

THE TRANSLATING SUBJECT: ANOTHER DOUBLE OF ALEJANDRA PIZARNIK'S LYRICAL I?¹

Madeleine Stratford
Université du Québec en Outaouais

Susi Herrero Díaz (Translation)

Abstract

Fragmentation of the subject is one of the distinctive features of the poetry of Argentine writer Alejandra Pizarnik (1936-1972). Indeed, her poems convey her perpetual dissatisfaction with language, which cannot express her lyrical self in all of its complexity or resuscitate her biographical self. Particularly in her fourth poetry book, *Árbol de Diana* (1962), the poet's creative persona suffers from a serious multiple personality disorder. Now, what happens when a translating subject takes on the voice of Pizarnik's already fragmented lyrical I? First, an analysis of the original pronouns will show that the book's lyrical I is most often a woman who is both one and multifaceted, and that this shifting subject permeates all the poems. Then, the transformations of this voice will be observed in three of the most circulated translations of the book, in order to identify and determine the degree of intervention of the translators' re creative persona: Claude Couffon's "je" (1983), Frank Graziano and María Rosa Fort's "I" (1987), and Juana and Tobias Burghardt's "ich" (2002).

Résumé

La fragmentation du sujet constitue l'une des caractéristiques distinctives de l'œuvre de la poète argentine Alejandra Pizarnik (1936-1972). En effet, ses poèmes communiquent son éternelle insatisfaction à l'égard de la langue, qui n'arrive jamais à exprimer son je lyrique dans toute sa complexité ni à ressusciter son je biographique. En particulier dans son quatrième recueil, *Árbol de Diana* (1962), le « moi » créateur de la poète souffre d'un sérieux trouble de personnalité multiple. Or, que se passe-t-il quand un sujet traduisant se glisse sous la peau du « je » pizarnikien, lui-même déjà pluriel? D'abord, une analyse des pronoms originaux démontrera que la voix lyrique du recueil, à la fois une et multiple, et le plus souvent féminine, imprègne l'ensemble des poèmes. Ensuite, nous observerons les transformations que cette voix a subies dans trois des traductions les plus diffusées du recueil, dans le but de cerner la présence et le degré d'intervention du « moi » recréateur des traducteurs : le « je » de Claude Couffon (1983), le « I » de Frank Graziano et María Rosa Fort (1987), et le « ich » de Juana et Tobias Burghardt (2002).

Keywords Poetry. Lyrical I. Fragmentation. Translating subject. Intervention.

Mots-clés Poésie. Voix lyrique. Fragmentation. Sujet traduisant. Intervention.

¹ This article is the English version of "Le sujet traduisant : un autre double du je lyrique d'Alejandra Pizarnik?" by Madeleine Stratford. It was not published on the print version of *MonTI* for reasons of space. The online version of *MonTI* does not suffer from these limitations, and this is our way of promoting plurilingualism.

Introduction

The poetry of the Argentinian author Alejandra Pizarnik (1936-1972) often tries to blur the distinction between the world of words and the real world, between the lyrical I and the biographical self. Indeed, language never succeeds in “expressing” Pizarnik’s lyrical I in all its complexity or in truly “resuscitating” her biographical self. Unable to exist on paper, Pizarnik’s speaking subject lacks unity and suffers from a personality disorder. The theme of the double is all-pervasive in her poetry; so much so that it constitutes one of the distinctive features of her style.² As regards the content, the lyrical I often contemplates its reflection in a mirror,³ a recurrent symbol in Pizarnik’s works. Also, the subject commonly enters into dialogue with its shadow.⁴ As far as the form is concerned, this “I” has a wide array of referents, most of them feminine: human beings defined by an attribute (a little girl, a traveler, or a shipwrecked, insomniac or silent woman, etc.), animals (a female wolf, a bird), or even inanimate objects (a doll, a mannequin, a dead body).⁵ Moreover, the speaking subject is not only represented by the first person singular (*yó*), but also hides behind the second person (*tú*), or the third, usually in its feminine form (*ella*).

Now, what happens when a translating subject adds to these doubles, taking on the voice of Pizarnik’s already fragmented lyrical I? Is it possible to distinguish the traces of an additional fragmentation? This paper will treat this issue by analyzing Pizarnik’s fourth poetry book, *Árbol de Diana* (AD), first published in 1962, which encapsulates the ontological quest of Pizarnik’s fragmented lyrical “I”.⁶ Published by the reputed publishing house Sur (headed by Victoria Ocampo) and with a foreword by Octavio Paz, the first book Pizarnik wrote in France⁷ had great success both in the Argentinian and the international poetry scene. This book occupies a central place in Pizarnik’s work and is particularly representative of her poetic style. In the first place, this poetry book is placed, chronologically speaking, right in the middle of Pizarnik’s poetic output. Also, it contains the first fruits of the author’s literary “pilgrimage” to Paris, a crucial period in her life. Both personally and professionally, this book represents a true “coming of age”. Thematically, AD tells the quest for the linguistic and ontological unity of a lyrical I, a quest that proves to be a constant feature in the poet’s work. Concerning its formal aspects, the cycle contains short epigrammatic poems characteristic of Pizarnik’s “youth” period, as well as her first prose poems, which are more commonly associated to her later works.

Firstly, after a brief presentation of Alejandra Pizarnik and her work, a systematic analysis of the distribution of personal pronouns in the source text will show that the lyrical I, being at the same time one and multifaceted, permeates all the poems, at times explicitly, at times implicitly. Then, this paper will examine what becomes of this multifaceted lyrical speaker in

² See Aira 1998: 17; Guibelalde 1998: 45; Lopez Luaces 2002; Monder 2004: 20; Running 1996: 92; Telaak 2003: 306.

³ See Ferrell 2001: 48; Fitts 1995: 55; Rubí 2002: 102.

⁴ See in particular Guibelalde 1998: 46-47 and Zeiss 2001: 325-343.

⁵ See Aira 1998: 17-18; Álvarez 1997: 23; Fitts 1995: 53; Genovese 1998: 66; Goldberg 1994: 70; and Zeiss (2001: vi), who studies five of Pizarnik’s “personae”: la melancólica, la niña, la polígrafa, Sombra and Sacha.

⁶ See Borinsky 1995: 295; Depetris 2004: 37; Kuhnheim 1996: 68; Rodríguez Francia 2003: 250.

⁷ The second book Pizarnik wrote in France is *Los trabajos y las noches*, published in 1965 shortly after she returned to Buenos Aires.

three of the most circulated complete translations of the book: the French version by Claude Couffon (1983), the English version by Frank Graziano and Maria Rosa Fort (1987), and the German version by Juana and Tobias Burghardt (2002).

An analysis chart inspired in Francis R. Jones' model (1989: 1987), will be used in order to determine the translators' degree of intervention:

1. "Transference" (one meaning = one meaning; several meanings = several meanings);
2. "Divergence" (one meaning = several meanings);
3. "Convergence" (several meanings = one meaning);
4. "Improvisation" (compensating additions);
5. "Abandonment" (omissions);
6. "Adaptation" (no semantic equivalence);
7. "Importation" (loanwords, cognates, calques).

The use of transference will result in a high degree of fidelity to the original meaning and style of the author. As for divergence, convergence and improvisation, their use shows certain fidelity to the style and meaning conveyed by the author, but also makes the translator's intervention more noticeable. Adaptation will produce target texts in which the translator's personal mark will be much more noticeable than that of the author; these texts will also show a rather adaptive approach to pronoun translation. Finally, importation will create a foreignness that may be seen as a form of improvisation when the Spanish text itself seems ungrammatical or as an adaptation when its usage creates ungrammaticality which is not present in the source text. In his model, Jones describes these categories from the point of view of the translation process. However, the object of study in this paper is translation as a product; therefore, Jones' categories have been adapted so that they can be used to describe the translated texts themselves as well as their effects on the target reader rather than the purpose (conscious or unconscious) guiding the translators. Each translation choice has consequences over the lyrical progression of AD cycle. This paper will make a comparative analysis of this progression in the source text and in the target texts.

1. Alejandra Pizarnik and her work

The daughter of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, the Argentinian poet Alejandra Pizarnik was born in Buenos Aires in 1936 and died in 1972 at the age of 36 from a tranquilizer overdose. In part due to her early death, and also because she obsessively corrected her texts, Pizarnik published few works during her lifetime. Apart from the poems and articles published in literary magazines, she left seven brief poetry books and one piece of poetic prose. In all her writings, Pizarnik questions her mother tongue. The main doubt that she feels towards the communicative power of language places her within the group of contemporary writers about whom Steiner says that they do not feel "at home" when using their mother tongue (Steiner 1992: 185). Her poetry books include a reduced number of very short poems, so much so that they sometimes give the impression of being incomplete. Nevertheless, even if they can sometimes appear as fragments, her "terribly exact" poems (Pizarnik cited in Lasarte 1983: 868) are the result of passionate retouches. Neither her word choices nor the word layout are accidental. In an interview with Alberto Lagunas, Pizarnik talked about the importance of respecting a certain "distance" between her and the poem so as to "illuminate" the first draft (Pizarnik cited in Lagunas 1988-89:46). Even though she was not looking for formal perfection, all the time she devoted to polishing her poems confirms that her writing process is not limited to the psychic automatism which characterizes surrealist artists. Edgardo Dobry summarizes well her case: "Pizarnik parece ser consciente del agotamiento de los métodos del surrealismo. Se queda con su imaginaria, con su ideología poética, pero renuncia a los largos desarrollos, a las digresiones documentales del discurrir onírico de los surrealistas" (Dobry 2004: 36).

