

**Science Fiction: The Hyperaware Enunciator and the Concept of Journey from the Point of View of Referencing Processes / *A ficção científica: o enunciador hiperperceptivo e a viagem do ponto de vista na referenciação***

*Stener Carvalho Fernandes Barbosa\**

**ABSTRACT**

Science fiction is a literary genre that has spread around the world due, among other reasons, to its popularity; narratives contain exotic characters and fantastic intrigue. It is considered by the circle of scholars and critics, however, a “minor” literature; for discourse linguists, its aesthetic attributes remain in the background. The theory of points of view (POV), for example, can contribute to a better assessment of the genre. This article aims to study this literary genre via enunciation. First, we talk about studies in narratology to delimit the place of science fiction (or sf) in the universe of narratives. Secondly, we talk about concepts and notations from POV theory within narratological studies to trigger a dialogical analysis of literary discourse. Thirdly, we analyze a fragment from *Dune*, by Frank Herbert, in its version into Brazilian Portuguese (2017). Finally, we propose that “superpowers” held by characters in this genre can be explained linguistically.

**KEYWORDS:** Science fiction; Narrative; Point of view; Superpowers

**RESUMO**

*A ficção científica é um gênero literário que se espalhou mundo afora devido, entre outros motivos, à sua popularidade; as narrativas contêm personagens exóticos e intrigas fantásticas. É considerada, contudo, pelo círculo de eruditos e críticos, uma literatura “menor”, mas, para os linguistas do discurso, seus atributos “estéticos” ficam em segundo plano. A teoria dos pontos de vista (PDV), por exemplo, pode contribuir para uma melhor avaliação do gênero. O presente artigo tem como ambição estudar enunciativamente esse gênero literário. Em primeiro lugar, falaremos sobre estudos da narratologia, para marcar o lugar da ficção científica (ou fc) no universo das narrativas. Em segundo lugar, falaremos sobre as noções e notações da teoria PDV dentro do estudo narratológico para acionar uma análise dialógica do discurso literário. Em terceiro lugar, analisaremos um fragmento da narrativa Duna, de Frank Herbert, em sua versão para português brasileiro (2017). Ao final, propomos que os “superpoderes” dos personagens nesse gênero podem ser explicados linguisticamente.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Ficção científica; Narrativa; Ponto de vista; Superpoderes

---

\* Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Faculdade de Letras, Departamento de Linguística, Campus Pampulha, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3423-9311>; [stenercarvalho@gmail.com](mailto:stenercarvalho@gmail.com)

## Introduction

Science fiction is an internationally disseminated literary genre due, among other reasons, to its popularity. However, it is known as a non-academic genre, that is, it has little institutional circulation and enjoys reduced credibility in the university environment. Because it is not even designated as “belles-lettres,” nor does it hold the status of “classic,” the genre is occasionally seen as literature of “low aesthetic level, of great imaginative poverty (...), with lifeless characters and situations lacking deep meaning” (Rosenfeld, 2011, p. 37)<sup>1</sup> – evidently, this refers to value judgement by “critics,” supported by theories that reproduce a certain disdain in regard to popularity. Among others, one may cite the well-known theory averse to “cultural industry” and its resistance to the consumption of mass culture (Adorno; Horkheimer, 2002). However, elsewhere, far from the rule of the “beautiful” and an “aesthetic court” – even away from deep philosophical analyses on *late capitalism* –, it is worth considering that science fiction is a narrative like any other; a simple remark, but no less fascinating. This textual type carries exotic characters, pulsating plots, and fabulous intrigue. Like any other text, it constitutes a genre, that is, its characteristics have stabilized within a common framework, set into a certain routine. Plots that seem to prioritize “fun” in the context of science fiction are commonplace in cinematic entertainment productions. Furthermore, producers search from the fabulous universe of books for film adaptations of “classic” works that have become as famous as they are banal (Andrews; Rennison, 2006). However, its characteristics, as a human activity in discursive communication between admirers, are defined through several adjectives: dystopian, utopian, fabulous, futuristic, alternative etc. In other words, in its richness, science fiction (often referred to as “sf” in critical work) is usually characterized as a scientific reality imagined in the future, or an alternative reality with fantastic properties, a “fabulous fiction.” Many are the adjectives; many are the characteristics.

As “fabulous fiction,” one of these adjectives, science fiction attempts to reflect on the “moral of the story,” be that implicit or explicit, to stimulate debate about the human condition, the paths of society, and the destinies of humanity, among many other

---

<sup>1</sup> In Portuguese: “baixo nível estético, de grande pobreza imaginativa (...), com personagens sem vida e situações sem significado profundo.”

ethical questions resulting from true moral dilemmas: what is right, what went wrong, how we got to this point etc.

As fiction, the dynamics pushing plots forward feature narrators and exotic characters. Typically, the story is told by an announcer-narrator who recounts various plots in fantastic environments. A narrator reports on diverse characters and promotes encounters in a network that frames intergalactic worlds, futuristic realities, intrigue from dystopian societies, special weapons, aliens, and even messianic resurrections. Developing plots such as these position the figure of the narrator as a true focus within the imaginative plot, usually on a planet Earth of the future or in outer space, light-years away from here.<sup>2</sup>

Science fiction, however, is not an alternate reality, devoid of current social and political issues. It is divided into subgenres focusing on issues external to narrated discourse, even though these issues still guide its agenda. Some dystopian narratives create realities dominated by authoritarianism – much like the totalitarian regimes that marked the “real” world of the twentieth century. The stories of *1984*, *Animal Farm*, or *Brave New World* are widely known. Before those examples, *We*, by Yevgeny Zamyatin, challenged Stalin’s regime in the Soviet Union. In Brazil, the work of fiction *Não verás país nenhum* [Thou Shalt See No Country], by Ignácio de Loyola Brandão, portrays a “futuristic military regime” that is strikingly similar to the dictatorship that lasted between 1964 and 1985 in Brazil. That is, science fiction is far from being an “innocent” genre.

Over time, sf developed new foci through different speakers, diverse writers, powerful and imaginative new political identities. For example, some dystopias were built around realities dominated by sexist regimes; a classic example is novelist Margaret Atwood’s *The Handmaid’s Tale*, adapted for television. Though it does not pivot upon imagined science, the novel projects a dystopian, sexist, and tyrannical world. In addition to it, others seem increasingly popular, such as Naomi Alderman’s *The Power*, a feminist and futurist novel that confronts men and women.

The genre lists countless other instances, as science fiction has developed significantly since its consolidation in the nineteenth century. Some attribute the genre’s birth to Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. However, without delving into the sterile

---

<sup>2</sup> At this point, we treat science fiction from the *space opera* subgenre. The simplification is purposeful to refer the reader to more detailed readings of this textual typology (Westfahl, 2003).

controversy of a “discursive mythical Adam”<sup>3</sup> (who birthed the genre), fact is that science fiction currently makes up popular imagination across the world.

In this text, we discuss the narrative of science fiction from the perspective of “centers of perspective,” that is, through modal subjects, also widely known as enunciators (Rabatel, 2016). More specifically, we analyze a fragment from the first book in the story of *Dune*, a science fiction novel by Frank Herbert, that gained notoriety for presenting a protagonist who is a messianic revolutionary at the age of 15. His name is Paul Atreides,<sup>4</sup> sometimes referred to (by POV theory) as a modal enunciator (unspoken expression), sometimes as a speaker-enunciator (spoken expression, or l2/e2).

