

TRANSLATION, LITERATURE AND CULTURAL STUDIES

An anthology of secondary texts, with comments
(**in blue**) for class use

BA Thesis Module
José María Pérez Fernández
Facultad de Traducción e Interpretación
Universidad de Granada

* This is a work in progress. Last update 19/02/17

INDEX

- # 1 Translation studies in the 1990s and beyond, p. 3
- # 2 Cultural and Ideological Turns, p. 8
- # 3 The role of the translator: visibility, ethics and sociology, p. 16
- # 4 Translation between the local and the global, p. 36
- # 5 Philosophical approaches to translation, p. 50
- # 6 Intersemiotic translation, p. 63
- # 7 New directions from the new media, p. 66
- # 8 The Languages of Cinema, p. 69
- # 9 Translation, Literary and Cultural Studies, p. 73
- # 10 Cultural translation / the translation of cultures, p. 94
- # 11 Translation and the Construction of Literary Canons, p. 112
- # 12 REFERENCES, p. 171

1 Translation studies in the 1990s and beyond

“The conceptual paradigms that animate translation research are a diverse mix of the theories and methodologies that characterized the previous decade, continuing trends within the discipline (polysystem, skopos, poststructuralism, feminism), but also reflecting developments in linguistics (pragmatics, critical discourse analysis, computerized corpora) and in literary and cultural theory (postcolonialism, sexuality, globalization). Theoretical approaches to translation multiply, and research, which for much of the century was shaped by traditional academic specializations, now fragments into subspecialties within the growing discipline of translation studies” (Venuti ed., 2004, p. 325)

Translation and Cultural Studies

“At virtually the same time, another interdiscipline emerges, **cultural studies, cross-fertilizing such fields as literary theory and criticism, film and anthropology**. And this brings a renewed functionalism to translation theory, a concern with the social effects of translation and their ethical and political consequences. Culturally oriented research tends to be philosophically critical and politically engaged, so it inevitably questions the claim of scientific objectivity in empirically oriented work which focuses on forms of description and classification, whether linguistic, experimental, or historical. The decade sees provocative assessments of the competing paradigms. It also sees productive syntheses where theoretical and methodological differences are shown to be complementary, and precise descriptions of translated text and translation processes are linked to cultural and political issues. At the start of the new millennium, translation studies is an international network of scholarly communities who conduct research and debate across conceptual and disciplinary divisions.” (Venuti ed. 2004 pp. 325-6)

Translation, linguistics and pragmatics

“Varieties of linguistics continue to dominate the field because of their usefulness in training translators of technical, commercial and other kinds of nonfiction texts. Theoretical projects typically reflect the training situation by applying the findings of linguistics to articulate and solve translation problems. **Leading theorists draw on text linguistics, discourse analysis, and pragmatics to conceptualize translation on the model of Gricean conversation** (see Hatim and Mason 1990; Baker 1992; Neubert and Shreve 1992; cf. Robinson 2003). **In these terms, translating means to communicating the foreign text by cooperating with the target reader according to four conversational ‘maxims’: ‘quantity’ of information, ‘quality’ of truthfulness, ‘relevance’ or consistency of context, and ‘manner’ or clarity (Grice 1975). A translation is seen as conveying a message with its ‘implicatures’ by exploiting the maxims of the target linguistic community. Pragmatics-based translation theories assume a communicative intention and a relation of equivalence, based on textual analysis. They also recognize that these factors are further constrained by the function of the translated text.**” (Venuti, ed. 2004, p. 326)

“Other linguistics-oriented theorists [aim] to describe translated texts in finely discriminating analyses. The work of Basil Hatim and Ian Mason, alone and in collaboration, brings together an ambitious array of analytical concepts from different areas of linguistics. And their examples embrace a wide variety of text types, literary and religious, journalistic and political, legal and commercial. Their work shows how far linguistic approaches have advanced over the past three decades [...] Hatim and Mason perform nuanced analyses of actual translations in terms of style, genre, discourse, pragmatics, and ideology. Their unit of analysis is the whole text, and their analytical method takes into account—but finally transcends—the differences between ‘literary’ and ‘nonliterary’ translation (see Hatim and Mason 1990 and 1997)” (Venuti, ed. 2004 p. 327)

Pros and cons of corpus-based approaches to translation

“Scholars engaged in corpus-based studies have pointed to **theoretical problems raised by the search for universals of translated language**. Because the computerized analysis is governed by ‘abstract, global notions,’ it may emphasize norms over innovative translation strategies; and since these notions are constructions derived from ‘various manifestations on the surface’ of a text, they exclude the various interpretations a text may have in different contexts (Baker 1997: 179, 185). Computerized translation analysis is focused on text production to the exclusion of reception—except by the computer programmed to identify and quantify the abstract textual categories” (Venuti, ed. 2004, p. 327)

“Nonetheless, **computer analysis can elucidate significant translation patterns in a parallel corpus of foreign texts and their translations, especially if the patterns are evaluated against large ‘reference’ corpora in the source and target languages**. For example, unusual collocations of words can be uncovered in a foreign text so as to evaluate their handling in a translation. And **this kind of description might be brought to bear on cultural and social considerations**. Dorothy Kenny interestingly suggests that ‘a careful study of collocational patterns in a translated text can shed light on the cultural forces at play in the literary marketplace, and vice versa’ (Kenny 1998: 519; see also Kenny 2001). **Computer-discovered regularities in translation strategies can support historical studies, confirming or questioning hypotheses about translation in specific periods and locales**” (Venuti, ed. 2004 p. 328)

Translation, cultural studies and the formation of identities

“Culturally oriented research suspects regularities and universals and emphasizes the social and historical differences of translation. This approach stems partly from the decisive influence of poststructuralism, the doubt it casts on abstract formalizations, metaphysical concepts, timeless and universal essences, which might have been emancipatory in the Enlightenment, but now appear totalizing and repressive of local differences. Poststructuralist translation theory, in turn, calls attention to the exclusions and hierarchies that are masked by the realist illusion of transparent language, the fluent translating that seems untranslated. And this enables an incisive interrogation of cultural and political effects, the role played by translation in the creation and functioning of social movements and institutions.” (Venuti, ed. 2004 pp. 328-9)

“In an exemplary project that combines theoretical sophistication and political awareness, linguistic analysis and historical detail, Annie Brisset (1990/1996) studies recent Québécois drama translations that were designed to form a cultural identity in the service of a nationalist agenda. The extract included here relies on Henri Gobard’s concept of linguistic functions to describe the ideological force of Québécois French as a translating language. In the politicized post-1968 era, as

Brisset demonstrates, nationalist writers fashioned Québécois French into what Gobard calls a ‘vernacular’, a native or mother tongue, a language of community. Between 1968 and 1988 Québécois translators worked to turn this vernacular into a ‘referential’ language, the support of a national literature, by using it to render canonical worlds dramatists, notably Shakespeare, Strindberg, Chekhov, and Brecht. In these translations, Québécois French acquired cultural authority and challenged its subordination to North American English and Parisian French.

Yet **a struggle against one set of linguistic and cultural hierarchies might install others that are equally exclusionary**. Sharing Antoine Berman’s concern with ethno-centrism in translation, Brisset points out that the Québécois versions, even when they used a heterogeneous language like the working-class dialect *joual*, ultimately **cultivated a sameness, a homogeneous identity, in the mirror of foreign texts and cultures whose differences were thereby reduced. ‘Doing away with any ‘ambiguity’ of identity’, as she puts it, ‘means getting rid of the Other’**. **Brisset’s work illuminates the cultural and political risks taken by minor languages and cultures who resort to translation for self-preservation and development.**

The 1990s witness a series of historical studies that explore **the identity-forming power of translation, the ways in which it creates representations of foreign texts that answer to what is intelligible and interesting in the translating culture**. Resting on a synthesis of various theoretical and political discourses, including Marxism and feminism, poststructuralism and postcolonial theory, **this work shows how the identities constructed by translation are variously determined by ethnicity and race, gender and sexuality, class and nation. Here translating goes beyond the communication of foreign meanings to encompass a political inscription.**” (Venuti, ed. 2004 p. 329)

“Translation is frequently theorized as a cultural political practice that might be strategic in bringing about social change. The 1992 essay by **Gayatri Spivak** reprinted below constitutes a feminist intervention into postcolonial translation issues. But it is also a working translator’s manifesto, a record of the complex intentions that motivated her versions of the Bengali fiction writer Mahasweta Devi.

Spivak outlines a poststructuralist conception of language use, following Derrida and de Man, ‘rhetoric’ continually subverts meaning constructed by ‘logic’ and ‘grammar’, a subversion that is also social in effect, ‘a relationship between social logic, social reasonableness and the disruptiveness of figuration in social practice.’ Spivak argues that translators of Third World literatures need this linguistic model because ‘without a sense of rhetoricity of language, a species of neocolonialist construction of the non-western scene is afoot.’ She criticizes western translation strategies that render Third World literatures ‘into a sort of with-it translatese’, immediately accessible, enacting a realistic representation of those literatures, but devoid of the linguistic, cultural, and geopolitical differences that mark them. She advocates literalism, an ‘in-between discourse’, that disrupts the effect of ‘social realism’ in translation and gives the reader ‘a tough sense of the specific terrain of the original’.

Spivak is aware of the contingency of cultural political agendas, whether couched in theoretical statements like her essay or in translation strategies. Different social situations can change the political valence of a translation. The metropolitan feminist, she observes, ‘translates a too quickly shared feminist notion of accessibility’, when the fact is that a politically laden term like ‘gendering’ can’t be easily translated into Bengali. The ideologically motivated translator of Third World writing must be mindful that ‘what seems resistant in the space of English may be reactionary in the space of the original language’” (Venuti ed. 2004 p. 330)

“Kwame Anthony Appiah also imagines a ‘frankly political’ role for literary translation. In the 1993 essay reprinted here, however, his point of departure is different: a critique of analytical philosophy of language. Appiah restates the argument against translatability by questioning the use of the ‘Gricean mechanism’, wherein communicative intentions are realized through inferential meanings derived from conventions. **A literary translation, Appiah argues, doesn’t communicate the foreign author’s intentions, but tries to create a relationship to the linguistic and literary conventions of the translating culture that matches the relationship between the foreign text and its own culture. The match is never perfect and might be ‘unfaithful to the literal intentions’ of the foreign text so as ‘to preserve formal features’.**

Perhaps most importantly, ‘why texts matter’ to a community ‘is not a question that convention settles’ because ‘there can always be new readings, new things that matter about a text.’ A literary translation, like any interpretation, can proliferate meanings and values, which, however, remain indeterminate in their relation to the foreign text.” (Venuti, ed. 2004 pp. 330-331)

“Appiah indicates that the indeterminacy is usually resolved in academic institutions, in pedagogical contexts. There ‘what counts as a fine translation of a literary text [...] is that it should preserve for us the features that make it worth teaching.’ Appiah cites a translation project that evokes the asymmetries in the global cultural and political economy: an English version of an African oral literature, proverbs in the Twi language. He acknowledges that the political significance of this translation would not be the same in the American academy as in the English-speaking academy in Africa. Whatever the location, however, a political pedagogy is best served by what Appiah calls a ‘thick’ translation, which ‘seeks with its annotations and its accompanying glosses to locate the text in a rich cultural and linguistic context.’ This translating uses an ethnographic approach to the foreign text (Appiah’s term is taken from anthropologist Clifford Geertz’s notion of ‘thick description’). Yet it is ultimately designed to perform an ideological function in the target culture: combating racism, for instance, or challenging Western cultural superiority.” (Venuti, ed. 2004 p. 331)

“Jacques Derrida’s wide-ranging contribution to this volume, a 1998 lecture delivered to a French translators association, addresses the potential social effects of translation strategies by examining the concept of relevance. For Derrida, the relevant translation is mystifying: it ‘presents itself as the transfer of an intact signified through the inconsequential vehicle of any signifier whatsoever’, whereas in fact the translator replaces the signifiers of the foreign text with another signifying chain, trying to fix a signified that is no more than an interpretation oriented towards the receiving culture. Although critical of this mystification, Derrida sees it as inevitable insofar as every translation participates in an ‘economy of in-betweenness,’ positioned somewhere between ‘absolute relevance, the most appropriate, adequate, univocal transparency, and the most aberrant and opaque irrelevance’” (Venuti, ed 2004 p. 331)

Film translation

“Film translation has received some scholarly attention, theoretical accounts that map areas of research, as well as case studies that attend to cultural and political issues like censorship and nationalism (see Delabastita 1989; Lambert 1990; Danan 1991; Gambier 1996). But much of the literature remains oriented towards practical issues, despite the insights that this kind of translation might yield for various fields. Subtitling must preserve coherence under narrow temporal and spatial constraints (audiovisual synchronization, number of characters), so it necessarily offers a partial communication of foreign meanings, which are not simply incomplete, but re-established according to target concepts of coherence.

This is precisely the area that **Abé Mark Nornes** explores in his 1999 essay... He shows how a synthesis of translation theory with film history might illuminate the cultural and social implications of subtitling and suggest innovative translation practices. A professional subtitler himself, Nornes draws on Japanese film translation to illustrate what he calls ‘corrupt’ subtitles: ‘in the process of converting speech into writing within the time and space limits of the subtitle they conform the original to the rules, regulations, idioms, and frame of reference of the target language and its culture’. Such subtitles are corrupt because they conceal their own ‘textual violence’ and pre-empt any ‘experience of the foreign’ for the audience.” (Venuti 2004 p. 332)

Lawrence Venuti

“**Lawrence Venuti’s** work typifies main trends in culturally oriented research during the 1990s. It theorizes translation according to poststructuralist concepts of language, discourse, and subjectivity so as to articulate their relations to cultural difference, ideological contradiction, and social change. The point of departure is the current situation of English-language translating: on the one hand, marginality and exploitation; on the other, the prevalence of fluent strategies that make for easy readability and produce the illusion of transparency, enabling a translated text to pass for the original and thereby rendering the translator invisible. **Fluency masks a domestication of the foreign text that is appropriative and potentially imperialistic, putting the foreign to domestic uses which, in British and American cultures, extend the global hegemony of English. It can be countered by ‘foreignizing’ translation that registers the irreducible differences of the foreign text—yet only in domestic terms, by deviating from the values, beliefs, and representations that currently hold sway in the target language.** This line of thinking revives **Schleiermacher and Berman, German Romantic translation** and one of its late twentieth-century avatars. But following poststructuralist **Philip Lewis and modernist poet-theorist Ezra Pound**, it goes beyond literalism to advocate an experimentalism: innovative translating that samples the dialects, registers, and styles already available in the translating language to create a discursive heterogeneity which is defamiliarizing but intelligible in different ways to different constituencies in the translating culture.” (Venuti, ed 2004 p. 334)

“The final contribution below addresses a question that haunts translation theory informed by Continental philosophical traditions, like poststructuralism and their contemporary political ramifications in feminism, postcolonialism, and queer studies. **→→→If translating doesn’t so much communicate the foreign text as inscribe it with the intelligibilities and interests of the translating culture, how can a translated text reach the ethical and political goal of building a community with foreign cultures, a shared understanding with and of them?** This question prompts a return to basic issues in twentieth-century translation theory: equivalence and shifts, audience and function, identity and ideology. The autonomy of the translated text is redefined as the target-language ‘remainder’ that the translator releases in the hope of bridging the linguistic and cultural boundaries among readerships. Translating always encounters incommensurabilities, different ways of comprehending and evaluating the translated text and indeed the world. But these encounters do not so much negate the communicative function of a translation as splinter it into potentialities that can only be realized in reception. **←←←**” (Venuti ed 2004 pp. 334-5)

2 Cultural and Ideological Turns

In their introduction to the collection of essays *Translation, History and Culture*, Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere dismiss the kinds of linguistic theories of translation we examined in Chapters 3 to 6, which, they say, ‘have moved from word to text as a unit, but not beyond’ (Bassnett and Lefevere 1990: 4). Also dismissed are ‘painstaking comparisons between originals and translations’ which do not consider **the text in its cultural environment**. Instead, Bassnett and Lefevere go beyond language and focus on **the interaction between translation and culture, on the way in which culture impacts and constrains translation and on ‘the larger issues of context, history and convention’** (*ibid.*: 11). **They examine the image of literature that is created by forms such as →→→anthologies, commentaries, film adaptations and translations, and the institutions that are involved in that process←←←**. Thus, the **move from translation as text to translation as culture and politics** is what Mary Snell-Hornby (1990), in her paper in the same collection, terms **‘the cultural turn’**. It is taken up by Bassnett and Lefevere as a metaphor for this cultural move and serves to bind together the range of case studies in their collection. These include **changing standards in translation over time, the power exercised in and on the publishing industry in pursuit of specific ideologies, feminist writing and translation, translation as ‘appropriation’, translation and colonization, and translation as rewriting, including film rewrites.**’ (Munday 2012 p. 192)

Translation as rewriting

‘André Lefevere (1945.1996) worked in comparative literature departments in Leuven (Belgium) and then in the USA at the University of Texas, Austin. His work in translation studies developed out of his strong links with polysystem theory and the Manipulation School. Although some may argue that Lefevere sits more easily among the system theorists, his later work on translation and culture in many ways represents a bridging point to the ‘cultural turn’. His ideas are most fully developed in his book *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (Lefevere 1992).

Lefevere focuses particularly on the examination of ‘very concrete factors’ that systemically govern the **reception, acceptance or rejection of literary texts**; that is, ‘issues such as **power, ideology, institution and manipulation**’ (Lefevere 1992: 2). **The people involved in such power positions are the ones Lefevere sees as ‘rewriting’ literature and governing its consumption by the general public. The motivation for such rewriting can be ideological** (conforming or rebelling against the dominant ideology) **or poetological** (conforming to or rebelling against the dominant / preferred poetics). An example given by Lefevere (*ibid.*: 8) is of **Edward Fitzgerald**, the nineteenth-century translator (or ‘rewriter’) of the *Rubaiyat* by Persian poet, mathematician and astronomer Omar Khayyám (1048-1111). Fitzgerald considered Persians inferior and felt he should ‘take liberties’ in the translation in order to ‘improve’ on the original. He made it conform to the expected western literary conventions of his time and the work was a phenomenal commercial success (Davis 2000: 1020).’ (Munday 2012 p. 193)¹

¹ Another significant case of translation / rewriting is Don Juan Manuel’s (1282-1348) ‘Cuento XI: Don Illán’ in his *Conde Lucanor o Libro de Patronio* and the 20th-century version penned by Jorge Luis Borges (‘El brujo postergado’). Another visual refashioning of pre-existing iconic codes is Roy Lichtenstein’s pop-art version (<http://www.lichtensteinfoundation.org/tempofapollo.htm>) of the Classical Greek temple of Apolo at Corinth (<http://kevrekidis.deviantart.com/art/Temple-of-Apollo-80677015>).

Lefevere (*ibid.*: 9) claims that ‘the same basic process of rewriting is at work in translation, historiography, anthologization, criticism, and editing’. This bringing together of studies of ‘original’ writing and translation shows translation being incorporated into general literary criticism. However, it is translation that is central to Lefevere’s book:

Translation is the most obviously recognizable type of rewriting, and ... it is potentially the most influential because it is able to project the image of an author and / or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin. (Lefevere 1992: 9)

For Lefevere, **the literary system in which translation functions is controlled by two main factors**, which are: (1) **professionals within the literary system, who partly determine the dominant poetics** [critics, reviewers, academics, translators, dominant poetics]; and (2) **patronage outside the literary system, which partly determines the ideology**. [individuals, groups, institutions: ideology, economics, status]’ (Munday 2012 pp. 193-4)

‘The patronage outside the literary system ... are ‘the powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature’ (*ibid.*: 15). Patrons may be:

- Influential and powerful individuals in a given historical era.
- Groups of people (publishers, the media, a political class or party)
- Institutions which regulate the distribution of literature and literary ideals (national academies, academic journals and, above all, the educational establishment)

Lefevere (*ibid.* 16) identifies three elements to this patronage:

(1) The ideological component: This constrains the choice of subject and the form of its presentation. Lefevere adopts a definition of ideology that is not restricted to the political. It is, more generally and perhaps less clearly, ‘that giltwork of form, convention, and belief which orders our actions’. He sees patronage as being basically ideologically focused.

(2) The economic component: This concerns the payment of writers and rewriters. In the past, this was in the form of a pension or other regular payment from a benefactor. Nowadays, it is more likely to be royalty payments and translator’s fees. Other professionals, such as critics and teachers, are, of course, also paid or funded by patrons (e.g. by newspaper publishers, universities and the state)

(3) Status component: This occurs in many forms. In return for economic payment from a benefactor or literary press, the beneficiary is often expected to conform to the patrons’ expectations. Similarly, membership of a particular group involves behaving in a way conducive to supporting the group: Lefevere gives the example of the Beats poets using the City Lights bookstore in San Francisco as a meeting point in the 1950s’ (Munday 2012 p. 195)

Translation as rewriting (a process which also included other agents, such as publishers, anthologists, or editors)

From Lefevere 1992

“This book deals with **those in the middle, the men and women who do not write literature, but rewrite it. It does so because they are, at present, responsible for the general reception and survival of works of literature among non-professional readers, who constitute the great majority of readers in our global culture, to at least the same, if not to a greater extent than the writers themselves**” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 1).

“What is usually referred to as ‘the intrinsic value’ of a work of literature plays much less of a part in this than is usually assumed. As is well known, the poetry of John Donne remained relatively unknown and unread from a few decades after his death until his rediscovery by T.S. Eliot and other

modernists. Yet it is safe to assume that the ‘intrinsic value’ of his poems must have been the same all along. Similarly, many ‘forgotten’ feminist classics originally published in the twenties, thirties, and forties of our century have been republished in the late seventies and eighties. The actual content of the novels was, presumably, no less feminist than is now, since we are dealing with exactly the same texts. The reason why the republished feminist classics are not forgotten all over again lies not in the intrinsic value of the texts themselves, or even the (possible) lack thereof, but in the fact that they are now being published against the background of an impressive array of feminist criticism, which advertises, incorporates, and supports them.” (Lefevere, 1992, pp. 1-2).

“Whoever identifies the goal of literary studies as such with the interpretation of texts will either have no explanation for these phenomena, or else have somewhat embarrassed recourse to vague notions such as fate. It is my contention that the process resulting in the acceptance or rejection, canonization or non-canonization of literary works is dominated not by vague, but by very concrete factors that are relatively easy to discern as soon as one decides to look for them, that is as soon as one eschews interpretation as the core of literary studies and begins to address issues such as power, ideology, institution, and manipulation. As soon as one does this, one also realizes that rewriting in all its forms occupies a dominant position among the concrete factors just referred to. This book is an attempt to emphasise both the importance of rewriting as the motor force behind literary evolution, and the necessity for further in-depth study of the phenomenon” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 2).

“Rewriters have always been with us, from the Greek slave who put together anthologies of the Greek classics to teach the children of his Roman masters, to the Renaissance scholar who collated various manuscripts and scraps of manuscripts to publish a more or less reliable edition of a Greek or Roman classic; from the seventeenth-century compilers of the first histories of Greek and Latin literature not to be written in either Greek or Latin, to the nineteenth-century critic expounding the sweetness and the light contained in works of classical or modern literature to an increasingly uninterested audience; from the twentieth-century translator trying to ‘bring the original across’ cultures, as so many generations of translators tried before, to the twentieth-century compiler of ‘Reader’s Guides’ that provide quick reference to the authors and books that should have been read as part of the education of the non-professional reader, but go increasingly unread.” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 2)

“Whether they produce translations, literary histories or their more compact spin-offs, reference works, anthologies, criticism, or editions, rewriters adapt, manipulate the originals they work with to some extent, usually to make them fit in with the dominant or one of the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time. Again, this may be most obvious in totalitarian societies, but different ‘interpretive communities’ that exist in more open societies will influence the production of rewritings in similar ways. Madame de Staël, for instance, can be shown to have been rewritten in pro- or anti-Napoleonic and pro- or anti-German terms during the French Second and Third Republics, which prided themselves on being among the most open societies of their time.” (Lefevere, 1992, pp. 8-9).

“The same basic process of rewriting is at work in translation, historiography, anthologization, criticism, and editing. It is obviously also at work in other forms of rewriting, such as adaptations for film and television... Since translation is the most obviously recognizable type of rewriting, and since it is potentially the most influential because it is able to project the image of an author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture, lifting that author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin, four chapters of this book will be devoted to the study of translated literature. Four more will be devoted to each of the other main forms of rewriting. As a heuristic construct for the study of rewriting I shall make use of the concept of ‘system,’ first introduced into the domain of literary studies by the Russian Formalists, in the conviction that their models may indeed ‘provide a direction for future enquiry’ (Morson 2).” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 9)

“In an attempt to overcome provincialism in literary scholarship, I have extended my readings to cover Afro-English and Dutch literature. A fair number of examples have also been taken from Chinese, Arabic, and other non-Western literatures... At a time when career advancement and other institutional considerations tend to further, or even necessitate the production of ‘high’ rewritings of literature in the very speculative manner practiced by various guru figures (many younger people in the profession are likely to be given tenure or promoted on the basis of publications written in a manner of discourse they themselves would be the first to banish from any composition classes they teach), I have constructed the argument of this book on the basis of evidence that can be documented, and is. Since some of this material is not likely to be familiar to the average reader of this type of book, I have had liberal recourse to quotations from sources generally regarded as authoritative.” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 10).

There follows several chapters, short and to the point, and clearly written (clarity is always a courtesy to the reader). Chapter one deals with **patronage**, and again it contains very basic, but nevertheless useful and interesting insights (which turns this volume into a useful, and clear introduction to the topic established by its title):

“Patronage basically consists of three elements that can be seen to interact in various combinations. There is an ideological component, which acts as a constraint on the choice and development of both form and subject matter. Needless to say, ‘ideology’ is taken here in a sense not limited to the political sphere; rather, ‘Ideology would seem to be that grillwork of form, convention, and belief which orders our actions’ (Jameson 107). There is also an economic component: the patron sees to it that writers and rewriters are able to make a living, by giving them a pension or appointing them to some office. Chaucer, for instance, successively acted as ‘the King’s envoy, the controller of customs on wool, hides and sheepskins, [and] the subforester of North Petherton’ (Bennet 1:5). Chaucer’s contemporary, John Gower, on the other hand, was his own patron, at least in this respect, being ‘an independent country gentleman, whose means allowed him to write in Latin, French and English’ (Bennet 1:6). Yet he was not independent on the ideological level: he wrote his *Confessio Amantis* at the request of Richard II, and he ‘wrote a final passage praising the King. Some years later, the poet found it expedient to omit this passage, and to insert a new preface, praising Henry IV’ (Bennett 1:6)” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 16)

“Patrons also pay royalties on the sale of books or they employ professionals as teachers and reviewers. Finally, there is also an element of status involved. Acceptance of patronage implies integration into a certain support group and its lifestyle, whether the recipient is Tasso at the court of Ferrara, the Beat poets gathering around the City Lights bookstore in San Francisco, Adolf Bartels proudly proclaiming that he has been decorated by Adolf Hitler, or the medieval Latin Archipoeta, who supplied the epigraph to this chapter, which reads, rewritten in English: ‘I shall write unheard of poems for you, if you give me wealth’” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 16)

“Two factors basically determine the image of a work of literature as projected by a translation. These two factors are, in order of importance, the translator’s ideology (whether he/she willingly embraces it, or whether it is imposed on him/her as a constraint by some form of patronage) and the poetics dominant in the receiving literature at the time the translation is made. The ideology dictates the basic strategy the translator is going to use and therefore also dictates solutions to problems concerned with both the ‘universe of discourse’ expressed in the original (objects, concepts, customs belonging to the world that was familiar to the writer in the original) and the language the original itself is expressed in” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 41)

Note how in the following text Berman talks about ‘gains’ and ‘loses’ in translation—the use of such language can be compared with Venuti’s use of the concept of ‘remainder’ (*q.v.*), Pym 1995, Robinson 1997, and

Bourdieu's concept of literary and cultural capital (what he calls 'the economy of linguistic exchanges', Bourdieu 2005: 37-42). Note, interestingly, that here Berman describes that in good translations, there may be an eventual surplus—in the form of a potential that existed in the original, but was not released until it was rendered into another language—for another readership, and within a different cultural milieu. These mercantile, and financial, tropes used to describe the operations of translation can be usefully compared with postcolonial / imperialist tropes (cf. Lorenzo Valla's description of the translator as a conquering soldier), and also with theological, and metaphysical, or poetic tropes used to describe translation.²

Translation as a creative rewriting (a repotentialization) of the original:

In this framework there will also be room to analyze the system of "gains" and "losses" manifested in all translations, even successful ones—what is called the "approximating" character of translation. **Affirming, at least implicitly, that the translation "potentiates" the original, Novalis has contributed to our understanding that gains and losses are not situated on the same level. That is to say, in a translation there is not only a certain percentage of gains and losses; alongside this—undeniable—level, there is another level where something of the original *appears* that does not appear in the source language. The translation turns the original around, reveals another *side* of it.** What is the other side? This is what needs to be discerned more clearly. In that sense, the analytic of translation should teach us something about the work, about its relation to its language and to language in general. Something that neither a mere reading nor criticism can unveil. By reproducing the system-of-the-work into its language, the translation tilts it, which is, unquestionably, again a "potentiation." Goethe had the same intuition when he talked about "regeneration." The translated work is sometimes "regenerated"; not only on the cultural or social level, but in its own *speaking*. To this, in addition, corresponds an awakening in the target language of still latent possibilities by the translation, which it alone, in a different way than literature, has the power to awaken. The poet Hölderlin opens up the possibilities of the German language, homologous but not identical to those he opened up as a translator.' (Berman 1992 pp. 6-7)

Translation and gender

'The interest of cultural studies in translation inevitably took translation studies away from purely linguistic analysis and brought it into contact with other disciplines. Yet this 'process of disciplinary hybridization' has not always been straightforward. **Sherry Simon, in her *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission* (1996), criticizes translation studies for often using the term 'culture' 'as if it referred to an obvious and unproblematic reality' (*ibid.*: ix). Lefevere... for example, had defined it as simply 'the environment of a literary system'.**

Simon approaches translation from a gender-studies angle. **She sees a language of sexism in translation studies, with its images of dominance, fidelity, faithfulness and betrayal.** Typical is the seventeenth—century image of *les belles infidèles*, translations into French that were artistically beautiful but unfaithful... or George Steiner's male-oriented image of translation as penetration in *After Babel*. **Feminist theorists also see a parallel between the status of translation, which is often considered to be derivative and inferior to original writing, and that of women, so often repressed in society and literature.** This is the core of feminist translation theory, which seeks to

² On this see José María Pérez Fernández. "Traducción y poética en Octavio Paz a través de sus versiones de John Donne" (part 1 [Letral](#) 5 (2010): 70-90 & part 2 [Letral](#) 7 (2011): 13-37)

‘identify and critique the tangle of concepts which relegates both women and translation to the bottom of the social and literary ladder’ (Simon 1996: 1)’ (Munday 2012 pp. 198-99)

‘Other chapters in Simon’s book revalue the contribution women translators have made to translation throughout history, discuss the distortion in the translation of French feminist theory and look at feminist translations of the Bible.’ (Munday 2012 p. 199)

‘The important role played by women translators up to the present is emphasized by Simon’s reference to the feminist Suzanne Jill Levine, the translator of Guillermo Cabrera Infante’s *Tres Tristes Tigres*. In contrast to the self-effacing work of some of the earlier translators mentioned above, Levine collaborated closely with Infante in creating a ‘new’ work... From the feminist perspective, however, it is not only Levine’s self-confidence but also her awareness of a certain ‘betrayal’—translating a male discourse that speaks of the woman betrayed—that fascinates Simon. She hints (*ibid.*: 82) at the possible ways Levine may have rewritten, manipulated and ‘betrayed’ Infante’s work in her own feminist project.’ (Munday 2012 p. 200)

Postcolonial translation theory

‘In *Translation and Gender*, Sherry Simon’s focus centres on underlining the importance of the cultural turn in translation. In the conclusion, she insists on how ‘contemporary feminist translation has made gender the site of a consciously transformative project, one which reframes conditions of textual authority’ (1996: 167) and summarizes the contribution of cultural studies to translation as follows:

Cultural studies brings to translation an understanding of the complexities of gender and culture. It allows us to situate linguistic transfer within the multiple ‘post’ realities of today: poststructuralism, postcolonialism and postmodernism. (Simon 1996: 136)’
(Munday 2012 pp. 201-202)

‘In subsequent years it is in fact postcolonialism that has attracted the attention of many translation studies researchers. Though its specific scope is sometimes undefined, postcolonialism is generally used to cover studies of the history of the former colonies, studies of powerful European empires, resistance to the colonializing powers and, more broadly, studies of the effect of the imbalance of power relations between colonized and colonizer. The consequent crossover between different contemporary disciplines can be seen by the fact that essays by Simon and by Lefevere appear in collections of postcolonial writings on translation, and Simon herself makes extensive reference to the postcolonialist Spivak. In particular, Simon highlights (*ibid.*: 145-7) Spivak’s concerns about the ideological consequences of the translation of ‘Third World’ literature into English and the distortion this entails. **Spivak has addressed these questions in her seminal essay ‘The politics of translation’ (1993/2004), which brings together feminist, postcolonialist and poststructuralist approaches. Tensions between the different approaches are highlighted, with Spivak speaking out against western feminists who expect feminist writing from outside Europe to be translated into the language of power, English. In Spivak’s view, such translation is often expressed in ‘translatese’, which eliminates the identity of individuals and cultures that are politically less powerful and leads to a standardization of very different voices:**

In the act of wholesale translation into English there can be a betrayal of the democratic ideal into the law of the strongest. This happens when all the literature of the Third World gets translated into a sort of with-it translatese, so that the literature by a woman in Palestine begins to resemble, in the feel of its prose, something by a man in Taiwan.

(Spivak 1993/2004: 371-2)’
(Munday 2012 p. 202)

‘Spivak’s critique of western feminism and publishing is most biting when she suggests (*ibid.*: 379) that feminists from the hegemonic countries should show real solidarity with women in postcolonial contexts by learning the language in which those women speak and write. In Spivak’s opinion, the ‘politics of translation’ currently gives prominence to English and the other ‘hegemonic’ languages of the ex-colonizers. Translations into these languages from Bengali too often fail to translate the difference of the Bengali view because the translator, although with good intentions, over-assimilates it to make it accessible to the western readers. Spivak’s own translation strategy necessitates the translator’s intimate understanding of the language and situation of the original. It draws on poststructuralist concepts of rhetoric, logic, and the social.’ (Munday 2012 pp. 202-3)

‘Spivak’s word is indicative of how cultural studies, and especially postcolonialism, has focused on issues of translation, the transnational and colonization. The linking of colonization and translation is accompanied by the argument that translation has played an active role in the colonization process and in disseminating an ideologically motivated image of colonized peoples. Just as... we saw a parallel which feminist theorists have drawn between the conventional male-driven depiction of translations and of women, so has the metaphor been used of the colony as an imitative and inferior translational copy whose suppressed identity has been overwritten by the colonizer. Translation’s role in disseminating such ideological images has led Bassnett and Trivedi (1999: 5) to refer to the ‘shameful history of translation’.

The central intersection of translation studies and postcolonial theory is that of power relations. Tejaswini Niranjana’s *Siting Translation: History, Poststructuralism, and the Colonial Context* presents an image of the postcolonial as ‘still scored through by an absentee colonialism’... She sees literary translation as one of the discourses (the others being education, theology, historiography and philosophy) which ‘inform the hegemonic apparatuses that belong to the ideological structure of colonial rule’ (*ibid.* 33). Niranjana’s focus is on the way translation into English has generally been used by the colonial power to construct a rewritten image of the ‘East’ that has then come to stand for the truth. She gives other examples of the colonizer’s imposition of ideological values. These vary from missionaries who ran schools for the colonized and who also performed a role as linguists and translators, to ethnographers who recorded grammars of native languages. Niranjana sees all these groups as ‘participating in the enormous project of collection and codification on which colonial power was based.’ (*ibid.* 24)’ (Munday 2012 p. 203)

‘Asymmetrical power relationships in a postcolonial context also form the thread of the important collection of essays entitled *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, edited by Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi (1999). In their introduction (*ibid.*: 13) they see these power relationships being played out in the unequal struggle of various local languages against ‘the one master-language of our postcolonial world, English’. Translation is thus seen as the battleground and exemplification of the postcolonial context. There is a close linkage of translational to transnational. ‘Transnational’ refers both to those postcolonials living ‘between’ nations as emigrants (as in the example of Salman Rushdie, described in Bhabha 1994) and, more widely, as the ‘locational disrapture’ that describes the situation of those who remain in the melting pot of their native ‘site’:

In current theoretical discourse, then, to speak of postcolonial translation is little short of tautology. In our age of (the valorization of) migrancy, exile and diaspora, the word ‘translation’ seems to have come full circle and reverted from its figurative literary meaning of an interlingual transaction to its etymological physical meaning of locational disrapture; translation seems to have been translated back to its origins. (Bassnett and Trivedi 1999: 13)

Crucial, here, are the interrelated concepts of ‘in-betweenness’, ‘the third space’, and ‘hybridity’ and ‘cultural difference’, which postcolonialist theorist Homi Bhabha uses to theorize questions of identity, agency and belonging in *The Location of Culture* (Bhabha 1994). For Bhabha, the discourse of colonial power is sophisticated and often camouflaged. However, its authority may be subverted by the production of ambivalent cultural hybridity that allows space for the discourse of the colonized to interrelate with it and thus undermine it. The consequences for the translator are crucial. As Michaela Wolf (2000: 142) states, ‘The translator is no longer a mediator between two different poles,

but her/his activities are inscribed in cultural overlappings which imply difference.’ More recent work on colonial difference, by Sathya Rao (2006), challenges Bhabha’s view that postcolonial translation is subversive. Rao proposes the term ‘non-colonial translation theory’, which ‘considers the original as a radical immanence indifferent to the (colonial) world and therefore untranslatable into it’ (*ibid.*: 89). This calls for a ‘radically foreign performance’ or non-translation.’ (Munday 2012 p. 205)

3 The role of the translator: visibility, ethics and sociology

The cultural and political agenda of translation

Like the other cultural theorists discussed in Chapter 8 [see the section above], **Venuti insists that the scope of translation studies needs to be broadened to take account of the value-driven nature of the sociocultural framework.** Thus he contests Toury's 'scientific' descriptive model with its aim of producing 'value-free' norms and laws of translation (see Chapter 7):

Toury's method... must still turn to cultural theory in order to assess the significance of the data, to analyse the norms. **Norms may be in the first instance linguistic or literary, but they will also include a diverse range of domestic values, beliefs, and social representations which carry ideological force in serving the interests of specific groups. And they are always housed in the social institutions where translations are produced and enlisted in cultural and political agendas.**

In addition to **governments and other politically motivated institutions**, which may decide to censor or promote certain works... the groups and social institutions to which Venuti refers would include the **various players in the publishing industry as a whole.** Above all, these would be the **publishers and editors who choose the works and commission the translations, pay the translators and often dictate the translation method.** They also include the **literary agents, marketing and sales teams and reviewers.** The reviewers' comments indicate and to some extent determine how translations are read and received in the target culture. Each of these players has a particular position and role within the dominant cultural and political agendas of their time and place. **The translators themselves are part of that culture, which they can either accept or rebel against.**' (Munday 2012 pp. 216-17)

Venuti and the translator's invisibility:

'The Translator's Invisibility draws on Venuti's own experience as a translator of experimental Italian poetry and fiction. **Invisibility** is a term he uses 'to describe the translator's situation and activity in contemporary British and American cultures' (Venuti 2008: 1). Venuti sees this invisibility as typically being produced:

- (1) **by the way translators themselves tend to translate 'fluently' into English, to produce an idiomatic and 'readable' TT, thus creating an 'illusion of transparency';**
- (2) **by the way the translated texts are typically read in the target culture:**

A translated text, whether prose or poetry, fiction or nonfiction, is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers and readers when it reads fluently, when **the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text—the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation but the 'original'.** (Venuti 2008: 1)

Venuti (1998: 31) sees the most important factor for this as being ‘the prevailing conception of authorship’. Translation is seen as derivative and of secondary quality and importance. Thus, the English practice since Dryden has been to conceal the act of translation so that, even now, ‘translations are rarely considered a form of literary scholarship’ (Venuti 1998: 32)’ (Munday 2012 pp. 217-18)

Venuti discusses invisibility hand in hand with two types of translation: **domestication and foreignization**. These practices concern both the choice of text to translate and the translation method. Their roots are traced back by Venuti to Schleiermacher and his 1813 essay ‘Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens’ ...³. Venuti sees **domestication as dominating British and American translation culture**. Just as the postcolonialists are alert to the cultural effects of the differential in power relations between colony and ex-colony, so Venuti (2008: 15) bemoans the phenomenon of domestication since it involves ‘an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values’. This entails translating it in a transparent, fluent, ‘invisible’ style in order to minimize the foreignness of the TT. Venuti allies it with Schleiermacher’s description of translation that ‘leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him’. Domestication further covers adherence to domestic literary canons by carefully selecting the texts that are likely to lend themselves to such a translation strategy.’ (Munday 2012, p. 218)

‘On the other hand, **foreignizing** ‘entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language’ (*ibid.*: 242). It is the preferred choice of Schleiermacher, whose description is of a translation strategy where ‘the translator leaves the writer in peace, as much as possible and moves the reader toward [the writer]’ (Schleiermacher 1813/2004: 49). Venuti (2008: 15-16) follows this and considers foreignizing practices to be a ‘highly desirable... strategic cultural intervention’ which seeks to ‘send the reader abroad’ by making the receiving culture aware of the linguistic and cultural difference inherent in the foreign text. This is to be achieved by a non-fluent, estranging or heterogeneous translation style designed to make visible the presence of the translator and to highlight the foreign identity of the ST. This is a way, Venuti says, to counter the unequal and ‘violently’ domesticating cultural values of the English-language world.’ (Munday 2012 pp. 218-19)

In *The Scandals of Translation*, Venuti links foreignization to ‘**minoritizing**’ translation. One of the examples he gives of a minoritizing project is his own translation of works by the nineteenth-century Italian novelist Iginio Ugo Tarchetti (1839-1869) (Venuti 1998: 13-20). The very choice of works to translate is minoritizing: Tarchetti was a minor writer, a Milanese bohemian who confronted the literary establishment by using the standard Tuscan dialect to write experimental and Gothic novels that challenged the moral and political values of the day. As far as the language is concerned, the minoritizing or foreignizing practice of Venuti’s translation comes through in the deliberate inclusion of foreignizing elements such as modern American slang. These aim to make the translator ‘visible’ and to make the readers realize they are reading a translation of a work from a foreign culture.’ (Munday 2012 p. 219)

Importantly, **domestication and foreignization are considered to be not binary opposites but part of a continuum, and they relate to ethical codes made by the translator in order to expand the receiving culture’s range:**

The terms ‘domestication’ and ‘foreignization’ indicate fundamentally *ethical* attitudes towards a foreign text and culture, ethical effects produced by the choice of a text for translation and by the strategy devised to translate it, whereas the terms like ‘fluency’ and ‘resistancy’ indicate fundamentally *discursive* features of translation strategies in relation to the reader’s cognitive processing. (Venuti 2008: 19)’ (Munday 2012 p. 220)

³ See an English translation in Venuti, ed. 2004 (Friedrich Schleiermacher, ‘On the different methods of translating’, in Venuti, ed. 2004, pp. 43-63).

‘Although Venuti advocates foreignizing translation, he is also aware of some of its contradictions. It is a subjective and relative term that still involves a degree of domestication since it translates a ST for a receiving culture. Indeed, foreignization depends on the dominant values of the receiving culture because it becomes visible precisely when it departs from those values. However, Venuti stoutly defends foreignizing translations. They ‘are equally partial [as are domesticating translations] in their interpretation of the foreign text, but they tend to flaunt their partiality instead of concealing it’ (2008: 28). In addition, Venuti (*ibid.* 19) emphasizes the ‘culturally variable and historically contingent’ nature of the domestication and foreignization. Just as we saw with the discussion of descriptive studies, the values associated with these terms, reconstructed from close textual analysis or archival research, vary according to external cultural and historical factors.’ (Munday 2012 p. 221)

Antoine Berman: the ‘negative analytic’ of translation

‘Questions of how much a translation assimilates a foreign text and how far it signals difference had already attracted the attention of the noted French theorist, the late Antoine Berman (1942-1991). Berman’s *L’épreuve de l’étranger: Culture et traduction dans l’Allemagne romantique* (1984), translated into English as *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany* (1992), precedes and influences Venuti. The latter himself produced a more recent English translation of the prominent article ‘La traduction comme épreuve de l’étranger’ (Berman 1985), in English entitled ‘Translation and the trials of the foreign’ (Berman 1985b/2004). In it Berman (*ibid.* 276) describes translation as an *épreuve* (‘experience’/‘trial’) in two senses:

- (1) for the target culture in experiencing the strangeness of the foreign text and word;
 - (2) for the foreign text in being uprooted from its original language context.’
- (Munday 2012 pp. 221-22)

‘Berman deplors the general tendency to negate the foreign in translation by the translation strategy of ‘naturalization’, which would equate with Venuti’s later ‘domestication’. ‘The properly ethical aim of the translating act’, says Berman (*ibid.*: 277), is ‘receiving the foreign as foreign’, which would seem to have influenced Venuti’s ‘foreignizing’ translation strategy. However, Berman considers that there is generally ‘a system of textual deformation’ in TTs that prevents the foreign from coming through. His examination of the forms of deformation is termed **negative analytic**:

The negative analytic is primarily concerned with **ethnocentric, annexationist translations and hypertextual translations (pastiche, imitation, adaptation, free writing), where the play of deforming forces is freely exercised.** (Berman 1985b/2004: 278)

Berman, who translated Latin American fiction and German philosophy, sees every translator as being inevitably and inherently exposed to these ethnocentric forces, which determine the ‘desire to translate’ as well as the form of the TT. He feels that it is only by psychoanalytic analysis of the translator’s work, and by making the translator aware of the forces at work, that such tendencies can be neutralized. His main attention is centred on the translation of fiction:

The principal problem of translating the novel is to respect its shapeless polylogic and avoid an arbitrary homogenization. (Berman 1985b/2004: 279)

By this, Berman is referring to the linguistic variety and creativity of the novel and the way translation tends to reduce variation. He identifies twelve ‘**deforming tendencies**’ (*ibid.* 280), listed below.’ (Munday 2012 p. 222)

(1) **Rationalization:** This mainly entails the modification of syntactic structures including punctuation and sentence structure and order. An example would be translations of Dostoevsky which remove some of the repetition and simplify complex sentence structures. Berman also refers to the abstractness of rationalization and the tendency to generalization.

(2) **Clarification:** This includes explicitation, which ‘aims to render “clear” what does not wish to be clear in the original’ (*ibid.* 281)

(3) **Expansion:** Like other theorists, Berman says that TTs tend to be longer than STs. This is due to ‘empty’ explicitation that unshapes its rhythms, to ‘overtranslation’ and to ‘flattening’. These additions only serve to reduce the clarity of the work’s ‘voice’.

(4) **Ennoblement:** This refers to the tendency on the part of certain translators to ‘improve’ on the original by rewriting it in a more elegant style. The result, according to Berman (*ibid.* 282) is an annihilation of the oral rhetoric of formless polylogic of the ST. Equally destructive is the opposite—a TT that is too ‘popular’ in its use of colloquialisms.

(5) **Qualitative impoverishment:** This is the replacement of words and expressions with TT equivalents ‘that lack their sonorous richness or, correspondingly, their signifying or ‘iconic’ features’ (*ibid.*: 283). By ‘iconic’, Berman means terms whose form and sound are in some way associated with their sense. An example he gives is the word *butterfly* and its corresponding terms in other languages.

(6) **Qualitative impoverishment:** This is loss of lexical variation in translation. Berman gives the example of a Spanish ST that uses three different synonyms for *face* (*semblante*, *rostro* and *cara*); rendering them all as *face* would involve loss.

(7) **The destruction of rhythms:** Although more common in poetry, rhythms is still important to the novel and can be ‘destroyed’ by deformation of word order and punctuation.

(8) **The destruction of underlying networks of signification:** The translator needs to be aware of **the network of words that is formed throughout the text**. Individually, these words may not be significant, but they add an underlying uniformity and sense to the text. Examples are augmentative suffixes in a Latin American text –*jaulón* (large cage), *portón* (‘large door’, etc.)

(9) **The destruction of linguistic patternings:** While the ST may be systematic in its sentence constructions and patternings, translation tends to be ‘asystematic’ (*ibid.*: 285). The translator often adopts a range of techniques, such as rationalization, clarification and expansion, all of which standardize the TT. This is actually a form of incoherence since standardization destroys the linguistic patterns and variations of the original.