According to Melanie Nicholson, it is mainly the aesthetic vision of Surrealism rather than its writing techniques that influenced 20th century Latin American authors (Nicholson 1999: xiv).

Over 35 years after her death, Pizarnik is still placed at the forefront of the literary scene, perhaps even more than during her life. Melissa A. Lockhart attributes her success, at least in part, to the mythical aura brought about by her premature death: “[...] her death, [...] contributed to making her an almost mythical figure in the realm of Argentine letters” (Lockhart cited in Mackintosh 2003: 120). Thus, many critics are as much –if not more– interested in Pizarnik as a “character” as in her texts, often offering a biographical analysis of her poems. Over the last few years, however, more and more academics have been attempting to reverse this trend.⁸ Although they admit the importance of the role played by the author’s life circumstances, they refuse to understand her work as a simple “suicide note”. It is under this non-biographical perspective that this paper will analyze how the lyrical I has been translated in the most circulated versions of AD in French, English and German.

2. Multiple incarnations of the Spanish lyrical I

There are marks of four categories of pronouns in AD’s cycle: the first person singular, the first person plural, the second person singular, and the third person singular. These marks can appear in different forms: that of an explicit subject pronoun or of verb inflection (when the subject pronoun is omitted); that of an object pronoun (direct or indirect); and that of an adjective or a possessive pronoun. This being said, it is the first person singular that is most used: its number of visible marks is higher than that of the rest, and can be found in most poems. In fact, each of the 38 poems seems to represent a stage in the life of the lyrical I, from birth to death. In the first poem (AD 1),⁹ a lyrical voice says that it has just “jumped out of itself to the dawn”¹⁰ of the blank page, separating from the author’s real self to “sing” the sad birth of a voice without a body. This poem shows the beginning of a foreword disseminated throughout the cycle and completed by other texts conjugated in the past tense. Together, these “flashbacks” seem to create a *mise en abyme* effect which permeates all the content of the cycle.

Thus, the lyrical I in AD attempts to “explain” its many painful births (AD 21) in 38 scenes made of “words from this world” (AD 13). Halfway between the real world (“*allá*”), and the world of words (“*aquí*”) (AD 21), the lyrical I has “built its home” within language itself (AD 16), and “fledged its birds” (AD 16). In AD 9, the guardian of words is a “petrified bird” and words are “bones” that sparkle like “precious stones”. Thus, it is with its own “bones” (words?) that the lyrical I has fought the “wind” of language. However, the lyrical I loses the battle against this silence, “putting an end all alone” to the life that nobody had really given her (AD 16). If the words of the lyrical I are to be believed, then, she is a “little traveler” in the world of language, gradually “dies” word by word throughout the cycle, “telling her death” while pronouns and characters, “wise nostalgic animals”, of an original unity, in turn live “within her warm body” (AD 34).

Within the cycle, there are 50 marks of the first person singular which can be found in 16 poems. Nearly half of these marks (23 out of 50) are “yo” subjects, most of which are implicitly expressed by verbal inflection (22 out of 23). The explicit “yo” only appears once, in AD 11. These twenty-three subject pronouns coexist with seventeen object pronouns: six reflexive pronouns (“*me*”), six direct objects (“*me*”) and five indirect objects (“*mi*”). The cycle contains as well nine marks of the possessive case: two pronouns (one instance of “*mío*” and one of “*míos*”) and seven adjectives (five “*mi*”, and two “*mis*”). The gender of this “yo” is most of the time ambiguous, but in the four poems in which it is specified (AD 11, 15, 17, 27), it is feminine. Therefore, if each of these occurrences referred, as is argued here, to one and the same voice, it would be clearly a female’s.

⁸ See Álvarez 1997: 7; Bassnett 1990: 47-48; Dobry 2004: 40; Fitts 1995: 67; Genovese 1998: 61-62; Kuhnheim 1996: 76; Suárez Rojas 1997: 25; Telaak 2003: 304.

⁹ The figure after the abbreviation AD corresponds to the poem number.

¹⁰ All the translations and reformulations in this section were originally made in French by the author of this paper, and then transposed into English by the translator of the paper.

As regards the first person plural, it only appears eight times distributed in six poems, a distribution clearly less important than that of "yo". However, the presence of the first person plural increases as the poems progress. Indeed, there is a first occurrence of the first person plural at the beginning of the cycle (AD 2), another two at the end of the first third of the cycle (AD 11), and the last 5 cases appear together in the last third (AD 26, 29, 31 and 37). This seems to create certain cohesion between the characters in the cycle, which become increasingly "united", linguistically speaking, in a "nosotras". Although there is no explicit subject pronoun ("nosotros" or "nosotras") in the cycle, four conjugated verbs contain marks of the first person plural (AD 11, 26, 29, 31). In addition, there also appear: a reflexive pronoun ("nos"), an indirect object ("nos"), and two possessive adjectives ("nuestros" and "nuestra"). The gender of the referent is ambiguous in seven of the eight cases. The only exception is AD 11, where "yo" combines with "la que fui" to form an implicit "nosotras", with "yo" being then once again feminine.

With twenty-two instances, the presence of the second person singular is nearly three times more frequent than that of the first person plural, but it only appears in five poems. In fact, most of the instances of "tú" (15 out of 22) can be found in two poems: AD 16 (7 marks) and AD 35 (8 marks). Therefore, the presence of the second person also shows a lower degree of distribution within the cycle than that of the first person singular. Always implicitly expressed, the "tú" subject appears in twelve conjugated verbs.¹¹ The reflexive pronoun "te" appears seven times.¹² There are also three possessive adjectives in AD 16 (one "tu" and two "tus"). With regard to the gender of the second person, it is once again ambiguous, at least at first sight. Its antecedent is clearly specified twice by means of appositions: one of them is masculine ("amor mio" in AD 3) and the other one feminine ("mi vida" in AD 35). However, these specifications do not allow the reader to attribute a gender to the second person, for the two abovementioned expressions are used to speak to a beloved person regardless of their gender. In addition to this, the expression "mi vida" could also be understood in its literal sense, meaning "the life of the lyrical I", which would imply that the lyrical voice is speaking to itself. In fact, only AD 16 has a feminine subject, whose gender is made explicit by the use of the adjective "sola". As in the previous cases, it is possible that all the instances of "tú" refer to a same person, once again of female sex.

The analysis of the distribution of third-person-singular subject pronouns is more complex, mainly because of their frequent omission. This paper will only analyze the pronouns lacking an explicit antecedent which could indirectly refer to the lyrical I of the cycle. Thus, excluding the indefinite relative pronoun "quien" (AD 33) and its interrogative version "quién" (AD 4), there are 18 marks of the third person singular ("él" or "ella")¹³ distributed in five poems. However, nearly half of these marks (8 out of 18) appear in AD 20; another third (6 out of 18) appear in AD 6, and the last two marks are found in AD 8. As in the case of "tú", the instances of the third person singular are unequally distributed, having a more uneven distribution than those of "yo". Besides, one third of these marks refer to a female: three instances of "ella", one reflexive pronoun ("se"), and two possessives ("su" and "sus"), all of which can be found in AD 6. In the fourteen other cases, nothing shows the gender of the omitted pronoun. Contrary to what Kuhnheim says (1996:68), it is only rarely that the pronoun "ella" explicitly "absorbs" the lyrical "I". In fact, this only happens in AD 6.

In short, this brief study of the distribution of personal pronouns suggests that the 38 poems of AD, disparate at first sight, form a whole which tells the birth, the short life and the death of a multifaceted lyrical I, and that the thematic structure of this "whole" depends to a large extent on the distribution of the linguistic manifestations of the subject. Among all the pronouns, those

¹¹ Two verbs in AD 2; two in AD 16; one in AD 18; one in AD 28; four in AD 35.

¹² Twice in AD 3, once in AD 28, and four times in AD 35.

¹³ Even though theoretically those conjugated verbs could also refer to "usted", this is not likely to be the case here. Apart from the fact that Pizarnik rarely uses this pronoun in her poems, the word "usted" does not appear anywhere in the cycle.

of the first person singular hold a dominant position. In fact, even if the marks of the three other grammatical persons are put together, these are still slightly smaller in number than the marks referring to “yo” (48 as against 50). In addition, “I” is the most repeated and most active subject pronoun, both in number and in frequency: twenty-three verbs in ten poems are conjugated in the first person singular, as compared to four verbs in four poems using the first person plural, twelve verbs in five poems using the second person singular, and fifteen verbs in five poems conjugated in the third person singular.

Furthermore, over a quarter of the “yo” subjects (5 out of 23), a quarter of the “nosotras” subjects (1 out of 4), and half of the “tú” subjects (7 out of 12) are accompanied by a reflexive pronoun, which creates a strong identity relation between subjects and reflexive objects which may extend to other object pronouns. Rackers thinks that “Pizarnik rarely gives the reader (or the translator) enough context to deduce the sex of the character or speaker” (Rackers 2003: 10-11). However, it has been shown above that the poet actually gives clear signs of this, for the gender of pronouns is feminine every time it is specified. Likewise, a majority of the characters representing the lyrical I are females:¹⁴ Diana (title), “la silenciosa en el desierto”, “la viajera con el vaso vacío”, “la sombra de su sombra” (AD 3); “la pequeña viajera” (AD 34); “la pequeña olvidada” (AD 4); “la pequeña muerta” (AD 22); “una niña de seda” (AD 12); “la que ama al viento” (AD 7); (AD 25) “la dormida” (AD 32 and AD 36); and la “hermosa autómatas” (AD 17), among others. Consequently, if the cycle is viewed as a whole, it can be concluded that the different repetitions of a same pronoun have the same referent, in this case feminine.

