deixis at this level of impostulation, as on the level of impostulated direct speech, provides the source for a number of differences in focalisation, related primarily to announced subjectivity. In examples (8) to (12) below it is rather obvious that the discourse deixis and announced subjectivity that provide something of a metatextual commentary on the story, as well as the self-awareness of the narration, are mostly absent from SK. This has the result that the narration in SK has fewer markers of focalisation and particularly of the fact that this is impostulated narrative, and appears to be closer to retrospective impostulated narrative.

	IS	JLK	SK
(8)	Among the girl's young siblings two brothers, who had remained with their mother out of loyalty, <b>reinforced perhaps by trepidation at what she might do if they dared voice discontent ...</b>	Twee van die jong meisietjie <b>se</b> broers, wat uit lojaliteit by hulle ma gebly het, <b>miskien versterk deur hulle versigtigheid vir wat sy sou doen as hulle dit sou durf waag om hulle ongelukkigheid te verwoord ...</b>	Twee van die meisie se broers, wat net uit lojaliteit en vrees by haar ma aangebly het ... -
(9)	... where, <b>who knows</b> , it <b>might be possible</b> to reclaim the family's old farms.	... waar, <b>wie weet</b> , dit <b>miskien moontlik</b> sou wees om weer hulle familie se ou plase op te eis.	-
(10)	<b>What was interesting, as far as Petronella was concerned</b> , was that throughout her life she drew her inspiration ...	<b>Wat interessant was, sover dit Petronella aangegaan het</b> , was dat sy haar lewe lank inspirasie gekry het ...	Dwarsdeur haar lewe was daar net ...

(11)	<b>What matters</b> is that soon after arriving at <b>what she regarded as</b> her first destination ...	<b>Wat wel belangrik is</b> , is dat, kort na haar aankoms by <b>wat sy maar as</b> haar eerste bestemming <b>beskou het</b> ...	Kort na hul aankoms ... -
(12)	... but <b>whatever the specific circumstances, which surely are of little consequence in a story</b> , he told her – or she came to <b>understand</b> ...	... maar <b>wat die spesifieke omstandighede ook al was, wat tog sekerlik weinig strekking in 'n storie het</b> , hy het haar vertel – of sy het hom verstaan – ...	... <b>hoe dit sy</b> , hy het haar laat verstaan dat ... -

In these examples, the announced subjectivity in IS and JLK clearly marks the focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien, often with a sense of speculation that emphasises the unreliability of the narration. In (12) in particular, the fact that this is a story is emphasised in these two texts, thereby foregrounding the tension between story and history that is not equally evident in SK.

The person deixis at this level is less self-reflexive than at the level of impostulated direct speech, but there are a few instances in this (her)story where the first person is used, foregrounding the voice of Ouma Kristina/Kristien. In (13) the focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien is again more evident in IS and JLK than in SK:

	IS	JLK	SK
(13)	On her own Petronella could not attain this; nor would she have wanted to, <b>I suspect, if she could.</b>	Op haar eie kon Petronella dit nie kry nie; en sy sou ook nie wou nie, <b>vermoed ek, selfs al kon sy.</b>	By haar sou – of wou – Petronella nooit kers vashou nie.

In addition to the markers of person deixis, the announced subjectivity in (13) also provides an indication of the focalisation that is stronger in IS and JLK than in SK.

The difference in focalisation in (14) to (16) is again situated in the markers of subjectivity, although here it relates not to the impostulated focalisation through Petronella, but to the focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien:

	IS	JLK	SK
(14)	Benjamin, reputed to suffer permanently from brain damage as the result of a blow to the head his mother had once dealt him with a plough after he'd <b>inadvertently</b> broken the blade.	... Benjamin, wat klaarblyklik permanente breinskade opgedoen het as gevolg van 'n hou wat sy ma hom teen die kop gegee het met 'n ploeg nadat hy <b>per ongeluk</b> die skaar gebreek het.	Dié het glo breinskade opgedoen toe sy ma hom eenkeer met 'n ploeg oor die kop geslaan het nadat hy 'n skaar gebreek het.

(15)	Petronella's method was <b>disarmingly straightforward</b> .	Petronella se tegniek was <b>gerusstellend eenvoudig</b> .	Haar metode was <b>eenvoudig</b> .
(16)	What she did was probably to consult the Dutch encyclopedia <b>which had so amazingly survived the flood with her</b> .	Wat sy waarskynlik eerder gedoen het was om die Hollandse ensiklopedie te raadpleeg <b>wat so wonderbaarlik saam met haar aan die vloed ontkom het</b> .	Sy het waarskynlik net op haar ou manier die Hollandse ensiklopedie nageslaan ... -

In all three these examples the subjectivity in IS and JLK is marked by means of adjectives ("inadvertently"/"per ongeluk"; "disarmingly"/"gerusstellend"; and "amazingly"/"wonderbaarlik"). However, none of these markers appear in SK, and in the case of (16), the satire evident in the fact that the encyclopedia survived the flood does not appear at all. As in the case of (3) to (6) above, the focalisation through the narrative origo is therefore significantly more neutral.

It would therefore appear that the complicating factors in terms of focalisation in this (her)story also result in differences in focalisation between the source text (IS) and translation on the one hand and the parallel text (SK) on the other. In most cases the focalisation through the narrative origo as well as the impostulated focalisation through Petronella, is marked more clearly in IS and JLK by means of markers of discourse deixis, subjectivity and announced subjectivity. Therefore, the macrofocalisation of this (her)story is changed due to the fact that the satire and irony evident in the focalisation through the narrative origo are emphasised in IS and JLK. In terms of the markers of social deixis that provide an indication of Ouma Kristina's voice, SK, however, impostulates a more informal narrative origo on this level as it does on the other levels.

### Part VI, Chapter 2-3

As in II:10, and for much the same reasons, more geographical information is provided in these chapters in IS, again impostulating a different audience:

	SK	JLK	IS
(1)	... <b>doer uit die Kolonie uit daar aangekom</b> ...	... arrived at the settlement <b>from the distant Colony</b> .	... <b>from the further reaches of the Dutch colonial settlement at the Cape</b> .

This time, the historical aspect of Dutch colonialism is explicated for a foreign audience thereby changing the narrative origo.

In (2), the self-reflexivity in IS is emphasised more than in SK or JLK with the more specific focalisation on the narrative present:

	SK	JLK	IS
(2)	Sy het na my gelê en kyk toe ek inkom: daardie besondere kyk van haar wat nie vrae stel nie en ook nie beskuldig of verwyd nie, maar net sê: <i>Hier is jy.</i>	She was looking at me when I came in: that special look of hers that neither asks questions nor accuses or reproaches; it merely seems to say: <i>There you are.</i>	She looked at me when I came in: that special look she has, neither accusing nor questioning, simply to acknowledge that I am there: <b>a look that makes me conscious of my own presence, a look that can be both reassuring and disconcerting.</b>

The focalisation in IS therefore foregrounds the self-aware quality of the focalisation through Kristien and as such impacts on the macrofocalisation.

After the introduction, the impostulated narrative in these chapters again displays some differences in focalisation. In (3) and (4) below, the differences are related to the markers of discourse deixis, person deixis and announced subjectivity:

	SK	JLK	IS
(3)	Ek kan nie presies sê hoeveel daar van hulle was nie, <b>seker so 'n vier of vyf</b> ...	I can't say exactly how many of them there were, <b>probably about four or five</b> ...	I'm not sure how many there were of them, <b>four or five as far as I could make out</b> ...
(4)	Of haar redding, <b>hang nou af van wie praat.</b>	Or her salvation, <b>depending on who's talking.</b>	... some might say her salvation, <b>but that depends on one's point of view.</b>

In (3) the announced subjectivity is evident in all three texts, but the added person deixis in IS results in an instance of *différance*. On the one hand "as far as I could make out" could be regarded as providing the same focalisation as "seker so" in SK and "probably about" in JLK if referring to the fact that Ouma Kristina could not "make out" from the accounts passed on to her along the line of mothers and daughters. On the other hand, and this is perhaps the first meaning activated by "as far as I could make out", this impostulates the presence of the first-person speaker at the scene, which is, of course, impossible. The implication for the focalisation is that Ouma Kristina's voice is marked more clearly and that the announced subjectivity also marks an "omniscient" quality.

In (4), the difference between “hang nou af wie praat” and “depending on who’s talking” on the one hand and “but that depends on one’s point of view” is not so much situated in the semantics, but rather in the metaphoric quality. The difference between talking and viewing (point of view) becomes important particularly due to the frame of viewing activated in IS that emphasises the impostulated focalisation.

In (5) and (6) below it becomes clear that sight is an important aspect of the focalisation in this (her)story, although the emphasis on sight is situated in SK and JLK in this case:

	SK	JLK	IS
(5)	... n swart poel water so diep <b>dat jy die bodem nie kon sien nie</b> ; ...	... on the brink of a black pool of water that was so deep <b>that you couldn’t see the bottom ...</b>	... near a magic pool of black water so deep <b>it was said to have</b> no bottom ...
(6)	Toe Hermina laat een middag veld toe is om Lottie te gaan roep, <b>het sy dit met haar eie twee oë gesien</b> : die kind had geen skaduwee nie.	And it wasn’t as if she made this up. When Hermina went to the veld late one afternoon to fetch Lottie home, <b>she saw it with her own two eyes</b> : the child had no shadow.	It wasn’t just something she’d made up. <b>Hermina herself discovered</b> , one late afternoon when she went out to call Lottie in from the veld, that the child had no shadow ...

In (5) an imaginary observer is impostulated in SK and JLK, whereas the focus in IS is on the unreliability of the narration evident in the announced subjectivity. The fact that Hermina is described as having seen with her own eyes that Lottie had no shadow in SK and JLK, likewise emphasises the visual aspect of the impostulated focalisation through Hermina (who could, of course, not pass this on to one of the members of the lineage), unlike the “discovered” in IS – although the visual is also implied there. The significance of this difference in focalisation is situated in the explicit mentioning of the fact that she **saw** in SK and JLK, tying in with the impostulated importance of perception in these chapters.

These chapters also present differences in focalisation located in the use of discourse deixis and announced subjectivity as well as subjectivity. However, whereas IS and JLK contained a higher frequency of these markers than SK in II:10, the tables seem to have turned here, with SK and JLK containing more of these markers. In (7) to (11) below, this becomes clear:

	SK	JLK	IS
(7)	Maar waar sy dan nou ook al haar uitheemse skoonheid vandaan gekry het. <b>wat saak maak, is dit:</b> dat die stam haar vereer het; maar dat dit mettertyd ook haar ondergang was.	But regardless of where she got her exotic beauty, <b>what's important is</b> that the tribe exalted her for it; but that it would eventually also be her downfall.	Whatever the reason for her outlandishly beautiful looks, if these were initially the cause of veneration among the members of her adopted tribe, they also brought about their downfall
(8)	<b>Wat gebeur het, was dit: ...</b>	<b>What happened was this:</b>	-
(9)	Daar was destyds al hoe meer van dié trekkers wat die wêreld in die binneland begin mak maak het. <b>wat 'n ander manier is om te sê dat hulle ... alles voor hulle uitgeroei het</b> soos hulle glo die beskawing kom versprei het.	At the time there were an increasing number of these trekkers who started taming life in the interior, <b>which is just another way of saying that they destroyed everything in their path ... as they apparently came to spread civilisation.</b>	More and more of these trekking groups were by then moving into the interior like packs of scavenging dogs spreading civilisation and the gospel ...
(10)	Op 'n dag kom daar 'n man aan ... Dit was natuurlik Bart Grobler, <b>wie anders.</b>	One day a man arrived looking for a bride ... It was Bart Grobler, of course, <b>who else?</b>	One day a man arrived in search of a bride ... It was, of course, Bart Grobler.
(11)	... (sy is glo minder as 'n jaar daarna dood, "aan 'n gebroke hart". <b>soos die oumense gesê het</b> ) ...	(apparently she died less than a year later, "of a broken heart", <b>as the old people used to say</b> ),	(one can't be sure, but rumour has it that she died within the year, of grief)

In all of these examples the markers of discourse deixis in SK and JLK are absent from IS. This, along with the announced subjectivity in (9) and the subjectivity in (7), (8), (10) and (11), results in a more self-reflexive and self-aware narrative origo in SK and JLK. Therefore, the focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien in these two texts is foregrounded more than in IS, as is the storification of the events from history. This changes the impostulation of the narrative origo in IS in spite of the fact that the announced subjectivity and discourse deixis is marked to some extent in (7), (10) and (11), if not to the same degree.

The fact that SK and JLK seem to be marked more clearly in terms of discourse deixis in these examples also emphasises Brink's aim with the rewriting of history in these texts. Brink (1996b:22) states that the importance in these stories "lies in the recognition of the need to storify".

Although JLK seems to be closer to the text taken as source (SK in these chapters) in most cases, (12) and (13) below present an example of a difference in focalisation between JLK on the one hand and IS and SK on the other:



	SK	JLK	IS
(12)	... maar ofskoon <b>sy vlot ter tale was</b> in Hollands ...	... but although she was <b>could help herself</b> in Dutch ...	... But although she was <b>fluent</b> in Dutch, ...
(13)	... en <b>met haar bietjie kennis van Hollands</b> (wat vir haar redders onomstootlik bewys het dat sy uit 'n beskaafde huis afkomstig was) ...	... and <b>with her smattering of Dutch</b> (which was final proof to her saviours that she came from a civilised home)	... and <b>with her rudimentary knowledge of Dutch</b> (proof, to her rescuers, that she had been nurtured by civilised people)

The fact that Lottie is described as being “vlot ter tale in Hollands” in SK and “fluent in Dutch” in IS in (12), whereas she is described as having only a “bietjie kennis van Hollands” in SK and “rudimentary knowledge of Dutch” in IS, could be interpreted as an inconsistency in these two texts. In JLK, she is described as being able to “help herself in Dutch” in (12) and as having only a “smattering of Dutch” in (13). If, on the other hand, the inconsistency in IS and SK is interpreted as impostulated focalisation through Lottie, instead of focalisation only through Ouma Kristina/Kristien, then the apparent discrepancy is rendered a marker of irony and as such a marker of focalisation not present in JLK. Either way, this difference signals a difference in focalisation between JLK and the parallel texts that impacts on the impostulation of the narrative origo.

As in (7) to (11) above, the markers of focalisation in (14) to (16) present a difference between SK and JLK on the one hand and IS on the other, in this case in terms of subjectivity:

	SK	JLK	IS
(14)	... net mooi niks oor nie .... niks ...	... nothing remained ... nothing.	There was nothing left ...
(15)	<b>Dit was genoeg om 'n mens te laat arig voel</b> ...	<b>It was enough to give you the creeps</b> ...	<b>It was eerie</b> ...
(16)	Maar sê nou niemand verstaan nie? wou Hermina weet. Selfs dan, het Lottie met 'n <b>raaiselagtige glimlaggie</b> geantwoord, sou dit nie eintlik saak maak nie.	But what if no-one understood? Hermina wanted to know. Even then, Lottie replied with a <b>mysterious smile</b> , it wouldn't really matter.	And what if no one understood? asked Hermina. Even then, said Lottie, <b>smiling</b> , it wouldn't ultimately matter.

The repetition of “nothing” in JLK and “niks” in SK foregrounds the focalisation due to the resulting marker of subjectivity. The same can be said in terms of (15) where the person deixis further enhances the subjectivity and in terms of (16) where the adjectives “raaiselagtige” in SK and “mysterious” in JLK adds to the subjectivity. In

---

all these examples the focalisation is therefore marked more clearly in SK and JLK than in IS.

If read in conjunction with (7) to (11), this would seem to indicate a predominance of markers of focalisation in SK and JLK in these chapters, in contrast to the predominance of markers of focalisation in IS and JLK in II:9-10. However, the (her)story of Petronella in II:9-10 also presents a stronger emphasis on the impostulated focalisation through Petronella, whereas there is very little impostulated focalisation through Lottie in this (her)story. It would therefore not be meaningful to compare the two (her)stories too closely.

#### **4.2.2.3.5 Conclusion**

At this level of the impostulation the focalisation becomes rather complicated due to the lack of a stable point through which the focalisation is impostulated. The two complicating factors, namely the merging of the focalisation through Ouma Kristina and Kristien (Ouma Kristina/Kristien) and the extensive use of impostulated focalisation (i.e. the hypothetical and postulated focalisation through characters in the (her)stories) result in a number of shifts in focalisation. Due to an increased number of shifts in focalisation, there are also a number of clear differences between the three texts, although JLK is more or less always closer to the source text for understandable reasons.

The focalisation at this level is primarily evident in markers of announced subjectivity combined with markers of discourse and person deixis, as well as in markers of self-reflexivity that indicate focalisation not only through a combination of Ouma Kristina and Kristien, but also through various characters in the (her)stories. At this level there is fairly little self-reflexivity due to the sustained retrospective narration of events neither Ouma Kristina nor Kristien are impostulated as having had direct access to.

The most significant aspect of the impostulated focalisation through characters at this level of impostulation, is that the fairly limited focalisation mostly through Kristien at the other levels of impostulation is replaced by an "omniscient" unlimited

focalisation through Ouma Kristina and subsequently through Kristien (Ouma Kristina/Kristien).

The main differences between the three texts in terms of focalisation are present in a combination of markers of discourse and person deixis as well as markers of announced subjectivity (that is obviously closely related to this deixis) and subjectivity.

Petronella's (her)story reveals a strong emphasis on the impostulated focalisation through Petronella, and it would appear that this focalisation is more clearly marked in IS and JLK than in SK where many of the markers are either absent, or present to a lesser degree. Consequently, the macrofocalisation of this (her)story in IS and JLK also contains more satire and irony evident in the focalisation through the narrative origo. However, Ouma Kristina/Kristien's voice is marked more clearly in SK by means of markers of social deixis.

Lottie's (her)story, on the other hand, presents relatively little impostulated focalisation through Lottie and the focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien seems to be marked more clearly. In this (her)story, however, the focalisation in SK and JLK is foregrounded more than in IS due to a higher frequency of markers of discourse deixis and announced subjectivity.

Although this does not justify any particular conclusions concerning the predominance of focalisation in any of the texts, the predominance of markers of focalisation on a macrotextual level in one of the two texts does indicate the importance of focalisation in the translation of narrative texts. Conceivably, the reason for the shifts that occur in terms of the narrative origo in these parallel texts, is exactly the fact that they were produced in a more or less symbiotic process where neither of the two texts could be regarded as the source in entirety. It would be interesting to see whether the more neutral focalisation in one of the two parallel texts has anything to do with the fact that it happened to be the less dominant (or even target) text. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this study, it should suffice to conclude that the differences in focalisation at the microtextual level impact on the macrotextual level.

---

## 4.3 Conclusion

### 4.3.1 Introduction

The impostulatory levels identified and analysed in this chapter (with a view to the evaluation of the theoretical framework of the study, and to provide the basis for the synthesis in the model that will be provided in the final chapter) seem to be structured primarily around the predominant narrative time. In the case of this novel this is the narrative present in which most of the frame is situated. The relation of the focalisation to this temporal level is the source for most of the markers of metatextual impostulation as it determines whether the focalisation through the narrative origo relates to the narrative or to the impostulated relationship between the narrative origo and the reader.

The markers related to characterisation from and into the narrative origo prove to be instrumental in establishing the narrative origo from, through and into which the narrative is activated both presentationally and interpretively. These markers depend on markers of deixis (primarily discourse and social deixis) and subjectivity (announced subjectivity, subjective impostulation and self-reflexivity) for the establishing of the narrative origo on the macrotextual level. The markers of deixis determine the temporal, spatial, personal, social and discourse orientation of the focalisation.

The differences in focalisation identified in this chapter between the texts as well as within each text, impact on the impostulation, and particularly on the interpretive dimension of impostulation as the reader (and translator) has to sift through and interact with the various shifts in order to imbue the text with meaning. Therefore, Brink's discussion of the effect of the open-endedness of history on the reader also has a bearing on the impostulation against the background of these shifts. According to Brink (1996b:23),

[b]ecause the text is not offered as definitive, final, absolute, but as the exploration of a possibility among others, it invites the reader to keep her/his critical faculties alive by pursuing the processes of imagination in order to arrive at whatever proves more relevant, more meaningful, or simply more useful in any given context. It intensifies the relationship between the individual and her/his spatial and temporal environment.

This statement applies not only to Kristien's impostulated relationship with Ouma Kristina's herstory, but also to the impostulation of this herstory as well as Kristien's account of the narrative present. The shifts in focalisation between and within these texts consequently result in shifts in this impostulation.

Although the two parallel texts (SK and IS) display a large degree of similarity on the microtextual level, with very little evidence that the one is not the direct translation of the other (although the source is more difficult to determine), there are a number of shifts in focalisation that render the macrofocalisation in each text (and therefore also the macrotext) distinct. Likewise, although JLK seems to be fairly close to that text used as source, a number of differences do occur in the focalisation that render it not only different from the parallel text, but also different from the text used as source for the translation. However, it is not the aim of this study to prove that translations differ from "originals", but rather that shifts in focalisation between source and target text, and indeed between parallel texts, result in differences in the impostulation of the narrative origo of a narrative text. Furthermore, as is evident from the similarities between JLK and its source in terms of focalisation, it would seem that an analysis of focalisation as impostulatory technique could place the translator of narrative fiction in a better position to account for subtle shifts within a narrative without merely "smoothing them over" or neutralising their effect.

Derrida's interpretation of Benjamin, namely that "the relation between original and translation is based not on resemblance, but on difference" (Bannet, 1993:585), is therefore illustrated in the shifts that occur between IS, SK and JLK. Each text is completed through the differences between it and the other texts.

By way of summary and also to determine whether any conclusion can be made concerning the macrotextual aspects of focalisation in this novel, the main differences between the texts as identified in the analyses in this chapter will now be summarised.

#### 4.3.2 Focalisation in *Imaginings of sand/Sandkastele*

Substantial differences in social deixis between IS and SK result in the impostulation of significant differences in the narrative origo. The more informal narrative origo in the Afrikaans text (SK) at all impostulatory levels is impostulated through the use of a higher frequency of language variation, English words and phrases, and coarse language.

Although this difference in focalisation marked by the difference in social deixis is evident in the entire novel, the level of **metatextual impostulated narrative** provides the strongest emphasis on this aspect as it is addressed outside of the propositional content of the novel. The social deixis primarily serves to impostulate a smaller distance between the reader and the narrative origo in the more direct narrative origo in SK. On a macrotextual level, JLK emphasises Kristien's awareness of the opacity of language that forms an important part of the impostulation of the narrative origo in the rest of the novel. By contrast, the narrative origo in IS is impostulated by means of an emphasis on the impact of the use of the narrator's second language, English. This affects the focalisation in the rest of the novel by impostulating a more formal narrative origo in IS from the outset. The fact that the role of language is omitted entirely from SK creates a gap in terms of the focalisation that impacts on the impostulation of the narrative origo in spite of the logical reason for the omission.

The self-reflexive focalisation at the level of **direct impostulated narrative** seems to be marked more clearly in IS (and the Afrikaans JLK), supported in that text by markers of announced subjectivity. The focalisation in SK is more neutral in this regard. Therefore the self-aware and self-ironical aspects of the focalisation are more evident in IS, further supported by a stronger emphasis on hypothetical focalisation (this emphasis in IS is also evident at the level of metatextual impostulated narrative). The initial impostulation and characterisation of the narrative origo impostulates a possibly more rebellious narrator in SK, hiding her vulnerability behind a coarse façade, whereas in IS a more self-conscious narrator is impostulated hiding behind the façade of a more formal language. As a result, it

would appear that a larger distance is impostulated between the reader and the narrative origo in IS.

At the level of **retrospective direct impostulated narrative**, more significant differences appear between SK and IS than merely the difference in register signalled by the markers of social deixis. SK has a stronger emphasis on Kristien's growing disgust with Afrikaner cultural stereotypes and the Afrikaner establishment, evident in the markers of social and discourse deixis in the focalisation, as well as in the use of figurative language. On the other hand, the focalisation of her political awakening at university is impostulated in more neutral terms in SK than in IS and JLK, with the result the focalisation through Kristien of the political motivation for her self-imposed exile is stronger in these two texts. A shift occurs in this regard between the first part of the impostulation at this level and the latter part in IS. Here the more formal register in IS is also supported by a predominantly more neutral and passive focalisation through Kristien on her political involvement as well as relationships with men.

At the level of **impostulated direct speech**, there are again significant differences in focalisation between IS and SK. Kristien's self-reflexivity and awareness of the atmosphere and the intimate relationship between her and Ouma Kristina is emphasised more clearly in the focalisation of the setting in SK, and the focalisation through Ouma Kristina is marked more clearly in IS. However, as in the case of the shift between the first and latter parts of the previous level of impostulation, a shift occurs here in terms of the markers of subjectivity. Whereas the focalisation through Kristien emphasises the subjectivity more clearly in IS in the first part (foregrounding Ouma Kristina's voice and the non-verbal interaction between her and Kristien), the markers of focalisation through Kristien of Ouma Kristina and her responses to Ouma Kristina's narrative is marked more clearly in SK in the latter part. As a result, each text impostulates a different narrative origo, although the parallels are evident. In terms of the aims of this study, however, each of these shifts is important on the microtextual as well as macrotextual level.

The focalisation at the level of **introduced impostulated narrative** becomes rather complicated due to the lack of a stable point through which the focalisation is

---

impostulated. The two complicating factors, namely the merging of the focalisation through Ouma Kristina and Kristien (Ouma Kristina/Kristien) and the extensive use of impostulated focalisation (i.e. the hypothetical and postulated focalisation through characters in the (her)stories) result in a number of shifts in focalisation. The most significant aspect of the impostulated focalisation through characters at this level of impostulation is that the fairly limited focalisation mostly through Kristien at the other levels of impostulation is replaced by an “omniscient” unlimited focalisation through Ouma Kristina and subsequently through Kristien (Ouma Kristina/Kristien).