(10) **The destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization:** This relates especially to local speech and language patterns which play an important role in establishing the setting of a novel. Examples would include the use of diminutives in Spanish, Portuguese, German and Russian or of Australian English terms and cultural items (*outback*, *bush*, *dingo*, *wombat*). There is severe loss if these are erased, yet the traditional solution of exoticizing some of these terms by, for example, placing them in italics, isolates them from the co-text. Alternatively, seeking a TL vernacular or slang equivalent to the SL is a ridiculous exoticization of the foreign. Such would be the case if an Australian farmer were made to speak Bavarian in a German translation.

(11) **The destruction of expressions and idioms:** Berman considers the replacement of an idiom or proverb by its TL ‘equivalent’ to be an ‘ethnocentrism’: ‘to play with “equivalence” is to attack the discourse of the foreign work’, he says (*ibid.*: 287). Thus, an English idiom from Joseph Conrad containing the name of the well-known London mental health hospital *Bedlam*, should not be translated by *Charenton*, a similar French institution, since this would result in a TT that produces a new network of French cultural references.

(12) **The effacement of the superimposition of languages:** By this, Berman means the way translation tends to erase traces of different forms of language that co-exist in the ST. These may be the mix of American English and varieties of Latin American Spanish in the work of Carlos Fuentes and new Latino/a writers, the blends of Anglo-Indian writing, the proliferation of language influences in Joyce’s *Finnegan’s Wake*, different sociolects and idiolects, and so on. Berman (*ibid.*: 287) considers this to be the ‘central problem’ in the translation of novels.

Counterbalancing the ‘universals’ of this negative analytic is Berman’s **positive analytic**, his proposal for the type of translation required to render the foreign in the TT. This he calls **literal translation**:

Here ‘literal’ means: attached to the letter (of works). Labor on the letter in translation, on the one hand, restores the particular signifying process of works (which is more than their meaning) and, on the other hand, transforms the translating language. (Berman 1985b/2004: 288-9)
(Munday 2012 pp. 223-4)

‘Berman’s work is important in linking philosophical ideas to translation strategies with many examples drawn from existing translations. His discussion of the **ethics of translation** as witnessed in linguistic ‘deformation’ of TTs is of especial relevance and a notable counterpoint to earlier writing on literary translation. But ethics also encompasses the context of translation and those ‘professionals’ (translators, publishers, reviewers...) whom Lefevere described.’ (Munday 2012 p. 225)

On the *visibility* of the translator:

Venuti’s ‘call to action’ (2008: 265-77), for translators to adopt ‘visible’ and ‘foreignizing’ practices, is perhaps a reaction to those contemporary translators who seem to debate their work along lines appropriate to the age-old and vague terms which we discussed in Chapter 2—for example, Gregory Rabassa (2005) discusses the relative exigencies of ‘accuracy’ and ‘flow’ in literary translation. Translators also often consider that their work is intuitive, that they must be ‘led’ by language and listen to their ‘ear’ ... In a similar vein, Margaret Sayers Peden, the translator of Latin American authors Sábato, Fuentes, Allende and Esquivel, listens to the **voice** of the ST. She defines this as ‘the way something is communicated: the way the tale is told; the way the poem is sung’ and it determines ‘all choices of cadence and tone and lexicon and syntax’ (1987: 9). John Felstiner, who translated Pablo Neruda’s classic poem about Machu Picchu, went as far as to listen to Neruda reading his poems so as to see the stresses and the emphases (Felstiner 1980: 51). In her new, American translation of the classic *Don Quixote*, Gabriel García Márquez’s translator Edith Grossman also declares that ‘the essential challenge of translation [is] hearing, in the most profound way I can, the text in Spanish and discovering the voice to say (I mean, to write) the text again in English’ (Grossman 2003/2005: xix)’ (Munday 2012 pp. 225-6)

‘The “invisibility” of translators has been such that relatively few of them have written in detail about their practice. However, this may be changing, with the publication of Norman Thomas di Giovanni’s (2003) account of his collaboration with Borges, of Grossman’s (2010) volume *Why Translation Matters* and of the memoirs of perhaps the most celebrated translator of all, Gregory Rabassa (2005). Two other full-length works of import by contemporary literary translators of Latin American Spanish are Felstiner’s *Translating Neruda: The Way to Machu Picchu* (1980) and Levine’s *The Subversive Scribe: Translating Latin American Fiction* (1991). Felstiner (1980: 1) makes the important point that much of the work that goes into producing a translation ‘becomes invisible once the new poem stands intact’. This includes the translator’s own background and research as well as the process of composition. Felstiner describes his immersion in the work and culture of the ST author, including visits to Machu Picchu itself and his reading of Neruda’s poem in that environment. However, he still uses age-old terms to describe ‘the twofold requirement of translation’, namely, ‘the original must come through essentially, in language that itself rings true’ (Felstiner 1980: 24). Phrases such as *come through essentially* and *ring true* are typical of the approaches of early translation theory discussed in Chapter 2 and suggest that there is a mystique about the ‘art’ of translation.’ (Munday 2012 p. 226)

‘On the other hand, Levine sees herself (1991: xi) as a ‘translator-collaborator’ with the Cuban author Cabrera Infante, and as a ‘subversive scribe’, ‘destroying’ the form of the original but reproducing the meaning in a new form (*ibid.*: 7). Levine sometimes creates a completely different passage in translation in order to give free rein to the English language’s propensity to punning, surprising the reader with a mixture of the Latin American and Anglo-Saxon.’ (Munday 2012 p. 226)

‘For Levine, adopting a feminist and poststructuralist view of the translator’s work, the language of translation also plays an ideological role:

‘A translation should be a critical act... creating doubt, posing questions to the reader, recontextualising the ideology of the original text. (Levine 1991: 3)

The **creativity** of translation is a growing theme, and the crossover between translation studies and creative writing has begun to be explored, linking with the mechanics of reading, cognitive processing and the experimental reformulation of the source (Loffredo and Perteghella 2006)

The stance and **positionality** of the translator have also become much more central in translation studies. Chapter 8 described some of the forms in which translation is manipulated by the ideology of the sociocultural context. Such an ideological effect has its counterpart in the stance of the translator him or herself. Maria Tymoczko, in an article entitled ‘Ideology and the position of the translator: In what sense is a translator “in between”?’, echoing Homi Bhabha’s ‘third space’ (see chapter 8), takes issue with those who see the translator as a neutral mediator in the act of communication:

‘[T]he ideology of translation resides not simply in the text translated, but in the voicing and stance of the translator, and in the relevance to the receiving audience. These latter features are affected by the place of enunciation of the translator: indeed they are part of what we mean by the ‘place’ of enunciation, for that ‘place’ is an **ideological positioning** as well as a geographical and temporal one. These aspects of a translation are motivated and determined by the translator’s cultural and ideological affiliations as much as or even more than by the temporal and spatial location that the translator speaks from. (Tymoczko 2003: 183)’
(Munday 2012 p. 227)

Tymoczko (*ibid.* 199) rejects the ‘Romantic’ and ‘élitist’ western notion of uncommitted, individual translators working away on their own and concludes that ‘effective calls for translators to act as ethical agents of social change must intersect with models of engagement and collective action’. Carol Maier (2007), herself both translator of Latin American literature and a translation studies theorist, names this positioning ‘*intervenience*’ and the translator ‘**an intervenient being**’.

Some translators have certainly shown themselves to be more vociferous about the injustices of the publishing process and some are openly antagonistic towards translation theorists. Rabassa (2005) slates the ‘translation police’ of reviewers and ‘nitpicking academics’ who focus microscopically on errors in a translation, ignoring the literary value of the target text. British translator Peter Bush (1998, 2006), formerly Director of the British Centre for Literary Translation, also criticizes translation theory (at least of the linguistic kind) while detailing the professionalism of the literary translator, as reader, researcher, writer and reviser.’ (Munday 2012 p. 228)

The power network of the publishing industry

‘There is a range of other agents playing key roles in the preparation, dissemination and fashioning of translations. These include commissioners, mediators, literary agents, text producers, translators, revisers and editors. The volume edited by Milton and Bandia (2009) provides detailed examples of such cultural ‘**gate keepers**’, to use Bourdieu’s term, whose work has been innovative either stylistically or politically.

For many authors writing in other languages, the benchmark of success is to be translated into English. In fact, the decision whether or not to translate a work is the greatest power wielded by the editor and publisher. According to Venuti (1998: 48), publishers in the UK and USA tend to choose works that are easily assimilated into the target culture. The percentages of books translated in both countries are extremely low, comprising only between two and four per cent of the total number of books published (Venuti 2008: 11). On the other hand, not only is the percentage of books translated in countries such as Germany and Italy much higher, but the majority of those translations are also

from English (*ibid.*). Venuti sees the imbalance as yet another example of the cultural hegemony of British and American Publishing and Culture. It is very insular and refuses to accept the foreign, yet is happy for its own works to maintain a stronghold in other countries. Venuti has expressed this in damning terms in the introduction to *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*:

It can be said that Anglo-American publishing has been instrumental in producing readers who are aggressively monolingual and culturally parochial while reaping the economic benefits of successfully imposing Anglo-American cultural values on a sizeable foreign readership. (Venuti 1992: 6)

Market forces reinforce and even determine these trends. Thus, the first print-run for a literary translation in the UK or the USA rarely exceeds 5000 (Venuti 1995: 12). For this reason many translations into English, and other languages, continue to depend on grants from organizations such as the National Endowment for the Arts in the United States or from sponsorship from the Embassies or other institutions of the source culture.’ (Munday 2012 pp. 229-230)

Paratexts and epitexts

‘The whole gamut of **paratexts** (devices appended to the text) is the subject of the cultural theorist Gérard Genette’s *Paratexts* (1997). Genette considers two kinds of paratextual elements: (1) **peritexts**; and (2) **epitexts**.

(1) **Peritexts** appear in the same location as the text and are provided by the author or publisher. Examples given by Genette are titles, **subtitles, pseudonyms, forewords, dedications, prefaces, epilogues and framing elements such as the cover and blurb**.

(2) An **epitext** ‘is any paratextual element not materially appended to the text within the same volume but circulating, as it were, freely, in a virtually limitless physical and social space’ (*ibid.*: 344). Examples are **marketing and promotional material**, which may be provided by the publisher, **correspondence on the text by the author**, and also **reviews and academic and critical discourse on the author and text which are written by others**. **The paratext is ‘subordinate’ to the text (*ibid.*: 12) but it is crucial in guiding the reading process**. For example, a reader who first encounters a review of a book will approach the text itself with certain preconceptions based on that epitext. If we additionally adopt the analytical approach of reception theory, we can analyse reviews synchronically or diachronically. An example of a synchronic analysis would be an examination of a range of reviews of a single work; examples of a diachronic analysis would be an examination of reviews of books of an author or newspaper over a longer time period.’

(Munday 2012 pp. 233-4)

Reading prefaces – prefaces as paratexts and their role in the history of translation (from Hayes 2009)

If the relation of a translation to its source text slices across frames of reference that include linguistic choices, critical hermeneutics, and differing modes of literary reception, the relationship of the translator’s preface to the translated text (and to its original) adds an additional layer of complexity. As a genre, the critical preface—often, indeed, a translator’s preface—arose in Italy and France in the Renaissance and became popular in England in the course of the seventeenth century. The freedom of the translator’s preface is surely one of the genre’s most appealing qualities: content and tone may vary from elegy to political satire, from autobiography to *explication de texte*. Gérard Genette’s typology of literary prefaces in *Seuils* (authentic or fictive, authorial or “allographic”, and so on) does not capture the peculiar position of the preface written by a translator, who both is and

is not the author of the text being presented; whose motives for translating may be pedagogical, spiritual, commercial, or oppositional; who may aim to influence the standard of taste, to shock—*épater le bourgeois!*—or to warn of a perceived danger. As in other prefaces, the writer / translator offers a pact to the reader; unlike other prefaces, that pact includes a relationship with a third party, the original author, and frequently others, such as patrons and other translators (past, present, or future). The preface is furthermore the site of a transaction that is difficult to locate in time. It represents a completed reading of a work that we as readers have yet to encounter; it dislocates original authors from their place in history. One of the most commonly recurring topoi in neoclassical prefaces is the translator's desire to 'make the author speak' as if he or she were alive before us, sharing our language. As Glyn Norton notes in his perspicacious study of Renaissance translators' prefaces, the translator 'embarks on an act of deconstruction', setting forth the historical and personal contexts of reading and interpretation, the problems of meaning, interpretation, and cultural equivalency.' (Hayes 2009 pp. 7-8)

It is tempting to sketch the outlines of a typology of translators' prefaces. Leaving aside fictive translators' prefaces to many a novel, one would need to take into account the function of the preface in different genres and disciplines—such as literature, history, philosophy, science, and travel writing—and the different functions performed by the preface: historical background, explanation, justification, and what Genette calls the 'lightning rod' (ranging from the topos of modesty to apparent condemnation, as in the prefaces to the 1647 French version and the 1649 English version of the Qur'ān). The preface may discuss the origins of the source text (Pierre Le Tourneur's eighteenth-century prefaces to Young and Shakespeare) or those of the translation (William Gifford's Juvenal [1802]); anti-prefaces lampoon the genre (numerous prefaces of Roger L'Estrange); dueling prefaces attack one another (Silhouette's and Resnel's prefaces to their rival translations of Pope's *Essay on Man* in the 1730s). A translator's preface can also become juxtaposed to a translated author's preface (Aphra Behn's Fontenelle of 1688) or metamorphose into an editor's preface (Aphra Behn's Fontenelle of 1688) or metamorphose into an editor's preface (Pierre Du Ryer's 1653 preface to Vaugelas's *Quinte-Curce*). And of course many of these texts involve sustained reflections on aesthetics, the relative merits of prose and verse, questions of language and meaning, national character, and so on.' (Hayes 2009 8)

The sociology and historiography of translation

Recently, the study of translators, rather than the texts and cultures, has become centre-stage in translation studies research. This includes the dramatic increase in works of translation historiography... The simultaneous development of a 'sociology' of translation (cf Pym 2006, Wolf and Fukari 2007, Milton and Bandia 2009) has investigated the role of the translator as active agent, drawing mainly on the theory of French ethnographer and sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and his concepts of:

- **field** of social activity, which is the site of a power struggle between participants or agents—for us, this field is translation and the participants potentially include the author, commissioner, publisher, editor, translator, and reader;
- **habitus**, which is the broad social, identitary and cognitive make-up or '**disposition**' of the individual, which is heavily influenced by family and education; **habitus is particularly linked to field and to cultural capital and has been central to recent sociological work in translation studies**;
- the different types of **capital** which an individual may acquire or be given—these comprise the more tangible **economic capital** (money and other material assets) and the more intangible: **social capital** (such as networks of contacts), **cultural capital** (education, knowledge) and **symbolic capital** (status); and
- **illusio**, which may be understood as the cultural limits of awareness.'

(Munday 2012 p. 234)

‘Bourdieu’s work has been adopted by some scholars as a less deterministic alternative to the polysystem framework, especially as a means of theorizing the role of the translator, which seemed worryingly absent from earlier theories.’ (Munday 2012 pp. 234-5)

In her introduction to the special issue of *The Translator* devoted to Bourdieusian concepts, Inghilleri... considers that research employing Bourdieu’s theorization can help us understand how translators and interpreters are ‘both implicated in and able to transform the forms of practice in which they engage’. Jean-Marc Gouanvic’s work is important in this context. His monograph *Sociologie de la traduction* (Gouanvic, 1999) examines French translations of American science-fiction, and his article in the Inghilleri collection (Gouanvic 2005) investigates the habitus of three major French translators of American literature... Here, the habitus as an integral part of the individual translator’s history, education and experiences is emphasized:

the **habitus**, which is the generative principle of responses more or less well adapted to the demands of a certain field, is the product of an individual history, but also, through the formative experiences of earliest infancy, of the whole collective history of family and class (Bourdieu, quoted in Gouanvic 2005: 158-9)

Although Gouanvic claims that lexical and prosodic choices revealing the ‘voice’ of the translator are ‘not a conscious strategic choice but an effect of his or her specific habitus, as acquired in the target literary field’ (*ibid.*: 158), the relation between these choices in the text and the translator’s ‘disposition’ is far from evident. What exactly causes a translator to act in a given way in a given situation, and why does one translator act differently from another? This question has been treated from a mainly linguistic angle in stylistic studies of translation.’ (Munday 2008 p. 235)

Translation, ethics and a sense of community

‘As mentioned earlier, the ‘neoclassical’ approach associated with translators and theorists from d’Ablancourt to Tytler fell under severe censure during the nineteenth century, beginning with Staël and the Romantics. In his seminar study of German Romantic translation theory, *L’Épreuve de l’Étranger*, **Antoine Berman** called for historical studies of translating practice that would show ‘how in each period or in each given historical setting the practice of translation is articulated in relation to the practice of literature, of languages, of the several **intercultural and interlinguistic exchanges**’. **Clearly there is much to be gained, both for the history of ideas and for our own contemporary understanding of the issues, in examining the relations between translation and the philosophy of language, literary expression, the book trade, and national and cultural politics in a given context.** Berman, however, went on to make a case for what he called the ‘ethical aim’, or *visée éthique*, of translation—‘to open up in writing a certain relation with the Other, to fertilize what is one’s Own through the mediation of what is Foreign’—and to which he opposed ‘bad’ or ‘ethnocentric’ translations that carry out ‘a systematic negation of the strangeness of the foreign work’ [NOTE 33 to p. 16: For a series of articles assessing the impact of Berman’s work on translation studies, see Nouss, Alexis, ed. “Antoine Berman aujourd’hui”. Special issue, *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Redaction* 14, no. 2 (2001)]. Already, there is a tension in Berman’s manifesto between the descriptive and the normative, and a potential danger, which Berman himself acknowledged, that historical translation studies might simply degenerate into a sieve for separating out ‘good’ versus ‘bad’ translations, thereby effacing their historical locatedness. In more recent years, **Lawrence Venuti** has offered a similar critique, decrying neoclassical practice as ‘hegemonizing’ and arguing that adaptative or ‘fluent’ translation strategies have an ‘exclusionary impact on foreign cultural values’, maintaining the prerogatives of cultural elites and ‘closing off thinking about cultural and social alternatives.’ Like Berman, he argues in favour of an ethical approach to translation that, instead of adapting foreign works to national taste, would ‘foreignize’ the national language, bringing it in closer contact with the linguistic realities of other cultures. However valuable these arguments might be as we reflect on

the place of translation in the world today—and I believe that they are quite valuable—they are a highly reductive account of neoclassical translation”. (Hayes, 2009, p. 16)

Venuti 2004: Translation, communication, domestication and the ‘ethical politics of difference’ (compare with Appiah 2004, and with Berman 1992) – **the translator as an agent in the construction of ‘a community with foreign cultures’, through strategies such as the ‘domestic inscription in translating’** (see below)

‘Even though no one seems likely to deny that communication is the primary aim and function of a translated text, **today we are far from thinking that translating is a simple communicative act. In contemporary translation theory** informed by Continental philosophical traditions such as existential phenomenology and poststructuralism, **language is constitutive of thought, and meaning a site of multiple determinations**, so that translation is readily seen as investing the foreign language text with a domestic significance. Translation never communicates in an untroubled fashion because **the translator negotiates the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text by reducing them and supplying another set of differences, basically domestic, drawn from the receiving language and culture to enable the foreign to be received there. The foreign text, then, is not so much communicated as inscribed with domestic intelligibilities and interests**. The inscription begins with the very choice of a text for translation, always a very selective, densely motivated choice, and continues in the development of discursive strategies to translate it, always a choice of certain domestic discourses over others. Hence, the domesticating process is totalizing, even if never total, never seamless or final. It can be said to operate in every word of the translation long before the translated text is further processed by readers, made to bear other domestic meanings and to serve other domestic interests.’ (Venuti 2004 pp. 482-3)

‘Seen as domestic inscription, never quite cross-cultural communication, translation has moved theorists towards an ethical reflection wherein **remedies are formulated to restore or preserve the foreignness of the foreign text**. Yet an ethics that counters the domesticating effects of the inscription can only be formulated and practiced primarily in *domestic* terms, in domestic dialects, registers, discourses, and styles. And this means that the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text can only be signalled indirectly, by their displacement in the translation, through a domestic difference introduced into values and institutions at home. This ethical attitude is therefore simultaneous with a political agenda: the domestic terms of the inscription become the focus of rewriting in the translation, discursive strategies where the hierarchies that rank the values in the domestic culture are disarranged to set going processes of defamiliarization, canon reformation, ideological critique, and institutional change. A translator may find that the very concept of the domestic merits interrogation for its concealment of heterogeneity and hybridity which can complicate existing stereotypes, canons, and standards applied in translation.

When motivated by this ethical politics of difference, the translator seeks to build a community with foreign cultures, to share an understanding with and of them and to collaborate on projects founded on that understanding, going so far as to allow it to revise and develop domestic values and institutions. The very impulse to seek a community abroad suggests that the translator wishes to extend or complete a particular domestic situation, to compensate for a defect in the translating language and literature, in the translating culture. As Maurice Blanchot argues, the very notion of community arises when an insufficiency puts individual agency into question (Blanchot 1988: 56). **The ethically and politically motivated translator cannot fail to see the lack of an equal footing in the translation process, stimulated by an interest in the foreign, but inescapably leaning towards the receptor. This translator knows that translations never simply communicate the foreign texts because they make possible**

only a domesticated understanding, however much defamiliarized, however much subversive or supportive of the domestic.

In the absence of cross-cultural communication unaffected by domestic intelligibilities and interests, **what kinds of communities can translation possibly foster? What communities can be based on the domestic inscription of the foreign that limits and redirects the communicative aim of translation?**' (Venuti 2004 p. 483)

In the 1970s **Gideon Toury** tried to define translation as a communicative act while acknowledging the domestic values that come into play, the target norms that constrain communication. **Translation**, he wrote,

is communication in translated messages within a certain cultural-linguistic system, with all relevant consequences for the decomposition of the source message, the establishment of the invariant, its transfer across the cultural-linguistic border and the recomposition of the target message

(Toury 1980: 17; his emphasis)

"The establishment of the invariant": if communication in translation is defined as the transmission of an invariant, doesn't the very need to establish the invariant mean that translating does something more and perhaps other than communicate? The source message is always interpreted and reinvented, especially in cultural forms open to interpretation, such as literary texts, philosophical treatises, film subtitling, advertising copy, conference papers, legal testimony. How can the source message ever be invariant if it undergoes a process of "establishment" in a "certain" target language and culture? It is always reconstructed according to a different set of values and always variable according to different languages and cultures. Toury ultimately reckoned with the problem of communication by sidestepping it altogether: he shifted the emphasis away from exploring an equivalence between the translation and the foreign text and instead focused on the acceptability of the translation in the target culture. Thinking about the foreign is thus preempted in favor of research that describes domestic cultural norms.' (Venuti 2004 pp. 483-4)

But let's pursue this preempted line of enquiry. What formal and thematic features of a foreign novel, for instance, can be described as invariant in the translation process? Since canons of accuracy vary according to culture and historical moment, definitions of what constitutes the invariant will likewise vary. Let's ask the question of current translation practices. Today, translators of novels into most languages seek to maintain unchanged the basic elements of narrative form. The plot isn't rewritten to alter events or their sequence. And none of the characters' actions is deleted or revised. Dates, historical and geographical markers, the characters' names—even when the names are rather complicated and foreign-sounding—these are generally not altered or only in rare cases (e.g. Russian names). Contemporary canons of accuracy are based on an adequacy to the foreign text: an accurate translation of a novel must not only reproduce the basic elements of narrative form, but should do so in roughly the same number of pages.

In 1760, however, Abbé Prévost claimed that accuracy governed his French version of Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* even though he reduced the seven English volumes to four in French. "I have not changed anything pertaining to the author's intention," the Abbé asserted, "nor have I changed much in the manner in which he put that intention into words". To us, such statements don't merely substitute a different canon of accuracy (founded on notions of authorial intention and style); they also seem to exceed the very genre of translation. Prévost's text involved abridgement and adaptation as well.' (Venuti 2004 p. 484)

In current practices, a translation of a novel can and must communicate the basic elements of narrative form that structure the foreign-language text. But it is still not true that these elements are free from variation. Any language use is likely to vary the standard dialect by sampling a diversity of substandard or minor formations: regional or group dialects, jargons, clichés and slogans, stylistic innovations, archaisms, neologisms. **Jean-Jacques Lecercle calls these variations the "remainder" because they exceed communication of a univocal meaning and instead draw attention to the conditions of the communicative act, conditions that are in the first instance linguistic and cultural, but that ultimately embrace social and political factors** (Lecercle 1990). The remainder in literary texts is much more complicated of course, usually a sedimentation of formal

elements and generic discourses, past as well as present (Jameson 1981: 140-1)' (Venuti 2004 pp. 484-5)

'Any communication through translating, then, will involve the release of a domestic remainder, especially in the case of literature. The foreign text is rewritten in domestic dialects and discourses, registers and styles, and this results in the production of textual effects that signify only in the history of the receiving language and culture. The translator may produce these effects to communicate the foreign text, trying to invent domestic analogues for foreign norms and themes. But the result will always go beyond any communication to release target-oriented possibilities of meaning.' (Venuti 2004 p. 485)

'The remainder does not just inscribe a domestic set of linguistic and cultural differences in the foreign text, but supplies the loss of foreign-language differences which constituted that text. The loss occurs, as Alasdair MacIntyre has observed, because in any "tradition-bearing community" the "language-in-use is closely tied to the expression of the shared beliefs of that tradition," and this gives a "historical dimension" to languages which often fails to survive the translating process (MacIntyre 1988: 384). MacIntyre argued that this problem of untranslatability is most acute with "the internationalized languages-in-use in late twentieth-century modernity," like English, which "have minimal presuppositions in respect of possibly rival belief systems" and so will "neutralize" the historical dimension of the foreign text (*ibid.*). In English translation, therefore,

a kind of text which cannot be read as *the text it is* out of context is nevertheless rendered contextless. But in so rendering it, it is turned into a text which is no longer the author's, nor such as would be recognized by the audience to whom it was addressed.

(*ibid.*: 385; MacIntyre's emphasis)

(Venuti 2004 p. 486)

'Can a translation ever communicate to its readers the understanding of the foreign text that foreign readers have? Yes, I want to argue, but this communication will always be partial, both incomplete and inevitably slanted towards the domestic scene. It occurs only when the domestic remainder released by the translation includes an inscription of the foreign context in which the text first emerged.' (Venuti 2004 p. 484)

'The form of communication at work here is second-order, built upon but significantly beyond a lexicographical equivalence, encompassing but exceeding what Walter Benjamin called "information" or "subject matter." "Translations that are more than transmissions of subject matter," Benjamin wrote, "come into being when in the course of its survival a work has reached the age of its fame." I understand the term "fame" to mean the overall reception of a literary text, not only in its own language and culture, but in the languages of the cultures that have translated it, and not only the judgements of reviewers at home and abroad, but the interpretations of literary historians and critics and the images that an internationally famous text may come to bear in other cultural forms and practices, both elite and mass. A translation of a foreign novel can communicate, not simply dictionary meanings, not simply the basic elements of narrative form, but an interpretation that participates in its "potentially eternal afterlife in succeeding generations." And this interpretation can be one that is shared by the foreign-language readers for whom the text was written. The translation will then foster a common understanding with and of the foreign culture, and understanding that in part restores the historical context of the foreign text—although for domestic readers.' (Venuti 2004 pp. 487-88)

→→→ 'The domestic inscription in translating constitutes a unique communicative act, however indirect or wayward. It creates a domestic community of interest around the translated text, an audience to whom it is intelligible and who put it to various uses. This shared interest may arise spontaneously when the translation is published, attracting readers from different cultural constituencies that already exist in the translating language. It may also be housed in an institution where the translation is made to perform different functions, academic or religious, cultural or political, commercial or municipal. Any community that arises around

a translation is far from homogeneous in language, identity, or social position. Its heterogeneity might best be understood in terms of what Mary Louise Pratt calls a “linguistics of contact,” in which language-based communities are seen as decentered across “lines of social differentiation” (Pratt 1987: 60). A translation is a linguistic “zone of contact” between the foreign and translating cultures, but also within the latter.

The interests that bind the community through a translation are not simply focused on the foreign text, but reflected in the domestic values, beliefs, and representations that the translator inscribes in it. And these interests are further determined by the ways the translation it used. **In the case of foreign texts that have achieved canonical status in an institution, a translation becomes the site of interpretive communities that may support or challenge current canons and interpretations, prevailing standards and ideologies. In the case of foreign texts that have achieved mass circulation, a translation becomes the site of unexpected groupings, fostering communities of readers who would otherwise be separated by cultural differences and social divisions yet are now joined by a common fascination. A translation can answer to the interests of a diverse range of domestic audiences, so that the forms of reception will not be entirely commensurable. Because translating traffics in the foreign, in the introduction of linguistic and cultural differences, it is equally capable of crossing or reinforcing the boundaries between domestic audiences and the hierarchies in which they are positioned. If the domestic inscription includes part of the social or historical context in which the foreign text first emerged, then a translation can also create a community that includes foreign intelligibilities and interests, an understanding in common with another culture, another tradition.**⁷ (Venuti 2004 p. 491)

‘In its ability to support... [the] linguistic and cultural differences, to be intelligible and interesting to them in their own terms ... [a] translation [can foster] its own community, one that... [is] *imagined* in Benedict Anderson’s sense: the members ‘will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’⁴ (Anderson 1991: 6). In the case of a translation, this image is derived from the representation of a foreign text constructed by the translator, a communication domestically inscribed. **To translate is to invent for the foreign text new readerships who are aware that their interest in the translation is shared by other readers, foreign and domestic—even when those interests are incommensurable.**’ (Venuti 2004 p. 495)

‘The imagined communities that concerned Anderson were nationalistic, based on the sense of belonging to a particular nation. Translations have undoubtedly formed such communities by importing foreign ideas that stimulated the rise of large-scale political movements at home. At the turn of the twentieth century, the Chinese translator Yan Fu chose works on evolutionary theory by T.H. Huxley and Herbert Spenser precisely to build a national Chinese culture. He translated the Western concepts of aggression embodied in social Darwinism to form an aggressive Chinese identity that would withstand Western colonial projects, notably British...

The imagined communities fostered by translation produce effects that are commercial, as well as cultural and political. Consider, for example, the mass audiences that gathers around a translated bestseller. Because of its sheer size, this community is an ensemble of the most diverse domestic constituencies, defined by their specific interests in the foreign text, yet aware of belonging to a collective movement, a national market for a foreign literary fascination. These constituencies will inevitably read the translation differently, and in some cases the differences will be incommensurable. Yet the greatest communication gap here may be between the foreign and domestic cultures. The domestic inscription in the translation extends the appeal of the foreign text

⁴ A very significant case of the power of a translation for the creation of a *community* is the *King James Version* of the Bible, which has created international communities of readers across many different periods, as it has also contributed to institutionalized the Church of England, and the political and administrative institutions of the state in Great Britain, as one of its cultural and therefore, political pillars. Another significant case is the ‘imagined’ translations of the prophet Joseph Smith, around which the community of Mormonism was created. Enzina’s translation of the Gospel (‘Habla Dios’) is another relevant case of a translation that sought to create a community of Spanish-speaking believers / readers of the Gospel.

to a mass audience in another culture. But widening the domestic range of that appeal means that the inscription cannot include much of the foreign context. A translated bestseller risks reducing the foreign text to what domestic constituencies have in common, a dialect, a cultural discourse, an ideology.’ (Venuti 2004 p. 496)

The utopian dimension in translation

‘The communities fostered by translating are initially potential, signalled in the text, in the discursive strategy deployed by the translator, but not yet possessing a social existence. They depend for their realization on the ensemble of domestic cultural constituencies among which the translation will circulate. To engage these constituencies, however, the translator involves the foreign text in an asymmetrical act of communication, weighted ideologically towards the translating culture. Translating is always ideological because it releases a domestic remainder, an inscription of values, beliefs, and representations linked to historical moments and social positions in the receiving culture. In serving domestic interests, a translation provides an ideological resolution for the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text.’ (Venuti 2004 p. 498)

‘Yet translating is also utopian. The domestic inscription is made with the very intention to communicate the foreign text, and so it is filled with the anticipation that a community will be created around that text—although in translation. In the remainder lies the hope that the translation will establish a domestic readership, an imagined community that shares an interest in the foreign, possibly a market from the publisher’s point of view. And it is only through the remainder, when inscribed with part of the foreign context, that the translation can establish a common understanding between domestic and foreign readers. In supplying an ideological resolution, a translation projects a utopian community that is not yet realized.’ (Venuti 2004 pp. 498-99)

Behind this line of thinking lies **Ernst Bloch’s theory of the utopian function of culture**, although revised to fit an application to translation. **Bloch’s is a Marxist utopia. He saw cultural forms and practices releasing a “surplus” that not only exceeds the ideologies of the dominant classes, the “status quo,” but anticipates a future “consensus,” a classless society, usually by transforming the “cultural heritage” of a particular class, whether dominant or dominated** (Bloch 1988: 46-50).

I construe Bloch’s utopian surplus as the domestic remainder inscribed in the foreign text during the translation process. Translating releases a surplus of meanings which refer to domestic cultural traditions through deviations from the current standard dialect or otherwise standardized languages—through archaisms, for example, or colloquialisms. **Implicit in any translation is the hope for a consensus, a communication and recognition of the foreign text through a domestic inscription.**

Yet the inscription can never be so comprehensive, so total in relation to domestic constituencies, as to create a community of interest without exclusion or hierarchy. It is unlikely that a foreign text in translation will be intelligible or interesting (or both simultaneously) to every readership in the receiving situation. **And the asymmetry between the foreign and domestic cultures persists, even when the foreign context is partly inscribed in the translation.** Utopias are based on ideologies, Bloch argued, on interested representations of social divisions, representations that take sides in those divisions. In the case of translating, the interests are ineradicably domestic, always the interests of certain domestic constituencies over others.

Bloch also pointed out that the various social groups at any historical moment are non-contemporaneous or non-synchronous in their cultural and ideological development, with some containing a “remnant of earlier times in the present” (Bloch 1991: 108). **Cultural forms and practices are heterogeneous, composed of different elements with different temporalities and affiliated with different groups. In language, the dialects and discourses, registers and**

styles that coexist in a particular period can be glimpsed in the remainder released by every communicative act. The remainder is a “diachrony-within-synchrony” that stages “the return within language of the contradictions and struggles that make up the social; it is the persistence within language of past contradictions and struggles, and the anticipation of future ones” (Lecerclé 1990: 181, 215). Hence, the domestic inscription in any translation is what Bloch calls an “anticipatory illumination” (*Vor-Schein*), a way of imagining a future reconciliation of linguistic and cultural differences, whether those that exist among domestic groups or those that divide the foreign and domestic cultures.” (Venuti 2004 p. 499)

Translation, ethics and community beyond literature

“Translating that harbors the utopian dream of a common understanding between foreign and domestic cultures may involve literary texts, whether elite or mass. But usually it takes much more mundane forms, serving technical or pragmatic purposes. Consider community or liaison interpreting, the oral, two-way translating done for refugees and immigrants who must deal with the social agencies and institutions of the host country. Community interpreters perform in a variety of legal, medical, and educational situations, including requests for political asylum, court appearances, hospital admissions, and applications for welfare. Codes of ethics, whether formulated by professional associations or by the agencies and institutions themselves, tend to insist that interpreters be “panes of glass” which “allow for the communication of ideas, once again, without modification, adjustment or misrepresentation”. But such codes don’t take into account the cultural and political hierarchies in the interpreting situation, the fact that—in the words of a British interpreting manual—“the client is part of a powerless ethnic minority group whose needs and wishes are often ignored or regarded as not legitimate by the majority group”. And of course, the “pane of glass” analogy represses the domestic inscription in any translating, the remainder that prevents the interpreting from being transparent communication even when the interpreter is limited to exact renderings of foreign words.” (Venuti 2004 p. 500)

In practice, many community interpreters seem to recognize the asymmetries in the interpreting situation and make an effort to compensate for them through various strategies. Robert Barsky’s study of refugee hearings in Canada demonstrates that the interpreter can put the refugee on an equal footing with the adjudicating body only by releasing a distinctively domestic remainder. The foreign-language testimony must be inscribed with Canadian values, beliefs, and representations, producing textual effects that work only in English or French. Legal institutions value linear, transparent discourse, but the experiences that refugees must describe—exile, financial hardship, imprisonment, torture—are more than likely to shake their expressive abilities, even in their own languages. “Restricting the interpreter’s role to rendering an ‘accurate’ translation of the refugee’s utterances—which may contain hesitations, grammatical errors and various infelicities—inevitably jeopardizes the claimant’s chances of obtaining refugee status, irrespective of the validity of the claim” (Barsky 1996: 52)). Similarly, the interpreter must reconcile the cultural differences between Canada and the refugee’s country by adding information about the foreign context, historical, geographical, political or sociological details that may be omitted in testimony and unknown to Canadian judges and lawyers.” (Venuti 2004 p. 500)

Translation, common language, and utopia: the following text by Lezra 2005 deals with the reality of a global world which lacks a common language (other than that of international finance, and English) where traditional languages / identities / cultures are overridden by transnational trends and *de facto* powers. Lezra quotes from Hardt and

Negri, about the failure of the utopian project –with its accompanying language—of international communism, and the lack of a working, viable alternative. Here the concept of translation, and the processes it can bring about, appears as part of a conglomerate of cultural dynamics with an important political and an ideological dimension. Lezra’s (and above all, Hardt and Negri) take up the utopian dimension of translation, discussed by Venuti elsewhere in this reader, and provide it with a more ideological, political dimension.

‘Globalization has taken our tongues from us—local, autochthonous, idiomatic, ancestral tongues. Its clamorous internationalism hangs critics on a mute peg, with **no common voice or general vocabulary on which to string alternative inter- or transnational forms of work, thought, and organization**. And so the disarmed, heteroglot opposition takes shelter in various weak utopianisms, in weakly regulative images generally and understandably drawn from increasingly abstract domains (from reinvigorated notions of the “human” and of “humanism,” for instance or, most recently, from the sketchy descriptions of an antihegemonic *Europe* that Jürgen Habermas and Derrida erect against the depredations of the United States in Iraq and elsewhere). Consider for example these words from Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s *Empire*, in which **an active and complex ethic of circumstantial translation serves this sheltering, utopian function**:

[T]here is no common language of struggles that could “translate” the particular language of each into a cosmopolitan language. Struggles in other parts of the world and even our own struggles seem to be written in an incomprehensible foreign language. This too points toward an important political task: **to construct a new common language that facilitates communication, as the languages of anti-imperialism and proletarian internationalism did for the struggles of a previous era. Perhaps this needs to be a new type of communication that functions not on the basis of resemblances but on the basis of differences: a communication of singularities** [NOTE 2 to p. 204: Michael Hards and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 57]

Not a little *pathos* inflects these lines, in which Negri and Hardt seek to recast the grammar of organiz, critical, intellectual discourse in the wake of the collapse of state socialism. Their acknowledgment that the global vocabularies of more or less orthodox, internationalist Marxisms disastrously ignored every struggle’s particularities quickly becomes a way of reflecting upon the increasing fragmentation of current critical idioms. For Negri and Hardt, the peculiarity of one or another circumstance requires—the injunction is distinctly an ethico-political one—an act of translation into a “new common language,” imagined here as a “communication of singularities” in both senses furnished by the genitive: communication between radically particular, circumstantial “struggles,” and the communication of that particularity across national, linguistic, political and other frontiers.” (Lezra 2005 pp. 203-4)

Community, the nation, and sixteenth-century Europe’s search for ‘a cultural, economic, and political modernity whose defining description would not arrive until much later’ – here Lezra describes Negri and Hardt’s proposal of ‘translation’ in its ideological and political dimension—i.e. as the method and strategy to articulate a common language of political oppositon to *empire* and the current process of globalization—as a form of ‘weak utopia’

‘Set aside the claims of novelty (the “new common language,” the “new type of communication” that Negri and Hardt describe). A part of the appeal of *Empire* (and of many of the most effective, weak-utopian critiques of globalization) is surely due to the odd *familiarity* of its prescriptions. Thus the concept that Empire seeks to furnish for **weak-utopian “translation,” a**

vehicle for the “communication of singularities,” has the unmistakable shape of the general equivalent or index commodity value [NOTE 3 to p. 204: The same is achieved, to some extent, by Ernesto Laclau’s call for a “constructed universal.” See Ernesto Laclau, “Constructing Universality,” in *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek (London and New York: Verso, 2000)] (*Empire shifts the equivalent’s indexing function from the general economic domain, to the critico-descriptive one.*) So also the figure of the critic, whose new, singular “translations” retain the roughly Gramscian gusto for reasoned *sabotage* that Negri’s early writing provocatively displays. **Even the notion of oppositional internationalism itself, one might argue, arises alongside the earliest understandings of the nation form, as Europe reached in the course of the sixteenth century for a cultural, economic, and political modernity whose defining description would not arrive until much later.**’ (Lezra 2005 p. 204)

Translation, globalization and postcolonialism – on the political, anti-imperialist dimensions of translation as a ‘weak-utopian concept’ with which we can articulate a new type of critical discourse against current ‘economic and cultural globalization’:

‘Say then that we seek useful, consequential discursive alternatives to globalization—a “tongue,” a cosmopolitan epistemology, a new international. We ask in this context that might be the *genealogy* of the recent turn to “translation,” of its “new” characterization as a communication of singularities, of its deployment as a weak-utopian concept on which a critique of economic and cultural globalization can be mounted. We understand these questions to be prefatory but necessary to considering the ethico-political demand made for contemporary intellectuals in works like *Empire*, or by critics like Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, Derrida, Habermas, and others. Even posing these roughly genealogical questions requires of us a peculiar set of historical translations among the contemporary moment, the defining and familiar nineteenth-century historiographic devices that continue to inform our postmodern vocabularies, and the early modern historical moment, when technological, demographical, and other shifts bring the twin knots of incipient nationalization and linguistic translation to the fore, and into explicit contact with each other.’ (Lezra 2005 pp. 204-5)

Emily Apter on translation, World Literature (as a new concept in academia), global markets, and the expansion of ‘Globish’ – the post-national situation of the international literary markets – and how the push for a French version of World Literature naturally relies, as its Angloamerican counterpart does, on colonial postulates and cultural power struggles. Other authors have come up with alternative terms and concepts, such as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s ‘planetary’. In this chapter Apter denounces the commercial, homogenizing ethos that drives the creation of a new discipline in academia, i.e. that of World Literature (with its competing, French counterpart in *Littérature mondiale*) which runs parallel with the development of a global editorial market facilitated by the new material conditions for the production and distribution of literary markets (where frequently novels, for instance, are written with an eye on their easy translatability into other languages, and the use of plots, characters and conventions that can similarly appeal to

a translational audience). She then embarks on the philosophical deconstruction of the concept of ‘World / Monde / Welt’, to expose the underlying ideologies that lurk underneath this particular untranslatable

‘The appellation World Literature in institutional academia abolishes the ontologically objectionable “us-them” dichotomy between national and “foreign” language departments. Global literary markets generate new consumers of literature with tastes, interests, and cultural literacies no longer satisfied by writing authored by or aimed principally at *les français de France* [or in the case of Angloamerican literature, merely to those two markets, but a global, Globish speaking market, even beyond the boundaries of the former British Empire, towards countries where English is not the language of the former colonial power, but the international lingua franca]... **World Literature is suited to an era in which the electronic dissemination of information, even in countries with restricted Internet and Web access, has transformed the economics of literary distribution and editorial gatekeeping.**’ (Apter 2013 p. 176)

‘Any French version of World Literature respectful of the Goethean / Auerbachian heritage in the humanities will perpetuate Eurocentric humanist universalism as well as a static lexicon of style, periodization, and genre defined largely by Western classics. ... World Literature inadequately takes stock of the impact of colonialism and decolonization on literary history. *Littérature-monde*, like World Literature paradigms in general, either reinforces old national, regional, and ethnic literary alignments or projects a denationalized planetary screen that ignores the deep structures of national belonging and economic interest contouring the international culture industry. World literature remains oblivious to the systematic critique of globalized literary studies contained in Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s concept of “planetarity” (in *Death of a Discipline*). In their rush to franchise “global” campus outposts all over the world, universities seize on World Literature as a catch-all rubric for flimsy programs in the humanities that ignore rather than deepen local knowledge’ (Apter 2013 p. 177)

‘... *litt-monde* partisans and detractors alike assume translatability as both a given and heuristic good, thereby devaluing the importance of non-translation and untranslatability for the politics of cultural relationality. And second, the term “world” in *littérature-monde* remains curiously under-theorized as a reserve of philosophical untranslatability and conceptual density... More emphasis on how philosophy has defined “monde” would contribute theoretical substance to the paradigm of *littérature-monde* and nuance debates around world literatures in every language’ (Apter 2013 p. 178)

Apter on translation, intellectual property rights, and national canons

‘Building on Derrida’s articulation of linguistic disappropriation in *Monolingualism of the Other; or, The Prosthesis of Origin* (“I speak only one language and it is not my own”), I conjecture that one reason why literary studies falls short as anti-capitalist critique is because it insufficiently questions what it means to “have” a literature or to lay claim to aesthetic property. Literary communities are gated: according to Western law and international statute, authors *have* texts, publishers *have* a universal right to translate (as long as they pay), and nations *own* literary patrimony as cultural inheritance. →→→ Translation, seen as authorized plagiarism, emerges as a form of creative property that belongs fully to no one. As a model of deowned literature, it stands against the swell of corporate privatization in the arts, with its awards given to individual genius and bias against collective authorship. A translational author—shorn of a singular signature—is the natural complement, in my view, to World Literature understood as an experiment in national sublation that signs itself as collective, terrestrial property.’ (Apter 2013 p. 15)

World Literature and its new cartography vis à vis (or built upon) ‘a combative arena of competing literary nationalisms’. Jean-Luc Nancy: at a time when globalization lies at the centre of controversies, proposals and counter-proposals that seek to redefine our highly / densely communicated world in a non-imperialist, non Euro-centric, non Western, manner or mode, a study of how TRANSLATION contributed to bring Europe (or the concept thereof) into existence as the forerunner of the Enlightened universalism and the mercantile ethos that underlies current concepts of World Literature and its accompanying cultural, political and economic globalization and homogenization, is a pressing necessity.

The French term *mondialisation* as a positive, expansive and creative process vs. the English *globalization*, which flattens, homogenizes and annihilates differences (and creativity, one would add) into a mercantilist totality where everything has already been translated. In contrast, *mondialisation* preserves some of the untranslatable components, which turn it into a more original process, respectful of differences. At a certain level this reads like a culture war, a competition for global cultural supremacy, in which French theory and philosophy casts itself as the positive ideology or discourse that respects difference and humanity (‘the expanse of the world of human beings, cultures and nations’), as opposed to Anglo-American globalization, dominated by the free circulation of capital and currency, creating a totality where difference has been demolished under the weight of the dominant discourse (which has spread all over the globe by virtue of international financial markets, and the political and military power of the British Empire, first, and then the American position as dominant world power during the post WWI period). Under *Globish*, all difference, all identities have been translated into a homogeneous ‘enclosure in the undifferentiated sphere of a unitotality’. Naturally, this discourse sees itself standing upon the moral high ground, not only because it respects and contributes to preserve difference, but also because it does so within a perspective that is respectful of the environment. Apter concludes this chapter with a paragraph that lists the proliferating alternatives to evil *Globish* and globalization.