It should also be noted that the first person plural includes, semantically speaking, a first person singular, which is evidenced in AD 11 by means of a compound subject (“yo y la que fui”). Also, the evocation of a second person implies the presence of a speaker related to the first person. Indeed, when “yo” or “nosotras” address an interlocutor (“tú”), it is their participating narrative voice that can be heard. Besides the 42 occasions where the “yo” is explicitly mentioned, this “yo” can also be found implicitly included in the eight 8 marks of the first person plural and in the 22 marks of the second person singular. By contrast, the third person singular does not seem to be so clearly linked to the lyrical I. This may be due to the fact that this third person not only appears as a pronoun, but is also the voice of different characters which can all act as referents. In fact, the global image of the lyrical I which is offered in the cycle is that of an ever-changing little sleepwalker who travels through time and space, sometimes leaving her body to better observe herself, and who describes these different astral travels, small transient deaths, until she stops talking and “truly” dies once the cycle is over.

These observations confirm the semantic weight of the first person singular throughout the cycle. Indeed, be it by means of explicit or implicit mention, or by being compared with other personal pronouns or characters, a lyrical I leaves its mark in nearly every poem, forming the common trunk of the poetic “tree” that Pizarnik has created. On paper, the first person is continuously reflected, being at the same time subject and object. When this first person lacks words to express itself, it remains silent. Made of letters and sounds, the lyrical I dies as soon as the biographical I stops writing. Nevertheless, just as the phoenix always rises from its ashes, the lyrical I is brought back to life every time AD is read. But, in which form will this lyrical I be made to rise in the translations by Couffon, Graziano and Fort, and the Burghardts? The following section will focus on these translators’ treatment of the different personal pronouns under which the lyrical I lies hidden.

3. Linguistic incarnations of the French lyrical I (Couffon, 1983)

At first sight, the difference between the distribution of the first person singular marks in Spanish and French seems to be quantitative: there are fifty explicit or implicit marks in the original, whereas the French version contains forty-three. However, the relevance of the French marks –although smaller in number–is comparable to that of the Spanish marks, for they

¹⁴ There are only three male characters in the cycle: “un mudo” (AD 5); “alguien en mi dormido” (AD 14), and “un angel” (AD 25).

appear in the same 16 poems.¹⁵ Actually, the difference between the Spanish “yo” and the French “je” is rather a qualitative one. Firstly, the fact that the pronoun has been translated does not guarantee equivalence. In AD 11 there is a case of divergence, for the female sex of the subject (“la que fui”) is not specified in French (“moi d’hier”). The opposite case (convergence) can be found in AD 21, where the subject having a non-specified gender (“he nacido”) becomes feminine (“je suis née”). Lastly, the ten cases of elimination of pronouns present in the source text¹⁶ and the three cases where marks have been added¹⁷ do not show the same degree of fidelity to the original content. For instance, only the five cases where a reflexive pronoun¹⁸ and an implicit subject pronoun¹⁹ have been added or eliminated can be viewed as transferences. In those cases, the pronouns’ role remains the same: there are three verbs with first person singular subjects both in the French and the Spanish poems. Also, a case of improvisation can be found in AD 19, where “que tengo en los míos tatuados” is translated as “qu’il y a tatoués dans les miens”. Here, the use of an impersonal structure probably aims to avoid the ambiguity that the verb *avoir* could have caused. Indeed, “que j’ai tatoué dans les miens” would have meant that “je” was the author of the tattoo, whereas “yo” in Spanish is only the person wearing the tattoo.

Furthermore, there are five cases of abandonment of a “yo” subject which contribute to covertly diminishing the “active” participation of the first person. In four cases, Couffon has not conveyed the possible “verbal” meaning of three “homonyms” present in the source text: “lleno” (AD 10), translated as “peuplé”; “camino” (AD 14), translated as “route”, and “extraño”, translated as “étrange” (twice in AD 15).²⁰ The case of AD 19 is more complex: in Spanish, the absence of a subject in the first line, “cuando vea los ojos”, creates ambiguity as to whether “vea” has a first or a third person singular subject (*él*, *ella*, or even *usted*). In French, the importation of the Spanish elliptical structure (“quand verra les yeux”) has three consequences. At the grammatical level, it creates a foreignizing effect which is not present in the source text, prescriptive French grammar requiring (unlike Spanish) the presence of an explicit subject pronoun. At the semantic level, this structure partially reproduces the ambiguity of the source text, and could then be seen as a case of improvisation. Nevertheless, the degree of ambiguity is not as high as in the Spanish text, because the French conjugated form “verra” may refer to an ambiguous third person singular (*il*, *elle* or *on*), but not to the first person singular. This is why this seems closer to a case of divergence, given its influence over the distribution of the first person singular instances.

Lastly, the abandonment of the pronoun “mí” in the line “cuídate de mí amor mío” (AD 3) produces a semantic loss which exceeds the limits of the poem. Since “mí” is the first of the indirect objects of the imperative “cuídate”, its presence makes it possible in Spanish to establish a relation of identity between the lyrical I and three characters: “la silenciosa en el desierto”, “la viajera con el vaso vacío”, and “la sombra de su sombra”. These characters play a major role within the cycle: they are the first symbolic incarnations of the lyrical I, each of them starting a network of semantic links with other protagonists. In French, the translation “prends garde, mon amour, prends garde” makes “je” no longer an explicit double of the three abovementioned characters. This weakens the first person’s links with the other characters in the cycle, which stem from this parallel in Spanish.

¹⁵ AD 1, 3, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 27, 33, 35, 38.

¹⁶ See “mí” (AD 3); “lleno” (AD 10); “camino” (AD 14); “extraño” (AD 15); “vea” and “tengo” (AD 19); “me” (AD 33).

¹⁷ See “je m’avance” (reflexive) and “[je] me pleure” (implicit) in AD 17 and “mon rôle” (AD 15).

¹⁸ “Voy” is translated as “je m’avance” (AD 17); “quedarme” is translated as “rester” and “me iré” is translated as “je partirai” (AD 33).

¹⁹ In AD 17 the segment “je me fais danser et [je] me pleure” contains two “je” subjects, one explicit and the other implicit.

²⁰ In Spanish, the word “lleno” can be an adjective (“full”) or a verb (“llenar”); “camino” can be a noun (“path”) as well as a verb (“caminar” – to walk); and “extraño” can be both an adjective (“strange”) and a verb (“extrañar” – to miss). In each of these cases, the “verb” would be conjugated in the simple present, first person singular. Although the “verbal” interpretation of these terms is not obvious, it cannot be excluded given Pizarnik’s tendency to use multiple-meaning structures.

As has been noted above, there are eight explicit or implicit marks of the first person plural in the source text. Seven of these eight marks have been kept in Couffon's version. Most of them (5 out of 7) are the result of transference.²¹ The other two constitute one case of abandonment and one case of divergence which have interconnected effects. The mark appearing in AD 2, "Éstas son las versiones que nos propone", has not been translated in any way. Present from the very first poem in the cycle, the Spanish "nos" suggests that the lyrical I speaks to itself, to its own incarnations and even seems to invite the reader to join the "conversation". In French, "Voici les versions proposées" does not specify the addressee: neither the lyrical I nor its readers are openly being spoken to. As a result, the first "nous" in the French version of the cycle is that of AD 11: "yo y la que fui nos sentamos". Unlike the "nos" in AD 2, the one in AD 11 cannot include the reader, for it only refers to two explicit facets of the lyrical I. In the 1983 edition, the two "moi" pronouns form, as in Spanish, a compound subject: "moi d'aujourd'hui et moi d'hier nous asseyons".²² However, as has been mentioned above, the gender of this "moi" is not specified in French, thus making the gender of this "nous" also ambiguous. Hence the classification of these two marks among the cases of divergence.

Unlike the first person singular and plural, the second person singular holds a more prominent place in French than in Spanish. Apart from keeping the French equivalents of the twenty-two original marks of the second person singular, Couffon's version includes two new marks: one is explicit (AD 3), and the other implicit (AD 28). The first addition is a third repetition of the imperative "cuidate" ("prends garde") in AD 3. With this repetition, "tu" is made three times more present in the poem than "je", whereas in Spanish the second person only appears twice. Here, the greater asymmetry between the source text and the translation leads to consider this addition –which was not "mandatory" from a translation point of view– as a creative license that can be classified as an adaptation. Also, the translation of the lines "the alejas de los nombres / que hilan el silencio de las cosas" as "tu t'éloignes des noms / filant le silence des choses" (AD 28) constitutes a case of divergence, for the present participle used in the target text creates doubt about the agent of the verb "filer". On the one hand, "filant" can be understood –as happens in Spanish– as a description of these names ("les noms qui filent") while the "tu" subject goes away ("t'éloignes"). On the other hand, "filant" can be seen as a gerund, in which case "tu" would be the one that goes away while "filant le silence des choses", i.e. "tu" would be the subject of the present participle. Paradoxically, this case of divergence, by turning a single-meaning passage into a multiple-meaning one, creates an ambiguity typical of Pizarnik's works which could as well be seen as a case of improvisation.