Petronella’s (her)story reveals a strong emphasis on the impostulated focalisation through Petronella, and it would appear that this focalisation is more clearly marked in IS than in SK where many of the markers are either absent, or present to a lesser degree. Consequently, the macrofocalisation of this (her)story in IS also contains more satire and irony evident in the focalisation through the narrative origo. However, Ouma Kristina/Kristien’s voice is marked more clearly in SK by means of markers of social deixis. Lottie’s (her)story, on the other hand, presents relatively little impostulated focalisation through Lottie and the focalisation through Ouma Kristina/Kristien seems to be marked more clearly. In this (her)story, however, the focalisation in SK is foregrounded more than in IS due to a higher frequency of markers of discourse deixis and announced subjectivity.

Although the above findings do not justify any particular conclusions concerning the predominance of focalisation in any of the texts, the predominance of markers of focalisation on a macrotextual level in one of the two texts does indicate the importance of focalisation in the translation of narrative texts. Conceivably, the reason for the shifts that occur in terms of the narrative origo in these parallel texts is exactly the fact that they were produced in a more or less symbiotic process where neither of the two texts could be regarded as the source in entirety. It would be interesting to see whether the more neutral focalisation in one of the two parallel texts has anything to do with the fact that it happened to be the less dominant (or even a target) text. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this study, it should suffice to conclude that there are differences in focalisation at the microtextual level that impact on the macrotextual level and that impact on the interpretive dimension of impostulation (therefore on both reader and translator).



Derrida's (2001:175) thoughts on the play of the trace, which leaves "the other body intact but not without causing the other to appear", can therefore be applied to the interpretive dimension of impostulation in the shifts that occur between the three texts. In the shifts in focalisation discussed in this chapter, the play of the trace in each text leaves the other body intact in spite of the fact that it never fully causes it to appear in either parallel text or translation.

---

## 5. CONCLUSION AND AVENUES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

### 5.1 Introduction

From the analysis of *Imaginations of sand/Sandkastele* based on the evaluation of theoretical concepts related to translation theory and focalisation theory, it would seem that focalisation theory can indeed provide a number of tools to facilitate the analysis of parallel texts as well as texts and their translations. The markers of focalisation defined in Chapter 3 proved particularly useful in the analysis of the subtle shifts in focalisation not only within each text, but also between the parallel texts (and my own translation of selected passages). On the basis of these findings it would now seem appropriate to propose a model for the translation/rewriting of narrative texts based on the markers of focalisation discussed in this study.

However, before proceeding with the description of this proposed model, the main insights derived from the theories of translation and focalisation will now be presented in summary.

### 5.2 Translation theory and deconstruction

The main insight for translation theory derived from the investigation of deconstruction in this study is related to the idea that the unnameable is the impulse for translation. This notion indicates the importance of gaps and traces in translation. Traces generate the possibility and promise of as well as a yearning for meaning, and are created by the gaps that arise from the conflict between the translatable and untranslatable. However, translatability and untranslatability should not be regarded as binary oppositions but rather as conditions for each other's existence. The impact of the trace – of the spatial and temporal dimensions contained in *différance* – consequently has to be determined in the process rather than in the product of translation.

Therefore, this study emphasises the productive potential of translation that emerges from the play of the trace. Derrida's notion of *différance* is central here in that it implies that translation does not fix the same meaning but instead creates new

avenues for further difference. In other words, translation activates hidden traces, ensuring the survival of the original text at the same time as the translation issues forth from it.

The relationship between “original” and translation also moves away from the conventional hierarchical perspective. A relation does obtain between source text unit and target text unit, but they form a contract and as such the one can never have final priority over the other. Untranslatability is also closely related to the cont(r)act between the translation and the “original”, a contract through the contact between two texts that are always **becoming** in a symbiotic relationship of rewriting.

In this view of translation, translators and readers have to engage in the play of the trace. Furthermore, the study has found that focalisation as an impostulatory technique is precisely such a play of the trace produced by the gaps surrounding the impostulation of the narrative origo.

### **5.3 Impostulation, focalisation and the narrative origo**

In order to expand the definition of the conventional concept of focalisation for the purpose of this study, the term **impostulation** was introduced. Impostulation may be described as that aspect of narrative through which narrative attitudes, experiences, angles, memories, mental activities or cognition, perspectives, voices, emotions as well as characters and events are projected imaginatively in and onto the narrative origo in an elaborate dramatisation and series of impersonations. The only two active participants in narrative are the author and the reader who actualise and activate the narrative through imaginary projection from, through and into a narrative origo.

Impostulation has two dimensions that render focalisation a function of both reader and author as real-life impostulators. The first dimension is an **interpretive dimension** through which the reader/author imbues a text with significance by means of imaginary perception and experientiality (also narrativisation). The second dimension is the **presentational dimension** by means of which a range of

---

experiences are dramatised – not least of which are personal experiences – through postulation, impersonation, imposture, and so forth.

These dimensions of impostulation present a way to approximate the silences in narrative. Impostulation is therefore largely a matter of traces (or aspects that are impossible to represent) that remain elusive manifestations of narrative functions, processes and agents.

The **narrative origo** is impostulated as a stance actively imposed by the reader and author from outside the text and is combined with a postulated narrative stance in the text. It provides the deictic centre that is a vortex from which and through which and into which characters, events, mental activity, perspective and narrative voice are impostulated both interpretively and presentationally. Although it may, in certain cases, be very closely related to an identifiable narrator, it is never limited to this agent since it remains an impostulation.

Due to the fact that the narrative origo provides the context of space, time and point of view for impostulation, it provides the anchor for the focalisation in a narrative text. **Focalisation** is therefore a function of impostulation, in addition to narration. It primarily refers to the relationship between the narrative origo and the impostulation of events, characters, attitudes, cognition and so forth.

In focalisation a “play of traces” is activated that is neither a substance in the form of a visual perspective or stance nor in the form of a voice. It contains within it the trace of the “voice” of the narrator, the memories and perceptions of characters, readers, rewriters, narrators, and so forth, without naming anything specific and thus becoming fixed and hence being silenced – it constantly erases itself in the act of its own disclosure. This final aspect of focalisation is also the core of the problem presented by focalisation in the translation of a narrative text, since the impostulatory trace that is focalisation can never be pinned down.

Just as no translation can focus exclusively on the microtext, focalisation can never be reduced simply to microstructural markers. Nevertheless, the microtextual presentational elements evident in markers related to characterisation, subjectivity

and deixis provide the “raw” material the reader and translator have to engage with in varying degrees in order to sustain the narrative origo interpretively.

Although the theory of narrative impostulation does not rely on distinct narrative levels as conventional narratology does, impostulatory levels can be distinguished. These levels, however, are not fixed categories but constantly shift as the focalisation **through the narrative origo** shifts in a narrative text. The basis of the difference between the impostulatory levels is located in the temporal aspects in relation to the predominant narrative time.

#### **5.4 Towards a model for the translation of narrative fiction**

From the analyses and comparisons in Chapter 4, a number of aspects related to focalisation appear that suggest that it is indeed possible to devise a model for the translation of narrative texts based on the analysis of particular markers of focalisation as impostulatory technique. The first aspect that seems to suggest itself, is the fact that the gaps and traces surrounding focalisation as impostulatory technique are not linked exclusively to shifts in focalisation. In many cases something that would not constitute a translation shift in terms of conventional theories does present a shift in focalisation between the texts. This necessitates a careful analysis of the macrostructure of any narrative text against which the microstructure has to be measured constantly.

The traditional conception of focalisation provides for shifts in focalisation within one text primarily in terms of the apparent projection of point of view to a character other than the narrator. In the framework of impostulation, shifts in focalisation cover a much wider scope, as should be clear from Chapter 4. However, the apparent projection of focalisation is still an important aspect of the shifts in focalisation. In this paradigm, projection is regarded mainly as hypothetical focalisation and therefore still proceeds through the narrative origo. The significance of this for the translation of narrative texts is that these hypothetical focalisations often contain a high concentration of gaps and traces as well as silences that could easily be overlooked and that should therefore be analysed carefully.

The first step in this proposed model is to identify the predominant time level in the text in order to be able to situate the narrative origo. This should facilitate the identification of impostulatory levels, which will be particularly useful in terms of the macrotextual aspects that impact on the translation of narrative texts. In this respect the levels identified and applied in Chapters 3 and 4 could provide useful guidelines, although I hesitate to include them in this model for the simple reason that it may create the impression that these levels should be regarded as discontinuous or exclusive.

The markers of focalisation identified in Chapter 3 provide the basis for this proposed model. Although not all the markers proved to be equally important for the purposes of the translation/rewriting of the narrative texts discussed in this study, a number of aspects did appear useful in the interpretation of narrative texts with a view to translation/rewriting.

#### **5.4.1 Deictic markers**

Deixis presents the most obvious markers of focalisation, as it deals with various orientational parameters related to time, space, person, register and discourse in relation to the narrative origo. Temporal, spatial and person deixis present little trouble to the translator, although social and discourse deixis tend to complicate the interpretation and presentation of focalisation in translation/rewriting.

- **Social deixis**

Social deixis is extremely important in terms of focalisation in that it determines the level of formality (register) as well as the sense of familiarity in the narrative origo. However, it is not always possible to express markers of social deixis such as colloquial language, language variation and the formality of forms of address in a similar manner in the two languages involved in the translation contract. Therefore, it is important for the translator of narrative texts to take note of these markers as well as the gaps and traces surrounding them in order to be able to create gaps and traces in a different manner, even if the aim is not to create equivalence. This is one of the instances in which untranslatability becomes the impulse to translate.

In terms of social deixis, the particular languages involved in the translation contract play an important role. Different conventions of formality, forms of address and language variations, to name only a few, are aspects that the translator not only has to account for, but also has to exploit in the process of translation.

Social deixis, however, has two dimensions that impact on the translation of narrative texts (as well as on other texts). On the one hand, the fact that translators conventionally work into their mother tongue or language of predominant use, results in the activation of certain cultural and social facets in the presentational dimension of focalisation as impostulatory technique, which has the potential to enrich the translation. On the other hand, the markers of social deixis in the source text, such as language variation and informal register tend to be neutralised or made more formal in the translation. Since the interpretive dimension of focalisation as impostulatory technique is involved here, the translator has to pay particular attention to the markers of social deixis as they impact on the activation of the narrative origo.

- **Discourse deixis**

In terms of shifts in focalisation as impostulatory technique, **discourse deixis** creates a number of traces that are as difficult to account for in translation/rewriting as the traces created by social deixis. This is due to the fact that discourse deixis often activates a metatextual element in narrative that presents shifts in focalisation in relation to the predominant narrative time. The translator therefore has to take note of these markers in order to account for the shifts in focalisation that arise from the shift between the propositional content of the narrative and the organisation of the narrative.

#### **5.4.2 Markers of subjective impostulation**

Markers of subjective impostulation present the crux of the role of focalisation in the translation of narrative texts. In these markers (subjectivity, self-reflexivity and announced subjectivity) the full impact of gaps and traces is located. In the impostulation of the narrative origo by the translator as reader and author, the

---

markers of subjective impostulation provide the key to, among others, the cognitive, emotional, ideological and cultural dimensions of focalisation. Only through a careful analysis of these markers can the subtle nuances and shifts in focalisation be interpreted and presented by the translator. This is the case primarily because of the gaps, traces and silences contained in these markers that often do not permit "one-to-one correspondence".

- **Subjectivity**

Markers of subjectivity are important in the translation of narrative texts mainly because they impostulate the cognitive, emotional and ideological stance in the narrative origo. These markers can be identified in the use of **adjectives** and **adverbs** that indicate the (often value-laden) impostulated access to the thoughts of characters. In these markers the subjectivity mainly proceeds **from** the narrative origo. Particularly in cases where the focalisation is not marked by means of markers of deictic orientation, these markers of subjectivity mark or foreground the focalisation. Translators therefore have to be alert to subtle shifts in focalisation signalled by these markers, which impact on the narrative origo.

- **Self-reflexivity**

The markers of focalisation related to self-reflexivity are primarily linked to the impostulated narrative origo (foregrounding the narrator's impostulated self-awareness). These markers are often combined with markers of discourse deixis that indicate a degree of metatextuality. The most important aspect of this category of markers for the translation of narrative texts is the fact that it draws attention to the impostulated voice in the narrative, often combined with elements of satire and irony in the narrative. Consequently, these markers often consist of little more than gaps and traces that have to be interpreted and presented by the narrator on the basis of the macrotextual elements of focalisation. In these markers the focalisation is mainly marked as subjectivity **into** the narrative origo.

- **Announced subjectivity**

This category of markers is the least complicated of the markers of subjective impostulation, although it is still important in the identification and analysis of



shifts in focalisation. Since markers of announced subjectivity (often accompanied and signalled by phrases such as “she thought”, “they imagined”, etc.) foreground the unreliability of the narration, this category is particularly useful in narrative texts that do not impostulate an authoritative narrator (as is the case in much twentieth-century and contemporary fiction). Although this category of markers is closely related to the first category (subjectivity), the impostulated access to the thoughts of characters is always announced. Therefore the focalisation signalled by these markers mostly proceed **through** the narrative origo (concerning impostulated characters) and, as in the case of markers of self-reflexivity, draws attention to the impostulated narrative voice.

#### **5.4.3 Markers of characterisation**

As illustrated in Chapter 4, characterisation is closely related to the markers of deixis and subjective impostulation. Although characterisation is an aspect that is not conventionally related to focalisation, it also becomes important in terms of the role of focalisation in the translation/rewriting of narrative texts. This is due to the fact that characterisation in the context of impostulation concerns the relationship between the narrative origo and the narrative, but always in relation to the narrative origo as combination of author and reader (and translator) as well as the impostulated qualities of narrators and characters as these qualities impact on the constitution of the narrative origo.

### **5.5 Conclusion**

In the application of the above model, the translator has to remain aware of the fact that the two texts are both part of a contract, and that the interpretive dimension of impostulation is not discontinuous with the presentational dimension. Both these dimensions impact on the analysis of the “original” and on the process of translation.

It is therefore evident that focalisation as impostulatory technique plays an important role in the shifts that occur in the process of translation/rewriting as well as between parallel texts. The translator has to employ analytical strategies informed by markers such as those used and explained in this study. The interpretive and presentational

dimensions of impostulation that influence both the writing and reading of narrative texts therefore also provide the translator with tools to address, and optimise, the shifts that occur within any narrative text as well as between parallel texts and texts and their translations. Consequently, the microtextual analysis of markers of focalisation is, on the one hand, informed by the macrotextual analysis of the impostulatory structure of narrative texts, and also influences the macrotextual analysis. This symbiosis between the macrotext and the microtext mirrors the symbiosis between source and target text.

In the application of the proposed model presented above, the translator therefore has to determine predominant modes on the macrotextual level that are activated on the microtextual level. By utilising these guidelines, the play of the trace that is *différance* and that is translation, can thus be optimised as a creative potential in the interest of both “original” and translation.

## **5.6 Avenues for further research**

It would be meaningful as an avenue for further research to test the findings of this study, as well as the usefulness of the tools provided by the markers of focalisation to the translation/rewriting of narrative texts, by means of corpus-based approaches. This could firstly be done in terms of parallel corpora (on texts such as Brink’s parallel novels, or on other more conventionally translated texts) by tagging and comparing the markers of focalisation after a more specific description and definition of the markers has been done. Should the findings of such a study correlate with the findings of this study, a source text could then be analysed in a similar manner with a view to translation/rewriting; in other words as a form of pre-editing and analysis.

The application of the proposed model for the translation of narrative texts should not, however, be limited to literary texts. The model should also provide a useful tool for the translation of any narrative texts that rely on the gaps and traces surrounding focalisation and proprietary relations in a narrative.

## 6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Attridge, D., ed. 1992. Jacques Derrida: Acts of literature. New York: Routledge.
- Bal, M. 1985. Narratology: Introduction to the theory of narrative. **Trans.** Christine van Boheemen. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bal, M. 1992. Narratology and the rhetoric of trashing. *Comparative Literature*, 44(3):293-307, Summer.
- Bannet, E.T. 1993. The scene of translation: After Jakobson, Benjamin, De Man, and Derrida. *New Literary History*, 24:577-595, Summer.
- Basbanes, N.A. 1996. Brink translates well in any language. [Web:] <http://ftp.sitrib.com/96/DEC/08/art/19515071.html> [Date of access: 9 November 1998].
- Bassnett, S. 1980. Translation Studies. London: Methuen.
- Begam, R. 1992. Splitting the *différance*: Beckett, Derrida and the unnamable. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 38(4):873-892, Winter.
- Benjamin, W. 1992. The task of the translator. **Trans.** Harry Zohn. (In: Schulte, R. & Biguenet, J., eds. 1992. Theories of translation: An anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.)
- Berman, A. 1985. Translation and the trials of the foreign. (In: Venuti, L., ed. 2000. The translation studies reader. London: Routledge. p. 284-297.)
- Bloom, H., De Man, P., Derrida, J., Hartman, G. & Miller, J.H. 1979. Deconstruction and criticism. New York: The Seabury Press.
- Bradbury, M. & McFarlane, J., eds. 1991. Modernism: 1890-1930. London: Penguin.
- Bradford, R. 1997. Stylistics. London: Routledge.
- Brink, A.P. 1973. Kennis van die aand. Pretoria: Human & Rousseau.
- Brink, A.P. 1974. Looking on darkness. London: Faber & Faber.
- Brink, A.P. 1982a. A chain of voices. London: Minerva.
- Brink, A.P. 1982b. Houd-den-Bek. Emmerentia: Taurus.
- Brink, A.P. 1983. Mapmakers: Writing in a state of siege. London: Faber & Faber.
- Brink, A.P. 1996a. Sandkastele. Pretoria: Human & Rousseau.

- Brink, A.P. 1996b. Reinventing a continent (Revisiting history in the literature of the New South Africa: A personal testimony). *World Literature Today*, 70(1):17-23, Winter.
- Brink, A.P. 1997. *Imaginations of sand*. London: Minerva.
- Brink, A.P. 1998a. *The novel: Language and narrative from Cervantes to Calvino*. New York: New York University Press.
- Brink, A.P. 1998b. Stories of history: Reimagining the past in post-apartheid narrative. (In: Nuttall, S. & Coetzee, C., eds. 1998. *Negotiating the past: The making of memory in South Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.)
- Brink, A.P. 1998c. *Duiwelskloof*. Pretoria: Human & Rousseau.
- Brink, A.P. 1998d. *Devil's Valley: A novel*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Brink, A.P. ([brinkap@mweb.co.za](mailto:brinkap@mweb.co.za)) 2000. Re: Sandkastele. [E-mail to:] J.L. Kruger. ([engilk@puknet.puk.ac.za](mailto:engilk@puknet.puk.ac.za)) Aug. 18.
- Bühler, K. 1982. *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Stuttgart: Fischer.
- Chatman, S. 1986. Characters and narrators: Filter, center, slant, and interest-focus. *Poetics Today*, 7(2):189-204, Summer.
- Chatman, S. 1990. What can we learn from contextualist narratology? *Poetics Today*, 11(2):309-328, Summer.
- Cohn, D. 1990. Signposts of fictionality: A narratological perspective. *Poetics Today*, 11(4):774-804, Winter.
- Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics. 1997. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Conrad, J. 1989. *Heart of darkness*. London: Penguin.
- Conrad, J. 1994. *Lord Jim*. London: Penguin.
- Derrida, J. 1979. "Living On" and "Border Lines". **Trans.** James Hulbert. (In: Bloom, H., De Man, P., Derrida, J., Hartman, G. & Miller, J.H. 1979. *Deconstruction and criticism*. New York: The Seabury Press.)
- Derrida, J. 1981. *Positions*. **Trans.** Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. 1982. *Margins of philosophy*. **Trans.** Alan Bass. Brighton: The Harvester Press.
- Derrida, J. 1985a. *Des tours de Babel*. **Trans.** Joseph F. Graham. (In: Graham, J.F., ed. 1985. *Difference in translation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.)

- Derrida, J. 1985b. The ear of the other: Otobiography, transference, translation. **Trans.** Peggy Kamuf. New York: Schocken.
- Derrida, J. 1992. Ulysses gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce. **Trans.** Tina Kendall. (In: Attridge, D., ed. 1992. Jacques Derrida: Acts of literature. New York: Routledge.)
- Derrida, J. 2001. What is a "relevant" translation? *Critical Inquiry*, 27(2):174-200, Winter.
- Edmiston, W.F. 1989. Focalization and the first-person narrator: A revision of the theory. *Poetics Today*, 10(4):729-744, Winter.
- Elnadi, B. & Rifaat, A. 1993. André Brink. *UNESCO Courier*, 46(9):4-5, Sept.
- Faulkner, W. 1990. As I lay dying. New York: Vintage.
- Fludernik, M. 1996. Towards a "natural" narratology. London: Routledge.
- Genette, G. 1980. Narrative discourse. **Trans.** Jane E. Lewin. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Genette, G. 1983. Nouveau discours du récit. Paris: Le Seuil
- Gentzler, E. 1993. Contemporary translation theories. London: Routledge.
- Graham, J.F., ed. 1985. Difference in translation. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Grieshaber, N.J. & Venter, J.L., eds. 1985. Linguistic Society of Southern Africa conference papers 10 – 11 July 1985. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal.
- Gutt, E.-A. 1991. Translation and relevance: Cognition and context. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- HAT (Verklarende handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse taal). 1985. Johannesburg: Perskor.
- Herman, D. 1994a. Hypothetical focalization. *Narrative*, 2(3):230-253, Oct.
- Herman, D. 1994b. Textual you and double deixis in Edna O'Brien's A pagan place. *Style*, 28(3):378-411, Fall.
- Herman, V. 1999. Deictic projection and conceptual blending in epistolarity. *Poetics Today*, 20(3):523-541, Fall.
- Holmes, J.S. 1972. The name and nature of Translation Studies. (In: Venuti, L., ed. 2000. The translation studies reader. London: Routledge. p. 172-185.)
- Holmes, J.S. 1973-4. On matching and making maps: from a translator's notebook. *Delta*, 16(4):67-82.

- Holmes, J.S., Lambert, J. & Van den Broeck, R., eds. 1978. *Literature and translation*. Leuven: Acco.
- Hopkinson, A. 1996. Hidden from history: Imaginations of sand – André Brink. *New Statesman & Society*, 9(391):45-46, February 23.
- House, J. 1977. *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- House, J. & Blum-Kulka, S., eds. 1986. *Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Jahn, M. 1996. Windows of focalization: Deconstructing and reconstructing a narratological concept. *Style*, 30(2):241-268, Summer.
- Jahn, M. 1997. Frames, preferences and the reading of third-person narratives: Towards a cognitive narratology. *Poetics Today*, 18(4):441-468, Winter.
- Jakobson, R. 1959. On linguistic aspects of translation. (In: Venuti, L., ed. 2000. *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge. p. 113-118.)
- Jay, P. 1997. Translation, invention, resistance: Rewriting the conquest in Carlos Fuentes's "The two shores". *Modern Fiction Studies*, 43(2):405-431, Summer.
- Koskinen, K. 1994. (Mis)translating the untranslatable: The impact of deconstruction and post-structuralism on translation theory. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs/Translators' Journal*, 39(3):446-452.
- Lefevere, A. 1992. *Translating literature: Practice and theory in a comparative literature context*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Levenston, E.A. & Sonnenschein, G. 1986. The translation of point-of-view in fictional narrative. (In: House, J. and Blum-Kulka, S., eds. 1986. *Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.)
- Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewandowska-Tomasczyk, B. & Thelen, M., eds. 1992. *Translation and meaning. Part 2*. Maastricht: RHM.
- Lewis, P.E. 1985. The measure of translation effects. (In: Venuti, L., ed. 2000. *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge. p. 264-283.)

- Mauranen, A. 2000. Strange strings in translated language. A study on corpora. [Web:] <http://www.ccl.umist.ac.uk/events/conference/corpus2.htm> [Date of access: 18 November 2001]
- May, R. 1994. Where did the narrator go? Towards a grammar of translation. *Slavic and East European Journal*, 38(1):33-46.
- Nelles, W. 1990. Getting focalization into focus. *Poetics Today*, 11(2):365-382, Summer.
- Neubert, A. 1986. Translatorische Relativität. (In: Snell-Hornby, M., ed. 1986. *Übersetzungswissenschaft – Eine Neuorientierung: Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis*. Tübingen: Franke Verlag.)
- Newmark, P. 1977. Communicative and semantic translation. *Babel*, 23:163:77.
- Newmark, P. 1988. *Approaches to translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. 1964. *Towards a science of translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nuttall, S. & Coetzee, C., eds. 1998. *Negotiating the past: The making of memory in South Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Petzold, J. 2000. André Brink's magical history tour: Postmodern and postcolonial influences in *The first life of Adamastor*. *English in Africa*, 27(2):45-58, Oct.
- Plummer, R. 1996. New past for old. *Southern African Review of Books*, 41, Jan./Feb.
- Pym, A. 1999. Doubts about deconstruction as a general theory of translation. [Web:] <http://www.fut.es/~apym/on-line/decon.html> [Date of access: 28 March 2001].
- Pym, A. 2000. European translation studies, *une science qui dérange*, and why equivalence needn't be a dirty word. [Web:] <http://www.fut.es/~apym/deranger.html> [Date of access: 25 January 2001].
- Rimmon-Kenan, S. 1983. *Narrative fiction: Contemporary poetics*. London: Routledge.
- Rimmon-Kenan, S. 1996. *A Glance beyond doubt: Narration, representation, subjectivity*. Ohio: Ohio State University Press.
- Robinson, D. 1997. *What is translation? Centrifugal theories, critical interventions*. Kent: Kent State University Press.
- Sapire, J.E. 1995. Literêre vertaling en die invloed van teorie op die praktyk. *Tydskrif vir Letterkunde*, 33(2):66-73, Aug.
- Sarup, M. 1993. *An Introductory guide to post-structuralism and postmodernism*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Schulte, R. & Biguenet, J., eds. 1992. *Theories of translation: An anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Short, M. 1996. *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*. London: Longman.
- Snell-Hornby, M., ed. 1986. *Übersetzungswissenschaft – Eine Neuorientierung: Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis*. Tübingen: Franke Verlag.
- Snell-Hornby, M. 1988. *Translation studies: An integrated approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Snell-Hornby, M. 1990. Word against text: Lexical semantics and translation theory. 97-104. (In: Lewandowska-Tomasczyk, B. & Thelen, M., eds. 1992. *Translation and meaning, Part 2*. Maastricht: RHM.)
- Tolliver, J. 1990. Discourse analysis and the interpretation of literary narrative. *Style*, 24(2):266-284, Summer.
- Traugott, E.C. 1995. The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. [Web:] <http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/discourse.pdf> [Date of access: 18 November 2001].
- Tulloch, S., ed. 1993. *Reader's Digest Oxford complete wordfinder*. London: Reader's Digest.
- Van den Broeck, R. 1988. Translation theory after deconstruction. *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, 22:266-88.
- Van der Voort, C. 1991. Narratology and translation studies. (In: Van Leuven-Zwart, K.M. & Naaijken, T. 1991. *Translation studies: The state of the art*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. p. 65-73.)
- Van Leuven-Zwart, K.M. 1986. Vertellers in vertalingen: De verteller vertaald – De vertaler vertelt. *Forum der Letteren*, 27(3):188-204, Sept.
- Van Leuven-Zwart, K.M. & Naaijken, T. 1991. *Translation studies: The state of the art*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Venuti, L., ed. 1992. *Rethinking translation: Discourse, subjectivity, ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Venuti, L., ed. 2000. *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. 2001. Introduction. *Critical Inquiry*, 27(2):169-173, Winter.