‘For some literary critics, the worlds of literature are mapped in a combative arena of competing literary nationalisms (Pascale Casanova) and emergent literary world-systems... For others, the worlds of literature are thinkable as data systems based on quantitative indices of plot and style, as suggested by Franco Moretti.’ (Apter 2013 pp. 186-7)

Jean-Luc Nancy's *The Creation of the World or Globalization...* brings to light the manifold differences between “globalization” (**the crushing uni-totally of the network society**) and *mondialisation* (a creative “world-forming”), not to mention the more subtle distinctions between the English “globalization” and the French *globalisation*. **Nancy casts the philosophy of world as a translation problem.** Taking his cue from Cassin's *Vocabulaire*, he defers to the Untranslatable *mondialisation* in his preface to the English edition of the book:

It is not without paradox that in many languages the French term *mondialisation* is quite difficult to translate, and that perhaps this difficulty makes it almost “untranslatable” in the sense that the term has acquired in the recent *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies*. This difficulty lies in the fact that the English term *globalization* has already established itself in the areas of the world that use English for contemporary information exchange... **there has been in the English *globalization* the idea of an integrated totality, appearing for example with the “global village” of McLuhan, while *mondialisation* would rather evoke an expanding process throughout the expanse of the world of human beings, cultures, and nations.**

The usage of either term, or the search for an English translation that would keep the semantics of “world” are not without real theoretical interest: **the word *mondialisation*, by keeping the horizon of a “world” as a space of possible meaning for the whole of human relations (or as a space of possible significance) gives a different indication than that of an enclosure in the undifferentiated sphere of a unitotally. In reality, each of the terms carries with it an interpretation of the process, or a wager on its meaning and future. This also means that it is understandable that *mondialisation* preserves something untranslatable while *globalization* has already translated everything in a global idiom** [Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Sense of the World*, trans. Jeffrey Librett, Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota P., 1997]

Mondialisation is summoned to offset the negative effects of globalization, itself cast as the philosophical equivalent of *Globish*.’ (Apter 2013 pp. 187-8)

‘Nancy projects a non-sovereign multiplicity of worlds that disavows the conventional alignment of planetary law with unequal territorial distribution: *cosmos / nomos*. Here, one could say, he approaches Peter Szendy's “nomos of the sensible,” characterized by the aesthetic repartition of the world's material forms. Finally, **Nancy's philosophical wording asks to be read with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's notion of “planetarity,” set apart “from notions of the planetary, the planet, the earth, the world, the globe, globalization and the like in their common usage.”** Associated with “a species of alterity belonging to a system that we inhabit on loan,” **planetarity for Spivak refuses a custodial model of sustainability “that keeps geology safe for good imperialism” and “emphasizes capital's social productivity but not its subalternizing tendency”** (Apter 2013 p. 189)

In these interrogations of the cosmopolitical, cosmological and philosophical dimensions of World, all wheels are turning and **no point of orientation is consistently privileged**. Philosophical world-making, another way of defining what world literatures do, is called out with different names—*mondialité* (Nancy), philosophizing in languages (Cassin), planetarity (Spivak), *toutmondialisme* (Glissant), *philosofictions* (Szendy). And these names emerge as heterocosms (alternative worlds accessible to all) that encourage reimagining what in the world the “world” in literature might be.’ (Apter 2013 pp. 189-90)

4 Translation between the local and the global

Translation and multilingualism

In the same passage Machiavelli also formulated his idea of Europe as a multiplicity of states in search of a precarious balance beyond the idea of empire. The mosaic of linguistic communities and the texts that embody them were the fragments that mapped this political vision, and the complexity of this network was compounded by liminal regions where several languages were spoken.⁵ Europe appears as a transnational web with a constellation of centers held together as much by the tensions that differentiated them as by the elements they shared. Translation and the book trade were among its most important cohesive and tensing agents: through the material networks of print and the virtual processes of interlinguistic exchange that they sustained there circulated a colourful array of discursive standards and values that turned early modern Europe into a variegated but dynamically coherent mosaic informed by a multiplicity of spheres. These spheres in turn consisted of reading communities that to a large extent resulted from the new cultural and material conditions facilitated by the invention of print, and they also entered into a complex relation with the book market through the creation of demands that drove the production of printed volumes in new directions.⁷

(José María Pérez Fernández, 'Andrés Laguna: Translation and the Early Modern Idea of Europe'. *Translation and Literature* 21 (2012): 299-318. Click [here](#) to download a preliminary version of this article from our institutional repository).

It is impossible to separate the history of translation from the history of languages, of cultures, and of literatures—even of religions and of nations. To be sure, this is not a question of mixing everything up, but of showing how **in each period or in each given historical setting the practice of translation is articulated in relation to the practice of literature, of languages, of the several intercultural and interlinguistic exchanges.** To take an example, **Leonard Foster has shown that European poets at the end of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance were often multilingual** [NOTE 2 to p. 2: *The Poet's Tongues: Multilingualism in Literature*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970]. **They wrote in several languages for an audience which was itself polyglot.** No less frequently did they translate themselves. Such is the moving case of the Dutch poet Hooft who, on the occasion of the death of his beloved wife, composed a whole series of epitaphs, at first in Dutch, then in Latin, then in Italian, then—somewhat later—again in Dutch. As if he needed to pass through a whole series of languages and self-translations in order to arrive at the right expression of his grief in his mother tongue. Reading Foster, it seems clear that the poets of that period worked—be it in cultivated or popular spheres—in an infinitely more multilingual environment than our own period (which is also multilingual, but in a different way). There were the learned languages—the “queen” languages, as Cervantes put it: Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; there were

⁵ For a useful survey of Early Modern awareness of linguistic diversity, and the theoretical production of the period on this topic, see Peter Burke, “Linguistic diversity” (in *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, C.U.P., 2004, pp. 25-42, also 63-74). See also John Hale’s “Borders and Languages”, in his *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance* (London: HarperCollins, 1993), pp. 143-63. Needless to say, this linguistic diversity and the role it played in the idea of Europe, was not a new phenomenon: on this, and on the role played by translators and interpreters in those regions that were linguistically mixed, see “Race Relations on the Frontiers of Latin Europe (1): Language and Law”, chapter 8 in Robert Bartlett’s *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change, 950-1350* (London: Penguin, 1994) pp. 197-220. For a survey of the political counterpart to this cultural and linguistic diversity see Maravall’s “Universalismo a través de pluralidad” (chapter IV in his *Carlos V y el pensamiento político del Renacimiento*, 1999, pp. 179-208).

different written national languages (French, English, Spanish, Italian), and a mass of regional languages and dialects, etc. A person walking along the streets of Paris or Antwerp must have heard more languages than are heard today in New York City: His language was only one among many, which relativized the meaning of the mother tongue. In such an environment writing tended to be, at least in part, multilingual, and the medieval rule that assigned certain poetic genres to certain languages—for example, from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, among the troubadours in the north of Italy, lyrical poetry was assigned to Provençal while epic, or narrative poetry was assigned to French—was in part prolonged. Thus Milton wrote his love poems in Italian because, as he explained in one of them to the Italian lady to whom they were addressed, “*questa è lingua di cui si vanta Amore*”. It goes without saying that the said lady also knew English, but that was not the language of love. For men like Hooft and Milton, the conception of translation must have been different from ours, as was their conception of literature. For us, self-translations are exceptions, as are the cases where a writer chooses a language other than his own—think of Conrad, or Beckett. We even think that multilingualism or diglossia make translation difficult. In short, the entire relation to the mother tongue, toward foreign languages, toward literature, toward expression and translation is structured differently today.’ (Berman 1992 pp. 2-3)

‘To write the history of translation is to patiently rediscover the infinitely complex and devious network in which translation is caught up in each period or in different settings. And it is to turn the historical knowledge acquired from this activity into an opening of our *present*.’ (Berman 1992 p. 3)

[...]

‘The condition of translation is not only ancillary; it is, in the eyes of the public as well as in the eyes of the translators themselves, suspect. After so many successful accomplishments, masterpieces, the overcoming of so many alleged impossibilities, how could the Italian adage *traduttore traditore* still remain in place as the last judgment on translation? And yet, it is true that in this domain, *fidelity* and *treason* are incessantly at issue. Translating, as Franz Rosenzweig wrote, “is to serve two masters”; this is the ancillary metaphor. The work, the author, the foreign language (first master) have to be served, as well as the public and one’s own language (second master). Here emerges that may be called the drama of the translator.

If the translator choose the author, the work, and the foreign language as exclusive masters, aiming to impose them on his own cultural realm in their pure foreign form, he runs the risk of appearing to be a foreigner, a traitor in the eyes of his kin. And the translator cannot be sure that this radical attempt—in Schelermacher’s words, “to lead the reader to the author”—will not turn against him and produce a text leaning toward the unintelligible. But if the attempt is successful and the accomplishment perhaps recognized, the translator cannot be sure that the other culture will not feel “robbed,” deprived of a work it considered irreducibly his own.. Here we touch upon the hyperdelicate domain of the relations between the translator and “his” authors.’ (Berman 1992 p. 3)

‘On the other hand, if the translator settles for a conventional adaptation of the foreign work—in Schleiermacher’s words, “leading the author to the reader”—he will have satisfied the least demanding part of the public, sure enough, but he will have irrevocably betrayed the foreign work as well as, of course, the very essence of translation.

Nevertheless, this impossible situation is not the inescapable reality of translation: It is, rather, based on a number of ideological presuppositions. **The lettered public of the sixteenth century, mentioned by Forster, rejoiced in reading a work in its different linguistic variants; it ignored the issue of fidelity and treason because it did not hold its mother tongue sacred. Perhaps this very sacralization is the source of the Italian adage and of all the “problems” of translation. Our lettered public, for its part, demands that translation be imprisoned in a dimension in which it must be suspect. Hence—though this is by no means the only reason—the effacement of the translator who seeks “to make himself very small,” to be a humble mediator of foreign works, and always a traitor even as he portrays himself as fidelity incarnate.**

Time has come to meditate on this repression of translation and on the “resistances” that underlie it. We may formulate the issue as follows: **Every culture resists translation, even if it has an**

essential need for it. The very aim of translation—to open up in writing a certain relation with the Other, to fertilize what is one’s Own through the mediation of what is Foreign—is diametrically opposed to the ethnocentric structure of every culture, that species of narcissism by which every society wants to be a pure and unadulterated Whole. There is a tinge of the violence of cross-breeding in translation. Herder was well aware of this when he compared a language that has not yet been translated to a young virgin. It is another matter that in reality a virgin language or culture is as fictitious as a pure race. We are dealing here with unconscious wishes. Every culture wants to be self-sufficient and use this imaginary self-sufficiency in order to shine forth on the others and appropriate their patrimony. Ancient Roman culture, classical French culture, and modern North-American culture are striking examples of this.

Here, translation occupies an ambiguous position. On the one hand, it heeds this appropriatory and reductionary injunction, and constitutes itself as one of its agents. This results in ethnocentric translations, or what we may call “bad” translations. But, on the other hand, the *ethical aim* of translating is by its very nature opposed to this injunction: The essence of translation is to be an opening, a dialogue, a cross-breeding, a decentering. Translation is a “putting in touch with,” or it is *nothing*.’ (Berman 1992 p. 4)

Berman on the *ethics of translation*:

‘On the theoretical level, the *ethics of translation* consists of bringing out, affirming, and defending the pure aim of translation as such. It consists of defining what “fidelity” is. Translation cannot be defined solely in terms of communication, of the transmission of messages, or of extended *rewording*. Nor is translation a purely literary / esthetical activity, even when it is intimately connected with the literary practice of a given cultural realm. To be sure, translation is writing and transmitting. But this writing and this transmission get their true sense only from the ethical aim by which they are governed.

[...]

But this positive ethics in turn supposes two things: first a *negative ethics*, that is, a theory of those ideological and literary values that tend to turn translation away from its pure aim. The theory of non-ethnocentric translation is also a theory of ethnocentric translation, which is to say of *bad translation*. A bad translation I call the translation which, generally under the guise of transmissibility, carries out a systematic negation of the strangeness of the foreign work’ (Berman 1992 p. 5)

Translation and monolingualism. The case of classical Greece
 The following is from the entry TO TRANSLATE in Cassin, ed. 2014, pp. 1139-1155. See the basic definition of translation in the first two paragraphs of the article, which surveys, *inter alia*, the proximity between translation and interpretation through *hermêneuein*, at the all-important moment when the Old Testament was translated into Greek, i.e. the *Septuagint Bible*. The text also deals with the proximity between translation and metaphor—for more details on this see Matthew Reynold’s *The Poetry of Translation*. On the origins in German Romanticism (Schleiermacher) of the concepts of domestication and alienation / estrangement through translation (which have been picked up recently by Lawrence Venuti)

“‘To translate,’ in the generally accepted sense of ‘passing from one language to another,’ derives from a relatively late French adaptation of the Latin verb *traducere*, which means literally ‘to lead

across' and whose application is both more general and vaguer than translation itself. We do well to keep in mind this initial, indefinite vagueness attached to the verbs we translate as the verb 'to translate', verbs that always also designate something additional or something other than the passage from one language to another. We should keep in mind as well the determining role of Latin culture as it appropriated and adapted Greek culture in the construction of the Latin languages. It takes at least two languages for any translation, but the Greeks, even when they spoke other languages, were willing to recognize only the *logos* [λόγος], their *logos*, the Greek language. Yet **the lexicon of translation is partly Greek as well, since it derives from another foundational moment, the commission in Alexandria of a translation into Greek of the Old Testament, the Septuagint Bible, which joins together both interpretation and translation within *hermêneuein* [ἑρμηνεύειν] and in the hermeneutic gesture.**

In different languages, particularly in Latin and German, a skein of recurring and varying tension runs through this lexicon of translation: **between the precise and exact relations from one word to another (the *verbum e verbo* of the *interpres*) and the literary image (the *sensum* and *sensu* of the orator). The close proximity between translation, metaphor, and equivocation (the medieval *translatio*) is troubling for us. As a result, translation can both be appreciated as 'treason', treachery, or betrayal, according to the Italian saying '*traduttore, traditore*', and on the other hand, as the very essence of tradition (starting with that *translatio studii* that applies to the displacement of Greek, then Latin, then Christian knowledge right through to the *Überlieferung*, or transmission, that enabled Heidegger access to an authentic *Übersetzung*, or 'translation'). But as Schleiermacher explains, there are basically two, and only two, manners of translation: the exchange of supposedly equivalent linguistic values in the passage from one language to another according to the methods of an interpreting agency (*dolmetschen*) that 'leaves the reader in peace as much as possible'; and the displacement of the reader in relation to his native language by virtue of the translation (*übersetzen*) such that they become foreign to each another, which is perhaps the best method for presenting it." (TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, p. 1139)**

The following is a very interesting text on Greek monolingualism (vs multilingualism). Note how the Greek term *logos* can be interpreted in many different ways (as reason, discourse, or language, i.e. the skill that distinguishes human beings from animals). Note also the use in Greek of the verb *hellênizein* which covers the lexical fields, and is therefore associated with the arts of rhetoric, speaking correctly, freedom, and civilization. This is the origin of the humanist idea that language and linguistic exchange (language use, rhetoric, pragmatics) constitutes the foundation of human civilization (for instance, the Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vives described language as *rheuma logou*, i.e. as the *flow of reason*.)

Not also the relation between the concepts of *hellênizein* and *ὁμιλία*: conversation, community, usage of a word (see for example Sextus Empiricus' *Adversus mathematicos* 1.10.176-79)

"One needs at least two languages in order to translate. But the Greeks, in A. Momigliano's expression (*Sagesse barbares*), were "proudly monolingualistic." Instead of speaking their language, they let their language speak for them. In this way, **the polysemic value of the term *logos***[λόγος] allowed them to dispense with distinguishing between discourse and reason, between the language they speak and the language proper to man (see LANGUAGE, LOGOS, and GREEK, box 4)." (TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, p. 1139)

“In a more definitive manner, *hellênizein* [‘ελληνίζειν] (after the adjective *hellên* [‘ελλην], ‘Greek’) **fixes under the same term the meanings of ‘speaking Greek’ and ‘speaking correctly’, or even, insofar as the corpus of rhetoric and the historico-political corpus are bound together here as one, to ‘behave as a free, civilized, and cultivated individual’—in short, as a person. To speak, to speak well, to think well, and to live well—these goals all nest together.** Two occurrences in Plato reveal their interrelatedness. In the *Meno* (82b), the only criterion that Socrates applies to the young slave in order for him to come to understand the idea of the square root is that he ‘Hellenize’: ‘*Hellên men esti kay hellênizei?* (He is Greek and speaks our language?) Answer: Yes, he is ‘born to the household’ (*oikogenês*). **In the *Protagoras*, the apprenticeship into political competence and the practice of *isêgoria* [ἰσηγορία], that equality of speech that is a characteristic of Athenian democracy.** (3273: In the city, all are teachers of virtue, just as everyone in the home teaches the child to speak Greek. ‘In the same way, if you asked who teaches *hellênizein*, you would not find anyone’. See VIRTÙ, Box 1; cf. B. Cassin, *L’Effet sophistique*, pt. 2. chap. 2)” (TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, pp. 1139-40)

“Beginning with Aristotle, *hellênizein* or *hellênismos* [Ἑλληνισμός] serves as a chapter heading in treatises on rhetoric (Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3.5: ‘On correction’) or on grammar (Sextus Empiricus: ‘Is there an art of the Greek? [*Esti d’archê tês lexeôs to hellênizein*, *Adversus mathematicos*, 1.10). **One has the choice of rendering the first sentence of the Aristotelian description as ‘The basis of expression is to express oneself in Greek,’ or as ‘The principle of style is in speaking correctly’** (*Rhetoric*, 3.51407a20-21; on *lexis*, see WORD, II.B and SIGNIFIER/SIGNIFIED).

In order for what one writes to be easily read or spoken aloud, one must simply respect the ‘natural order’ (*pephukasi* [πεφύκασι]), the sequences set out by articles and conjunctions (that remain within the reach of memory in the same way as they are within hearing in the city) that respect semantic propriety (proper nouns, *idia*; see PROPERTY), propriety of reference (by avoiding ambiguities and circumlocutions; see COMPARISON, HOMONYM), and propriety of grammar (the internal consistencies of genre and number). **Speaking naturally, by following the accepted norms of clarity and precision—this remains the definition of Hellenism and of the classical ‘style’: ‘whoever Hellenizes... is able to present the idea of things in a clear and distinct manner, as in a conversation [*homilia* (ὁμιλία)] which signifies a band of warriors, companionship, society, commerce, relation—including sexual relation—the lessons of a master, discussion and the normal usage of a word’ (*Adversus mathematicos*, 1.10-176-79). **This concept cannot but provide support for a claim to universal legitimacy.**” (TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, p. 1140)**

On Greek monolingualism and Greek terms for translation – interpretation – metaphor (compare with Matthew Reynold’s *The Poetry of Translation*) – translation and poetry (cf. Octavio Paz, among others)

“If translation does not constitute a problem all unto itself, this is because the difference between languages is not taken into consideration as such. Instead, the place of translation is more of a gap or void. So it should not come as a surprise that there is no Greek verb that signifies ‘translating’ purely and simply, even if a certain number of them can be rendered that way.” (TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, p. 1140)

“The verb that Catherine Dalimier chose to render as ‘translation,’ *apodidôî* [ἀποδιδῶ], literally signifies ‘to render to someone by right,’ ‘to retribute,’ **‘to give in exchange’,** ‘to transmit’. It substitutes for the expression *tithenai eis ti* (389d, 390e), ‘to transpose, to impose’ (the name in itself) ‘in’ (syllables), as one imposes the form of a shuttle on a particular piece of wood: the terms definitely derive from another technical model. Most often, besides, the difference between languages is taken into account in the major philosophical texts only as a gap or void, as if by inadvertence. It is only

implicit in the text or in a concept, and there is simply no term to specifically designate the operation of translation; thus, Aristotle's *De interpretatione* simply mentions that 'just as all men have not the same writing, so all men have not the same speech sounds' (1.16a5-6; see SIGN, Box 1) and refers to the Stoics' 'signified' as that which Sextus Empiricus defines as 'what the barbarians don't understand when they hear the sound' (*Adversus mathematicos*, 8.11; see SIGNIFIED/SIGNIFIER, II.A)

The operation of translation is touched upon from many different points of view. Thus our verb *hellênizein*, when used transitively, can mean 'learning Greek' (Thucydides, 2.68), to 'Hellenize' a barbarian, or later—but **essentially only in relation to the translation of the Bible—to 'express in Greek', and thus to 'translate' words or a text** (in the second century CE, in Dion Cassius [55.3], in relation to what we would call the transliteration of 'Noah' or 'Jacob'; see Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, 1.6.1). **The same holds true for a number of composite verbs that incorporate meta, as indicating trans- port and trans- formation: *metapherein* (to transport, transpose, employ metaphorically, or in report); *metaphrazein* (to paraphrase), and especially *metagraphein* (to change the text, to falsify, but also to transcribe, to copy). These all designate literary operations of a poetic, rhetorical, or philological nature and only marginally take on the meaning of 'translating' in classical Greek.** (For *metaphrazein*, see Flavius Josephus, *ibid.* 9.14.2; for *metagraphein*, see Thucydides ['On being translated', 4.50.2] and Lucian, *How History Must Be Written*, 21, in which a purist claiming to be an inheritor of Thucydides purports to 'transform Roman names [*metapoiêsai*]' and 'to translate them into Greek [*metagrapσαι es to hellênikon*] such as Chronion for Saturn' or others even more ridiculous." (TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, p. 1140)

"The Aristotelian title *Peri hermêneias* is rendered as *De interpretatione*, as *Lehre vom Satz*, but never as 'On Translation,' and yet it is the phrase *hermêneuein*, meaning 'interpreting, explaining, expressing,' in the manner of one who puts his thoughts into words (Plato, *Laws*, 966b) as well as one who serves as the interpreter for the gods (the poet, the rhapsodist, the seer), that is the most likely candidate for the retroversion of 'translating' (starting with Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 5.44). At least this is what the future will hold (see below, II and III)." (TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, pp. 1140-41)

From Greece to Rome: first instance of *translatio imperii*. Classical ideas of translation (*vis*, compare with Bruni) vs. Jerome (*verba*)

"In the classical Latin authors, the translation from Greek into Latin very barely satisfies modern criteria, and the process of translation itself is not clearly defined in the Latin language: the verbs *vertere*, *convertere*, *exprimere*, *reddere*, *transferre*, *interpretari*, *imitari* can all refer to what we would call 'literal translation' as well as to looser adaptations of Greek models. The fact that we are unable to find a sharp distinction between literal translation and literary adaptation in these verbs rather clearly indicates that the question of translation is posed differently in the classical period than it could subsequently be raised starting with Jerome and the translation of sacred texts, when faithful rendering *verbum pro verbo* will become the very principle of translation: for the classics, translation consists of adhering to a meaning (*vis*) and not to a word (*verba*), and it is primarily an occasion for reflection on the creative modalities of the Latin language. At play in 'translation' is the very reception of Greek culture in Rome, with all that entails." (TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, p. 1141)

Very interesting: Cicero on philosophical translation (from Plato and Aristotle), and on translation as metaphor, and from here to translation as true creation. Rome's imperial appropriation through translation of Greek philosophy (see in this respect the quotation from Cicero's

Tusculan Disputations). Compare this also with Lorenzo Valla's dedication of his Latin translation of the Greek historian Thucydides, where he describes himself as a soldier bringing into Latin (which stands as a symbol of the Roman Empire) the spoils of his conquest from the original Greek text.

Cicero's *Brutus*, 274 and metaphors as *verba translata*. Translation and metaphor. Translation and immigration: Seneca on translation, domestication and citizenship.

Lucretius: poetry as translation from 'obscure subjects' to the luminous splendor provided by their translation into poetry, through metaphor and poetic devices. This bears an interesting comparison with Shakespeare's 'airy nothings' given in poetry 'a local habitation and a name' (see below)

"The articulation between translating / adapting / creating sketched out by the Latin playwrights is explicitly taken up by Cicero, who defines his conception of philosophical translation in reference to the practices of the founders of Latin literature:

Even if I were to translate [*vertere*] Plato or Aristotle literally, as our poets did with the Greek plays, I hardly think I would deserve ill of my fellow citizens for bringing [*transferre*] those sublime geniuses to their attention... If I think fit, I will translate certain passages, particularly from those authors I just mentioned, when it happens to be appropriate, as Ennius often does with Homer and Afranius with Menander.

(*On Moral Ends*, 1.7)

What is at work in this 'transfer' from Greece to Rome is not some simple transport of booty, even if this dimension is always present in the background (see, e.g., *Tusculan Disputations*, 2.5: where it is expressed that it is necessary to tear away [*eripere*] Greece's philosophical preeminence in philosophy and transfer it to Rome): the verb *transferre* also describes the displacement of meaning that is at work in the deployment of metaphor. By using the same verb for the activity of translation and the creation of metaphors, Cicero establishes the link in language between translating and writing; one has only to apply to translation what he has to say about the development of metaphor, undoubtedly starting from the Aristotelian reflections on metaphor as a process of enrichment of language, to define translation as a true creation:

The third genre of ornament, the metaphorical use of a word, is born of necessity and constrained by need and inconvenience; it subsequently finds general application as a result of the pleasure and ease which it provides.

(*On the Ideal Orator*, 3.155)

(TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, p. 1142)

"But this *rapprochement* has a broader scope as it is inscribed in language itself. The Greeks, who have no need to 'translate,' do not take advantage of this potential usage of *metapherein* (Plato uses it once to designate the transcription of proper names: *Crito*, 113a), and when Plutarch invokes the philosophical works of Cicero (*Life of Cicero*, 40), he uses the verbs *metaballein* and *metaphrazein* to designate his 'translations' in general and employs the term 'metaphor' only in connection with isolated translations of terms that Cicero was unable to render through a word in its common form of usage. The work of polysemy that Cicero achieves through *transferre* is invisible to the Greek language because its referent is something only thought in Rome: to translate

is to achieve a new splendor, a new brilliance that results from a use of language that is out of the ordinary, that results from borrowings instead of the familiar and proper usage: ‘these metaphors are a kind of borrowing [*mutationes*] which enable us to find elsewhere what we are lacking ourselves’ (*On the Ideal Orator*, 156). The language of the other can thus provide what is lacking, but borrowings are only acceptable and provide appropriate ornamentation if they are fully reappropriated. To put metaphors (*verba translata*) to good use, ‘rather than suddenly appearing in some place that does not belong to them [*alienum locum*], they must appear to take up residence [*immigrasse*] in their own surroundings’ (*Brutus*, 274). This none other than an integration, a borrowing that does not arrive as a foreigner but makes itself at home. Seneca will also say that the ‘Latin grammarians give the [*Greek*] word *analogia* the right to the city [*civitas*]’ (*Seneca’s Letters to Lucilius*, 120.4). This idea of the reception of the Greek language, described as the integration into the body of citizens, validates the link established between translation and the use of metaphors by the verb *transfere*. It does not consist of a change from one language to another. It takes place within a single language, as a result of the transfer from Greece to Rome, as displacements and borrowings that create splendor: ‘[T]he metaphors draw attention to the discourse and illuminate it like so many shining stars’ (*On the Ideal Orator*, 3.170). This is the sense in which Lucretius calls his poem a ‘translation’ of the doctrine of Epicurus: ‘bringing to light the obscure discoveries of the Greeks’ (1.136-137) and ‘composing sparkling verses on obscure subjects’ (1.933)—bringing new splendor and luminous intelligibility through translation by appeal to the senses. If ‘all metaphors are addressed directly to the senses, especially to the sense of vision, the most penetrating of them all’ (*On the Ideal Orator*, 3.160), one can see that what is at stake in the transference by translation is precisely to achieve a form of immediacy in the form of the ‘living’ language of Latin.”

(TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, pp. 1142-3)

Shakespeare: on how the poet’s imagination translates ‘airy nothings’ into human language, and gives them a ‘local habitation and a name’:

Lovers and madmen have such seething brains,
Such shaping fantasies, that apprehend
More than cool reason ever comprehends.
The lunatic, the lover, and the poet
Are of imagination all compact.
One sees more devils than vast hell can hold;
That is the madman. The lover, all as frantic,
Sees Helen’s beauty in a brow of Egypt.
The poet’s eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,
Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven;
And as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things unknown, the poet’s pen
Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothing
A local habitation and a name.

(Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, Act V, scene 1, lines 4-17)

On the ethical aim of translation as a ‘putting in touch with’ as opposed to the translator as an agent of imperialism – look further, for instance, into Lorenzo Valla’s dedication of his Latin translation of the Greek

historian Thucydides, where he describes himself as a soldier bringing into Latin (which stands as a symbol of the Roman Empire) the spoils of his conquest from the original Greek text. The following text also describes how Thucydides was interpreted / translated / appropriated to legitimize different types of political discourse

‘One of the claims that I aim to make plausible is that Thucydides played an important role in the articulation of early modern political thought. Another is that a determinative chapter in the story of how Thucydides became the figure now familiar to theorists of politics and international relations was written in these decades, particularly via a focus on what Thucydides was taken to say about the imperatives of war. Earlier writers who cited Thucydides had not developed a pattern of quotation and commentary that amounted to the stable ascription of a political teaching. But by the late sixteenth century, Thucydides was regularly held up as an authority about the legitimacy of imperial expansion and preventive attack, and was read as providing a clear-eyed view of the underlying realities of power. It is from this period that we can identify a group of thinkers whom we can call the early modern Thucydideans, distinguished not only by their reliance on Thucydides, but also by their association of Thucydides with this set of preoccupations. Appeal to Thucydides to justify pre-emption or preventive war was tightly connected to such an appeal to justify imperial expansion. The prospect that another power was intent on empire was presented as a threat to one’s own interests or existence, thus providing the warrant for pre-emption. And expansion was itself justified as a necessary defence against those who were ready to attack to prevent such expansion. Advocates of imperial or anticipatory war marched under other banners, often simultaneously, including honour, glory, and Christian duty. At least when Thucydides is invoked, however, it is clear that the dominant justification at stake is instead what we might call that of national interest, and particularly the necessity of defence.

From early on, Thucydides was held up as an exemplar both by supporters of monarchical empire and by republicans. In the early fifteenth century, for example, the republican Leonardo Bruni adopted Thucydides as a congenial predecessor. He had been sent a Greek manuscript of Thucydides from Venice, but resisted a plea to translate it, writing to Niccolò Niccoli in December of 1407: “Do you not realise how many sleepless nights would be needed to produce such a work?” The requisite nights, nearly four years of them, were not put into the project of a full translation until 1452, when one was completed by Lorenzo Valla, then a supporter of Rome [NOTE 7 to p. 27: Pade 1985 assesses Valla as a translator of Thucydides, with a focus on book III. See also Ferlauto 1979. The 1564 and 1588 Stephanus editions of Thucydides have frequently but mistakenly been taken to provide a reliable text of Valla’s translation (Westgate 1936), as has the Portus edition of 1594.] **Valla wrote in his preface to Pope Nicholas V that he was like a soldier who had been sent to conquer the hardest and harshest province of the Greek world for the Roman empire** [NOTE 8 to p. 28: See Chambers 2008: 1-2. See the preface to Valla’s earlier *Elegantiarum linguae latinae* about “this more splendid rule”: “wherever the language of Rome prevails, there is the Roman empire” (“hunc splendidiorem dominatum... Ibi romanum imperium est ubicumque romana lingua dominatur”) Garin 1952: 596]. **Once he had done so, the formerly formidable territory of Thucydides’ history slowly became accessible from anywhere in Europe** [NOTE 9 to p. 28: For a catalogue of Thucydides translations and commentaries through 1600, see Mariane Pade’s painstaking contribution to the *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum* (Pade 2003)]?

(Kinch Hoekstra, ‘Thucydides and the bellicose beginnings of modern political theory’, in *Thucydides and the Modern World. Reception. Reinterpretation and Influence from the Renaissance to the Present*, ed. by K. Harloe and N. Morley. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 25-54, pp. 26-28)

Translation and national identity: the case of Luther’s translation of the Bible

Luther's translation open a double horizon: an historical-cultural one... and the more limited one of future German translations and their meaning. Since Luther, no translation from a foreign work and a foreign language can be made without some reference to this translation of the Bible, even if it is only to put his principles aside and to attempt to go beyond them. Voss, Goethe, and Hölderlin will take precise stock of this. If the Lutheran Bible establishes a rupture in the history of the German language, culture, and literature, it also establishes one in the domain of translations. *Moreover, it suggests that the formulation and the development of a national culture of its own can and must proceed by way of translation, that is, by an intensive and deliberate relation to the foreign.*

This affirmation may appear, and in part is, of the utmost triviality. At least it is our custom to consider it such. But it is one thing to think that, for one's own development of whatever order, it is good "to rub one's brains with another" (Montaigne); it is another to think that any relation to oneself and to what is one's "own" passes radically through this relation to the other and to the foreign, so much so that it is by such an *alienation*, in the strictest sense of the word, that a relation to oneself is possible.' (Berman 1992 p. 32)

Translation has the paradoxical potential to create international / transnational / multicultural communities (frequently, with an important utopian component, as Venuti has demonstrated elsewhere). But it is also a very productive tool when it comes to the establishment of national identities. This is the subject of Venuti 2005.

The following texts also deal with Shakespeare, translation and the 'universal spirit' that manifests itself in the concept of 'world literature'.

Preliminary distinctions:

When you offer a translation to a nation, that nation will almost always look on the translation as an act of violence against itself. Bourgeois taste tends to resist the universal spirit. To translate a foreign writer is to add to your own national poetry; such a widening of the horizon does not please those who profit from it, at least not in the beginning. The first reaction is one of rebellion.

--André Lefevere, *Translation / History / Culture*

These comments are drawn from Victor Hugo's 1865 preface to his son François Victor's version of Shakespeare's works. They are worth examining, not simply because Hugo uses translation as the basis for a critique of nationalism, but because his critique at once exposes and is itself riddled with contradictions that have characterized the relations between translation and national identities, regardless of the language and culture in which the translating is performed. Formulating the contradictory implications of Hugo's comments, then, will be a useful way to introduce my reflections on nationalist agendas in translation.

Translation can be described as an act of violence against a nation only because nationalist thinking tends to be premised on a metaphysical concept of identity as a homogeneous essence, usually given a biological grounding in an ethnicity or race and seen as manifested in a particular language and culture. **Since translation works on the linguistic and**

cultural differences of a foreign text, it can communicate those differences and thereby threaten the assumed integrity of the national language and culture, the essentialist homogeneity of the national identity... Nationalism, Hugo suggests, goes hand in hand with a literary xenophobia, a fear that foreign literatures might contaminate native traditions, an attitude that he tellingly phrases in biological terms: ‘Who could ever dare think of infusing the substance of another people into its own very life-blood?’ (Lefevere 1992, 18)’ (Venuti 2005 pp. 177-178)

‘This attitude, however, is contradicted by the fact that **nations do indeed ‘profit’ from translation. Nationalist movements have frequently enlisted translation in the development of national languages and cultures, especially national literatures.** A language, Hugo remarks, ‘will later be strengthened’ by translation, even if ‘while waiting it is indignant’ (Hugo 455). The forms taken by such translation agendas vary with the social situations in which they are deployed, and their varying approaches to foreign texts and cultures may be diametrically opposed, seeking either to preserve or to erase linguistic and cultural differences. Yet in both cases **the differences of the foreign texts are exploited to construct a national identity that is assumed to pre-exist the translation process.** As Jacques Derrida explains, nationalist thinking rests on a circular logic: the nation, imagined to be a homogeneous essence, must be constructed, but the construction is understood as “a recourse, a re-source, a circular return to the source” (Derrida 1992, 12). **Nationalist translation agendas depend on the same circularity: the national status of a language and culture is simultaneously presupposed and created through translation. Insofar as such agendas implicitly reveal the incompleteness of the nation, translation is a scandal to nationalist thinking, providing yet another motive for indignation and offense, for perceiving a translated texts as an international act of violence.**

The concept of nation, moreover, can be regarded as democratic, at least in principle, subsuming social divisions beneath a collective identity. The term that Hugo uses in his critique is “le peuple” (the people), an undifferentiated population united here in its resistance to a translation. Yet the arbiters of a national culture, even the theorists who articulate the very idea of a nation, may well belong to an elite minority. Hence, Hugo implicitly equates the cultural values of one class, “bourgeois taste,” with the collective culture that resists translation. **Nationalist translation agendas have often been initiated by cultural elites who aim to impose their linguistic and literary values on an entire population. The success of these agendas shows, however, that nationalisms cannot be viewed simply as forms of class dominance: translations must be accepted by a mass audience to be effective in constructing national languages, cultures, identities** (cf. Easthope 6-8)’ (Venuti 2005 p. 178)

‘Do Hugo’s comments, although critical of nationalism, take a clear stand on nationalist translation agendas? Here too contradictions emerge. **On the one hand, he acknowledges that translation traffics in linguistic and cultural differences that threaten nationalisms even while enriching national literatures. On the other hand, he suppresses the constructive hybridizing effects of these differences by positing the existence of a “universal spirit,” an essentialist concept of humanity that transcends the boundaries of class and nation.** In a posthumously published commentary on translation, similarly, he asserts that translators “transfuse the human spirit from one people to another,” but when he addresses the languages that mediate this transfusion, his thinking again issues into contradiction: “The human spirit is greater than every idiom. Languages do not all express the same quantity of it” (Hugo 631). Even though translation is seen as the practice that overcomes the boundaries between national languages and cultures to communicate the universal spirit, we must still ask what linguistic and cultural differences shape the translator’s work on another literature and complicate the communicative process. **At every turn, Hugo must confront the question of which nation at once gives rise to and is affected by a particular translation practice.**’ (Venuti 2005 pp. 178-79)

‘His universalism actually reveals the close relationship between his thinking and nationalism. Derrida points out that “nationalism does not present itself as a retrenchment onto an empirical particularity, but as the assigning to a nation of a universalistic, essentialist representation” (Derrida 1992, 19). Considered from the vantage point of an individual social agent, then, **nationalism is not the empirical fact of national citizenship, but an identification with or self-**

recognition in a particular discourse of nation.... Universalism can be useful in criticizing the exclusionary effects of nationalism, but by suppressing linguistic and cultural differences it pre-empts the articulation of theoretical concepts to understand how national identities are formed and what role translation might play in their formation.’ (Venuti 2005 p. 179)

‘Translation can support the formation of national identities through both the selection of foreign texts and the development of discursive strategies to translate them. A foreign text may be chosen because the social situation in which it was produced is seen as analogous to that of the translating culture and thus as illuminating the problems that a nation must confront in its emergence. A foreign text may also be chosen because its form and theme contribute to the creation of a specific discourse of nation in the translating culture. Similarly, a foreign text may be translated with a discursive strategy that has come to be regarded as a distinguishing characteristic of the nation because that strategy has long dominated translation traditions and practices in the translating culture. A translation strategy may also be affiliated with a national discourse because it employs a dialect that has gained acceptance as the standard dialect or the national language. Such translation practices form national identities through a specular process in which the subject identifies with cultural materials that are defined as national and thereby enable a self-recognition in a national collective. The fact that the materials at issue may include forms and themes, texts and cultures that are irreducibly foreign is repressed in a fantastic identification with an apparently homogeneous national identity. The irreducible foreignness of these materials may actually result in an intensification of national desire: in this instance, whatever linguistic and cultural differences may be communicated by a translation elicit a desire for a unified nation that the translation cannot fulfill by virtue of those very differences.’ (Venuti 2005 p. 180)

‘Nationalist agendas in translation involve the conceptual violence that occurs whenever the unity of a nation is proclaimed, whether at its founding moment or subsequent in its cultural and political institutions. **An assertion of national unity fictively creates that unity in the very process of asserting it by repressing the differences among the heterogeneous groupings and interest that comprise any social collective. As Derrida remarks, “the properly performative act must produce (proclaim) what in the form of a constative act it merely claims, declares, assures it is describing” (Derrida 1987, 18).** Translation nationalisms are based on performative acts of this sort because they assert a homogeneous language, culture, or identity where none is shared by the diverse population that constitutes the nation. Such agendas in translation necessarily entail various exclusions, not only in drawing distinctions between the nation and its foreign others, but in privileging certain cultural forms, practices, and constituencies within the supposedly unified nation. Foreign texts are chosen because they fall into particular genres and address particular themes while excluding other genres and themes that are seen as unimportant for the formation of a national identity; translation strategies draw on particular dialects, registers, and styles while excluding others that are also in use; and translators target particular audiences with their work, excluding other constituencies.’ (Venuti 2005 pp. 189-90)

Against world literature: translation studies and comparative literature. Emily Apter’s volume (*Against World Literature*, 2013) is a sober counterpoint to the enthusiasm aroused by the relatively new discipline of *World Literature*. Like translation, international relations, and diplomacy—within one of the many spheres in which the discourses that constitute them circulate—oscillate between universalist, even utopian, claims, on the one hand, and on the other its dialectical counterpoint, the emphasis on the essential difference from the other. The opening pages in Apter’s volume provide an interesting, and important, survey of the

history of the young discipline of World Studies, and its relation to translation studies. It also includes a discussion of important questions of philosophy and political issues as they relate to these two disciplines.

‘World Literature, as a disciplinary rallying point of literary criticism and the academic humanities, became increasingly prominent from the mid-1990s on. Between 1991 and 1997, under the editorial stewardship of Djelal Kadir, the journal *World Literature Today* cast World Literature as a hosting ground to literary postcolonialism. Pascale Casanova’s watershed book *La République mondiale des lettres* sparked renewed interest in World Literature in France after it appeared in 1999 despite an opening salvo that sounded anxieties over whether it was even legitimate to speak of World Literature. In its second life in English as *The World Republic of Letters*... the book became a flashpoint in literary and cultural studies, especially with respect to allegations that it preserved a Eurocentric (and more specifically Francocentric) perspective in its reliance on the metropole-periphery distinction and Europe-generated criteria of cultural legitimation. *Debating World Literature*, a collection of essays edited by Christopher Prendergast in 2004, assessed the impact of Casanova’s book as well as Franco Moretti’s influential essay ‘Conjectures on World Literature’ (2000) as it set out to rescue the ‘literature’ half of the World Literature configuration from the de-aestheticizing jaws of globalization. A conference held at Istanbul Bilgi University in December 2008 titled ‘World Literature in Between’, which kicked off with a conversation between David Damrosch and the Nobel Prize-winning Turkish author Orhan Pamuk, served as a prelude to the launch of The Institute of World Literature, spearheaded by David Damrosch at Harvard University. The Institute held its inaugural session at Peking University, Beijing in 2011 and on the same occasion marked The First Congress of the World Literature Association with a special focus on ‘The Rise of World Literatures.’ As anthologies, volumes of **critical essays and specialized studies with a world literary focus** propagate—**some emphasizing networks and systems oriented around Marx’s hypothetical of a literary International, others emphasizing a Goethean lienage adjusted to an era of global finance capital**—the disciplinary construct that is here designated with upper case has secured its foothold in both the university institution and mainstream publishing. It stands in contrast to lowercase ‘world literature’, which may be considered a descriptive catch-all for the sum of all forms of literary expression in all the world’s languages’ (Apter 2013 pp. 1-2)

‘A primary argument of this book is that many recent efforts to revive World Literature rely on a translability assumption. As a result, incommensurability and what has been called the Untranslatable are insufficiently built into the literary heuristic. Drawing on philosophies of translation developed by Jacques Derrida, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Samuel Weber, Barbara Johnson, Abdelfattah Kilito and Édouard Glissant, as well as on the way in which the Untranslatable is given substance in the context of Barbara Cassin’s *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies: Dictionnaire des intraduisibles* (whose English translation I supervised with co-editors Jacques Lezra and Michael Wood), the aim is to **activate untranslability as a theoretical fulcrum of comparative literature with bearing on approaches to world literatures, literary world systems and literary history, the politics of periodization, the translation of philosophy and theory, the relation between sovereign and linguistic borders at the checkpoint, the bounds of non-secular proscription and cultural sanction, free versus privatized authorial property, the poetics of translational difference, as well as ethical, cosmological and theological dimensions of worldliness.** Though the book is divided into chapters, it is conceived as a long essay in which the problematics unfold with reference to a central thesis about the interest of **an approach to literary comparatism that recognizes the importance of non-translation, mistranslation, incomparability and untranslatability.**’ (Apter 2013 pp. 3-4)

‘Translation studies’ particular appeal derived from its ability to respond to a planetary remit without sacrificing engagement with the world’s languages. The number of publications, books, book series, articles in journals about, and journals devoted to the practices and theory of translation spiked from 2000-2012, attesting to the combination of excitement and disaggregation characteristic of the emerging discipline. **Translation studies gained traction in the humanities because it was interdisciplinary without diluting a disciplinary formation in comparative literature. It drew**

on the tradition of *translatio studii* in Renaissance humanism (so important to comparative literature's foundation as a discipline), reworking it for a contemporary global education. Among the substantive issues that transferred most obviously from early periods to the present, I would mention **knowledge transmission; philosophies of 'world,' 'humanity' and 'human rights'; the idea of a 'classic'; aesthetic judgment and its critique; vernacularization and linguistic ethnocentrism in tension with cosmopolitan culture.** Such topics go to the heart of what is of direct concern to graduate students preparing to teach subjects in the humanities at a difficult juncture in the economy of education. As teachers in training, graduate students have an obvious stake not only in acquiring pedagogies (competence in the translation *practicum* and the related subfield of translation theory), they also need to identify problems and topics that clearly communicate why the humanities matter in contemporary society. Translation remains one of those areas that relates to a larger public without sacrificing intellectual nuance. **It is also the kind of paradigm—the translational humanities—whose global relevance has just begun to be understood in relation to public policy, legal theories of authorship and intellectual property, and international security, and whose implications as a language technology for media theory ask to be more fully explored.**' (Apter 2013, pp. 4-5)

The illusion of transparency in translation: i.e. the (false) perception that the translated text is a mere pristine reflection that reproduces the original without taking or adding anything from it. This process hides from the reader the fact that the original has been *domesticated*, that the original has been made to speak in the reader's target language. In this case, in plain English. This illusion of transparency in translation, as Venuti points out, is of a piece with a well-established Anglo-American empirical tradition that 'language we use can give unmediated access to truth or reality'.

'The very illusion of transparency... is characteristic of Anglo-American cultural traditions: not only has it dominated English-language translation at least since the seventeenth century, but in implying that language use can give unmediated access to truth or reality, it is closely linked to the empiricist epistemologies that have long distinguished British and American philosophies (Venuti 1995, Easthope)' (Venuti 2005 pp. 182-3)

5 Philosophical approaches to translation

When it comes to philosophical approaches to translation, Berman's book on German Romanticism has much to say—and Octavio Paz clearly came under the influence of these views on translation in his own essays and his poetics (see Pérez Fernández's articles on the subject). There are also a couple of chapters in Apter 2013 (“Derrida's Theologies of Translation”, pp. 228-246); and “Kilito's Injunction: ‘Thou Shalt Not Translate Me’” (Apter 2013: pp. 247-261), which deal (like Paz's work) with translation, philosophy and theology. The latest contribution to this field has been Cassin's *Dictionary of Untranslatables* (2014)

Steiner's hermeneutic motion

‘The hermeneutic movement owes its origins to the eighteenth and nineteenth century German Romantics... In the twentieth century, leading figures included Heidegger (1889-1976) and Gadamer (1900-2002). However, it is George Steiner's hugely influential *After Babel* which was the key modern reference for the hermeneutics of translation. Steiner (1975/1998: 249) defines the **hermeneutic approach** as ‘the investigation of what it means to “understand” a piece of oral or written speech, and the attempt to diagnose this process in terms of a general model of meaning.’ (Munday 2012 pp. 243-44)

‘Originally published in 1975, with subsequent editions in 1992 and 1998, *After Babel* claims to be ‘the first systematic investigation of the theory and processes of translation since the eighteenth century’. Steiner's initial focus is on the psychological and intellectual functioning of the mind of the translator, and he goes on to discuss the process of meaning and understanding underlying the translation process. When he returns to considering the ‘theory’ (always in inverted commas) of translation, it is to posit his own hermeneutically oriented and ‘**totalizing model**’. This model, following Roman Jakobson, →→→conceives of translation in a wide compass in which it shares features with acts of communication that are not limited to the interlingual:

A ‘theory’ of translation, a ‘theory’ of semantic transfer, must mean one of two things. It is either an intentionally sharpened, hermeneutically oriented way of designating a working mode of all meaningful exchanges, of the totality of semantic communication (including Jakobson's intersemiotic translation or ‘transmutation’). Or it is a subsection of such a model with specific reference to interlingual exchanges, to the emission and reception of significant messages between different languages... The ‘totalizing’ designation is the more instructive because it argues the fact that all procedures of expressive articulation and interpretative reception are translational, whether intra- or interlingually←←←. (Steiner, 1998: 293-4)

Steiner's description of the hermeneutics of translation, 'the act of elicitation and appropriative transfer of meaning' (*ibid.*: 312), is based on a conception of transfer not as a science but as 'an exact art', with precisions that are 'intense but unsystematic' (*ibid.*: 311). The **hermeneutic motion** which forms the core of Steiner's description (*ibid.*: 312-435) consists of four moves'. (Munday 2012 pp. 243-44)

'The main points of each move are as follows:

(1) **Initiative trust** (*ibid.* 312-313): The translator's first move is '**an investment of belief, a belief and trust that there is something there in the ST that can be understood**. Steiner sees this as a concentration of **the human way of viewing the world symbolically**. In the case of translation, the translator considers the ST to stand for something in the world, a coherent 'something' that can be translated even if the meaning might not be apparent immediately. This position entails two risks described by Steiner:

- The 'something' may turn out to be 'everything'. This was the case of medieval translators and exegetists of the Bible (and, one might add, for translators of sacred works from other traditions) who were overwhelmed by the all-embracing divine message.
- It may be 'nothing'. This may be either because they are deliberately non-communicative (e.g. nonsense rhymes) or because meaning and form are inextricably interwoven and cannot be separated and translated.

(2) **Aggression** (*ibid.*: 313-14): This is an 'incurative... extractive... invasive' move. Steiner looks to Heidegger for a basis of this view of comprehension as 'appropriative' and 'violent'. Noting St Jerome's use of the metaphor of meaning made captive by the translator, Steiner graphically depicts the translator's seizure of the ST: 'The translator invades, extracts, and brings home. The simile is that of the open-cast mine left an empty scar in the landscape' (*ibid.*: 314). Steiner considers that some texts and genres 'have been exhausted by translation' and that others have been translated so well that they are now only read in translation—for the latter, Steiner gives the example of Rilke (1875-1926)'s German translations of the sonnets of French Renaissance poet Louise Labé (c. 1520-1566)

At times Steiner describes the aggression involved as '**penetration**' (*ibid.* 314, 319)... This metaphor has been strongly criticized by feminists for its violent male-centric sexual imagery.' (Munday 2012 pp. 245-46)

(3) **Incorporation** (*ibid.*: 314-16): The third movement in Steiner's hermeneutics refers to how the ST meaning, extracted by the translator in the second movement is brought into the TL which is already full of its own words and meanings. Different types of assimilation can occur: Steiner considers the two poles to be '**complete domestication**', where the TT takes its full place in the TL canon, such as Luther's German Bible; or '**permanent strangeness and marginality**', such as Nabokov's 1964 English rendering of Pushkin (1825-1832)'s Russian verse novel *Onegin*, which consisted of a literal translation with more footnotes than text.