The third person singular seems to be the one experiencing the most changes in Couffon's version. As aforementioned, the original text contains eighteen marks of the third person singular, from which only six are explicitly feminine, all concentrated in AD 6. By contrast, fourteen of the seventeen marks in the French translation are explicitly feminine. Apart from the six instances of the pronoun "ella" in AD 6, which are the result of a direct transference in French, the eight omitted subject pronouns in AD 20 turn into explicit "elle" pronouns. On the one hand, the insertion of "elle" pronouns in AD 20 makes the translation "idiomatic", the absence of the subject not being usual in French. On the other hand, the preference given here to the female sex suggests that Couffon may have seen AD 20 as a "continuation" of AD 6. It could otherwise suggest that Couffon has considered the female sex to be the most probable interpretation in view of the author's female identity. The four other cases concerning third person singular pronouns are cases of improvisation, as each of them seems to be aimed at reproducing the ambiguity of the Spanish structure. In the first line of AD 2, "Éstas son las versiones que nos propone", the verb "propone" has an indefinite third-person subject: "él", "ella", or even "usted". In French, the translation of this verb as a past participle acting as an adjective ("Voici les versions proposées") allows the translator to hide the author of the action, which could be a third person, a first person, or even a second person, both singular or plural. The same case can be found in AD 8: the subject of the verb form "vendrá", which appears

²¹ AD 26, 29, 31, 37.

²² It should be noted, however, that from the 1986 edition onwards there is an explicit "nous" subject: "moi d'aujourd'hui et moi d'hier nous nous asseyons".

twice in succession, is not specified (“No es verdad que vendrá. No es verdad que no vendrá”). Couffon’s translation keeps the ambiguity of that third person’s gender by means of a double transposition where the verb is shifted into a noun (“Il n’est pas vrai que sa venue sera. Il n’est pas vrai que sa venue ne sera pas”).

In addition to this, the appearance of three new instances of the third person singular accentuates the fragmentation of the lyrical I in French: one “on” pronoun in AD 5 and another two of them in AD 31. Since the pronoun “on” appears for the first time in AD 5, and has no referent, a French speaker may understand it as a synonym of “nous”, a colloquial form so widespread that it is also accepted in literary language.²³ Should this be the case in AD 5, this improvisation, probably aimed at preserving the ambiguity of the original infinitive structure, would compensate for the abandonment of “nos” in AD 2. However, it is not so clear that the two other “on” pronouns can be synonyms of “nous”. Indeed, there is already one “nous” pronoun in AD 31, and literary language does not usually accept the simultaneous appearance in the same text of instances of “nous” and “on” having the same referent (Hanse 1994: 614). This being said, since “on” can replace any personal pronoun (Grevisse 1980: 645), it could theoretically refer here to the first, the second or even the third person.²⁴ Although from a prescriptive point of view, “on” scarcely ever refers to different persons in a same sentence (Hanse 1994: 616), this possibility cannot be excluded in the “ungrammatical” context of AD, where the identity of the lyrical I is rather unstable.

Ultimately, this analysis of the translation of personal pronouns which may refer to the lyrical I shows the use of an array of strategies. Certainly transference is the most common one, representing more than half of the cases (60 out of 95). There are, however, nine cases of divergence, eleven of convergence and seven of improvisation. Yet since these modifications often aim to compensate for a loss or to recreate an ambiguity, most of them remain faithful to the thematic structure of the poetic cycle. By contrast, the six abandonments and the two adaptations in the French version diminish the importance of the first person and highlight that of the second person. Also there seems to be a higher degree of passivity in the French lyrical I, with fewer verbs conjugated in this person. Therefore, even though Couffon’s approach to pronoun translation is in general faithful to the original –although idiomatic–, his creative hand is nonetheless distinguishable. In this respect, there is one adaptive modulation which illustrates this quite well in the last line of AD 12, where “de flor que se abre al viento”, which literally means “of a flower that opens itself to the wind”, is described by Couffon from the opposite point of view: “de fleur que le vent fait éclore” [of a flower made to open by the wind]. In Spanish, this “flower” is a feminine active subject whereas in French “fleur” is a passive direct object, and the subject, “vent” is masculine. Of course, the scene described is still the same, with two actions taking place simultaneously: a flower opens while the wind blows. However, the shift from the author’s feminine subject to the translator’s masculine one acquires a symbolic value when taking into account that in Spanish, the reader listens directly to Pizarnik’s lyrical voice, whereas in French, this voice is expressed through Couffon, who is a man.

4. Linguistic incarnations of the English lyrical I (Graziano and Fort, 1987)

There are forty-four marks of the first person singular in the English translation, that is, six less than in the original cycle. However, while the Spanish text only contains one mark (out of fifty) lacking textual manifestation,²⁵ in Graziano’s version six of these cases can be found. One of these “abandonments” cannot really be considered as such, for it concerns the verb “quedarme”, translated as “staying behind”, which is not pronominal in English (AD 33). In the other cases, the translators have omitted one of the repetitions of a subject pronoun (AD 1, 17, 21) or of an

²³ See Grevisse 1980: 645 and Hanse 1994: 614.

²⁴ Nevertheless, the second “on” in AD 31 can no longer refer to “yeux”, whereas in Spanish, “ojos” is the only potential explicit referent of “se alimenten”.

²⁵ It is the line “y doblemente sufrido” (AD 21), where the subject and the auxiliary verb “yo he” of the preceding line have been omitted, but still apply to “sufrido”.

object pronoun (AD 14 and 38) which has already been mentioned in the poem. Therefore, the English translation only includes thirty-eight tangible marks of the first person singular, that is, ten less than the Spanish text. Another five cases of abandonment contribute to diminishing the active presence of the first person singular. Firstly, Graziano and Fort have not translated the “verbal” meaning of the homonyms in the cycle (“lleno”, “camino”, “extraño”). This entails, as in Couffon’s translation, the disappearance of four “yo” subjects. Then the use of transposition in “nací”, rendered as “my birth” in AD 15 highlights the “passive” nature of the subject in AD 15. Maybe with the aim of giving the first person a more “active” role, Graziano and Fort translated the ambiguous verbal form “vea” (AD 19) as “I see”, which constitutes a case of convergence. Of course, the choice of the first person might also be aimed at not revealing the gender of the referent (“he” and “she” being gender-marked), in which case this could be seen as an improvisation. After all, the gender of the subject in AD 15 and 27, –overtly feminine in Spanish– is no longer specified in the English version. Nevertheless, the translators could have also used a gerund in AD 19, the effect of which would have been even more ambiguous: “when seeing the eyes”. The choice of the first person here could therefore be aimed at compensating, at least in part, for the abandonment of the other “yo” subjects.

As in the Spanish cycle, the English version contains eight marks of the first person plural. However, they are only the result of direct transference in five cases²⁶ and can only be found in five of the six original poems. Specifically, all textual marks referring to the first person plural have disappeared in AD 11. There is still a compound subject (“I and the one I was”) but the explicit grammatical union between these two “I” becomes implicit with the verb “sit down”.²⁷ Symbolically, the two “I” preserve their individuality by not melting into one single character anymore. If there are eight marks of the first person plural in the English version, it is because two possessive adjectives have been added, one in AD 29 (“our throats”), and the other in AD 31 (“our eyes”). On the one hand, this choice makes the English text more idiomatic because, unlike Spanish, English generally uses possessive adjectives and not definite articles to refer to body parts.²⁸ On the other hand, these modulations seem to compensate for the loss of marks in AD 11, restoring the original number of first-person-plural pronouns, and thus giving “we” a more substantial place in the English version, which would be similar to that of the original “nosotros”.

In the English version, there are twenty-one marks of the second person singular, that is, one less than in the source text. However, not all of them are the result of transference. For instance, a case of divergence can be found in AD 16: all the marks present in the source text have been preserved, but the gender of their referent, which in Spanish is a female due to the use of the adjective “sola”, is no longer specified in English. On the one hand, the wording used in English, “by yourself”, is gender-neutral, and gives more relevance to the second person. On the other hand, the multiple-meaning potential of the Spanish adjective is no longer present in the translation, for “by yourself” does not necessarily imply that the second person is “alone”, but simply that it has not been helped by anyone. Also, there is a case of addition in AD 23, which results from translating “hasta pulverizarse los ojos” as “until your eyes are pulverized”. Here, the pronoun “your” could be probably seen as having an indefinite meaning.²⁹ Yet this “your” can also have a “personal” connotation, as happens with the French “on”. This “personalizing” reading seems even more feasible when considering AD 23, where the lyrical I is indeed speaking of its “tattooed eyes”. Actually, a restrictive “indefinite” interpretation of this fragment would have only been possible if Graziano and Fort had used the expression “one’s eyes” in AD 23.

²⁶ See “nos” translated as “us” (AD 2); “pulsamos” as “we play” and “nuestros” as “our” (AD 26); “vivimos” as “we live” (AD 29); “pulsamos” as “we play” (AD 31); “nuestra” as “our” (AD 37).

²⁷ In fact, Rackers is the only English translator having explicitly conveyed this “union” by means of an adverb: “I and who I was sit together” (2003: 27).

²⁸ See Thomson and Martinet (1986: 21).

²⁹ About the indefinite use of the second person singular, see Thomson and Martinet (1986: 79).