- Vermeer, H.J. 1989. Skopos and commission in translational action. **Trans.** Andrew Chesterman. (In: Venuti, L., ed. 2000. The translation studies reader. London: Routledge. p. 221-232.)
- Wenzel, M.J. 2001. Integrations and mutations in recent South African writing with specific reference to André Brink's Imaginations of sand and Devil's Valley. Forthcoming.
- Woolf, V. 1992. Jacob's room. London: Penguin.
- Woolf, V. 1996. To the lighthouse. London: Penguin.
- Wybenga, D.M. 1985. Is "hier" dalk "daar"? (Deiktiese sentrums of verwysingspunte?). (In: Grieshaber, N.J. & Venter, J.L., eds. 1985. Linguistic Society of Southern Africa conference papers, 10 – 11 July 1985. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal.)
- Zach, N. 1991. Imagism and Vorticism. (In: Bradbury, M. & McFarlane, J., eds. 1991. Modernism: 1890-1930. London: Penguin. p. 228-242.)

## ADDENDA: TRANSLATIONS (JLK)

### Addendum 1: Direct impostulated narrative

#### Part I: Chapter 1 (IS:3-5); Chapter 5 (IS:16-21)

##### 1

*Jy's nou mooi groot*; om die een of ander rede maal die simpel frase in my kop al vandat die vliegtuig in Heathrow opgestyg het. Die groot tuiskoms. Na al die jare van wonder hoe dit sou wees; soveel ander het dit al gewaag, party begroet deur oproerige skares, toyi-toyiende, jillende, singende; ander het skelm die land binnegesluit langs agterstraatjies. Maar nie ek nie. Die dag toe ek die land verlaat het, het ek gesweer dit sou vir altyd wees. En ek het vasgebyt, standvastig voor alle natuurlike aansprake. Toe kom die oproep, en wat anders kon ek doen? Daar was nie 'n oomblik se aarseling nie. Eers nadat ek reeds tot 'n eng lot op die vliegtuig gevonniss is, ingedruk tussen twee lywige sakemanne – die een aan my linkerhand, teen die paadjie, in die tekstielbedryf; die ander 'n siviele ingenieur; beide fluks aan die suip, elk vasbeslote om die ander uit te oortê om 'n date met my te kry (die een teen die paadjie het selfs – drie-uur in die oggend terwyl die vensterman, skynbaar aan die slaap, probeer om sy hand onder my kombers in te wurm – kiam in my oor gefluister dat ons badkamer toe moet gaan) – het dit tot my deurgedring dat ek *actually* op pad is huis toe. Wat huis ookal op die oomblik mag wees. Maar dis soos dit moet wees. Ouma Kristina is anders; was dit nog altyd. En ek kan nie anders as om te gehoorsaam nie, nie net omdat ek haar naamgenoot is nie. (As ek my pa se wense gehoorsaam het en my opwagting in die wêreld as 'n seun gemaak het – hy was oortuig dat dit *second-time-lucky* sou wees – sou ek, ter nagedagtenis aan 'n lang linie voorvaders, Ludwig Maximilian Josef Heinrich Schwarzenau an der Glen geheet het. Toe ek sonder die kenmerkende aanhangsel van die regte geslag te voorskyn kom, het hy met afkeuring weggedraai en hom verbeel ek het nie gebeur nie. As my ma haar sin gekry het sou ek met 'n operanaam belas gewees het, Aida of Lucia of Elvira, wie weet, selfs Butterfly; saliglik het Ouma se praktiese sin geseëvier, soos in die geval van my ouer suster, en ek het gewoon Kristien geword.)

Die dood het die manier (die strekking van dr Johnson se woorde in die nou solder bokant Gough Square waarheen ek saam met Michael is, die poeletjie vaal lig op die vloer soos te-flou tee, die dag toe ons lovers geword het) om die gedagtes te fokus. Maar dis nie die dood as sulks wat my holderstebolder huiswaarts sleur nie. Ek het dit deur Pa se dood gemaak, en Ma s'n. Nie met 'n 'verharde hart' nie, bloot die onafwendbare aanvaar. Hoekom dan, nou, ingee aan Ouma? Is dit omdat wat gebeur het so skokkend is, die sinnelose geweld daarvan, op 'n tyd as alles veronderstel is om terug te keer na wat ookal in daardie godverlate plek as normaal beskou word? Of is dit die feit dat sy nie, toe Anna se oproep gekom het, dood was nie, maar sterwend, wat my met 'n keuse gelaat het – miskien selfs 'n noodlottige keuse?

Dis die soort ervaring wat herinneringe ontlok. Terwyl ek die verkennende hand van my regterbeen weer en terselfdertyd bewus word van 'n ander op my linkerbeen wat met Tarquinius se verowerende strede in die rigting van sy doelwit beweeg, ontsnap ek na herinneringe aan Ouma, na herinneringe aan herinneringe.

'Hoe kry Ouma dit reg om so baie te onthou?' het ek haar stortvloed stories een dag, jare gelede, onderbreek.

Sy het net geglimlag, haar mond 'n dieper plooi tussen soveel ander (sy was reeds onmeetbaar oud toe ek nog net 'n klein dogtertjie was), en gesê, 'Ek is eintlik maar 'n doodgewone mens, Kristien.' En nes ek het sy maar al te goed geweet dat dit 'n leun was. 'Maar daar's een ding wat my uitsonderlik maak. My geheue. Jy's reg. Ek het 'n ongelooflike geheue. Partykeer verras ek myself. Ek kan goed onthou wat nooit eers gebeur het nie.'

Die twee manshande skuif vasberade, onwillekeurig nader oor my onderskeie bene: die jagter aan my linkerhand getooi in 'n karbonkel van 'n ring, die ander met klossies swart

stoppels tussen dik litte (het ek vroeër, tydens ete, vasgestel: ek let altyd hande op). Twee klein varkies gaan na die mark. Ek leun terug, kop agteroor en gee myself oor aan Ouma. Hulle beskou dit waarskynlik as teken van my oorgawe aan hulle (ek is, after all, vroulike vlees, ek mag ingeneem word). Dan neem ek die twee naderende hande en plaas hulle in my skoot opmekaar.

Ek tel tot drie voor die boodskap die twee stelle vervlegte vingers bereik en hulle wat dan oorhaastig weggeruk word. Een van die twee fluister venynig in my oor. 'Bitch,' sover ek kan uitmaak. Na die voorval kan ek in vrede rus.

Ons skeur deur die nag, Afrika onsigbaar maar alomteenwoordig. Hoe maklik kan elf jaar nie van mens afgestroop word nie, 'n sloop onmerkbaar gestroop van 'n liggaam wat geen weerstand bied nie, wat my kaal laat, nader aan die dood. Die verlies van onskuld. Nou; hier. Nie eendag lank, lank gelede nie – kan dit al twintig jaar wees? Ek was nog nie dertien nie – toe ek binnetoe gehardloop het van my wegkruipplek in die reuse lukwartboom af, my rok opgelig het en vir Ouma my deurdrenkte broekie gewys het, die enigste grootmens met wie ek dit ooit sou durf waag om te deel: 'Ouma Kristina! Ek bloei binnekant, is ek besig om dood te gaan?' Kalm, doeltreffend het sy beheer geneem. Sy't my badkamer toe gestuur met duidelike opdragte, en toe vir Jeremia, die handlanger, beveel om haar al die pad dorp toe te vat na die apteker toe; teruggekom met die bruinpapierpakkie en my na haar slaapkamer geneem, die allerheiligste vir almal anders as ek, om my 'toe te rus' te midde van giggelbuie afgewissel met ernstige en ongelooflike vertrouilikhede. *Jy's nou mooi groot.*

Op haar spieëltafel die klein olieverskilderytjie in sy raam, niks groter as 'n koevert nie, van die kaal man wat onbeskaamd na die toeskouer kyk ('Ma, om Vadersnaam, sit tog die ding weg, die kinders word nou groot'). Ons het dit nooit gewaag om haar daarvoor uit te vra nie. Nie eers ek nie. Ons het dit wel, wanneer ons ook al somervakansies by haar deurgebring het, gewaag om skelm in daardie haas-verbode halfdonker kamer in te hol, giggelend te staar, en ons dan weer uit die voete te maak. Daardie middag, in haar oorvol, halfdonker kamer diep binne die onsamehangende kasarm, soos 'n lugspieëling op die wit, warm vlaktes, het die uitlokkende prent wat van haar spieëltafel af die misterie van my bloeding dopgehou het, op die een of ander manier deel geword van my gevoel vir haar; en as dit 'n raaisel gebly het was dit nie omdat die kaal man nie 'n naam of geskiedenis gehad het nie, maar omdat sy verkies het om dit geheim te hou.

Sy het sy liggaam, nie sy identiteit nie, in haar verduideliking van wat binne my aan die gebeur was ingeweef – nie as 'n grafiese seksles nie, maar as 'n storie. Haar stories het altyd alles opgelos, sonder om die magic van die wêreld te versteur. Wat miskien verklaar hoekom ek nooit genoeg daarvan kon kry nie.

- Ouma Kristina, vertel my van die vrou met die hare so lank soos 'n rivier – die meisie wat haarself in die kelder om die lewe gebring het – die vrou wat die paleis gebou het – die een wat so sterk soos 'n buffel was – die een wie se tong uitgesny is – die een wat uit die water uitgekom het – die een wat in die sand geskryf het –

As dit nie Ouma se leiding onnodiglik sal uitrek nie, hou tog asseblief uit tot ek daar is. Ek's op pad terug, na al hierdie lange jare. Ek het nie vergeet nie, Ouma sal sien. Ek sal luister na elke enkele storie wat Ouma vir my wil vertel: moenie dat hulle saam met Ouma graf toe gaan nie. Ek kom huis toe, terug na wat ookal oorgebly het van daardie onwaarskynlike kasteel in die woestyn. Ek kom, Ouma sal sien. Ek's nou mooi groot.

## 5

Anna wag my in by die pretensieuse lughawetjie buite George. My twee suur reisgenote het my inderhaas verlaat toe ons in Johannesburg aangekom het. Een het in die gedrang verdwyn, maar ek het die ander een, die tekstielman met die ring, toevallig weer raakgeloop toe ons by doane uitstap, hy reguit in die kollektiewe omhelsing van 'n vrou en twee tienerdogters in. Ek kon net nie die versoeking weerstaan om my teen hom aan te vlei en sy arm te neem nie. 'Nogmaals dankie,' het ek smeulend gesê. 'Vir alles.' Toe streef ek sy hand en sê, 'Moet nou nie 'n vreemdeling wees nie, jy het my nommer,' voordat ek met my verslete koffer wegliep terwyl hulle my verslae agternakyk. In 'n verwaarloosde hokkie het ek my staangemaak onder 'n storkop wat willekeurig en met tussenposes drie dun

straaltjies water, twee koud en een vuurwarm, ver van mekaar in die algemene rigting van my gesepte liggaam gespuit het. Toe droog ek myself af met die handoek wat 'n ongeërgde oppasser aan my oorhandig het terwyl sy onverpoosd luidrugtig gesprek voer met 'n onsigbare persoon, klaarbyklik aan die oorkant van die lughawegebou. Toe koop ek 'n koppie koffie en 'n verlepte toebroodjie – wat mens ook nie alles onthou nie – en blaai deur 'n sleazy Sondagkoerant. Op bladsy drie kry ek die berig. Honderdjarige op afgeleë plaas aangeval. Sewende bejaarde slagoffer in drie weke. Grootskaalse mensejag deur die polisie van stapel gestuur. Boerekommando fynkam omgewing. Minister maan die publiek om nie die reg in eie hande te neem nie. Veiligheidsmaatreëls in landelike gebiede opgeskerp. Mev. Kristina Basson, wat twee maande gelede honderd en drie geword het, na berig word in kritieke toestand. En toe, dankvader, word my aansluitingsvlug aangekondig. Vir nog drie uur het ek gesit en visvang en insluimer, vir al wat ek weet met 'n oop mond, maar sonder die sturnis van voornemende minnaars. En hier is ek uiteindelik; en hier is sy.

Aanvanklik herken ek haar nie eers nie en loop skoon verby haar. Ek stop eers en draai om toe ek haar stem agter my hoor. Kan elf jaar so 'n groot verskil maak? Hierdie moeë, vormlose vrou omring van 'n swetterjoel kinders – is dit die suster wat eens aan my voorgehou is as die toonbeeld van alles wat ek moes maar nooit sou kon wees nie? Sy oorweldig my in haar arms, gee my 'n nat soen, en oorhandig my dan aan haar gebroedsel om deur hulle beklim, bekrap en bespoeg te word ('Tannie, Tannie, het jy vir my iets saamgebring?')

Ek veg hulle af. Na wat in Londen gebeur het, intimideer kinders my. Ek weet ek sal daaraan moet werk, maar ek sien net nie nou daarvoor kans nie.

As ek uiteindelik uit die losgemaak te voorskyn kom vra ek uitasem, 'Anna, is sy okay?'

Haar gesig vertrek, maar sy knik oormatig. 'Sy lewe. Dis omtrent al.'

'Kan jy my dadelik na haar toe vat?'

'Wil jy nie eers bietjie rus nie?'

'Nee, die res kan wag.'

Ek gryp my verslete koffer van die vervoerband af.

'Is dit al wat jy gebring het?' vra Anna, maar dis moeilik om te sê of dit bewonderend of neerhalend gesê is.

'Ek het nie veel nodig nie,' sê ek so neutraal as moontlik. 'Dis net vir 'n paar dae.'

Sy loer vinnig na my hand. 'Nog nie 'n ring nie?'

'Nee.'

'Maar daar was eens op 'n tyd een?'

Ek haal my skouers op. Voordat die inkwisisie voortgesit kan word daal die kinders op my neer en stoei met alle geweld om die koffer by my af te neem. Anna wend geen poging aan om eers 'n skyn van dissipline op hulle af te dwing nie – dis duidelik dat sy al lankal oorgegee het. Sy lyk verwaarloos en verstrooid; haar grimering is halfhartig aangesit, haar klere is vaal en hang vormloos aan 'n liggaam wat smag na aandag. Hoe anders is sy nie nou as die ouer suster wat ek uit haar fleur onthou nie – lank en regop en beeldskoon, met vol borste en 'n voorkeur vir rokke en bloesies met halse so laag dat mens omtrent tot by haar koekie kon sien. Die herinnering bring 'n nuwe gloed van simpatie vir my suster. Maar dit laat tog ook 'n gevoel van woede in my opwel, woede oor al daai jeugdige energie en uitbundigheid weg is. Kyk net hoe lyk jy, wil ek amper sê – maar ek kan haar nie so seermaak nie.

Te midde van luidrigtige protestasies word die kinders agter op Anna se bakkie ingeboender wat buite in die parkeerterrein staan. Net die jongste, 'n onaangename klein seuntjie, word voor in die kajuit saam met ons toegelaat.

'Nie baie gemaklik nie,' sê ek weer sonder om te dink. 'Jy moet vir jou 'n kar kry.'

'Ek het altyd een gehad,' sê Anna met – as ek my nie misgis nie – 'n tikkie verwyf. 'Maar Kasper het gemeen hierdie sal meer prakties wees.'

'Vir jou of vir hom?'

Sy bloos effens, krap die ratte en verduidelik dan nadruklik, 'Ek moet 'n klomp aflewerings maak, jy weet, en dis makliker met die kinders.'

'Waar's Kasper?'

'Hy's uit op kommando. Ek dog ek het jou gesê. Die boere is op die oorlogspad met hierdie besigheid, jy kan jou indink.'

'Moet dit nie eerder aan die polisie oorgelaat word nie?'

'Hulle vertrou nie meer die polisie nie. Met die verkiesing volgende week... Ek sê jou, die land is in 'n gemors.' Sy draai haar kop om na my te kyk. 'Ek kan nie glo jy's regting hier nie. Jy lyk so – smart.'

'Jy lyk ook goed,' sê ek vinnig.

'Asseblief!' 'n Tikkie ongeduld in haar stem. 'Ek weet wat jy regtig dink. Ek lyk seker soos 'n plaasjapie. Maar as jy die tipe lewe ly wat ons hier het, is daar nie tyd vir mooimaak nie.'

'En jy dink ek –' Ek sal die onderwerp moet verander; hoekom kon ons nog nooit meer as tien minute in mekaar se geselskap deurbring sonder om mekaar die hare in te vlieg nie? Ek bedwing myself en sê dan so kalm as moontlik, 'Ek wil weet van Ouma. Hoekom was sy stoksielalleen?'

'Het jy vergeet hoe sy is? Ons het keer op keer probeer om haar in die ouetehuis te sit. Maar sy's nog net so hardkoppig soos altyd. Erger, eintlik. En in elk geval, wie sou nou kon dink –' Sy's op die punt om weer in trane uit te bars. 'Ek bedoel, ander mense gaan dood as hulle sewentig of tagtig is, selfs negentig. Kon hulle haar nie maar gelos het om in vrede dood te gaan nie? Vir iets soos dié om te gebeur as jy al oor die honderd is –'

'Sy's ongelooflik sterk.'

'Sy gaan nie hierdie ding oorleef nie. Niemand anders sou eers lewendig daar uitgekóm het nie. Ek het jou mos gesê, ek dink sy hou net uit om jou te sien.' En dan voeg sy met nog 'n tikkie verwyt by, 'Jy was nog altyd haar witbroodjie. Kasper sê sy -'

'Ek neem aan Kasper kan nie wag om sy hande op Ouma se plaas te kry nie.'

Haar gesig bloos 'n diep rooi. Maar in plaas daarvan dat sy aggressief terugkap, soos wat ek nogal gehoop het sy sou, val sy terug op haar kermstemmetjie. 'Dit is darem die familieplaas' sê sy. 'En ek is die oudste. Kasper is my man, so dis niks minder as reg nie –'

'Ouma is nog nie dood nie,' val ek haar vererg in die rede. Dan laat vaar ek dit eerder – daar is tog geen sin in nie. Ek hou van 'n goeie fight, maar om Anna aan te val is soos om 'n kussing te slaan. 'In elk geval, Ek is nie hier om enigiemand enigiets te ontnem nie. My lewe is elders.'

'Toe ons gister gepraat het –' sê sy impulsief, met 'n effense opflikkering in haar stem. 'Ek wens jy was nie so ver nie. Ons was so naby toe ons klein was.'

'Nie regtig nie,' sê ek, nie om haar seer te maak nie, net om haar te herinner. 'Jy het jou bende gehad, julle het alles saamgedoen. Ek was veels te jonk vir jou. Ek het jou aan bande gelê. Teen die tyd wat jy kêrels gehad het was ek waarskynlik 'n regte klein pes.' Ek bly vir 'n oomblik stil om die herinnering kans te gee om in te sink. 'Jy was nogal 'n dish toe, onthou jy? Jy kon pick 'n choose. Ek verstaan nog steeds nie hoekom –'. Ek bly skuldig stil. 'Sorry Anna, ek het dit al weer gedoen.'

Sy gee 'n ongemaklike laggie, haar kneukels wit op die stuurwiel. Sy bestuur soos 'n ou vrou, haar oë vasgenaël op die pad. Die dorp val agter ons weg as ons tussen die donker berge inry. 'n Skerp dennegeur vul die lug. Ek draai die venster oop; 'n seebries van daar doer onder af spoel oor ons. Die kind skree verontwaardig. Ek maak weer die venster toe.

Dis soveel jare sedert ek laas op hierdie pas gery het, maar dit kom alles so duidelik terug soos daardie herinnering van die see. Die sensasie, nie soseer dat mens langs die kontoere van die berge ry nie, maar dat mens reguit in hulle inry, omhul deur hulle klam teenwoordigheid, die rykheid van die kleure, die vele skakerings van groen, die swart en bruin en byna-rooi, die suggestie van 'n geheime voël- en dierelewe, kolle ongeskonde woud in diep voue, vlugtige blikke op smal wit watervalle. Selfs die kind tussen ons is momenteel stil.

Ek antisipeer reeds die volgende fase. Hieraan sal ek nooit gewoond raak nie – die skielikheid waarmee die berge wegval as mens op die hoë plato daaragter uitgespoeg word. Ek snak byna hoorbaar na my asem as die hoë lig oor ons breek met 'n felheid waaraan my oë lankal nie meer gewoond is nie. Niks sags hier nie – alles is oombliklik brutaal. 'n Ruwe en tuimelende landskap, oker en gebrande omber (dis nog te vroeg vir die aalwyne). So asof die aarde gedein en gestorm het en toe skielik versteen het. En dan bedaar die

onstuimigheid, die landskap vou oop, die vlaktes rol om ons oop en onthul die steeds onleesbare hierogliewe van bossies en klip, erosieslote, polle droë gras, klompies blou-grys garingbome of turksvye, ry op ry blou heuwels in die verte. En ons word self deel van hierdie oergeskrif, net nog 'n storie wat deur die wind gefluister word.

Stukkies woestyn – nie so ongenaakbaar soos in die meeste seisoene wat ek onthou nie (die reëns moes onlangs geval het, en oorvloedig), maar emfaties in beide buitelyne en detail. Konfigurasies van klip. Patrone van grond en sand. Minimaal en kaal, die afgeetsde lyne stroop alles weg wat blote ornament en fantasie is, daag die verbeelding uit. 'n Ruimte waarin lugspieëlings beide vereiste en beginpunt word. Hierdie was nog altyd Ouma Kristina se landskap. As mens mooi kyk, en lank genoeg, sal hulle te voorskyn kom, ek weet dit – die vrou wie se tong uitgepluk is; die een wat op boombas en klippe en sand geskryf het omdat niemand vir haar pen of papier wou gee nie; die een wat verdwyn het, wie se voetspore bloot opgehou het; die een wat die skape opgepas het wat sy in klippe verander het om te keer dat hulle afdwaal; die volstruisvrou; die boomvrou; die kind wat 'n kind gebaar het; Ouma Kristina self. 'Kyk om jou, my kind. Hier sal jy uitvind wat behoue bly en wat deur die wind weggewaai word. Eendag lank lank gelede –'

'Het Ouma ooit vir jou die storie vertel van die vrou wat uit die woestyn gekom het?' vra ek vir Anna.

Sy kyk vinnig na my, frons en skud haar kop. 'Kannie sê dat sy het nie. Sy kan so vervelig wees.'

'Wel, die vrou het in die woestyn gebly. Niemand het enigiets van haar geweet nie. En sy het die woestyn net drie keer in haar hele lewe verlaat om stad toe te kom. Elke keer het sy dieselfde vraag gevra.'

'Wat?' Sy stop by 'n verkeerslig – ons het die dorp bereik. Outeniqua – die naam self ontsluit 'n stortvloed herinneringe. Bewussyn van die woestyn word momenteel opgeskort, maar die indrukke bly.

'Sy het vir die mense gevra, "Weet julle wat ek vir julle gaan sê?"'

'Nogal 'n simpel vraag, moet ek sê.'

'Die eerste keer wat sy gekom het het die mense 'Nee' geantwoord, hulle het nie 'n idee gehad nie. "Julle is dom," het die vrou gesê en teruggegaan woestyn toe. Toe, baie jare later, het sy teruggekeer en dieselfde vraag gevra. Gedagtig aan die eerste keer het die mense slinks 'Ja' geantwoord, hulle weet. "Maar dan het julle my nie nodig nie," het die vrou gesê en weggegaan woestyn toe. Vir jare daarna het die mense oor haar bly praat. En toe op 'n dag was die vrou terug. "Weet julle wat ek vir julle gaan sê?" het sy gevra, soos vantevore. Hierdie keer was die mense reg vir haar. Die helfte het 'Ja' geantwoord en die ander helfte 'Nee'. Die vrou het moeg geglimlag en gesê, "Dan kan die wat weet vir die wat nie weet nie sê." Toe het sy teruggegaan woestyn toe en niemand het haar ooit weer gesien nie.'

Anna draai met moeite in 'n systraatjie in. 'Is dit nou die storie?' Vra sy.

'Wat meer wil jy hê?'

'Regtig, Kristien.' Sy hou stil. 'Ons is hier.'