## 1 The Character, the Action, and the POV

Without seeking to describe in detail Paul’s characteristics, for the purpose of analysis considering the point of view in the narrative of *Dune*, we must describe one of his aptitudes, or, rather, his hypersensitivity. In other words, Paul was raised by his mother, a witch from an intergalactic sect who taught him “hiperalertness”<sup>5</sup> (Herbert, 2005, p. 269). As a result, Paul is a character who expresses traits beyond that sensitivity seen in supposedly “normal” characters from the diegesis, for pragmatic reasons that are made explicit during his characterization in the narrative. Paul “feels” things he does not understand. This trait is considerably important for analyzing POV in *Dune*,<sup>6</sup> in Paul’s case. To that end, we assume that characters’ psychological traits can endorse their position in the narrative – especially in sf – to compose their vision in the face of developing diegesis. This does not, however, rule out the importance of another narrative attribute: the enunciative “action” refined in the “plot” (Candido, 2011, p. 54) or in the “intrigue” (Todorov, 2008, pp. 83-84). That action is developed through notional verbs,

---

<sup>3</sup> There are those who turn to Thomas More, with the publication of the famous fantasy *Utopia* in 1516, to found the genre, or even those who go to 1627, with the work *Nova Atlantis*, to say that it all began with Francis Bacon. What seems more plausible to us is that science and fictional narrative were created through a dialogical interdiscursivity. Electing a founding father, a biblical Adam (Bakhtin, 1986) is a sterile and non-dialogical debate.

<sup>4</sup> Criticism of the book that has Paul Atreides as a “messiah” is directed at his character as a white savior. In France the phenomenon is called *complexe du sauveur blanc* – and not without reason. There are many others with this same profile, especially in cinema, such as Neo from the movie *Matrix* and others in the same line of white, straight, cis and young men.

<sup>5</sup> In fact, “hyperacuity” or “hyperawareness” stems from a millennial combination of genetic encounters. However, it is his mother who teaches him to control these skills.

<sup>6</sup> For Reference, see footnote 7.

but also sensory verbs. The development of diegesis depends on understanding action at the level of the fictional plot. We entirely agree with Todorov, as “there are no characters outside of action, nor independent action of characters” (2019, p. 119).<sup>7</sup> This implies that there are no “psychologisms,” with detailed descriptions of characters’ traits, without the corresponding constituent action, which is usually exposed by an enunciative sequencing of the plot, even moving the character from one place to another within the *intrigue* of science fiction. This “path” taken by the character in the text, as it unfolds possible actions, take place not infrequently by *phoric cohesion*. In fact, this on-and-off movement in the *plot* is also triggered by “perceptions of the world” that, for the most part, are expressed by sensory verbs and point towards elsewhere, in the text, with semantic purpose. In general, these so-called phoric words “point towards the recovery of information either in the situation or in the text” (Neves, 1990, p. 87). This happens through two movements, namely anaphoric (when retrospective) or cataphoric (when prospective). That is, phoric cohesion retrieves information to compose semantic orientation for the narrative’s *intrigue* and, in our case, for science fiction. Later we discover that this retrieval of information in sf, in fact, can promote improvements on a modal enunciator’s point of view.

## 2 Narrator vs. Narrative

Before discussing *Dune* specifically, we must approach the impactful debate within the field of Narratology that is the narrator’s potential influence upon their narrative.

The interest in narrative gained significant dimensions in the mid-twentieth century. Before that, Russian formalists developed fruitful work on the nature of this textual form around 1920 (Todorov, 2008). However, from a French perspective, Narratology was mainly divided between *structuralism* and *post-structuralism* (Dosse, 1993). This means that diegesis sometimes was treated as a structure of objective elements, and sometimes as enunciative events inside the narration. In other words, on the one hand, Narratology was dedicated to privileging the objective structure of diegesis (Todorov, 2008, Greimas, 2014) and, on the other, to the analysis of visions on narrators’

---

<sup>7</sup> In Portuguese: “não há personagens fora da ação, nem ação independente de personagens.”

subjective investments (Genette, 2015a and 2015b; Rabatel, 2016). Even so, different approaches to narratives started from a common debate: the relationship of the narrative text with the discourse of those who narrate. In this sense, what is sought with these different studies was to emphasize that the narrative tells a story by avoiding, here and there, “intrusions of the author” (Blin cited by Genette, 2015a, p. 69). Of course, these studies always suggest a traditional view of the narrator’s “invisible”<sup>8</sup> investments in the objective account that one wants to convey, whether through factual story or imagined fiction. However, it is already known that contemporary literature challenges traditional views on the disappearance of the “author.” The case of science fiction, of course, is not dissimilar. The genre also seems to postulate that the narrative speaks for itself, without a narrator. If we unequivocally follow the path of enunciation theory, in fact, there is no longer a narrator. These are Benveniste’s conclusions about verbs in French: the person ceases to exist as the tense marking a past event is aimed at setting the narrator’s person out of the narrative enunciation:

In fact, there is no longer, then, even a narrator. Events are presented as they occurred, as they appear on the horizon of a story. No one speaks here: events seem to narrate themselves (1976, p. 267).<sup>9</sup>

This understanding of enunciation positions *narrative* (or story) on the one hand and *discourse* on the other, that is, objectivity on one side and subjectivity on the other. Linguistically, this means that the deepening gulf between the subjectivity of discourse and the objectivity of narrative somehow lies within a given impersonality or personhood of enunciation:

(...) a discourse is “subjective” as it marks, explicitly or not, presence (or reference to) of an “I;” however, this “I” is not defined by the person who sustains that discourse (...). In the opposite direction, narrative objectivity is defined by the absence of any reference to the narrator (Genette, 2015a, pp. 65-66).<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> It is Todorov’s “poetic personality,” that is, “an invisible *self* most of the time, which refers to the narrator” (2019, p. 61).

<sup>9</sup> In Portuguese: “Na verdade, não há mais, então, nem mesmo narrador. Os acontecimentos são apresentados como se produziram, à medida que aparecem no horizonte da história. Ninguém fala aqui: os acontecimentos parecem narrar-se a si mesmos.”

<sup>10</sup> In Portuguese: “(...) a discourse is “subjective” as it marks, explicitly or not, presence (or reference to) of an “I;” however, this “I” is not defined by the person who sustains that discourse (...). In the opposite direction, narrative objectivity is defined by the absence of any reference to the narrator.”

Subsequently, linguists and literary critics began to contest that “non-subjective” character attributed to narrative and became interested in the “clues” given by the speaker-narrator or, at least, in contesting an objective and unequivocal character of the narrative. This is why Genette, after detailed discussions on the boundaries of narrative, states:

Discourse can “tell” without ceasing to be discourse; narrative cannot enunciate without stepping out of itself. But it also cannot abstain without falling into aridity and destitution, which is why narrative, so to speak, does not exist anywhere in its rigorous form (2015a, p. 69).<sup>11</sup>

This implies that, if there is no place where narrative exists in its rigorously objective form, there are indications that narrative carries “author intrusions,” that is, subjectivities inherent from the discourse of those who narrate. The one who narrates will participate in the narrative to some extent. Enunciatively, however, adopting the impersonality of the third person, narrative will retain the impression that “events seem to narrate themselves” (Benveniste, 1976, p. 267).<sup>12</sup>

### **3 Basic Notions from the Interactionist Theory of POV**

Before presenting an analysis of the narrative discourse in *Dune*’s science fiction, we say that the articulation of basic notions from POV theory will be done only via a quick presentation about some concepts and notations (Rabatel, 2016), to meet the requirements of this article. These concepts and notations are then applied to text fragments. It is not the aim here to exhaust these concepts, as they foster extensive debate within theoretical perspectives; their discussion is limited to what pertains the proposed analysis. This presentation is of didactic nature; this section, in this article, can be skipped at any time by a competent reader who is not interested in basic demonstrations. However, reading it may be enlightening on some points about interactionist analysis of points of view (POV):

---

<sup>11</sup> In Portuguese: “O discurso pode “contar” sem deixar de ser discurso; a narrativa não pode discorrer sem sair de si mesma. Mas ela também não pode se abster sem cair na aridez e na indigência, e é por isso que a narrativa, por assim dizer, não existe em nenhum lugar em sua forma rigorosa.”

<sup>12</sup> As a matter of fact, there is then no longer even a narrator. The events are set forth chronologically, as they occurred. Noone speaks here; the events seem to narrate themselves.