Unlike the source text, in which there are eighteen marks of the third person singular distributed in five poems,³⁰ the English version only contains fifteen of these marks distributed in three poems.³¹ Firstly, Graziano and Fort have used in AD 2 the same type of improvisation as Couffon, replacing the null-subject verb “proponer” by a past participle, “proposed”. As in French, the English passive voice allows for the ambiguity of the agent to be kept; the passive voice can even emphasize this ambiguity, for the agent does not necessarily have to be a third person singular any more.³² Secondly, in AD 8 the gender-neutral pronoun “it” is also ambiguous, but its use results in a case of convergence. Clearly “it” can only refer to an inanimate object, which leads to see “the shadow” or “what I’m waiting for” as their potential referent. However, in the source text, the subject of the verb “vendrá” could also be a person, that is, one of the facets of the lyrical I. Lastly, it has been mentioned above that all references to the third person have disappeared and replaced by first-person references in the English version of AD 19. Conversely, there is a “she” pronoun which functions as agent of all verbs in AD 20, whereas the gender of the subject is not specified in the Spanish poem. This “she” in AD 20 may be related to the female character in AD 6.

Moreover, the gender of the indefinite pronoun “alguien”, clearly masculine in AD 14, becomes ambiguous in Graziano and Fort’s translation, as well as in all the other English translations of the poem.³³ This trend suggests that doing otherwise must have been difficult in English, where adjectives do not reflect gender or number. By contrast, with the expression “Who will stop sinking his hand [...]” in AD 4, Graziano and Fort make the pronoun “quién” masculine, whereas in Spanish its gender is not specified. Nevertheless, the translators could have reproduced the ambiguity of the source text by using the possessive case of the third person plural (“their”) as done by Álvarez (1979: 62) and Rackers (2003: 23). Therefore, the insertion of “his” could be considered as an attempt to compensate for the loss of the masculine reference in AD 14.

Interestingly, the translators try to preserve, and even to highlight, the sexual ambiguity of the pronouns without an explicit referent, and yet they systematically specify the female sex of the lyrical I’s symbolic manifestations, that is, of the characters in the cycle. For instance, in AD 7, 17 and 36 the lyrical voice remains feminine by the use of a pronoun (“she”) or a possessive adjective (“her”). Also, the English translators often specify the approximate age of the subject. For instance, where the Spanish text contains the qualifying adjective “pequeña” (AD 4, 22, 34), which can refer to a “niña” (AD 12) or to a facet of the subject’s past (AD 11), the translators often add the noun “girl” –the sole exception to this trend is found in AD 34, where the female sex is only shown by means of the possessive “her”. In contrast, the insertion of the noun “woman” in AD 3 and AD 32 suggests that, in the translators’ view, these facets of the subject belong to her “adult” present rather than to her past childhood. Apart from Graziano and Fort, only Bassnett and Chartkoff have used the word “woman”³⁴ in their translations; the rest of English translators stick to the noun “girl” or to the expression “little one”, which suggests that most of them perceive AD’s lyrical I exclusively as a child. To a certain extent, this perception is not surprising, for it matches the public image that Pizarnik herself built up, an image that has remained after her premature death in 1972 at the age of 36. As Fiona Mackintosh explains: “After her death, Pizarnik was frequently presented as a childlike figure in various homages [...]. The fact that both she and her poetry exuded such an air of childish vulnerability, and that

³⁰ AD 2, 6, 8, 19, 20.

³¹ AD 6, 8, 20.

³² Although its use may seem obvious, the passive voice is not the only choice in French. In his version, Couffon could have used an impersonal “on” (que l’on propose), or a pronominal form (qui se proposent). Also, even if the passive voice is more common in English than in French, and although some might argue that the passive voice is a more “literal” solution, the translators could have preserved the ambiguity of the source text by turning “proposed” into an epithet (These are the proposed versions).

³³ See Bassnett 2002: 19; Chartkoff 2005: n. p.; Kuhnheim 1996: 69; Molloy 1991: 216; Rackers 2003: 28; Rossi 2002: 218.

³⁴ See Bassnett 2000: 17 and 22, and Chartkoff 2005: AD 3 and 32.

after her death she has been ‘canonized’ as a child poet has made ‘el mito Pizarnik’ that much more compelling” (Mackintosh 2003: 122).

In his introduction to the anthology, Graziano highlights the challenge posed by the frequent omission of pronouns in Pizarnik’s work: “Since English requires pronouns where Spanish does not, we were occasionally obliged to make gender assumptions based upon whatever textual evidence presented itself, thus suffering the loss of the original’s ambiguity as we had no alternative but to impose a reading and assign pronouns” (Graziano 1987: 5). This remark shows the translators’ will to find a compromise between the respect for the grammar rules of the target language and the reproduction of the multiple meanings conveyed in the source text. This brief analysis about Graziano and Fort’s treatment of the grammatical manifestations of AD’s lyrical I shows that the translators’ choice of pronouns results indeed from a plausible reading of the original cycle in which the gender of the pronouns’ referents is not specified whenever possible. Even though the English translators –respectful towards the grammar rules of the target language– always insert a pronoun, this is sometimes compensated for by avoiding pronoun repetition in enumerations, and by not specifying the gender of the referent, thus keeping the multiple meanings of several null-subjects. Concerning the translators’ treatment of characters, they try to highlight their female gender by adding a noun or a gender-marked pronoun, reinforcing in doing so the impression that the lyrical I is a child.

5. Linguistic incarnations of the German lyrical I (Burghardt, 2002)

The German translation resembles the French and the English versions as regards the distribution of the first person singular, for it contains fewer marks of this grammatical person than the original cycle (42 vs. 50). Like Couffon, and Graziano and Fort, the Burghardts have not translated the potential meaning as verbs of the homonyms in AD 10, 14 and 15, thus making four “yo” subjects disappear. In addition, the German translators have used a modulation procedure similar to the one used by Couffon in AD 19, where “que tengo en los míos tatuados” has been translated as “die auf meiner tätowiert sind” [which are tattooed on mine]. As happens with the French “qui sont”, the German structure probably aims to avoid the potential ambiguity of the form “habe”, the use of which could have meant that the lyrical I was the author of the tattoo. Similarly to Graziano and Fort, however, the Burghardts seem to have compensated for the loss of “tengo” by translating “vea” as “ich sehe”. As happens in English, this convergence is to a certain extent equivalent to a case of improvisation; moreover, it has the advantage of not revealing the gender of the subject.

Finally, it is worth noting the disappearance of a reflexive pronoun in AD 17 which produces an important change of meaning as “me lloro en mis numerosos funerales” becomes “über meine zahlreichen Begräbnisse weine” [I cry for my many funerals]. In Spanish, the lyrical I cries over itself and repeats this action in its many funerals. However, it would have been possible to convey a similar meaning in German by means of the verb “beweinen”: “ich beweine mich selbst an meine zahlreichen Begräbnisse” [I cry over myself/I mourn my own death in my many funerals]. Instead, the subject in the Burghardts’ translation is sad because of funerals and neither the frequency nor the moment when the subject “cries” are specified. In addition to this, the reflexive pronoun in the preceding line, “donde me danzo” is equally eliminated in the German translation, which reads as follows: “in dem ich für mich tanze” [where I dance for myself]. So, whereas the Spanish reflexive pronoun suggests that the subject literally “becomes” or “transforms into a dance” the German object pronoun only implies that nobody else is watching the show. Lastly, it should be noted that the gender of the first person singular in AD 17, which is clearly a female in Spanish due to the presence of the adjective “sonámbula”, turns ambiguous in the Burghardts’ translation.

Of all the translators in this study, the Burghardts are the only ones to have directly transposed all the marks of the first person plural. Like the source text, their version contains eight of these marks distributed in the same six poems.³⁵ Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning a

³⁵ AD2, 11, 26, 29, 31 and 37.

case of modulation in AD 29, where the fragment “vivimos con una mano en la garganta” has been translated as “[wir] werden abgewürt” [we are being asphyxiated]. On the one hand, the shift from the active to the passive voice contributes to making the lyrical I even more powerless than in the Spanish text. On the other hand, the “hand” that the lyrical I has on its throat has completely disappeared in the German translation. In Spanish this hand could belong to the lyrical I and, in that case, this would be another “reflexive” action performed by the subject, who would be at the same time agent and patient. In German, the passive structure suggests that the action of “asphyxiating” is carried out by someone other than the subject. However, the Burghardts' translation could have been closer to the source text had they written something like “Hier leben wir mit einer Hand an dem Hals” [Here we live with a hand on our throats].

The German version contains exactly the same number of marks of the second person singular as the Spanish text; moreover, they can be found in the same spots.³⁶ In spite of this, their translations cannot always be considered as cases of transference. In AD 3, for instance, “amor mío”, can refer to a woman or a man, whereas “meine Liebe” can only refer to a woman. Maybe the Burghardts's purpose here was to compensate for not having specified the gender of the second person in AD 16, which is feminine in Spanish but turns ambiguous in German. Also the expression “meine Liebe” might be a subtle translators' reference to Pizarnik's homosexuality.³⁷ In order to keep the sexual ambiguity of the beloved person, the Burghardts could have chosen, as Siefer did (2000: 39), a more neutral expression, such as “mein Schatz” [my treasure], which applies to both men and women. Lastly, in AD 35, the modulation –which could even be seen as an adaptation– used when translating “déjate doler” [let yourself experience pain] as “sei Schmerz” [be pain] produces a clear change of meaning. However, as far as the grammatical marks are concerned, the translators compensate for the loss of this reflexive pronoun by repeating the imperative “sei Schmerz” at the end of the poem, thus restoring the original number of marks (eight) of the second person.