## Part VII: Chapter 7-8 (SK:441-446)

### 7

Sam Ndzuta stands next to me at Ouma's graveside. The small graveyard is filled with as many of the crowd as could squeeze into it. A seemingly motionless cloud of birds hangs over us, casting a shadow over the entire farm. Eight graves. Too much for the mind to take. It's like a skyscraper: when it passes a certain level, it ceases to impress the imagination.

But it's also a matter of experience. I may be stunned by the mere extent thereof, but to Sam it's nothing out of the ordinary. "How many times have I been to these funerals in the

townships," he whispers in my ear. "Three at a time, five, thirteen, twenty-six. After a while one stops counting."

But to those in today's crowd those other funerals passed by outside the ambits of history. After all, they were black. Cut down by the police, by the "security forces"; if not, then they were the victims of black-on-black violence. To them today's funeral is different. It's a twisting in on the self. I wonder whether Sam would understand it, or whether he would rather see it as an instance of white on white. Would he realise that he is involved in this himself? Or would he think that it doesn't really concern him, in the same way that we ignored our own terrible complicity in the past?

If Ouma Kristina can be trusted, Wilhelmina once said: "If it is the will of God we will stay here; if not, we will pack our things and trek." But what happens when there are no more horizons to trek beyond? What happens when the world catches up with you, when the force of a Black Hole does not allow one ray of light to escape in order to pass on the message of what has happened and what is still happening?

Michael phoned again, somewhere during the past few days. His voice was expressionless from the shock. "Jesus, my love, the last time I spoke to you I thought you were making some sick joke about the deaths in your family. Can you ever forgive me?"

"I really don't know, Michael," I answered. I wasn't trying to be cruel; I have no idea what I meant by it. I simply said the first thing that came into my head: that I don't know, that I could no longer predict anything about myself.

"I've just read the papers," he said. "I still can't believe it."

"I can't either. I keep thinking I'll hear the car outside and see Anna get out. I keep wishing **she'd** bring the children. Even the boys I couldn't stand. I keep thinking, hoping – But what's the use?"

"What's done cannot be undone?" he quoted.

"Please!" I replied sharply. "This really is no time for wise cracks."

"I wasn't meaning to sound clever. I just don't have any words of my own. A poor player. Sorry." An uncomfortable silence. I think we were equally desperate to connect, to touch each other, simply to know there is someone at the other end, a hand to touch, a shoulder to cry on. I recalled the first days of our love, that visit to Gough Square, Dr. Johnson's winged words, at a time when death was still literary; even then it touched us so deeply that we rushed back home and made love behind my red door. Now death is real. Our earlier reactions appear pathetic in retrospect, even obscene. I heard his voice in my ear: "I don't suppose you've had any time to think about coming back?"

"I'm not coming back."

It was a shock to hear myself saying it. It wasn't something I had considered or decided. But suddenly the words took shape; and the moment I said it I knew it was true. It was the one thing I was sure of, now that the words had been spoken between us.

"What do you mean?" It sounded as if someone had knocked the wind from him.

"I'll probably have to come over to sort out my things. But my life has been displaced. I have to be here now."

"But what about *us*?"

For a moment it was difficult to pronounce the words; but it had to be said, not for my sake alone, but for his. "It hasn't worked out, Michael. There's no one to blame for it. Or if there is it's me, not you. I have no idea yet of what I'm going to do, but whatever it is it will be over here, not there."

I knew perfectly well – nothing as simple or hackneyed as the need to accept a "challenge"; neither to "prove" anything. It was something that went much further and much deeper.

And where I'm standing among the graves, while all the coffins are being lowered simultaneously – to the barely-disguised satisfaction of the undertaker, to whom it must be not only a sign of approval from Above, but probably a guarantee for future success – I know once again that it was the right decision. In fact, I have no other choice. But there's a difference between making a decision because you have no other option and making a decision because you *want* to, one you would have made even from among a hundred other

options. I chose this place: not because I was born here and regard it as my fate to stay here; but because I left, and came back, and because I am here now out of my own free will. Perhaps for the first time in my life this is a decision that hasn't been forced on me from outside, but something which took shape inside of me, like a child in the womb. And this one I will not deny. It is mine.

The birds are beginning to break free from the cloud they formed. In an overwhelming wave of sound they disappear into all directions, return, swoop down low over our heads, make astounding dives down to the edge of the graves, and then climb up steeply. A breathtaking performance. Most people are staring at the graves so intently, throwing their handfuls of wilted rose petals, their handfuls of dust into them, that they do not appear to notice it.

The only thing missing, I think to myself, is old Moishe – or rather old Moishe as a boy – to act as mourner, crying so much that he falls into a grave; and earning a pound by doing so. So that his grandchild and the latter's runaway girl will be able to go to Baghdad one day to listen to the camels singing Latin psalms in the palm trees at sunset.

The crowd begins to shuffle away. They trample the flower beds. Children begin chasing after peacocks and don't even notice that they are stepping in chicken and goose dung. I stay behind a little longer. The undertaker gestures and his workers step up to start filling the graves. I watch the red dust swirling up in thick clouds, caught in the sun shining through them almost horizontally from behind them.

Yes. In spite of everything. This is where I belong.

I've long since lost the passionate conviction I held in my youth that I could change the world; but I also know that it *can* be changed, and that I want to be a part of that change. It is no personal decision or private commitment. For much too long the women of my tribe, of all tribes, have been hurt one by one, have tried to hang on, in the little bit of space the powerful male rulers of the world allowed them. I am not prepared to run away in search of my shadow. I don't want to be changed into a tree, drown in shit, or embroider my name on a piece of cloth. Above all I don't want to wipe out my whole family with me. I understand the rage: for the love of God, how *well* I understand. But it cannot continue like this forever. What I want to tackle is something much more mundane. I want to work with others towards making possible a world – slowly, gradually, but relentlessly, this I swear – in which it will no longer simply be inevitable to be a victim. I know that the present – this small square filled with graves – is less real than the possible.

There are beacons, points of no return, that signal not the end of hope, but its beginning.

Kasper's brother, the one who came to sit next to us in church, come back to offer me his arm. He probably thinks that I am too overwhelmed by grief to follow on my own. But I don't want to offend him, and to explain would take way too long. I take his arm.

## 8

The moon is in its last quarter and there is very little light. But Ouma Kristina radiates a faint glow, not enough to see by, but sufficient to show where she is sitting: on the headstone where the date of her death is still missing, as it will remain in future. A single death wasn't enough after all; Oscar Wilde was right. I made myself comfortable on the peacock's spot on the wall. A few ostriches lined up against the nearest fence, awkward dark phantoms in the night. At the gate a pair of cranes click confidentially. The palace a pitch black shadow through the trees. There are a few owls around, and every now and again one hears the sleepy chirping of half-awake birds in their sleep. They are back in their old trees. The day's crowd has left. They left devastation in their wake. Tomorrow we will have to launch a major cleaning operation. Think about the future.

The dead are silent. Their fate is in my hands now.

That must be what old Thando Kumalo meant when he said: "Salani kahle."

"It went well," Ouma said. "Under the circumstances."

"You should have been here, Ouma."



"No, I didn't want to spoil Anna's day. After all, I don't like funerals. People don't enjoy themselves as they used to in the old days."

"I missed you, Ouma."

"But I'm here now. I will always be here. Unless you decide to leave again."

"No, I don't think so. I decided that if Ouma could come back all the way from Baghdad, then I can also come back home."

"Why? Because it's easier now?"

"No!" I reply heatedly. "Because it's harder. Because there's work to be done. For the sake of others, but just as much for my sake." I stare fixedly at her; right through her. "Are Ouma up to helping me?"

"We will all be here, my child. She stares out over the graves, and far past them. "Can you imagine what we are going to get up to now-!"

"Until an elephant comes along one day and blows the story away?" I ask mischievously.

I can't see her face, but she does appear to be smiling. "No," she says. "Not his time. I'm not going to make it easy on you."

"And why not, Ouma?"

"You're a big girl now, Kristien."

## Addendum 2: Metatextual impostulated narrative

### Part 1: Chapter 4 (IS:16)

#### 4

As jy nog 'n paar honderd bladsye saam met my gaan deurbring, moes ek seker harder probeer het om van die begin af 'n beter indruk te maak. Miskien het jy al klaar 'n gly in my gevang. *Mea culpa*. In baie opsigte is ek nou nie juis 'n aangename mens nie. Ek kan gemeen wees, bevooroordeeld, moedswillig, wraakgierig, onbetroubaar, noem maar op. My pa het verseker aan my gedink as 'n heks. (Miskien is dit wat die man op die vliegtuig gesê het, 'Witch'?) Dis te sê as hy ooit die moeite gedoen het om oor my na te dink. Mens leer om met baie dinge te cope; ander kom spook weer later by jou, of neem wraak wanneer jy dit die minste verwag. Dis selfs nog moeiliker om daarmee te cope as mens, soos ek nou doen, probeer om dit te verwerk deur die gebrokenheid van taal. Tog gee taal mens 'n soort afstand wat handig is as jy jou inlaat vir sulke soul-searchings soos wat ek hier doen. Mense het nog altyd gesê ek het 'n slag met woorde, maar mens kan nooit heeltemal in woorde uitdruk wat jy eintlik bedoel nie. En dan is ek ook nog geneig om meegvoer te raak deur woorde en selfs hoogdrawend te raak. So wees gewaarsku. Jy sal my maar moet vat soos ek is. En dan's ek boonop links ook.

### Addendum 3: Retrospective direct impostulated narrative

#### Part 3: Chapter 2 (IS:136-143)

##### 2

Vir my was daar geen Damaskuservaring nie, geen "great leap for mankind" (of "womankind" dan) nie, net 'n klompie kleinerige verskuiwingkies, elk betreklik nikseggend opsigself, maar elkeen net genoeg om die volgende een moontlik te maak. Hierdie opstandigheid het soms vreemde and selfs verwronge vorms aangeneem. Al het ek baklei teen die idee om die gehoorsame dogter te wees het ek dit so behendig gedoen dat ek nooit gevang sou word nie – alhoewel die gevaar altyd daar was. Ek het klein goedjies by klasmaats gesteel, dinge wat vir hulle van groot waarde was, en dit dan weer weggegooi omdat ek dit in elk geval tog nie wou gehad het nie. Soos die keer toe ek 'n klein keramiekbeeldjie van 'n hoenderhaan gesteel het, nogal oulik geverf, en toe nie 'n clue gehad het wat om daarmee te doen nie. Op die ent het ek 'n hele middag daaraan spandeer om 'n klein laaikassie uit vuurhoutjiekassies te maak en dit met bont geskenkpapier oor te trek. Toe het ek die haantjie daarop geplak en dit by die kerkbasaar verkoop, wat op 'n manier die skuld gekanselleer het. Sulke goed.

Toe ek alreeds in Londen was, was daar die keer wat ek verby 'n groot kennisgewing op iemand se garagedeur geloop het met die woorde:

DON'T EVEN THINK OF PARKING HERE.

En skielik kon ek aan niks anders dink as om daar te parkeer nie, al het ek nie eers 'n kar gehad nie. Om die waarheid te sê, ek het vir dae, miskien selfs weke, pal probeer uitfigure hoe ek 'n kar in die hande kon kry net om dit daar te gaan parkeer. Sien wat ek bedoel?

In die speletjies wat ons as kinders gespeel het wou ek altyd die indiaan wees, nie die cowboy nie; of die ridder, nie die hulpelose prinses wat wag om gered te word nie; die een wat met die drake baklei het en partykeer gewen en partykeer verloor het, nie die een wat gered moes word nie. Selfs op hoërskool het ek begin twyfel aan my vroulike lot: nie net die idee van trou nie, maar dat 'n man en kinders die alfa en omega van my lewe behoort te wees. Ek skat Ma het baie daarmee te doen gehad. Oor wat sy aan ons gedoen het; maar ook oor wat sy Pa toegelaat het om aan haar te doen. Die meeste van my vriende kon nie wag om losgelaat te word om te flirt en met hulle drange te eksperimenteer nie, om hulle vlerke uit te try nie, veilig in die wete dat hulle uiteindelik rustig sou settle, vir ewig en altyd, amen. Asof die fasinatie daarmee om die fokus van manlike drange te wees jou kon laat vergeet wat jy daaruit kon kry. Die blote gedagte het my gewalg.

Een keer het ons by 'n vriend van Pa gaan eet. Dit was 'n Sondag, na kerk, en ons was almal gestraightjacket in ons kisklere. Ons is vooraf gewaarsku dat dit 'n baie belangrike man was; ons moes onself gedra – "gesien word en nie gehoor word nie". En ons het. Maar die man se eie twee kinders was nog klein, omtrent so drie of vier, en was *hulle* nou klein stoutgatte! Halfpad deur die ete het die man na sy vrou gekyk en met sy kop beduie, en sy het hulle uitgevat om in die tuin te gaan speel sodat hulle nie haar man en die gaste kon pla nie. Sy moes toe maar op haar eie eet, na die tyd, terwyl die ander koffie in die sitkamer gedrink het. Ek onthou nog hoe ek agternagehol het om in die tuin met hulle te gaan speel, al was ek al omtrent agt of tien en seker van beter moes gewees het, maar dit het net soveel lekkerder daar buite gelyk. Behalwe dat dit terribel was om die vrou so op die swaai te sien sit en huil terwyl sy probeer het om dit weg te steek. Ek het na haar toe geloop en myself teen haar vasgedruk waar sy gesit het, en besluit om vir haar my "geheim" te vertel om haar beter te laat voel - naamlik dat ek nooit kinders sou hê as ek groot is nie - maar dit het haar net nog meer laat huil.

Op 'n manier het varsity my lewe beter gemaak, maar dit het dit ook slegter gemaak. Beter, omdat ek vir die eerste keer 'n bietjie vryheid gesmaak het. Maar ook slegter omdat ek gewees het dat die oomblik van waarheid nadergekom het. Vakansies was terribel, behalwe in die somer as ons hier na Sinai toe gekom het. Daar was altyd fights met Pa - oor ek nie hard genoeg gewerk het nie, of "useless" vakke gevat het, of verkeerde boeke gelees

het, of my rug op "my mense" gedraai het, of die verkeerde klere gedra het. Bliksem, daar was een fight wat vir dae aangehou het net omdat ek 'n bloes aangetrek het wat na Pa se mening see-through was en my nipples gewys het, en dit was omtrent die enigste ding wat ek daar gehad het. 'n Meisie wat haar nipples wys, het hy volgehou, maak haarself goedkoop deur openlik te verkondig dat sy beskikbaar is. Vir eens het Ma my kant gekies, al was haar argument 'n effe dubbelsinnig: ek het tog niks om te wys nie, het sy volgehou, so waaroor die bohaai? Ek het probeer afsydig wees, toe smalend en toe op hom geskree, toe 'n gek van myself gemaak deur in trane uit te bars, en op die ou ent het ek net siek gevoel (al het ek geweier om die bloes uit te trek). Wat eintlik in my gedagtes bly vassteek het was sy finale waarkuwing, "Wel, moenie by my kom huil as jy verkrag word nie." Waarop ek nie anders kon nie as om vir hom te skree, "En moenie by my kom huil as jy in die eiers geskop word nie." Dit het my die finale vernedering van 'n loesing besorg, al was ek veronderstel om toe al te oud gewees het daarvoor.

Teen die einde van my universiteitsloopbaan - ek is Stellenbosch toe, nie Pretoria soos Anna nie; al was dit net om so ver as moontlik van my ouers weg te kom, maar dit was nie sonder 'n tikkie ironie nie, aangesien Stellenbosch hulle eie alma mater was. Gevolglik het hulle my skuif entoesiasties ondersteun - het ons 'n familieuitstappie gemaak na verlangse familie in Namibië (wat toe nog Suidwes was); hy was altyd baie bewus van familiebande. Die enigste ligpunte op die hele terrible vakansie was die besoeke aan die Namib, die verskuivende duine buite Walvisbaai, wat elke keer anders gelyk het as mens daar kom - en tog was hulle ewig en onveranderlik. Ek dink ek sou daar kon gebly get. Ek het verlief geraak op die woestyn; dit was die eerste keer wat ek 'n beeld kon skep om by die naam Afrika te pas, en tot vandag toe is dit die duidelikste beeld in my kop. Die res van die vakansie was aaklig. Hoofsaaklik omdat die hele reis rondom 'n jagekspedisie beplan is, wat vooraf opwindend geklink het maar op die ou ent minder inspirerend uitgedraai het.

Ons het die grootste gedeelte van die tyd op hierdie uitgestrekte plaas deurgebring, noord van Okahandja, tot verby die horison. 'n Hele army familie en vriende het op die plek neergesak. Die meeste van ons het buite gekampeer want die lae, vaal, neerdrukkende plaashuis was gans te klein om ons almal te huisves. Dit opsigself was nie 'n probleem nie, behalwe dat die tente wat in 'n sanderige droë rivierloop onder die kameeldorings opgeslaan is, gou oortrek was met besonder geniepsige voëlluse; en dat Ma konstant gekla het oor die afwesigheid van geriewe. Dan was sy nog bang vir elke naggeluid ook. Een keer toe 'n donkie naby die tente bulk, was sy oortuig dat dit 'n leeu was en het sy Pa handeviervoet uitgestuur, klaarblyklik om die gedierte met sy kaal hande dood te maak.

Elke dag voor sonop het die mans met hulle gewere in hulle bakkies weggeroep terwyl die vroumense agtergebly het om te werk. En werk het hulle gewerk, van lank voor sonop tot die mans teen sononder teruggekome het, want slegs deur hulle voordurende geswoeg kon hulle bestaan regverdig. In die biltong wat hulle gesny het, in die marinades wat hulle voorberei het en in die myle wors wat hulle gestop het kon ek duidelik die meedoënlose gang van die sisteem sien.

Na 'n paar dae kon ek dit nie meer vat nie. Toe vlug ek - saam met die manne op die bakkie, waar die vorige dag se bloed tot 'n donker jellie gestol het op die metaalvloer, bedek met rooi stof. Ek het 'n lemoen saamgevat, en 'n blikkie bier, 'n stuk seningrige biltong, en 'n boek. Ek het die grootste deel van die dag daar naby spandeer en amper uitgepass van die verswelgende hitte terwyl ek probeer het om Jung se *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* te lees. Derdejaar Sielkunde. Totdat die manne in die deinsigerige namiddag teruggekome het, amper soos die Israëliete uit Kanaan, met die bebloede karkasse van die wild wat hulle die dag geskiet het oor hulle skouers.

Dit was die laaste keer wat ek saam is; maar ek het tog die vrouens gelos om hulle energieke take uit te voer, en ten spyte van Ma se ernstige waarskuwings oor leeus en luiperds en die meer naamlose gevare van Afrika, die veld vasberade ingestap met 'n verkyker, 'n knapsap vol voorrade and Roberts se *Voëls van Suid-Afrika* om te gaan voëls kyk (alhoewel enige verskoning sou deug); en natuurlik het ek verdwaal, en kort voor lank my toebroodjies en droëwors en louwarm koeldrank verorber en net begin dink dat ek van

die dors sou omkom toe ek gevind is, tot my vernedering, deur 'n soekgeselskap van mans onder leiding van Pa en ons gasheer, lank na sonder.

Dis moeilik om te sê of ek meer woedend was vir hom omdat hy my gekry het of omdat dit sy skuld was dat ek in die eerste plek op my eie afgedwaal het. Miskien het ek alreeds begin bewus word van die feit dat 'n tyd sou kom wat ek dit nie langer sou verduur nie. Daar was geen toekoms vir my in hierdie opgefokte land nie. Selfs toe was dit nie maklik om 'n besluit te neem wat sou beteken dat ek myself heeltemal moes ontwortel nie. Op universiteit het ek betrokke geraak by effens linkse politiek (daar was geen meer radikale opsies op kampus nie). Ten minste 'n gedeelte van my motivering moes gewees het dat ek geweet het hoe dit Pa sou afpis. Hy was so selfvoldaan oor sy toewyding aan die wonderlike saak van Afrikanerpolitiek (wat sover ek kon agterkom basies in praktyk neergekom het op sy eie vooruitgang) dat dit byna verpligtend geword het om aanhoudend nuwe maniere te kry om hom te krenk.

Maar dit was nie alles gemotiveer deur eie belang nie. Se ver as wat sulke besluite ooit vasgepen kan word in tyd en ruimte, onthou ek 'n partytjie, teen die einde van my tweede jaar, by die huis van vriende in die laney voorstad van Dalsig – gekenmerk deur pseudo-Spaanse argitektuur, gemanikuurde tuine met inheemse bome en struie en triomfantelike middelklaswaardes. Iemand se verjaarsdag, dink ek. Die weer was perfek en ons het om die verligte swembad rondgehang in die nagloed van te veel kos en selfs nog meer drank; dit moes omtrent middernag gewees het. Die geselskap, ontlok deur wie weet wat, het, soos wat dit 'n groep studente betaam wat meegevoer word deur 'n roekelose oorskatting van hulle eie intellektuele vermoëns, oor niks minder as die mens se stand gehandel nie. Alles natuurlik stewig gewortel in die Europese tradisie, die ene Hegel, Heidegger, Sartre en Camus, 'n tikkie Foucault, en natuurlik 'n totaal kliniese en gesteriliseerde Marx. Te midde van al hierdie halfgebakte geleerdheid, is ons knus gesekwestreerde wêreld skielik versteur toe 'n man, 'n swartman in verslete overalls, deur die privetheining gebars gekom het. oor die grasperk gestrompel het, stoele, tafels en skinkborde onderstebo gestorm het. verby die swembad en weer deur die oorkantste heining na die bure se tuin is. Voordat ons mooi tot verhaal kon kom het nog twee mans deur die privet agternagebars, die keer twee konstabels in blou uniforms, rewolwers in die hand. Bang-bang jy's dood. Heeltemal onbewus van ons teenwoordigheid, totaal verlore in hulle agtervolging, verby die swembad, deur die struie, tot hulle ook in die bure se tuin verdwyn het. Alles was net so skielik oor as wat dit begin het. Die hele gedoente was so onwerklik dat dit moeilik was om te glo dat dit ooit gebeur het. Dit was of 'n skielike vloedgolf die plek getref het en chaos agtergelaat het voor dit verdwyn het.

'n Paar van ons het by die bure gaan hoor wat gebeur het, maar hulle was salig onbewus van alles. (Ons het ook die koerante die volgende dag dopgehou, maar daar was geen sprake van enigiets ongehoords nie.) 'n Paar dapper siele het probeer om die gesprek te hervat, maar daar was geen woema oor nie en dit het gou doodgeloop en almal is huis toe. Ek het geen idee of enige van die ander ooit weer daarvoor gewonder het nie. as ek reg onthou het niemand ooit weer daarna verwys nie. Maar vir my was dit nog 'n verskuiwinkie, asof die hele versteekte ander helfte – vier vyfdes – van lewe in Suid-Afrika skielik met geweld ingebars het in die gemaklike klein enklawetjie waarin ek grootgemaak is. Dit was asof daai ander man, die een wat daardie dag na Pa toe gekom het vir hulp, met 'n bebloede kop, opgewek is om by my te kom spook. Miskien was my reaksie vrugteloos, en sentimenteel, en beslis skaamtelik 'wit'. Maar om vir een angswekkende oomblik aangesig-tot-aangesig te kom met daardie geheime en donker deel van die lewe in hierdie land waarop alles anders gepredikeer is, het veroorsaak dat ek nie sommer net kon terugkeer na my gebruikelike salige onbewustheid asof niks gebeur het nie.

As ek die godsdienstige tipe was mag dit my dalk geïnspireer het, soos die meeste van my medestudente met slegte gewetens, om by die een of ander sendingaksie van die kerk aan te sluit. Maar met dinge soos wat dit was het ek weinig keuse gehad. Ek het wel betrokke geraak by watter linkserige politieke aktiwiteite ook al op ons kampus toegelaat is, waar die blote suggestie van 'n bevraagtekening van "tradisionele waardes" beskou is as 'n potensiele tereurdaad, geïnspireer deur die Rooi Gevaar.

So, eintlik was dit alles baie veilig. Maar dit het my tog 'n sekere gevoel gegee dat ek besig was om deel te word van groter issues, van 'n beweging wat momentum begin kry het en lynreg ingegaan het teen wat Pa altyd so heftig beskryf het as "ons volk se stryd om erkenning". En dit het my deur die volgende paar jaar gedra. Die merkwaardigste - en mees bevredigende - ontdekking was dat, ongeag van hoe versigtig en tentatief ons posisie in werklikheid was, dit binne die konteks van kampuslewe beskou is as uiters gevaarlik.

Wat veral die wenkbroue laat lig het was my verhouding, in my honneursjaar, met Eric Olivier wat op Stellenbosch beskou is as 'n effe vreemd: artistiek, onkonvensioneel, met 'n bitsige satiriese streep wat nie goed afgegaan het by die rugbytypes wat die studentelewe oorheers het nie. Wat Eric tot prominensie verhef het was sy betrokkenheid by anti-weermag veldtogte, die verbranding van oproepinstruksies, en sy opgang in die geleedere van die End Conscription Campaign. Dit was verstommend om die skaam, hakelende seun skielik deur 'n oortuiging aangevuur te sien wat my partykeer amper bangemaak het. Erik het my gefascinate. Maar die verhouding het nie lank gehou nie. Op 'n dag toe hy van 'n kunsklas af teruggekom het, is hy in 'n kar weggeraap. Ek het hom nooit weer gesien nie. Ons - party van ons altans - het demonstrasies gereël, briewe aan koerante geskryf, en die admingeboue met plakate beplak wat geëis het dat die universiteit moet ingryp om hom uit aanhouding te bevry, alles tevergeefs.

En toe was dit my beurt.