Point of View (POV)	Expression of subjectivity in enunciative instances through what is said (locution) and unsaid (modulization).
L1 (narrator)	The capital letter “L,” followed by the digit “1,” refers to the speaker-narrator, that corresponds to the <i>first speaker</i> . Recognized as the dialogic manager of enunciators’ POVs. They operate the perspective center for the modal subject (imputation).
E1 (narrator’s center of vision and focus)	The capital letter “E,” followed by the digit “1,” refers to the <i>First Enunciator</i> , which corresponds to the perspective center whose expression is the POV (expression of the subjectivity of L1).
L1/E1, l2/e2, l3/e3 etc.	The oblique bar “/” symbolizes syncretism (coincidence or synchrony) between L1 and E1, that is, L1/E1. It will also serve to represent consonance between l2/e2, l3/e3 etc.
L2 l3 etc. (second, third speakers etc.)	The lowercase “l,” followed by variable digits (l2, l3 etc.) symbolizes the different speakers as distinct from the first. They are vocalized by <i>dicendi</i> verbs or by polyphonic signs (dashes, quotation marks etc.).
E2 e3 etc. (second, third enunciators etc.)	The lowercase “e” followed by variable digits (e2, e3 etc.) symbolizes the enunciators. They are perspective centers <i>par excellence</i> . As they are not expressed in a spoken way (locution verbs), they can manifest themselves in an unspoken way through modalizers (such as discursive adverbs).
Enunciative Responsibility (RE)	Whoever says they are responsible for what they say. There are two RE: a full RE and a limited ER. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full RE concerns the assumption of propositional content, which is present in the statement, by L1/E1. They accept the entirety of that content at their own risk. It is spoken. It is the commitment the First Speaker has with what they are saying (e.g., I say X).</li> <li>• Limited RE occurs by the phenomenon of imputation (assigning a POV to an l2/E2) from L1/E1. Because it is an imputation from L1/E1, it is said by a second speaker and will be an RE, albeit limited (eg: He says X).</li> </ul>
Imputation	Imputation is the displacement – or sliding – of the perspective center from one enunciative instance to another;
quasi-RE	Quasi-RE is a responsibility that is almost enunciative; because there is no locutionary verb (or any polyphonic sign that defines it) the enunciator can be held responsible not for what they say, but for what they think, feel, or see (sensory perceptions).

Chart 1 – Basic concepts and notations for analysis. Source: Rabatel, *Homo narrans* (2016).



#### 4 The challenge of Identifying POV and ER in Written Narrative

One of the biggest challenges in a dialogical analysis of the narrative is the identification of point of view (POV) and for *whom* it stands. POV is one thing; it is another to know who it is, or, specifically, who *carries the POV's enunciative responsibility* (Ducrot, 2020; Rabatel, 2016). This means that the POV revealed by character speeches (via *dicendi* or *sentiendi* verbs) or by the perception they manifest in the plot (even without explicitly locutionary verbs) fluctuates in the narrative to the point of creating (why not?) a same POV for different enunciative instances. It is enough that one and the other share “propositional content” (Rabatel, 2016, p. 59); thus, hypothetically, there could be a single POV for two enunciators, for example. However, the most important part of this debate lies in identifying the POV – and whose responsibility (RE) it is for that same POV; like icing on the cake, the imputation of ER from one enunciative instance to another is another challenge. It is the synthesis of dialogical analysis, or at least for the analysis we perform here:

- (a) to identify the POV;
- (b) to identify who bears responsibility for that POV; and
- (c) to map how that POV is imputed to it.

In POV narratological theory – especially thanks to Rabatel’s contribution with his interactionist theory on POV – item (a) happens when we perceive the “perspective center” (2016, p. 87) as an “enunciative source” (2016, p. 84), even when its form is not locutionary. On the other hand, (b) concerns the instance that manages, or rather, hierarchizes the POV and its responsibilities inside a given narrative. Who is responsible? They are *fully responsible* for what they claim someone who says what they do, that is:

“I say X.”

(Rabatel, 2016, p. 91)

However, they are also responsible for what the speaker says, because the narrator is saying what they say, that is:

“He says X.”

In the latter case, we have *limited responsibility* and, in the former case, *full responsibility* (Rabatel, pp. 91-92). The imputation of item (c), on the other hand, is characterized as POV slippage from one enunciative instance to another. This movement also happens to the responsibility attributed to each POV, that is, not only POV displacement happens, but also to those who impute responsibility for that same POV. In this last case of responsibility by imputation – also called *limited responsibility* –, the first speaker (the one who wrote “He says that X”) imputed the POV to “He;” even if we know the one who said it was the first speaker, it is to “He” that the first speaker attributes responsibility for saying what, in theory, they had already said. This debate is so serious that imputing enunciative responsibility can and should generate legal responsibilities. Just replace “X” with a spurious example, such as “you are a monkey.” In this case, we have a “He” who had a racist POV imputed upon himself, and whose enunciative responsibility will generate criminal and legal effects of an aberrant insult or, in other words, shameful and infamous<sup>13</sup> (Emediato, 2023).

Finally, in (c), a POV can be moved from one instance to another without a locutionary verb, that is, a *dicendi* or *sentienti* verb, as it happens in both examples of the verb “say” in the present tense (“I say”... and “He says”...). As a rule, enunciative responsibility can only exist if expressed by what is said (Ducrot, 2020). This means that only through locutionary verbs or any spelling that replaces polyphonic locution – such as incises, quotation marks, dashes, italics etc. –, responsibility can be determined. Another way of stating the nature of enunciative responsibility is that it can only be imputed from one speaker to another. Therefore, it only occurs through speech that has been expressly said, written, or spoken, that is, speech narrated and reported from one enunciative instance that *says*<sub>1</sub> (first speaker) to another *that says*<sub>2</sub> (second speaker). Does this mean that modal enunciators – those who *say* nothing – can be held accountable enunciatively? Of course, they can! There are ways of sliding POVs to assign what we call quasi-RE, that is, a *nearly* enunciative responsibility<sup>14</sup> (Rabatel, 2016). This happens

---

<sup>13</sup> The enunciative aspects of adoxal discourses (“shameful” discourses) were discussed in the book by EMEDIATO, Wander. *Interações polêmicas e violência verbal em temas sociais sensíveis* [Polemic Interactions and Verbal Violence in Sensitive Social Issues]. Campinas, Pontes, 2023. We emphasize this work by the pragmatic-enunciative aspect of dialogical discourse analysis, as we will do here.

<sup>14</sup> We prefer “quasi-enunciative responsibility” to “enunciative quasi-responsibility” because we understand that there is an imputation of responsibility. It just isn’t essentially enunciative. We maintained, however, the conventional abbreviation built by Rabatel (2016, *passim*).

when a POV is assigned without a *dicendi* verb or explicit phrase. It is the case of the one who says or writes (First Speaker) as they attribute an action to another who is not *saying*, but supposedly feeling, *without anything to say*. That is:

“He loves X.”

In this particular case, the one who says “He loves X” is the speaker-narrator, and it is not the speaker-narrator who loves. He imputes that sentimental POV to “He,” but “He” did not say that he loved – it was the speaker-narrator who did. In other words: the speaker-narrator attributed to “He” the sentimental responsibility of loving “X.” As this imputation does not qualify as “enunciative responsibility” in its exclusively locutional aspect, then we say that a quasi-RE was imputed to him, or a *nearly enunciative responsibility*. Moreover, it is important to know that both POV and RE, or quasi-RE, are usually imputed to meet the interests of the dialogical manager for that narrative, that is, the speaker-narrator.