As regards the third person singular marks, only the six feminine marks in AD 6 and the masculine indefinite pronoun “alguien” are cases of direct transference into German. In AD 20, the Burghardts make use of convergence when choosing, as Couffon and Graziano and Fort, a feminine third person (“sie”). This choice is in keeping with the meaning conveyed in the original cycle, for every time the gender of a personal pronoun is specified, it is clearly feminine. By contrast, both the interrogative pronoun “quién” (AD 4), and its relative version, “quien” (AD 33) –whose gender is not specified in Spanish– become masculine in German. Yet it would have been possible to preserve their gender-neutral nature. The translators did not need to use the gender-marked possessive “seine” before the noun “Hand” (AD 4): they could have used instead the definite article, “die Hand”. Similarly, they could have used “wie man geht” [as one leaves] rather than “wie jemand der geht” [as someone who (masculine) leaves] in AD 33. In AD 2, the Burghardts resort to improvisation: in order to avoid specifying the agent of “nos propone”, they use a reflexive structure where the patient, “Wendungen” [versions], becomes the subject of “die sich uns anbieten” [which “propose themselves” to us]. Paradoxically, this passive structure –much more common in Spanish than in German–,³⁸ looks almost like a syntactic calque. In AD 8, the use of the neuter pronoun “es” can also be regarded as a case of improvisation. Unlike the English “it”, “es” can refer both to an inanimate object and to a person. Of course, this pronoun can no longer refer to the “shadow”, since “Schatten” is masculine in German, but it can still refer to “[das], worauf ich warte” [what I am waiting for] or even to the “Mädchen aus Seide” [young girl made out of silk] in AD 12. In fact, the word “Mädchen”, even though it refers to a female, is grammatically neutral due to the diminutive suffix “-chen”. Notwithstanding this, in AD 12 the Burghardts insist on the female condition of this character by turning the adjective “sonámbula” into a feminine noun, “Schlafwandlerin”, and by translating “su” as “Ihr”. In fact, the feminine is frequently used in German to refer to

³⁶ AD 3, 16, 18, 28, 35.

³⁷ Interestingly, Schmitt preferred the use of the masculine, “mein Liebling” (Schmitt 2000: 48).

³⁸ According to Schanen and Confais, this type of structure is of limited use in German (2005: 183).

the real gender of the referent of “Mädchen”. However, it is more difficult to establish an identity relation between the German gender-neutral “automata” in AD 17, “das [...] Werkzeug”, and the feminine pronouns in brackets, which could refer both to the lyrical I [“ich”] or to any other character.

Overall, the analysis of the grammatical marks referring to the German lyrical I shows that the Burghardts insert a pronoun wherever the German grammar rules so require, and that their choice of pronouns seem to be always based on a possible reading of the poem. In most occasions, they use transference (55 cases), conveying in their translation both the meaning and the effect of the source text. They add some cases of improvisation (4), which are mainly aimed at reproducing the ambiguity of the source text. Among the other cases of partial change of meaning, the cases of divergence and convergence seem to counterbalance each other’s effect, for there is almost the same number of cases where the gender of the referent becomes ambiguous (14) as of cases where it is not so (12). However, it seems that the Burghardts tend to eliminate the subject’s reflexive actions, maybe because these images could seem unusual or ungrammatical in German, regardless of the foreignizing effect that they may indeed have in the source text itself. In addition, there is a subtle extra-textual reference to Pizarnik’s homosexuality in the choice of the vocative phrase “meine Liebe” (AD 3), a reference which is not present in other German translations of Pizarnik’s work.

Conclusion

As regards the use of pronouns, all the translators tend to respect the grammar rules of the target language, and therefore introduce a subject pronoun in clauses that have a null subject in Spanish. Only Couffon –solely in AD 19– tries to make an importation of the Spanish original structure by eliminating the subject pronoun. In addition, the choice of the pronoun or the gender of its referent always seems to result from a possible reading of the poem. Even though the systematic insertion of a pronoun can sometimes create more ambiguity –as happens in the cases of the French personal/impersonal “on”, the English feminine/masculine “I”, or the German neuter/feminine “es” –, this insertion normally contributes to imposing the translator’s univocal reading of the poem. Interestingly, all the translations analyzed here have proved to be influenced (consciously or unconsciously) by the translators’ perception of Pizarnik’s “literary character”. In Graziano and Fort’s work, this influence is evidenced by the repeated use of the word “girl” instead of “woman”, which highlights the image of a “child” that Pizarnik projected. In the Burghardt’s work, this influence can be seen in a subtle extra-textual reference to Pizarnik’s homosexuality conveyed by the vocative phrase “meine Liebe” in AD 3. As for Couffon’s translation, it does not seem to contain any clear references to Pizarnik’s biographical self other than the practically systematic choice of the feminine gender to translate the null subjects of verbs in the third person singular. This choice could be the result of a global reading of the cycle, or may be due to the fact that Pizarnik herself was a woman.

Furthermore, none of the translators in the corpus studied here has translated the “verbal” reading of Pizarnik’s homonyms “lino”, “camino” and “extraño”, thus surreptitiously modifying the thematic structure of the translated works. Interestingly, if we observe all the French, English and German translations of the poems concerned (AD 10, AD 14 and AD 15), we can see that, of all translators –French, English and German-speaking translators alike–, only Rackers (2003) and Rossi (2000) have translated the verbal meaning of “extraño” as “I miss” in AD 15. In all the other cases, the omission of the verbal reading of the above three words contributes to diminishing the active role of the lyrical I. However, it cannot be taken for granted that Couffon, Graziano and Fort, and the Burghardts have not reproduced the grammatical ambiguity of these words simply because they did not notice it, or that they have translated these fragments “on automatic pilot”. For instance, Mark Rackers, another English translator of Pizarnik’s work, explains in his Master’s thesis the problem posed by the double meaning of “camino” in AD 14, an ambiguity which he admits not having been able to maintain:

What my translation does not convey in the above poem is the multiple meanings in the fourth line —the original reads 'camino del espejo,' meaning possibly 'on the way to the mirror' or 'path of the mirror,' or 'path in the mirror,' or even 'I walk from the mirror.' Both the central image of the mirror of Pizarnik's line, and the potentiality of the phrase, suggest a doubling. The coexistence is not a tense one —it is a twin enterprise, not merely an opposition (Rackers 2003: 6).

In addition, it has been noted above that other cases of "yo" and "nosotros" subjects have been eliminated in the versions studied here in all the target languages. Ultimately, this increased "passivity" of the French, English and German lyrical I could be seen as a subtle sign – conscious or unconscious– of the translator's presence, a sign of the substitution of the "writing subject" for the "translating subject" inherent in any translation act. This may be a sign that the lyrical I in *Árbol de Diana*, which is already plural, experiences an additional fragmentation when translated to include among its doubles the voice of the translator as a "re-creative" agent: Couffon's "je", Graziano and Fort's "I" and the Burghardt's "ich".

Appendix 1: French translation of the marks referring to the lyrical I

AD	Transference		Divergence	Convergence	Improvisation		Abandonment		Adaptation
1	(yo) he dado (yo) he dejado (yo) he cantado mí mi (cuerpo) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	j' j' j' moi mon (corps) <i>Unspecified gender</i>							
2					propone (<i>Ambiguous 3rd person</i>) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	∅ (proposées) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	nos	∅	
3	cuidate cuidate (amor) mío <i>Unspecified gender</i>	prends (garde) prends (garde) mon (amour) <i>Unspecified gender</i>					mí	∅	∅ prends (garde)
5					∅ (ver)	on (<i>ambiguous</i>)			
6	ella ella ella se (desnuda) su (memoria) sus (visiones) <i>Female</i>	elle elle elle se (dévêt) sa (mémoire) ses (visions) <i>Female</i>							

8	(yo) espero <i>Unspecified gender</i>	j' <i>Unspecified gender</i>				vendrá vendrá <i>(Ambiguous 3rd person)</i> <i>Unspecified gender</i>	sa (venue) sa (venue) <i>(Ambiguous referent)</i> <i>Unspecified gender</i>		
10	(yo) recorto <i>Unspecified gender</i>	je <i>Unspecified gender</i>						(lleno*)	∅
11			yo (yo) fui (nosotros) nos sentamos mi (mirada) <i>Female</i>	moi moi nous nous asseynons mon regard <i>Unspecified gender</i>					
13	mí (llevándo)me <i>Unspecified gender</i>	moi m'(emportant) <i>Unspecified gender</i>							
14	(yo) digo (yo) merezco mí me (come) me (bebe) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	je je moi me (mange) me (boit) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	alguien (dormido) <i>Male</i>	quelqu'un (qui dort) <i>Unspecified gender</i>				(camino*)	∅

15	(desacostumbrar) me (yo) nací <i>Female</i>	me (deshabituer) je <i>Female</i>				(extraño*) (extraño*)	∅ ∅	∅ ∅	mon (rôle)
16	(tú) has construido (tú) has golpeado (tú) has terminado (tú) has terminado tu (casa) tus (pájaros) tus (huesos) <i>Female</i>	tu ∅ (implicit) ∅ (implicit) tu ta (maison) tes (oiseaux) tes (os) <i>Female</i>							
17	mí (yo) voy (yo) me danzo (yo) me lloro mis (funerales) <i>Female</i>	moi je m' (avance) je me (fais danse) (je) me (pleure) mes (funérailles) <i>Female</i>							
18	(tú) hablas (ver)me <i>Unspecified gender</i>	tu me (voir) <i>Unspecified gender</i>							