Ek is deur die primaria van my koshuis ingeroep, deur die huiskomitee afgeransel, en uiteindelik deur die rektor ingeroep en amptelik betugtig. My gedrag is bestempel as onaanvaarbaar vir 'n Afrikaner, en veral laakbaar in 'n jong dame. Ek is gevra om van die SR te bedank en gefire van die redaksie van die studentekoerant af. Mense is gewaarsku om nie met my te assosieer nie. Dit was great.

Die res van my studentelewe het verloop volgens wat waarskynlik 'n tipiese Afrikaanse-student-wat-die-lig-gesien-het patroon moes gewees het: ek het 'n paar vriende verloor, maar ook 'n paar nuwes gemaak, veral kleurlinge, comrades van die UDF. Een van hulle was Jason. Hy was 'n kleurlingonderwyser, twaalf jaar ouer as ek, 'n organiseerder vir die UDF, wat al twee keer aangehou is. As dinge anders was kon ek maklik op hom verlief geraak het, maar ons verhouding was streng platonies. Ek het geweet dat sy werk in die UDF veels te belangrik was om deur komplikasies van 'n ander soort in gevaar gestel te word.

Daar was ander wat in my vleeslike behoeftes kon voorsien as en wanneer dit nodig was. Ek het nogal van mans gehou, en om by hulle te slaap as die mood reg was, maar ek het nie die behoefte gehad vir involvement nie behalwe as dit op my voorwaardes was. Een of twee episodes het nogal sleg uitgedraai en daarna was ek meer versigtig; maar ek het gehoor gegee aan die behoeftes en drange van my liggaam en ek was nogal trots op die feit dat ek, hopenlik meestal, verstandig kon oordeel. As die groot verterende hartstog waarin ek moet bieg ek nog in die geheim geglo het nog nie oor my pad gekom het nie, was ek seker dat dit bloot 'n kwessie van tyd was voor dit wel sou gebeur.

Die dénouement was nogal onverwags. Teen die begin van my MA-jaar is ek in die voorportaal van die koshuis besoek deur twee stereotipes in sportbaadjies en Terylenebroeke; en na 'n bietjie onhandige geskerts het hulle tot die punt gekom. Ek is uitgenooi om 'n ogie te hou oor sekere van my medestudente en gereeld aan die twee here terug te rapporteer. Dit was alles so blatant dat ek skaars my ore kon glo. Reg of verkeerd, ek het my Pa se hand daarin gesien. Ek's bevrees ek het in hulle gesigte gelag. En toe was hulle skielik minder gemoedelik. "Dink eers bietjie daaroor na," het die ouer een van die twee gesê. "Ons wil nie vandag al 'n antwoord van jou hê nie. Dis jou keuse." En toe 'n skaars merkbare pouse voor hy bygevoeg het, "Natuurlik kan ander deur jou besluit geraak word. Man met die naam Jason Smith? Ek's seker jy sou jou ouers die vernedering van 'n ontugsaak wou spaar."

Ek het geweier om hulle die satisfaksie te gee om te sien dat ek geruk was.

Die besoek was soos 'n lugte aardskudding, 'n onderwaterontploffing wat allerhande gemors en dooie visse na die oppervlak laat kom het. My eerste instink was om na Jason se blokhuisie toe te ry in Belhar om hom te waarsku; maar dit sou dwaas wees om hom aan

enige verdere risiko bloot te stel. Die besluit wat ek geneem het was net soveel om sy ontwil as om myne - dit was nie eers nodig om dit te neem nie, teen daardie tyd het dit gevoel of dit reeds binne my geneem is - om die land te verlaat.

### Part 3: Chapter 5 (SK:197-206)

#### 5

For the first few months after my arrival in London I was on a high – driven by the compulsion to make it “work” and to “show them”, to plunge (as I recklessly believed) into history; above all to prove to myself that I could succeed. I wanted to burn as many bridges as I could to make it impossible to return. The past was gone. At first I found myself in Earl’s Court, but it had a bad vibe: too many South Africans, the wrong type. Thanks to a few recommendations I brought with me, I eventually arrived in Stockwell. There I picked up a fellow countryman in exile – or he me – a shady attorney who turned out to be little better than a confidence trickster, and with him I moved to North London. Before leaving South Africa I had sold the small car Father gave me on my twenty-first birthday without a second thought; this at least gave me something to survive on initially. But I had to get a job, not only for the money, but because of the independence it would bring; to continue loafing about without a job would ruin me.

Through a few of my UDF contacts I met ANC exiles and Anti-Apartheid people as well as guys in Amnesty International. That provided odd jobs such as poster production, organising meetings, writing snippets for small newspapers; for a time I was even editing assistant for a few low-budget Third World doccies. But this kind of job offered no security and even if one could bargain on a measure of protection from Anti-Apartheid and on sympathy from the GLC, you were constantly aware of being watched by the Thatcher government, hand in glove with PW and company. I needed a more solid base. And in order to get one I first had to obtain more acceptable qualifications. I enrolled for my teaching diploma. Not exactly an inspiring or enriching experience, but still better than a kick in the butt, and I attended classes with admirable dedication.

And then the marriage. I’m afraid it was far from glamorous. In fact, it was no more than a practical solution to a number of irritating problems. After that first disaster with the lawyer boyfriend, I remained celibate for the time being. But my natural urges, exacerbated by an exceptionally cold winter, made me reconsider. There was a lot of free love in the circles I moved in, and as the temperature dropped and the nights became more lonely, I made use of the odd available opportunity that presented itself. Not bad; but nothing spectacular either; nothing that made the earth move. Simply a matter of making friends and influencing people. But inevitably one also made enemies in the process, and the whole thing became something of a vicious circle. I’ve always agreed with Ouma Kristina that only those who can risk making enemies deserve friends, but it served no purpose to gather grudges left and right. After all, I realised, rather to my own surprise and satisfaction, that I was basically more monogamous than I thought. And since I happened to be in a fairly stable relationship with someone in the AAM at the time, I suggested that we get married and he said yes. His name was Jean-Claude Thompson, JC to his friends, a name he got from a doting French mother. Perhaps it was this connection that determined his skills as a lover, particularly in the oral department, which could have influenced my decision somewhat. Not that it was taken as lightly as it may sound; but the most important consideration was after all that a marriage was a shortcut to a working permit.

On that we agreed from the outset. We both knew exactly what was at stake: survival. I got my diploma and started teaching, at first in a rowdy comprehensive in Hackney, then on to something more manageable in Camden Town, and eventually in a school close to Paddington (which made the Sussex Gardens flats particularly convenient); and in addition I made my own little contribution to the Struggle. Nothing heroic: mainly participating in demo’s and marches, fundraising, some liaison (according to JC my butt in a pair of jeans could make the difference between a donation of two hundred and five hundred pounds;

which is why I eventually quit), and also a lot of work on committees on women's issues. More than enough to keep me occupied for forty-eight hours a day. The most important benefit was the knowledge that I was putting an axe to my father's tree with every little thing I did.

Life changed drastically when I got pregnant. Both JC and myself were caught unprepared when we were overcome by just one incredibly beautiful summer's weekend in a meadow near Stowe-on-Wye. JC did his reputation proud – and I was left holding the baby (in a manner of speaking). I am trying to tell it as soberly as possible. Perhaps I have always been afraid of not being able to handle the emotion. But perhaps it is simply an aversion to melodrama, in a family that has produced more than enough of it over the years. I didn't make a scene then, at least not in public; and I won't now.

But why did it leave me with such a sense of defeat? It all began when, already one week late, I had the test done. At first it was as if I had been caught for some minor offence, nothing more than that; but when I told JC about it that evening, he simply asked, without even looking up from his paper: "And when are you going?"

It was totally unnecessary to allow it to turn into an argument, but his total lack of emotion – his assumption that it did not even have to be discussed – made me explode.

"When am I going where?"

"To have it done."

"To have what done?"

"Don't be daft. The abortion, of course."

We had agreed long before that we did not want children; but that wasn't the point. It was the way he simply assumed that it would be done, that I had no say in the matter, as if it was no more of an issue than an ingrown toenail or a corn.

"What are you looking at me like that for?" he asked petulantly. "Don't tell me –"

"I'll make an appointment for next week," I said, and stormed out.

That week, and the weeks following the brief impersonal visit to the clinic, I missed my family for the first time. No, not my family. My sister. And of course Ouma Kristina. But for some or other reason I wrote to Anna. I knew I would be able to discuss it with Ouma on one of her nocturnal visits. And much later, perhaps, matter-of-factly, I would inform my parents that I "lost" the baby. What I needed now was the presence and support of a sister. In a way it was probably a good thing that she didn't reply. It made me realise finally – as if there had ever been any doubt – that I could or would never return. Nothing, not even the burning of my bridges through my involvement with the AAM, made me so painfully aware that my decision was irrevocable.

All of that I could handle. What was tougher, were those lonely nights while JC was peacefully snoring away beside me; or those times when I unexpectedly, in a bus or on the tube or on my way past a block of flats or a park, heard a baby cry. The kind of sentimentality I would never have expected in myself. I became positively tearful for months on end. I even went for therapy for a while. Eventually – very soon, actually – it drove JC and me apart. I accepted my share of the responsibility. But what pissed me off, was that he suddenly no longer trusted me, as if the incident somehow exposed something untrustworthy, something unreliable even, in me, a kind of female instability that began to threaten his male certainties and choices for the future. That is why, one fine day, I told him to shove off as matter-of-factly as I asked him to marry me; we went through all the legal processes, and one particularly beautiful day in September we got divorced.

JC was considerate enough to organise a transfer to the Paris office; unless it was simply a better offer. In any case, it allowed me to continue with my own political activities, even if rather haphazardly. I tried to convince myself that it was important; above all I needed a sense of involvement, solidarity, a ready-made circle of friends that could dispel the loneliness. And eventually I started to make peace with what had happened; life has a way of carrying on, after all. Anything was better than admitting to my family that I had made a balls-up of the whole overseas move. It had always been important to prove that I can pull through.



My contact with South Africa (I couldn't bring myself to think of it as "home" anymore) dwindled; eventually it consisted of little more than a meaningless Christmas card, a note on birthdays. Only Ouma continued to receive letters at fairly regular intervals – a letter of two or three pages a couple of times a year. She assured me that she missed me, but she never tried to pressure me; if I had to return, she knew, I would. She knew both of us too well to insist on it. And in her wise, unyielding way, in a handwriting that grew bigger and more uneven year after year, like insects tracks across the page, she kept supporting me in everything I undertook, without ever enquiring exactly what it was.

More important than her letters were her visits. I now find myself on uncertain ground, I know; but among all the quirks and peculiarities of our family I don't suppose it's all that odd. Others would call it dreams, but I knew that they were actual visits she made to allow me to spill my guts, and to offer me the calm and profound assurance of her understanding. Not that she always approved; but she was always there. "If that is what you really want to do, then *do it*." And she didn't give a damn whether others considered it irresponsible or reckless. "You are the only one who can judge, Kristien. Listen to your heart." That is what kept me going. For eleven years.

There isn't much more to tell. The odd affair, sometimes worthwhile, often not; now and then a one-night stand that could range from hilarious to depressing. Eventually Michael, whose worst eccentricity in the three years we've been living together has been the night when he woke with a scream and sat up: and when I asked him what the matter was, he explained self-consciously that it had been a nightmare. He spotted an endnote at the foot of the bed.

The only disturbance on the fairly calm surface of my life over the past few years had been Sandile Hlati. For once in my life – the only time yet, although I reserve the right to be surprised again – I loved a man properly. Unconditionally, without questions, exuberantly, head-over-heels. Had it not been for the fact that we had to get up so early after our first night, I would have hung out the sheets. Sandile was in the ANC office, recently returned from a few years in Prague. He was beautiful. But I'll try to contain myself. He was considerate, he discussed everything under the sun with me, he listened to what I had to say, his laugh was contagious, the way in which he enjoyed life made me glow. And on top of it all he was an ordinary person, thank God: in other words, he could be headstrong, moody, funny, pedantic, depressed; he could overreact; he could forget appointments. We could talk for eleven hours on end without a break, and then make love for – I never counted. I only know that I never failed to be surprised when I saw afterwards how late, or early, it had become. Sandile never ceased to amaze me. He could shower me with attention; but when there was work to be done, nothing could distract him, not even my most provocative attempts to seduce him. He was devoted. He was passionate. He adored my feet. He was left, like me. Secretly he was a poet. He was brilliant. And he was married.

I'm not particularly proud of any of my relationships with men. But I've always, based on some old-fashioned notion of propriety, avoided married men; and I'm able to spot the married state with unfailing instinct. I must have been a customs officer's dog in a previous life.

The very first day Sandile appeared in my life, at a sad office function on a particularly grey day, all the signs were there already. He didn't make any effort to hide anything either. Even when the wetness hit me, as Ouma Kristina would put it, I fought it. We became friends. I made up my mind, even if for different reasons, that it would be as it had been with Jason. But Jason was no match for Sandile. I refuse to blame the stars, fate, or our poor Lord. We did it ourselves. And once we'd passed a particular cape, we surrendered. Without looking for excuses or explanations – the hard work, the danger that threatened us daily (even in London there were prying agents and assassins), the bitterness of forced or self-imposed exile, the transience of life, or whatever other reasons offered by lovers over the course of history – but, when the moment came, we acknowledged our love and flung ourselves into it as one would plunge into the cliché of a deep pit.

But we were also discrete: it was the condition for our love; and I doubt whether anyone caught wind of it.

It lasted five months, seventeen days and thirteen hours.

And then I met his wife. Nozipho. She had recently returned from a visit to her parents who had had to travel to Botswana especially in order to be with her, since she was also *persona non grata* in South Africa. He had told me about her; we never tried to deny her existence. But to meet her in the flesh, with two small children by her side, was different. Nozipho was small and lean-built, well-dressed, not particularly beautiful, but with a wide, sincere smile and eyes attesting of her deep satisfaction with life, no matter how bad things got. She handled the children with great ease; and Sandile even more so, with the spontaneity of a body that had no secrets for the other and yet retained some sense of mystery. If that doesn't sound too corny.

We only spent a couple of hours in each other's company, and there were a number of other ANC people as well. A strange experience. For the first time – and that includes the cramps I got after the abortion – I truly felt what it's like when your womb contracts; and it was much worse than a purely physical pain. Simultaneously I felt oddly distant, as if I weren't really there; with a certainty inside of me as to what I had to do. And when he kissed me goodnight, I pressed his hand; and he knew what I meant.

The full extent of the pain, the tears, his and mine, only struck later. But by then the worst was past. And we were both strong enough to persevere. To say that it had been for the sake of his family would sound holier-than-thou, or banal, or both. There was no sense of trying to do something noble or praiseworthy; it was simply unavoidable. What they had as a family was not something that could be put at risk by something as selfish or personal as passion. He made it easier by requesting a transfer after a few months – the darkest and most shitty months of my life. The executive officer wasn't too pleased; they needed him in London. And since he didn't dare reveal the true reason, it wasn't particularly easy to convince them. Until Sandile went to see the president himself in confidence; after that his request was granted and he left for Washington. Since then we have had only sporadic contact, not at all regular; and our letters were tempered by the control forced by memory. Finally, as it sadly happens, the violence of the passion subsided and dwindled to a dull pain, until that too faded – except for the odd, sudden, precious moments of particular vulnerability.

I kept on working for the ANC, mostly over weekends, but slowly the enthusiasm waned. Without planning or even wanting it, a time of reckoning arrived. Not that I had any problems with the Struggle; quite the contrary. The issues were real, urgent, obvious. But perhaps that was part of the trouble. In the context of British politics, where everything – on the surface at least – was so boring and predictable, my enthusiasm started to wane; I started to doubt any matter where black-and-white choices were still possible. More important, however, was the sense, rightly or wrongly, that I wasn't at all in the eye of the storm, that I was struggling somewhere on the periphery, part of a support system, not the real McCoy; I was busy with manageable women's things, in the shadow of the men. Far away, in the remote south, under the fulmination and shaking finger of a mad old president, the convulsions of a white regime sent out dark and desperate waves across the world: mass murders, assassinations, disappearances, torture, detention, corruption, necklacings. And on top of it all we had to find answers, devise plans and programmes, conceive counter-attacks and infiltration, organise conferences and clandestine meetings. More and more I started feeling like a useless appendix, everything but a vital organ. If something like a rainbow did still exist somewhere, I was rather part of its faint shadow. It was my own fault, not that of the ANC. There were women on the front. But I was never one of them. History passed me by. At best my life was something of an easy alternative. After Father's death I stopped altogether. There was nothing dramatic about the decision: it was just that I could no longer see the sense in it all. It had been carrying on for too long, and still no end was in sight: those horrible States of Emergency, one after the other, the murders, the raids, the invasions of neighbouring countries, the entire sub-continent going to the pigs in a blaze of violence. Had I become a traitor? Hardly. It was simply that I no longer had the energy, the desire, to carry on believing and hoping; unlike those who devoted their lives to the Struggle,

I quietly became stranded on a sandbar and was abandoned there, somewhat tired in the legs, somewhat shaky, somewhat cynical, somewhat guilty, nothing special.

In my last letter from Sandile, something over a year ago, he said that he was going back, home. It was no longer necessary to stay away; all the exiles were returning, amnesty had been granted, he would become part of the transitional process which brought us here to these elections everybody is expecting so nervously and uncertainly. After that I haven't heard a thing, although his name often appears in the papers, even with a picture at times. Sandile, my love. Part of the entire unsolved past. No, Anna, I'm not travelling that lightly after all.

## Addendum 4: Impostulated direct speech

### Part II: Chapter 8 (IS:85-96)

#### 8

En nou sit ek hier en skryf. Om hier te wees vul my met 'n gevoel van vrede. Ek het al die ligte afgesit behalwe die klein leeslampie by die bed wat die nuwe skryfblok op my skoot verlig. Ek moet skryf, het sy gesê, terwyl sy praat, 'n flou fluisterstemmetjie, soos die geritsel van papier, maar onverwags hardnekkig. Die huis is stil, behalwe vir die ou balke wat af en toe kraak, nou hier en dan weer daar, onder in die kelder of bo in die dak. Trui en Jeremia slaap langsaan, een van hulle snork liggies. Die vreemdeling, neem ek aan, is in die kelder. In 'n hoek in Ouma se kamer sien ek, elke nou en dan as ek opkyk, drie uile wat op een mahonie rakstaander ingedruk sit, hulle onheilspellende oë starend. Buitekant hoor mens af en toe die skril geluide van vlermuise, die roep van 'n naguiltjie, partykeer selfs 'n tortelduif wat half wakker word en dan weer insluimer. Ouma Kristina het intussen so onrustig begin rondvrotel dat ek begin wonder of sy nie yl nie. Haar ongeskende hand tas aanhoudend in die lug rond, maar haar oë bly toe.

"Wat's fout, Ouma?"

"Die prentjie," sê sy vererg sonder om haar oë oop te maak.

"Die huis is vol prente, Ouma. Watter een soek Ouma?"

"Jy weet van watter een ek praat. Dit het altyd hier op die speelkas gestaan."

Dan praat sy seker van die klein manlike naakstudie, die een wat die grootmense oor die jare soveel vererger besorg het, en vir ons wat nog besig was om groot te word, soveel skelm fasinasië: die slank gespierde liggaam in 'n Dawid-pose, die bos wilde swart krulle, sy prominente besnede penis. Die styl was Victoriaans, in die Pre-Rafaelitiese formaat, en daarom was die onverbloemdheid soveel te meer skokkend. Ons het almal geweet dit was een van Ouma se kleinode en dat mens nie daarvoor durf vrae vra nie. Maar hoekom sou sy dit juis nou soek?

"Waar's dit?" dring sy aan, en haar stem rasper soos skuurpapier.

"Maar Ouma – probeer ek so taktvol moontlik. "Het Ouma dan vergeet van die vuur?"

Haar wasige oë fladder geskok oop voordat 'n vliesie van berusting daarvoor vorm.

"Verbrand?"

Ek druk haar hand. "Ek's jammer Ouma. Daar was niks van die kamer oor nie. Dis 'n wonderwerk dat Ouma gered is."

"Ek moes ook maar gegaan het. Maar ek moes eers met jou praat."

"Ek's hier, Ouma."

Om in die nag hier by haar te sit is weer soos toe ek 'n kind was. Solank as wat ek kan onthou het Ouma Kristina al gesê dat sy *iets* in my raaksien wat my gemerk het as die een wat verkore is om al haar versamelde stories te ontvang. Daar moet altyd een wees, het sy verduidelik, om die stories oor te lewer, om te verhoed dat hulle langs die pad verlore raak. Ek het haar nooit vreeslik ernstig opgeneem nie, al was ek natuurlik trots daarop dat ek die uitverkore een was. Maar benewens die pure genot wat ek uit hulle geput het moet ek bieg dat ek nooit enige diepere betekenis in haar warboel stories gesien het nie. En om uitverkore te wees het natuurlik ook 'n prys gehad: partykeer as sy nie kon slaap nie het sy skielik in haar wit nagrok verskyn met 'n parrafienlamp in die hand (al kon sy die elektiese lig met 'n skakelaar aansit), om my uit die muur-tot-muur bed waarin al die kinders geslaap het te sleep en my te beveel om te luister. Sy sou my dan óf in haar bed tel óf my kombuis toe lei waar ons ons by die lang geskropte tafel sou tuismaak met bekere melk of suurlemoenstroop, en dan sou sy begin om stories te vertel totdat ek aan die slaap geraak het. Ek onthou nog die sagte geel lig, die skadu's teen die mure, die bewustheid van die geheime donker wegkruipplekke van die huis rondom ons. Net soos vannag.

"Verbrand," herhaal sy na 'n ruk terwyl sy weer haar oë oopmaak om na my te staar, asof sy vasbeslote is om nie die vaagste flikkering van uitdrukking op my gesig te mis nie. 'Arme kind. Nou het jy niks meer oor van jou oupa nie."

"My oupa?" Onwillekeurig skud ek my kop. "Maar dit kon tog nie Oupa gewees het nie. Hy sou tog nooit – Ek bly skuldig stil. "Ek dog Oupa was blond voordat hy grys geword het?"

Sy glimlag geammuseerd. "Ek praat nie van die man met wie ek getrou het nie, Kristien. Ek praat van jou Oupa."

Dis moeilik om die gedagtes wat sy in my losgeskud het te beheer. Ons het nog altyd Ouma se aartsopstandigheid geken, veral nadat die ouderdom aan haar 'n vryheid gegee het waarvan selfs sy nie vroeër sou kon gedroom het nie, maar daar moes tog sekerlik – in daardie tyd – perke gewees het.

"En so 'n goeie gelykenis," hervat sy terwyl sy nog steeds verseg om haar oë van my af weg te neem. My beste ooit, ek's seker."

"Maar Ouma het tog nooit geskilder nie, het Ouma?"

"Nie vandat jy my geken het nie. Nie sedert daardie prentjie nie. Maar wat weet jy nou eintlik van my?"

"Dan's dit tyd dat Ouma my vertel."

"Ja, dis tyd om my idiote vry te laat."

"Ouma se idiote?"

"Onthou jy nie die storie wat hulle oor die ganske Klein Karoo vertel nie? Oor die volstruistyd. Toe die mees welgestelde families van die distrik al die rykdom versamel het. Ongelooflik, eintlik. Ydel mense wat nie met die hoi polloi wou meng nie. Toe begin hulle maar ondertrou, en mettertyd was daar 'n paar idiootjies in elke familie. Opgesluit in die kelder en opgepas deur weesmeisies uit die stad. Die skande van die groot families, nooit toegelaat om buite onder God se son te loop nie. Met die uitsondering van een uur per week, tussen twee en drie elke Sondag as almal geslaap het, suf geëet aan die Sondagmaal. Die uur van die idiote het hulle dit genoem." Sy gee 'n diep sug en haar oë val weer toe. "Ek dink die tyd het nou aangebreek vir my eie idiote." Nog 'n skielike verandering in haar stemtoon. "Ek wens die hele verdorpe plek het afgebrand, Kristien. Ek haat dit. Ek kan dit nie langer verduur nie."

"Maar ek het nog altyd gedink Ouma was mal oor die huis?"

"Natuurlik was ek. Soos wat 'n mens leer om lief te wees vir jou tronksel, skat ek. En dit was 'n tronk, moenie 'n fout maak nie. My eie moeder is hier opgesluit."

"Bedoel Ouma sy was – ?"

"Nie 'n idioot nie, as dit is wat jy dink. Of ten minste nie soos die ander nie. Wat ek bedoel is, vir ons mense hoef 'n idioot nie noodwendig verdraag of 'n waterkoppie te gewees het nie. Enigiemand wat afgewyk het van die norm is beskou as 'n idioot. Enigiemand wat dit gewaag het om anders te wees."

"Ek verstaan nie. Ek dog Ouma se ma was Petronella Wepener, die een wat hierdie plek gebou het, een van die mees vooraanstaande vrouens in die distrik."

"Sy't my grootgemaak, ja. Hulle het vir almal gesê dat sy my ma was. Hoe anders kon hulle die skande oorleef? Maar sy was eintlik my ouma. My ma was Ragel. Ek skat baie mense het dit vermoed, maar niemand kon ooit seker wees nie. Hulle is laat verstaan dat Ragel weggehardloop het."

"Dan is sy die een wat die skilderye in die kelder gemaak het?"

Sy doen nie eers die moeite om dit te antwoord nie. "En dis nie al nie," sê sy. "Ek hoop net ons gaan genoeg tyd hê. Daar is soveel wat ek jou moet vertel. Al die stories. Die hele geskiedenis."

"Stories of geskiedenis?"

"Nie veel verskil nie, is daar? Toe jy 'n kind was het jy gedink hulle was stories. Maar op die een of ande manier pas hulle almal inmekaar." Nog 'n lang stilte. Dan, sonder enige ooglopende verband, voeg sy by, "Ons het nog altyd hierdie hunkering na die onmoontlike gehad. Ek, jy, jou ma, al die ander voor ons."

"Vertel my daarvan."

En dis wat sy doen.