## 5 POV Within the Narrative

The development of the enunciative approach in narratology revealed that simply detecting the impersonal (by the pronoun “she” or “he,” for example) or personal (by the pronoun “I”) character of a text is not enough to reveal multiple “visions” that the characters themselves may develop within the *intrigue*. Since the 1970s, these “visions” began to be called “points of view” (POV), more specifically. Considering contributions from cinema analyses (audio-visual narratives), POV is:

(...) the optical perspective of a character whose gaze or look dominates a sequence, or, in its broader meaning, the overall perspective of the narrator toward the characters and the events of the fictional world. (Stam *et al*, 1992, p. 106).<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> In the original: “(...) *la perspectiva óptica de un personaje cuya mirada o visión domina una secuencia, o, en su sentido más amplio, la perspectiva general del narrador hacia los personajes y los hechos del mundo ficcional.*”

We can accept different “visions” taken from within the diegesis itself as “optical perspectives,” or even from the relationship between these visions (or POV) and the reader or viewer themselves. The narrator-director’s “vision” (or Speaker POV) can differ from the “vision” of the characters (or Enunciator POV) and, in turn, differ from the almost incalculable effect of the final “vision” of the interpreter (reader-spectator POV). Linguistically speaking, POV1 of the speaker-narrator can be anti-oriented towards the POV2 of the enunciator and, in addition, suggest a different reading upon the POV3 of the “protoenunciator” or the “prototypical enunciator,” which is the idealized reader-spectator model from sf (Rabatel, 2013, p. 54). That is, inside the narrative, POV1 may not coincide with POV2 and, in turn, may also not coincide with POV3 (for instance, when the reader does not capture an ironic device). In an exclusively enunciative sense, POV3 is attributed to that “magical” reader of the plot, because they open the “access roads to texts” (Rabatel, 2016, p. 45) that multiply with each character performance – each in their own way and each at various moments as the narrative flows. Better said, the reader:

(...) being, at the same time, inside and outside, with all the characters whose POV can rebuild, and above them, because of its mobility, which allows them, thus, to recover meaning from inside of the work and articulate an *intentio operis* with another *intentio auctoris*, relating them in turn to the concerns of their *hic* and *nunc* (Rabatel, 2016, pp. 45-46).

The reader articulates narrative intentions (*intentio operis*) and narrator intentions (*intentio auctoris*) when they open access to points of view (POV) of different characters who, at each enunciative manifestation, reveal themselves as centers of modal or deictic subjectivity. The POV is, among other definitions, the “gaze” at this perspective center with subjective autonomy, including characters and readers of the diegesis. These points of view, therefore, manifest themselves in the most diverse enunciative instances.

## 6 Excerpt from *Dune*

*Dune* is a heterodiegetic narrative,<sup>16</sup> that is, the narrator does not participate in the narrative, according to the classic study on enunciation proposed by Benveniste (1976). In this sense, *Dune* is a diegesis in which the relationship between Speaker and narrative is that of the narrator's distancing as a result of objectivity and enunciative erasure.

Briefly describing the scene in the excerpt selected for analysis, it describes the moment when Paul and his family (along with Duke Leto's entourage, his father) prepare to leave Caladan (home planet of the house Atreides) towards Dune (a fief planet ceded by the Emperor). Preparations and moving plans are already in the final stages to leave their planet of origin. Some objects are still in Paul's training room. In that room, Paul receives military training from Thufir Hawat (an old "Mentat," advisor known as the "master of assassins"). The scene will take place between Paul and Thufir. Paul is already in the room.

Thufir Hawat slipped into the training room of Castle Caladan, closed the door softly. He stood there a moment, feeling old and tired and storm-leathered. His left leg ached where it had been slashed once in the service of the Old Duke.

*Three generations of them now*, he thought.

He stared across the big room bright with the light of noon pouring through the skylights, saw the boy seated with back to the door, intent on papers and charts spread across an ell table.

*How many times must I tell that lad never to settle himself with his back to a door?* Hawat cleared his throat.

[...]

"I heard you coming down the hall," Paul said. "And I heard you open the door."

"The sounds I make could be imitated."

"I'd know the difference."

*He might at that*, Hawat thought. [...]

(Herbert, 2005, p. 41).

Figure 1 – Corpus of analysis from *Dune*.

<sup>16</sup> According to Genette, the narrative can be homodiegetic, heterodiegetic, intradiegetic, extradiegetic, autodiegetic, and metadiegetic. Genette's narratological study was fundamental for understanding the narrator's participation or not in the diegesis itself (2015a; 2015b).

Before continuing, a second reading of the selected excerpt is advisable to capture more closely the configuration of the text, now knowing that *Dune*'s narrative, through the use of *italics*, expresses a character's thoughts. We will see later that this is more than a matter of style.

For analytic purposes, we will divide this scene into three fragments, as listed in Chart 2.

Excerpt 1	<p>Thufir Hawat slipped into the training room of Castle Caladan, closed the door softly. He stood there a moment, feeling old and tired and storm-leathered. His left leg ached where it had been slashed once in the service of the Old Duke.</p> <p><i>Three generations of them now, he thought.</i></p>
Excerpt 2	<p>He stared across the big room bright with the light of noon pouring through the skylights, saw the boy seated with back to the door, intent on papers and charts spread across an ell table.</p> <p><i>How many times must I tell that lad never to settle himself with his back to a door?</i> Hawat cleared his throat.</p>
Excerpt 3	<p>"I heard you coming down the hall," Paul said. "And I heard you open the door."</p> <p>"The sounds I make could be imitated."</p> <p>"I'd know the difference."</p> <p><i>He might at that, Hawat thought.</i></p>

Chart 2 – *Corpus* divided into three excerpts

In excerpts 1 and 2, we identified three (3) enunciative instances, namely:

- The narrator (L1/E1) – first speaker (narrator), heterodiegetic in the narrative and dialogic manager of the POV;
- "Thufir Hawat" (e2) – enunciator, according to Thufir Hawat;
- "the boy," Paul (e3) – third enunciator who has hypersensitivity, Paul Atreides.

This first excerpt from the scene – initially by reading fragment 1 – must be analyzed considering these 3 (three) enunciative instances, as they can reveal to whom that enunciative responsibility (RE) belong in a very opaque POV, that is, the enunciative POV that "slipped" and "softly" entered,<sup>17</sup> in an action described as, at first glance, simply

---

<sup>17</sup> Hereafter, we make an enunciative analysis of the translation of the book "*Dune*" (Herbert, 2010) into Portuguese. That is quite significant, because they are two different languages. However, to a certain degree, we argue that one can thoroughly analyze a translation for semantic and comparative issues, of course, always pointing out an "ellipsis." The equivalent to the adverb *suavemente* is the translation of "*softly*," this is closer to the dictionary meaning of Portuguese because of the equivalent function that the suffixes "-mente" (Portuguese) and "-ly" (English) fulfil. What matters is that they both specify the manner and give *way* to verbal action. Therefore, we reiterate, the analysis proposed here is entirely possible.

careful by Thufir, by adverbs of manner in the Brazilian translation and by verb and adverb in English. There are three possible hypotheses of RE for the POV whose identification is initially and apparently a mere description of Thufir’s action by the way he does it:

	Hypothesis 1 RE belongs to L1 Narrator	Hypothesis 2 RE belongs to e2 (Hawat)	Hypothesis 3 RE belongs to e3 Paul.
POV for <i>slipped</i> and <i>softly</i> .	RE is L1’s, that is, it is a POV of the scene narrator, by mere description of the action and of the way Thufir walks.	Quasi-RE is e2’s, that is, a Thufir POV is shown by adverbial modalizers (in Portuguese), equivalent to <i>slipped</i> and <i>softly</i> .	Quasi-RE is e3’s due to the character’s trait, and the adverbial modalizers (in Portuguese), equivalent to <i>slipped</i> and <i>softly</i> .

Chart 3 – ER and POV hypotheses

Each hypothesis on enunciative responsibility is directed to each instance: either to the narrator (hypothesis 1), to Hawat (hypothesis 2), or to Paul (hypothesis 3).

In the case of POV by *slipped* and *softly*, we have three possibilities of assessing “whose the POV is,” or rather, to whom belongs the enunciative responsibility (RE) for what is narrated. Either we have a mere description of the narrator, or a quasi-RE belonging to Thufir, or we have quasi-RE from Paul’s hyperperception as a “perspective center.” In synthesis, there are three possible hypotheses on whose vision is directed at the *quiet* entrance:

- 1) Either this view is a mere verbal-adverbial description of L1 (narrator), in hypothesis 1;
- 2) Or this view is Hawat’s, as he *slipped into*, defining the input process as e2’s quasi-RE, in hypothesis 2;

3) Or this view is Paul's, because *slipped into* and *softly* completed each other in a sense through the pragmatic characteristic of the character, that is, he "feels" Hawat's entry process, in hypothesis 3.