The crucial point Steiner makes (1998: 315) is that the importing of the meaning of the foreign text 'can potentially dislocate or relocate the whole of the native structure'. With further metaphors, he suggests the two ways in which this process functions:

(a) as '**sacramental intake**': the target culture ingests and becomes enriched by the foreign text; or

(b) as '**infection**': the target culture is infected by the source text and ultimately rejects it. Steiner gives the example of French seventeenth-century neoclassical literary models (e.g. the plays of Corneille, Racine and Molière) which complied with the strict technical artistic principles of ancient Greece and Rome. Initially, these were poorly imitated in Russian and German, among others, but were ultimately rejected by the more fluid ideas of European Romanticism.'

(Munday 2012 p. 246)

[...]

(4) **Compensation** (*ibid.* 316-19) or the ‘enactment of reciprocity’ is ‘the crux of the *métier* and morals of translation’. Steiner describes the aggressive appropriation and incorporation of the meaning of the ST which ‘leaves the original with a dialectically enigmatic residue’. In other words, although there has been a loss for the ST the ‘residue’ is positive.’ (Munday 2012 p. 247)

Translation of the Bible. The Septuagint as a case of Greek monolingualism. The Greek translation of the Old Testament as the ‘linguistic matrix for Christian doctrine’

“The translation of the Bible into Greek is not a counterexample to the monolingualism of the Greeks but rather an illustration of it. This translation is of Jewish inspiration rather than of Greek, born from the idea that Greek is *de facto* the language of culture *par excellence*, which enables it to render accessible the Book *par excellence*.

The body of literature that will be given the overarching title of *Biblia* in the 12th century of the Common Era was translated into Greek first, though only in part, in Alexandria starting in the third century before Christ. It was a great novelty in the world of culture. **These Greek ‘writings’ (*graphai*)**, which even today embody the Old Testament in the Greek Orthodox Church, **served straightaway as the linguistic matrix for Christian doctrine, providing the concepts and expressions that course through the new phraseology.** These texts provided the basis for most of the older versions of the Bible, right up to the translations of Cyril and Methodius (middle of the eleventh century) into old Slavonic. Competing Greek versions of the text appeared in the course of the second century, including an extremely literal one, commissioned by the rabbis from the proselitizer Aquila. But this did not keep the former from serving as the exclusive source of the first Latin translations. **Saint Jerome first proposed a series of scientific and literary revisions before deciding to translate the Hebrew texts of Jewish writings directly into Latin. The end result of his work of revision and translation was the Latin Vulgate, the official Bible of Roman Catholicism until the middle of the 20th c.** Jerome remained the champion of what he would himself call *hebraica veritas*. This conception even served as a model for Luther’s German Bible. But in actuality, and despite his intent, a reign of *latina veritas* was the result of Jerome’s labors instead. For centuries the Latin Vulgate would provide the textual basis for most translations into the so-called vernacular languages. Whatever the destiny of the Greek Bible itself, its appearance in classical antiquity signals an important moment in the very history of culture. Moses, in fact, lays down a challenge to Homer! And most of all, the objective foundations of the lexicon and of the discourse that have subsequently come to be known as ‘translation’ are put irreversibly in place.” (TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, p. 1143)

The Greek Jewish community – the *politeuma*, or ‘community within the city’ reinforced by the Greek translation of the Law of Moses – *nomos* or *nomothesia* (‘constitution’). The myth of the seventy-two translators. The *universalization* of the Bible through its translation into Greek – *the language of learning par excellence*.

“Thus, in the third century before Christ, the peoples of *Iouda*, or the *Ioudaioi*, took up the translation of their *hagiai graphai*, ‘holy writings’, into Greek, starting first and foremost with the Law of Moses, *nomos*—or as they would say, their *nomothesia*, or ‘constitution’. The *politeuma*, the ‘community within the city’ that they formed in Alexandria, protected their difference of nationality, and it would subsequently gain political recognition as well. Versions of the other books followed: spread out over two or even three centuries and probably completed by Christian writers. **This was an event without precedent. The idiom of the Greeks, the language of thought that aspired to universality, now became the language of the Bible.**

Toward the end of the second century BCE, a widespread legend, first referred to in the *Letter of Aristeas*, would introduce ‘the book’ (*hê biblos*), as the law in question became Greek, as the extraordinary work of seventy-two scholars of *Iouda* at the request of the grand priest of Jerusalem. The order is said to have come from the royal librarian of Alexandria at the request of the second monarch of the Ptolemaic dynasty, Ptolemy Philadelphus (Ptolemy II). The latter wanted the books of the *Ioudaioi* included in the famous library of his sumptuous city. According to the same source, each of the translators translated the text in a rigorously consistent way, identical to the work of the other translators. **In the middle of the second century CE, Christian authors circulated or forged the letter and set in place the Latin word *septuaginta*, ‘seventy’. They made this into the general title of this collection of Greek writing that they had inherited and would henceforth be the only ones to use. The word is still in use today—although not without ambiguity, since the legendary role of the ‘seventy’ applied only to the five books of Moses—as the title of the Greek Old Testament.”**

(TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, p. 1143)

Most interesting: on how the translation of the Bible into Greek contributed to the lexical and semantic rearrangement in that language of the vocabulary used to refer to the activity of translation and all its associated processes. Translation and hermeneutics.

“The unprecedented event of the translation of the Law appealed immediately to the theoreticians of local Judaic community, which was entirely hellenophonic. **It was thus and at that moment that the conceptual field of translation became established in the Greek lexicon.** The verb *hermêneuein* and the nouns, *hermêneia* and *hermêneus* saw their respective meanings of ‘express’ or ‘signify’, ‘expression’, ‘signification’ or ‘interpretation’ and ‘interpreter’ become qualified to specifically signify ‘translate,’ ‘translation,’ and ‘translator.’ Other etymologically related and practically synonymous terms, such as *diarmêneuein* and *diarmêneusis*, were subject to the same process. The word *metagraphê*, ‘copy’ or ‘transcription’, came itself to signify ‘translation’, and *metagraphêin*, ‘to transcribe’ or ‘to copy’, became equivalent to ‘translate’. **The verb *metageîn*, to ‘deport’, now applied to the text as ‘transferred into another language’; in other words, ‘translated’** (*Prologue* by the translator of the *Siracides* around BCE). Recourse was also taken to *metharmozein*, ‘to arrange differently’. **Three great agents or Judaic witnesses of this semantic innovation succeeded one another between the second century BCE and the first century CE all of them convinced that the translation of the Law was in response to an external political will.** Around 180 CE, the philosopher **Aristobolus** claimed that the ‘entire translation’ (*hermêneia*) of the Law’ was realized under Ptolemy Philadelphus, but he insisted that there had been previous attempts at translation, ones that were fragmentary or flawed, which is impossible to verify anyway. **His intention was to make more credible his own belief that Moses, the father or universal culture, was the original teacher of the Greek thinkers, especially of Plato and Pythagoreas, who would have learned directly from the Greek sources of ‘the Law’** (text cited by Eusebius of Caesaria, *Praeparatio evangelica*, 13.12.1). Aristobolus was the first to demonstrate the use of *hermêneia* in the technical sense of ‘translation.’ A half-century later, and still in Alexandria, a lengthy piece of fiction appeared carried down in its entirety under the title *Letter of Aristeas*. This work decisively confirms the use of *hermêneia* as ‘translation’ a term it immediately distinguishes from *metagraphê*, ‘transcription’. It also contains the formulaic expressions *ta tês hermêneias* and even *ta tês metagraphês*, the ‘work of works of translation’ that one ‘executes’ (*epitelein*), or that one ‘achieves’ (*telein*). As for the ‘translators’, it would seem that they are still designated only by a participle of the verb *diarmêneuin*.”

(TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, pp. 1143-4)

Very interesting: TRANSLATION AND PROPHECY. Translation as revelation (compare this with Pérez Fernández 2007, 2010 and 2011). ‘Language (*logos*) as the interpreter (*hermêneus*) of thought or spirit

(*nous*), whence his [Philo's] expression *ho hermêneus logos*, 'the speech which translates our thought'. Homer, Virgil, Dante and epic poetry as prophecy.

"The decisive setting up of the complete lexicon of translation is both certified and commented upon by the Alexandrian exegete and philosopher Philo in the first decades of the first century. The relevance, if not the legitimacy, of the act of translating the *hierai bibloi* (the sacred books) or simply *graphai* (writings) is demonstrated within the framework of a theological reasoning in which the mythological figure Moses plays the central part. Here are two essential texts:

1. For any time that Chaldeans who know the Greek language, or Greeks who know Chaldean [i.e. Hebrew] were to come upon the two versions [*graphai*] simultaneously, namely the Chaldaic and the translated version [*hermêneustheisê*], they would look upon both of them with admiration and respect them as sisters, or rather as one and the same work in both substance and form, and they would call their authors not translators [*hermêneustheisê*] but hierophants and prophets to whose pure minds it had been granted to go along with the purest spirit [*pneuma*] of Moses.

(‘A Treatise on the Life of Moses’, 2.37)

2. For a prophet does not utter anything whatever of his own, but is only an interpreter [*hermeneus*] of another being who prompts and suggests to him all that he utters, at the very moment he is seized by inspiration [*enthousia*].

(‘The Special Laws’, 4.49)

For Philo, the Greek translation of the writings is equally as ‘inspired’ as the Hebrew original. The same holds true in his eyes for the interpretation of the sacred texts, which is limited to a small number of the elect, or the ‘initiates.’ To add force to his argument, he resorts to the register of the mysteries in the same manner as the Alexandrian writers in their explications of Homer’s works. →→→The schema that underlies his propositions is that of language (*logos*) as the interpreter (*hermêneus*) of thought or spirit (*nous*), whence his expression *ho hermêneus logos*, ‘the speech which translates our thought’ (*De somniis*, 1.33). He uses the same schema in relation to the fact or process of divine revelation. The science and God’s word (*logos*) have their interpreter (*hermêneus*) in Moses. Philo designates the latter as *ho theologos* (*De proemiis et poenis*, 53; *De vita Mosis*, 2.115). Insofar as the divine *logos* expresses itself through the ‘holy laws [*nomoi hieroi*], Mose is their *hermêus*, or more precisely, *prophêtes*. Yet he himself needs interpreters in his own image and of his stature, whence Philo’s report of a chain of interpreters, ‘prophets’, in which the translator and commentator hold the same rank, each ‘inspired.’ (We can compare this with Plato’s *Ion*, in which the chain of enthusiasm goes from the muse or from the god to the poet and then to the rhapsodes, whose performanes intepreted the interpreters [553c-535a]). Thus all the quantitative and qualitative divergences of the Greek version of the holy books are a priori justified and already fully recognized as authentic *graphai*. In some cases, the translator went to great lengths to repair the language of the works, occasionally going so far as to write what amounts to a new text. This is particularly evident for the book of Proverbs, entirely redrafted by a talented author or Greek wisdom. This is indeed the case of a *hermêneus* who is not so much a ‘translator’ as an ‘interpreter’ with literary and even musical connotations, since the book also contains poetry. But if there is translation nevertheless, it is insofar as the biblical message remains constant through its potency and deep articulations in relation and opposition to everything else. The semantic plenitude of the word *hermêneus* is thus assured.”

(TO TRANSLATE, in Cassin, ed. 2014, p. 1144)

The following is from the ‘Preface’ to Cassin 2014, by its English editors and translators. They start by situating the dictionary within a well-

established tradition that starts in the Enlightenment. This is an essentially European legacy—note that in its original French title, the emphasis of this dictionary was on its European nature (Franco-centric, mostly): *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies* – only in the subtitle did Cassin introduce the term ‘untranslatable’ (*Dictionnaire des intraduisibles*). Its English translators and editors turn this title and subtitle upside down, and eliminate this European focus. They are very much aware of this, and they justify this decision in the preface to the Princeton U.P. edition.

The following is a most revealing paragraph on several counts: in the first place it illustrates what some scholars today understand as ‘Europe’, or what they think the term and its adjective evokes (Christendom, humanism, Enlightenment, etc.). By eliminating the word ‘European’ from the title the American scholars who curated the English edition appropriate the project by universalizing / globalizing it. This is a rather interesting paradox: American scholars siding with, or practicing, the type of continental philosophy that opposes Anglo-American cultural imperialism (in the terms discussed for instance by Apter 2006 and 2013) do translate and appropriate the original French / European project from American cultural and academic institutions (Princeton, New York University). So they feel the need to explain why they use (somewhat apologetically) English ‘global hegemony’ to spread the sort of vocabulary and register used by *continental philosophy* or *theory* (as this is called in American academia)—so idiosyncratic and controversial—‘theoritese’ / ‘theorish’ vs ‘Globish’ or ‘translate’.

This global hegemonic language, tainted by the imperialism of the linguistic communities and the policies that drove their universal expansion, will serve to promote a new type of linguistic diversity, in the words of the translators, a ‘renewed emphasis on the particularities of idiom’. This good message should lead to ‘advance experimental forms in research, data-mining, and pedagogy, as well as models of comparativism that place renewed emphasis on the particularities of idiom’ (p. ix)

“Although some of us worried about a certain awkwardness in the use of the adjective ‘untranslatable’ as a noun, by foregrounding it in the English title we signaled its important role as an organizing principle of the entire project. We also decided to eliminate the reference to Europe. This was a difficult call, as the European focus of the book is undeniable. Removing the emphasis on ‘European philosophies’ would leave us open to criticism that the *Dictionary* now laid claim to being a work of world philosophy, a tall order that it patently did not fill. Our justification on this score was twofold: so that future editions of the *Dictionary of Untranslatables* might incorporate new entries on philosophy hailing from countries and languages cartographically zoned outside of Europe; and because, philologically speaking, conventional distinctions between European and non-European languages make little or no

sense. Moreover, it was our sense that the adjective ‘European,’ often assumed to refer to a common legacy of Christendom, humanism, and Enlightenment principles, actually misrepresents the complexity of identifying ‘Europe’ culturally and geopolitically at any given moment in history.” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. ix)

“Notwithstanding concerns about the global hegemony of English (and more pointedly still, about those forms of standardized, Internet-inflected, business English commonly dubbed ‘Globish’ that are frequently associated with financial ‘outcomes’ and ‘deliverables’), we assume that the book, by dint of being in English, will disseminate broadly and reach new communities of readers. The book’s diffusion in Asia, South Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America will lead, we hope, not only to more translations in other languages, but also to spin-off versions appropriate to different cultural sites and medial forms. We hope that the English edition, in its current and future iterations, will help to advance experimental formats in research, data-mining, and pedagogy, as well as models of comparativism that place renewed emphasis on the particularities of idiom. Philosophical importance, in this case, is accorded to how a term ‘is’ in its native tongue, and how it ‘is’ or ‘is not’ when relocated or translated in another language. →→→Idiomatic and demotic nuance←←←are fully recognized as constitutive of philosophy, prompting a shift from concept-driven philosophical analysis to a new kind of process philosophy, what Cassin calls ‘philosophizing in languages’” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. ix)

In the opinion of its editors, its global diffusion through translation into English will be a sort of antidote to the flattening effects of the expanding use of English as the universal lingua franca of science and knowledge. This aim is part of a larger, more ambitious programme which seeks to redefine *curricula* in search of innovative, experimental ways of redefining, remapping knowledge and its diffusion – a new cartography of knowledge through translation (just as the humanist programme did five centuries ago)

“In promoting revived connections among philosophy, translation, linguistics, and philology, the *Dictionary* encourages curricular initiatives in the form of courses, colloquia, and cross-institutional degree programs. The *Dictionary* proves useful for teaching in myriad ways, especially at advanced undergraduate and graduate levels. In an era in which countries all over the world are adopting policies—often in line with the European Union’s endorsement of English as its *lingua franca*—that would make English the official language of instruction in scientific and technical fields (if not the social sciences, area studies, and the humanities as well), students increasingly naturalize English as the singular language of universal knowledge, thereby erasing translation-effects and etymological histories, the trajectories of words in exile and in the wake of political and ecological catastrophes. In the *Dictionary* there is a consistent effort to communicate the political, aesthetic, and translational histories of philosophical keywords.” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. ix)

“Though it is not set up as a concept-history, →→→the *Dictionary* lends itself to pedagogical approaches that explicate how concepts come into existence in, through, and across languages←←←.” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. ix)

Its English editors and translators have also intervened in a number of ways in the new edition, adding and altering the original—another form of appropriation—sometimes to (in their own words) ‘enhance the *Dictionary*’s relevance to literary theory and comparative literature’ (p. xi), *inter alia*:

“Topical additions on language, translation, and humanism included supplements on “glossolalia” (by Daniel Heller-Roazen), in the entry LOGOS; **Leonardo Bruni’s practice of translation (by Jane Tylus) in TO TRANSLATE;** and **“the humanities” (by Michael Wood) in BILDUNG.** These highlights were intended to enhance the *Dictionary’s* relevance to literary theory and comparative literature. In response to a raft of recent interdisciplinary debates around surveillance, security, care, and cure, we solicited an entry on the wildly ramified cognates of SECURITAS by John T. Hamilton. What began as a new supplement by Kenneth Reinhard to MITMENSCH grew into a separate entry, NEIGHBOR. We also felt compelled to do more with the cluster of semes associated with “sex” and “gender”. While both terms were represented in the original, and entered into dynamic relation with *genre* and *Geschlecht* (and thus to related concepts discussed in those entries, such as ‘species’, ‘kind’, ‘race’, and ‘people’), we were able to turn this word grouping into a site of critical cross-examination. In this case, Judith Butler on ‘gender trouble’ and Stella Sandford on the French de-sexing of ‘sexual difference’ in English, invite being read in colloquy with Monique David-Ménars and Penelope Deutscher on GENDER and Geneviève Fraisse on SEX.” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. xi)

One of the remarkable general features of the encyclopedia is its multilingual nature—and its emphasis on rewriting the history of philosophy, i.e. in its French original edition, on rewriting the history of European philosophy, or the Western tradition, from the standpoint of the ‘untranslatable’ – i.e. from the study and analysis of those travelling words which have populated the polyglot and multicultural constellation which are the texts that come together to form the corpus of Western philosophy. The epistemological foundation, in other words, for the variety of disciplines that constitute what we call European culture. What its American translators and editors pursue, it appears, is to globalize this Eurocentric approach. This is a book which, as its American editors declare, flaunts its “stake in what it means ‘to philosophize in translation’ over and beyond rewriting the history of philosophy with translation problems in mind” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. vii)

As regards its Euro-centric approach, this volume, produced originally from the centres of French intelligentsia, must be read alongside recent volumes such as Denis Guénoun’s *About Europe. Philosophical Hypotheses* (Trans. Christine Irizarry, Stanford, CA: Stanford U.P. originally published as *Hypothèses sur l’Europe: Un essai de philosophie*, Strasbourg: Éditions Circé, 2000)

“A massive translation exercise with encyclopedic reach, the *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon*—first published in French under the title *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies: Dictionnaire des intraduisibles*—belongs in a genealogy that includes Diderot and d’Alembert’s *Encyclopédie* (1751-66), André Lalande’s *Vocabulaire technique et critique de philosophie* (1902-23), Émile Benveniste’s *Le Vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, Laplanche and Pontalis’s *The Language of Psycho-Analysis* (1967, classified as a dictionary), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (an

online resource inaugurated in 1995), and Reinhart Koselleck's *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (a dictionary of political and social-concept history, 2004). Along another axis, it recalls Raymond Williams's short compendium of political and aesthetic terms, *Keywords*, informed by British Marxism of the 1960s and 70s. Unlike these works, however, **the *Dictionary* fully mobilizes a multilingual rubric.** Accordingly, entries compare and meditate on the specific differences furnished to concepts by the Arabic, Basque, Catalan, Danish, English, French, German, Greek (classical and modern), Hebrew, Hungarian, Latin, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, and Spanish languages.

The book was the brainchild of its French editor, **Barbara Cassin**, herself a **specialist of classical philosophy**. In 1998, in the introduction to her translation of Parmenides's poem *On Nature*, Cassin had already ascribed the 'untranslatable' to the interminability of translating: **the idea that one can never have done with translation. In her writings on the pre-Socratics and the Sophists, she tethered the untranslatable to the instability of meaning and sense-making, the performative dimension of sophistic effects, and the condition of temporality in translation. Translation's 'time', in Cassin's usage, was associated with the principle of infinite regress and the vertiginous apprehension of infinitude.**" (Apter's "Preface" in Cassin, 2014 p. vii)

Cassin puts great emphasis on the fact that, far from being 'stand-ins for national subjects', languages actually show very diffuse outlines, beyond the constructs of national identity or linguistic communities, and how easily they transmute into polyglot worlds. This polyglot heterogeneity is a common feature of European interaction, and it responds to the idea of Europe as a linguistic and cultural mosaic.

"Though the original language of the *Dictionary* was French, and the orientation was toward the Hellenic, Scholastic, Enlightenment, and German European tradition, Cassin was interested in what she called a "metaphysics of particles." She referred here to **the shape-shifting capacities of linguistic particulates within a particular language** (as in the way German prefixes and suffixes become operative as building blocks of new words). Each language, she maintained, "contains within itself the rules of its own invention and transgression." →→→ **The book emphasizes the singular philosophical nuances of discrete languages not because Cassin was committed to resurrecting fixtures of "ontological nationalism" (whereby languages are erected as stand-ins for national subjects), but rather because she wanted to emphasize the mobile outlines of languages assuming a national silhouette or subsiding into diffuse, polyglot worlds ←←←.**" (Apter's "Preface" in Cassin, 2014 pp. xii-xiii)

"Opposed to the model of the dictionary as a concept mausoleum, Cassin treated words as free radicals, as *parole in libertà*. She devised the construct of *lemmes* (directionals, or signposts) as navigating mechanisms. The directionals would prompt readers to pursue philological links, logical arguments, and conceptual lines of flight revealed by a term's history of translation that would not be apparent in a cross-referencing index. Sometimes these directionals resemble miniature articles unto themselves. **Signaling where terms congregate, form star clusters, or proliferate in multiple languages, they contour preponderant overarching ideas and recurrent story lines.** These include (but are not obviously limited to) the logic of classical orders; theologies of the law; metaphysical transcendence; aesthetic and domestic economy; sense and signification; human versus nonhuman; gender and species; materialism (both realist and speculative) and phenomenological experience; orders of sovereignty in the naming of polity and political institutions; utopian theories; dialectical thinking; *Dasein*, self-consciousness, and intersubjectivity; temporality and history; memory, cognition, and the intuition of intelligence; creative originality; free will and moral autonomy; rational self-interest and analytic reason; possessive individualism; and the emergence of the modern liberal subject." (Apter's "Preface" in Cassin, 2014 p. xiii)

“What the dictionary does best, perhaps, is produce a **cartography (Caygill called it a “geo-philosophy”)** of **linguistic diaspora, migration, and contested global checkpoints** from early empires to the **technologically patrolled and surveyed post-9/11 era**. →→→National languages are **profiled not as static, reified monuments of culture, nor as technologies of signification stripped of political consequence, but as internally transnational units, heterodox micro-worlds** ←←←.

This said, the *Dictionary* is not without its nationalist hauntings. Nowhere are such hauntings more evident than in the entries devoted to languages themselves. Despite the editors’ express intention to undercut national language ontologies, there is recidivism in these entries.” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. xiii)

“**Even the term ‘translation’, which signifies language in a state of non-belonging, turns out to be nationally marked.** The entry TO TRANSLATE notes that *dolmetschen*, an anachronistic verb whose origins go back to Martin Luther’s translation of the Bible into German, renders ‘to translate’ as, literally, ‘to render ad German’ or ‘to Germanize’. Schleiermacher was instrumental in replacing *dolmetschen* with *übersetzung* on the grounds that *dolmetschen* referred to the functional work of the interpreter, whereas *übersetzung* referred to the loftier challenge of rendering thought. From this perspective *übersetzung* is the name of a disavowed Germanocentrism that clings to the history of the word ‘translation’” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 pp. xiii-xiv)

There is an interesting dimension, with great heuristic potential, in this activity of ‘philosophizing through translation’, which leads to the question of community – and common – or, as Apter puts it, of ‘languages together’ and ‘philosophy cast as a political theory of community’

“If there is one thing we have come away with, however, it is a deep excitement about →→→using philosophical translation as a way of doing philosophy or ‘theory’, or literary criticism←←←. We see the book as a major contribution to a renewed philosophical turn in translation theory and practice. It occasions reflection on how ‘untranslatable’ carries within it a philosophy of ‘languages together’. What we find in this book, in a sense, is **philosophy cast as a political theory of community**, built up through the transference and distribution of irreducible, exceptional, semantic units. →→→The places where languages touch reveal the limits of discrete national languages and traditions←←←. We obtain glimpses of languages in paradoxically shared zones of non-national belonging, at the edge of mutual unintelligibility. Such zones encompass opacities at the edges of the spoken and written, a bilingualism that own up to the condition of un-ownable, unclaimable language property, and perverse grammatology. →→→Untranslatables signify not because they are essentialist predicates of nation or *ethnos* with no ready equivalent in another language, but because they mark singularities of expression that contour a **worldscape according to mistranslation, neologism, and semantic dissonance**←←←.” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. xv)

Cassin on the multilingual / polyglot nature of Europe – Translation And the Early Modern Idea of Europe – philosophizing in languages – translation – languages – networks

“One of the most urgent problems posed by the existence of Europe is that of languages. We may envisage two kinds of solution. We could choose a dominant language in which exchanges will take place from now on, a globalized Anglo-American. Or we could gamble on the retention of many

languages, making clear on every occasion the meaning and the interest of the differences—the only way of really facilitating communication between languages and cultures. The *Dictionary of Untranslatables* belongs to this second perspective. But it looks to the future rather than to the past. It is not tied to a retrospective and reified Europe (which Europe would that be, in any case?), defined by an accumulation and juxtaposition of legacies that would only reinforce particularities, but to a Europe in progress, fully active, *energeia* rather than *ergon*, which explores divisions, tensions, transfers, appropriations, contradictions, in order to construct better versions of itself.

Our point of departure is **a reflection on the difficulty of translating in philosophy**. We have tried to think of philosophy within languages, to treat philosophies as they are spoken, and to see what then changes in our ways of philosophizing. This is why **we have not created yet another encyclopedia of philosophy, treating concepts, authors, currents, and systems for their own sakes**, but a *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, which starts from words situated within the measurable differences among languages, or at least among the principal languages in which philosophy has been written in Europe—since Babel. From this point of view, Émile Benveniste’s pluralist and comparatist *Vocabulary of Indo-European Institutions* has been our model. **In order to find the meaning of a word in one language, this book explores the networks to which the word belong and seeks to understand how a network functions in one language by relating it to the networks of other languages.**” (Cassin’s “Introduction” to Cassin, ed. 2014, p. xvii)

With regards to the use of ‘untranslatability’ within the realm of age-old aporias in Western thought—infinite regress, the instability of meaning, difference and so on—the preface resorts to Derrida to attempt a definition (paradoxical, contradictory, as ever) of what ‘untranslatability’ means:

“In this picture, what is lost in translation is often the best that can be found, as readers find their way to a *Denkraum*—a space of thinking, inventing, and translating, in which words no longer have a distinct definition proper to any one language.

This said, it is by no means self-evident what “untranslatability” means. This is how Jacques Derrida’s *Monolingualism of the Other* approaches the term (in Patrick Mensah’s translation):

Not that I am cultivating the untranslatable. **Nothing is untranslatable**, however little time is given to the expenditure or expansion of a competent discourse that measures itself against the power of the original. But the ‘untranslatable’ remains—should remain, as my law tells me the poetic economy of the idiom, the one that is important to me, for I would die even more quickly without it, and which is important to me, myself to myself, where **a given formal ‘quantity’ always fails to restore the singular event of the original**, that is to let it be forgotten once recorded, to carry away its number, the prosodic shadow of its quantum... **In a sense, nothing is untranslatable; but in another sense, everything is untranslatable;** translation is another name for the impossible. In another sense of the word “translation”, of course, and from one sense to the other—it is easy for me always to hold firm between these two hyperboles which are fundamentally the same, and always translate each other.

As Jacques Lezra notes, **one sense of the term “translatable”, then, is signaled by the articulation between geometry and rhetoric provided by the concept of hyperbole**. Here, tendentially, **“to translate” means to map one point or quantum onto another according to an algorithm: translation is understood as mechanics, as a function, as measure or common measure**. This sort of “translation” requires us to understand natural languages as if they were mapped onto a mathematical, or mathematizable, or quantifiable space: what one might call

the monadic or mapping or isomorphic definition of translation. Both word-for-word translation and sense-for-sense translation, those archaic Cain-and-Abel brothers of the translational pantheon, can be imagined according to this sort of mathematical, functional paradigm. **But what happens when we “translate” this sort of functional translation from the domain of quanta to the domain of rhetoric, even of philosophical rhetoric, where hyperbole has a quite different sort of standing? Here nothing like a smooth, mathematizable space prevails** outside of the fantasy of a certain Neoplatonist.” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 pp. x-xi)

“Over and over, as editors, we confronted the task of ‘translating the untranslatable’. This involved at once a plunge into the Benjaminian problematic of translatability as such, qualified by Samuel Weber in terms of Walter Benjamin’s activation of translation’s ‘-abilities’ (the ‘*barkeit*’ part of *Übersetzbarkeit*), and a trial (*épreuve*, endurance test) requiring the conversion of translation failure into something of value and interest. We became increasingly drawn to the paradoxical premise of the book, namely, that of the untranslatable as the interminably (not) translated. One of the risks of the casual use of ‘untranslatable’ is the suggestion of an always absent perfect equivalence. Nothing is exactly the same in one language as in another, so the failure of translation is always necessary and absolute. Apart from its neglect of the fact that some pretty good equivalencies are available, this proposition rests on a mystification, on a dream of perfection we cannot even what, let alone have. If there were a perfect equivalence from language to language, the result would not be translation; it would be a replica. And if such replicas were possible on a regular basis, there would not be any languages, just one vast, blurred international jargon, a sort of late cancellation of the story of Babel. The untranslatable as a construct makes a place for the private anguish that we as translators experience when confronted with material that we don’t *want* to translate or see translated. A certain density or richness or color or tone in the source language seems so completely to defy rendering into another language that we would just as soon not try: the poverty of the result is too distressing, makes us miss the first language as we miss a friend or a child. This may be true at times, but we can make a virtue out of seeing differences, and the constant recourse to the metaphor of loss in translation is finally too easy. We can, in any case, be helped to see what we are missing, and that is what much of this book is about.” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. xiv)

“We have not explored all the words there are, or all languages with regard to a particular word, and still less all the philosophies there are. **We have taken as our object symptoms of difference, the ‘untranslatables’, among a certain number of contemporary European languages, returning to ancient languages (Greek, Latin) and referring to Hebrew and Arabic whenever it was necessary in order to understand these differences. To speak of *untranslatables* in no way implies that the terms in question, or the expressions, the syntactical or grammatical turns, are not and cannot be translated: the untranslatable is rather what one keeps on (not) translating. But this indicates that their translation, into one language or another, creates a problem, to the extent of sometimes generating a neologism or imposing a new meaning on an old word. It is a sign of the way in which, from one language to another, neither the words nor the conceptual networks can simply be superimposed. Does one understand that same thing by ‘mind’ as by *Geist* or *esprit*, is *pranda* ‘justice’ or ‘truth’, and what happens when we render *mimesis* as ‘representation’ rather than ‘imitation’? Each entry thus starts from a nexus of untranslatability and proceeds to a comparison of terminological networks, whose distortion creates the history and geography of languages and cultures. The *Dictionary of Untranslatables* makes explicit in its own domain the principal symptoms of difference in languages.” (Cassin’s “Introduction” to Cassin, ed. 2014, p. xvii)**

“What made it unique was its attempt to rewrite the history of philosophy through the lens of the “untranslatable”, defined loosely as a term that is left untranslated as it is transferred from language to language (as in the examples of *polis*, *Begriff*, *praxis*, *Aufheben*, *mimesis*, “feeling”, *lieu commun*, *logos*, “matter of fact”), or that is typically subject to mistranslation and retranslation.” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. vii)

“The work’s international reception was... enlarged by its translations (some of them under way) into Arabic, Farsi, Romanian, Russian, and Ukrainian. When Princeton University Press committed to publish an English edition, the editors confronted a daunting and very particular set of challenges: how to render a work, published in French, yet layered through and through with the world’s languages, into something intelligible to Anglophone readers; how to translate the untranslatable; how to communicate the book’s performative aspect, its stake in what it means “to philosophize in translation” over and beyond rewriting the history of philosophy with translation problems in mind” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. vii)

Emily Apter worked closely with Etienne Balibar. A team of scholars affiliated with the UK journal *Radical Philosophy* also collaborated in the project. This is also a militant project, imbued with the spirit and the epistemology of *Continental philosophy*, and as such, directly confronting the Anglo-American tradition of analytical philosophy.

In being a case of multi-authored translation, its nature also overlaps with recent studies on this unexplored phenomenon, its history and its current relevance (see Belén Bistué’s *Collaborative Translation and Multi-Version Texts in Early Modern Europe*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2013)

“The collective affiliated with the U.K.-based journal *Radical Philosophy* was also integral to the project’s gestation. ... *Radical Philosophy*’s abiding commitment to a practice of philosophical translation that would shake up the teaching of philosophy in departments dominated by the normative strictures of the Anglo-analytic philosophical tradition.

The *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, like its French predecessor, and like the editions published or under way in other languages, was a labor of many” (Apter’s “Preface” in Cassin, 2014 p. viii)

6 Intersemiotic translation

In his essay ‘On linguistic aspects of translation’, Roman Jakobson distinguishes three different categories of translation:

- (1) **Intralingual** translation, or ‘rewording’ – ‘an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language’
- (2) **Interlingual** translation, or ‘translation proper’ – ‘an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language’
- (3) **Intersemiotic** translation, or ‘transmutation’ – ‘an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of non-verbal sign systems’

These definitions draw on **semiotics**, the general science of communication through signs and sign systems, of which language is but one. Its use is significant here because **translation is not always limited to verbal languages. Intersemiotic translation**, for example, occurs when a written text is translated into a different mode, such as music, film, or painting

[...]

It is **interlingual translation**, between two different verbal sign systems, that has been the traditional focus of translation studies. However... the very notion of ‘translation proper’ and of the stability of source and target has been challenged. The question of what we mean by ‘translation’, and how it differs from ‘adaptation’, ‘version’, ‘transcreation’ (the creative adaptation of video games and advertising in particular), ‘localization’ (the linguistic and cultural adaptation of a text for a new locale) and so on, is a very real one. Sandra Halverson (1999) claims that **translation can be better considered as a prototype classification, that is, that there are basic core features that we associate with a prototypical translation, and other translational forms which lie on the periphery.**’ (Munday 2012 pp. 8-9)

Jakobson on theories of signification – the linguistic / semiotic codification of the empirical and abstract world and how this relates to translation – for further details about this see Pérez Fernández’s article on Octavio Paz’s translations of John Donne.⁶

‘According to Bertrand Russell, “no one can understand the word ‘cheese’ unless he has a nonlinguistic acquaintance with cheese”. If, however, we follow Russell’s fundamental precept and place our “emphasis upon the linguistic aspects of traditional philosophical problems”, then we are obliged to state that no one can understand the word “cheese” unless he has an acquaintance with the meaning assigned to this word in the lexical code of English. Any representative of a cheese-less culinary culture will understand the English word “cheese” if he is aware that in this language it means “food made of pressed curds” and if he has at least a linguistic acquaintance with “curds”. We never

⁶ ‘Traducción y poética en Octavio Paz a través de sus versiones de John Donne’ (part 1 [Letral](#) 5 (2010): 70-90 & part 2 [Letral](#) 7 (2011): 13-37)

consumed ambrosia or nectar and have only a linguistic acquaintance with the words “ambrosia”, “nectar”, and “gods”—the name of their mythical users; nonetheless, we understand these words and know in what contexts each of them may be used’. (Jakobson 2004 p. 138)

‘The meaning of the words ‘cheese,’ ‘apple,’ ‘nectar,’ ‘acquaintance,’ ‘but,’ ‘mere,’ and of any word or phrase whatsoever is definitely a linguistic—or to be more precise and less narrow—a semiotic fact. Against those who assign meaning (*signatum*) not to the sign, but to the thing itself, the simplest and truest argument would be that nobody has ever smelled or tasted the meaning of ‘cheese’ or of ‘apple.’ There is no *signatum* without *signum*. The meaning of the word ‘chese’ cannot be inferred from a nonlinguistic acquaintance with cheddar or with camembert without the assistance of the verbal code. **An array of linguistic signs is needed to introduce an unfamiliar word.** Mere pointing will not teach us whether ‘cheese’ is the name of the given specimen, or of any box of camembert, or of camembert in general or of any cheese, any milk product, any food, any refreshment or perhaps any box irrespective of contents. Finally, does a word simply name the thing in question, or does it imply a meaning such as offering, sale, prohibition, or malediction? (Pointing actually may mean malediction; in some cultures, particularly in Africa, it is an ominous gesture).’ (Jakobson 2004 pp. 138-39)

‘For us, both as linguists and as ordinary word-users, the meaning of any linguistic sign is its translation into some further, alternative sign, especially a sign “in which it is more fully developed,” as Peirce, the deepest inquirer into the essence of signs, insistently stated. The term “bachelor” may be converted into a more explicit designation, “unmarried man,” whenever higher explicitness is required. **We distinguish three ways of interpreting a verbal sign: it may be translated into other signs of the same language, into another language, or into another, nonverbal system of symbols. These three kinds of translation are to be differently labeled:**

1. **Intralingual translation or *rewording* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language.**
2. **Interlingual translation or *translation proper* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language.**
3. **Intersemiotic translation or *transmutation* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems.**

The intralingual translation of a word uses either another, more or less synonymous, word or resorts to a circumlocution. Yet synonymy, as a rule, is not complete equivalence: for example, “every celibate is a bachelor, but not every bachelor is a celibate.” A word or an idiomatic phrase-word, briefly a code-unit of the highest level, may be fully interpreted only by means of an equivalent combination of code-units, i.e., a message referring to this code-unite: “every bachelor is an unmarried man, and every unmarried man is a bachelor,” or “every celibate is bound not to marry, and everyone who is bound not to marry is a celibate.”

[...]

Most frequently, however, **translation from one language into another substitutes messages in one language not for separate code-units but for entire messages in some other language.** Such a translation is a reported speech; the translator recodes and transmits a message received from another source. Thus **translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes.**’ (Jakobson 2004 p. 139)

Jakobson against the ‘dogma of untranslatability’:

‘Both the practice and the theory of translation abound with intricacies, and from time to time attempts are made to sever the Gordian knot by proclaiming the dogma of untranslatability... All cognitive experience and its classification is conveyable in any existing language. Whenever there is deficiency, terminology may be qualified and amplified by loan-words or loan-translations, neologisms or semantic shifts, and finally, by circumlocutions... No lack of grammatical device in

the language translated into makes impossible a literal translation of the entire conceptual information contained in the original.' (Jakobson 2004 p. 140)

Linguistic communication as interpretation – interpretation as translation

'In its cognitive function, language is minimally dependent on the grammatical pattern because **the definition of our experience stands in complementary relation to metalinguistic operations—the cognitive level of language not only admits but directly requires recoding interpretation, i.e., translation.** Any assumption of ineffable or untranslatable cognitive data would be a contradiction in terms. But in jest, in dreams, in magic, briefly, in what one would call everyday verbal mythology and in poetry above all, the grammatical categories carry a high semantic import. In these conditions, the question of translation becomes much more entangled and controversial.' (Jakobson 2004 pp. 141-42)

7 New directions from the new media

Communication, media and translation. See Marshall McLuhan's *Understanding Media* (1st published 1964), London & New York: Routledge, 2001. In particular his chapter 6, "Media as Translators" (pp. 62-67)

Audiovisual translation – codes and narratives

‘Very dramatic developments in translation studies have occurred in the field of audiovisual translation, most notably subtitling. Initially audiovisual translation was more or less overlooked by translation theory. Katharina Reiss (1971/2000) had included what she termed an **‘audio-medial’** text type, but this was not developed and indeed her definition seemed to refer more to fields such as advertising rather than film and documentary translation. In James S. Holmes’s map there is a category of **‘medium-restricted’ theories** but no specific mention of audiovisual at all. Later, Snell-Hornby (1988/1995) links ‘film’ to ‘literary translation’ in her integrated theory.’ (Munday 2012 p. 268)

‘Early articles by Titford (1982) and Mayoral et al. (1988) coined the term **‘constrained translation’**, focusing on **the non-verbal elements that marked out audiovisual translation**. Notwithstanding these publications, and despite a lengthy bibliography, **Dirk Delabastita** was justified in saying that the field was ‘still a virgin area of research’ at the time of his groundbreaking article **‘Translation and mass communication: Film and TV translation as evidence of cultural dynamics’** (1989: 202). That article sought **to identify some of the important characteristics of this type of translation, namely that ‘film establishes a multi-channel and multi-code type of communication’** (*ibid.*: 196). These codes include what Delabastita describes as:

- **the verbal** (with various stylistic and dialectical features)
- **the literary and theatrical** (plot, dialogue, etc., appropriate to the genre)
- **the proxemic and kinetic** (relating to a wide range of non-verbal behaviour)
- **the cinematic** (camera techniques, film genres and so on)

Delabastita avoids any simplistic verbal-non-verbal distinction by emphasizing that the visual channel sometimes conveys verbal signs (e.g. credits, letters, shop signs) and that the acoustic channel transmits some non-verbal signs (music, background noise, etc.). He maps this against five types of operative realizations drawn from Classical rhetoric (repetition, addition, reduction, transmutation and substitution) to give a large number of possible translation procedures (*ibid.*: 199-200)

It is noteworthy that Delabastita constantly compares film translation to other forms of translation, such as theatrical performance, in order to determine its distinctive character. In his view, the major difference is that, whereas drama is constituted slightly differently on each occasion it is performed, film is recorded and ‘is perfectly producible in material terms’. That is, once recorded, the film is distributed and replayed to and by different audiences but, except on rare occasions, it remains unaltered. There are also very particular **constraints** that normally govern the translation of

film, namely the co-existence of the sound channel and the vision channel, which restrict the procedures open to the translator.’ (Munday 2012 p. 269)

‘Frederic Chaume proposes a combination of **translation studies and film studies** in an attempt to produce an ‘integrated’ model of analysis of ‘rules’ and norms designed for the analysis of ‘the signifying codes of cinematographic language’ (Chaume 2004: 13, 16). Chaume identifies ten such codes (*ibid.*: 17-22). The first four concern the acoustic channel:

- 1) **The linguistic code:** Here Chaume makes the crucial point that problems such as wordplay, co-presence of multiple languages, culture-specific elements, etc. ‘are shared by other translation types (e.g. legal, scientific, technical, etc.) and should not be considered problems specific to audiovisual translation’. For him, the features of the linguistic code in audiovisual texts are that they are most often scripted but ‘written to be spoken as if not written’, which poses considerable demands on the translator to conform to a similar register.
- 2) **The paralinguistic code:** The preparation of dubbing scripts would involve the addition of symbols to indicate laughter, pauses, and so on, while in subtitling graphical signs (upper case, exclamation marks, suspension marks, etc.) indicate voice level, tone and pauses.
- 3) **The musical and special effects code:** The representation and adaptation of song lyrics and their function.
- 4) **The sound arrangement code:** There are differences depending on whether the speaker is on or off screen. This will necessitate orthographic variation in subtitling (an off-screen character’s words may be indicated in italics) and will affect both the translation procedure and sound quality in dubbing (an on-screen speaker’s words will need to be lip-synchronized).

The other six codes relate to the visual channel

- 5) **The iconographic code:** Iconographic symbols unlikely to be recognized by the TT viewer (e.g. a picture or portrait of a figure famous in the SL culture but not in the TL culture) may need verbal explanation if it is important for the understanding of the text. Coherence with the image needs to be maintained. Similarly, any wordplay with reference to an item that appears on screen creates a specific problem. Like Delabastita above, Chaume (*ibid* 19) makes the point that audiovisual translation is distinct since the presence of the image on screen restricts the range of free translation that would be open to written translation.
- 6) **Photographic codes:** Examples of the problems which arise are changes in lighting which necessitate a change of colour for subtitles and also the use of a culture-specific visual or colour feature which may confuse or be misunderstood by the TT audience. So, while in Asia white is often associated with death (for example, a white carnation in a Japanese film), in the west it is more commonly the colour black. On the other hand, a red carnation may be the symbol of love.
- 7) **The planning code:** Relates to close-ups that require lip synchronization in dubbing and also the translation of important information on features that are not spoken (on posters, etc.).
- 8) **The mobility code:** Concerns the positioning of the characters in a dubbed scene and the need to co-ordinate movement and words (e.g. a shake of the head and a negative phrase in most cultures).
- 9) **Graphic codes:** The representation of intertitles, titles, text and subtitles that appear on screen in the ST. This is a particular problem for dubbing.
- 10) **Syntactic codes:** Involve editing principles, such as the checking of the association of a verbal textual element to the image and other semiotic forms and also the start and end of sequences.

Chaume's codes are useful in drawing attention to the non-linguistic and particularly to the visual. Only one of the ten codes is linguistic, a huge departure from the norm in most translation studies work. The main focus is applied. That is, on a model that has pedagogical applications, for teaching the techniques to trainee subtitlers. However, in Chaume's paper, and perhaps due to space limitations, there is little indication of precisely how these codes are realized on screen. As far as the linguistic code is concerned, there seems to be quite general agreement on the relatively restricted number of such issues in audiovisual translation (reduction, omission, register variation, humour, punctuation, etc., see Gambier 2003: 153). It is quite possible that future progress in descriptive studies will come from the exploration of the other codes and from taking up Jorge Díaz Cintas's call for macro-level incorporation of those aspects of power, culture and ideology that for some time have been common in 'mainstream' translation studies (Díaz Cintas 2003: 32)' (Munday 2012 pp. 276-8)

New Technologies

The use of new technologies in translation has 'spawned innovative theoretical work that discusses what these changes mean for the translator and for our conceptualization of translation. **Anthony Pym's *The Moving Text: Localization, Translation, and Distribution*** (2004), partly a reworking of his earlier *Translation and Text Transfer* (1992), is a major contribution to the theoretical discussion. It revisits common issues of translation within this new context. For example, a translation theory perspective is applied to **internationalization**, which leads to the adaptation of accepted communication models. Thus, the production of multiple TL versions (e.g. software localized for distribution worldwide in the local languages) modifies the 'simple' model of ST-TT transfer. An internationalized, **interlingua** version (a term taken from machine translation) is used as a basis for producing the versions for the TL locale. It is this interlingua version which is constantly updated, so that the status and role of the initial ST disappears (Pym 2004: 34-5, drawing on Lamber 1989). In internationalization, instead of representing a measure of TT against its ST, equivalence is above all concerned with the **functionality** of the target text. **Pym identifies the differentiating features of this new industrial phenomenon as being complexity and size of environment:**

Perhaps the most obvious of these differences is that of size. Internationalization, indeed the whole discourse of localization, is traditionally concerned with narrow professional locales. Translational equivalence, on the other hand, is traditionally concerned with large-scale complex social entities [and] cannot help but engage in the complexity and overlaps of culture. (Pym 2004: 65)

The picture Pym paints of localization is one of a dehumanizing process focused on marketing locale rather than human cultures. Projects are conducted in teams of individuals who rarely see the larger picture and who are governed by deadlines, regulations and the market (*ibid.* 198). In addition, a more recent phenomenon which needs to be taken into account is that of **collaborative translation** (also known as **crowdsourcing**) often among large groups of non-professional translators. Outstanding examples include the translation (or local-ization) of Facebook, or Wikipedia. But such practices raise ethical questions of quality, fair pay and status—can or should a competent translation be attempted without payment and without the employment of professionals?' (Munday 2012 pp. 281-2)

8 The Languages of Cinema

‘As my title suggests... mainly I want to consider the issue of translation in film: what is being translated onto film; **how viewers translate among the different sign-systems they are seeing on a screen** (and hearing on a sound track); how and when national cultures count and do not count.’ (Wood 2005 p. 89)

Grigori Kozintsev’s *King Lear*

‘The credits are in Russian, and just before they end we hear a human voice chanting, also in Russian. Then comes a series of noises calling out for interpretation or naming. They sound like, and turn out to be, the creaking of a crude wooden-wheeled cart being pushed over rough ground, and the limping, irregular footsteps of a man walking with a stick on the same terrain. The images appear. They are black and white, and shot mostly from a middle distance, that is, neither in close-up nor in long shot. A group of poorly dressed people, men and women, many of them cripples, make their way with difficulty over a hillside dotted with stones like monoliths. It is hard to place them in time or space by their ragged clothes, but we may think of some undefined period in Europe somewhere between the Middle Ages and the Enlightenment. They look like whatever the European poor are supposed to look like when we allow them into the historical picture. One of them pauses, and blows a signal on a primitive horn: an announcement of some kind. Orchestral music starts up in the sound track. Now we do get a long shot, and a clearer sense of the hillside. Beyond it is a valley, into which these people—there must be a hundred or more of them—are peering. We cannot locate them in relation to the gathering mass of people because they have only sky behind them. But then suddenly we are in a particular place, where different, much better-dressed people are waiting, and two poised and wealthy-looking gentlemen walk down a wooden stairway leading from the battlements of a castle. The castle looks medieval, the two gentlemen and the waiting assembly seem to belong to a generic European Renaissance. The men speak, in Russian, the opening lines of *King Lear*:

I thought the King had more affected the Duke of Albany than Cornwall.
It did always seem so to us, but now, in the division of the
kingdom, it appears not which of the dukes he values most, for
equalities are so weighed, that curiosity in neither can make choice
of either’s moiety.