"As kind was ek baie alleen," ritsel haar papierstem in die donkerte voort, in pas met die geskribbel van my pen soos ek skryf. "Al die ander Wepeners was al groot, Eulalie en

Willem en Barend en Martiens. Hulle was natuurlik eintlik my ooms en tannie, al het ek nie die vaagste benul gehad nie. Ek is grootgemaak met die idee dat hulle my ouer suster en broers was. Eulalie moes omtrent ses en twintig gewees het toe ek gebore is, Willem omtrent vier en twintig en die tweeling, Barend en Martiens, omtrent twintig. Die twee was nog in die omtrek om hand by te sit met die plaaswerk, maar hulle het in die dorps huis ingetrek. Willem het sy skoonmense se plaas in die distrik bestuur en Eulalie het Vrystaat toe getrek, getroud met 'n boer, drie kinders. So jy kan verstaan dat ek grootliks aan my eie lot oorgelaat is. My ouma, Petronella – op daardie stadium het ek natuurlik nog gedink sy's my ma – moes omtrent sestig gewees het toe ek tien jaar oud was en haar man selfs nog ouer, wat beteken het dat hulle nie te veel erg gehad het aan 'n klein dogtertjie onder hulle voete nie. Wat my op 'n manier gepas het, want soos jy weet kan hierdie huis 'n kind omtrent vir altyd besighou. Die enigste plek waar ek nooit toegelaat is nie, was die kelder. Die deure aan die bo- en onderpunt van die trap was altyd gesluit, en ek is die dood voor oë gesweer as ek ooit sou waag om daar in te gaan. Maar dit het net my verbeelding op loop gesit.

“Ek onthou nie meer presies hoe dit op die ou ent gebeur het nie, maar een Sondag het ek op die sleutel afgeklim. Die grootmense was kerk toe en ek is by die huis gelos met die een of ander obskure siekte; ek het gereeld sulke Sondagkoors gehad. Dis moontlik dat Lizzie 'n medepligtige hierin was – die kleuringdogtertjie wat my enigste maatjie was, die voorman se dogter, net so onhebbelik soos ek.

“Ek sal nooit die afwagting vergeet waarmee ek teen die koue trappe afgesluip het nie – die lantern in my hand het vreesaanjaende skadu's teen die muur langs laat skarrel. En toe die skilderye, totaal skokkend vir iemand wat so streng soos ek grootgemaak is. Jy weet, ek moes selfs met my onderrok aan bad. Ek onthou nou nog die gevoel van die swaar nat ding wat aan my ledemate kleef. Party nagte het ek nagmêrries gehad oor verdrink in diep donker waters, my arms en bene magteloos vasgeklem deur die lang rok wat my dieper en dieper afgesleur het bodem toe. En natuurlik het dit my nog meer nuuskierig gemaak oor my liggaam. Jy was net so toe jy klein was. Moenie dink ek het dit nie gesien nie. En as dit gereën het, miskien omdat dit so selde gebeur het, het ek al my klere uitgetrek en in die solder ingekruip en van daar af op die dak waar ek vir ure in 'n houpie gesit en myself bejammer het.

“So jy kan dink watter ontploffing die skilderye in my kop veroorsaak het. Om hulle in die donker te sien, in daardie diep kleure, die rooie en groene en bloue wat na my toe gloei soos vreemde eksotiese visse wat uit 'n donker onderwêreld opgeswem kom. Mans met verstommende ereksies, oopgesperde vrouens wat hulle goeters soos gapende wonde vertoon, en allerhande soorte kopulasies tussen mense en diere en voëls en monsters, selfs bome en klippe. Ek was tegelyk geskok en gefasineerd, en van daardie dag af kon ek nie wegbly nie, is ek teruggelok soos 'n mot na die dodelike gloed van 'n vlam.

“Op die ou ent het hulle natuurlik uitgevind en ek het 'n afgedankste pak slae gekry. En toe ek 'n week of so later weer met die trappe afgekruip het, want natuurlik is dit die eerste ding wat ek gedoen het toe ek voldoende herstel het, was ek verstom om die mure skoon aan te tref. Witgekalk van bo tot onder om alle tekens van die skilderye te verberg. Ek was so geskok dat ek na my pa toe gehardloop het en hom met vuiste en voete toegetakel het, sy maermêrries geskop het en met my kop in sy vet pens ingehardloop het, al skreeuend en vloekende in taal wat ek nie eers geweet het ek ken nie. Eers heelwat later het hy uitgevind hoekom ek hom so uit die bloute aangeval het, en toe het ek natuurlik nog 'n loesing gekry. Maar op die ou ent het hulle maar opgegee. Eintlik het hulle nie 'n keuse gehad nie, want teen daardie tyd het hulle besef dat as ek eers vasgebyt het, ek nie weer laat los nie. Selfs al het hulle die sleutel op die onmoontlikste plekke weggesteek sou ek dit waarskynlik kry; en teen die tyd dat hulle dit uiteindelik misplaas het deur dit so goed weg te steek dat hulle dit self nie weer kon kry nie, het ek lankal 'n ander sleutel in die solder gekry wat in die kelderslot gepas het.

“Maar, wil jy nou meer, minder as 'n maand later was die skilderye terug in al hulle blatante glorie. Eers heelwat later het ek uitgevind dat hulle al verskeie maal vergeefs probeer het om die mure wit te kalk. Vir my was dit 'n wonderwerk. Maar vir hulle ook, as jy

my vra, te oordeel aan die uitdrukking op hulle gesigte elke keer as hulle afgekom het om my te soek en weer die skilderye gesien het, as't ware opgewek uit die dood."

"Maar wat het toe van die skilderye geword? Vandag is daar tog net kolle oor."

"Dit het eers gebeur toe die Wepeners dood is. Ek skat hulle het toe nie meer 'n doel gedien nie. Nog 'n wonderwerk, of die vernietigende gang van die tyd? Ons sal nooit weet nie."

"Maar hoe het Ouma toe uitgevind van die kunstenaar?"

"Soos jy kan dink het ek die Wepeners nie vir 'n oomblik met rus gelaat oor die oorsprong van die sondige beelde nie. Maar hulle het nooit eers 'n sweempie laat blyk nie. Die naaste wat hulle ooit daaraan gekom, of in elk geval tot ek omtrent agt en twintig was, was om te sê dat die Duiwel die beelde geskilder het. Hulle het waarskynlik gedink dit sou my afskrik. Maar dit het net mooi die teenoorgestelde uitwerking gehad. Ek's bevrees ek wou nie veel met God te doen hê nie. Ek het 'n oordosis godsdien in die Wepeners se huis gehad; en bowendien, hy het vir my supisieus baie na 'n strengere weergawe van Hermanus Johannes geklink. Ek het veel eerder die Duiwel verkies, hy het veel interessanter geklink; en ek sou enige tyd met Dokter Faustus plekke geruil het, as ek toe iets van hom geweet het."

"Hoekom het hulle Ouma nie sommer weggestuur nie? Dit sou alles tog veel makliker gemaak het, vir amal."

Ek dink ek was daagliks vir hulle 'n noodsaaklike herinnering aan hulle skuld. En hulle kon dit op my uithaal. Hulle het dit waarskynlik as hulle persoonlike verantwoordelikheid voor God beskou om 'n ogie oor my te hou, selfs toe hulle al oortuig was dat ek 'n vrot eier was. En elke nou en dan, veral as ek siek was en nie kon weghardloop nie, het hulle die dominee genooi, of ouderlinge, om vir my te kom bid en die bose geeste uit my te dryf wat hulle oortuig was 'n permanente woning in my gemaak het. Wat party van daardie toegewyde ou ooms (almal het my op 'n manier laat dink aan my beeld van die Almagtige God), alles gedoen het om die Duiwel uit my uit te lok sodra hulle gereël het om alleen by my te wees, hoef ek nie op uit te wy nie. Maar hulle het my beslis 'n besonder verwronge idee van godsdienis gegee.

"Die een goeie ding wat uit dit alles gekom het was dat ek weereens aan myself oorgelaat is. Behalwe dat ek, van die dag wat ek my eerste maandstonde gehad het, vir alle praktiese doeleindes op die plaas gevange gehou is. Geen verdere skoolopleiding nie, behalwe dat hulle 'n goewernante gehuur het. Lizzie was my enigste metgesel. Sy't haar ma met geboorte verloor en het by haar ouma en oupa, Salie en Nenna, gebly. Jy onthou haar tog seker nog. Sy was omtrent presies so oud soos ek, net 'n paar dae verskil, en ons het ons lewe lank onafskeidbaar gebly. Nie dat dit die ou mense se goedkeuring weggedra het nie. Beide ons pa's het hulle bes gedoen om enige vriendskap tussen ons te ontmoedig, sonder om ooit 'n behoorlike rede daarvoor te gee. Ek het eers jare later uitgevind wat die rede daarvoor was, en toe het dit in elk geval ook nie meer saakgemaak nie. Ons was só – en sy hou twee knopperige vingers omhoog – "en dit het omtrent vir negentig jaar so aangehou, totdat sy dertien jaar gelede oorlede is. As dit nie vir Lizzie was nie sou my kinderjare sielsaliglik ongelukkig gewees het. Natuurlik was die voëls ook daar. Waar die twee van ons ookal gegaan het was daar voëls; gewoonlik was dit hulle wat ons gewaarsku het as ons ouers op pad was.

"Ek weet nie hoe dit gebeur het nie, maar vandat ek baie klein was, was daar 'n spesiale verstandhouding tussen ons en die voëls. Petronella het my eenkeer vertel hoe hulle om my stootwaentjie gefladder het as hulle my vroegdag buite onder die bome gelos het om te slaap. Aanvanklik het sy probeer om hulle te verwilder, bang dat hulle op my komberse sou skyt, maar hulle het nooit nie; en op die ou ent het sy my alleengelos by hulle. Hulle het my as't ware opgepas. Een keer, is ek later vertel, het hulle begin skreeu en kwetter toe 'n slang na die stootwaentjie op pad was; en toe die slang nie omdraai nie, het hulle die indringer bloot begin aanval. Selfs die vinkies en wewers en stompsterte het aan die aanval deelgeneem, en dit het groter voëls gelok, en net toe Petronella buitentoe kom om te sien wat die kabaal veroorsaak, het 'n valk neergeswiep en met die geelslang weggevlieg.

"Maar ek het tog menslike geselskap benewens die van Lizzie begeer, en dit is my grootliks ontsê aangesien Hermanus Johannes en Petronella onhebbelik jaloers geraak het

die oomblik as daar mense op die plaas aangekom het, selfs al was dit huisvriende of bure. Dit was 'n lewe van ontsettende ontbering.

"Wat dit nog moeiliker vir my gemaak het was die familie se ondervindinge in die Boereoorlog. Hier in die Kaapkolonie, natuurlik, was ons grotendeels buitekant die aksie, en my pa-oupa was veels te oud om eers daaraan te dink om betrokke te raak; maar my oombroers is al drie deur die oorlog verswelg: Willem is op die slagveld gedood, Barend is tereggestel as 'n Kaapse rebel, en Martiens het aan disenterie omgekom in Bermuda."

"En wat van Eulalie?" vra ek.

"Dood in die konsentrasiekamp by Bethulie, met al haar kinders. Die familie was vas oortuig dat die Engelse haar gemaalde glas gevoer het. Ons het 'n klein fyngeborduurde lappie gekry wat sy gemaak het, kompleet met haar naam daarop asook haar geboorte- en sterfdatums. Sê jy nou vir my hoe't sy dit geweet."

"Die Wepeners was seker gebroke," sê ek.

"Hulle het oornag oud geword, dit kan ek jou sê. Skielik het die toekoms in hulle gesigte toegeklap. Geen seuns om oor te neem nie, en natuurlik het net seuns saakgemaak. Ek was al wat hulle oorgehad het. G'n wonder hulle het so ondraaglik besittig geraak nie.

"Saliglik het ek teen die tyd vriende gemaak met 'n ou Joodse smous wat gereeld die plaas twee keer 'n jaar besoek het; hy het my liefde vir lees ontdek en, omdat ek uit ondervinding geweet het hoe my ouers sou reageer (slegs die Bybel en Petronella se ensiklopedie is in ons huis toegelaat – ek sal jou later meer daaroor vertel), het hy my gou skelm van boeke begin voorsien. Lizzie het hulle vir my in haar huis weggesteek, omdat ons geweet het niemand sou so laag daal as om soontoe te gaan nie, en soos wat ek hongerig alles verslind het wat ou Moïse sy hande op kon lê, het die lewe 'n bietjie meer draaglik geword.

"Hy was 'n wonderlike ou man. Ek het altyd gedink hy lyk soos 'n profeet uit die Ou Testament. Sy familie het al die pad van Litaue af na Afrika getrek en die mees ongelooflike ontberinge oorleef. Hy het altyd gesê dat twee dinge hom gered het. Lag en stories. As mens die twee dinge het, het hy volgehou, kon niks jou gees doodmaak nie. In die Talmoed staan daar geskrywe, het hy my vertel, dat God mense geskep het om vir Hom stories te vertel, maar later het hulle ongelukkig van Hom vergeet, hulle het selfs vergeet dat hulle self stories was wat eerste deur God vertel is. En van toe af, as mens ou Moïse kan glo, het mans en vrouens vir mekaar stories vertel. Om die gat te vul wat ontstaan het nadat die Groot Storieverteller aan die slaap geraak het. Hy kon die ongelooflikste stories oor sy eie lewe vertel, en elke keer was dit anders. Vir hom was die lewe een groot feesviering. Hy't my altyd vertel hoe, toe hy nog 'n kind was, en brandarm, hy geld verdien het deur by begravinge te huil. Vir 'n doodgewone vertoning kon hy 'n sjelings verdien, vir 'n goeie weeklaag het hy vyf sjelings verdien. En as hy so hartverskeurend gehuil het dat hy in die graf ingeval het, kon dit selfs 'n pond wees. Nodeloos om te sê, het hy omtrent altyd in die graf beland en moes hy uitgehys word. Dis hoe hy genoeg bymekaargekry het om sy besigheid te begin. G'n wonder dat ou Moïse se stories en boeke my van eensaamheid gered het nie, selfs al het hy net tweemaal 'n jaar gekom.

"Vandat ek sestien of sewentien was het die jongmanne oor naweke begin besoek aflê. Maar hulle is summier deur die Wepeners weggewys. Dit was eers nadat die veremerk in duie gestort het toe die Groot Oorlog uitbreek het wat hulle meer geneë begin raak het dat ek moes trou. Danksy Petronella se ensiklopedie is ons die ergste gespaar – die het haar aangespoor om te begin diversifiseer nog lank voor die ineenstorting. Maar die beter geleenthede in die Klein Karoo het begin verdwyn namate die een na die ander volstruisplaas bankrot gespeel het. En ek het ook nie jonger geword nie. Ek het nie 'n duit omgee nie, ek was nie van plan om te trou net om ander tevrede te stel nie. Ek het nog altyd van iets anders gedroom, iets groter, iets buitengewoon, al kon ek nie die woorde vind om dit te verduidelik nie. Hermanus Johannes Wepener het gedink ek's 'n heks. Miskien het hy ook rede gehad.

"In elk geval, iets moes gedoen word, en nadat sy al die potensiële kandidate deurgekyk het, het Petronella op Francois Basson besluit – dié sou een van die grootste plase in die Klein Karoo erf. En wat meer was, die plaas het aan Sinai gegrens. Alles is tussen die twee



families gereël: eers het die mans bymekaargekom en toe is die vrouens ingelaat op die reëlings. Hulle was vas oortuig dat hulle my gered het van oujongnooiskap, 'n lot erger as die dood. Niemand het my opinie gevra nie. Die huwelik het tog niks met persoonlike gevoelens te doen gehad nie, het hulle geglo. Dit was bloot 'n vorm van ruilhandel om aliansies te verstewig of rykdom te konsolideer of om die erfposisie te verseker. En 'n jong vrou soos ek was die geldeenheid."

"So toe't Ouma seker geweier?"

"Natuurlik wou ek hulle almal in hulle peetjie instuur. Maar die simpel feit was dat ek inderwaarheid vir Francois Basson se sjarme geval het. Daar was 'n wilde streep in die man wat ek net nie kon weerstaan nie. Die oomblik wat die huwelik vasgestel is het die Wepeners 'n blinde oog gekeer. En die vryheid was bedwelmend. Vir die eerste keer het ek 'n smakie gekry van hoe die lewe weg van Sinai kon wees. Ek en Francois het vir ure gaan perdry, oor die vlaktes gallop, reg tussen die oorblewende troppe volstruise deur dat jy net sien vere waai het. Party aande het hy my weggevoer na die dam op hulle plaas en dan sou ons nakend in die water baljaar. Vir die eerste keer het ek persoonlik die passies ervaar wat die Meisie so openlik op die mure van die kelder uitgestal het. Dit was nie liefde nie. Dit was wellus.

"Maar skaars 'n maand voor die troue is dit afgestel. Die burgemeester se dogter, Letitia Meyer, het aangekondig dat sy Francois se kind verwag. As dit enigiemand anders was is ek seker die Basson's sou hulle omgekoop het. Maar die burgemeester was 'n ander saak. En op die dag waarop ons sou trou is die tweetjies toe getroud.

"Ek was verpletter. Eers heelwat later het ek beseef hoe 'n noue ontkoming ek gehad het. Want Francois het 'n slagpat uitgedraai. Hy het geen ware belangstelling in boer gehad nie, en na sy ouers se dood het hy begin om al hulle opgegaarde rykdom te verspil. Letitia is met geboorte dood en die kind het dit ook nie gemaak nie. Francois het agteruit begin gaan. Dit was 'n lang en pynlike proses om dop te hou – dit het jare geneem. Hulle sê hy het op die einde in die middae op sy voorstoep gesit en reguit uit die bottel gedrink terwyl hy die bobbejane dophou wat sy wingerde uit die Swartberge binneval – die familie was een van 'n handvol wat na wingerde oorgeslaan het kort na die wingerdluise gekom en gegaan het: met die gevolg dat hulle van die mees suksesvolle oorlewendes was nadat die veremark in duie gestort het. Maar dit het nie meer saakgemaak nie. In die vroeë dertigerjare, tydens die Groot Depressie, het hy sy limiet bereik. Terwyl hy die bobbejane dopgehou het waar hulle sy wingerde geplunder en sy pampoene en patatlande verwoes het, het hy onbeheersd aan die lag geraak, sy bottel geswaai en vir hulle geskreeu, "Julle bliksems, geniet dit terwyl julle nog kan! Ek gaan die hele plaas onder julle gatte uitsuip!" En op die ou ent het hy paraffien oor die huis uitgegooi en dit aan die brand gestee, toe sy breins uitgeblaas met sy haelgeweer, net daar op die stoep met die bobbejane wat toekyk.

"Die plaas is verkoop, dit het nog een of twee keer van eienaars verwissel. 'n nuwe huis is gebou, en op die ou ent het Kasper dit natuurlik gekoop. Hy wou so naby as moontlik aan Sinai kom. Maar dis 'n ander storie.

"Nog lank voor Francois se lot hom getref het, is my eie noodlot bepaal. Ten minste het die Wepeners en Bassons hulle allerbeste gegee. As ek nie met die oudste Bassonbroer kon trou nie, wat dan van die tweede oudste, Cornelis Frederik? Nog 'n maal het die patriarge byeengekom, die vrouens is ingeroep, en 'n besluit is geneem. Maar die keer was ek hardkoppig. Francois het my kop met sy wildheid gedraai. Maar jong Cornelis Frederik was anders. Nie dat daar enigiets met hom verkeerd was nie, teen daardie tyd was daar al twee idiote in die familie, maar hy was nie een van hulle nie. Die probleem was bloot dat hy my verveel het. Cornelis was te goed, te standvastig, te behoorlik om waar te wees.

"Maar wat kon ek doen? Watter ander hoop het ek gehad as om te trou? Ek was al sewe en twintig. Maar steeds het ek vasgeskop. Ek is gesmeek, mee geraas, en geslaan. Die inspanning het amper vir Hermanus Johannes 'n beroerte besorg; hy moes vir dae in die bed bly. Ek het geweier om bes te gee. Weereens het die troep ou manne deur die huis masjeer. Dominee Hechter. Al die ouderlinge, eers een-een, toe in een sombere, indrukwekkende, swartgeklede konklaaf. Toe die suurgat susters van die gemeente.

Hoekom? Hoekom? Hoekom? Wou hulle weet. Omdat hy my nie nat maak nie, het ek vir hulle gesê. Ek wens jy kon hulle sien.

"Ek het hulle daar gelos, maar nie in oorwinning nie, eerder in verslaendheid. Al mag dit dalk nie so gelyk het nie was ek naby aan oorgee. Ek het myself belowe dat as ek die geringste vonkie in Cornelis kon wakkermaak, ek sou ja sê. Maar dit was onmoontlik. Ons ouers het ooglopend gereël om ons saam te laat – te laat? Ons is aan mekaar opgedring – om `n vorm, enige vorm, van band te smee. Ek het my enkel vir hom gewys, my knie, `n blik op my dy. Ek het in daardie dae nogal mooi bene gehad, kan ek jou sê. Hy het gepraat van God's wil en die voersoeke van die vlees. Een aand hier in die tuin het ek `n laaste wanhopige poging aangewend. Kyk, het ek vir hom gesê, as jy my wil hê, om hemelsnaam, vat my dan. Vat my nou of los my vir altyd. Hy het dit van die hand gewys. Sonder waarskuwing het ek my klere van my lyf gestroop en vir hom gedans, `n fantastiese, buitensporige, bacchantiese dans. Dit moes vir hom `n angswekkende ervaring gewees het, besef ek nou, toe ek soos `n besete dier rondgehol het en myself in struik en bosse neergewerp het, in boomstamme en die hoenderkamp vasgehardloop het in `n stofwolk en in hoendermis getrap het. Uiteindelik, uitasem, pap en uitgeput het ek in sy arms geval. Hy het `n manmoedige poging aangewend om my terug te kry in my klere terwyl hy sagte en vertroostende woordjies gefluister het, dinge soos, "My liewe kindjie, my arme klein dogtertjie," al was hy nie veel ouer as ek nie, en toe ek uiteindelik met behulp van ons albei se lomp pogings weer om en by behoorlik was het hy aangebied om vir my te bid. Arme man. Ek het hom gegryp waar dit duidelik onhanteerbare pyn veroorsaak het en met al die krag wat ek nog bymekaar kon skraap het ek gedraai; as daar enigsens meer daarvan was sou ek dit geknoop het, maar daar was `n jammerlike tekort."

"En toe't Ouma hom weggejaag?"

"Nee. Die volgende week het ek sy huweliksaanbod aanvaar," sê sy.

"Ouma het ja gesê?"

"Ek het. Jy sien, dit het by my opgekom dat daar nog vyf Basson-broers was, idiote uitgesluit. En die blote gedagte dat ek deur dieselfde sirkus met almal van hulle sou moes gaan – want die familie was vasbeslote om Sinai te bekom – was een te veel vir my. Selfs al het dit gevoel of ek my doodsvonnis onderteken. Om die waarheid te sê, ek het in die geheim onderneem om selfmoord te pleeg voor die huweliksdag. Gelukkig, soos wat dinge uitgedraai het, was so `n drastiese stap onnodig."

"Wat het toe gebeur?"

"`n Ingryping van Bowe. Op een van sy besoeke het ou Moïse nie net handelsware en smokkelboeke saamgebring nie, maar ook sy nefie. En die oomblik wat ek oë op Jethro gelê het, het die nattigheid gekom. Hy was vyf en twintig, hy het in Parys studeer, hy het die stem van `n engel gehad – nie dat ek ooit een gesien of gehoor het nie, maar ek het net geweet. Hy was die enigste man wat ek ooit ontmoet het wat gemaak is om by my te pas, die enigste een wat my daarvan kon red om te trou. `n Man wat ek kon liefhê, mee kon baklei, en die wêreld aan die brand kon steek. Hy kon musiek maak op sy kitaar wat die sterre kon laat dans en die maan laat kantel. Hy het die mees ongelooflike hande gehad wat ek ooit aan `n man gesien het, en die witste vel, die swartste oë, die wonderlikste mond. Hy het teruggekom om `n jaar by sy grootoom deur te bring (blykbaar was sy ouers oorlede) en om `n bietjie geld te verdien; dan sou hy weer terugkeer Europa toe. Om wat te doen? Om te sing en te dans en te skryf en te leef." Haar oë, wat die hele tyd toe was, flikker oop en `n glimlag pluk aan haar mondhoeke.

Ek neem `n diep teug asem. "Jethro was die man in die skildery?" vra ek met `n gevoel van gewaarwording.

"Natuurlik."

"En julle het weggehardloop?"

"Ja en nee. Ek het eers probeer om die regte ding te doen. Op die laaste dag voordat ou Moïse en Jethro sou vertrek het ek met die Wepeners gepraat. Hulle kon hulle ore nie glo nie, soos wat jy jou kan indink. En ten spyte van al die verwyte wat ek teen hulle opgebou het my lewe lank, kon ek nie anders as om hulle jammer te kry nie. Alles wat hulle oor die jare probeer bereik het, vir hulle self en vir my, het om hulle in duie gestort. Toe sê

Hermanus Johannes, my pa-oupa, iets wat alles verander het. Sy gesig het vertrek asof hy op die punt was om beroerte te kry. (Dit was, om die waarheid te sê toe tog 'n beroerte wat sy dood veroorsaak het skaars 'n maand of so nadat ek weg is.) Hy het na Petronella gedraai en met 'n woede wat ek selde in my lang lewe teëgekrom het, het hy teenoor haar uitgespoeg, "Slegte bloed sal uit. Dis Rachel se skuld. Dit kom van jou af. Daar was nooit enigiets soos die aan my kant van die familie nie."

"Waarvan praat julle?" het ek gevra.

"Hy het Petronella aan die skouers gegryp. 'Vertel jy haar,' het hy geskree.