A possible conclusion is that this last hypothesis, which considers the "psychologism" of Paul's character, is not a strictly enunciative analysis. In any case, this only reinforces the question: after all, whose is the first point of view (POV) for Hawat's sneaky, *soft*, and *gentle* entrance?

Let us look at the statement for that POV once more:

Ex.1 (excerpt 1):

Thufir Hawat slipped into the training room of Castle Caladan, closed the door softly.

Leaving, for now, the seemingly descriptive adverb aside, we turn to a discussion of verbs. *Closed* and *entered* (equivalent terms used in the Brazilian Portuguese version) are not explicit locutional verbs (nor are there polyphonic signs), so there can only be, if any, a heterodiegetic quasi-RE. It is not about full responsibility (as in *I say X*); it is also not a limited RE, because there are no second speakers. We are left with a quasi-RE, since the enunciator Thufir performs his action through notional verbs. However, there are no verbs in the excerpt that carry an expression of feelings or sensory perception – that is the problem! They are verbs of action and not of perception, and this further occludes a precise discernment of imputation of the POV, leading us to bring this POV closer and closer to hypothesis 1. Fostering dissatisfaction with the approach of the POV in this excerpt to the narrator's RE by "mere description of the scene," an extra-enunciative method is proposed, that is: *perceptive comments* are added and attributed to the enunciators (e2 or e3), as there are no verbs that show the enunciator's "states of mind" transparently. Let us follow Rabatel's (2016) example, that is:

For the general characterization of the phenomenon, it is secondary to know whether this imputed POV comes from a speech, a thought, a hearing, or an inference. Likewise, whether it is imputed fairly or not, in a certainty-based or hypothetical way. On the other hand, that information matters from a pragmatic point of view (p. 93).<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> In Portuguese: "Para a caracterização geral do fenômeno, é secundário saber se esse PDV imputado provém de uma fala, de um pensamento, de um ouvir dizer ou de uma inferência. Da mesma forma, se ele é imputado justamente ou não, de forma baseada em certeza ou hipotética. Por outro lado, esses dados importam de um ponto de vista pragmático."



Let us try to upsurge these comments, in a hypothetical setting, to evaluate, from a pragmatic point of view, to whom the action of entering the room could belong, building examples to support the other hypotheses (2 and 3). We are here grasping for possible universes of non-existent enunciative constructions (as they were not written by L1). However, we are aware that the pragmatic point of view, *extra-enunciatively*, may import descriptive limits upon this analysis. On the other hand, this exercise can also demonstrate an important role in the configuration for the global POV, such as the presentation of the characters:

Ex.1 hypothetical (a.1):

Thufir Hawat slipped into the training room of Castle Caladan, closed the door softly. *This was an attitude thought by him (e2) at the time of slipping in, OR;*

Ex.1 hypothetical (b.1):

Thufir Hawat slipped into the training room of Castle Caladan, closed the door softly. *This was Paul's impression (e3).*

In hypothetical (a.1) and hypothetical (b.1), perceptions were constructed to correspond to Thufir and Paul, respectively. That is, in (a.1) the POV would be e2's. In (b.1), e3's. However, by applying *perceptual commentary* by L1/E1 (from the speaker-narrator), we would remove the heterodiegesis characteristic from *Dune's* narrative to include homodiegesis, which would throw the narrator into the scene and unsettle *Dune's* own narrative. The narrator would thus find themselves inside the situation, with Paul and Hawat.

Ex.1 hypothetical (c):

Thufir Hawat slipped into the training room of Castle Caladan, closed the door softly. *I saw (L1), actually; he slipped into.*

In fact, we can accept the possibility that this POV *does not* belong to L1/E1. The narrator (L1/E1) seems – at least initially – to transfer that POV. If we accept, for now, that the POV of the entrance belongs to the characters (enunciators) and not to the narrator (First Speaker), we would still face another great challenge: to whom has this quasi-RE slipped? To Thufir (e2) or to Paul (e3)?

To properly answer this question, we need to approach what some narrative studies note as POV by referencing (Cortez, 2004). Before that, however, we must

demonstrate that the scene sequence (the enunciative sequence for the “intrigue”) is e2 Thufir’s represented and “existential” point of view (POV):

Ex.2 (excerpt 1):

[...]. He stood there a moment, feeling old and tired and storm-leathered. His left leg ached where it had been slashed once in the service of the Old Duke.

*Three generations of them now*, he thought.

“He stood there” defines a passage, a division of plans. There is a distance that opposes the plane of L1-narrator to the plane attributed to the e2-character. The “there” for the character in the scene (different, then, from the “here” from the extrascene narrator), despite being a description by the L1-narrator, is perceived by e2-character, or rather, it is “there” that the POV for the character Thufir manifests his perception. It is “there,” in another plane of diegesis, distant from the narrator, that e2 feels his age and his exhaustion (“feeling old, tired and storm-leathered”). It is not just a generic characterization, but an enunciative “state of mind” driven by the “left leg that hurt.” That is, after describing the *soft and gentle* entry in the first part of excerpt 1, in the next point of the narrative, e2 goes from a sneaky action to a feeling of tiredness, a sense of physical suffering when he encounters Paul. Specifically, if at first the identification of the “entrance POV” is opaque, then that “felt POV” belongs to the enunciator Thufir. One needs only to note the sensory verb in the reflective and emotional “feeling,” which becomes a sensory and physical “hurt” in the past tense of the imperfect (in the Brazilian Portuguese version).<sup>19</sup> Sensory verbs provide access to the speaker’s POV about his mood; in the sequence, that suggests that, if the entry still creates doubt about the POV and its possible imputation, then it is clear that Thufir is a “perspective center” in the sequence from excerpt 1, due to the manifestation of a sensory POV.

Finally, “*Three generations of them now*, he thought” demonstrates the complexity of this POV, as he also thinks about the generations of the Atreides in his “existential” reflection. As previously said, the italics in *Dune*’s narrative correspond to the characters’ thoughts. However, in addition to being simply a stylistic feature, in this particular case italics demonstrate an inner monologue. When the enunciative instance thinks (through the use of italics in *Dune*), the POV is explicit; however, it is explicit to

---

<sup>19</sup> There is no such tense in English. We reiterate, however, that semantically the original “ached,” which was translated as “hurt,” has the same meaning of promoting existential sensations in the character through a wound that refers to reminiscences of other times. That is, it remains a sensory verb.

the reader, because the POV of “thought” is internal to the enunciator. The other enunciators – like Paul (e3) – do not have access to this thought in the narrative.<sup>20</sup> Thufir (e2) does not say what he thinks. He moves in the room, feels the pains of memory and thinks of a POV that is represented without expressing himself polyphonically. There is no “mixture of voices” in this case, but rather a “mixture of mental spaces” (Rabatel, 2016, p. 64). If there are “voices,” they have not left e2’s head. That is, at the same time we have a POV that feels, that thinks, that reasons, and that is sensitized, but those things are not said – and therefore there is no second speaker (I2/e2) but a dialogic enunciator (e2). The result is that there is no limited ER. This is the complex dimension of the enunciator Thufir (e2), who exposes an inner monologue in a full exercise of autodialogism.

Later, in excerpt 2, italics do not serve as a manifestation of “existential” reflection. They serve as thoughts about the boy’s training, who seems to have forgotten his combat training.

E.g.: 3 (excerpt 2)

He stared across the big room bright with the light of noon pouring through the skylights, saw the boy seated with back to the door, intent on papers and charts spread across an ell table.

*How many times must I tell that lad never to settle himself with his back to a door?*  
Hawat cleared his throat.