The division of the kingdoms. That, presumably, is what the blast of the horn announced, that is what the cripples and the poor are assembling to hear about, however remotely. That is what the gentry are attending to more closely.’ (Wood 2005 pp. 79-80)

‘We are looking at the beginning of Grigori Kozintsev’s film of *King Lear* (1971). The Russian words we hear are those of Boris Pasternak, author of this translation, and the discreetly sounding music is by Dmitri Shostakovich. But the words we see on the screen, if we are viewing a print with English subtitles, are not a translation of what we hear. They are the text of *King Lear*, the source of the speeches, not their rendering in English. We are hearing Pasternak’s translation, but reading untranslated Shakespeare. This unusually complicated relation of Russian to English, and of screen speech to screen text, opens up a whole range

of questions about language and translation in film, although the questions take on their full force only when we remember the larger context of the presentation: printed credits, chanting voice, noises off, black and white moving images, sound of horn, music in the sound track, difficulty of correlating images, hillside and castle, crowd and horsemen, speech in Russian, text in English.’ (Wood 2005 p. 80)

‘Who are these people on the hillside, for whom Shakespeare’s text seems to give no warrant, since it opens with the words I have just quoted? They inhabit “a cruel stone world,” in Kozintsev’s words, they and the landscape are “the ends of a civilization”: “the road to Lear’s castle, a way through the ravages of epoch, a stone chronicle.” But they do in fact respond to a textual cue. They are the “wretches” whom Lear, like most productions of the play, has forgotten and whom he remembers only in extreme destitution and distress. They are the people of the kingdom he has given away, and to whom he belatedly thinks a ruler should “shake the superfluous”—as if he or any other ruler would ever think the superfluous was superfluous while they had it. Kozintsev does not make his Lear speak of any superfluous, but he does bring these people—rhetorically present in Shakespeare’s “wretches, wheresoe’er you are”—physically to the screen. They cluster on the hillside at the start of the film, and they or their counterparts return when Lear enters a hovel on a heath, a huddled heap of faces and limbs, a vision of a human tangle borrowed, perhaps, from the crowded ship’s quarters of Eisenstein’s *Battleship Potemkin* (1925). Lear addresses them not as a memory of injustice but as a present mass of human suffering:

Poor naked wretches...
 That bide the pelgint of this pitiless night [the subtitle has storm],
 How shall your houseless heads, and unfed sides,
 Your loop’d and window’d raggedness, defend you
 From seasons such as these? O, I have ta’en
 Too little care of this!

Houseless, unfed, and ragged, they are the world of the governed, “the people without rights,” as Kozintsev calls them, the hapless human contents of the portions into which Lear has divided up his kingdom, and the film places them at its opening in order to remind us that a kingdom is more than a land, and that a land anyone wants to rule almost always has people on it.’ (Wood 2005 pp. 80-81)

Akira Kurosava’s *Ran*

‘Another hillside, more horsemen. But the hills are vast and grassy, and we see long vistas of them, a green landscape of rounded summits and deep valleys. The horsemen sit waiting, in groups of four or three or two, the only visible movement the twitching of their horses’ tails. There is faint, high violin music in the sound track. The credits on the side of the screen are in Japanese, so we can guess where we are. A closer look at the horsemen reveals them to have the beards and costumes of ancient Japanese warriors, longbows in their hands, quivers of arrows strapped to their backs. Suddenly a boar appears in close-up, and we know why the horsemen are waiting. The boar hears a sound, a starts to run. The hunting warriors appear behind him in hot pursuit. Other boars appear and the chase is on, boars and mounted huntsmen racing through the long grass. We see the oldest of the huntsmen draw his bow, still riding fast as he does so. The music now features a high-pitched flute, and the screen suddenly shows the film’s title, two large red characters, which look almost as if they have been painted in blood: *Ran*, meaning chaos.’ (Wood 2005 p. 81)

‘After the title the huntsmen sit in a canvas enclosure discussing their day. The oldest one, Lord Hidetora, falls asleep, and awakens to announce a strange dream. Then Hidetora says the time has come for peace, and he is stepping down, leaving his hard-won territories and his first castle to his eldest son; his second and third castles and corresponding lands to his second and third sons. He will retain only a thirty-man escort and the title of Great Lord. He plans to visit each of his son’s castles

in turn. The first two sons make obsequious speeches, saying all the right things, and the third son calls his father senile and crazy. The third son is blunt and harshly outspoken, not merely honest, but we begin to recognize the structure. The third son is Cordelia, he cannot lie, and he understands that his father fails to understand himself. More important, he understands, and clearly says, that their whole world is one of strife and chaos, that one cannot step down from a history of violence, and that an imperious, warlike father is not likely to have raised docile and unambitious sons. Like Cordelia, the third son is banished, and the story follows the patterns of *Ing Lear*—with the significant difference, of course, that English daughters have been transformed into Japanese sons. The film is Akira Kurosawa's *Ran* (1985).' (Wood 2005 pp. 81-2)

'The hunting scene corresponds in more than one way to that of the gathering crowd in Kozintsev's *King Lear*. The huntsmen, like the crowd, are waiting, and until we see the boar, we do not know what they are waiting for: an enemy, perhaps, a raid, or the onset of a battle. And although we soon learn the men are gathered for a sporting occasion, the occasion itself, the fast-riding, armed horsemen, and the ensuing conversation, are full of memories of war. More discursively, Kurosawa, like Kozintsev, is giving us, in imagery, a deep story that Shakespeare's text only hints at. In place of 'the people without rights' and their stony terrain, we have a culture of vigilance and discipline and the struggle for survival. 'I've tried to give Lear a history', Kurosawa said. 'I try to make it clear that his power must rest upon a lifetime of bloodthirsty savagery'. He makes this more than clear in the abdication scene I've just described, but all kinds of hints of this history lie in the opening images, with their complicated mixture of beauty and menace.' (Wood 2005 p. 82)

'In both Kozintsev's and Kurosawa's films something more than a production of Shakespeare is taking place: the cinema is not just a modern stage. In effect, **we are witnessing a double translation: from culture to culture and from medium to medium. The cultural translation is easy enough to track, and translation seems close enough to the right word. Shakespeare's ancient England becomes Kozintsev's Renaissance Russia; Lear's time becomes Shakespeare's time.** In the early stages of planning his film, Kozintsev visited Lear's 'places' in England: 'Newcastle-upon-Tyne, a ninth-century cathedral, castles, Anglo-Saxon monuments...'. He reports, 'I did not yet know what surroundings Lear was to have. Only not these; the action could not take place here'. Later he says his scene was to be 'the world of history without external historical characteristics; a world which is absolutely real (filmed on location), without existing in nature, constructed out of a montage which will last for two hours'. Much film theory is compressed into this lucid and paradoxical sentence, and we have seen the practice that results: **the construction not of an illusion but of an emblematic reality. Kurosawa's translation of England into Japan, here as in his earlier film, *Throne of Blood* (1957), based on *Macbeth*, comes eerily close not so much to Shakespeare as to what we imagine the world of Shakespeare's sources to be like: violent and unforgiving, less courtly and Christian than he has managed to make it, even if his characters (in *King Lear*) do repeatedly invoke pagan gods. And the translation of three daughters into three sons is, I think, more than a response to cultural difference.** It is true that Shakespeare's audience would have had no difficulty in imagining powerful women, since their country had been ruled by two shrewd and ruthless queens for all of the fifty years before Shakespeare wrote *King Lear* and there is no Japanese equivalent for such public authority being given to women. But even if the shift of gender starts in historical plausibility, it ends somewhere else: in an implied question about the difference gender makes in struggles for power. This is too large a subject to tackle here, but it is worth saying briefly that *Ran* seems both to insist on the difference, and to make it, after we have registered all the obvious effects of dress and language and means of action, rather hard to find, since the most lethal and captivating figure in the film is not the king or any of his three sons, but the first son's wife (and second son's mistress), Lady Kaede.' (Wood 2005 pp. 82-3)

'**The translation from medium to medium is harder to describe correctly, since literally we are seeing the realization in one medium of a text designed for another: a virtual translation, let's say, or a real translation of the virtual text composed of various stage productions of the play, remembered, reconstructed, or imagined. It is not clear that translation is exactly the right word here; not clear either that there is a better one, since the phantom of a stage production of a famous play must haunt all film versions. One of the things these films must**

necessarily be, apart from films, is not-the-play. We think of live bodies, physical space, real time, and the triumphs and failures of stage illusion—that unmistakable, never precisely repeated gesture, that terrible makeup. A film has none of this, and in films based on Shakespeare we remember this absence. In fact, the difference between good and bad Shakespeare films often has to do with this absence. The trick is not to make us forget it, but to persuade us to do something with our memory. Kozintsev and Kurosava remind us constantly that their films are films, and it is for this reason that the notion of translation will not go away—even though it can usually quite easily be made to go away in the cinema. Both films turn a literal absence of fleshly life, a sequence of shadows on a screen, into a series of questions about the end or absence of life, about mortality and the shadowiness even of much actual existence. Think again of Kozintsev’s notion of a setting that is real but does not exist in nature and is made out of montage. A film world is always remade, put together out of pieces. **Both of these films ask us to think about the pieces and the putting together. And beyond that, since the translation is double (from medium to medium and from culture to culture) they ask us to think of the national origins of two sets of pieces, and of the national styles involved in putting them together**—assuming that even the most talented individual directors do not work entirely outside of any tradition.’ (Wood 2005 p. 83)

‘There are other relations of sound and image, and we have only to think of the celebrated seven minute ‘silent’ sequence in *Ran* to see what they may be. This sequence is silent in the sense that it has no dialogue or sound effects, only slow, haunting Mahler-influenced orchestral music (by Toru Takemitsu). But the silence is sudden, and the absence of noise is felt throughout the sequence. Lord Hidetora is being attacked by his two elder sons, we hear horses neighing, soldiers shouting, and see his abrupt alarm. One of his soldiers, several arrows in his body, collapses and dies, but not before saying they are in hell. Then the music rises, and everything else goes totally silent: arrows hit the castle walls, guns are fired, soldiers fall, Hidetora’s concubines commit suicide, men are yelling, flames appear, clouds billow—all inaudible. Then Hidetora’s eldest son Taro rides into the castle courtyard. The battle is over, apparently. The slow music continues, and so does the silence of the represented world. Then sound returns loudly as a gunshot kills Taro—one of his brother’s men has murdered him. Kurosawa’s metaphors are both visual and aural: a scene of carnage and sounds both heard and unheard. Death and betrayal are hell, and hell is silence, the dream-like muffling of the noises of the world, a place where even extreme violence cannot make itself heard.’ (Wood 2005 pp. 87-88)

‘The sequence, like the most memorable moments in many films, presents us with a finely articulated instance of the complexity of our question about translation. Here are countless elements that are local and untranslatable; local and translatable; not local at all but not translated; or translated into the most enduring, cosmic terms. We see persons and a world both clothed and unclothed in interpretation, in Proust’s terms, dressed in the brilliant colors of ancient courtly Japan, but also showing glimpses of Lear’s ‘thing itself’, ‘unaccommodated man’. And as we listen to the civilized music of the Western concert hall we try in vain to hear the sounds of an Eastern world that has died.’ (Wood 2005 p. 88)

9 Translation, Literary and Cultural Studies

Kwame Anthony Appiah on literary translation:

‘Literary conventions... make possible acts that can be defined by reference not only to the meanings—both literal and non-literal, direct and indirect—of utterances, but also to features that are broadly formal—alliteration, meter, rhyme, plot-structure. What they do not usually do—and here, as I say, proverbs are an exception—is determine how we should construct a meaning—in the sense of a set of intentions operating through the Gricean mechanism—for the work.

Because the novel and the sonnet are not conventionally constituted by a process of meaning-generation, there is no set of conventions to which we can refer, analogous to the conventions of literal meaning, for deciding what the work means; there are no literary intentions, conventional and Gricean, to correspond to literal intentions. Because there are literal intentions we can say what a literal assertoric utterance is for—it is to communicate such-and-such information; it may be possible, then, in literal translation, to find a sentence in a target language that has more or less the same literal intentions as the utterance in the object-language. If it is not possible, it may be clear enough why: there is no way of expressing that thought in the target language, perhaps because the referent of some term is unknown here, or because a social practice in which the utterance is embedded—the curse, say—is absent. Success and failure at this level are well-enough defined.

But for literary translation our object is not to produce a text that reproduces the literal intentions of the author—not even the one’s she’s cancelling—but to produce something that shares the central literary properties of the object-text; and, as is obvious, these are very much under-determined by its literal meaning, even in the cases where it has one. A literary translation, so it seems to me, aims at producing a text whose relation both to the literary and to the linguistic conventions of the culture of the translation is relevantly like the relations of the object-text to its culture’s conventions. A precise set of parallels is likely to be impossible, just because the changes that metrical and other formal features of a work can be reproduced while preserving the identity of literal and non-literal, direct and indirect, meaning are vanishingly small.

And, in fact, we may choose, rightly, to translate a term in a way that is unfaithful to the literal intentions, because we are trying to preserve formal features that seem more crucial. But even if we did not have to make such choices, even if we could, *per impossibile*, meet all the constraints of the Gricean meaning and all the literary conventions, we would not have produced the perfect translation: we could do better, we could aim to reproduce literary qualities of the object-text that are not a matter of the conventions.

So that the reason why we cannot speak of the perfect translation here is not that there is a definite set of desiderata and we know they cannot be met; it is rather that there is no definite set of desiderata. A translation aims to produce a new text that matters to one community the way another text matters to another: but it is part of our understanding of why texts matter that this is not a question that convention settles; indeed, it is part of our understanding of literary judgment, that there can always be new readings, new things that matter about a text, new reasons for caring about new properties.’ (Appiah 2004 p. 397)

Appiah offers here some very interesting thoughts on the concept of literature, and how it relates to education—and translation. This has important implications first for translation as a vehicle for the transmission and articulation of knowledge, and second for an analysis of the material conditions that make it possible and therefore determine not only the whole process, but the end-product. In the same way as there is a continuum between literary and non-literary texts (a distinction which is only conventional), there is also a continuum between different types of semiotic systems or codes, and of the process of symbolic or semiotic transfer between them—i.e. what Jakobson calls intersemiotic translation. Here we move from ‘literal’ translation, on to ‘literary’ translation, and then finally on to ‘cultural’ translation—i.e. the translation of the complex conglomerates of signifiers that weave the *text* of a culture. Appiah’s emphasis on the reception of text, on the reading process, also focuses on the nature of translation as *interpretation*. Not least relevant among the different topics that Appiah deals with in his text, is the *pedagogical* and *ethic* role of reading, literature and translation, what he calls the process of undertaking ‘the harder project of a genuinely informed respect for others’, since translation addresses alterity, addresses different types of discourse, and the variety of identities they constitute. In that respect, Appiah concludes that ‘until we face up to difference, we cannot see what price tolerance is demanding from us’

It is a feature, simply put, of the written text that we do not have settled and definite ideas about what matters about it. What is also clear is that in our culture we have settled on a particular set of institutional mechanisms for addressing the question of what matters... **The role of literature, indeed, the formation of the concept, the institution of ‘literature’—which is to say our concept of it—is indissoluble from pedagogy.** Roland Barthes expressed the point in a characteristic—and justly oft-cited—apothegm:

“l’enseignement de la littérature” est pour moi presque tautologique. La littérature, c’est ce qui s’enseigne, un point c’est tout

Abstracted from its context, this formulation no doubt requires some qualifying glosses. But let me express the point only slightly hyperbolically: what counts as a fine translation of a literary text—which is to say a taught text—is that it should preserve for us the features that make it worth teaching.

Questions of adequacy of translation thus inherit the indeterminacy of questions about the adequacy of the understanding displayed in the process we now call ‘reading’—which is to say that process of writing about texts which is engaged in by people who teach them. If I may be excused the solecism of quoting what I myself have written elsewhere:

To focus on the issue of whether a reading is *correct* is to invite the question, ‘What is it that a reading is supposed to give a correct account *of?*’ The quick answer—one that, as we shall see immediately, tells us less than it pretends to—is, of course, ‘the text’. But the text exists as linguistic, as historical, as commercial, as political event; and while each of these ways of conceiving the very same object provides opportunities for pedagogy, each provides different opportunities: opportunities between which we must choose. We are inclined at the moment to talk about this choice as if the purposes by which it is guided were, in some sense, given. But were that true, we would have long agreed on the nature of a literary reading: and there is surely little

doubt that the concept of a ‘literary reading’, like the concept of ‘literature’ is what W.B. Gallie used to call an ‘essentially contested concept.’ To understand what a reading is, is to understand that what counts as a reading is always up for grabs.

In the same place I argued that **we should give up language that implies an epistemology in which the work has already a meaning that is waiting for us to find and ask instead what modes of reading are productive.** Since reading in this sense is, as I have suggested, so strongly bound up with questions about teaching, **answers to the question “What modes of teaching are productive?” will derive from an ethics and politics of literary pedagogy: from a sense about why we should teach texts, which we should teach, what this teaching is worth to our students, and so on.** And what this notion suggest, of course, for the concerns of this talk is that we might seek to **operate with a correlative notion of productive modes of translation.**’ (Appiah 2004 pp. 398-99)

Appiah’s concept of ‘thick translation’

‘... a translation that aims to be of use in literary teaching; and here it seems to me that such ‘academic’ translation, translation that seeks with its annotations and its accompanying glosses to locate the text in a rich cultural and linguistic context, is eminently worth doing. I have called this ‘thick translation’...

Remember what I said at the start: utterances are the products of actions, which like all actions, are undertaken for reasons. **Understanding the reasons characteristic of other cultures and (as an instance of this) other times is part of what our teaching is about:** this is especially important because in the easy atmosphere of relativism—in the world of ‘that’s just your opinion’ that pervades the high schools that produce our students—one thing that can get entirely lost is the rich differences of human life in culture. One thing that needs to be challenged by our teaching is the confusion of relativism and tolerance... And that, of course, is a task for my sort of teaching—philosophical teaching—and it is one I am happy to accept. But there is a role here for literary teaching also, in challenging this easy tolerance, which amounts not to a celebration of human variousness but to a refusal to attend to how various other people really are or were. **A thick description of the context of literary production, a translation that draws on and creates that sort of understanding, meets the need to challenge ourselves and our students to go further, to undertake the harder project of a genuinely informed respect for others. Until we face up to difference, we cannot see what price tolerance is demanding from us.**’ (Appiah 2004 p. 399)

Hayes’s introduction (Hayes 2009) features some interesting insights on methodological issues, and on the ways in which the history of translation should be approached. She emphasizes the importance of prefaces (i.e. paratexts). The introduction has an interesting and useful section on how to build up a corpus which includes bibliographical databases—as it also complains about the frequent lack of bibliographical databases.

The appropriation of cultural, rhetorical and literary capital – on the construction of national identities

In the same way as Cicero appropriated the rhetorical capital and prestige of the Greeks through translation,⁷ the project of the Académie Française, and one of its chief translators, Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt, sought to appropriate Cicero's literary capital through their translation of *Huit oraisons de Cicéron*

In 1638, Paris publisher Jean Camusat created a stir by bringing out a handsome quarto volume that was immediately understood to be an anonymous manifesto for the literary and cultural ambitions of the recently formed Académie française. The work, *Huit oraisons de Cicéron*, was a set of translations from Cicero; the translators were known to be four young intellectuals attached to Valentin Conrart, the 'father' of the Académie. Chief contributor to the enterprise was Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt; educated at the Collège de Sedan and, like Conrart, a Protestant, he went on to become the leading translator of the day. The *Huit oraisons* volume proposed a French style of eloquence equal to that of the great Roman orator; it signalled a national project dedicated to promoting the preeminence of the French language. The *Huit oraisons* also opened a chapter in the history of translation in the West. By emphasizing both the literary values of their audience and the freedom of their approach, d'Ablancourt and his colleagues reshaped 'ancienne Eloquence' to modern sensibilities and struck a profound chord with readers. Such 'neoclassical' translations would become one of the principal vectors not just for the understanding of the classics but also for the development of a national literature in both France and Britain, providing the basis for an ongoing series of debates on translation, authorship, language, and culture for over a century to come.' (Hayes 2009 pp. 1-2)

'Translation is one of the key means by which the singularity of the literary event becomes absorbed into cultural practice. Translation makes language visible, reminding us that the bridges between cultures can never be taken for granted, but instead require patient probing and an openness to otherness and difference. The history of translation helps us to put contemporary issues within a larger perspective, to enlarge our experience, and to understand our alternatives. In recent decades, the rise of translation studies as an independent discipline at the confluence of philosophy, historical linguistics, and literary studies, as well as the calls for 'global awareness' in popular culture and public life, have produced a vibrant, interdisciplinary, and timely field of inquiry. Through translation studies we examine our place within language, culture, and history, and our ability to communicate that reality and to understand the realities of others.

These are the broader concerns animating my study of the work of translators in France and Britain throughout **the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a period of intense intercultural dialogue** between the two countries, **during which translation and the critical reflection inspired by it provided a framework for crucial features of the transition to modernity.** Among the questions confronted by translators are **the shifting relation to the classical past and the working-through of the loss of that past, the consolidation of national identity as represented in the national language,** the construction of multiple approaches to authorial identity as well as a variety of techniques for expressing individual subjectivities in writing, and the creation of new conceptual spaces for imagining otherness, dialogue, and cultural change. These themes emerge across several spheres of activity. **Translations from the Greek and Latin classics afforded sources of inspiration and emulation that enabled the vernacular literature to develop its own voice; translations from the Christian scriptures (and sacred writings from other traditions) provided new ways of experiencing one's faith and new avenues for exploring the relationship between language, truth, and meaning; and translations from recent and contemporary works in the modern languages have broadened cross-cultural communication and expanded the republic of letters.'** (Hayes 2009 2-3)

'At the moment of the publication of the *Huit oraisons*, d'Ablancourt and his friends were poised—by personal connections and talent, as well as by the confluence of political,

⁷ In his *De oratore* (1.34.155) Cicero had already described how he used to translate from Greek to transfer the rhetorical and stylistic excellence from the best Greek orators into his native Latin usage. But he also did so to improve his competence in that language.

institutional, and aesthetic developments bound up in the founding of the Academy—to play a key role in the making of French classical taste.

The “belles infidèles” occasioned considerable debate in their day. Neoclassical translation practice actually involved a range of approaches to **issues of freedom versus fidelity, the relation of past to present, and the capacity of language to represent other cultural realities.** Nevertheless, beginning with Germaine de Staël and the Romantics, there has been a tendency to lump all the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries’ translators together and to condemn translation “in the French manner” as overly restricted to the confines of local taste and unavailable to authentic cultural dialogue. This critique has been amplified in the work of recent theorists such as Antoine Berman and Lawrence Venuti, who qualify French and English neoclassical translation practice as ‘ethnocentric’ and ‘hegemonizing’. While I believe that such critiques have provoked useful discussion of the norms appropriate for translators today, I also believe that we need a clearer, more nuanced understanding of the past. Certainly, **inasmuch as the work of neoclassical translators subtends broader cultural projects such as the centralization and purification of the national language to the exclusion of regional variants and other local languages, it too has its darker side, its affiliation with nationalism and internal colonization. Bible translation, to cite another example, can be viewed in relation to expansionism and the rise of imperialism during the period studied here.**’ (Hayes 2009 pp. 6-7)

Translation and the European Enlightenment

‘While vernacular translations played a significant role throughout Europe from the Middle Ages onward, **I focus on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century France and England not only because of the significant place each country had in the other’s political and social imagination, creating a cross-channel dialogue that would become a crucial feature of the European Enlightenment, but also because during this period translators in the two countries were extremely aware of each other’s practice. An implicit conversation on *how* and *why* to translate mirrored the exchange of ideas in the literary, philosophical, and scientific communities** [NOTE 2 to p. 3: Recent scholarship on ‘the Channel zone’ emphasizes the significance of the Anglo-French dialogue in this period. See the essays in M. Cohen and C. Dever, *Literary Channel*; see also Falvey and Brooks, *Channel in the Eighteenth Century*. Franco Moretti charts the ongoing relationship of France and Britain as the ‘narrative super powers’ of the nineteenth century (*Atlas of the European Novel*)]. Beginning in the 1640s, exiled English royalist men of letters at the court of France, such as John Denham and Abraham Cowley, came into contact with the work of d’Ablancourt and his circle. The neoclassical translators were best known for translations characterized by strong literary values and highly adaptative or ‘localizing’ translation strategies aimed at making the original author ‘speak French’ according to the standards of taste of the day. While not without controversy, such translations—dubbed *les belles infidèles* (lovely unfaithful ones)—proved extremely popular in both countries and set the standard for literary translation. The intensity of the cross-channel dialogue continued to increase throughout the eighteenth century. Not only did the French and British translate each other’s works extensively, but French and British translators also read each other’s work, commenting on it—and sometimes borrowing from it. The mutual translations and commentaries bespeak a broad and extremely complex pattern of identity and difference, emulation and rivalry, *anglomanie* and *anglophobie*, Francophilia and Francophobia throughout the period.’ (Hayes 2009 p. 3)

Translation in 18th-century Germany – vs. the French tradition of *les belles infidèles* – culture wars fought in the turf of translation as French, English and German compete for the position of leader as the international currency for literary capital

“This chapter, devoted to Herder and the problematic of translation established in Germany in the second half of the eighteenth century, could be placed under the aegis of two notions that recur frequently in texts of that period: *Erweiterung* and *Treue*. *Erweiterung* means expansion, amplification. We have already encountered that word in Novalis, when he states that only in Germany have translations become “expansions.” ***Treue* means fidelity. The word carries great weight in German culture at the time and stands for a cardinal virtue in the affective sphere as well as in translation and national culture.** In this respect, to state that a translation must be faithful is not as trivial as it may seem at first sight. For, as Rosenzweig says, to translate is “to serve two masters” [Rosenzweig 1969 p. 194]: the foreign work and the foreign language; one’s own public and one’s own language. A double fidelity is needed, then, incessantly threatened by the specter of a double treason. But fidelity, for that matter, is by no means an historical constant. **At the time when, in Germany, fidelity is being celebrated with almost marital overtones by Breitinger, Voss, and Herder, France translates without the least concern for fidelity and continues its never-abandoned tradition of “embellishing” and “poeticizing” translations. The German theory of translation consciously positions itself against these translations “after the French manner.”** At the close of this period, A.W. Schlegels expressed this view in very vigorous terms:

Other nations have adopted a totally conventional phraseology in poetry, so that it is totally impossible to make a poetic translation of anything whatsoever into their language—Fench is an example... It is as if they wanted every foreigner among them to behave and to dress according to the customs of the land, and that explains why they never really get to know the foreign. [NOTE 2 to p. 36: August Wilhelm Schlegel, *Geschichte der klassischen Literatur* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1964), p. 17. Quoted in Lefevere, *Translating Literature*, p. 52]

This way of translating is in perfect conformity with the dominant position of French culture at the time, a culture which did not need to go through the law of the foreign to affirm its own identity. French, far from opening itself to the influx of foreign languages, rather tended to *replace* these as a means of communication in the European intellectual and political sphere. In these circumstances, there is no room for any consciousness of fidelity. The position of eighteenth-century German only acquires more weight in the process. It refers to a cultural problematic which, as it were, is the *reverse* of the French [NOTE 3 to p. 198: Collardeau has given a remarkable summary of the French problematic at the end of the eighteenth century: “If there is any merit in translating, it is perhaps only to perfect the original, if possible, to embellish it, to appropriate it, to give it a national air and, in some way, to naturalize this foreign plant.” (Quoted in Van der Meerschen, “Traduction française, problèmes de fidélité et de qualité,” in “Traduzione – tradizione,” special issue of *Lectures* 4-5 [1980], p. 18].

This problematic could be formulated at first in the following way: the German language lacks “culture,” and to acquire it, it must to through a certain *expansion*, which presupposes translations marked by fidelity. For in what respect woul a translation that mirrors the “French manner” expand the horizon of the language and the culture? Such is the general argument for Breitinger, Laibniz, Voss, and Herder.’ (Berman, 1992, pp. 35-36)

Cassin 2014 on Herder, linguistic nationalism and the role played by philosophy and translation in the Herder, Heidegger and the German tradition in general:

“The other position from which we wish to distinguish our own is the one that has led philosophy from the idea of **the spirit of language**, with all its clichés, to an **‘ontological nationalism’** (the expression is that of Jean-Pierre Lefebvre). **The position finds its image in Herder, at the moment when he determines that translation, as imitation and transplantation, is the true vocation of the German language:** “If in Italy the muse converses in song, if in France she narrates and reasons politely, if in Spain she imagines chivalrously, in England thinks sharply and deeply, what does she do in Germany? She *imitates*. To *imitate* would thus be her character.... To this end we have

in our power an admirable means, *our language*; it can be for us what the *hand* is for the person who imitates art' (Herder, *Briefe*). The position is also represented by a certain Heideggerian tradition of 'philosophical language', that is to say, the language best suited to speak faithfully for being, which occupies a predominant place in the history of this so Continental Western philosophy. Martin Heidegger thinks that Western thought is born less in Greece than in Greek and that only the German language rises to the level of Greek in the hierarchy of philosophical languages, so that 'untranslatability finally becomes the criterion of truth' (Lefebvre, 'Philosophie et philologie'). 'The Greek language is philosophical, i.e., ... it philosophizes in its basic structure and formation. The same applies to every genuine language, in a different degree, to be sure. The extent to which this is so depends on the depth and power of the existence of the people and race who speak the language and exist within it. Only our German language has a deep and creative philosophical character to compare with the Greek' (Heidegger, *Essence of Human Freedom*). Even if it is 'true' in one sense (Greek and German words and forms are obligatory places of passage for many articles in the *Dictionary*), this is not the truth we need. Our work is as far as could be from such a sacralization of the untranslatable, based on the idea of an absolute incommensurability of languages and linked to the near-sanctity of certain languages. This is why, marking our distance from a teleological history organized according to a register of gain and loss, we have not conferred a special status on any language, dead or alive." (Cassin's "Introduction" to Cassin, ed. 2014, p. xviii)

Translation as the impossible re-production of a speech act

"Thus far, I have been arguing for a historicizing viewpoint, insisting on the need to acknowledge the cultural specificity of each text, its contexts and concerns. Those concerns inevitably take on a new sheen in the light of our own, however. **We are not the public most immediately conceived by the creators of the texts; no amount of research will allow us total access to the palimpsest of allusion that constitutes each utterance.** I am talking as much about reading, about literary criticism, as about translation. **No reader today, however erudite, can replicate a seventeenth-century reader's response to d'Ablancourt's work, any more than d'Ablancourt could be perfectly sure that he had produced in readers of his *Tacite* the same effect that Tacitus had on the Romans of his day.** Which is not to say that he was wrong to imagine doing so. **The recurring proposopoeia of so many translators' prefaces—to make Virgil (or Homer, or Cervantes) speak as though he had been a compatriot of the translator—is an impossible speech act, but a compelling one.** Others felt differently: as Etienne de Silhouette observed in the 1730s, if Alexander Pope had written *The Essay on Man* in French, he probably would have written something quite different." (Hayes 2009 pp. 18-19)

"During the period from Galileo's recantation to the French Revolution, the world in which the neoclassical translators lived and worked underwent dramatic changes; the changes in the regime of translation are subtler but critical. Within the context of a given set of problems and practices, we see **an increased probing of the foundations of language, selfhood, and the cultural environment; an awareness of change; a growing appreciation for the specificities of language and its embeddedness in time and place.** Thus, while emphasising certain topics and trends in various chapters, I shall maintain a roughly chronological order. The initial two chapters each offer a broad survey of seventeenth-century translators' reflections in France and Britain. In the first, I examine d'Ablancourt's circle as well as the Jansenist translators at Port-Royal in order to look at **the place of translation in the constitution of French neoclassicism, which it both subtends and disrupts,** and at the rise of the notion of the French language as 'clear' and 'universal', but also subject to change. Turning to the English context, I focus **on translation's role for the Carolinian exiles, the interplay of translation and politics, and conflicting efforts to shape collective memory in the aftermath of the Civil War.** These chapters are followed by individual studies of two pivotal

turn-of-the-century figures whose influence was felt throughout the 18th century **John Dryden and Anne Dacier, both of whom crystallize tensions of the previous generation and open doors to the future in a pair of prefaces that are major theoretical and artistic statements. Dryden's *Dedication of the Aeneis* (1697) reaches not only back to Virgil but to his previous translators John Denham and Jean de Segrais in a reflection that confronts time, change, and the contradictory status of the translator-author. In her preface to the *Iliad* (1711) and contributions to the ensuing polemical exchange, Dacier examines historical distance, the legacy of past to present and the materiality of language in ways that frequently appear more 'modern' than her adversaries *les Modernes*.”** (Hayes, 2009, pp. 23-4)

“As we move into the eighteenth century, certain underlying issues take on more prominence; the availability of translation as a tool for *l'esprit philosophique* becomes more pronounced, and translation intersects with the primary threads in Enlightenment epistemology and social thought. The discourse on translation is a key site for the development of national consciousness; both French and English translators aim at defining and identifying with the national language, construing national identity in terms of the cross-Channel other. While translation and language theory can contribute to ethnocentrism and cultural stereotyping, what emerges in some quarters is an awareness of cultural specificity and of language as such. The remaining chapters thus look at questions that involve both French and English translators. Chapter 5, “Gender, Signature, Authority”, examines the work of women translators, their multiple strategies for being in the text, and their assumption of indirect authority / authorship. Chapter 6 discusses the ways in which Enlightenment thought intersected with tradition in the translation of ancient texts. Chapter 7, “Adventurers in Print,” turns to translation from the modern languages, with special attention to the practice of conferring formal critical prefaces and notes on modern works, a phenomenon particularly prevalent in the French treatment of English writers such as Pope, Shakespeare, Richardson, and Young. In conclusion, I examine the ways in which the history of translation was presented during the eighteenth century as a further means of setting the present study in historical perspective.” (Hayes, 2009, p. 24)

Hayes has an interesting “Writing the history of translation” section which discusses different schools and scholars in the field—which deserves careful reading. The following paragraph demonstrates how translation played an important role in the emergence of Enlightened Europe. Hayes here refers to the 17th century, and she focuses on England and France, but the trend hailed from far back: this is one more reason to justify a volume on Translation and the Early Modern Idea of Europe that seeks to encompass a wider variety of linguistic communities, and which also takes its starting point in the last years of the 15th century and the 16th century (and then the early 17th century, until Westphalia, say). There is no doubt that things intensify and gain momentum towards the end of the 17th century, and they sort of bloom in the 18th century, but again, the momentum was already there, and it started with the humanist translators of the late 15th century and continued apace during the 16th and 17th centuries:

“While vernacular translations played a significant role throughout Europe from the Middle Ages onward, I focus on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century France and England not only because of the significant place each country had in the other’s political and social imagination, creating a cross-channel dialogue that would become a crucial feature of the European Enlightenment, but also because during this period translators in the two countries were extremely aware of each other’s practice. An implicit conversation on *how* and *why* to translate mirrored the exchange of ideas in the literary, philosophical, and scientific communities. Beginning in the 1640s, exiled English royalist men

of letters at the court of France, such as John Denham and Abraham Cowley, came into contact with the work of d'Ablancourt and his circle. The neoclassical translators were best known for translations characterized by strong literary values and highly adaptative or 'localizing' translation strategies aimed at making the original author 'speak French' according to the standards of taste of the day. While not without controversy, such translations—dubbed *les belles infidèles* (lovely unfaithful ones)—proved extremely popular in both countries and set the standard for literary translation. The intensity of the cross-channel dialogue continued to increase throughout the eighteenth century. Not only did the French and British translate each other's works extensively, but French and British translators also read each other's work, commenting on it—and sometimes borrowing from it. The mutual translations and commentaries bespeak a broad and extremely complex pattern of identity and difference, emulation and rivalry, *anglomanie* and *anglophobie*, Francophilia and Francophobia throughout the period." (Hayes, 2009, p. 3)

Similar conclusions may be reached by reading the first paragraph of her “Conclusion: Historizing Translation” section. In particular, what she refers to as the awareness of the historicity of language had already appeared in late 15th century Italy, notably in the work of Lorenzo Valla, with far-reaching consequences. What Hayes says in the chapter she devotes to translation in the 18th century, and how translation intersects with the epistemology of the Enlightenment deserves more careful examination. Perhaps something new is that, by the 18th century, a series of theories of translation had already accrued over time, but even this already started in the 15th century (both in Italy and in Castile). Again, it is a case of the exacerbation and general pervasiveness of trends that had already somehow started in the late 15th and the 16th centuries:

“As we have seen, neoclassical translation is marked from its inception by historical consciousness: an awareness of the historicity of language—usage—and of translation practice. In France and England, the early neoclassical translators proclaim the ‘newness’ of their endeavor, their break with past practices, the progress and triumph of the national language. As the ‘new and nobler way’ becomes the standard for all, translation remains bound up in questions of temporality, of the entwining of past and present. By the eighteenth century, translation is perceived as having its own history. What can neoclassical translation history tell us about neoclassical translation practice? In these final pages, I turn to three accounts, quite different in their aims and scope: the preliminary discourse and chapter on the history of translation theory from the abbé Goujet’s *Bibliothèque française* (1740), Samuel Johnson’s *Idler* essays on the history of translation (1759), and Alexander Tytler’s *Essay on the Principles of Translation* (1791). While all three reflect mainstream neoclassical taste in translation, all call on us to view the movement in its complexity.” (Hayes, 2009, p. 237)

“In a lively and thought-provoking discussion of methodological issues in translation history, Anthony Pym argues that ‘even if everything that has preceded us were absolute rubbish... we should be able to say why what has been done is rubbish, according to what methodological faults, and how our future non-rubbish is going to correct those faults’ [Pym, 1998, 11]. Contemporary translations studies is too vast a field for me to give more than the briefest summary of those threads—rubbish or not—that have the most bearing on the present project. My intellectual debts are apparent from the bibliography. As I have already indicated, however, while scholars of translation history such as George Steiner, Louis Kelly, or Frederick Reiner have the great virtue of recognizing the rich interconnections among older statements on translation, their tendency to conflate the *longue durée* into a single moment or set of issues erases their historicity. I have already mentioned Steiner’s decision to designate nearly all writing on translation before Schleiermacher as ‘pre-hermeneutic’. All three tend to organize their analyses along structural or thematic lines, as if historical moment had no bearing on the question. Kelly’s discussion of the topos of the translator’s ‘struggle’ cites within a single paragraph Henri Meschonnic, Saint Jerome, Cecil Day Lewis, Yves Bonnefoy, Philo Judaeus,

Roger Bacon, Vladimir Nabokov, and Walter Benjamin [Kelly, Louis G. *The True Interpreter. A History of Translation in the West*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979, p. 132]; Renier refers to the eighteen hundred years from Cicero to Alexander Tytler as a single 'period' with a single 'theory of language' [Renier, Frederick. *Interpretatio: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1989, p. 13]. Of course, translation theory has its continuities, both temporal and transnational—but it is also situated in time and place. Etienne Dolet was burned at the stake and Perrenot d'Ablancourt elevated to the Académie Française within a century of each other." (Hayes, 2009, pp. 13-14).

"A great deal has been written on 'polysystem theory' in translation studies, a movement that is geographically scattered but still most closely associated with the work of Gideon Toury, Itamar Even-Zohar, and the journal *Poetics Today* [NOTE 28 to p. 14: See Toury, *Theory of Translation*, as well as numerous issues of *Poetics Today*, in particular the special issues on 'Translation Theory and Intercultural Relations' (edited by Even-Zohar and Toury) and 'Polysystem Studies' (edited by and featuring a collection of a number of important pieces by Even-Zohar). See also the essays in Hermans, *Manipulation of Literature*]. Toury's best-known work emphasizes the need to determine the 'norms' according to which a translation (or other literary work) functions within a literary system: What is linguistically or culturally acceptable? What function does the presence or absence of the author's or translator's name have in the publication and reception of the work? While Toury's interest in 'universals of translational behavior' encompasses transhistorical questions, others have offered interesting accounts of specific, historically situated literary systems as well as of systems changing over time. Descriptivist translation studies dovetails with other sociologically oriented approaches in literary studies, such as the examinations of the 'literary field' inspired by the work of Pierre Bourdieu. Thus historians such as Alain Viala and Gregory Brown have examined the categories by which works were judged and literary careers were made in the Ancient Regime [NOTE 29 to p. 14: <...> On the relation of polysystem theory to Bourdieu's work, see Codde, Philippe, "Polysystem theory revisited: A New Comparative Approach". *Poetics Today* 24, no. 1 (2003): 91-126]. The fact that 'strategies for success' for writers and translators were very different in 1630 and 1790 should warn us from too easy a conflation of similar-sounding translation theories from those years. (Is that not indeed the lesson learned from Pierre Menard?) **Who our translators were by birth, where they were educated, what faith they professed, what other forms of writing they engaged in, what sources of income and what forms of patronage they benefited from, what salons, academies, epistolary networks, and political activities they participated in—all of these elements infuse and have a bearing on the meaning of their work.**" (Hayes, 2009, pp. 14-15)

Like Pym's 1998 volume, Hayes's introduction provides an even-handed and sobering defence of historicism when it comes to the evaluation of translations and translators.

"For Bourdieu and other literary sociologists, as for the polysystems theorists, the aim is to understand the cultural reality of a moment in terms of 'success': how does the system operate so that certain works meet with approval, certain attitudes and positions achieve recognition and capital (whether cultural or real), while others do not? In such a view, the literary field is a 'force-field' in which 'positions-taking (works, political manifestos or demonstrations, and so on), which one may and should treat for analytical purposes as a 'system' of oppositions, are not the result of some kind of objective collusion, but rather the product and the stake of a permanent conflict [NOTE 30 to p. 15: Bourdieu, *Règles de l'art*, 381; citation from *Rules of Art*, 232. <Bourdieu, Pierre. *Les Règles de l'art: Genèse et structure du champ littéraire*. 2nd. Ed. Paris: Seuil, 1998. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995]. **While I have endeavoured to keep aspects of this agonistic literary 'system' and of translator's socioeconomic status, relative prestige, and so forth in mind in the readings ahead, it will quickly become clear that my main purpose lies not in determining what produced 'success' in the field of translation. Here the aims and methods of a literary scholarship influenced by philosophy and the history of ideas part ways with a more sociological approach. Hence I will be less concerned with describing the translation practices that best appealed to the**

reading publics—who won or lost the *Querelle d’Homère* or even the English Civil War, and who achieved or lost status thereby—than with exploring the texture of the ideas voiced, the sometimes surprising connections and disjunctions with each other and with ongoing debates in our own day. Instead of a demystifying ‘history of the present’ laying bare the origins of contemporary practices, my focus here is the reconsideration of roads not taken, possibilities left unfulfilled. The past, lie a text waiting to be translated, offers alternative readings, retranslations, that may stimulate new questions for the present” (Hayes, 2009, p. 15)

“Although the ‘history of translation’ cannot be undertaken without attention to its location in time and place, it nevertheless continues to pose questions that remain urgent for us today. Recognition of the historicity of these texts does not therefore preclude engaging them on our own contemporary intellectual terrain. Indeed, such dialogue between past and present is not only inevitable but desirable. And this leads me to the third moment in my rapid methodological overview, the role neoclassical translation theory and practice have played in what could be termed the ‘ethical turn’ in recent histories of translation.” (Hayes 2009, p. 15)

“Language is opened up, exposed, ‘pierced’ by the interlocutor, whose unavoidable participation in the construction of meaning guarantees an infusion of change and unpredictability. Lévinas pursues this notion into the domain of print. The printed book appears fixed, unavailable to interruption. And yet ‘books have their fate; they belong to a world they do not include, but recognize by being written and printed, and by being prefaced and getting themselves preceded by forewords. They are interrupted, and call for other books and in the end are interpreted in a saying distinct from the said’. The point about the printed text—and prefaces—in general is especially true if translations, which call out beyond themselves in the crisscrossing of cultures and literary traditions. Another language shadows the translation, interpellating and opening up its seeming fixity. A complex set of relations, mediated by language, among translators, texts, readers, and many others, prevents any reduction into distinct, neatly paired terms of self and other. There is no fundamental reason to see ‘modernizing’ neoclassical translation as a form of usurpation, not when both translator and text are in perpetual movement, and when the evocation of the *tiers*, reader and other translator (reader), shares in the general responsibility. It is also the case that the complete self-dispossession of the translator before texts, traditions, social environments, relationships, or language itself is not the only imaginable ‘place’. Even the self-effacing translators of Port-Royal, working collectively and often under a variety of pseudonyms, sensitive and answerable to a God hidden within the literality of the letter, do not present themselves as empty conduits of meaning; rather, they must make choices within the boundaries of a specific time and place.” (Hayes, 2009, pp. 20-21)

On Derrida and translation:

“Derrida... reminds us that there is ‘always more than one language’ as he engages throughout his career with **the complex relations inherent in translation, variously evoked as debt, contract, double-bind, and, ultimately, promise.** The importance of Derrida’s work to translation theorists was underscored with the appearance in the mid-1980s of a collection of essays by a number of prominent critics edited by Joseph Graham, *Difference in Translation*, which also marks the first publication in both English and French of Derrida’s influential essay on Benjamin, “Des tours de Babel”. Much has been written since.” (Hayes, 2009, p. 21)

Translation, shared languages and the lessons of history for political uses

‘As historian Kevin Sharpe has put it, the English Civil War “fractured the Elizabethan world-picture” by creating unresolvable tensions within what had previously appeared to be the “shared languages” that articulated the ideals and goals of the body politic. **The questions of what constitutes a shared language and how to proceed in the absence of a shared language are**

very much at the heart of the work of translation and its role in the determination of modes of reading and interpretation. One of the most distinctive differences between the intellectual terrain in France and England during this period [i.e. the 17th century] is precisely the extraordinary politicization of all levels of discourse, including translation. Certainly **throughout early modern Europe there existed a shared frame of reference according to which particular texts from classical antiquity might be invoked to imply a particular comment on the present...** In the England of the 1620s... Thomas May's translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia* (1627) was already marked as an "anti-absolutist" text, offering the image of Rome at "that unhappy height, in which shee could neither retain her freedom without great troubles nor fall into a *Monarchy* but most heavy and distastfull." May's point was sufficiently clear that either he or his dedicatees had the dedications removed from most copies of the work for fear of reprisals. Two years later, Thomas Hobbes's translation of Thucydides provided a sort of cautionary response, suggesting that just as a contemporary of the Greek historian "might have added to his experience" by reading the work, so too might present-day readers through "attentive reading of the same." **The injunction to find lessons for the present through an "attentive reading" of the past is a traditional justification for the reading of history, but it is also an invitation to read between the lines. As Annabel Patterson, Lois Potter, and other scholars have shown, translation was one of numerous techniques by which oppositional viewpoints might be "encoded" for transmission to the public.**' (Hayes 2009 p. 66)

'Translation continued to provide a means for promoting 'dangerous' ideas without asserting ownership of them. In the late 1640s, the French translation of the Qur'ān and the English translation based on it featured similar 'firewalls,' lengthy prefaces denouncing the "absurdity" of Islam, but left the full text intact and offered positive images of Muslims interspersed throughout the seemingly negative commentary. **Throughout the period, translations of Lucretius and the Stoic philosophers allowed for the expression and dissemination of materialism and non-Christian beliefs.** John Evelyn might shrug off critics of his translation of Book I of *De rerum natura* by reminding them that all pagan poets were by definition irreligious ("Plato was a Leveller"), but in his complete translation Thomas Creech carefully protected himself from confusion with his author through orthodox commentary and annotation. Edward Sherburne's freethinking moment from a translation of Seneca offers another example:

The Spirit which informs this Clay
So fleets away.
Nothing is after Death; and this
Too, *Nothing* is:
The Gaol or the extremest space
Of a swift Race.