"En dit was waar ek die eerste keer van my ma gehoor het."

## Part II: Chapter 12-14 (SK:143-153)

### 12

"I am her only blood," Ouma Kristina says after taking another deep breath of oxygen. "And the first time I heard about her was on the day that I told the Wepeners about my plan to marry Jethro. To this day I've learned little more, even though I've searched every nook and cranny of this house over the years for clues. But there's nothing. Only the paintings. And me, her daughter, as I only discovered on that remarkable day.

"And then you ran away with Jethro?"

"What else was there to do? Hermanus Johannes would have shot me on the spot. Petronella wasn't quite as bad; to tell you the truth, she later told me that she silently approved. Finally one of her offspring could join the Jews and return to the sea."

"Is that what you did? – returned to the sea?"

"Not exactly. First we went to the Cape, yes, but only to catch a boat. Old Moishe arranged everything through a network of family and friends. And that is how we went overseas."

"Where did you go?"

"We went to Persia," she says without blinking an eye. "Baghdad."

"On a magic carpet, I suppose?" I ask with a hint of sarcasm.

She looks up at me unperturbed. "I'm not asking you to believe me, Kristien," she says. "Only to listen."

Still somewhat irritated, I decide to please her. "How was it?"

"From the air it was incredible. All the minarets and domes and towers and things, gold as far as the eye could see. Something like I imagined the New Jerusalem to be, you know, covered in jasper and rubies. All my childhood reading from Revelations and the books old Moishe brought along – my favourite was "The Arabian Nights" – made our arrival seem like a homecoming. Almost too good to be true."

"Didn't Jethro get into trouble?" I ask primly. "Seeing that he was a Jew and everything?"

Her eyes flicker, but I can't quite decide whether it's in amusement or scorn. "You don't miss a thing, do you?" she says. "But that only happened afterwards. At the beginning – I mean, how could they know? I was the only one who saw him without clothes. A picture of a man, I must add."

"Other men in the Middle East are also circumcised."

"Are you telling the story or am I?" An irritated nod of her head on its slender stem. "In any case, it's not as if I'm talking about the Middle East, I'm talking about Persia."

"And how did you manage to find a place to stay?"

"I told you old Moishe had contacts everywhere because of his trading. And Baghdad was filled with traders, they went back and forth across all seven seas. In fact, the first man who put us up was called Sindbad. Not *the* Sindbad, of course, but, I believe, one of his descendants. He showered us with the most valuable gifts and showed us everything these was to see. The days were unbearably hot, but in the evenings it cooled off, and at sunset we used to walk to the outskirts to watch the camels in the palm trees singing Latin psalms. There was a feast every night, sometimes in Sindbad's palace, or else with friends. With - what is it that they call those girls? – obelisks, and eunuchs, and veiled dancers, and

storytellers, and the most wonderful food and drink, and opium pipes, and perfume. During the day we were left to our own devices. Jethro wrote poems, or sang, he had a beautiful voice, and I painted. I always loved drawing and painting, and once the Wepeners realised that I was only interested in painting landscapes and still-lives, they left me in peace. But in Baghdad I could give my imagination free reign. There was no stopping my talent. I must have painted hundreds of portraits of Jethro."

"And was it obvious on all of them that he was Jewish?"

"More on some, less on others."

"But why didn't you just stay there forever?"

"Because there's a snake in every Paradise, my child. Whether it's Valhalla or Nirvana, or whatever they call the place in Persia. And this particular snake was a man with the name of Achim Sidi Achim. One of the most powerful noblemen in Baghdad, a family friend of the Great Fisherman. He was still fairly young, not even forty, and quite something to look at, in a Persian kind of way, I mean. So, to cut a confusing story short, he went and fell in love with me. And he wanted to marry me come hell or high water. There was no problem for him, since Jethro and I were not married according to Persian law. Neither according to any other law, come to think of it. And Achim Sidi Achim only had three hundred wives, so there was room for quite a few more in his harem. Those Persian men, I tell you –

"In any case, Achim Sidi Achim began calling on me late afternoons when Jethro was out with his friends. I tried my best to dissuade him, but he wouldn't listen to reason. He could easily have had Jethro killed quietly, they have a very refined way of doing things in Persia, but since he loved me so much, he decided rather to take the honourable route and challenged Jethro to a duel. It could all have worked for the best. Jethro was a wonderful swordsman. But the problem was that such duels were, according to Persian tradition, fought in the nude. It's part of the code of honour of those sword fighters – what do you call them again?"

"Samurai?" I offer without batting an eyelid.

"That's right. Well, and then Jethro was, you could say, unmasked well and truly in front of all the noblemen and courtiers and things. And he was hardly out of his pants or a large shout went up: 'Heathen! Heathen!'

"But as I already told you, Jethro was a remarkable swordsman. With a quick movement of his wrist he slashed in the direction of Achim Sidi Achim's manhood, and cleanly took off only the foreskin, nothing more and nothing less."

"Right,' he said, 'now it's a fair fight. Let's fight to the death.'

"But of course he didn't have a chance against that bunch of madmen. I was prepared to throw myself in front of him to protect him from the crowd with my body, but that sort of thing only happens in stories. I was much too bewildered, and the only thing I could think of was to get away as quickly as possible. There was no time for packing. All I could think of was to throw one of Jethro's burnouses over my head – I think that's what it's called – and to hide one of the small paintings of Jethro in it's folds. And then I left."

"But how did Ouma get back all the way from Baghdad?"

"I need not burden you with that."

"An elephant came and blew the story away?"

"It wasn't as easy as all that," she admonishes. "I had to walk hundreds of miles through the Gobi desert. Thousands. After a while a passing caravan picked me up and took me back all the way to England where I caught a steamboat back home. At that stage, of course, I had already realised that I was pregnant. Only then I started wondering whether it wouldn't have been better to stay and die on the body of my lover. But it was too late for tears. I had to consider the future. For the sake of the perfect love I knew with Jethro. And the only thing I had to console me was the baby inside of me, and one small painting. Now that is also lost. Like everything else."

She is so weak that I'm beginning to wonder whether she's going to survive the night. But her willpower pulls her through: undoubtedly the same willpower that made it possible for her to escape the angry mob in Baghdad and survive in the desert. The oxygen also helps a little when I help her to press the mask on her shrivelled-up face.

"Where was I?" she eventually asks in a little gasp.

"We can carry on tomorrow. Now you first have to rest."

"Where was I?" she repeats, and I realise that there is no chance of getting her to stop now.

"On your way back from Baghdad," I say resignedly.

"That's right. Yes, that's it." Apparently she is trying to collect her thoughts.

"Wasn't the family rather upset when you came back?"

She begins to talk again and her thoughts sound less confused. The brief pause must have helped after all.

"Hermanus Johannes Wepener died from a stroke shortly after I left, I think I already told you that. But Petronella was delighted to see me. She hadn't aged well. It was almost pathetic to see how dependent she had become on me. The last few months of her life – she was over eighty when I returned and she didn't last much longer – we got to know each other better than ever before. As death approached, she began to talk more openly about Rachel. On the night of her death she really tried her best, but I suspect that by that time she no longer had the words for what she wanted to say."

"So it remained a mystery?"

"More or less. But she did say one thing – entirely unintentionally, I think – that opened an entirely different door to me. Just before she died, it was on the Sunday evening, Lizzie and I were with her. Suddenly she said with a strange smile: 'Yes, it's only right that the two of you are here. This is how it should be. Like sisters.' And then she passed away."

"You've lost me now."

"At first I didn't understand either. But it kept bugging me. And after the funeral I asked Lizzie whether she knew something I didn't. No, she replied, but she was also wondering. And then we went to see her decrepit old grandfather, Salie. He never spoke a single word to me as long for as I can remember. Always treated me like some kind of disease. But now there was nothing to hold him back any longer. His old spouse, Nenna, died while I was away, and I suppose Petronella's death finally made it possible for him to talk freely. Especially after I told him that Petronella spilled the beans in any case on her deathbed."

"But what on earth could he know about it?"

"He could have been my father."

I gape at her. "Come again?"

"It was one of the strangest and most terrible things I ever heard, Kristien. And even if it's impossible to prove it, the possibility still exists. He had nothing to lose."

"What was it, tell me?"

"Thirty-one years ago, he told us, Hermanus Johannes Wepener tried to seduce Salie's daughter Lida. At that time she was a mere child of twelve or thirteen. He tried to bribe her with beads, with a gold pound, and even with a ring full of shiny stones. But she was petrified and wouldn't hear of it. So he raped her."

My face has gone numb – I know what's coming, no matter how incredible it may seem.

"When Lida arrived back home with her dress covered in blood, Salie took a spade and went looking for Hermanus Johannes Wepener. But he must have expected something like that and was waiting for Salie with his gun. Salie had no choice but to turn back. But there was one thing he could do in revenge. He could do to the daughter of Hermanus Johannes Wepener what the man had done to his daughter. And that daughter was Rachel."

It's some time before I manage to more or less compose my thoughts. "But why didn't Wepener murder Salie? Didn't he even chase him off?"

"The day when old Salie told Lizzie and me was the first day he spoke a word about the matter. And of course Rachel didn't say a thing either. Neither Petronella nor Hermanus Johannes could therefore ever know for certain what had happened, irrespective of the

suspicions they may have harboured. And remember that he also had a guilty conscience. In the end they had each other by the balls. That's how men fight, isn't it?"

"But how can you be sure that that is what Petronella had meant on her deathbed?"

"I can't, and that's the point. No-one will ever know. Perhaps she herself only had an unfounded suspicion all those years. Or perhaps she looked it up in her encyclopaedia. But the how and the when are irrelevant, only the story matters. And that will never end."

14

Outside a nightjar calls. In the corner the owls shuffle. One flaps its wings and flies through the open window. In the next room I can hear Trui groan in her sleep.

"What about you, Ouma? I ask. "When you returned from abroad, pregnant and all: how on earth did you convince Cornelis Basson to marry you?"

"He didn't require any convincing. The moment he heard about my return, he came running. Said he'd been waiting for me. And he was in a hurry to get married, which suited me just fine. His parents disowned him when they heard about it, and that made things easier for the remaining brothers. Be that as it may, my own inheritance was more than enough for the two of us."

"Did you move here after Petronella's death?"

"Even before. We couldn't wait, my stomach was beginning to show. And this house is more than big enough to hide anything."

I hesitate and shake my hand which has gone numb from all the writing. Then I venture: "Did Cornelis really not care? Or didn't you tell him?"

"Of course I told him," she replies indignantly. "He turned white, but in his eyes I was incapable of wrong. A greater love had no one, shame. I'm sorry, I mean that in the best possible way. But it was nothing more than a practical arrangement, and he knew that full well."

"And yet it lasted half a century."

"Of course I never slept with him."

I look at her in astonishment, but her eyes remain shut; pure spite, I think. It's like the games we used to play as children: you make the most terrible face possible, and then turn your face away and take care not to look at the other person the entire day, then she can't do anything in return.

"Ouma never slept with him?" I repeat, flabbergasted. "But you had six children?"

"Nine. Three died in infancy."

"Then it must have been the Holy Ghost," I say sarcastically.

"Like Zeus, the Holy Ghost also assumed strange shapes in his day."

"I thought you were going to tell me the truth," I reproach her.

"No. I said you should come so that I can tell you stories."

"I'm no longer a child, Ouma," I say, more sharply than I intended.

"That would be a pity." Finally she opens her blue-veined paper-thin eyelids.

"Ouma Kristina –" I try to get a hold of myself. She's dying, I tell myself; she has the license of approaching death, of which I know nothing. "Tell me this: if Ouma felt so strongly not to sleep with Oupa, why didn't you just raise Jethro's child alone?"

"That's what I also wondered afterwards. It's easy to know what to do after the fact. But then, pregnant and alone – I'm afraid I allowed myself be guided by what others would think. But that was the last time, I swear. I had to make a sacrifice for the child's sake, so that it could have a name."

"And the other children?"

She shrugs. "Most women regards piety and devotion as their fate in life. I decided I would prefer to be judged according to my sins. At least it wasn't as boring." A tired but amused grin. "In any case, I realised that I rather liked being pregnant. Not raising children. And definitely not the fathers bugging me. That's why I left most of the work for Lizzie. But to expect – that sense of completion, to be entirely self-sufficient, to cover myself entirely. To feel my body ripen like a watermelon, to feel my breasts fill with milk – it was amazing to

lie on my back and watch the milk oozing from my nipples and running over my body, under my arms; and when I pushed myself up on my elbows, it ran down my stomach and over my raised bellybutton, in into my pubic hair, and down my thighs – in my imagination I could see it run across the floor, out of the door, over the veld, until ants gathered from all over, following the trickles, covering me – it was a kind of fulfilment like I've never experienced otherwise. Call me crazy if you like. We all need our own kind of craziness, otherwise we'll shrivel up and die."

"I still can't believe that you really thought it necessary to marry Oupa."

"I married him for the same reason that Petronella married Hermanus Johannes Wepener. For the reason most women get married."

"Which is?"

"Because we aren't allowed to lead an independent life that is worthwhile. So we play along. As long as we can derive our value and authority from a man, we are accepted. Mrs. Cornelis Basson. God, have you any idea how I fought against that name? It was as if I negated myself. But what else could I do, in 1921? With that name I could look the world in the eye. It was a passport, something making even a widow respectable, or a divorced woman. As long as you don't try to go it alone. If you do tackle it by yourself, you can shout until you're blue in the face, no one will listen. Not because you're speaking too softly, but because no one listens. That's why we try to survive as best we can. The first step is always the hardest. After that everything is make-believe."

I stare at her, uncertain of my own feelings.

"Don't look at me like that," she says. "Why don't you say anything?"

"What about love?" I ask awkwardly, thinking: Jesus, how corny can you get?

But she realises that I'm being serious. "I loved Jethro. At least, I think I did. There was a time when I thought I loved Francois Basson. But love is never so absolute that you can't imagine it with someone else."

This time it takes a long time before I speak again; she lies waiting patiently, with only a hint of amusement on her face. (We have to stop now, I think; she could hardly last much longer, she must be exhausted. But like her, I don't know how much time we have left.)

"Did you ever tell Mother, Ouma? About Jethro, I mean. That Oupa wasn't her father."

"I think that was my only indiscretion. Some things should rather remain a secret. I used to think the truth was everything. But some people can't handle the truth. And Louisa was one of those."

"When did you tell her?"

"She must have been about thirteen. The worst possible time, I realised afterwards. But I paid for it. She never trusted me again."

"She never mentioned anything," I remark. "But then, she never discussed anything with me." I hesitate. "And the other children? Did you tell them too?"

"No. When I saw what it did to Louisa, I decided to keep quiet. You learn your lesson, even if it is too late."

For the first time in my life I feel curious about my mother: that cold, proud, secretive woman I always disliked so intensely; whom I feared so. And Ouma Kristina, I can see, can't wait to tell me. The little, at least, that she knows.

## Addendum 5: Introduced impostulated direct narrative

### Part II: Chapter (9-)10 (IS:97-105)

#### 9

Die ou huis sug en draai in sy slaap, soos 'n spookskip wat lê en kreun op 'n donker see, sonder bestemming. Sy stilte is gevul met geheime lewe: voëls en knaagdiere, skarrelende insekte, Trui en Jeremia in hulle kamer, die vreemdeling in die kelder.

Soms raak haar stem heeltemal weg. Ek kan nie eers heeltemal seker wees dat wat sy sê is wat ek skryf nie. En wat ek haar hoor fluister raak vervleg met wat ek onthou, of blyk om te onthou, uit vroëre dae toe sy soortgelyke stories vertel het. Tog het ek die gevoel dat ons kommunikasie nie bepaal word deur iets so uiterlik soos 'n stem nie. Daar's 'n meer onmiddellike insinuering van wat sy sê op my bewussyn; sy artikuleer my skrywende hand.

Ek kry die gevoel, terselfdertyd ontsenuend en gerusstellend, dat ek besig is om iets te herwin: nie die story as sulks, opgeraap uit wat miskien of miskien ook nie deel van my geskiedenis kon gewees het nie, maar hierdie onverklaarbare drang van die werklike na die onwerklike, asof dit daarin die enigste regverdiging moet kry.

Ek weet dit sou Pa geskok het, en vir Ma ook; hulle eng Calvinisme het nie sulke versinsels geduld nie. Maar het hulle nie in die proses presies hierdie drang van die verbeelding misken wat ons in Afrika anker nie? Hierdie beelde uit 'n plek diep binne ons wat toentertyd neerslag gevind het in spookstories, en die stories en grappies en versinsels van reisigers en trekkers en smouse snags langs hulle waens, toe die magiese nooit verder weg was as 'n klipgooi of skietende vonke nie? Hoe hartseer tog – nee, hoe gevaarlik – om dit alles vir so lank te onderdruk het.

#### 10

“Ouma moet nou ophou praat”, sê ek vir haar. “Ouma is moeg. Ons kan later aangaan.”

“Nee. Ons weet nie hoeveel tyd ons nog het nie. En ek wil hê jy moet verstaan van my ma.”

“Later,” smeek ek.

Maar sy hou vol, en ek stel 'n kompromie voor: eers 'n paar slukkies suikerwater, dan suurstof. Dank Vader die apparaat werk foutloos. Van nou af, beveel ek haar, moet sy haar vertellings onderbreek met diep teue uit die noupassende suurstofmaskertjie. Haar stem bly swak, maar sy lyk minder uitgeput.

“Om te verstaan van my ma,” fluister sy, haar oë weer toe, asof sy in haar slaap praat, “moet jy eers meer weet van Petronella. Hoe sy hier gekom het, hoe sy haar lewe gevorm het, of ten minste probeer vorm gee het, hoekom sy met Hermanus Johannes Wepener getrou het. Haar ma was die Vet vrou van die Transvaal. Reg deur die gewelddadige jare van die Groot Trek, in 'n wêreld geskep deur mans, het sy oorleef deur meer mansgenoen as hulle te wees. Maar op die ou ent het die Geskiedenis haar vergeet. Ek sal jou later meer van haar vertel. Nou is dit eers Petronella se beurt.”

Petronella is gebore aan die mond van die Umgeni, 'n jaar of twee nadat die Boere en Zoeloes hulle laaste, fatale ontmoeting by Bloedrivier gehad het, net mooi toe die Engelse begin beplan het om die nuwe land wat die Voortrekkers uiteindelik oorwin het te annekseer. Die eerste paar jaar van haar lewe het die dogtertjie op die familieplaas teen die see gebly. Sy het dae op die strand deurgebring, omring deur die krokodille wat uit die rivier geseil en op die hoë sandbanke gaan lê het: omdat hulle so doodsbang was vir Wilhelmina het hulle meer betroubare kinderoppassers geword as enige hond. Partykeer, as Wilhelmina besigheid elders gehad het, kon sy vir klein Petronella omtrent heeltemal aan hulle sorg toevertrou, en dan het sy sandkastele gebou op die skoon uitgestrekte strand, of ingewikkelde patrone in die sand getrek, voordat sy teruggesit het as die gety inkom om gefasineerd toe te kyk hoe die hele dag se toegewyde arbeid vernietig word; sy't geweet sy



kon altyd weer die volgende dag van nuuts af begin. Ander kere het sy sommer net daar op 'n duin gesit, arms om haar bene gevou, en uitgestaar oor die oneindige Indiese Oseaan.

By een van hierdie geleenthede, toe haar ma haar op die strand by die krokodille gelos het voor sy haar besigheid gaan doen het, het Petronella 'n skip sien verbyvaar in die rigting van Port Natal, in volle seil. Dit was 'n gesig soos niks anders wat sy nog ooit gesien het nie, en dit sou haar drome vir jare daarna obsessee, selfs toe sy op haar oudag van haar kop af begin raak het. Terselfdertyd het dit vir haar gelyk na die oplossing vir al haar ma se probleme. Hulle moes vir hulle 'n skip bou, het sy die aand voorgestel, en sommer net wegseil oor die see tot hulle by 'n plek kom waar die Engelse hulle nooit weer sou kry nie. Maar Wilhelmina het die idee afgemaak: waar daar ookal see is, het sy gesê, sal daar vroeër of later ook Engelse wees. En as Natal geannekseer sou word, wat by die dag meer waarskynlik begin lyk het, sou die enigste oplossing wees om hulle rug op die see te keer en weer land in te trek, na die diepste binneland, waar die stam ten minste 'n tuisland kon vestig en vry wees.

Petronella was gebroke. Maar diep in haar hart het 'n vasberadenheid posgevat wat niks ooit weer sou kon uitwis nie. Sy was diepgrondiglik en amper fataal verlief op die see – nie 'n verliefdheid soos wat mens sal voel vir 'n idee of 'n saak of 'n landskap nie, maar 'n brandende, dringende en amper sensuele verbintenis. Sy sou die eerste moontlike geleentheid aangegryp het om weg te hardloop, terug see toe, as dit nie was dat haar ma, wat so iets te wagte moes gewees het, haar in die wa vasgebind gehou het totdat hulle hopeloos te ver weg was nie.

Hulle trek het uiteindelik tot ruste gekom langs 'n onbenullige klein stroompie wat deur die subtropiese plantegroei van die Noord-Transvaal gekronkel het, 'n streek wat kort vantevore binnegedring is deur 'n groep betreklik angswekkende godsdienstige fundamentaliste wat, oortuig daarvan dat hulle die lengte van Afrika deurkruis het, dit aangesien het vir die Nyl. Die Beloofde Land was naby. Ongelukkig het die gebied, ten spyte van die asemrowende natuurskoon en vrugbaarheid, ook geblyk om 'n doodsvallei te wees besmet met tsetsevlieë wat die beeste uitgeroei het, en malaria wat die mense uitgewis het.

Hier het Wilhelmina haar derde man begrawe (sy het altyd swakkelinge verpes, maar kon dit nie weerstaan om met hulle te trou nie) en ook die meeste van haar oorblywende kinders; haar hele wêreld het om haar in duie gestort. En net voor Petronella se twintigste verjaarsdag het haar ma uiteindelik die gees gegee – getrou aan haar natuur, nie met 'n whimper nie maar met 'n bang.

Twee van die jong meisietjie se broers, wat uit lojaliteit by hulle ma gebly het, miskien versterk deur hulle versigtigheid vir wat sy sou doen as hulle dit sou durf waag om hulle ongelukkigheid te verwoord, het besluit om terug te keer na die Oos-Kaap waar, wie weet, dit miskien moontlik sou wees om weer hulle familie se ou plase op te eis. Petronella se oorblywende suster het 'n maand na haar ma se dood getrou en Potchefstroom toe getrek, op daai stadium die hoofstad van die Transvaal. Petronella is agtergelaat met 'n enkele broer, Benjamin, wat klaarblyklik permanente breinskade opgedoen het as gevolg van 'n hou wat sy ma hom teen die kop gegee het met 'n ploeg nadat hy per ongeluk die skaar gebreek het. Broer en suster het teen hierdie tyd in 'n gehuggie gebly naby die bouwal van die huis waarin hulle moeder begrawe gelê het, op die buitewyke van Nylstroom.

Petronella, wat 'n streep godsdienstigheid weggehad het van 'n baie jong ouderdom af, het verskeie nagte met die gedwee Benjamin gekonfereer en besluit op 'n plan van aksie vir hulleself. Dit was eintlik alles baie voorspelbaar. In die tyd wat hulle daar gebly het, het sy alreeds meer as een keer probeer om 'n boot te bou om hulle terug te neem see toe, maar telkemale het 'n Goddelike ingryping tussenbeide getree. 'n Donderstorm, eenkeer, waarin die vreemde raam deur weerlig in puin gelê is; 'n ander keer het 'n groep swartes wat verbygekom het nadat hulle deur die trekkers van hulle voorvaders se grond verwyder is, die balke en planke, wat met moeite gesaag is, weggedra vir vuurmaakhout. Op die ou ent het haar ma 'n einde daaraan gemaak deur alle verdere pogings te verbied – en as Wilhelmina gepraat het, het hulle uit dure ondervinding geweet, het mens geluister.

Uiteindelik was Petronella nou vry om die droom wat haar lewe oorheers het na te volg. Hulle sou 'n skip bou, het sy haar vertraagde broer vertel, net daar op die oewer van die Nyl,

en dan sou hulle stroomaf dryf, rigting noord, totdat hulle die hoofstad van Egipte bereik het; daar sou hulle die magtiging van die heersende Farao kry om die Rooi See oor te steek en hulle weer aan te sluit by die volk van Israel van wie die Boere afgestam het. En so sou hulle die geluk vind waarvoor haar formidabele moeder haar lewe so vrugtelos opgeoffer het. Na haar voortdurende blootstelling aan die herinneringe van haar moeder en die versteurde profete onder hulle bure, was daar 'n heel verstaanbare verwarring in Petronella se gemoed tussen die Beloofde Land en daardie strook sand langs die see wat vorm aan haar bewussyn gegee het gedurende haar vroegste jare en wat ook die enigste vryheid was wat sy ooit in haar lewe toegelaat is. Maar hierdie was nie sommer 'n gier nie, het sy Benjamin verseker. God het dit persoonlik aan haar geopenbaar in 'n nagtelike besoek, dat daar 'n nuwe sondvloed oppad was; en tensy hulle voorbereid was, sou hulle weggesleur word soos die sondaars van die Ou Testament, die een bron waaraan sy haar toegewyde lewe gemeet het. Hierdie besoeke was deel van haar lewe vandat die familie by die trek weg van die beleerde Natalse kus aangesluit het; en soos wat Petronella tot adoloesensie ontwikkel het, het dit gelyk of God meer en meer entoesiasties geraak het oor hierdie toenemend dwingende ontmoetings met sy diensmeisie. En dit het gelyk of sy ook, moet mens byvoeg, besonder buitensporige en verdagte lyflike plesier daaruit geput het.