The POV is still a perception by the enunciator Thufir, through quasi-RE. However, we now know that the POV is Thufir’s, based on the sensory nature of the verbs (“looked,” “saw”). For e2, the boy is intent (“absorbed,” in the translated version) revealing that he raises hypotheses himself about the boy’s state of mind. That is, the character Thufir, as an enunciator, characterizes the other character, Paul. *How many times must I tell that lad never to settle himself with his back to a door?* is a self-reflection, but a different from the previous, existential one: through a rhetorical question, he now judges the way Paul is distracted. Through his internal monologue, Thufir complains about the prodigy’s recurring inattention. We perceive this through clear dialogical orientation of meaning. *How many times must I tell that lad* reveals that the master has said that before. It is once more an autodialogism, that is, an internal reflection.

---

<sup>20</sup> Paul, while hypersensitive, is not telepathic, at least at this point in the narrative.

Finally, it seems that the initial challenge has not yet been overcome: whose POV perceived “slipped into” and “softly?” To answer this question, we need to resort to the hypothesis defended here: POV improvement through referencing processes. To that end, we must talk about phoric POV.

## 7 Referencing and POV

Many studies on POV theory are dedicated to understanding the expression of subjectivity through the source of an enunciative perception in a single utterance. This exposed a complex search to identify the responsibility of a POV, occasionally through unitary discourse records. However, as we know, narratives such as those typical of science fiction are constructed by hundreds or thousands of fictional utterances, mobilizing many other enunciators. These enunciators are often treated as synonymous with the manifestation of perception in utterances, but advanced studies within the theoretical framework have already revealed that perception alone does not summarize the mechanisms for POV exposure. That is:

The mechanisms of POV, genially identified by Ducrot, legitimately go beyond the framework of perception reports, relying on the understanding of an enunciative-referential mechanism in action throughout (Rabatel, 2016, p. 66).<sup>21</sup>

The fabric of a narrative is composed of an enunciative sequence describing characters’ actions, but also of the perceptual-sensory expression within these enunciative instances. However, many of these characters are enunciators who communicate through referencing processes and become speakers when they say what they think in different directions of the narrative – but there are those who do not speak. In this case, a *nearly* enunciative activity is attributed to them through a process of phoric referencing, that is, just as we have the mechanism of perception, we also have enunciative-referential mechanisms to mark a POV, at times even beyond the utterance. Thus, the point of view (POV) may not be contained in an utterance if we want to observe a text’s semantic improvement, or rather, a general understanding of its meaning. Thus, the POV would

---

<sup>21</sup> In Portuguese: “Os mecanismos do PDV, genialmente identificados por Ducrot, vão a além, legitimamente, do quadro dos relatos de percepção, apoiando-se na compreensão de um mecanismo enunciativo-referencial em ação por todo o lugar.”

manifest itself beyond the *referent's* frontier (Cortez, 2004). Words, when connected in a coherent textual process (nouns, verbs, pronouns, adverbs etc.), produce meaning within a text, as textual linguistics shows us. We call this phenomenon *referencing or referencing process*, because this semantic connection is always present and remains in permanent dynamism. In the referencing process, there is a phoric journey from the lexicon of departure (or referent) to the lexicon of arrival (or referred to). The cohesive movement of phoric referencing can be prospective (cataphoric) or retrospective (anaphoric), but referencing is more than a word that refers to another word – or that refers to an inanimate object in the world. The referencing process mobilizes the speaker of the discourse to compose cohesion of meaning, crossed by interactional, interlocutory, and intersubjective issues. There is a social dynamic in referencing:

The issue of referencing operates a displacement [...]: it does not privilege the relationship between words and things, but the intersubjective and social relationship within which versions of the world are publicly elaborated, evaluated in terms of adequacy to the practical purposes and ongoing actions of the enunciators (Mondada, 2001, p. 9).<sup>22</sup>

In general, literature already understands that it refers to the fiction it narrates and it also knows it refers not only to objects in the world, but also to subjects, such as the reader themselves. This is why we approach the relationship of objects and subjects in full production of meaning inside literary discourse. That is:

In literary discourse, as in everyday discourse, meaning can be isolated from a set of other meanings that could be called interpretations. However, the problem of meaning is more complex here: while, in the word, an integration of the units does not go beyond the level of the sentence, in literature sentences are again integrated into utterances, and the utterances, in turn, in units of larger dimensions, even entire works (Todorov, 2008, p. 59).<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> In French: “La question de la référénciation opère un glissement [...]: elle ne privilégie pas la relation entre les mots et les choses, mais la relation intersubjective et sociale au sein de laquelle des versions du monde sont publiquement élaborées, évaluées en termes d’adéquation aux finalités pratiques et aux actions en cours des énonciateurs.”

<sup>23</sup> In Portuguese: “No discurso literário, como no discurso cotidiano, o sentido pode ser isolado de um conjunto de outros sentidos aos quais se poderia dar o nome de interpretações. Entretanto, o problema do sentido é aqui mais complexo: enquanto, na palavra, a integração das unidades não ultrapassa o nível da frase, em literatura, as frases se integram de novo em enunciados, e os enunciados, por sua vez, em unidades de dimensões maiores, até obras inteiras.”

It is not inadmissible to observe – in heterodiegesis – a *referent POV* completing itself in a *referred* utterance. As stated, investigations on POV are sometimes enclosed in a minimum unit of discourse, that is, considered through the linguistic elements indicated by a single utterance. However, in complex genres such as science fiction novels, that POV can be expressed by “interenunciative” processes, that is, by semantic coherence traveling from a *referent* to a *referred* one.

It is in this journey that we analyze excerpt 3, right after the progressive sequence featuring a situation of dialogue built by the narrator (L1/E1). That is, to refer to Hawat’s quiet and *soft* entrance, e2 decides to cross the room and, in the sequence, he hears from Paul about his perception:

- Ex 3
- I heard you coming down the hall, Paul said. - And I heard you open the door. (1st)
  - “The sounds I make could be imitated.” (2nd)
  - “I’d know the difference.” (3rd)
- He might at that, Hawat thought.*

The situation presented is dialogical, between Paul and Thufir Hawat. There are two utterances by Paul (the 1st and the 3rd) and one by Hawat (the 2nd). This means they are no longer modal enunciators (unspoken perceptions), but speaker enunciators (said perceptions). The locutionary verb *said* opens the perspective of speech to Paul about his point of view (POV). Enunciative responsibility is limited. There is imputation of POV by *verbum dicendi*, that is, this polyphonic “opening” is an imputation of the narrator’s POV to a second (or third) speaker, meaning – as is already known – an ER by imputation. In this case, there would not even be any need for an “opening” via *dicendi* verb, since the dash (standard speech marker for fiction in Brazilian Portuguese)<sup>24</sup> is a polyphonic sign, that is, an indicator of RE sliding dialogue to the other speakers. In fact, Hawat and Paul are second and third speakers, respectively (12/e2 and 13/e3), and their enunciators are in accordance with their proper speakers, as they express the points of view (POV) of each enunciative instance. Again, we have three enunciative instances. However, at this point in diegesis, they are quite different:

---

<sup>24</sup> Originally, in the English text, we found the dialogue with quotation marks and not with dashes. There is no change in the sense, as both are signs of explicit and dialogical polyphony.

- The narrator (L1/E1) – first speaker, narrative reporter, and dialogic manager;
- Hawat (I2/e2) – second speaker, in line with the second enunciator, Thufir Hawat;
- Paul (I3/e3) – third speaker, in line with the third enunciator, Paul Atreides, the boy with hyperperception.

Unlike the examples from excerpts 1 and 2 – when the relationship was between a speaker-narrator and two modal enunciators (Paul and Hawat) –, excerpt 3 establishes a relationship between three speakers. That is: all three in excerpt 3 *say* and are held responsible for what *they say*. Therefore, the possibility of imputation by quasi-RE, which is a kind of non-enunciative responsibility, is immediately dismissed. While in excerpts 1 and 2 there is a dialogism by relationship between modal enunciators, in excerpt 3 there is a polyphonic dialogism by relationship between vocal speakers.