In a note for the benefit of "the unwary Reader," Sherburne cites Christian denunciations of Seneca's skepticism; other notes, however, offer references and quotations from a host of other Roman philosophers who thoroughly expound the tenets of Stoicism. **Translation thus continued to make oppositional or non-normative discourse available.**' (Hayes 2009 pp. 78-9)

Translation and the emergence of the novel: on the inherently transnational nature of literary canons

'A truly literary work is always developed against the background of translation. *Don Quixote* is the most striking example of this. In his novel, Cervantes explains that the manuscript containing his hero's adventures was allegedly written by a Moor, Cid Hamet Bengeli. This is not all: several times

Don Quixote and the priest engage in scholarly discussions concerning the translation, and most of the novels that have upset the hero's spirit are also translations. There is a fabulous irony in the fact that the greatest Spanish novel should have been presented by its author as a translation from the Arabic, which had been the dominant language in the Peninsula for centuries. To be sure, this could teach us something about the Spanish cultural consciousness. But also about the connection between literature and translation. This connection can be witnessed throughout the centuries: from the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century poets through Hölderlin, Nerval, Baudelaire, Mallarmé, George, Rilke, Benjamin, Pound, Joyce, Beckett.

This is a fruitful field of research for the theory of translation, provided it goes beyond the narrow framework of transtextuality, and is connected to research on languages and cultures in general—a multi-disciplinary field within which translators could collaborate fruitfully with writers, literary theorists, psychoanalysts, and linguists.' (Berman 1992 p. 9)

Coldiron on the importance of the material conditions for the production of literature (print, in this case, for we are talking about the 15th and 16th centuries) and the establishment of national literary canons. Translation intersected with these phenomena: a detailed study of the processes involved in the production and diffusion of literary texts demonstrates the inherently transnational nature of literary canons, and the fundamental role played by translation in their establishment.

“The first book printed in English was not printed in England: William Caxton Englished the *Recuyell of the Hystories of Troye* from the French, and he printed it in Bruges in 1473. What did it mean to ‘english’ a book? The verb *to English* simply meant ‘to translate into English’, but the actual practice of englishing involved much more than verbal translation. The *Recuyell*, like so many other early printed English books, came from a French-language, mediated-medieval work and was produced by a bilingual printer-translator using continental technology, typefaces, paper and book design. **Not only the literary text but also the materials and methods of its production were foreign and underwent processes of acculturation. In this, the *Recuyell* is no anomaly, no quirky experimental exile. Its francophone, Burgundian origins instead signal a crucial characteristic of early modern English literary culture: a constitutive foreignness established in translation, transformed by a new technology, and perpetuated in reprints. In a century better known for nation-formation, most of the first English printed books were ‘englished’ in this broader, more complex sense: through appropriative acculturation performed by means of verbal translation and material-textual mediation.**

Printers Without Borders investigates, from substrate to superstructure, the ways and means of this englishing, the printers and translators who accomplished it, and its implications for literary history.” (Coldiron 2015 p. 1)

Coldiron also puts special emphasis on those authors and books that are now, as she puts it “uncanonized”—this is a welcome turn away from the traditional emphasis on the Great Works in the canon, whose existence would not have been possible without the ‘uncanonized’ authors and books and texts that constituted their seedbed and infrastructure, their living environment, as it were. She also appropriately emphasizes its European and multilingual dimensions of these national canons. But what Coldiron here describes as a fundamental foundational feature of the Early Modern English canon turns out to be a constant feature not

just in the European renaissance, but in all periods (see in this respect Chakravorty, among others, on culture and translation, etc.). For instance, European humanism may have, to a large extent, been a grand illusion (to paraphrase the expression coined by the late Tony Judt), but literary (and political) nationalism are equally ‘illusional’ (when they are not merely delusional). For further details about this, see José María Pérez Fernández and Edward Wilson-Lee’s “Introduction” to *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp. 1-21)

“First, the initial century or so of printing in England (between 1476 and roughly the end of the sixteenth century) should command the attention of literary historians, for it ushered in a new information technology and concomitant, multidimensional changes. Second, many of the works printed during this special phase are now uncanonized if not largely forgotten, but they formed the actual originating milieu of the now familiar canon of English Renaissance (or early modern) literature. The present book thus reads beyond the canonical, further into the actual historical record of printed works. A related matter is that **englished books, usually read inside a monolingual national canon, can be better understood in terms of the polyglot European Renaissance.** During this first century of print, the adoption of foreign textual practices and the engagement with continental vernaculars were essential to English literary culture. Third, **two main kinds of textual transformation—printing and translation—were key catalysts of this special phase of literary history. The present book examines them together, as co-processes that transformed foreign works for English readers and thereby enriched English letters, lexicon and repertoire, and even shaped English identity.** Fourth, **printing and translation converged to energize the grand cultural agendas of what we now usually identify, depending on our preferences for historical periodization, as ‘Renaissance’ (the recovery of the past) or ‘early modernity’ (the creation of the future).** The tussle over period terms leads to an important point: **together, printing and translation animated both the recovery of the past and the creation of the future.** And if a period line is to be drawn or a moment of change to be specified for literary England, it might be better found at the great textual turn of 1473 or 1476 than at historians’ dates of 1509 or 1558. Furthermore, **as transformative co-processes, printing and translation addressed a set of lingering problems of acculturation for the island nation, which, from one view, was emerging from a long Norman colonization into what we now call an early modernity.** But whether or not we view the English literary Renaissance as post-colonial with respect to what is now France, **printing and translation were instrumental in responding to a persistent sense that English letters lagged behind those of the continent.** Finally, my greatest concern here is with an apparent paradox: that **what is asserted and promulgated as English literature was actually founded on and thoroughly permeated by the foreign.**” (Coldiron 2015 2)

“This project’s literary history takes seriously the technical and aesthetic means by which the foreign comes to constitute the English, and it aims at a fuller reading of the vibrant foreign presences inside English letters.

Along with a great debt to translators, the literary culture of the English Renaissance owed much to the early printers. **Early printers and translators collaborated closely—indeed, sometimes so closely at to be in the same body, since many English printers, beginning with Caxton, were themselves also translators.** Today, printers (and translators) are too often misunderstood as merely mechanical, replicating drudges, churning out copies of the same old things. In practice, Renaissance printers and translators were more akin to earlier-twentieth-century film producers: not faceless middlemen or technicians, but **entrepreneurs, experimenters, and innovators. They played a tremendous role in artistic selection, in transforming older materials for a new medium and language, and in assessing and shaping the tastes of new audiences. The printers needed content, and translators provided it, opening a vast store of works proven popular and salable on the continent, and durable, though restricted, in**

manuscript. The translators, in turn, benefited from the printers' ability to reach many more readers than had ever before been possible. On both sides, translators and printers made the past and the foreign available and legible in several senses, creating not only linguistic readability but also cultural comprehensibility. They brought thousands of works to expanding readerships in a relatively short span of time. **The early printers' englishing of the foreign past constituted another, parallel sort of translation, involving the material re-mediation and visual redesign of medieval manuscripts and / or contemporary foreign editions.**" (Coldiron 2015 3)

"Both the literary forms and the printers' forms—that is, both the verbal and physical structures in which words were set—were also often foreign-born, with the result that the first two generations of printers in England were 'translating' continental technology and technique as much as the translators were rendering words, styles, genres. Each form of textual transformation, printing and translation, activated potentials inherent in the other." (Coldiron 2015 3-4)

The commercial stage—the public, urban theatres, in places like London, or Madrid—developed a few decades later became another important new medium for the diffusion of national and international ideas, alongside translators, printers and publishers.

The "material re-mediation and virtual redesign of medieval manuscripts and / or contemporary foreign editions" described by Coldiron constitutes an interesting parallel, that runs parallel to linguistic translation and cultural translation—a new sort of material translation that involved the refashioning of the content of manuscripts to the new medium of print.

Coldiron uses interesting concepts like rhizome, echo or residue – see the bibliography in footnote 7. These concepts can also be applied when evaluating the role of translation in the establishment of national and international literary canons. The whole paragraph emphasizes the central, and constitutive role, played by translation in the essentially transnational and international nature of these canons. Phenomena like the appropriation of cultural and literary capital that goes hand in hand with imperial expansion and geopolitical competition, 19th-century nationalism and other such trends (see for instance what scholars like Barbara Fuchs say about the occlusion of Spanish literature in the English canon, or the eminent example of C.S. Lewis' 'New Learning and New Ignorance') conspired to ignore or even deliberately obliterate **this phenomenon**. Note, and elaborate, on the concept of translation as 'naturalization', and how it is conceptually and even ideologically loaded. **The printer and the translator as creators of transnational cross-linguistic and cross-cultural COMMUNITIES.**⁸

⁸ Barbara Fuchs, *The Poetics of Piracy. Emulating Spain in English Literature* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013). C.S. Lewis' "New Learning and New Ignorance", in his classic study *Poetry and Prose in the Sixteenth Century. The Oxford History of English Literature* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1954). See also José María Pérez Fernández's "Spanish Bawds and Quixotic Libraries: Adventures and Misadventures in Early English Hispanism and World Literature", in *Comparative Literature* (2016) 68(4): 370-388; doi:10.1215/00104124-3698467.

“Such a view of **englishing as both verbal-linguistic and material-textual**, and as occurring via meaningful patterns, has wider implications for literary history, which has largely been written language by language, nation by nation. Most national literary histories necessarily keep foreign Others separate, excluding or minimizing any alterities within so as to self-define most clearly. Until very recently, they have not, by and large, set out to recount how the foreign enters and contacts the native tradition, nor **how very formative the foreign is, either as a supporting structure of a given national literature, as a resonant echo, or as rhizome and residue underneath and within it. However, that is just how the foreign operated for early printed English literature: as structure, residue and resonance** [NOTE 7 to p. 7: On rhizome, see Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Helen R. Lane, and Mark Seem (New York: Viking Press, 1977). On residue, see Walter Ong, “Oral Residue in Tudor Prose Style”, *PMLA* 80.3 (1965): 145-154. On resonance, see Wai-Chee Dimock, “A Theory of Resonance”, *PMLA* 112.5 (1997): 1060-1071. **Foreign literatures often make themselves known structurally in adapted narrative modes, poetic forms, or genres.**]. **Even as national vernacular literatures in print gained their respective grounds—a story well told in our separate national literary histories—printers and translators were also creating transnational discourse communities by ‘naturalizing’ (another common term for translating) works.** Many of those works nevertheless remained visibly, vividly foreign: englished, but still signalling alterity. Those joint agents of textual transformation, printers and translators, in some happier version of Schleiermacher’s famous dilemma of the Janus-like, forward- and backward-looking translator, served simultaneous impulses toward prior texts and future readers, toward English and foreign, toward nation and transnation. **Even in building an English literary culture, the printers’ and translators’ work relied on residual foreignness and thus connected readerships across existing linguistic-cultural (and emergent national) boundaries.**” (Coldiron 2015 7)

“Although scholars increasingly follow **Karlheinz Stierle’s notion that the ‘co-presence of cultures’ is a signal characteristic of the Renaissance, this messy, sometimes contradictory, often paradoxical part of literary history is less well told, especially for English literature.** [NOTE 8 to p. 8: Karlheinz Stierle, “*Translatio Studii* and Renaissance: From Vertical to Horizontal Translation2 in *The Translability of Cultures: Figurations of the Space Between*, ed. Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser (Stanford University Press, 1996), 55-67. The ‘transnational’ trend in recent early modern scholarship testifies to this increased awareness.]” (Coldiron 2015 7-8)

Coldiron uses polysystem theory (i.e. Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury) to illustrate and analyse the situation in early modern England. **She also invokes comparative literature, translation studies and the concept of the contact zone. For further details about this see Emily Apter’s *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature* (Princeton University Press, 2006)**

“In England, translators’ and printers’ paratexts contained similarly fascinating snapshots of early modern literary polysystems, with national and transnational impulses in tension [NOTE 13 to p. 11: On polysystem theory, see Itamar Even-Zohar’s foundational statements in “The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem”, *Poetics Today* 2.4 (1990): 45-51; or Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995)]. Perfectly sensible, then, that until the late sixteenth century, transmission patterns reveal a predominant practice of an appropriate or inward-directed translation. That is, most translators in sixteenth-century England did not make printed translations from English into other languages; nearly all, beginning with Caxton, brought in foreign texts with the stated aim of enriching English language and literature. We should recall **Itamar Even-Zohar’s foundational arguments that translations activate literary polysystems most energetically when “(a) a literature is ‘young’, in the process of being established; (b) when a literature is either ‘peripheral’ (within a group of correlated literatures) or ‘weak’ or both; and (c) when there are turning points, crises, or literary vacuums in a literature”** [“The Position of Translated Literature”, 47]” (Coldiron 2015 10-11)

“From comparative literature and translation studies, **Mary Louise Pratt’s concept of the contact zone of early print culture as a generative site of encounter with alterity** applies on several planes here [NOTE 26 to p. 17: Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and*

Transculturation (New York: Routledge, 1992)]. In addition to the humming, literal contact zone of print culture, every translation is a verbal contact zone, just as a translated page can be a contact zone where foreign visual elements interact. This is clearly so in the compressed-pattern, multilingual pages treated in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. **Caxton’s englished incunables, too, are sites of contact between script and print technologies, and between scribal and printerly authorities and methods. In another regards, Lawrence Venuti’s far-reaching concept of the translator’s invisibility, which has previously stimulated my own notion of historicizing visibility in translation, here finds a further application to the visibility of foreign elements on printed pages.** The insights of Itamar Even-Zohar and subsequent polysystems theorists such as Gideon Toury inform every page of poetic analysis here, but I also cross-apply their work to what I think of as **the polysystems of print**, when, for instance, comparing the specific textual habits of French and English printers.” (Coldiron 2015 17)

Coldiron has an interesting section on patterns of translation and transmission, which she classifies into three different types: catenary, radiant, and compressed. She also emphasises the fact that texts (and books too) are things in motion

“‘Texts do not emerge simply by linear means’, as William Kuskin says, despite our linear literary histories. And **books are things in motion, despite our habit of stabilizing them for study.** To observe patterns of translation and transmission allows us to trace more precisely in what ways the foreign past came to be so thoroughly embedded in an early modern textual culture that proclaimed and paraded its Englishness. Patterns of translation and transmission reveal the tendencies and habits of early print culture that obtained across topics, authors, and genres. These patterns show us how texts circulated through the culture, how they resonated, what their particular foreign engagements were. Here I identify and explain the three general patterns of translation and textual transmission created in this book—catenary, radiant, and compressed—with discussion of why they matter and how pattern analysis can enrich our understanding of early modern English literature.” (Coldiron 2015 20)

Catenary patterns and the traditional concept of *translatio*

“Despite Kuskin’s and my shared emphasis on the non-linear, textual transmission sometimes does take place in relatively simple, straight lines, where one text draws on a clear and / or acknowledged lineage of prior texts for its content, form, and emphasis; yet englished books’ transmission paths are often more complicated. Questions about points and lines—that is, about the conceptual patterns we impose on literary change to understand it better—turn out to matter quite a bit. **A linear pattern, the *translatio*, has been one of the most influential organizing principles of Western literary history. In the sixteenth century, the *translatio* served as a way of thinking about the long arc of history, and as a way of linking the intellectual to the political. For early moderns, the *translatio* was an essential historiographic paradigm and the basis of Tudor, Valois, and Medici myths of empire.** Indeed Sallust’s original formulation of it allows the link between nationhood and letters, the *translatio imperii* and *studii* (‘Ita imperium semper transfertur...’ [thus empire always transferred]) as had its best-known medieval restatement in the *Cligès* prologue. The power and validity of the *translatio* for early modern culture are undeniable. For moderns, it has offered insight into historiography, into long-term views of political and intellectual change, into the connections between them. **But many printed vernacular translations into English followed other transnational paths, diverging frequently enough to trouble confidence in the *translatio*’s complete explanatory power.** Alterations of and alternatives to the linear pattern of cultural transmission actually do illuminate for us aspects of the formation of early modern literature other than the best-known Greek-Roman-Italian-French line.⁹

⁹ This pattern ignores the Hispanic component, so important over the course of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and even beyond, and also so neglected; in a footnote (no. 34 to p. 21) Coldiron does mention Greek and Dutch; Spanish simply does not exist.

In short, there was a lot of other englishing going on apart from that line, with foreign texts forming the English in other ways and with other rationales and implications.” (Coldiron 2015 20-21)

“The term *catenary* tries to account for some of those complications to the linear. **By *catenary pattern*, I mean serial incidents of translation in which printed and reprinted translations undergo phases of concentration or dilation, something like pearls on a chain. A catenary pattern suggests different relations to the past and to the foreign, for it may involve peripatetic excursions across cultures, looping back-translations, or staccato points of translation that deliberately do not position themselves in a direct line of influence.** The reiterative reproductions that characterize the whole Renaissance reprint culture suggest what Kuskin’s recent study of Caxton terms a recursive relation to the past and to authority, and I would add, to the foreign. **Other catenary-pattern texts wander through multiple cultures, loop, and diverge.** Such peripatetic patterns further imply the kind of *déterritorialisation* that Deleuze and Guattari theorized; these patterns also reveal that re-acculturation became and remained a key issue in representation for English book producers. **Still other printed translations appear in what we might think of as punctual-catenary pattern, at sudden points of topical concern. Such translations seem less related to long lines of influence or textual genealogy than to immediate, contextual flash-points.**” (Coldiron 2015 21)

What Coldiron says about what she calls punctal pairs recalls what Gillespie said (probably with more eloquence and persuasion) in his (for further details on this see Pérez Fernández “Translation and English Literary History. A Bibliographical Essay”, *Sendebarr*, 21: 373-378 (2012) - <http://hdl.handle.net/10481/21883>)

The following is from my review of Stuart Gillespie’s *English Translation and Classical Reception. Towards a New Literary History*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

In another interesting twist that elaborates on the sinuous and fluid nature of literary canons, Gillespie demonstrates how the canon of classical Roman and Greek poetry, originally the source of legitimacy and literary capital transferred to the English tradition, was, in its own turn, “reciprocally affected” (p. 93). He illustrates this with an account of the relation between Shakespeare, Greek Tragedy and Plutarch, a case in which “Shakespeare... has been ‘read back’ on to the Greeks” (p. 47). This process was mediated by Sir Thomas North’s English translation of Plutarch, which was the source of much of the material in Shakespeare’s Roman plays. North, in turn, translated from the French rendering of the Greek original penned by Jacques Amyot—one of the most important translators in early modern Europe. And Shakespeare’s prominence in the Western canon has finally led contemporary critics and readers to a new awareness of Aeschylus and Euripides as seen through the eyes of the Bard. Gillespie emphasises that Roman literature itself was built upon translations of Greek authors, and we can thus ask ourselves to what extent Seneca’s Roman tragedies—the closest Shakespeare actually got to Greek tragedy—were translations of sorts from their Greek counterparts. Episodes like this turn Gillespie’s book into a fresh and timely reminder that we do need to reassess the impact of the classics upon vernacular literary canons. He demonstrates, for instance, how through his translation and imitation of Juvenal, the young Wordsworth liberated the Roman poet from a calcified neoclassical reading, and also how viewing Wordsworth’s Romanticism from the perspective of this early translation throws new light on the sort of poetics that constituted the starting point for his literary career. We end up, besides, with a fresh reassessment of what Juvenal means for us today, and of his place within the canon of English translations.

“One thinks of Borges’s classic statement that ‘el original es infiel a la traducción’ [**Does Coldiron miss the (postmodern) irony here? One could not be blamed for thinking she does**]..., which opens the possibility that punctal pairs need not be understood in only one chronological direction.” (Coldiron 2015 21-22)

“Instead of defaulting only to diachronic interpretation, the punctal pattern invites our attention also to the synchronic: to each version’s independence and to the potential for a theoretical reciprocity between versions. It is hard for literary historians (myself, at least) not to read in pragmatic, chronological, causal lines, especially given so many influence studies and such

powerful paradigms as the *translatio*. Still, whether we imagine them as punctal pairs or looping chains, these quasi-linear, catenary transmission-translation patterns, three cases of which are treated fully in Chapter 2, complicate the usual lines. They seem to have been entirely typical of actual printers' and translators' practice, and very common in England" (Coldiron 2015 22)

Radiant transmission and radiant textuality

"Whereas catenary patterns involve printed translations appearing repeatedly over long spans of time, the radiant and compressed patterns explored in Chapters 3 through 6 instead involve textual co-presence, and simultaneity or near-simultaneity. Texts translated and printed in these patterns therefore enact very different relations with the foreign and raise very different questions about English literary culture. **By *radiant pattern* I mean the printing of translations of a given work in several languages in a short space of time, say, within a few years by one agent, usually a printer. In this pattern, the translations radiate outward into several linguistic communities at once. (This does not always mean into several nations at once: another point of interest this pattern raises.)** In this radiant process, translations may also create a reputational appeal, a certain glow or radiance that today, shifting to an auditory metaphor, we might call 'buzz'. Chapter 3 treats the pragmatic radiance of the outward-translating transmission pattern, but we should not miss that such translations were often radiant in other senses as well." (Coldiron 2015 22)

"This radiant or radiating pattern was much more common on the continent than it was in England, at least in part because the thriving, continental houses, such as Aldus, Plantin, Giunti, or Tournes, had multilingual sets of type, floor space for the large wooden cases to contain and sort them, and teams of learned translators and correctors. These assets were uncommon in the smaller, English operations, especially earlier in the period. However, English-language versions were part of some continental radiant productions, such as the case treated in Chapter 3." (Coldiron 2015 22-23)

Radiant translations and transmissions, and the idea of [improbable] COMMUNITIES (in particular, Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, see other references above.)

"For readers, radiant translations may have created a fantasy of belonging that countered linguistic alterity and dispersal; that fantasy nevertheless allowed a reader the comfort of his or her own language. That is, in reading a radiantly produced version, readers may have imagined themselves part of a 'world' community reading the same work at the same time, while not actually being confronted with much alterity, linguistic or cultural. **This fantasy of belonging is revealed in the radiant translations' paratexts, but if we read more than one language version (as we shall do in Chapter 3), it is immediately exposed as improbable.** As so often, stepping outside a single language tradition reveals matters invisible from within it, and comparing the 'same' radiant works usually shows how very different they are. The paratexts often contain clues about how the given literary culture of one version differs from that of a contiguous literary culture, even at the same historical moment of production, and even as they claim likeness. One can thus usefully compare the paratexts of a radiant group for inferences about the multiple imagined communities around a particular work. **Working with this pattern of production and transmission may help future scholars expand further on the work of Benedict Anderson, in that the radiant-book producers' imagined communities are readerships doubly envisioned as transnational and localized at once.**" (Coldiron 2015 24)

McMurrans work illustrates the relevance of translation studies, its methodological and critical approaches to texts, for a proper understanding of genres and periods within an international perspective.

McMurrans, Mary Helen. *The Spread of Novels: Translation and Prose Fiction in the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.

“I begin with this oft-quoted scene in *Don Quixote* not because it is a clever metafiction about translating, but because it describes an underappreciated truth about eighteenth-century novels. As in the Don Quijote story, **translating and originality are not easily distinguished in eighteenth-century fiction, not least because novels did not simply move from the source to target language, and one nation to another, but dangled between languages and cultures.** *The Spread of Novels* is a study of this imbricated field and how it fed the novel’s emergence in the eighteenth century, focussing specifically on English and French as the novel’s core languages. **Although novels in the eighteenth century came from diverse regions and were translated from other European vernaculars, as well as Greek, Latin, and Arabic, cross-Channel translating was the most active and fervent arena and, few would argue, the site of the novel’s emergence. My goal is not, however, to prove that the modern origin or rise of the novel was transnational. The claim that eighteenth-century prose fiction is a mixed form and culturally hybridized through translation and transmission has been almost axiomatic since at least the eighteenth century. It has been renovated in recent scholarship on 18th-century fiction, and more broadly, in studies that reconfigure national literary traditions in regional, imperial, or global contexts. This study takes for granted the claim that prose fiction had a long and varied history in translation and that cultural mixing is endemic to the novel.** Rather than arguing that the rise of the novel is transnational I attempt to trace the dynamic history and changing meaning of fiction’s mobility in the 18th-century. Prose fiction was always already cross-national because of translation long before the rise of the novel and has only widened its realm of circulation since the mid-eighteenth century, but translating—both rendering practices and their meaning for literary relations—changed drastically in the eighteenth century. I argue that the novel emerges because of the ways in which fiction accommodated this shift in translating. In other words, I do not attempt to demonstrate the transnationality of the novel in the eighteenth century so much as historicize fiction’s extranationality as a key to the emergence of the novel. To begin, we need a method for the study of translation that recognizes the eighteenth century’s historical specificity.” (McMurrans 2009, pp. 2-3)

The volume focuses on the 18th century, and in particular in the mutual translation of French and English novels in this period (in this respect, it is also closely related to Hayes 2009). The book takes as its starting point the fact that literary traditions are more international than traditional approaches to national canons would have us believe, and that this internationality of traditions can be successfully traced back to periods earlier than the 18th century (which is normally the focus of similar approaches). The author declares that “cultural mixing is endemic to the novel”.

Actually cultural mixing is endemic to all literary traditions, and that in periods like the Renaissance, cultural mixing was accelerated by translation and the establishment of commercial networks of publishers, printers and booksellers, and that all these changing material conditions in turn altered the nature of this cultural mixing that constitutes the seedbed of the current European canon. McMurrans also voices a very relevant caveat, which experts in the field should carefully heed:

“In recent years, scholars have provided a much-needed alternative to linguistic and empirical approaches to translation by arguing for its cultural role. Linguistics alone can ‘unduly restrict [translation’s] role in cultural innovation and social change,’ as Lawrence Venuti has noted, and the alternative has been to argue that translation is at least a cipher for cultural processes, if not an agent in those processes. Focusing as much on the target nation and culture as the source culture, we now look more closely at how translation can ‘wield enormous power in constructing representations of foreign cultures’ and at **translation’s crucial role in nation building and national literary canons.**

Translation has also played an increasing role in colonial studies, seen as an instrument of colonization that can establish and extend imperial hegemony or alternatively seen as one of the ambiguous and negotiable aspects of colonial encounter. In a postcolonial context, scholars have shown how translating reappropriates or resists a hegemonic language and literary norms. At the same time, **the notion of ‘translating cultures’ or ‘cultural translation’ has come to the fore in discussions of globalization and transnationalism. While this latter trend represents the renewed purchase of translation in the academy, it has sometimes co-opted translating for nonlinguistic mediations, and Emily Apter [2002: 186] is rightly concerned to avoid allowing ‘the terms *translation* and *translingualism* to become pallid metaphors for any act of cultural negotiation’**” (McMurran 2009, p. 3)

In this regard, an approach that focuses on the material conditions of book production and distribution as this relates to the production of translated texts, can provide a fresh, and sobering approach beyond the more far-fetched theoretical disquisitions about the concept of *translation*, its cognates and all the tropes (even wordplay) that can emerge from its lexical field. McMurran’s Chapter 2 (“The Business of Translation”) precisely addresses the relation between translation and the book market.

10 Cultural translation / the translation of cultures

Venuti on translation, cultural translation and the universe of values that become involved within it

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Although in view of more recent research, the following remarks may sound somewhat outdated, they are important because the tendency to approach translation from a narrow linguistic perspective still persists in certain academic circles.

“Translation is stigmatized as a form of writing, discouraged by copyright law, depreciated by the academy, exploited by publishers and corporations, governments and religious organizations. Translation is treated so disadvantageously, I want to suggest, partly because it occasions revelations that question the authority of dominant cultural values and institutions. And like every challenge to established reputations, it provokes their efforts at damage control, their various policing functions, all designed to shore up the questioned values and institutions by mystifying their uses of translation” (Venuti, 1998: p. 1)

“My project is, first, to expose these scandals by enquiring into the relationships between translation and a range of categories and practices that contribute to its current marginal status. **Translation research and translator training have been impeded by the pervalence of linguistics-oriented approaches that offer a truncated view of the empirical data they collect. Because such approaches promote scientific models for research, they remain reluctant to take into account the social values that enter into translating as well as the study of it. Research thus becomes scientific, claiming to be objective or value-free, ignoring the fact that translation, like any cultural practice, entails the creative reproduction of values. As a result, translation studies get reduced to the formulation of general theories and the description of textual features and strategies. These lines of research are not only limited in their explanatory power, but directed primarily to other academic specialists in linguistics, instead of translators or readers of translations or even specialists in other humanistic disciplines. In the end, translation suffers from an institutional isolation, divorced from the contemporary cultural developments and debates that invest it with significance.**” (Venuti, 1998: pp. 1-2)

“By far the greatest hindrances to translation, however, exist outside the discipline itself. Translation is degraded by prevalent concepts of authorship, especially in literature and in literary scholarship, and these concepts underwrite its unfavorable definition in copyright law, not only the codes of specific national jurisdictions, but the major international treaties. Translation lies deeply repressed in the cultural identities that are constructed by academic, religious, and political institutions; in the pedagogy of foreign literatures, notably the ‘Great Books,’ the canonical texts of Western culture; and in the discipline of philosophy, the academic study of philosophical concepts and traditions. Translation figures hugely in the corporate world, in the international publishing of bestsellers and the unequal patterns of cross-cultural commerce between the hegemonic Northern and Western countries and their others in Africa, Asia, and South America. Translation powers the global cultural economy, enabling transnational corporations to dominate the print and electronic

media in the so-called developing countries by capitalizing on the marketability of translations from the major languages, preeminently English. ‘Developing’ here means no more than a backward relation to world capitalism. Translation embarrasses the institutions that house these categories and practices because it calls attention to their questionable conditions and effects, the contradictions and exclusions that make them possible—and discredit them.” (Venuti, 1998: p. 2)

“Because translating is intercultural, it involves a distinct kind of authorship, secondary to the foreign text and in the service of different communities, foreign as well as domestic. The only authority that translation can expect depends on its remaining derivative, distinguishable from the original compositions that it tries to communicate, and collective, remaining open to the other agents who influence it, especially domestic readerships.” (Venuti, 1998: p. 3)

“Translation is often regarded with suspicion because it inevitably domesticates foreign texts, inscribing them with linguistic and cultural values that are intelligible to specific domestic constituencies. This process of inscription operates at every stage in the production, circulation, and reception of the translation. It is initiated by the very choice of a foreign text to translate, always an exclusion of other foreign texts and literatures, which answers to particular domestic interests. It continues most forcefully in the development and discourses, always a choice of certain domestic values to the exclusion of others. And it is further complicated by the diverse forms in which the translation is published, reviewed, read, and taught, producing cultural and political effects that vary with different institutional contexts and social positions. By far the most consequential of these effects—and hence the greatest potential source of scandal—is the formation of cultural identities. Translation wields enormous power in constructing representations of foreign cultures. The selection of foreign texts and the development of translation strategies can establish peculiarly domestic canons for foreign literatures, canons that conform to domestic aesthetic values and therefore reveal exclusions and admissions, centers and peripheries that deviate from those current in the foreign language. Foreign literatures tend to be dehistoricized by the selection of texts for translation, removed from the foreign literary traditions where they draw their significance. And foreign texts are often rewritten to conform to styles and themes that *currently* prevail in domestic literatures, much to the disadvantage of more historicizing translation discourses that recover styles and themes from earlier moments in domestic traditions.” (Venuti, 1998: p. 67)

This is an interesting chapter that discusses some case studies to illustrate how translation determines how a specific cultural group view others, and how they construct a specific, selective image of that particular group through the choice of texts that are translated, texts that are not, and how they are translated; it also discusses case studies in which translation can be used to cement a particular reading community, creating a common sense of purpose, culture, etc. In particular, he discusses the question of early Christian translations of Scripture, using correspondence between Augustine and Jerome to illustrate his points (see Venuti, 1998: pp. 75-81)

“Translations thus position readers in domestic intelligibilities that are also ideological positions, ensembles of values, beliefs, and representations that further the interests of certain social groups over others. In cases where translations are housed in institutions like the church, the state, or the school, the identity-forming process enacted by a translated text potentially affects social reproduction by providing a sense of what is true, good, and possible... Translations may maintain existing social relations by investing domestic subjects with the ideological qualification to assume a role or perform a function in an institutions. Technical translations—legal or scientific textbooks, for instance—enable agents to achieve and maintain levels of expertise. But they may also bring about social change by revising such qualifications and thereby modifying institutional roles or functions.” (p. 78)]

Burke & Po-chia Hsia on cultural translation

“The turn towards history within Translation Studies has not yet been matched by a turn towards the study of translation on the part of historians, even cultural historians. A second aim of this volume is therefore to encourage a dialogue between workers in Translation Studies and in cultural history. Central to such a dialogue is **the notion of translation between cultures as well as between languages, in other words the adaptation of ideas and texts as they pass from one culture to another.**” (Burke & Po-chia Hsia, eds. 2007, p. 3).

“The term ‘cultural translation’ was originally coined by anthropologists in the circle of Edward Evans-Pritchard, to describe what happens in cultural encounters when each side tries to make sense of the actions of the other. A vivid example, famous among anthropologists, is Laura Bohannan’s account of how she told the story of Hamlet to a group of Tiv in West Africa and heard the story ‘corrected’ by the elders until it finally matched the patterns of Tiv culture [Bohannan, Laura. “Shakespeare in the Bush” [1971]. Reprinted in James P. Spradley & David McCurdy, eds. *Conformity and Conflict: Readings in Cultural Anthropology*. 8th ed., New York, 1994.]”.

“The concept of cultural translation has recently been taken up by a group of literary scholars concerned with the translability of texts [Budick, Sanford & Wolfgang Iser, eds. *The Translability of Cultures*. Stanford, 1996>]. It may also be used to refer to visual images (discussed by Hsia below) and to everyday life. **It has often been suggested, from August Schlegel through Franz Rosenzweig to Benvenuto Terracini, Octavio Paz, and George Steiner, that understanding itself is a kind of translation, turning other people’s concepts and practices into their equivalents in our own ‘vocabulary’. As Paz puts it, ‘learning to speak is learning to translate’ (aprender a hablar es aprender a traducir)**” (Burke & Po-chia Hsia, eds. 2007, pp. 8-9).

“Translation implies ‘negotiation’, a concept which has expanded its domain in the last generation, moving beyond the worlds of trade and diplomacy to refer to the exchange of ideas and the consequent modification of meanings. The moral is that a given translation should be regarded less as a definitive solution to a problem than as a messy compromise, involving losses or renunciations and leaving the way open for renegotiation.” (Burke & Po-chia Hsia, eds. 2007, p. 9)

Pym, Anthony. *Methods in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1998.

The preface contains a lot of interesting material on a volume that seeks to provide some insights / ideas on methods for the study of the history of translation. The most appealing (and promising) aspect of its contents is that these methods stem from actual historiographical practice—which turns it into a most refreshing approach.

“The problem of carrying out research on past translators and past translations should, by rights, constitute a fairly obscure topic, of interest to no more than the occasional graduate student. Yet translation history has attracted considerable academic interest in recent years, as indeed have all aspects of translation theory and practice. As a part of the much wider problem of how cultures should interrelate, historiographical methods in this field go well beyond narrow technical skills; they are of concern to the many neighbouring disciplines that translation studies now draws on and to which, in the best of cases, it can contribute. →→→ **Translation history can be a source of ideas and data for the political or sociological study of international relations; it might have more than a few words to say in the development of language policies; its models should be able to address the increasing internationalization of audiovisual culture; it has a great deal to contribute to the general history of literature and of ideas, especially given the way nationalist**

paradigms have traditionally excluded translators from such fields of inquiry ←←←. Any attempt to develop a method for translation history must thus be prepared to address at least two related questions: first, how to do translation history (for people who are going to do some); second, why it should be done one way rather than another (for people who want to relate translation history to wider concerns in the humanities). This book tries to ask both these questions, addressing them with both potential readerships in mind.

My main concern in the first six or so chapters are with practical aspects like how to identify a problem to be solved, how to make a list of translations, how to plot translations and translator on a map, and what it actually means to arrange elements in a system. Readers in search of more purely theoretical ideas might find some of this material cook-bookish, although I do not believe that technical discussions are only for technicians.

A few largish ideas nevertheless start to stir **from about chapter seven, where the dominant concepts of descriptive translation studies are reviewed in terms of international relations, the allusiveness of causation, the identity of translators, a search for interculturality, and a few laments about the current lack of any strong interdisciplinary framework adequate to the task. If you like, the second half of this book is for those more interested in the theory than in the practice of translation history. Yet my overall aim is to explore the relations between the two sides, hopefully encouraging each potential readership to consider seriously the perspectives of the other.**" (Pym 1998, p. vii)

"Given that this general aim requires me to position myself rather explicitly, I have sought to discuss problems in a fairly personal way, on the basis of my own experience. This has meant **writing in search of a method, not in defence of one; I am interested in postulates, not axioms.** The result involves only brief discussions about what history is or what translations could be. Nor have I been overly worried about inventing names for things. In fact, despite my desire to focus on methodology, **I often find myself trying to deflate the more theoretical aspects of translation history, insisting that the real knowledge comes from the study of history itself. A good deal of this book is based on the argument that historians should grapple quite directly with their material, getting their hands dirty before elaborating any grand principles concerning the methodology of their task.** In keeping with this stance, the ideas have been at every stage elaborated while I was working on the history of past translators." (Pym 1998, pp. vii-viii)

"So why should I now present the ideas more or less by themselves?"

One of the answers is that I like to keep my actual translation history relatively free of theoretical reflections. If I am writing about the twelfth-century School of Toledo, for example, I believe the results of my research should speak for themselves, regardless of what methods I use to teach them. This is in accordance with a certain separation of discourses proposed in the first chapter of this book.

A slightly better response is to insist that **theorization is not some alien element accidentally embedded in the historian's descriptive practice. It is itself a practice, with its own narrative qualities.** The idea of theorization-as-practice can be appreciated on several levels: as the legitimate and necessary activity of arguing against other theories, as a way of making someone think about how to do translation history, as a confessional peek into the laboratory behind the scenes, or simply as a process of self-reflection for the perplexed. In the case of this book, despite any pedagogical virtues in an ostensibly step-by-step approach, my theorization has its origins awash in the last-mentioned waters, those of perplexity. Most of my reflections on method have actually evolved from very practical methodological mistakes. You only have to navigate when you feel lost; I have only sought a method in moments when I felt I had none. The resulting kind of theorization is very much a part of practice, no matter how silent its workings." (p. viii)

"Here is my first mistake: During much of 1992-3 I found myself carrying out two research projects at virtually the same time. One was on twelfth-century Hispania; the other was on translation

flows between French and German poetry at the end of the nineteenth century. The fields were so different that they seemed not to belong to the same discipline. There was little information on twelfth-century translations; there was too much on nineteenth-century work. One project required careful attention to manuscript traditions; the other needed publishers' statistics. Medievalists were arguing about commas; modernists were busy defending social classes, genders and various ideas of progress or non-progress. Given the very different objects, the two projects involved quite different problematics, approaches and methods. However, since both studies concerned the history of translation, I felt in some way obliged to apply the same concepts and procedures. When something gave interesting results in the nineteenth century, I tried to make it work in the twelfth, and vice versa. This was good fun. But my research was very quickly in a mess." (Pym 1998, pp. viii-ix)

"This book has its origins in the notes I took to sort out the mess. The notes were essentially logbook reflections, founded not on pride but on personal questioning. True, I have done a lot of rearranging to make the result look reasonably coherent and consequential, going from fundamental issues to the more complex concepts. Yet no one should feel obliged to follow the steps one after the other. The various chapters are best read as fragmentary sketches for procedures that are not yet in place. I do not claim to have cleaned up all the mess. This also means my examples are rather more than examples; they are not mere illustrations that placidly confirm any grand theory. They are instead part and parcel of the theoretical reflections, since they have played their role in transforming, falsifying, and occasionally confirming my ideas about translation history.

Despite this tentative spirit, I am prepared to formulate four principles that gradually emerged from the research process, although not all on the same level or with the same potential use to other researchers:

(1) The first principle says that translation history should explain *why* translations were produced in a particular social time and place. In other words, translation history should address problems of social causation. This seems straightforward until you realize that narrowly empirical methods—the kind we find in many systemic descriptive approaches—are fundamentally unable to model social causation." (Pym 1998, p. ix)

This principle is excellent: it situates the area where the book is placed between the narrow-minded approach of empirical linguistics applied to the study of texts (an approach that frequently leads to dead-ends, consisting of the mere listing of data, without any interpretation), on the one hand, and on the other, the purely speculative field, that frequently disengages itself from textual and contextual data, to impose a pre-established, highly theoretical model of analysis (with its accompanying rhetoric) that eventually ends up finding what it is looking for. The latter model uses to project anachronistic schemes and intentions, like trans-historical ghosts that lurk in texts and their transposition from one into the other, with a post-structuralist, post-marxist and post-everything licence to move across space and time. Again, without any regard to chronology, let alone, frequently common sense.

"(2) The second principle is that the central object of historical knowledge should not be the text of the translation, nor its contextual system, nor even its linguistic features. The central object should be the human translator, since only humans have the kind of responsibility appropriate to social causation. Only through translators and their social entourage (clients, patrons, readers) can we try to understand why translations were produced in a particular historical time and place. To understand why translations happened, we have to look at the

people involved. True, a focus on people should not condemn us to random anecdotes and details: this book will take some nine chapters to construct a field of socially conditioned subjectivity as a preliminary to the history of translators. Yet the ultimate focus of attention must remain human rather than textual, almost in spite of the constraints of method.” (Pym 1998, pp. ix-x)

“(3) The third principle follows on from the above. **If translation history is to focus on translators, it must organize its world around the social contexts where translators live and work. These contexts are nowadays commonly assumed to be target cultures.** If I translate into English, I am somehow supposed to belong to English-language culture (which one?); I am perhaps even supposed to be dominated by English-language clients and patrons. Yet here I am, a professional translator born in Australia and living in Spain, selling translations and teaching translation in a situation I consider neither exotic nor atypical. In this professional context I cannot help but fix part of my attention on at least one culture beyond my native English, notably the Spanish/Catalan culture of my clients, source texts and students. So how can I be identified with any supposed monoculture? More important, if monocultural identifications are not consistently possible, many more translators than just myself stand a good chance of finding themselves in the intersections or overlaps of cultures, in what I could like to call ‘intercultures’. Of course, **the hypothetical interculturality of translators could be shared by all kinds of intermediaries, from diplomats and traders through to spies and smugglers. Such people might even form intercultural social groups.** As chance would have it, this is a suggestive and sometimes successful idea for the particular periods and places I have been working on. It has become a principle of the way I organize translation history. **As a general working hypothesis, then, translators tend to be intercultural, although far more research must be done before we can hope to give this term ‘intercultural’ a precise programmatic meaning.**” (Pym 1998, p. x)

“(4) The fourth principle concerns the reasons why anyone would want to do translation history in the first place. It basically states that the reasons—and my own reasons will be explained somewhere near the end of chapter one—exist in the present. **We do translation history in order to express, address and try to solve problems affecting our own situation.** This does not mean we blatantly project ourselves onto the past. On the contrary, the past is an object that must be made to respond to our questions, indicating categories and potential solutions that we had not previously thought of. Yet our initial point of departure is always the here and now. There should be no illusions on this point. The priority of the present is not only unavoidable but also highly desirable; I am in favour of serious subjective involvement in translation history. If humans are to stand at the centre of our object, then our historiographical subjectivity must also be humanized.” (p. x)

Pym contends that that translation history has to be something more than a “revitalized comparative literature”. In this regard the volume contains some vigorous and stimulating new insights, postulated from the actual practice of a translator and a scholar, not from the lofty and sophisticated heights of theory.

“Here again are my four general principles for a particular kind of translation history: **attention to causation, a focus on the human translator, a hypothesis projecting intercultural belonging, and the priority of the present.** None of these ideas are radically new; they all float in the intellectual air of our age. What might be new, though, is that I have sought to make them talk, together, in terms of the actual practice of translation history.

If any of the above principles find favour, all well and good. If not, let them at least suggest a soft transformation of our studies. **I believe translation history will eventually have to become something else, something wider, and not necessarily part of a revitalized comparative literature (there are more things in the world than literature) nor a facet of cultural studies (a concept that remains in dire need of definition).** If we learn to focus on human translators, and if translators can be seen as members of intercultural groups. **A logical extension of our discipline could be to study all kinds of intercultural groups, in the sense of intersections of cultures.**

Translation studies could become intercultural studies; translation history could be an essential part of intercultural history. And the world, currently regressing to scenes of competing cultural specificities, might one day be a little better as a result. Translation history need not point only to the past.” (Pym 1998, p. xi)

Translation and the ideal of a universal language

Contamine, Geneviève, ed. *Traduction et Traducteurs au Moyen Âge. Actes du colloque international du CNRS organisé à Paris, Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes les 26-28 mai 1986*. Paris: CNRS, 1989.

This volume contains a very interesting article by Jean-François Maillard, “Un avatar de la traduction: l’idéal d’une langue universelle à la Renaissance” (pp. 333-347). This is an important topic, since it addresses one of the issues that underlie the activity of translators in this period: i.e., beyond the search for linguistic equivalents, a search for an ideal universal language—which has cultural dimensions, and also cultural counterparts (for further details on this, see the volume by Umberto Eco; compare also with Jacques Lezra’s critique)

“L’humanisme inscrit en effet son oeuvre de traduction dans une perspective beaucoup plus ambitieuse: la science et la pratique des différentes langues de l’univers, à travers leur inventaire et leur déchiffrement généralisé, ne sauraient être isolées d’aspirations religieuses à **reconstruire une vision du monde cohérente**. Lui sert de moteur et de modèle **un double mythe théologico-philosophique emprunté au passé, celui d’une langue originelle et de l’unité encyclopédique du savoir**, telle que l’avait formalisée Raymond Lulle. C’est l’interaction de ces mythes anciens et de l’investigation, liée à la traduction, des diverses langues anciennes ou contemporaines qui permet au sens étymologique du terme l’avatar, ‘descente’ et surgissement imprévu en ses métamorphoses successives, de l’idéal d’une écriture et d’une langue universelles, du début du XVI^e siècle avec le Père Trithème jusqu’au milieu du siècle suivant avec le Père Kircher” (p. 333).

The article is very aptly placed at the end of a series of essays on medieval translations: as its author declares, behind the impulse of translators, there lurks a certain urge for a universal language, and for a unitarian elaboration of universal knowledge. This utopian ideal never found its way into reality, but it had a very pragmatic, de facto counterpart, in the encyclopedism of the Renaissance first, and then of the Enlightenment, both Golden Ages of translation too, and also periods in which the exchange of books, texts, languages, and translations in all its different modes, made up for the unapproachable ideal of a universal language and a single knowledge. The drive to comprehend as much as possible from amongst all the existing languages, and to somehow condense the common elements that they may have had, led to utopian endeavours, but also to very practical, down-to-earth projects, many of them grammar books, lexicons, and other volumes used for the comparison of different languages:

“En définitive, malgré leurs erreurs ou leurs mystifications à metre au ompte des myths et des objectifs religieux du temps, **linguistes et traducteurs ont créé hors des cercles restreints d’antan les conditions d’un dialogue scientifique ouvert sur la place publique.** Tout along du siècle, les matériaux nouveaux construisent **la discipline comparatiste en train de naître**, englobant même les langues modernes au moment où celles-ci, on le sait, revendiquent une dignité accrue dans le cadre national. En balisent quelques étapes le **Lexicon symphonicum** de Gelenius en 1537 exposant les parallélismes du latin, des langues germaniques, slaves et du grec, le Mithridates cité de Gesner développant l’accord et les différences de toutes les langues anciennes et modernes afin de faciliter la connaissance de chacune en particulier. Quant à la recherche de Nicolas Le Fèvre de La Boderie sur les règles générales convenant aux langues gréco-latines et semitiques, ella prolongue quarante ans plus tard celle de **Theodor Bibliander** comparant dans son **De natione communi ómnium linguarum et literarum de 1548** les écritures consonantiques et alphabétiques” (pp. 337-8).

“A la fin de la Renaissance, un tel amoncellement de matériaux et de connaissances des langues ne donne-t-il pas aux contemporains le sentiment d’un émiettement qui fait reculer d’autant le modèle idéal d’une langue universelle? Le titre même de l’enorme compilation du cousin de Vigenère Claude Duret tendrait à le suggérer: le **Thresor de l’histoire des langues de cest univers contenant les origines, beautés, perfections, decadences, mutations, changements, conversions, et ruines des langues** [NOTE 1 to p. 339: Paru à Coligny en 1613, posthume (réed. Slatkline Reprints, Genève, 1972), le texte achevé en 1607 fut sans doute écrit dans les premières années du siècle. Il fait état de 55 langues ‘plus celles des animaux et des oiseaux’. Kircher ira plus loins collectant encore (cf. *Oedipus aegyptiacus*, Rome, 1654, t. 3, p. 12-36) les écritures chinoise, indienne et mexicaine] *collectionne sans plus parvenir à construire une encyclopédie centrée sur un système cohérent. L’encyclopédie devient en Somme un ‘thesaurus’ dont le plaisir érudit, constitue désormais le ressort premier, mêlant aux considerations linguistiques et aux collections d’écritures de longs développements historiques, religieux et ethnographiques. Même si l’ideal d’une langue unique projetée sur le modèle de la langue originells mythique n’a pas disparu, il vacile quelque peu comme si l’on était plus aussi sûr qu’un demi siècle auparavant d’atteindre l’unité à travers una diversité aussi disparate*” (pp. 338-339).