19	míos (ojos) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	miens (yeux) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	vea (1 st /3 rd) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	verra (ambiguous 3 rd person) <i>Unspecified gender</i>		vea (1 st or 3 rd p.) (yo) tengo <i>Unspecified gender</i>	verra (Ambiguous 3 rd person) il (Impersonal) <i>Unspecified gender</i>		
20			dice sabe dice tiene dice dice dice sabe (ambiguous 3 rd person) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	elle elle elle elle elle elle elle elle elle <i>Female</i>					
21			(yo) he nacido Ø sufrido (implicit "yo") <i>Unspecified gender</i>	je j' <i>Female</i>					
26	pulsaremos nuestros (rostros) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	nous nos (visages) <i>Unspecified gender</i>							
27	me (abandona) <i>Female</i>	m' (abandonne) <i>Female</i>							

28	(tú) te alejas <i>Unspecified gender</i>	tu t'(éloignes) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	Ø (estos hilos)	filant ("tu" maybe implicit)				
29	(nosotros) vivimos <i>Unspecified gender</i>	nous <i>Unspecified gender</i>						
31	(nosotros) pulsamos <i>Unspecified gender</i>	nous <i>Unspecified gender</i>	Ø (Infinitive with impersonal meaning)	on (Ambiguous)		se alimenten (Ambiguous 3 rd person)	on (Ambiguous)	
33	(yo) me iré (quedar)me (yo) me iré <i>Unspecified gender</i>	je Ø (implicit) je <i>Unspecified gender</i>		quien <i>Unspecified</i>	celui-là qui <i>Male</i>			
35	déjate déjate déjate déjate mi (vida) mi (vida) mi (vida) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	laisse-toi laisse-toi laisse-toi laisse-toi ma (vie) ma (vie) ma (vie) <i>Unspecified gender</i>						
37	nuestra (transparencia) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	notre (transparence) <i>Unspecified gender</i>						

38	mis (poemas)	mes (poèmes)					
	me (desmiente) me (amordaza)	me (dément) me (bâillonne)					
	<i>Unspecified gender</i>	<i>Unspecified gender</i>					
	60 cases of transference		9 cases of divergence	11 cases of convergence	7 cases of improvisation	6 abandonments	2 adaptations

Appendix 2: English translation of the marks referring to thelyrical I

AD	Transference		Divergence	Convergence		Improvisation	Abandonment
1	(yo) he dado (yo) he dejado (yo) he cantado mí mi (cuerpo) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	I I (I) (from) myself my <i>Unspecified gender</i>					
2	nos <i>Unspecified gender</i>	(to) us <i>Unspecified gender</i>			propone <i>(Ambiguous 3rd person) Unspecified gender</i>	(proposed) <i>(Passive voice)</i>	
3	cuidate cuidate mí (amor) mío <i>Unspecified gender</i>	(you) beware (you) beware (of) me my (love) <i>Unspecified gender</i>					
4				su (mano) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	his (hand) <i>Male</i>		

6	ella ella ella se (desnuda) su (memoria) sus (visiones) <i>Female</i>	she she she (undresses) her her <i>Female</i>					
8	(yo) espero <i>Unspecified gender</i>	I <i>Unspecified gender</i>		vendrá vendrá (Ambiguous 3 rd person) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	it it (Neuter 3 rd p. referring to inanimate object)		
10	(yo) recorto <i>Unspecified gender</i>	I <i>Unspecified gender</i>				(lleno*)	(full)
11	yo (yo) fui mi (mirada) <i>Female</i>	I I my <i>Female</i>				(nosotros) nos sentamos	∅ (sit down)
13	mí (llevándo)me <i>Unspecified gender</i>	me me <i>Unspecified gender</i>					

14	(yo) digo (yo) merezco mí me (come) me (bebe) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	I I me (me) me <i>Unspecified gender</i>	alguien (dormido) <i>Male</i>	someone (asleep) <i>Unspecified gender</i>			(camino*)	(on the way to)
15		(desacostumbrar) me (yo) nací <i>Female</i>	myself my <i>Unspecified gender</i>			(extraño*) (extraño*)	(strange) (strange)	
16		(tú) has construido (tú) has golpeado (tú) has terminado (tú) has terminado (sola) tu (casa) tus (pájaros) tus (huesos) <i>Female</i>	you you you you (by) yourself your your your <i>Unspecified gender</i>					

17	mí (yo) voy (yo) me danzo (yo) me lloro mis (funerales) <i>Female</i>	me I I myself (I) myself my <i>Female</i>					
18	(tú) hablas (ver)me <i>Unspecified gender</i>	you me <i>Unspecified gender</i>					
19	míos (ojos) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	my <i>Unspecified gender</i>		vea <i>(Ambiguous 1st or 3rd person)</i>	I see <i>(Explicit 1st person)</i>		
20			dice sabe dice dice tiene dice dice dice sabe <i>(ambiguous 3rd person)</i> <i>Unspecified gender</i>	she she she she she she she she she <i>Female</i>			
21	(yo) he nacido Ø sufrido (implicit "yo") <i>Unspecified gender</i>	I (I) <i>Unspecified gender</i>					

23					(pulverizarse) (impersonal)	your (eyes are pulverized)	
26	pulsaremos nuestros (rostros) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	we our <i>Unspecified gender</i>					
27			me (abandona) <i>Female</i>	me <i>Unspecified gender</i>			
28	(tú) te alejas <i>Unspecified gender</i>	you <i>Unspecified gender</i>					
29	(nosotros) vivimos <i>Unspecified gender</i>	we <i>Unspecified gender</i>			(la garganta)	our (throats)	
31	(nosotros) pulsamos <i>Unspecified gender</i>	we <i>Unspecified gender</i>			(los ojos)	our (eyes)	
33	(yo) me iré (quedar)me (yo) me iré quien <i>Unspecified gender</i>	I (I) I someone <i>Unspecified gender</i>					

35	déjate déjate déjate déjate mi (vida) mi (vida) mi (vida) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	(let) yourself (let) yourself (let) yourself (let) yourself my my my <i>Unspecified gender</i>				
37	nuestra (transparencia) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	our <i>Unspecified gender</i>				
38	mis (poemas) me (desmiente) me (amordaza) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	my (contradicts)(me) (gags) me <i>Unspecified gender</i>				
	60 cases of transference	12 cases of divergence	12 cases of convergence	4 cases of improvisation	5 abandonments	

Appendix 3: German translation of the marks referring to the lyrical I

AD	Transference		Divergence	Convergence		Improvisation	Abandonment
1	(yo) he dado (yo) he dejado (yo) he cantado mi mi (cuerpo) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	ich ich (ich) mir meinen <i>Unspecified gender</i>					
2	nos <i>Unspecified gender</i>	uns <i>Unspecified gender</i>				propone (<i>Ambiguous</i> <i>3rd person</i>) <i>Unspecified</i> <i>gender</i>	die sich (anbieten) (<i>Passive</i> <i>voice</i>)
3	mi (amor) mío <i>Unspecified gender</i>	mir meine (Liebe) <i>Unspecified gender</i>		cuidate cuidate <i>Unspecified</i> <i>gender</i>	hüte dich hüte dich <i>Female</i>		
4				su (mano) <i>Unspecified</i> <i>gender</i>	seine (Hand) <i>Male</i>		

6	ella ella ella se (desnuda) su (memoria) sus (visiones) <i>Female</i>	sie sie sie (zieht) sich (aus) ihres (Gedächtnisses) ihrer (Anschauugen) <i>Female</i>					
8	(yo) espero <i>Unspecified gender</i>	ich <i>Unspecified gender</i>			vendrá vendrá (<i>Ambiguous</i> <i>3rd person</i>) <i>Unspecified</i> <i>gender</i>	es es (3 rd person neuter)	
10	(yo) recorto <i>Unspecified gender</i>	ich <i>Unspecified gender</i>					(lleno*) (voller)
11	yo (yo) fui (nosotros) nos sentamos mi (mirada) <i>Female</i>	ich ich (setzen) wir uns meines (Blickes) <i>Female</i>					
13	mi (llevando)me <i>Unspecified gender</i>	mir mich (mitnahm) <i>Unspecified gender</i>					

14	(yo) digo (yo) merezco mí me (come) me (bebe) <i>Unspecified gender</i> alguien (dormido) <i>Male</i>	ich ich mir (ißt) mich (trinkt) mich <i>Unspecified gender</i> jemand der <i>Male</i>					(camino*)	(Spiegelgang)
15	(desacostumbrar) me (yo) nací <i>Female</i>	mir (abgewöhnen) meiner (Geburt) <i>Female</i>					(extraño*) (extraño*)	(seltsam) (seltsam)
16		(tú) has construido (tú) has golpeado (tú) has terminado (tú) has terminado tu (casa) tus (pájaros) tus (huesos) <i>Female</i>	du du du du dein (Haus) deine (Vögel) deinen (Knochen) <i>Unspecified gender</i>					

17			mí (yo) voy (yo) me danzo (yo) lloro mis (funerales) <i>Female</i>	meiner ich ich (für) mich (ich) meine (Begräbnisse) <i>Unspecified gender</i>			me (lloro)	Ø
18	(tú) hablas (ver)me <i>Unspecified gender</i>	du mich (sehen) <i>Unspecified gender</i>						
19	mios (ojos)	meiner		vea (<i>Ambiguous 1st or 3^d p.</i>)	ich <i>Unspecified gender</i>		(yo) tengo	die (sind)
20				dice sabe dice tiene dice dice dice sabe (<i>Ambiguous 3rd person</i>) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	sie sie sie sie sie sie sie sie <i>Female</i>			
21	(yo) he nacido Ø sufrido (<i>implicit "yo"</i>) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	ich (ich) <i>Unspecified gender</i>						