However, the most important thing is still missing: in this dialogue, some verbs express sensory perceptions! That is what one sees in *I heard it* and *I would know it*. These verbs precisely indicate the cohesion of the POV for modal enunciators (excerpt 1) and speaker enunciators (excerpt 3). These verbs *refer to* the speakers (*I heard and I would know*) who slide to the *referred* adverbs directed at the enunciators (*softly* and *gently*, as translated) to retrieve the information from the protagonist’s POV in the scene. We arrive at the hyperperceptive POV of the now speaker Paul (excerpt 3), who has initially been opaque within the POV of the mode-adverbial enunciator Paul (excerpt 1). However, the slide by reference – of information retrieval – happens from excerpts 3 to 1, in retrospect. See below:


Modalized heterodiegetic situation	Dialogue situation between Paul and Thufir
Thufir Hawat slipped into the training room of Castle Caladan, closed the door <i>softly</i> .  	<i>“I heard you coming down the hall,”</i> Paul said. <i>“And I heard you open the door.”</i> <i>“The sounds I make could be imitated.”</i> <i>“I’d know the difference.”</i>
Adverbs of mode found in the Portuguese version: <i>softly</i> and <i>gently</i> .	Referring sensory verbs: <i>heard</i> and <i>would know</i> .

Table 4 – Retrospective slide of POVs

Therefore, there is an anaphoric POV, because, in the progression of *Dune's* narrative, the dialogue is posthumous to the descriptive situation of that *soft* entrance, that is, it is a retroactive reference. This indication of an anaphoric POV, however, seems to lack legitimacy as, at the very least, it begs the question: did Paul really hear the quiet entrance? Or did he just reveal it to affront Thufir? Or did he lie?

This doubt cannot prosper if we understand that the phoric POV improves in manifestation through the character's traits, that is, by their characteristics. In this sense, Paul is important in the observation of his psychological, moral, and extraordinary description. He is a boy prodigy, bred to be the new intergalactic messiah. The construction of hypersensitivity by the protagonist's pragmatic characteristic happens through semantic retrieval of information about the character's properties through verbs and adverbs that transform it into an enunciative instance that *hears sounds* of walking *softly* more than any other enunciative instance could do. Furthermore, we are not alone in arguing that this POV and this RE are Paul's. The character Thufir Hawat is also inclined to accept that Paul "felt" the *quiet* entrance when he slid this perception towards the boy, as Thufir (e2) manifests the possibility in his POV exposed in "*He might at that.*" The italics demonstrate that he is clearly inclined to believe Paul's perception, because he judged the possibility by an adverbial modality in Portuguese and modal verb in English. At this moment, we know that the enunciator Thufir confesses to himself that he was unable to deceive Paul with silent steps. The enunciator Paul, then, places the semantic POV in the adverb/verb from excerpt 1 with a gaze and a vision that only he could use. Thufir (e2) not only accepts but believes this possibility. That is, Paul goes from a hypersensitive character (e3) to a hyperaware dialogic speaker (I3/e3). These "superpowers" are, then, explained here in a linguistic way: the sum of the character's "psychologism" plus the anaphoric POV of those referred to. In other words, that POV was built by the enunciative set of references and by Paul's pragmatic characterization in *Dune's* intrigue. Sensory verbs and modal adverbs travel semantically to compose the phoric POV from science fiction diegesis. In fact, it truly is a "fantastic" genre.

Thus, we defend the hypothesis that POV improvement, with difficult initial identification of responsibility, may occur in the narrative in a posthumous, phoric, and semantic way. We argue that the initial unresolved question, as one focuses on the analysis of "perspective center" regarding revolutionary enunciator Paul Atreides, is



overcome when, interenunciatively, that POV flies over the diegesis between *referred* and *referents*. His is the POV *for the quiet* entrance, after retrieving information through sensory verbs. That vision by hyperawareness is his: the verbal referent *I heard* the aforementioned terms *slipped into* and *softly*. In other words, this is a panoptic POV due to character traits, but it is also improved enunciatively by the anaphoric journey of the POV that begins with supposed sensory verbs (locutional enunciator) and ends, in a retrograde movement, through referred modal adverbs (modal enunciator).

## **Final Considerations**

Science fiction is shunned by a large number of academics, intellectuals, and narrative scholars. Underestimated, it is considered minor literature amid the consecrated fictional compositions of literary discourse. It does not seem to deserve further studies either in literary criticism or linguistics.

However, from a sample of a science fiction text, we sought to demonstrate how rich it can be in possibilities for enunciative analysis. The theory of POV offers important concepts and notations that work incisively upon dialogical (enunciators' POV) and polyphonic (speakers' voices) perception of these "perspective centers."

In the special case of *Dune*, a possibility unfolds in theory, as modalizers that reveal modal subjects (such as adverbs) can generate doubt concerning enunciative responsibility. Still, it is possible to say that a POV is not the narrator's (not mere description), with two or more enunciators in a scene. In fact, to say that the POV is not a mere description of the narrator defies common sense about who owns a given POV.

As science fiction novels constitute a complex genre, an analysis with semantic scope through referencing is necessary to understand their processes for attributing enunciative responsibility. After all, POVs are not necessarily bound to the minimum unit of discourse, that is, to the utterance. A POV, through referencing processes, can be semantically improved using referent and referred lexicons.

In *Dune*, the revolutionary Paul has hyperawareness, which is why referent verbs of high perception content can travel within the *diegesis* to inform the POV exactly when they land in the referred lexicons. This sliding movement can be forward, in a cataphora, or backward, in an anaphora. It is really fascinating to see the prospective and

retrospective senses of science fiction discourse that can lead us to true interstellar travel through the universe of words.

## REFERENCES

ADORNO, Theodor; HORKHEIMER, Max. A indústria cultural: o iluminismo como mistificação de massas. Traduzido por Júlia Elisabeth Levy. In: LIMA, Luiz Costa. *Teoria da cultura de massa*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2002. p. 169-214.

ANDREWS, Stephen E.; RENNISON, Nick. *100 Must-Read Science Fiction Novels*. Londres: A & C Black Publishers Limited, 2006.

BAKHTIN, Mikhail. Os gêneros do discurso. In: BAKHTIN, Mikhail. *Estética da criação verbal*. Organização, tradução, posfácio e notas Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2006. p. 261-306.

BENVENISTE, Émile. *Problemas de linguística geral*. Tradução de Maria da Glória Novak e Luiza Neri e revisão do prof. Isaac Nicolau Salum. São Paulo: Nacional – Universidade de São Paulo, 1976.

CANDIDO, Antonio. A personagem do romance. In: CANDIDO, Antonio; ROSENFELD, Anatol; PRADO, Décio de Almeida; GOMES, Paulo Emílio Sales. *A personagem de ficção*. São Paulo: Perspectiva. 12. ed. 2011. p. 51-80.

CORTEZ, Suzana L. Referenciação e construção do ponto de vista. *Sínteses Revista dos Cursos de Pós-Graduação*, Campinas, v. 9, p. 139-151, 2004. Disponível em: <https://revistas.iel.unicamp.br/index.php/sinteses/article/view/6290>. Acesso em: 14 de fevereiro de 2022.

DOSSE, François. *A história do estruturalismo: o campo do signo – 1945 /1966*. Tradução de Álvaro Cabral. Campinas: Unicamp, 1993.

DUCROT, Oswald. *O dizer e o dito*. Tradução de Eduardo Guimarães. 2. ed. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2020.

EMEDIATO, Wander (org.). *Interações polêmicas e violência verbal em temas sociais sensíveis*. Campinas: Pontes, 2023.

GENETTE, Gérard. *Figuras 2*. Tradução de Nícia Adan Bonatti. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2015a.

GENETTE, Gerard. *Figuras 3*. Tradução de Nícia Adan Bonatti. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2015b.

GREIMAS, Algirdas Julius. *Sobre o sentido II: ensaios semióticos*. Tradução de Dilson Ferreira da Cruz e prefácio de Diana Luz Pessoa de Barros. São Paulo: EDUSP, 2014.