Hier moet dit dan nou ook gemeld word dat Petronella verbasend bedrewe was in die lees- en skryfkuns, hoofsaaklik danksy die opleiding van die voorste profetes van die stam, Tante Mieta Gous, wat die meisie beskou het as 'n moontlike opvolger. Hierdie mal ou skepsel het twee ster-leerlinge gehad, Petronella en 'n seun met die naam Petrus Landman. (Die enigste rede hoekom hy hier melding verdien is dat dit, na alle waarskynlikheid, hy was wat vir Petronella die idee van die ark ingeprent het: hierdie Petrus het haar vertel van een of ander vêriangse voorsaak van hom wat 'n skip gebou en weggeseil het, die woestyn in, en dit moes waarskynlik vorm gegee het aan die drang wat sy nog altyd gehad het om weg te seil.) Wat interessant was, sover dit Petronella aangegaan het, was dat sy haar lewe lank inspirasie gekry het uit net twee bronne – die Bybel, natuurlik, en 'n geïllustreerde Hollandse ensiklopedie van twyfelagtige oorsprong – beide gered uit die huis waarin haar moeder gesterf het. Die ensiklopedie sou sy gebruik vir profesie, soos sy dit gesien het, alhoewel ander dit eerder as fortuinvertelling bestempel het. Petronella se tegniek was gerusstellend eenvoudig. Sy sou stip na haar besoeker kyk, haar oë toemaak, en in 'n soort trans ingaan, waarna sy die groot boek op sy rug sou neersit en laat oopval waar dit ookal wou. Daar sou sy die kolomme vinnig bespied, en die eerste frase of illustrasie wat haar oog vang neem as 'n beginpunt, en haar beskermgees, of wat dit ook al was, die res laat doen. Sy het tot haar dood toe aan hierdie praktyk vasgeklou. Die enigste vreemde ding omtrent die hele besigheid was dat haar voorspellings sonder uitsondering waar geword het.

Die eerste keer wat sy daarvan gebruik gemaak het was toe sy op die ouderdom van twaalf of dertien haar moeder so getart het dat sy gedreig het om haar met 'n gietysterpan by te dam: in haar haas om weg te kom het Petronella die ensiklopedie van die tambotie eetkamertafel afgestamp, en toe sy 'n prentjie van 'n leeu sien op die plek waar die bladsye oopgeval het, maak sy onmiddelik die voorspelling dat 'n roofdier hulle kudde sou vernietig as haar ma sou voortgaan met die loesing. Die moeder was nie beïndruk daardeur nie, maar toe die twee uit die huis gebars kom het een van die seuns van die rivier af aangehardloop gekom al skreeuend dat 'n hele trop leeus besig was om die kudde te bekruip en iemand moet asseblief so gou as moontlik 'n geweer kry en kom, maak gou, maak gou om Vaders naam.

Sedert daardie dag het Petronella se reputasie stadig maar seker deur die meeste van die Noord-Transvaal versprei, tot so 'n mate dat sy self begin glo het in haar profesieë (en hoekom nie, alles het dan waar geword?). G'n wonder dat haar visie van die komende sondvloed 'n redelike konsternasie in daardie afgeleë Godvresende gemeenskap veroorsaak het nie. En so het sy en haar broer toe begin bou, met die bystand van watter hulp hulle ook al kon bekostig van swartes in die omgewing en van bure wat of vrygewig genoeg was om hulle dienste aan te bied, of liggelowig genoeg om gehoor te gee aan haar voorspelling van nog 'n dreigende sondvloed. Die boot was, om die minste te sê, massief, sy afmetings geneem uit 'n noukeurige bestudering van Genesis: driehonderd el lank, vyftig

el breed, en dertig el hoog, met hier en daar 'n deur en venster in ooreenstemming met die aanwysings wat die Here God eens aan sy getroue dienskneg Noag gegee het.

Die een probleem was net dat daar nie goferhout in die omgewing was soos wat in Noag se aanwysings gestipuleer is nie, en ook nie kiaal soos wat die Hollandse ensiklopedie aanbeveel het nie; op die ou ent moes hulle maar regkom met tambotie en wilde olyf; en die boot het glad nie onaansienlik uitgekom nie, al was dit 'n effe groot en lomp (onder andere omdat hulle geen benul gehad het hoe om 'n el te meet nie) vir die skamele stroompie van die Nyl in daardie geweste. Om die waarheid te sê, die vaartuig het die vloei van die stroompie geheel en al opgedam, wat ligte oorstromings in die gebied veroorsaak het en 'n totale droogte laer af, wat 'n paar vyandige uitbarstings onder die boere wat hierdeur geraak is veroorsaak het. Maar dit het nie te lank aangehou nie, want daardie selfde nag wat die ark voltooi is, en slegs ure nadat Petronella en Benjamin op die onderste vlak ingetrek en die massiewe seile gehys het wat geskoei was op haar herinneringe aan die wonderbaarlike gesig jare gelede op die strand van Port Natal, het die vloed toe gekom en alles in sy pad weggespoel en die boot daarmee saamgesleur, al die pad tot in Egipte.

Dit, ten minste, was wat Petronella plegtig gesweer het vir al die jare daarna. Natuurlik was daar diegene wat die spot gedryf het met die storie en volgehou het dat die ark in die storm slegs 'n paar honderd voet van waar die vloed dit die eerste keer opgetel het gestrand het, en dat beide passasiers so erg beseer is, dat hulle houvas op die werklikheid om die minste te sê verdag was toe hulle uiteindelik, te voet, die pad na die Beloofde Land aangedurf het. Dit mag verklaar hoekom Petronella – toe hulle weer hulle opwagting in die beskaafde wêreld gemaak het, heeltemal van koers af, in Algoa Baai, amper twee jaar na die vloed – die wye sandstrook en duine langs die Oos-Kaapse kus vir die Sahara of Sinai woestyn aangesien het, of die kus van die Rooi See. Hoe dit ook al sy, het sy tot die dag van haar dood vas geglo dat sy Egipte bereik het, nadat sy die laaste paar honderd myl te voet gereis het, aangesien die ark langs die pad gedisintegreer het. Maar hoekom sal ons nou hare kloof? In Afrika is dit nie die moeite werd om 'n bohai op te skop oor 'n paar duisend myl suid of noord nie.

Wat wel belangrik is, is dat, kort na haar aankoms by wat sy maar as haar eerste bestemming beskou het, en terwyl sy nog gewag het vir 'n oudiensie met die farao (sy was vol vertrouwe dat 'n kort en kragtige verwysing na die omstandighede rondom die oorspronklike uittoeg voldoende sou wees om hom oor te haal om haar op alle moontlike wyses te help om die see na Palestina oor te steek), 'n heel skaflike man sy opwagting gemaak het. Sy naam was Hermanus Johannus Wepener, en hy het gekom om van sy produkte in die Baai te verkoop. Toe sy hom vertel dat sy wag vir 'n geleentheid Kanaan toe was hy maar te bly om te kon help. Daar kon moontlik een of ander misverstand gewees het iewers langs die pad want mens kan skaars glo dat hy haar so openlik sou mislei het; maar wat die spesifieke omstandighede ook al was, wat tog sekerlik weinig strekking in 'n storie het, hy het haar vertel – of sy het hom verstaan – dat hy haar langs 'n kortpad na die land Kanaan kon neem, landlangs eerder as oor die see. Sy was ontsteld dat sy die see moes agterlaat – sy't soveel daarvoor gedroom en so ver gereis om daar uit te kom – maar sy het die man se geselskap genoegsaam geniet om in te stem, op voorwaarde dat haar broer hulle sou vergesel. En uiteindelik het hulle hier in die Klein Karoo aangekom wat, daarvan het Hermanus Johannes Wepener haar verseker, net so goed, indien nie beter nie, as die land Kanaan was. Ek sou raai dat sy in die geheim vermoed het dat hulle steeds in Egipte was, wat sou verklaar hoekom die plaas die vreemde naam van Sinai gegee is.

Hermanus Johannes Wepener was gretig om te trou en 'n familie te begin, maar Petronella wou seker maak dat sy op hom kon staatmaak. Mens moet die situasie probeer verstaan waarin sy haar bevind het, selfs buiten die ontstellende godsdienstige streep wat sy gehad het. Haar ganse lewe, soos die res van die gebroeders tussen wie sy grootgeword het, is sy oorheers deur die oorweldigende figuur van haar moeder. Watter verskille hulle ook al gehad het, daardie formidabele moederfiguur was altyd daar, nie bloot op die agtergrond nie, maar rondom haar familie, as die finale arbiter tussen wat toelaatbaar en wat verbode was, tussen reg en verkeerd, goed en kwaad. Maar haar moeder kon die rol vervul bloot omdat sy so uitsonderlik was, in elke sin van die woord, lewensgroot. Petronella op

haar eie, 'n jong vrou letterlik gestrand op die kus van 'n onbekende oseaan, was niks werd nie, geheel en al niks. En Benjamin, so lojaal soos enige hangoorhond maar saf in die kop, het niks beteken nie.

G'n wonder dat sy haarself teruggetrek het, as dit haar gepas het, in die vesting wat haar oordadige godsdienstigheid gebied het nie; maar dit sou 'n fout wees, sou ek sê, om te dink dat sy mal was. Slinks was sy wel, uitgeslape, partykeer onheilspellend slim; maar nee, nooit mal nie. Daarvoor het ek haar te goed geken, te veel van haar werklike kwesbaarheid gesien. Terselfdertyd was daar niks bepland of uitgedink in die wyse waarop sy dit wat Hermanus Johannes Wepener geblyk het om aan te bied, aan te gryp nie. Wat sy waarskynlik eerder gedoen het was om die Hollandse ensiklopedie te raadpleeg wat so wonderbaarlik saam met haar aan die vloed ontkom het. En dan om wat ook al haar die beste gepas het daarin te lees, naamlik om haar te verbind aan hierdie grootgeboude, welgestelde, klaarblyklik respektabele man wat aan haar een of ander vorm van aansien in die wêreld kon waarborg. 'Aansien' was tog wat haar ma altyd gehad het, as gevolg van haar fisiese durf en haar woeste humeur toe sy jonger was, haar blote grootte in haar later jare. Op haar eie kon Petronella dit nie kry nie; en sy sou ook nie wou nie, vermoed ek, selfs al kon sy. Maar met Hermanus Johannes Wepener aan haar sy kon sy enige Beloofde Land onder die son binnegaan.

Maar steeds wou sy heeltomal seker wees, voordat sy haar aan hom verbind, dat hy vertrou kon word om haar bevele op elke vlak uit te voer, en haar terselfdertyd die sekuriteit en die aansien sou gee wat sy kon aanvoel sy nodig gehad het. Sy het haar aanstaande gevolglik sistematies aan die toets onderwerp met 'n reeks Herkuleaanse take, die laaste waarvan was om al die wingerde, wat die trots van sy plaas was, uit te ruk. Hermanus Johannes Wepener het aan al die maatreëls voldoen. En einde ten laas is hulle getroud en het hulle met prysenswaardige toewyding begin met 'n gesin. Eulalie, Willem, Barend en Martiens, en toe die kind van die noodlot, Ragel.

Iewers langs die pad het Benjamin verdwyn. Die Vader alleen weet wat van hom geword het. 'n Armsalige swakkeling vir die grootste deel van sy lewe, van die dag wat die ploeg alle hoop op 'n normale toekoms vermorsel het, kon hy netsowel wat onder omstandighede 'n natuurlike dood sou gewees het gesterf het. Of, soos sommiges oor die jare gespekuleer het, hy kon dalk die eerste inwoner van die kelder geword het nadat die huis voltooi is. Of, soos 'n anders storie dit wou hê, is hy miskien per ongeluk in een van die dik mure ingemessel. 'n Meer kwaadwillige gerug wou dit hê dat hy die pa was van die kind wat Ragel kort na haar veertiende verjaarsdag verwag het. Of erger nog, dat hy Ragel se pa was, in die plek van Hermanus Johannes Wepener toe dié weer op een van sy reise na Algoa Baai of die meer verafgeleë Kaap was. Maar daar is gate in elkeen van hierdie argumente; so hoekom enige een kies? Hy het dalk bloot op 'n dag saam met die voëls weggevlieg, of in 'n aardvarkgat ingekruip om nooit weer te voorskyn te kom nie: is dit enigsens meer vergesog as enige van die ander verduidelikings? Die storie het hom nie meer nodig nie, so kom ons los hom daar, net nog 'n geraamte in nog 'n kas.

In een opsig – ongelukkig die enigste opsig wat uiteindelik saakgemaak het – het Hermanus Johannes Wepener haar gefaal. Hy het haar nooit weer teruggeneem see toe nie. Met die gevolg dat, selfs na al die beproewinge waaraan sy hom onderwerp het, sy hom vir die res van haar lewe as 'n verraaiers beskou het, onwaardig om haar vertrou te geniet. Gevolglik was hulle huwelik 'n voortdurende oorlog wat epiese afmetings aangeneem het. Op die oppervlak, veral voor ander, was hulle die perfekte paartjie; maar onder die oppervlak het alle hel gewag om los te bars. Ek vermoed dat godsdiens vir Hermanus Johannes Wepener die sekerste manier was om in die samelewing opgang te maak; Petronella het verlief geneem met die storms en teleurstellings van die getroude lewe want lyding was God se manier om sy onmeetbare liefde te betoon. En ook omdat – hiervan het beide die Bybel en die ensiklopedie haar verseker – dit in elk geval tot 'n einde moes kom.

Selfs na veertig jaar se getroude lewe het sy steeds die plaas beskou as 'n tydelike vesting, 'n waterput in die woestyn waarvandaan hulle uiteindelik sou vertrek na hulle werklike bestemming. En dit, sou ek raai, verduidelik die huis. Sy het dit nooit as 'n huis

beskou nie. Dit was haar finale boot, haar skip, haar ark, om haar te verlos van die korrupte wêreld; die vaartuig waarin sy, wanneer dit die Here God sou behaag, sou seil na die see wat elke aand oor die kus van haar drome gespoel het.

## Part VI: Chapter 2-3 (SK:382-390)

### 2

She was looking at me when I came in: that special look of hers that neither asks questions nor accuses or reproaches; it merely seems to say: *There you are*. I sat down in my usual spot. She began with her story. One that I've heard before, in many guises, when it had been nothing more than a story; before it became part of our history. Shorter than most of the others, but as unsettling. She spoke; I wrote. And this is what became part of my past:

After Kamma changed into a tree and was carried away by the birds, her children stayed with the tribe. I can't say exactly how many of them there were, probably about four or five; most of them were indistinguishable from the other Khoikhoi, but there was one, the eldest, a girl, that looked nothing like them, tall and slender, with long blonde hair. She definitely didn't take after her father, that is, Adam Oosthuizen, the giant with the red beard; but perhaps there were traces of her mother's family. It could also be, some of the Khoikhoi reasoned, that she was conceived from the communion between her mother and some exotic bird. But regardless of where she got her exotic beauty, what's important is that the tribe exalted her for it; but that it would eventually also be her downfall. Or her salvation, depending on who you refer to. What happened was the following: one day a group of farmers arrived at the settlement from the far-away Colony. At the time there were an increasing number of these trekkers who started taming life in the interior, which is just another way of saying that they destroyed everything in their path like a pack of wild dogs as they apparently came to spread civilisation. The land had to be tamed and invaded and pacified and conquered, the whole nine yards.

What exactly brought that particular group of farmers, lead by a highly respected and honourable man by the name of David Hartman, to that place, we have no way of knowing. It could be that they were on a hunting trip, or on a scouting trip like many others, before and after, or one of the die-hards in search of that mythical land of gold in the interior; it is also possible that they were there specifically because they were trying to get to the bottom of persistent rumours that had been doing the rounds about a strange blonde girl among the barbarians in the interior. All that really matters, is that they arrived one day at the place where the tribe was living at that stage, on the brink of a black pool of water that was so deep that you couldn't see the bottom; and that they then spotted the girl.

They tried to enquire who she was and how she got there; but although she was could help herself in Dutch, which she learned from her mother, she didn't want to say much; and the members of the tribe didn't want to say a word, terrified that anything they said would be used against them. As a result the god-fearing visitors came to the conclusion that the girl had to have been kidnapped as a young child; and before anyone in the settlement realised what was going on, they scooped her onto a horse and charged away. Everything happened so quickly that it looked in retrospect as if a whirlwind simply descended from the heavens and swept her away. Not even the guardian spirit of the tribe could prevent it. This spirit was a huge female snake that lived in the black pool, with a diamond on the forehead, a jewel so bright that anyone who dared look at it changed into a stone immediately.

The tribe dispatched men and women to look for the girl, further and further away, but there was no trace of her. They were deeply upset, because since Kamma was swept away by the birds, they have accepted responsibility for her children; the only option they now saw, was to pack their things immediately and move away from the place where they had been living for so long so happily.

But before this could happen, while the people were still dismantling the huts made from matting, the farmers returned, with the same David Hartman in the lead: this time not the handful of before, but a mighty army, a veritable crusade undertaken to take revenge on the

bunch of savages who dared to detain a member of the master race in their midst. When the farmers finally left, nothing remained of the settlement: not man women or child, not a long-tailed sheep or a goat or an ox, nothing. It was customary on such raids to capture as much livestock as possible, but this time it was different. The farmers were so angry that they simply wanted to annihilate everything in their path, to wipe all traces of that settlement from the face of the earth. Just to make sure that none of the Khoikhoi would ever again dare to lay a finger on a white girl.

That was the story the girl was brought up with by the Hartmans. At the beginning she was without a name: if she had one, it would of course have been in the language of the Khoikhoi, but this she never divulged to anyone - except perhaps to her long-haired daughter, Samuel, later, to whom she passed on her and her mother's stories; but if that was the case, Samuel had forgotten what it was, or else it got lost somewhere along the line of mothers and daughters - and the name she became known under in the white community who saved her, as they insisted, was Lottie.

From her mother she had already learned a few things about the way of life of the border farmers - the rudimentary houses filled with chicken and snorting pigs, the open fires, the handmade furniture, the huge meals, the pens of the livestock made from stone or thornbush, the domestic existence of the women, the hunting and nomadic customs of the men - and with her smattering of Dutch (which was final proof to her saviours that she came from a civilised home) she soon adapted. What stole her heart, was a single fragment of a mirror that belonged to David Hartman's wife, Hendrina. And when they started asking Lottie about her fascination with this fragment, she told Hendrina in confidence about her mother's magic mirror in which, as a young child, she saw the reflections Kamma brought back from the Oosthuizen's farm. Except, she made sure that she never mentioned any names. Her stories amused the Hartmans. They regarded them as the inventions of a keen young mind; and from her description of the ornate mirror they deduced that Lottie must have been born to a wealthy and distinguished family. They did everything in their power to enquire in the vicinity of the Cape (the only area where such important people could have lived), but could find no evidence of a family whose daughter was kidnapped in a raid by a bunch of Hottentots. The only logical conclusion was that the entire family had been murdered; and that provided even more justification for the total onslaught on the settlement of heathens.

Lottie had always been an uncommunicative child (and after everything she had to endure during her terrible captivity, it was, God knows, probably understandable), and she never made any effort to provide any clarity on all the speculations on her descent. She owed it to the memory of her mother, she later explained to Samuel, to keep the secret that Kamma herself never wanted to divulge. And after the initial attempts to delve into the dark recesses of the girl's mind, they left her alone. Hermina Hartman, who had no child of her own left after a series of miscarriages and other sinister incidents, smothered the foundling with affection.

She was twelve or fourteen when she was brought back from the interior, and not long after that she began to become a woman; but she remained lean long after that, a slender girl, a child of the wind, nimble and shy by nature. She was quick-witted, and Hermina quickly taught her to read and write: because Hermina was intent on civilisation and style. Her mother descended from a wealthy Batavian family of merchants.

The difference between Hermina's love and the curtness with which David treated the child, must have confused Lottie quite a bit; but she never meddled in the lives of others, and what Hermina therefore neglected to tell, Lottie never found out. In exchange for that, her own introversion was therefore respected.

The girl had one peculiarity that never ceased to surprise her foster parents. And it was the only thing she ever complained about: namely that the commando on their horses whipped her away from her home so quickly that her shadow was left behind. And it wasn't as if she made this up. When Hermina went to the veld late one afternoon to fetch Lottie home, she saw it with her own two eyes: the child had no shadow. She was on her way back across the ridge, the setting sun right behind her; even the most insignificant little shrub cast

a long black shadow over the veld. But Lottie walked as if her feet didn't really touch the ground, and her lean body cast absolutely no shadow.

It was enough to give you the creeps, and Hermina decided rather to keep the discovery to herself. But from that day forward she treated the girl differently: with a caution, a kind of dread, as if she had to learn to cope with the knowledge that this child was living on borrowed time. And that wasn't the only discovery that bugged the Hartmans: the others mainly concerned her propensity to wander around on her own in the veld. It was still a wild country, high in the Cold Bokkeveld apparently, and predators still abounded. Sheep that strayed and goats that ranged freely were often the prey of jackals, lynx, hyenas, leopards and even the odd lion. But nothing could stop Lottie; and David Hartman's mutterings about God and commandments were soon muted by his wife's protective urge.

Hermina was the only one the girl ever told the reason for her wanderings. But it's obvious, she said: she was looking for her shadow. She would never be able to rest before she had found it. That is why she had to leave messages everywhere. What kind of messages? Simply messages, Lottie said. And when Hermina insisted, the girl showed her: at first glance it looked like writing, but it was no ordinary human writing. The signs and codes she used sometimes looked like the trails left by snakes and lizards across the sand, or else it looked like the faint tracks of ants and field mice and meerkat. For days on end she scratched out these messages where the animals in insects of the veld could read them so that they could pass it on to her shadow: a secret code on the thick leaves of succulents, the bark of thorn bushes, the rough rock-lichen on the surface of rocks and stones, or in the sand of open spaces in plains.

She didn't mind that the tracks would be wiped away in a short period of time – by the wind, by the rare rain, by the stark contrast in temperatures, the slow cartwheels of the seasons, the migration of the animals of the veld. Every time she would simply return, her patience as steadfast as her ingenuity, to devise new languages time after time, in the hope that something or someone would one day understand and convey the message. But what if no-one understood? Hermina wanted to know. Even then, Lottie replied with a mysterious smile, it wouldn't really matter. For as long as she was without a shadow, anything would do – as long as she could leave a sign to show that she had been there.

### 3

One day a man arrived looking for a bride. He came from the heart of the Karoo, driven by the need to preserve his family name for the future. Of course it was Bart Grobler, who else? He didn't have any particular requirements, as long as the prospective bride was from the female sex. Given the nature of his need, it may have served his purposes better had he chosen a more robust woman; but most of the farmers from the outer districts insisted that sons in law move in with them to fortify the numbers of the population, or else they demanded a substantial dowry – since that was about all a female offspring could yield in exchange for the unforgivable sin of not being a boy. But Bart Grobler was not prepared to go for the first option and could not afford the second – he was already settled on his own farm in the Swartberg where it took a wagon seven weeks to pass through the terrible valleys – with the result that his options were rather limited.

Hermina Hartman clung to her adopted daughter like an ivy, the only person on whom she could pour out her frustrated generosity and misplaced faith in sophistication and civilisation after her over-eager elopement with the farmer from the interior; but David was eager to get rid of the disconcerting presence on his farm. Given the circumstances he saved her from (something she never appreciated sufficiently), she was something of a plague in the house. Hermina was convinced that the child arrived with them a pure girl: she did after all establish empirically that the barbarians who kept the girl prisoner did not "molest" her; but for some or other reason she neglected to share this knowledge with her husband.

What she therefore experienced as an irreplaceable loss (apparently she died less than a year later, "of a broken heart", as the old people used to say), was a liberation for David Hartman. A hasty, secret transaction was made between the two men, and before Hermina

could realise where the negotiations were heading, Lottie was gone in the wagon of her most recent – surly – saviour. By the time they arrived on his farm below the Swartberg, she was already pregnant; and it was doubtful whether her incessant pregnancies over the subsequent years would ever have granted them the opportunity to travel to a magistrate to legalise the relationship.

You already know the rest. One-one, two-two, three-three, once even quadruplets by the lantern. Lottie gave birth to her eighteen children and allowed Bart to call all of them Samuel. She never appeared to grow too attached to any of them, with the possible exception of the first daughter, the one with the incredibly long hair. One has to wonder whether she ever truly knew – or cared – what was happening to her body and why it had to be subjected to such strange and uncomfortable activities. As a result of the interminable succession of pregnancies she grew dazed, her body sagged and became huge and shapeless, as if the earth's gravity was running her down. And even then she still didn't cast a shadow.

As her litter grew in size, and as the house filled up and became increasingly noisy, she grew increasingly lonely. Apart from her cheeky eldest daughter once in a while, there was no-one she could take into her confidence. From sheer desperation she started conversing with everything that crossed her path: a mouse in the kitchen, a spider in the yard, birds in the trees, rocks, grass seeds. But as time went by she gave up talking entirely, even with herself. The only language she retained, was the hieroglyphics through which she surrendered herself to the silent world.

Whenever she could she ran off to the veld, into that barren semi-desert of hillocks and mounds and fanning plains with reefs still carrying the tracks of ancient seas and floods – shells and ammonites, crab shells, spines as delicate as the stems of ferns, the older bones of dinosaurs and the imprints of extinct fauna and flora. She would leave her multicoloured bunch at home – some white, some dappled, some openly brown, but all of them blessed with the name Samuel – left to the care of her eldest daughter while she herself roamed during the days, writing her illegible traces on the landscape, all those futile messages to that shadow from which she was severed permanently and for which she kept longing as for the lost past.

In the end, merely thirty, but old before her time, and with the warning signals of death already in her bones (this she herself told the daughter Samuel before she left), she simply stayed away one evening. The only sign they could find of her when they went looking for her during the subsequent days, were her scribbling on rocks and sand and bark. Her own tracks were invisible, as if her body, regardless of its bulk, had no weight, not even the weight of a shadow over the veld.