26	pulsaremos nuestros (rostros) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	wir unsere (Gesichter) <i>Unspecified gender</i>				
27			me (abandona) <i>Female</i>	(verläßt) mich <i>Unspecified</i>		
28	(tú) te alejas <i>Unspecified gender</i>	du (entfernst) dich <i>Unspecified gender</i>				
29	(nosotros) vivimos <i>Unspecified gender</i>	wir <i>Unspecified gender</i>				
31	(nosotros) pulsamos <i>Unspecified gender</i>	wir <i>Unspecified gender</i>				
33	(yo) me iré (quedar)me (yo) me iré <i>Unspecified gender</i>	ich (ich) (bleiben) ich <i>Unspecified gender</i>		quien <i>Unspecified gender</i>	jemand, der <i>Male</i>	

35	déjate déjate déjate déjate mi (vida) mi (vida) mi (vida) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	laß dich (du) sei laß dich laß dich mein (Leben) mein (Leben) mein (Leben) <i>Unspecified gender</i>			(doler)	(du) sei (Schmerz)	
37	nuestra (transparencia) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	unsere (Transparenz) <i>Unspecified gender</i>					
38	mis (poemas) me (desmiente) me (amordaza) <i>Unspecified gender</i>	meinen (Gedichten) (verleugnet) mich (knebelt) mich <i>Unspecified gender</i>					
55 cases of transference		14 cases of divergence	13 cases of convergence	4 cases of improvisation	6 cases of abandonment		

References

1. Primary Literature

1.1. *Árbol de Diana*: original poetry book

PIZARNIK, Alejandra. (1962) *Árbol de Diana*. Buenos Aires: Sur.

1.2. *Árbol de Diana*: translations classified by target language in chronological order of publication.

1.2.1. German

SCHMITT, Hans-Jürgen (author and transl.) (2000) *Wie mit gezücktem Messer in der Nacht – Delmira Agustini, Alfonsina Storni, Alejandra Pizarnik: Leben und Sterben dreier lateinamerikanischer Lyrikerinnen*. Zürich: Ammann Verlag. pp. 40-45; 47-48; 50.

SIEFER, Elisabeth (transl.) (2000) *extraña que fui – fremd die ich war*. Zürich: Teamart Verlag.

BURGHARDT, Juana & Tobias (transl.) (2002) *Cenizas – Asche, Asche*. Zürich: Ammann Verlag.

1.2.2. French

COUFFON, Claude (transl.) (1983) *Alejandra Pizarnik : Poèmes – Poemas*. Collection Nadir. Paris: Centre Culturel Argentin.

BARON SUPERVIELLE, Silvia & Claude Couffon (transl.) (1986) *Alejandra Pizarnik : Les travaux et les nuits – Œuvre poétique 1956-1972*. Collection du miroir. Paris: Granit/Unesco.

1.2.3. English

ÁLVAREZ, Lynne (transl.) (1979) “Alejandra Pizarnik – Selected Poems”. *Review* 24. pp. 53-69.

GRAZIANO, Frank (transl.) (1987) *Alejandra Pizarnik: A Profile*. Durango, CO: Logbridge-Rhodes.

MOLLOY, Sylvia (transl.) (1991) “From Diana’s Tree”. In: Castro-Klarén, Sara *et. al.* (ed.) *Women’s Writing in Latin America: An Anthology*. Boulder/Oxford: West- view Press. pp. 204-205.

ROSSI, Cecilia (transl.) (2000) “Diana’s Tree: poems by Alejandra Pizarnik, with a prologue by Octavio Paz”. *Comparative Criticism* 22. pp. 211-222.

BASSNETT, Susan (author and transl.) (2002) *Exchanging Lives – Poems and Translations*. Leeds, U.K.: Peepal Tree Press.

RACKERS, Mark G. (transl.) (2003) “Shadows and Mirrors: A Critical Translation of Alejandra Pizarnik’s *Diana’s Tree*, *Works and Nights*, and *Extraction of the Stone of Madness*”. M.A. thesis. San Diego State University.

CHARTKOFF, Zachary (transl.) (2005) <http://www.zacharychartkoff.com/category/translations>. n.p. (Consulted on 20-02-2008).

2. Secondary literature

AIRA, César. (1998) *Alejandra Pizarnik*. Rosario, Argentina: Beatriz Viterbo Editora (El Escribiente).

ÁLVAREZ, Enid. (1997) “A medida que la noche avanza”. *Debate feminista* 8. pp. 3-34.

- BASSNETT, Susan. (1990) "Speaking with Many Voices: The Poems of Alejandra Pizarnik". À: Bassnett, Susan (ed.) *Knives and Angels: Women Writers in Latin America*. London & New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd. pp. 36-51.
- BORINSKY, Alicia. (1995) "Alejandra Pizarnik: The Self and Its Impossible Landscapes". À: Agosin, Marjorie (ed.) *A Dream of Light and Shadow: Portraits of Latin American Women Writers*. Trans. Nancy Abraham Hall. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. pp. 291-302.
- DEPETRIS, Carolina. (2004) *Aporética de la muerte: estudio crítico sobre Alejandra Pizarnik*. Madrid: UAM Ediciones.
- DOBRY, Edgardo. (2004) "La poesía de Alejandra Pizarnik: una lectura de *Extracción de piedra de locura*". *Cuadernos hispanoamericanos* 644. pp. 33-44.
- FERRELL, Tracy. (2001) *Sexual Dissidents/Textual Dissonance: Transgressive Sexuality in the Writing of Alejandra Pizarnik, Cristina Peri Rossi, Luisa Valenzuela and Sylvia Molloy*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Colorado.
- FITTS, Alexandra. (1995) *Reading the Body / Writing the Body: Constructions of the Female Body in the Work of Latin American Women Writers*. Ph.D. thesis, Duke University.
- GENOVESE, Alicia. (1998) *La doble voz: poetas argentinas contemporáneas*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos (Biblioteca de las Mujeres).
- GOLDBERG, Florinda F. (1994) *Alejandra Pizarnik: 'Este espacio que somos'*. Gaithersburg, MD: Ed. Hispamérica.
- GUIBELALDE, Gabriel. (1998) *Aportes para la Extracción de la piedra de locura: Vida y obra de Alejandra Pizarnik*. Córdoba, Argentina: Editorial Dimas.
- JONES, Francis R. (1989) "On Aboriginal Sufferance: A Process Model of Poetic Translating". *Target* 1:2. pp. 183-199.
- KUNHEIM, Jill S. (1996) *Gender, Politics, and Poetry in Twentieth-Century Argentina*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- LASARTE, Francisco. (1983) "Más allá del surrealismo: la poesía de Alejandra Pizarnik". *Revista Iberoamericana* 125. pp. 867-877.
- LÓPEZ LUACES, Marta. (2002) "Los discursos poéticos en la obra de Alejandra Pizarnik". *Espéculo* 21. <http://www.ucm.es/info/especulo/numero21/pizarnik.html> (Consulted on 15-06-2007).
- MACKINTOSH, Fiona J. (2003) *Childhood in the Works of Silvina Ocampo and Alejandra Pizarnik*. Woodbridge: Tamesis (Monografías A, 196).
- MONDER, Samuel. (2004) "La última impureza: una poética de lo pictórico en Alejandra Pizarnik". *Literatura y otras artes en América Latina*. À: Balderston, Daniel; Oscar Torres Duque; Laura Gutiérrez; Biran Gollnick & Eileen Wil-lingham (eds.) *Actas del XXXIV Congreso del Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana*, Iowa City, 2 al 6 de julio de 2002. Iowa City: University of Iowa. pp. 17-22.
- RODRÍGUEZ FRANCIA, Ana María. (2003) *La disolución en la obra de Alejandra Pizarnik: Ensombrecimiento de la existencia y ocultamiento del ser*. Buenos Aires: Corregidor (La vida en las Pampas).
- RUBÍ, Martha Lorena. (2002) *Spanish American Feminist Literary Theory: An Approach Through the Concept of Willing*. Ph. D. thesis. The City University of New York.
- RUNNING, Thorpe. (1996) *The Critical Poem: Borges, Paz, and Other Language-Centered Poets in Latin America*. London: Associated University Presses.
- STEINER, George. (1992) *After Babel – Aspects of Language and Translation* (2nd edition). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- SUÁREZ ROJAS, Tina. (1997) "Alejandra Pizarnik: ¿La escritura o la vida?" *Especio de paciencia* 3. pp. 24-27.
- TELAACK, Anastasia. (2003) *Körper, Sprache, Tradition – Jüdische Topographien im Werk zeitgenössischer Autorinnen und Autoren aus Argentinien*. Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Berlin.

ZEISS, Elizabeth Anne. (2001) *The Subject between Texts in Alejandra Pizarnik's Poetry*. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin.

3. Reference works

GREVISSE, Maurice. (1980) *Le bon usage*. Paris-Gembloux: Éditions Duculot.

HANSE, Joseph. (1994) *Nouveau dictionnaire des difficultés du français moderne* (3e édition). Louvain-la-Neuve: Éditions De Boeck-Duculot.

SCHANEN, François & Jean-Paul Confais. (2005) *Grammaire de l'allemand – Formes et fonctions*. Paris: Armand Colin (Cursus).

THOMSON, A. J. & A. V. Martinet. (1986) *A Practical English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press