HERBERT, Frank. *Duna*. Tradução de Maria do Carmo Zanini. 2. ed. São Paulo: Aleph, 2017.

HERBERT, Frank. *Dune*. London: A Gollancz eBook, 2010.

MONDADA, Lorenza. Gestion du topic et organisation de la conversation. *Cadernos de Estudos Linguísticos*, v. 41, Campinas/SP, p. 7-36, 2001. Disponível em:

<https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/cel/article/view/8636999>. Acesso em: 9 ago. 2023.

NEVES, Maria Helena de Moura. Palavras fônicas: alguns pronomes e os artigos definidos. *Alfa: Revista de Linguística*, v. 34, São Paulo, p. 85-100, 1990. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/alfa/issue/view/289/36> . Acesso em: 11 de fev. 2023.

RABATEL, Alain. O papel do enunciador na construção interacional dos pontos de vista. In: EMEDIATO, Wander (org). *A construção da opinião da mídia*. Tradução e prefácio de Wander Emediato. Belo Horizonte: Editora Fale/UFMG, NAD, 2013. p. 19-66.

RABATEL, Alain. *Homo narrans*: por uma abordagem enunciativa e interacionista da narrativa. Pontos de vista e lógica da narração: teoria e análise. Tradução e prefácio de Maria das Graças Soares Rodrigues, Luis Passeggi e João Gomes da Silva Neto. São Paulo: Cortez, 2016. v. 1.

ROSENFELD, Anatol. Literatura e personagem. In: CANDIDO, Antonio; ROSENFELD, Anatol; PRADO, Décio de Almeida; GOMES, Paulo Emílio Sales. *A personagem de ficção*. 12. ed. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2011. p. 09-49.

STAM, Robert; BURGOYNE, Robert; FLITTERMAN-LEWIS, Sandy. *New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics: Structuralism, Post-structuralism, and Beyond*. London and New York. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

STAM, Robert; BURGOYNE, Robert; FLITTERMAN-LEWIS, Sandy. *Nuevos conceptos de la teoría del cine*. Barcelona: Paidós, 1992.

TODOROV, Tzvetan. *As estruturas narrativas*. Tradução e prefácio de Leyla Perrone-Moisés. 5. ed. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2008.

WESTFAHL, Gary. Space Opera. In: JAMES, Edward; FARAH, Mendlesohn (eds). *Science Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. p. 197-208.

Translated by *Amanda Pavani Fernandes* – [mandiepavani@gmail.com](mailto:mandiepavani@gmail.com)

*Received March 01, 2023*

*Accepted October 23, 2023*

## **Research Data and Other Materials Availability**

The contents underlying the research text are included in the manuscript.

## **Reviews**

Due to the commitment assumed by *Bakhtiniana. Revista de Estudos do Discurso* [*Bakhtiniana. Journal of Discourse Studies*] to Open Science, this journal only publishes reviews that have been authorized by all involved.

## Review I

The article entitled “Science fiction: the hyperperceptive enunciator and the concept of journey from the point of view of referencing processes” submitted to the *Bakhtinian Journal*, by reflecting enunciatively about science fiction narratives, especially departing from the work by Alain Rabatel (2013 and 2016), brings, on the one hand, a pertinent contribution for discursive studies in Brazil, notably for those who dwell on enunciative phenomena and, on the other hand, for literary studies. This is not gratuitous apologia for science fiction studies, but a gentle nudge so that discourse and literature scholars pay more attention to that type of literary production, which imposes on discourse, as a theoretical-analytical object, very relevant issues. Although the article does not engender an innovative theoretical gesture in relation to what has been scrutinized elsewhere by Rabatel on the theory of Points of View – epistemological foundation of the study – it poses some theoretical problems for that theory. The author does not propose solutions to these problems, however, as that was not the goal stated in the text. His intent was to shed light onto these problems to stimulate future solutions. For publication, the author must engage in a thorough review of language, because, in reading the text, it was possible to detect numerous problems of the most diverse types: number, typos, cohesion... These problems compromise the reading of the text. The abstract is a kind of condensed synthesis of these problems, which lay hidden not only in the corners of the text, but in the text in question, throughout the work. I also suggest that the author change the order of item “5) Basics of interactionist theory of POV” for item “3) The POV within the narrative,” because it seems a little out of place to me, which may confuse the reader. MANDATORY CORRECTIONS [Revised]

*Roberto Leiser Baronas* - Universidade Federal de São Carlos – UFSCar, Centro de Educação e Ciências Humanas, São Carlos, São Paulo Brazil; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0758-0370>; [baronas@uol.com.br](mailto:baronas@uol.com.br)

Reviewed on June 26, 2023.

## Review II

The text of the article “Science fiction: the hyperperceptive enunciator and the concept of journey from the point of view of referencing processes” fits the theme proposed by the author. The objectives outlined are fully achieved in the course of the work. The author demonstrates knowledge of the topic proposed, and the POV approach is based on relevant authors such as Rabatel (2013, 2016) and Cortez (2004). The analyses are accurate and detailed with the rigor one would expect to find in a scientific paper. The work, in fact, will bring contributions to the field of knowledge on text and discourse studies. APPROVED

*Maria de Fátima dos Santos* - Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco – UFRPE, Unidade Acadêmica de Serra Talhada – UAST, Serra Talhada, Pernambuco, Brzsil; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9865-0487>; [fatima.silvasantos@ufrpe.br](mailto:fatima.silvasantos@ufrpe.br)

Reviewed on June 27, 2023.

### **Review III**

Considering the current state of textual and semantic theories, there is no strictly a referent, but rather a referencing process. It is vital to take advantage of this assumption in the text, instead of talking about possibilities. In this sense, it makes no sense to say “When names, verbs, pronouns, and adverbs connect coherently for the production of meaning, within a text – like what textual linguistics shows us – we call this phenomenon referencing,” because Mondada’s theory, for example, and others, say these are always connected. It is thus possible to change this part and change the title, including substitutions of “reference” instances, as static element, for “referencing process,” something dynamic. Refer to the annotated text. APPROVED WITH RESTRICTIONS [Revised]

*Adail Ubirajara Sobral* - Universidade Federal do Rio Grande, Rio Grande, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5532-5564>; [adail.sobral@furg.br](mailto:adail.sobral@furg.br)

Reviewed on July 13, 2023.

### **Editorial Review**

Considering the previous reviews, we request that the author comply with the requests of the reviewers and resubmit the article to the journal by 07/31/2023. We also inform you that there is the possibility of interaction with the reviewers on the journal’s website.

### **Interaction Between Reviewers and Author**

Dear Dr. Roberto Leiser Baronas

Thank you very much for your consideration of the article. I will make the mandatory corrections in the title and I will shift, in the text, sections 3 and 5.

Stener Carvalho Fernandes Barbosa

Dear Dr. Maria de Fátima dos Santos

Thank you very much for the considerations that led to the approval. And yes, I hope to contribute to the debate on the interactionist theory of POV. In particular, my research focuses on institutional corpora and sensitive social themes, such as projects for controversial laws (abortion, sexuality, non-partisan school policies etc.). That is, it does not relate to science fiction. But this article on science fiction helped me to develop an examination of the theory and its applicability. In addition, of course, to exposing my admiration for that genre of literary discourse.

Stener Carvalho Fernandes Barbosa

Dear Dr. Adail Ubirajara Sobral

I also want to thank you for reading my submission carefully. I'm already reading Lorenza Mondada to give more robust support to the argument about POV and referencing processes. It will probably be included in the works cited section.

Stener Carvalho Fernandes Barbosa

I also hope that it will be included in the body of the text. :) I can even reread it.

Adail Ubirajara Sobral

#### **Review IV**

The requested corrections were made. *Adail Ubirajara Sobral* - Universidade Federal do Rio Grande, Rio Grande, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5532-5564>; [adail.sobral@furg.br](mailto:adail.sobral@furg.br)

Reviewed on August 28, 2023.