Another case discussed in the article is that of Mersenne’s *Polygraphia seu artificium linguarum quo cum omnibus totius mundi populis poterit quis correspondere* (Roma, 1663, whose title speaks for itself).

Eco, Umberto. *The Search for the Perfect Language*. [*La ricerca de la lingua perfetta nella cultura europea*] Trans. James Fentress. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

Like so many early modern social spheres, the markets, or the communities, targeted by translators and printers, were fragmented, and frequently, increasingly so. As a result, we cannot talk about a single market: there were different markets, and different types of consumers, for different types of books, and even within the realm of literary texts there were different markets for different genres, as the different conditions for the production of the volumes, and their physical features, demonstrate. How these material conditions were transferred / translated, from one linguistic community to another matters a lot, because they are inextricable from the rest of the circumstances that surrounded it.

As Umberto Eco declares in his conclusions to *The Search for the Perfect Language*—a book published simultaneously in several European languages (Italian, French, German, Spanish and English), by several European publishers, within a series called “The Construction of

Europe” where each book approaches different aspects of European history and culture, and is published in 5 different languages by these 5 different publishers—European aspirations to a universal language presuppose a principle of translability—this book rests on the assumption that this principle and that the idea of a common European culture was the result of the sublimation of the desires of a group of authors, printers, and translators who featured a variety of rather mundane reasons to embark on their respective projects. This is the reason why I think it is absolutely necessary to examine these material conditions so we can start looking into the phenomenological infrastructure of the construction of the Western canon: the body of cultural signs / culturemes upon which Europe built its panoply of cultural imperialism that for several centuries has dominated global culture. Eco’s book was a self-conscious attempt to conciliate this unresolved tension between unity and diversity: like the translators and printers who plied their trade in the Renaissance, Eco is embarked upon the challenging project of construction of a single community founded on a multiplicity of languages, and like so much European culture, it gravitated necessarily towards elevated ideals / speculation about a common language, prelapsarian, pre-Babelian lost unity, or with Walter Benjamin, the impossible aspiration to a single, paradoxically ineffable total language which the process of translation aspires to reach.

Norton, Glyn P. *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and its Humanist Antecedents*. Geneva: Droz, 1984.

This is a very interesting volume, which provides a useful introduction to humanist controversies and doctrines on translation. In his introduction, Norton discusses what is a constant component in translation and also in early modern concepts of European identity: the dialectic between diversity and unity, the imagined / perceived one that lies behind all languages, in the same way that among the early modern linguistic, cultural and political diversity of Europe there lies an evasive and protean common ground:

“The fact is that Renaissance notions of translation, no matter what their textual format, appear trapped in policies of refusal. They tend so see the act itself in monistic terms, an entity that somehow exists of apiece in the translator’s consciousness, but also reject implicitly any methodized attempts to locate the *Septuagint* model, to encode the base components of that act. For the Renaissance, two linguistic images conspire with each other in articulating this dilemma. First is **the view that languages, like men, are the products of a primal archetype a divinely revealed *Ur-Sprache* that is to the fission of tongues what Adam to his fallen offspring**. This homage to a divine, potentially replenishable system of language would find its natural spokesmen among those for whom etymology could place them in touch once again with the Kabbalistic sources of words. Such a spokesman is Jacques Bourgoing. In the preface to his *De origine usu et ratione vulgarij*

*vocum*¹⁰ (1583), he calls attention to the way the study of words is a reunifying experience, transcending the linguistic confusion of Babylon and restoring all our semantic connections with a Creation “spoken” and “written” by God. **A second and, in a sense, corollary view suggests that lexical multiplication is nonetheless a perpetual falling away from the original language, any venture to reconstruct bridges back to that language is ultimately doomed.** In 1533, Charles de Bovelles summarizes this second idea by asserting that ‘anyone would try in vain, in whatever vulgar tongue, to examine its centre and measure, to explore in it and establish the pure archetype of its uniformity.’ Yet with equal conviction, he later adds, ‘If, therefore, anyone wishes to examine the archetype and measure of all languages, let him return to the language of our first parent, without doubt more uniform and more remarkable than any tongue or language in the world’” (Norton, 1984: pp. 10-11)

“**Renaissance attitudes to the philosophy of translation are largely a commentary on this paradox. If, indeed, one could reconstruct the archetypal centre of all languages, then translation itself could conceivably be reduced to its primal *idea* or archetypal model,** much as it is in the tale of the *Septuagint*. The facts of our unstable linguistic condition suggest, quite the contrary, that the virtual necessity to translate and retranslate constitutes its own refusal of a universal formula for translation. In other words, most Renaissance theoretical texts on translation appear to hesitate between affirmation and query: translation is a necessity of human communication, but can it, in any but the most relative terms, be methodized? Surprisingly, only one theorist in the entire age ever sought to break out of this impasse and the result was the Renaissance’s sole diagrammatic venture into the illusion of method. His assertion, scarcely read today, is resonant in its contrastive relationship to the siting of the problem by sixteenth-century France; indeed, it is the only work from this period that approaches an encyclopedia of doctrine on translation. Written by **Lawrence Humphrey, Master of Magdalen College, Oxford, the treatise is revealingly entitled *Interpretatio linguarum: seu de ratione convertendi et explicandi autores tam sacros quam prophanos*** and was published at Basle in 1559. Humphrey speaks with all the dogmatic conviction of the Calvinist and looks back on an age that had stimulated the bloom of ‘all good arts’, yet astonishingly, had produced no instance of a codified program of translation. His work is thus motivated by a single subsuming theorem, the confidence that **‘the art [*via*] and procedure [*ratio*] of translation can be taught’.**” (Norton, 1984: p. 11)

“The terms *via et ratio*, observed in rhetorical vocabulary as circumlocutions for *methodus*, are incorporated in Humphrey’s wider attempt to denominate the enforcing structures behind the act. The translator’s every gesture, his arc of calculations and commitments, become schematized in a Ramist-inspired *diagramma*” (Norton, 1984: pp. 11-12)

The following remarks about translation in 15th century Italian humanist thought and its relation to French 16th-century theory might apply to the European context in general during the 16th and early 17th centuries. In this regard, and although we are dealing with the pre-print period, many of the theoretical and methodological, doctrinal, issues raised during the 15th century (as a result of the recovery of Classical texts from the past, and their translations, the development of the method of philological interpretation and analysis, etc.) would constitute the seedbed, or the foundation, upon which the networks of translated texts would rise. In spite of the fact that much of his focus is on France, Norton casts his nets pretty wide, and his volume is one of the best introductions to translation in the Renaissance, to humanist ideas on translation, and to the role played by translation in the establishment of an early modern canon:

“The theoretical sources against and through which these notions were to be worked out in Renaissance France were those of **Cicero, Quintilian, and Horace**, with a more than casual attention given to the last of these authors. Nothing, of course, was remarkable in this interest. **The three writers represented, for the Renaissance, the closest approximation to a methodized system for translation that was available at the time. →→→What is significant, and even**

¹⁰ The full title runs like this: *De origine usu et ratione vulgarium vocum linguae Gallicae, Italicae, & Hispanicae libri primi sive A, Centuria una* (Paris, Steph. Prevosteau, 1583)

crucial for this study, is the way this interest appeared to retrace patterns of development that had already risen and prospered under fifteenth-century humanist thought. In studying an array of French Renaissance texts, it became clear that translative language in the later period emanated from the same cycle of dynamic exchange with other texts as that initiated earlier on by Coluccio Salutati, Leonardo Bruni, and Giannozzo Manetti. To understand this development in sixteenth-century France, it was thus vital to come to terms with the humanist texts not so much as source material for French thinkers (indeed, there is little explicit evidence of such ties), but as a kind of rehearsal of the issues and patterns of dialogue between theorist and textual past that was to be redramatized in a later performance.” (Norton, 1984: pp. 14-15)

Berman on the metaphysical dimension of translation

‘What is the metaphysical aim of translation? In a text that has become almost canonical, Walter Benjamin speaks of the *task of the translator*. This would consist of a search, beyond the buzz of empirical languages, for the “pure language” which each language carries within itself as a messianic echo. Such an aim, which has nothing to do with the ethical aim, is rigorously metaphysical in the sense that it platonically searches for a “truth” beyond natural languages. The German Romantics, whom Benjamin mentions in his essay, and most notably Novalis, have been the purest incarnation of this aim. It is the translation *against Babel*, against the reign of differences, against the empirical. Curiously, this is also looked for, in its wild state as it were, by the pure drive of translating such as it is manifested, for instance, in A.W. Schlegel or Armand Robin. The desire to translate everything, to be a poly- or omnitranslator, is accompanied in Schlegel and Robin by a problematic, even antagonistic, relation to their mother tongue. For Schlegel, German is clumsy, stiff; capable, to be sure, of being put to “work,” but not to “play.” For him, the aim of polytranslation is precisely to make the “mother tongue” play. In one instance, this aim merges with the ethical aim as it is expressed by someone like Humboldt, for whom translation should “expand” the German language. In reality, however, the translating drive leaves any humanist project far behind. Polytranslation becomes an end in itself, the essence of which is to radically *denaturalize* the mother tongue. The translating drive always starts off with a refusal of what Schleiermacher has called *das heimische Wohlbe finden der Sprache*—the indigenous well-being of language. The translating drive always posits an *other* language as ontologically *superior* to the translator’s own language. Indeed, is it not among the first experiences of any translator to find his language deprived, as it were, poor in the face of the linguistic wealth of the foreign work? The difference among languages—other languages and one’s own language—is *hierarchized* here.’ (Berman 1992 pp. 7-8)

Translation and German cultural / national identity: from Luther to the Romantics¹¹

The following is a good example of cultural / literary appropriation through translation: note in particular Goethe’s remarks that thanks to all the translations that are being made into German, soon ‘other nations will learn German’, since ‘in this way they can to a large extent save themselves the apprenticeship of almost all other languages’. Note also how Goethe uses the mercantile trope when referring to this process of

¹¹ For further details on Luther’s translation, and its foundational role in German, see Berman’s chapter 1, ‘Luther: Translation as Foundation’ (Berman 1992, pp. 23-52)

appropriation of cultural and literary capital through translation. Note also Schlegel's paradoxical remarks about 'a manifold receptivity for a foreign national poetry', which would then aspire, through progress in translation skills and techniques, to 'ripen and grow into universality'.

Following the great age of translation in the Renaissance, and then the period of the Enlightenment and French Classicism, and of English 17th- and 18th-century translations, the German late 18th- and early 19th-century translators make up a third wave of sorts in the creation of a canon of World Literature. They are part of a much larger conglomerate of translators, critics, philologists and editors—in other words, they are agents of cultural exchange and creators of canons.

The whole process described here by Berman demonstrates how translation oscillates between the material demands of the market (those translations of Shakespeare that 'start from the public' instead of 'starting from the poet'), on the one hand, and more abstract, idealist attempts at universality, through the concept of *Weltliteratur* developed by Goethe. This German idealist view of translation contrasts with the more empirical tradition of English 18th-century translators (many of whom focus on the translation of novels, for instance). This is also closely related to the idea of *taste* and *Bildung*—and to its origins, according to Gadamer, in humanist: this is something that deserves close attention. In this respect, the concept of translation proposed by Octavio Paz is the heir of critics like Schlegel, Hamann or Novalis (who, as we can see below, claimed that "In the final analysis, all poetry is translation"). Schlegel and Novalis, in turn, influenced Walter Benjamin, and his famous essay on the task of the translator.

This tendency is dominant languages of power, such as the case with global English today, elevated to this position first through the British Empire and then through the global spread of American culture (which some would choose to call American Imperialism) is what post-colonial theories of translation are trying to counter (from Venuti and his ethics of translation, to more militant proposals such as Spivak's)

It is well known that the German Romantics, at least those associated with the journal *Athenäum*, produced a series of great translations which have turned out to be a durable asset to the German patrimony: A.w. Schlegel (together with Ludwig Tieck) translated Shakespeare, Cervantes, Calderón, Petrarch, as well as numerous other Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese works. Schleiermacher, for his part, translated Plato. This is an enterprise of systematic and highly selective translation. Translations by Goethe, Humboldt, and Hölderlin are also highly selective, but their orientation is considerably different.

All these translations, carried out at the dawn of the nineteenth century, refer historically to an event that has been decisive for German culture, language, and identity: Luther's sixteenth-century translation of the Bible. In effect, this translation marked the beginning of a tradition in which translation henceforth, and up to the present century, has been

considered an integral part of cultural existence and, furthermore, as a constitutive moment of Germanity (*Deutschheit*). This has not escaped the attention of a plethora of great German thinkers, poets, and translators from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries:

Leibniz:

I cannot believe that it would be possible to translate the Holy Scriptures into other languages as gracefully as we possess them in German [1: In Winfried Stun, *Probleme und Theorien des Übersetzens* (Munich: Hueber, 1967), p. 50]

Goethe:

Independently of our own production, we have already achieved a high degree of culture (*Bildung*) thanks to the full appropriation of what is foreign to us. Soon other nations will learn German, because they will realize that in this way they can to a large extent save themselves the apprenticeship of almost all other languages. Indeed, from what languages do we not possess the best works in the most eminent translations?

For a long time now the Germans have contributed to a mutual mediation and recognition. He who understands German finds himself on the market place where all nations present their merchandise.

The force of a language is not to reject the foreign, but to devour it. [2: Quoted in Fritz Strich, *Goethe und die Weltliteratur* (Bern: Francke, 1957), pp. 18, 47]

A.W. Schlegel:

Only a manifold receptivity for a foreign national poetry, which, if possible, must ripen and grow into universality, makes progress in the faithful reproduction of poems possible. I believe we are on the way to invent the true art of poetic translation; this glory has been reserved for the Germans. [3: August Wilhelm Schlegel, Afterword to Tieck, in *Athenäum* II, 2, pp. 280-81]

Novalis:

Apart from the Romans, we are the only nation to have felt the impulse of translation so irresistibly, and to owe to it so infinitely in culture (*Bildung*)... This impulse is an indication of the very elevated and original character of the German people. Germanity is a cosmopolitanism mixed with the most vigorous individualism. Only for us have translations become expansions. [4: Novalis, *Briefe und Dokumente*, vol. 4 of *Werke Briefe Dokumente*, ed. Ewald Wasmuth (Heidelberg: Schneider, 1954), p. 367 [Letter to A.W. Schlegel, 30 November 1797]]

Schleiermacher:

An internal necessity, in which a peculiar calling of our people is clearly expressed, has driven us to translating on a grand scale. [5: Friedrich Schleiermacher, "On the Different Methods of Translating," in André Lefevere, *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig* (Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1977), p. 88]

Humboldt:

Just as the understanding of a language increases, likewise the understanding of a nation widens. [6: Wilhelm von Humboldt, "Einleitung zu 'Agamemnon,'" in Lefevere, p. 42]
(Berman 1992 pp. 11-12)

'In Germany, as an activity that has generated an identity, translation from Luther until the present has been the object of a reflection for which an equivalent could probably hardly be found. **The translating practice here is accompanied by a reflection, sometimes purely empirical or methodological, sometimes cultural and social, sometimes outright speculative, on the meaning of the act of translation, on its linguistic, literary, metaphysical, religious, and historical implications, on the relation among languages, between same and other, between what is one's own and what is foreign. In itself, Luther's Bible is the self-affirmation of the German language against the Latin of 'Rome,' as Luther himself emphasized in his *Letter on Translation*. Nevertheless, in the eighteenth century, after the rich blossoming of baroque translations, and until Herder and Voss, the influence of French classicism brought along a trend of purely formal translations conforming to "good taste" as defined by the Enlightenment. Such**

is Wieland's case, whose translations of Shakespeare, as Gundolf tells us, "start from the public" instead of "starting from the poet." [NOTE 7 to p. 13: In Winfried Sdun, *Probleme und Theorien des Übersetzens* (Munich: Hueber, 1967), p. 29] This tendency, termed *galicizing* by the contemporary Germans themselves, is victoriously defeated by the penetration into Germany of English literature and the beginning of a return to the "sources" (folk poetry, medieval poetry, the philosophy of Jakob Boehme, etc.), as well as by an increasingly "manifold" (A.W. Schlegel's term) opening onto different world literatures. This is also the age, first with Lessing, then with Herder and Goethe, in which their *own* literature becomes an issue (not quite national, even less nationalist, as with late Romanticism), a literature which could clearly define its relation with French classicism, the Encyclopedists, the Spanish Golden Age, Italian renaissance poetry, Elizabethan drama, the eighteenth-century English novel and, finally and essentially, Graeco-Roman Antiquity, in the framework of the old battle between Ancient and Modern, revived by Winckelmann. In this respect, the issue is whether Greeks or Romans should be given prominence—an issue that was of the utmost importance to the *Athenäum* romantics and which will retain its actuality through Nietzsche.' (Berman 1992 pp. 12-13)

In this global self-definition, this *situation* within the space of European literature, translation plays a decisive role, largely because it is the *transmission of forms*. The revival, from Herder to Grimm, of folk tales and folk poetry, of medieval songs and epics, points in the same direction: It is an intratranslation of sorts, through which German literature acquires a vast treasury of *forms*, even more than a repository of themes and contents. Philology, comparative grammar, textual criticism, and hermeneutics, which are inaugurated in Germany at the turn of the eighteenth century, have a functionally analogous role in this enterprise: A.W. Schlegel is at the same time critic, translator, literary theorist, philologist, and comparatist. Humboldt is at the same time translator and theoretician of language. Schleiermacher is "hermeneuticist," translator, and theologian. Hence the close connection, the meaning of which will be seen later, between criticism, hermeneutics, and translation.' (Berman 1992 p. 13)

Within this cultural field, which the Germans were beginning to call *Bildung* (culture and education), the enterprises of the Romantics, Goethe, Humboldt and Hölderlin, will be developed. The translations of the Romantics, which take on the conscious form of a *program*, simultaneously correspond to a concrete need of the age (to enrich the poetic and theatrical forms), and of a vision peculiar to them, marked by the Idealism defined by Kant, Fichte, and Schelling. Friedrich Schlegel, Novalis, and Schleiermacher themselves take an active part in this speculative process. For Goethe, less of a theorist, translation is integrated into the context of *Weltliteratur* (world literature), for which the purest medium might well be the German language, as is suggested by the passages quoted above. Translation is one of the instruments for the constitution of a universality—a view belonging to German classicism, of which he, with Schiller and Humboldt, is the prime representative. For the Romantics of the *Athenäum*, translation on a "grand" scale is an essential moment, together with criticism, of the constitution of a "universal progressive poetry"—that is to say, of the affirmation of poetry as absolute. As a programmatic practice, it found its executors in A.W. Schlegel, I. Tieck, and its theorists in F. Schlegel and Novalis. To be sure, in the latter two one does not find a systematic exposition of criticism, the fragment, literature, or art in general. Nevertheless, in the mass of romantic texts, there is a reflection on translation, closely connected to the more fully developed reflections on literature and criticism. The issue for us, then, is to *reconstruct* this reflection by situating it in the labyrinth of their theories—a labyrinth which, in its structure, will turn out to be concerned with translation and translability. When Novalis writes to A.W. Schlegel, "In the final analysis, all poetry is translation," [NOTE 8 to p. 14: Novalis, *Briefe und Dokumente*, vol. 4 of *Werke Briefe Dokumente*, ed. Ewald Wasmuth (Heidelberg: Schneider, 1954), p. 368 [Letter to A.W. Schlegel, 30 November 1797]] he places the concept of *Dichtung* (supreme with him) and that of *Übersetzung* in an unfathomable essential proximity. When F. Schlegel writes to his brother, "The power to penetrate into the most intimate singularity of a great spirit, for which you have often ill-humoredly rebuked me, calling it 'the talent of the translator,'" [NOTE 9 to p. 14: Letter of 11 February 1792, quoted in Sdun, p. 117] he places *criticism*, *understanding* and *translation* within the same essential proximity, though in a

psychological way. One may be tempted to hear in this an echo of Hamann's words in *Esthetica in nuce*:

Speaking is translating—from an angelic language into a human language, that is to say, transposing thoughts into words—things into names—images into signs.

[NOTE 10 to p. 14: Johann Georg Hamann, *Sämtliche Werke* II, ed. Josef Nadler (Wien: Herder 1950), p. 199 (An excellent French translation of this text, by J.F. Courtine, can be found in *Poésie*, no. 3 (1980): 3-51]

(Berman 1992 pp. 13-14)

'The Romantic theory of translation, poetical and speculative, constitutes the basis of a certain modern consciousness of literature and translation in quite a few respects. Here, the aim of our study is double: on the one hand to *reveal* the still underestimated role of this theory in the economy of Romantic thought but, also, on the other hand, to *question* the postulates, and thus to contribute to a critique of our modernity. The "speculative" theory of translation and the "intransitive" or "monologic" theory of literature are related [NOTE 22 to p. 18: For a discussion of the "monologic" and the "intransitive," see Tzvetan Todorov, *Theories of the Symbol* and Mikail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*]. Striking twentieth-century examples may be found in Blanchot, Steiner, or Serres. This evolution, begun by the *Athenäum*, is now in its repetitive and epigonal phase: What is at stake today is a liberation from it so as to prepare a new domain of literature, criticism, and translation.

The "speculative" theory of translation and the "intransitive" theory of poetry are, in a profound sense, "things of the past," whatever may be the "modern" finery with which they adorn themselves. They block the way of the historical, cultural, and linguistic dimension of translation and poetry. And it is this dimension which is beginning to reveal itself at the present day.' (Berman 1992 p. 18)

'Walter Benjamin, in *The Concept of Art Criticism in German Romanticism*—perhaps the most perspicacious work on the *Athenäum* ever written—remains the only author who has fully measured the importance of the subject and who has situated it in the larger context of a reflection on Romanticism:

Apart from the translation of Shakespeare, the durable poetic work of the Romantics is the annexation of Romance artistic forms for German literature. Their efforts were consciously directed to the appropriation, development, and purification of these forms. But their relation to them was entirely different from that of the preceding generations. **Unlike the *Aufklärung*, the Romantics did not conceive of form as an aesthetic rule for art, the following of which was a necessary precondition for the pleasurable or edifying effect of the work. For them, form was neither a rule, nor did it depend on rules. This conception, without which A.W. Schlegel's truly significant translations from the Italian, the Spanish, and the Portuguese would be unthinkable, was developed philosophically by his brother.** [NOTE 28 to p. 21: Walter Benjamin, *Der Begriff der Kunstskritik in der deutschen Romantik*, in *Gesammelte Schriften* I, 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1974), p. 76]

Elsewhere, in "The Task of the Translator," Benjamin also mentions the Romantics:

They, more than any others, were gifted with →→→**an insight into the life of literary works which has its highest testimony in translation**←←←. To be sure, they hardly recognized translation in this sense, but devoted their attention to criticism, another, if a lesser, factor in the continued life of literary works. But **even though the Romantics virtually ignored translation in their theoretical writings, their own great translations testify to their sense of the essential nature and the dignity of this literary mode.** [NOTE 29 to p. 21: "The Task of the Translator," tr. Harry Zohn, in *Illuminations* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968), p. 76]

Even if Benjamin underestimates the value of those rare texts which the Romantics devoted to translation, it still remains that he has circumscribed exactly the space it occupies with them. Furthermore, **his own view of translation may be considered as a radicalization of Novalis's and F. Schlegel's intuitions.**' (Berman 1992 pp. 20-21)

Herder, translation, and nation:

Note the tropes used to express the anxiety at the presence of a cultural and linguistic *other* in the process of establishing an *authentic* and *essentialist* cultural and national identity. Translation as intercourse / rape / contamination / the mingling of bloods. Translation as *differentiation* and *dialectic* – *shift* and *metamorphosis*. Compare it, in this regard, with Dryden’s famous translation of Book XV in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (“On the Pythagorean Philosophy”), which he uses to discuss metamorphosis as one of the most insightful tropes for translation. Herder also describes the translator as a ‘merchant who really enriches the state’

It is well known that Herder developed an entire philosophy of culture, history, and language in which such notions as *genius*, *people*, *popular poetry*, *myth* and *nation* acquired their patent nobility. He himself translated poetry, notably Spanish “romances.” Because of his manifold poetic, philosophical, and linguistic interests, he was well placed to gauge the importance of the relation to the foreign that manifested itself in Germany with increasing force, specifically under the influence of English literature and Graeco-Roman antiquity. At the same time, a return to the “sources,” that is a return to popular poetry and the prestigious medieval past, was inaugurated. Herder, with his *Volkslieder*, played a leading role in this movement. His reflection, centered essentially on language and history, represents the first version of German classicism...

The problems of translation, as far as they affect the relation of the mother tongue to foreign languages, often have an immediate intensity for Herder, which is expressed in almost amorous and sexual terms. Thus

It is not to unlearn my language that I learn other languages; it is not to exchange the habits of my education that I travel among foreign peoples; it is not to lose the citizenship of my fatherland that I become a naturalized foreigner; if I were to act in this way, I would lose more than I would gain. But I walk through foreign gardens to pick flowers for my language, as the betrothed of my manner of thinking; I observe foreign manners in order to sacrifice mine to the genius of my fatherland, like fruits ripened under a foreign sun. [NOTE 9 to p. 38: Winfried Sdun. *Probleme und Theorien des Übersetzens in Deutschland vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Munich: Hueber, 1967, p. 26]

The relation of what is one’s own and what is foreign is expressed in images, but the specter of a possible treason lurks behind the very choice of the comparisons and the apologetic and defensive tone of the text. Predominance of the foreign: loss of what is one’s own. Transformation of the foreign into the simple pretext of the enrichment of what is one’s own: treason of the very experience of strangeness. (Berman 1992 p. 38)

In the face of the imbalances inherent in any relation to the foreign—imbalances which have their immediate projection in the domain of translation—the temptation to refuse this relation altogether is great. Klopstock, more than Herder, has experienced this temptation, not so much on the level of translation as on the level of interlingual relations, like the borrowing of foreign words. He was preoccupied by this problem as a poet and as a grammarian to the extent that he considered German a purer language than English (afflicted by an unsettling mass of Latin words) and freer than French (prisoner of its classicism). As for Herder, the mother tongue was for him “a sort of reservoir of the most original concept of the people”. As such, it had to delimit itself in relation to other languages and affirm its own territory. Hence the dream, for him and Herder, of a *virgin language*, protected against any foreign blemishes, in particular the blemish that translation runs the risk of being. Again, Herder’s language takes on a curious sexual coloring:

Even though there are many reasons to recommend *translations* for the formation (*Bildung*) of the language, language nevertheless has greater advantages in protecting itself from all translation. Before translation, a language resembles a young virgin that has not yet had intercourse with a man, and therefore could not have conceived the fruit of the mingling of their blood. It is still pure and in a state of innocence, the faithful image of the character of its people. Even if it would be nothing but poverty, caprice, and irregularity, it is the original national language. [Sdun, 1967 p. 26]

A text disturbing in its utopian naïveté, in the kind of profoundness which it possesses nonetheless, deriving from the image of the young virgin applied to the mother tongue as well as **the—obviously vertiginous—myth of a language closed onto itself, not “knowing,” in the biblical sense, any other languages. Utopia is the right term here, since the destiny of the virgin is to become a woman, just like, to draw from the stock of vegetal images with which German classicism and Romanticism are so well endowed, it is the destiny of the bud to become a flower and then fruit. The very choice of Herder’s image, even if one takes into account the Christian or perhaps Rosseauian valorization of virginity, shows that the relation to the foreign cannot and should not be avoided.**

For a culture and a language threatened too much by this relation, there remains the temptation of a pure closure onto itself, just like in late Romanticism we encounter the temptation of the ineffable, the unspeakable, and, as we shall see, the untranslatable: *Not only not to translate any more, but to become untranslatable itself, this is perhaps the most complete expression of a closed language.* A regressive temptation, if it is true that the relation to the foreign is also, and above all, a relation of *differentiation*, of *dialectic*, or however else one wants to call that movement of the constitution of the self by the experience [*épreuve*] of the non-self, which, as we shall see, is the very essence of *culture* for German classicism and idealism.’ (Berman 1992 pp. 38-39)

‘Trying, like Goether, to maintain a balance between this temptation and the inverse temptation of a pure being-outside-oneself (of which examples may be found in certain Romantics), and starting from the reflections of certain collaborators to the *Literaturbriefe*, Herder defines the nature, the role, and the options of the translator—which are all closely linked to the expansion of language and culture. Thus he quotes Thomas Abbt in his *Fragments*:

The genuine translator has a higher purpose than to make foreign books comprehensible to the reader; a purpose which elevates him to the rank of an author and which transforms the small vendor into a merchant who really enriches the state... These translators could become our *classic* writers. [Sdun 1967 pp. 25-6]

Homer, Aeschylus, and Sophocles created their masterpieces out of a language that did not yet possess any cultivated prose. Their translator must implant their masterpieces into a language which remains prose... even in hexameters, so as to lose it as little as possible. They clothed thoughts in words and images; **the translator himself must be a creative genius if he wants to satisfy both the original and his own language.** [Sdun 1967 p. 26]

Regarding another *Literaturbrief*, Herder goes further:

A second, higher degree: if **translators** could be found who not only study the author in order to translate the meaning of the original into our language, but also to find its **individual tone**, who **put themselves in the character of its writing style and express correctly for us the genuine distinctive traits, the expression, and the tone of the foreign original, its dominant character, its genius and the nature of its poetic genre.** Frankly, this is very much, but not yet enough for my ideal translator... If someone translated for us the father of poetry, Homer: an eternal work for German literature, a very useful work for geniuses, a precious work for the muse of antiquity and our language... All this can become a Homeric translation if it raises itself above the level of the *attempt*, if it becomes, as it were, *the whole life of a scholar* and **shows us Homer as he is, and as he could be for us...** So far for the introduction; and the translation? It should in no way be embellished... **The French, who are too proud of their national taste, draw everything close to it, instead of**

adapting themselves to the taste of another epoch... We poor Germans, on the other hand, still **almost without public and without country**, still without the tyrant of a national taste, we want to see this epoch as it is. And in Homer's case the best translation cannot accomplish this without the notes and explanations of an eminent critical spirit. [Sdun 1967 pp. 26-7]? (Berman 1992 pp. 39-40)

From Luther to Herder there is a progression which the French influence and the rationalism of the Enlightenment have at most only hindered: **At the time of the constitution of a literature and a theater that would form, as it were, the two center pieces of German culture** (and this is indeed the central preoccupation of Herder and Lessing), translation is called upon **for the second time** to play a central role. To be sure, it shares this role—and in this Herder announces the Romantics—with *criticism*. Regarding the text we have just commented upon, we may speak, for that matter, of *critical translation*. But from Herder's perspective, translation, so to speak, plays a more immediate role because it deals directly with language; which is a point that Jean Paul, in his *School for Aesthetics*, as well perceived—at a time, to be sure, when the translations Herder had wished for were already historic:

In Schlegel's Shakespeare and in Voss' translations, language lets its artful fountains play, and *both* works give weight to the wish of the author of the present work: that translators in general might know how much they have done for the sonority, the plenitude, the purity of the language, often more than the writer himself, because language, precisely, is their subject matter, whereas the writer sometimes forgets language to the benefit of the subject matter [Jean Paul, *Vorschule der Aesthetik* (Munich: Hanser, 1963), p. 304]

More specifically, what remains to be asked is: **To what extent does German culture, as it is defined in the second half of the eighteenth century with Lessing and Herder, then Goethe and the Romantics, specifically imply translation as an essential moment of its constitution?** And further: Once it has been stated that the essence of translation is the *fidelity to the spirit of the works* which opens a culture to the foreign and thus enables it to expand, **what are the preferred domains of translation that must be opened to the German Bildung?** In other words, having answered the questions *why translate?* and *how to translate?*, one must answer the question: *what should be translated?* These three questions are at the very center of any *historical* theory of translation.' (Berman 1992 p. 41)

11 Translation and the Construction of Literary Canons

Translation in Early Modern England. A review of Fred Schurink, ed. *Tudor Translation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011¹²

The origins of this volume lie at a conference at Newcastle University on 9 and 10 July 2009, which was part of the editor's Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship on 'Translation, Politics, and Society in Tudor England'.¹³

In the introduction the editor emphasizes the shortcomings of translation studies in assessing the general cultural impact of literary translation, and the need for a fresh perspective in literary history that can actually take stock of the central importance of translation. Indeed, if there ever was an inherently interdisciplinary subject, it is translation studies. The processes involved in translation contribute in an essential way to create canons and bring together a large variety of fields and traditions that comprehend, inter alia, literature, religion, politics, or science.

As the editor rightly emphasizes in his introduction, translation was a central part of the early modern educational programme. Authors and scholars were trained in a combination of classical rhetorical drills with the system of double translation. The stylistic and compositional habits that this method must have imprinted in the minds of generations of young students cannot have failed to remain deeply ingrained in their adult life as literary and cultural agents. Furthermore—as Hadfield's chapter on Spenser demonstrates—many of these authors cut their teeth in the business of poetic composition through translation.¹⁴

An excellent example that illustrates the interconnectedness of translation with a large variety of cultural phenomena features in Andrew Taylor's chapter, which provides an interesting account of revealing aspects of John Christopherson. The essay discusses the contrast between Christopherson as a Catholic translator vs his compatriot Laurence Humphrey, who militated in the reformist camp. Both also exemplify the international dimension of the question, and its inherently interconnectedness with other disciplines. Humphrey exemplifies the transmission of the classical legacy and of foundational Greek and Latin theological texts, and their eventual combination into a new type of discourse that influenced contemporary political theory. Taylor describes how in his translations Humphrey combined secular and scriptural trends into a type of civil discourse which in turn influenced Sir Thomas Smith's *De republica anglorum*. Humphrey also pioneered the creation of an early canon of English

¹² This is a longer, author's version, of a book review published in *Translation and Literature* 22 (2013) 266-272 (DOI: 10.33366/tal.2013.0118)

¹³ P. viii.

¹⁴ A case in point here is Christopher Marlowe, with all the translations and adaptations that he produced while still a student in Cambridge: if we have a case of a literary education through translation, or the practice of translation as the gateway to an independent career as a man of letters, Marlowe provides the perfect model (a subject which still does not have the monograph it deserves). Schurink, "Introduction", pp. 4-5.

translators in book III of his *Interpretatio Linguarum*, the only theoretical treatise on translation in Tudor England.¹⁵

Warren Boutcher's account of Christopher Watson proves how the transfer and circulation of pre-existing tropes, *topoi* and narratives—after they had been duly dismembered and fragmented for the convenience of the translator and his patrons—were used for the creation of all sorts of identities and cultural artefacts through the appropriation of political and religious capital. Boutcher's chapter traces the paths that led to Watson's rendering of Polybius and its legacy. A young Cambridge student in mid-Tudor England, Watson recounts how he interrupted his reading of Aristotle in search of historical narratives to relax from the dry abstractions of philosophy. This led him first to Edward Hall's *The union of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre and Yorke*. Impressed by the rhetorical skills and the use of classical exempla in a speech that the historian ascribed to the Earl of Westmoreland, Watson next decided to go *ad fontes*, which led him first to Perotti (the author of an early modern Latin version of Polybius), Livy, and eventually Polybius himself.¹⁶

Gordon Braden's chapter ("Edward Fairfax and the Translation of Vernacular Epic") deals with translations of contemporary epic poetry—in contrast to the much more abundant translations from classical epic, of which he provides revealing figures. Since epic functioned within the humanist canon as a sort of secular scripture bestowed with important educational civic and moral roles, early modern authors sought to produce a vast array of versions in a large variety of tones and styles. As was also the case with certain translations from classical epic and narrative poems (e.g. Ovid's *Metamorphoses*), there was also a certain degree of metrical experimentation in translations from their vernacular counterparts.¹⁷ Like other chapters in the volume, Braden sets out to provide an outline of a lesser known text. In this case this is Edward Fairfax's *Godfrey of Bulloigne*—his rendering of Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata*, which appears in contrast with the better known *Orlando* of Harington.¹⁸ Braden construes Fairfax's translation as an epitome of some of the most important rhetorical features of Tudor translation generally: "careful observance of the original's *inventio* and *dispositio*, improvisational freedom with its *elocutio*".¹⁹ Braden also proves how an important—albeit indirect and contextual—component that complicated the relations between Fairfax's original and his translation is Petrarch, and he concludes that Fairfax arguably construed the Petrarchan subtext of his translation through the mediation of contemporary English versions of the Italian poet.²⁰

Translation, writing, and rewriting created a complex web of *influences* that circulated in multiple directions. This *cartography* of readings and misreadings blurs and complicates the boundaries and relations between authors and interpreters, originals and imitations, source texts and translations. This map reveals the intricacy of the European canon, and can reach

¹⁵Humphrey's "recondite synthesis of classical and biblical wisdom" was eventually used to legitimize "his civil discourse", and in turn his translation of Philo's *De nobilitate* influenced Sir Thomas Smith's *De republica anglorum* (Taylor, 2011, p. 86). With his *Interpretatio*, Humphrey "surveys recent English translators, both vernacular and Latin... [an] extended roll call, which includes Thomas Wyatt, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, Thomas Chaloner, Thomas Elyot, John Caius, Nicholas Udall, Katherine Parr, and such lesser known figures as Richard Candish (Cavendish) and John Eden."

¹⁶ Boutcher, 2011, p. 108. Watson's volume includes an appendix, described in the title-page as "an abstract, compendiously coercted out of the life and worthy acts perpetrate by oure puissant Prince king Henry the fift". This abstract was inspired by Watson's reading of Edward Hall's *The union of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre and Yorke* (in particular by the part where the historian deals with the wonderful transformation of Prince Hal into Henry V, and his military prowess)—and there could be a connection here with the reading of Livy, the practical application of translation (in terms of military techniques, cf. for instance Morison's translation of the treatise on military strategy), and the contribution of translation, reading, compilation, etc. to nation building, etc. (see Boutcher, 2011, p. 204).

¹⁷ Braden 2011, p. 162. Vernacular epic is also the subject of Robert Cummings' chapter—an aspect of poetic translation that Andrew Hadfield mentions in his own chapter.

¹⁸ Braden 2011 pp. 162-3.

¹⁹ Braden 2011 p. 163, p. 164, p. 165.

²⁰ Braden 2011, p. 170.

further levels of complexity and richness when the scholar abandons traditional critical outlooks centred around the figure of the author, and the concept of originality, and shifts instead into a perspective that views texts as they circulate in multiple directions and on a variety of levels, flowing loosely across different periods and venues on the back of their interpretation, reception, and appropriation. To do this effectively the scholar need not abandon the solid critical habits that start with close-readings of the primary texts and continues with close examination of contextual evidence. Empirical examples like those provided by Braden reveal that more *imaginative* and creative forms of criticism—Harold Bloom comes to mind—are less speculative and more grounded upon the texts themselves than we have frequently been led to believe.²¹

Stuart Gillespie (2011, p. 47) describes the thesis advanced by Michael Silk on Shakespeare and Greek Tragedy, a most interesting case [Michael Silk, “Shakespeare and Greek Tragedy”, in Charles Martindale and A.B. Taylor, eds. *Shakespeare and the Classics*, Cambridge, 2004, pp. 241-47], and then Gillespie follows up with his own suggestion about the actual source for Shakespeare’s hero-centred tragic model, i.e. Plutarch:

“Critical discussions, not unlike what are sometimes called ‘works of the imagination’, all have their starting points, and one of this chapter’s is a recent essay by Michael Silk titled ‘Shakespeare and Greek Tragedy: Strange Relationship’. This leads the reader from the issue of Greek tragedy’s apparently very limited influence on Shakespeare to that of ‘Shakespearean “influence” on Greek tragedy’ [Silk, 2004, 241, quoting Charles and Michele Martindale]. Silk intriguingly suggests that one effect of the ‘profound affinity’ between Shakespearean and Greek tragedy, of their ‘common inner logic’, has been that the English dramatist ‘has exerted a multifarious interpretive pull’ over the ancient Greek plays—‘a kind of reverse, Eliotian influence’ [Sil, 2004, 246]. **Shakespeare, that is, has been ‘read back’ onto the Greeks, helping to stimulate modern critical awareness of the thematic function of Aeschylus’ imagery or of features in Euripides that might be regarded as comic or tragicomic. Most fundamentally, Silk suggests, Shakespeare has sponsored our ‘expectation of the unitary-heroic matrix’, the supposition in place since the seventeenth century that Greek tragedies are structured around a single hero.** One result of this, he speculates, is the current assignment of the role of normative Greek tragedian to Sophocles (though efforts have had to be made to bring *Antigone* into line), whereas it is Euripides who was more highly esteemed in Shakespeare’s time” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 47)

“Later, I will suggest that more may remain to be uncovered about the impact Greek tragedy had on Shakespeare, as well as his impact on it. But to start at the beginning: how did Shakespeare come to place his own writing within this ‘matrix’—to acquire his idea of how a tragic play could or should be constructed? This seems to have happened under the influence neither of classical Greek theatre nor of the later tragedies Shakespeare knew which derived from it, namely Senecan drama as mediated by English translators and by the sixteenth-century Italian plays of Cinthio and others. Rather, where this question leads us was suggested 50 years ago when **J.A.K. Thomson wrote: ‘I believe it was from Plutarch that Shakespeare learned how to make a tragedy of the kind exemplified in *Hamlet* and *Othello*, *Macbeth* and *Lear*. It was... in the course of writing *Julius Caesar* that he learned it’** [NOTE 4 to p. 48: Thomson, *Shakespeare and the Classics*, New York, 1952]. This proposition has since won general acceptance, and even those to whom it is still

²¹From Tasso to Spenser – from Spenser to Fairfax’s translation of Tasso. See Braden, 2011, p. 166, pp. 166-67.

unfamiliar should not be unduly surprised by it. Shakespeare is believed to have written *Julius Caesar* before any of the other plays named, under Elizabeth in 1599, and his source was Plutarch. ***Julius Caesar* may not in itself have a straightforwardly tragic structure, but it leads to Shakespearean tragedy because in it Shakespeare, in the words of a more recent commentator, Cynthia Marshall, ‘crosses his own Rubicon’, moving from ‘largely plot-driven plays’ to ‘deeply characterological drama’. Marshall suggests further that ‘what happens... in Shakespeare’s conversion of [Plutarchan] narrative into drama, is the establishment of our culture’s prevailing model of character as one that is at once intensely performative and putatively interiorized’** [NOTE 5 to p. 48: Cynthia Marshall, “Sight and Sound: Two Modes of Shakespearean Subjectivity on the British Stage”, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51(2000):353-61, 80, 73]. As I hope will become clear, what I think this formulation obscures is that **Shakespeare’s ‘model of character’ is itself one that looks backwards to the classics, as much as forwards to ourselves”** (Gillespie, 2011, p. 48)

“Lest I be thought to stray from my path, translation is decisively involved here, for, knowing nothing of the Greek Plutarch, Shakespeare was the beneficiary of the work of two of the most accomplished prose translators of the sixteenth century. They were the Englishman Sir Thomas North and behind him the admired Jacques Amyot, of whose 1559 French rendering, rather than the original Greek, North’s *Lives* (1579) was expressly a translation. Everyone knows that Shakespeare used Plutarch’s narrative material; he was also attracted to North’s way with words. Verbal parallels, at some points so extensive as to give the impression that Shakespeare is merely versifying North’s prose, occur throughout the Roman plays.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 48)

“Shakespeare used North, but did not use Amyot. We know this because Shakespeare’s texts reflect North’s adjustments of Amyot (inadvertent as well as deliberate), and indeed the very mistakes of North’s printers.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 49)

“Yes, Shakespeare’s drama helps us to recover the classical and Plutarchan conception. Yes, Shakespeare’s drama moves away over time from plot and towards character as its motivating force—and this he learned in large part from Plutarch. And no, Shakespeare’s tragic figures do not possess the ‘roundedness’ of novelistic characters. It is not only the twentieth-century debates about apparent inconsistencies in their presentation (“How many children had Lady Macbeth?”) that tell us he could not have ‘stood a stiff cross-examination’ on them, as Henry James reported feeling himself capable of undergoing on Mrs Brook in *The Awkward Age*. **We can recognize and ‘read’ Macbeth’s character, and it is plainly what drives the play from first to last; but it is based on only a few traits rather than constituting a full-blown Jamesian self complete with developmental history.** As we have said, it’s agreed that Shakespeare learned from Plutarch how character as opposed to plot could become the structural principle of a play. My further suggestion is that alongside this, in fact facilitating it, was the way Shakespeare and Plutarch entertained a similar conception of character itself. I’d like to suggest how this works in *Anthony and Cleopatra*, which, together with *Coriolanus*, is one of the Shakespearean tragedies that makes the most of the notion of character I am pointing towards.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 54)

If, as Michael Silk claims, Seneca was the closest that Shakespeare got to Greek tragedy, this would be after all a process in which translation of sorts would be

involved? In his introduction, Gillespie himself acknowledges that Roman literature was built upon translations of Greek authors, we can thus ask ourselves to what extent Seneca's tragedies were *translations* of sort from their Greek counterparts: "The activity of translation had, of course, been at the centre of western culture well before the arrival of the earliest forms of the English language. Translation was fundamental to Roman literature: it is taken for granted as much in modern as in ancient times that Latin letters grew expressly out of translations from works in the Greek epic and dramatic tradition. Livius Andronicus (c. 284-204 BCE), sometimes claimed as the 'father of Roman literature', introduced Greek writing to the Romans by translating the *Odyssey* into the Italian Saturnian metre and adapting Greek tragedy to the Roman stage. Others soon followed with closer or looser forms of translation and adaptation: Gnaeus Naevius with plays on the Trojan War; Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius with tragedy; Caecilius Statius with comedy. Translation, that is, had the effect of directly inaugurating Roman epic and drama at a time when these genres were barely emergent in their own right." (Gillespie, 2011, pp. 1-2)

"A range of effects which Plutarch might have mediated from Greek tragedy to Shakespeare can readily be enumerated. For *Julius Caesar* recent discussion has proposed mirroring scenes, the struggle against the continuing past and the ambivalent relevance of a distant figure. But is there something still more fundamental than these features? **Can it be that the 'doubleness' of character traits, the idea that human beings undo themselves not through their bad qualities but their good ones, the tragic sense of the destructiveness inherent in greatness, was one of the Greek tragic motifs that shaped Plutarch's *Antony*, and thereby made its way into Shakespeare's field of vision? ...** And so I find myself, after all, joining the pastime of asking how Greek contributed to Shakespearean tragedy and also asking whether, after all, we must accept (with Michael Silk) that Seneca was 'the closest he ever got' to it. **Certainly we may say that Antony's own despair at his inability to tell whether his actions will lead to good or ill not only implies precisely such a double edgedness to everything he is and does; it also sounds, as he expresses it, reminiscent of Sophoclean self-discovery... In the distinctively Greek stress on the selfsame traits operating to create as well as destroy a hero (as clear if not clearer in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* as in his *Antony*), we may be touching not only on what Shakespeare learned from Plutarch, but on what Greek tragedy gave to English".** (Gillespie, 2011, p. 57)

"My account has tried to do justice to both sides of the equation that reception always implies. Reading Plutarch helps us read Shakespeare and may even help us put our finger on where Shakespeare is coming from (with character, with tragedy). But from the other side, even if Shakespeare stands between us and Plutarch, giving us a Plutarch already comprehensively reprocessed, it is nevertheless the case that **thinking about Shakespeare is a way of thinking about Greek literature, non only the *Parallel Lives* but Athenian tragedy too, and about our response to it.**" (Gillespie, 2011, p. 59)

Translation studies has much to gain, and above all to offer, from this creatively eclectic and comprehensive approach. It should be a truism to declare that the moment we study translations, our outlook should automatically switch to international mode, but this is more frequently taken for granted than actually adopted. We do need an international historicist

approach to the networks involved in the production and distribution of translated texts—which always involves multiple agents—and then combine this historicist-empiricist approach with the sort of epistemological premises it calls for. The latter emerge from a consideration of translation as phenomenon that dissolves (*inter alia*) traditional notions of agency, authorship, or even identity, and that even profoundly determines knowledge and culture in the broadest sense of these terms.²² As Warren Boutcher illustrates in his chapter, patrons and dedicatees were important agents within these domestic and international networks, and they provide useful information about the material, political, religious and ideological interests within which the translator was working.²³ If on the one hand we must then regard translations as *autonomous* literary artefacts—as Schurink, following Boutcher, correctly proclaims²⁴—the translation scholar must also reorient his or her gaze towards the reception of texts, their different material conditions and cultural contexts of production, as well as the status of translators as über-readers who filter and determine to a large extent the eventual mode of reception of a particular text.²⁵ In other words, a proper critical account must take into consideration the multiple dimensions of the original, the translation, and their agents—what pragmatics calls the universe of discourse around the text.

The volume mentions an interesting case (among many others) in Andrew Taylor's chapter, in the form of Laurence Humphrey's letter to Magdalen College on Greek literature and the reading and imitation of Homer. Note that Humphrey also worked as corrector (as well as translator) at Froben's press in Basle. Taylor, 2011, pp. 85-6.

“In his *Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1965 [p. 49, p. 1]), J.C. Catford proposed that what is really meant when people say that a translation ‘means the same as’ or ‘is equivalent to’ its source is that the two texts ‘are *interchangeable in a given situation*’, that is, one can be substituted for the other. Translation, he says, is ‘a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another’. This account, which develops the contextual semantics launched by J.R. Firth, supplies a good explanation of why it is that translation can be done—much of the time—perfectly satisfactorily despite the disparities of meaning we have touched on.” (Reynolds, 2011 pp. 19-20)

“As these examples show, the purpose a text is designed to fulfil, and the purposes that readers bring to it, are crucial elements of its ‘situation’. They need to be taken into account by translators wondering how to set about their work and by critics judging whether a translation has been a success—that is, whether it has achieved the requisite kind of partial ‘equivalence’, given that the absolute equivalence of sameness is impossible.” (Reynolds, 2011, p. 20)

“A group of German scholars have elaborated this view into a theory of translation-purpose, or *Skopostheorie*. Hans Vermeer sums it up: ‘what the *Skopos* states is that one must translate, consciously and consistently, in accordance with some principle respecting the target text.’” (Reynolds, 2011 pp. 20-21)

The early chapters of Reynold's volume provide an interesting survey and discussion of different concepts and definitions of translation, and the aporias, controversy and troubles that this poses. Unlike some other volumes on literary translation, he brings together texts from cultural historians or literary critics (like Eco, or Steiner), insights provided by

²² Boutcher, 2011, p. 101, pp. 101-2.

²³ Warren Boutcher provides an interesting case that illustrates the relevance of the dedicatees of the translation (who were related to the family in the North East, the Nevilles, ancestors of the first earl of Westmorland, who delivers the speech. Boutcher, 2011, p. 109, p. 110.

²⁴ Schurink, “Introduction”, p. 2.

²⁵ Schurink, “Introduction”, p. 6.

translators, and also material from the field of translation studies, applied linguistics, linguistics, philosophy, poststructuralism, etc. He engages with them, sometimes agreeing, sometimes disagreeing, etc. The following paragraph introduces the figure of the reader / audience, and the context of reception of the text, i.e. an important part of the universe of discourse – in doing so, it goes beyond the text of the translation itself, to consider the ways in which it is viewed. Hermans has a point (although, of course, he takes it a tad too far: in this I do agree with Reynolds)

“Perhaps we might escape the difficulties in which we are becoming entangled if we are, simply, more resolute than Scott or Carne-Cross or Lewis or Tymoczko or Derrida in abandoning any idea of sameness, transmission, or carrying across. Theo Hermans has recently taken this line. In international diplomacy, he points out, versions of the same treaty in different languages are something through of, not as original and translation, but as ‘parallel authentic versions’ [NOTE 1 to p. 26: *The Conference of the Tongues* (Manchester, 2007), 10]. Even if one of them has in fact been drafted first and the others translated from it—that is, even if there are original and translations in a ‘genetic’ sense—the parallel texts are accepted as being all equally authoritative. This, he thinks, is the blueprint that allows us to understand how any translation comes to be taken as a substitute:

A translation cannot double up with its parent text. It uses different words, which issue from a different source, in a different environment. A translation cannot therefore be equivalent with its prototext, it can only be *declared* equivalent by means of a performative speech act. [NOTE 2 to p. 26: T. Hermans, “Paradoxes and Aporias in Translation and Translation Studies”, in Alessandra Riccardi (ed.), *Translation Studies: perspectives on an Emerging Discipline* (Cambridge, 2002), 10-23, 11]

This ‘performative speech act’ occurs when lawyers and politicians agree that the different versions in different languages all embody the same treaty. In literary culture, the relevant speech acts tend to be less binding than those of international law: they consist in publishers’ blurbs, reviews, and readers’ reactions. Nevertheless, Hermans sees them as having the same magical power.

I regard a translation as initially being merely another text until it is declared to be a translation. At that moment, provided the speech act succeeds, a change takes place: the translation continues to look as it did before, but its nature has altered because somehow it is now another work. [NOTE 3 to p. 26: *The Conference of the Tongues*, 91]

As we saw in Chapter 3, institutional structures play a crucial part in defining and policing different kinds of ‘equivalence’. But Hermans magnifies their role to a startling degree.” (Reynolds 2011 p. 26)

“What is missing from Herman’s argument is the recognition that his validating speech acts have to have grounds. All the difficulties that have been exercising us are swatted away with his swift subordinate clause, ‘provided the speech act succeeds’. But what determines whether it succeeds? The institutional assertion that a text is a translation will only work if that text already possesses qualities that are amenable to counting as translation. We are thrown right back into the problem of describing what these are.” (Reynolds, 2011 p. 27)

Helen Moore's chapter reminds us that in analysing the tropes used by translators to describe their trade we must take into careful consideration the shifts in meaning and usage that the particular terms in question have undergone. This is fundamental if we want to conduct an accurate analysis of what their usage actually reveals about the principles that drove the practice of translation in sixteenth-century England. Moore also provides evidence that demonstrates the permeability of texts not just in inter-linguistic terms, but also as regards intra-linguistic transfer between different spheres of discourse. For instance she describes cases in which the languages of medicine and religious doctrine overlap. There is much heuristic potential in closer examination of the ways in which the registers of different disciplines overlap and interact with each other. If we really want to focus on translation as a culturally constitutive process we do need to use critical concepts that transcend the notion of translation as the mere exchange of semantic content between languages. In this regard, the contribution of a fresh perspective provided by literary criticism is much welcome. But if it is undeniable that traditional translation studies fall short when applied to the multifarious phenomena that intervene in cultural exchange, a focus on the literary also misses much of its inner processes. Hence the need to incorporate contributions from cultural studies and its critical tools.²⁶ We must then move from the otherwise fundamental process of the discursive analysis of translation—starting with its basic syntactic, and semantic aspects, and then moving on to its pragmatic dimension—towards a broader focus on its historical and cultural context. In other words, we must move from a linguistic or discursive concept of translation studies—which must nevertheless remain as the firm anchor upon which this discipline must be founded—towards a vision of translation studies as cultural history and cultural studies.

Within this amplified framework, translation can be contemplated—as Schurink declares in his introduction in a phrase deliberately evocative of Eisenstein's famous volume on the impact of print—as an agent of cultural change. Translation as cultural history does intersect with a large array of other disciplines in the humanities which include the history of reading, the history of education, the history of the book, social history, and even economic history. If we take the concept of translation as standing for *interpretation* as a cyclical mode of codification, reception, and recodification of cultural icons—or culturemes, as they are termed in semiotics—it does indeed stand at the centre of cultural studies.

In several of its chapters Schurink's volume succeeds in demonstrating the rich and complex permeability of disciplines, texts and even media. It follows that in order to take proper stock of how translation lies at the centre of the multiple phenomena which we call culture we do need to transcend the nationalist narrative of literary canons and cultural identities. And we also need to couple this essentially transnational perspective with a special focus upon the underlying networks of agents that sustained the big names in the literary, artistic, or cultural canons. These underlying networks include not just authors, or creators, but in general agents that facilitated the material production of these cultural artefacts, their distribution and their reception. We need to branch out of the fetishistic centrality of the *author* and the *original* towards other cultural agents like printers, diplomats, translators, merchants, or exiled immigrants. Several chapters in this volume deal with some of them in one way or another.

²⁶ This entails an understanding of translation that transcends its more literal meaning—but handled carefully, to avoid contemplating everything as translation to the point in which the heuristic utility of this concept gradually dissolves into irrelevance by spreading it too thin. Moore, 2011, p. 52, p. 53.

The chronological scope of the volume is of fundamental importance. It focuses on a period (“from the reign of Henry VIII at the start of the sixteenth century to the death of his daughter Elizabeth in 1603” (p. 8)) that has frequently been neglected by scholarship as a mere transitory phase, a sort of second-rate dress rehearsal for the flourishing Golden Age of English literature. But the fact is that a reasonably clear understanding of such Golden Ages cannot be achieved without acknowledging the importance of the seedbed out of which they emerged.²⁷

Robert Cummings’s chapter (“Reading Du Bartas”) focuses on Sylvester’s English translation of Du Bartas’s *Les Semaines*. Cummings seeks to provide an outline of the actual influence that the abundant translations of Du Bartas’s unwieldy poem exerted upon some critically unexpected quarters. He does so by examining the period during which Du Bartas’s poem enjoyed critical and poetical acclaim in England—i.e. between 1591, when King James VI of Scotland translated part of it, to 1641, when Sylvester’s complete English version was last printed in the 17th century. Many different versions were composed and / or printed during this period in both England and Scotland.²⁸ Cummings dwells on the fragmentary nature of the original poem, and the particular interest of translators in those parts of it which are biblical epillions of sorts.²⁹ A large amount of partial translations were produced—including the intimidating ghost of a lost translation by Sidney that haunted other potential English translators. This abundance resulted in its English translators’ awareness “of each other in respect of their poetical achievement” (Cummings, 2011, p. 178), to the point that different versions—Thomas Hudson and Joshua Sylvester’s respective renderings of *La Judit*—were bound in the same volume in several editions (starting in 1621), “an invitation to comparison I think unprecedented and hardly paralleled since” (Cummings 2011 p. 178).³⁰ This fragmentation in the reception and translation of Du Bartas’s poem responds to its own “improvisatory construction...” and “rickety frame” (Cummings 2011 p. 180). The original poem itself was in the first place put together in this fragmentary manner by simply *adapting* or *translating* and then amplifying previously existing texts. This led in turn to its reading as if it were an encyclopedia or compendium of poetically articulated knowledge, and to its use as a source for oracles, sayings, and other poetic devices which were then set in prolific circulation. A prominent case of this recirculation (as Cummings describes it) led Shakespeare to *transfer* Du Bartas’s praise of France into his own famous speech about “This royal throne of kings, this scept’red isle” in *Richard II*. And Shakespeare in turn influenced Sylvester’s own English rendering of Du Bartas.³¹ It is no less significant that one of the paths through which Shakespeare’s version of the text reached Sylvester was *England’s Parnassus*, Robert Allott’s poetical dictionary, and as such a fragmentary cultural artefact engaged in canon construction.³² Even Milton used Du Bartas as a source of *happy inventions*. If—as Jardine and Grafton demonstrated years ago, and as Schurink confirms in his own chapter with additional evidence—Livy was read for action, then Cummings shows how Du

²⁷ Schurink, “Introduction”, p. 8.

²⁸ These included a full Latin translation by Sir Hadrian Damman (Edinburgh, 1600). Cummings, 2011 pp. 175-6.

²⁹ Cummings 2011 pp. 176-77.

³⁰ Cummings 2011 p. 177.

³¹ There is a similar case of the return of a translated text to its origin, in such a complicated manner in G. Braden’s chapter: check and compare in your review as an example of the complicated ways in which translation works and weaves poetic and literary and cultural canons, as well as all sorts of identities, cultural, national, religious.

³² It is very symptomatic that in this circulating network of influences, parts of Du Bartas and his translation into English eventually flowed into another fragmented text, that was equally encyclopaedic—and consequently used as a source of *copia* and *topoi*—i.e. *Englands Parnassus* (1600). And let us not forget that, like any other anthology, this one also contributed in important ways to the creation of an English poetic canon. This constitutes further proof that poetic invention goes hand in hand with translation and encyclopedism—see Ravisius Textor’s *Officina*. Cummings, 2011, p. 190, pp. 190-1. Compare with what Moore says in her chapter about the Tudor habit of tabulation – all of this brings together, and relates early modern poetics, encyclopedism, translation, the classification and distribution of knowledge, lexicography, education, etc.

Bartas was translated, read, and appropriated by different authors—including Shakespeare and Milton—for *‘beauties and toys’*.³³

Warren Boutcher’s chapter (“Polybius Speaks British: A Case Study in Mid-Tudor Humanism and Historiography”), in particular, makes a very strong case for a European, interdisciplinary perspective on Tudor translation that can straddle all sorts of boundaries as it also engages with the material conditions under which these texts were translated, produced and distributed. By focusing on Christopher Watson’s translation of Polybius (1568), Boutcher shares with other chapters in the volume its focus on relevant, but frequently neglected works from the mid-sixteenth century. Watson’s Polybius illustrates the relations between translation, historiography, and nation building.³⁴ These are years that coincide with the early period of Elizabeth’s reign, when the new monarch, her scholars and her political agents were struggling for a religious and political settlement that could define their cultural and national identity as they also sought to secure the international position of the kingdom vis-à-vis the complex geopolitical situation in Europe. Many texts from this period can be brought to the foreground to illustrate this nation-wide project to appropriate legitimacy, cultural, linguistic and doctrinal capitals from sundry sources, both domestic and international, contemporary and ancient.

The subject of Fred Schurink’s chapter (“Translation, Humanism and War in Tudor England”) is closely related to Boutcher’s topic, since he deals with Anthony Cope’s translation of Livy, *The historie of two of the moste noble captaines of the worlde, Anniball and Scipio* (1544).³⁵ Schurink follows in the wake of Jardine and Grafton’s groundbreaking essay on Gabriel Harvey’s reading of Livy. His declared purpose is—like the rest of the volume—to throw new light on the frequently undervalued humanism of mid-sixteenth-century England. This sort of humanism Schurink dubs “pragmatic humanism”—a most interesting concept that refers to the sort of scholarship that sought to read and translate texts from antiquity with a view to their practical application to current concerns—one wonders, incidentally, if there ever was any other sort of humanism.³⁶ An interesting hypothesis was that Cope might have been led to translate Livy on war as a result (in part, at least) of the atmosphere that pervaded England in the late 1530s. The translation was published in 1544, but most probably it must somehow have been conceived in the midst of the military and political tension in 1539 and afterwards. Cope’s alteration of the original provides interesting insights, indeed.³⁷

Andrew Taylor’s chapter (“Humanist Philology and Reformation Controversy: John Christopherson’s Latin Translations of Philo Judaeus and Eusebius of Caesarea”) focuses on Latin translations of Patristic Greek texts, a relatively obscure topic that was nevertheless

³³ On this see Cummings, 2011 p. 178, p. 180, pp. 181-2, p. 183 and p. 185. Elaborate on this contrast, between the focus of this chapter and the focus of Schurink’s chapter on Livy. Another interesting case of what Cummings calls “transplantation” (ie. *translation* understood in a pretty wide sense) involves the circulation of narratives, *topoi* and tropes from Apollonius Rhodius’s *Argonautica* through Virgil’s *Aeneid* (VIII, 22), then Du Bartas, and eventually Sylvester—a genealogy that in its Virgilian middle section branches out to Montaigne, Camões, and Ariosto (Cummings 2011 p. 189).

³⁴ Another of the threads that run through several of the chapters is the approach to texts that addressed the situation of England and its international relations, military conflicts and political-religious controversies.

³⁵ Schurink, 2011, p. 60.

³⁶ Schurink sets out to reassess this sort of humanism, and its currently established chronology. He also sets out to demonstrate that these pragmatic humanists went beyond obsequious or *disinterested* scholarship and did indeed become very active in the pursuit of their own particular agendas. Schurink, 2011, pp. 60-61, p. 73. See also his conclusions (which are OK) in p. 73, pp. 73-4.

³⁷ Note both Cope’s and Harvey’s interest in Livy’s third decade. Note also that in 1539 (the year when the international tensions were at one of its highest points) Richard Morison translated “a military manual by the Roman general Iulius Frontinus (which he claims to have read alongside Livy and which, as we shall shortly see, was an important precursor of Cope)” (Schurink 2011 p. 65). This manual was “*The Stratagems, Sleights, and Policies of War*, a translation of the Roman general Frontinus’s military manual produced in response to the threat of invasion by France and the empire of Charles V in the early months of 1539. Like Morison’s work, *The historie of Anniball and Scipio* was published by the king’s printer, Thomas Berthelet, who also issued a second edition of Elyot’s *Governour* and an anonymous translation of Bishop John Fisher’s psalms, *Psalmes or prayers taken out of holy scripture*, in fact by Cope’s patron Katherine Parr in 1544” (Schurink, 2011, p. 68). Schurink, 2011, p. 63, pp. 63-4, p. 67, p. 68, p. 69.

very important in the context of the intellectual and doctrinal controversies of the time.³⁸ Taylor describes Christopherson's use of the Venetian *Biblioteca Marciana*, which housed Cardinal Bessarion's collection of Greek manuscripts salvaged from the downfall of the Greek world of the late Byzantine Empire and was consulted by countless international scholars, who then distributed these texts in fresh manuscript or print editions with their corresponding translations all over Europe.³⁹ Christopherson's connections with the circles of Cardinal Pole in Padua and Venice amplifies this network with diplomatic agents, religious exiles, and theological dispute.⁴⁰ Religious exiles and travelling scholars became part of international networks that frequently used to gather around printers' workshops. They often found employment as printers themselves, proof-readers, editors or translators. In some cases this led them to pen grammars and handbooks for language instruction—which frequently were used to distribute their religious ideas, their scholarship and also early modern science. The experience of persecution and exile radicalised some of them. But some others shifted to more tolerant attitudes which gradually ushered in an international culture of *adiaphoric* individuals who approached the violently controversial issues of religious difference from a detached perspective that anticipated the more secular and sceptical views of the late 17th and 18th centuries. Christopherson's position between Tunstall and Parr illustrates this *via media*—which was often adopted out of sheer necessity and an instinct of survival. Since one of the tasks that translators took up in this period was to wage intellectual wars through their *interpretation* of doctrinal texts, this frequently led them into deliberately self-defensive ambiguity, and in doing so they helped to carve out a common adiaphoric ground that would contribute to the more secular and tolerant views of the Enlightenment.⁴¹

Hosington's article ("Tudor Englishwomen's Translations of Continental Protestant Texts: The Interplay of Ideology and Historical Context") is related to Taylor's in that it addresses female translators who rendered religious sermons and treatises into English.⁴² In doing so she also approaches the impact of the marketplace as it intersected with the developments and controversies of the Reformation. Hosington also explores the connection with exile through the case of Anne Cooke, who translated in 1548 five sermons by the Italian exile Bernardino Ochino, the founder of one of the several "strangers' churches" that sprung up in London. During the second half of the sixteenth century, these strangers' churches and the religious exiles that peopled them frequently would turn into beacons not just of Protestantism, but also into conduits of foreign texts and languages and their cultural products. Many of their members would become prominent translators, grammarians, educators in foreign languages or scholars working for powerful patrons like Leicester (*inter alia*) at the universities of Oxford or Cambridge.⁴³

Andrew Hadfield's chapter ("Edmund Spenser's Translations of Du Bellay in Jan van der Noot's *A Theatre for Voluptuous Wordlings*") describes the international polyglot environment in which Edmund Spenser grew up in London, then a booming metropolis that teemed with foreign diplomats, merchants, printers and religious exiles⁴⁴. This situation linked London with a wide network of European connections, as it also fostered the production of volumes

³⁸ Schurink, "Introduction", pp. 10-11, Taylor, 2011, p. 79.

³⁹ Taylor, 2011, p. 82.

⁴⁰ Taylor, 2011, pp. 83-4, p. 84.

⁴¹ Taylor, 2011, p. 80, pp. 80-81, p. 81.

⁴² Hosington, 2011, p. 122. She explores the contextual / historical relevance of the texts translated, and the reasons for their choice by these women translators—with Elizabeth Tudor, as is well known, as one of the most prolific among them: Hosington proves that her translations from Calvin played down, or simply avoided, the question of predestination and election, with which Elizabeth disagreed (Hosington, 2011, p. 125).

⁴³ Cases in point are del Corro, Alberico Gentili, with his patron, Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester, who is also the dedicatee of Florio's Italian handbook *Florio His firste Fruites* (1578, see Joyce Boro's chapter p. 21), and of Golding's *Metamorphoses*. Chapman dedicated his 1598 *Seaven Bookes of the Iliades* to the Earl of Essex (Reynolds 2011 note 9 to page 76 contains useful secondary bibliography on this translation and its relation to Essex).

⁴⁴ Schurink, "Introduction", p. 7, pp. 7-8. Hadfield, 2011, p. 155.

in several languages.⁴⁵ Van der Noot's *Theatre* was one among them. Hadfield demonstrates that, like other important English authors (Christopher Marlowe among them), Spenser cut his teeth as an author through translation. Hadfield here emphasises the influence of Spenser's headmaster, Richard Mulcaster (1531/2 – 1611, check out his *DNB*) and also his friend and mentor Gabriel Harvey. Hadfield provides a brief but rich survey of Spenser's connections with the exiled community—no doubt a foretaste of what his recently published biography of the poet will provide with more detail.⁴⁶ *The Theatre* was itself a collaborative endeavour, a sophisticated multi-authored product that involved, in Hadfield's description, “production techniques that signified a juxtaposition of European and English culture, relevant to a translated work produced in exile”. This is also an interesting case of *translation* understood in a much wider sense between different media or semiotic systems, from a vellum manuscript with Marot's *Visions de Pétrarque*, whose format in turn influenced Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*.⁴⁷ Hadfield also explores how Spenser's translations, viewed within the context of the whole volume, and interpreted side by side with the woodcuts that illustrate them, amount to an act of “cultural” multimedia translation of the historical exempla from Roman history, to Du Bellay's use of them in 16th-century France, and then Spenser's translation within the framework of a millenarian Protestant ethos with republican overtones—which in turn was a subject of particular relevance for Anglo-Dutch relations in 1586. One of the possible sources for Du Bellay's lament for the loss of ancient Roman Republican liberties may have been Polybius, which proves the byways and convoluted paths that bring together the subjects and individuals of other chapters in the volume. It would have been interesting if its editor could have elaborated on the coexistence of all these tendencies and cultural artefacts in this period, and how translation brought them together.⁴⁸

Joyce Boro's chapter (“Multilingualism, Romance and Language Pedagogy; or Why Were So Many Sentimental Romances Printed as Polyglot Texts?”) focuses on two sixteenth-century editorial and literary success stories: language-teaching manuals and the best-selling genre of sentimental romance.⁴⁹ When Boro describes Minsheu's usage of works from the Spanish canon (p. 22), we obtain information first about the international diffusion and literary reputation of contemporary Spanish works, and then fundamental insights about the processes that contributed to the creation of an international European canon. A continental map that can describe the network of translations and handbooks for language instruction would provide us with a fresh outline of this translational Continental canon. Boro's chapter is an important first step, in so far as it provides a most survey of the most prominent volumes for language instruction in the period. Her footnotes provide a treasure-trove of primary and secondary sources for further reading. Boro takes the well-known fact that “the romances were marketed and intended to be read as foreign-language manuals and that they participate in the twinned didactic traditions of linguistic and moral pedagogy” as a starting point to remind readers of the importance of this phenomenon, and proceeds to mention

⁴⁵ Hadfield, 2011, pp. 148-49.

⁴⁶ Hadfield, 2011, p. 143, pp. 143-4, pp. 144-45, p. 145, pp. 145-6.

⁴⁷ Hadfield, 2011, pp. 149-150, p. 150. On translation understood in a wider sense, see Reynolds Chapter 1, “The Scope of Translation”

⁴⁸ This act of cultural, poetic, and poetic transfer—what we might call a *translatio republicae* of sorts—holds an interesting parallel with Marlowe's translation of Lucan's republican epic, the *Pharsalia*, which also bemoans the fall of the Roman republic, and the onset of Imperial tyranny. Note that, like Marlowe's *Pharsalia*, (i.e. *Lucan's First Book Translated*, printed posthumously in 1600, but probably composed ca. 1586, the year of *A Theatre*, while Marlowe was in Cambridge, or just out of it), Spenser indulges in the contrast between harmony and turmoil [“On the one hand the structure of the poem symbolizes a sense of harmony and unity; but on the other, its subject matter represents a fractured world in turmoil, a contrast that Spenser used extensively throughout his life. The poem is extraordinarily precocious in its intellectual range and significance”. (Hadfield, 2011, p. 153)]. There are some interesting things in common with Spenser's interest in Republicanism and Marlowe's translation of a “republican” epic: the use of blank verse (check) and their connection with certain London literary circles, such as those around Edward Blount—the prominent printer to whom Thomas Thorpe dedicated the translation of Marlowe's *Pharsalia* when it was published in 1600 (Hadfield, 2011, pp. 154-55.)

⁴⁹ Schurink, “Introduction”, p. 9.

some other fundamental variables within this equation, such as diplomacy and trade, alongside the role they played in the development of volumes devoted to language teaching. Sentimental romance in particular constitutes an excellent case study, given the global European success of the genre, whose analysis yields revealing insights into the kind of reader reception that was accorded to it, and above all how it was used to normalise certain aspects of daily life, including sentimental and sexual behaviour, gender relations, political advice, and even linguistic and stylistic registers.⁵⁰ The evidence summarily collected by Boro, together with the contributions about cultural diversity and multilingualism of chapters like A. Hadfield's constitute some of the most interesting insights of the book, and a valuable first step which should lead to further detailed research into the intricate and as yet unexplored network of European linguistic relations and its intricate network of literary, political, religious and mercantile exchanges. This network, its agents and the texts that make it up, are also essentially dialogical, and no static or partial national account will do them full justice.⁵¹

A significant component in these language-learning handbooks, one of the discursive vehicles that were used to teach other languages, were proverbs. By reference to the marginalia and the manuscript annotations of their readers Boro demonstrates how these volumes were used as sources of pithy quotations—which illustrates one of their manifold modes of reception.⁵² The international role of proverbs can provide relevant inroads beyond the field of translation studies into related fields like early modern philosophies of language or political thought.⁵³ Joyce Boro's chapter also sets her readers on the path to a more profound analysis of the relations between humanist moral philosophy, its educational doctrines and language teaching. She mentions in this regard Ovid's *Heroides*—a most controversial but nevertheless founding text for this genre— Erasmus' admonition on the educational value of fiction, and how prefaces could be used to this effect. When approaching the relations between translation, education, and morality we must also take into consideration the intersection of translation with censorship, which alongside prefaces includes the moralising modifications introduced by translators, the issue of self-censorship, the role of publishers and editors as pre-emptive censors, and considerations on the agendas that led them all to implement cuts and modifications. Besides Ovid, the other usual suspects (e.g. Terence) are also mentioned. Boro also provides interesting information about language instruction and the discursive construction of seduction, courtship, or marital behaviour, which links her chapter with Helen Moore's essay, whose subject Thomas Paynell's rendering of the French *Thresor des douze livres d'Amadis de Gaule*, the *The treasure of Amadis of Fraunce*. More addresses the *educational* function of chivalric romances, another best-selling genre, within the general framework of the role accorded by humanism to fiction—in particular to chivalric fiction. She mentions how certain editions of the French *Thresor* were bound together with copies of Juan Luis Vives' *Dialogues* in a bilingual volume that was then used as a primer in Latin conversation. All this confirms the existence of a thriving market for this sort of recreational literature, whose readership also used these volumes as sources for language learning alongside moral instruction, in what eventually turns out to be yet another instance of the permeability of the European network of authors, translators, rhetorical handbooks, as well as the close relation between rhetorical instruction, language teaching, lexicography, and encyclopedism, *inter alia*.

⁵⁰ Boro, 2011, pp. 34-5, p. 20.

⁵¹ Boro 2011, p. 21.

⁵² Boro's note 62 to p. 31 provides abundant evidence from other manuscript marginalia in several volumes of translated Spanish sentimental romance. Boro, 2011 p. 31.

⁵³ This analysis could take as one of its starting points, for instance, the role played by language instruction in the translation and transmission of the sort of moral philosophy that went hand in hand with classical rhetoric (e.g. Quintilian: see Boro p. 25), or even in the spread of reformist ideas (cf. the booksellers of Valencia's complaint).

Boro describes the inherently rhetorical, dialogical, and persuasive nature of Spanish sentimental romances, a most important aspect of this genre. In the drift towards drama or the modern novel that its dialogues evince they inhabited a generic liminal space which exemplifies the shifting and inherently reticular nature of the whole process, both across frontiers—geographical and inter-linguistic—and across genres—i.e. intralinguistic. These romances also deal with the challenges of reading and interpretation, and above all, with the unease—an inherently humanist concern—about the ambiguous and powerful sway that rhetoric in general and fiction in particular exert upon the affects. Hence the profuse variety of textual and paratextual apparatus that was used as a moralising alibi for its inherently entertaining virtues: which was, at the end of the day, the main (if not the only) reason for commercial success of these volumes. This concern became a sort of obsession when it related to female affects: well beyond the English perspective, we must once again reframe the outlook towards a wider and more profound European outlook. In doing so, we must, of necessity, take into consideration the foundational precedents of Boccaccio’s *Fiammetta*, Piccolomini’s *Historia de duobus amantibus*, two European best-sellers profusely translated and distributed, first in manuscript, and then in print. And beyond Boccaccio and Piccolomini, we must examine the discursive and epistemological roots of the genre in the medieval *ars dictaminis*, Petrarch’s *Familiars*, or Cicero’s epistles.⁵⁴ The dialogical component also features in the epistolary nature of many of these romances—and again, the example of Piccolomini is here important too.⁵⁵ There is plenty of evidence that European readers appropriated the affective rhetoric of these epistles for their own subjective use: they transferred or *translated* the affective rhetoric of these fictional exchanges into their private, subjective sphere, where they set it up *in temple of their hearts*. The new style, realistic and verisimilar—these “plausible lies” in the felicitous expression coined by B. Yong in his English rendering of Boccaccio’s *Fiammetta*⁵⁶—was tremendously successful on many different levels. This success posed complex challenges as regarded the readerly reception of a rhetorical artefact whose verisimilitude can mislead undiscerning readers, and therefore affect the sentimental and moral education of young (and particularly female) readers. The figure of the undiscerning reader lies at the very roots of the genre, in *Fiammetta* and in the *Historia de duobus amantibus*. It would become embedded in the conceptual structure of a certain tradition in the early modern novel, with far-reaching consequences. And the whole process was facilitated by the processes involved in translation.

Helen Moore’s chapter also deals with the epistolary nature of the instruction in the *Treasure* and how these epistles provided patterns of pragmalinguistic behaviour—which in turn led to the construction of a social-linguistic persona. In cases like this translation was put at the service of the sociopragmatics of early modern humanism, and in the specific case of sentimental epistolary fiction, for the rhetorical cartography of an inner emotional self.⁵⁷ Moore’s chapter also underlines the relations with the publishing business and the book trade—in her references to the publisher of Paynell’s *Treasure*, Thomas Hackett—and also with this translator’s interest in sayings and exempla, which he displays, again, in the *Treasure*.⁵⁸ This leads to an examination of Paynell’s moralising encyclopedism—with interesting hints on how translation provided a language not just for moral instruction, but

⁵⁴ Boro, 2011, p. 29, pp. 29-30.

⁵⁵ More on the dialogical nature of these epistolary exchanges and the epistemological consequences (the academic background, and Juan de Flores, the rector of the University of Salamanca—check the volume by Pedro Cátedra), see Boro 2011, p. 31.

⁵⁶ *Amorous Fiammetta*, trans. Bartholomew Yong, London 1587, ivr

⁵⁷ Moore 2011 p. 47. Note, by the way, that the dedicatee of the *Treasure* is Sir Thomas Gresham, the financier and dedicatee of Rowland’s 1576 translation of *Lazarillo* (check Hackett, the publisher’s dedicatory epistle). Note also that some financial metaphors are used in a second preface poem. Check the bibliography by Lorna Hutson in note 30 too. Moore, 2011, p. 50.

⁵⁸ Moore, 2011 pp. 44-45, p. 46, q.vid. for further details on these three translations, which again show Paynell’s moralising encyclopedism, on this see p. 46.

also a common, vernacular language for social normalisation as it also opened up a common discursive space for other types of debates. As Moore mentions, there is pioneering research by Wakelin and Cummings, but this is a fundamental field that still has much material to yield.

Joyce Boro also surveys the existing scholarship on the role of romance fiction as handbooks for the social instruction and personal growth of young males.⁵⁹ She uses Lorna Hutson's distinction between chivalric and humanist romances, which facilitates the assessment of the international popularity of these romances and the coexistence of the chivalric values that some of them promoted with an international social, economic and political environment that was gradually moving towards more secular values promoted by an international elite of highly educated scholars, translators, merchants, printers and diplomats. These cultural agents may have been at the service of Church leaders, aristocrats and monarchs, promoting their own ideological values or aristocratic ethos. But as they did so they also started to establish their own networks and formulate more meritocratic and secular ideologies. Of course, many of these movements went hand in hand with some of the most radical among the Protestant churches that constituted the so-called dissenting tradition. But there were also cases of Catholics who proposed a *via media*. Paynell exemplifies the continuities between late medieval religious thought and the new trend of *devotio moderna*—the *via media* between the more advanced Reformers and traditionalist religious attitudes. Paynell is also an excellent example of the European dimension of Tudor humanism.⁶⁰ Moore surveys his wide-ranging interests, and his eclectic taste in literature and other disciplines. Like other Erasmusians in this period, Paynell is one of those underlying agents who were part of the transnational network of translators-humanists—some of them physicians—that constitute the foundation of Enlightened Europe. It is to be expected that the work and the contribution of scholars who (like Paynell or Laguna, and others) have so far remained under the radar for international scholarship will come to light. This will decidedly contribute to outline a map of the European situation and how translation contributed to the creation of a common European culture that transcended the boundaries that divided the different religious and linguistic communities.⁶¹

Paynell was a member of this international group of *adiaphoric* intellectuals who may have inclined more towards one side than the other, but whose religious allegiance never clouded their understanding of the necessity to build bridges—or rather, of the necessity to emphasize the *adiaphoric* links that already existed between the different camps. In this regard, besides an epistemologically constituent function as the process of linguistic construction and transfer that wove common European knowledge and tradition, translation also played a historical role in the establishment and development of difference and confrontation—there can be doubt about that—but also in the establishment of an Enlightened tradition, much disenchanted with religious controversy. Translators like Paynell contributed to create

⁵⁹ Boro 2011, p. 28.

⁶⁰ “Translation and diplomacy intersect with this early modern idea of Europe and its accompanying irenism. We have already sampled some of the individuals singled out by Laguna as friends of Europe, and a necessarily brief section of their external connections. This second list could be enlarged with a couple of English scholars from two different generations. Thomas Paynell (d. 1564?) translated Erasmus's *De contempt mundi* into English in 1533, and his rendering of the *Querela pacis* was printed in London in 1559. Like Laguna, Paynell was a doctor who translated and penned several books on a variety of topics, from medical matters to the counsel of magistrates. In 1553 he produced a translation of Vives's *De officio mariti* (*The Office and Duetie of an Husband*). He also served as a diplomat: it appears that Cromwell sent him with Christopher Mount on a mission to the Protestant Princes of Germany. A member of Thomas More's circle—for whose works he elaborated an index under Mary Tudor—Paynell remained a Catholic and managed to survive into Elizabeth's reign. His commonplace book features Paynell's English translations from Luther's Latin commentaries on the psalms side by side with original lines in honour of Thomas More” (Pérez Fernández, “Andrés Laguna: translation and the early modern idea of Europe”, *Translation and Literature*, 21: 299-318 (2012); also available at <http://hdl.handle.net/10481/21880>)

⁶¹ Moore 2011 p. 40, pp. 40-41.

this virtual international network upon which the developments of a more *adiaphoric*, secular, less partisan sort of approach to religion and knowledge, were founded.⁶²

In his 1533 translation of a medical treatise, *De morbo gallico*, Paynell defended the task of the translator with arguments similar to those used by merchants to defend their trade: translators import into their target language the goods it lacks, in the same way as merchants provide products for which there is a necessity, and consequently a potentially profitable demand. A trope that predated Paynell in England and Europe too, this is part of the new mercantile ethos of self-interested meritocracy that was starting to move away from the traditional aristocratic ethos.⁶³ This is a subject intimately related to the group of “mid-Tudor printers and booksellers who were meeting and fostering a demand for texts to educate the would-be magistrates and merchants of this new nation” mentioned in Warren Boutcher’s chapter.⁶⁴ Christopher Watson’s translation of Polybius (the subject of Boutcher’s essay) was published by Thomas Hackett in 1568, and dedicated to Thomas Gaudy—whose “family took its place amongst the clans of Cambridge- and Inns of Court-trained scholars, lawyers, and court officials buying up monastic and other properties in mid-Tudor Norfolk” (Boutcher, 2011, p. 103), i.e. the class of new men who would determine the political and cultural future of the nation. Anthony Cope, the subject of Schurink’s chapter, was also one of those part-time humanists that emerged from the milieu of Henry VIII’s court at a time when linguistic abilities and scholarly accomplishment (with both secular and religious texts) were just part of a much larger panoply of strategies that could be wielded for advancement in courtly circles. Cope is another example of the multifarious European connections of translators, publishers, humanists, printers and diplomats.⁶⁵

What Moore describes in her chapter as “emblematic of Tudor humanism”, i.e. tabulation, is actually a common European humanist practice. One of the earliest examples was Ravisius Textor’s *Officina*, i.e. the *Theatrum poeticum et historicum sive Officina Jobannis Ravisii Textoris*, first published in Paris in 1520, and reprinted on multiple occasions. This foundational work has been described as “a writer’s workshop containing a wide assortment of classical instances easily applicable for poetic adornment or rhetorical support, with the accent on the singular and the strange. The material is conveniently broken down into categories and indexed”⁶⁶. As was the case of *England’s Parnassus*—a text that followed in the wake of Textor’s *Officina* and its European offspring—these early modern encyclopedias were put at the service of knowledge and its distribution, but also at the service of poetic invention. Insightful and important as Moore’s chapter is, the general trend to look at phenomena from a national perspective more often than not tends to miss the larger picture. We do need a history of translation as a common European phenomenon, with implications in all branches of intellectual, political, social and religious life in the Continent. And beyond Europe, in particular with a view to the impact of translation overseas and in the process of Imperial Western expansion, we do need a global vision of translation in the early modern world. If we want to make sense of particular regional or national situations, we do need a comprehensive approach that deals with the linguistic and cultural diversity in early

⁶² Moore 2011 pp. 42-43.

⁶³ Boro 2011, p. 29. Moore, 2011, pp. 50-51.

⁶⁴ Boutcher, 2011, p. 103.

⁶⁵ Schurink, 2011, pp. 58-78, pp. 61-2, p. 62, pp. 62-3.

⁶⁶ Alan S. Trueblood, “The *Officina* of Ravisius Textor in Lope de Vega’s *Dorotea*”, *Hispanic Review*, 26 (April 1958): 135-141, p. 135. See also Walter J. Ong’s “Commonplace Rhapsody: Ravisius Textor, Zwinger and Shakespeare”, in R.R. Bolgar & L.P. Wilkinson, *Classical Influences on European Culture, A.D. 1500-1700*, Cambridge: CUP, 1976, pp. 91-126. The fact that, of the few existing scholarship about Textor, two important articles refer to his influence upon such canonical authors as Lope in Spain and Shakespeare in England demonstrates the European influence of works like Textor’s: i.e. it proves the existence of this underlying common European network.

modernity beyond the domestic European situation, in particular as regards its manifold relations with the Americas, the Turkish other, and the Far East, as far as China and Japan.⁶⁷

We already have important works in other fields that engaged with the re-presentation of the new lands (i.e. cartography). Very little has been written about translation in this global perspective. The ground for the project defined by Bacon in his *Instauratio Magna*, i.e. the colonization of new territories in the virtual realms of knowledge well beyond the physical worlds of the earth and the skies, was laid previously by early encyclopedists like Textor. And it was a European phenomenon, with a diversity of different local manifestations. In this regard, the table prepared by Paynell's for Rastell's edition of the English works of Thomas More is nothing less than a cartographical representation through the vernacular writings of the English humanist, an act that re-orientates the gaze of the reader towards those areas in which the encyclopedist has the power of an über-reader, as does the translator too. Another instance in this European process of a cartography of virtual knowledge, and the cartography of languages themselves, is the growing importance and practice of lexicography, which should remind us that many of those who wove the early modern networks of European knowledge were lexicographers, grammarians, and translators.⁶⁸ This was an age in which knowledge was being either discovered or recovered, surveyed and reclassified. In this cartographical *repastinatio* of knowledge, translation and early modern encyclopedism went hand in hand. Which is why it was not unusual for translators to be also editors, and even assistants in the routines of the printing shop: another fundamental agent in the cartography of knowledge and its global distribution.⁶⁹

Stuart Gillespie. *English Translation and Classical Reception. Towards a New Literary History*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Matthew Reynolds. *The Poetry of Translation. From Chaucer & Petrarch to Homer & Logue*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011.⁷⁰

These volumes call for a renovated role of translation when it comes to assessing literary canons – in this regard, they belong in a recent flurry of publications that seek to arouse the awareness of the academic world as regards the shortcomings of traditional approaches to national and international literary canons. In an environment saturated with volumes on national approaches, or even highly specialized approaches (gender studies, etc.), academic publishing seems to have awakened to this glaring gap in literary and cultural studies.

Because translation studies must of necessity branch out towards cultural studies—in which it inherently belongs. And even beyond cultural studies, it must also take into consideration other closely related disciplines: discourse analysis, semiotics, and even the theory and

⁶⁷ See for instance the map created by the Jesuits of China, Kunyu Wanguo Quantu (1609). On the relation between cartography, the classification and communication of knowledge, see José María Pérez Fernández and Edward Wilson-Lee's *Hernando Colón's New World of Print: Towards a New Cartography of Knowledge* (forthcoming in Yale University Press, 2019)

⁶⁸ Moore 2011 pp. 43-44, p. 44.

⁶⁹ Taylor, 2011, p. 87, p. 88, p. 95.

⁷⁰ This is a longer, author's version, of a book review published in *Sendebarr* 23 (2012) 373-378.

practice of human communication in all its complexity. Hence the recent proliferation of volumes on cultural translation—a most important concept.

Translation has become such a trending topic (to use a common term) that calls have been made to restrain its use to describe a range of phenomena that actually reaches beyond its scope (this has been particularly the case in postcolonial studies), and eventually end up diluting its actual meaning and relevance. It occurs to me that these overstretched concepts or definitions of translations emerge from one of its general underlying assumptions, i.e. the idea that translation implies *difference*, *distance* between two artefacts, and / or two agents, and that this difference or distance frequently involves a different in the hierarchical position of the agents and the artefacts involved⁷¹. This hierarchy can be one of ontological status, intellectual and cultural legitimacy or prestige, as well as political power.

“Although this kind of approach does not specifically rule out the meaning of ‘translation’ as an interlingual practice, clearly it is interested in much wider senses of translation than the movement from language one to language two. The danger here, in Trivedi’s view (2005), is that the notion of ‘cultural translation’ might drastically undervalue the linguistic difference and co-existence upon which translation in the more traditional sense relies. Trivedi accuses Bhabha of marginalizing bilingualism and translation as specifically interlingual practices, the precondition for polylingual cultural diversity. He calls for translation studies to insist on the centrality of translation’s polylingual aspect and to refute the generalization of ‘cultural translation’ into an umbrella term for all aspects of mobility and diasporic life.

Trivedi’s criticism might be extended to uses of the translation metaphor in anthropological and cultural studies which exclude or do not address language difference, thus potentially presenting a false sense of monolingualism to western audiences. **Metaphorical usage could at worst hollow out the word ‘translation’, not just into something that need not necessarily include more than one language but into something that primarily *does not* include more than one language—a factor, instead, of shifts and layering within globally dominant English without the need for bilingual translation to take place.** As Bachmann-Medick (2006) hints, in a nightmare scenario ‘cultural translation’ could mean the adaptation of everything to the dominant idiom of western capitalism, thus destroying difference or relegating it to unheard margins of global society. For critics such as Trivedi, the challenge to translation studies is thus to reassert the crucial role of translation in all its senses within interdisciplinary debates on cultural difference and globalization.” (Kate Sturge, “Cultural Translation”, in Mona Baker & Gabriela Saldanha, eds., *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2nd ed. London & New York: Routledge 2009, pp. 67-70, p. 69)

See what Reynolds says in this respect:

“Though it loosens as it spreads, the word retains some flavour of translation between languages. But it is hard to judge how much of one. In Pater’s case [who defines translation as “what happened when anyone uttered anythin: ‘all language involves translation from inward to outward’”], ‘translation’ cannot be used so vaguely as to mean just ‘change’ or ‘movement’: if it were, the remark would be inane. But neither can it mean exactly the same as when we talk of translation from English

⁷¹“Translation draws attention to difference even as it overcomes it: it formalizes the gap it simultaneously endeavours to cross.” (Reynolds, 2011, p. 15)

to Italian: if it did, it would commit Pater to denying the existence of any difference at all between language and thought. The French word ‘traduction’ was developing in a similar way at about the same time: Paul Valéry, writing in his *Cahiers* a decade or so after Pater, probed the slippages of meaning which resulted. What we usually call thought, he said, is still only a language, although a very unusual one (‘ce qu’on appelle ordinairement *pensée* n’est encore qu’une langue. À vrai dire très particulière’). **But where does translation in and out of it start? And what is translated? (‘mais où commence la traduction? Et quoi est traduit?’). Valéry’s questions are still relevant to cultural theory today, where—as Sherry Simon has remarked—‘translation’ is most often used ‘as a metaphor... to stand for the difficulty of access to language, of a sense of exclusion from the codes of the powerful’. So, ‘migrants strive to ‘translate’ their past into the present’, and women to “translate themselves’ into the language of patriarchy’. These recent usages convey an awareness that culture is text and that identity is constructed through language; but they tend not, any more than their nineteenth-century precursor, to hold themselves at all strictly to the model of translation-between-languages. The word ‘translate’ sometimes means ‘express again in different words’—and sometimes just ‘express’” (Reynolds 2011 8-9)**

The field of translation studies now wavers between the more limited approach of translation studies (represented by the work of Mona Baker, for instance), in which most of its practitioners come from the field of linguistics and / or vocational training, on the one extreme, and on the other cultural historians and other highly theoretical / ideologised disciplines, like postcolonial studies, in which translation amplifies its scope to refer to a multitude of phenomena.

In the midst of these two approaches there lies the renovated interest in the role played by translation in the construction of national literary canons, and in fresh approaches to these canons that take into consideration this fundamental constituent in the processes of literary and cultural developments. In branching out towards cultural studies and the politics of knowledge accumulation and distribution from a cross-cultural, cross-border, international perspective, literary studies of necessity had to end up taking into consideration the role played by translation. When writing literary history, academia seems to have finally realised that translation plays an important role in the appropriation of the literary capital that originally belongs in other traditions, and that, beyond literary history, the appropriation of this capital always goes hand in hand, to a lesser or higher degree, with more or less deliberate, more or less, systematic, agendas by cultural elites and its cultural agents, embarked in the process of building up the collection of icons/signifiers that make up a political settlement, the establishment of cultural and political dominance, frequently also hand in hand with religious settlements too. In the slow process that rids academia of romantic / post-romantic notions of national identity and national agency, translation is finally coming to the foreground as one of the constituent processes in the construction of these inherently multilingual, multinational identities and canons.

“One of the oddities of the way academic disciplines of English Literature and Classical Studies have developed, especially given early connections between them, is that translation history, an area which could in principle be of equal interest to each field, has been largely ignored by both. The book you are now reading is a sign of change and has affiliations on both sides: it is published within a series falling under a ‘Classical Studies’ rubric, while looming large in its immediate background is the ongoing *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, the first full-scale history of

English literary translation and a publishing project of Oxford University Press's Literature (not Classics, not Modern Languages) department. But these are very late omens and much remains to be done. Just as we are becoming used to reception moving towards the forefront of the study of ancient literatures, my view is that translation should move towards the forefront of the study of reception. The increasingly monoglot nature of the Anglo-American world might provide some excuse for the neglect of translations within the study of English Literature, but it cannot do the same for Classics" (Gillespie, 2011, p. 1)

Like many other current volumes, from its very outset Gillespie's book engages itself with the task of bringing translation to the foreground, by exposing its centrality in the establishment of classical Greek and Latin literatures, and then in the processes that punctuated its influential reception in the West in general, and in this particular case in the anglophone tradition. As Gillespie demonstrates, in more traditional, historicist accounts of literary traditions, translation is absent or under-represented or underexplored—as opposed to disciplines like cultural studies / postcolonial studies, where a much wider concept of translation as the transfer of power / cultural capital has been embraced with much enthusiasm (and according to some, as seen above, with a certain cavalier methodological attitude that has resulted in its loose use, and in not much rigorous employment, etc.).

In this regard, Reynolds provides a rather sobering paragraph, in which he correctly acknowledges that "Following Wittgenstein, I do not assume that the 'many different kinds of thing' that may be called 'translation' need have some theorizable essence in common just because they can be given the same name". And he goes on thus:

"As I try to draw out the distinctivenesses of the writing I am reading I will, in consequence, be alert to other words for the closenesses of texts in one language to texts in others, and to the metaphors that have always clustered under and around translation. As we have seen, apparently placid terms like 'transcribe' and 'transpose' can flower into metaphorical life, taking on descriptive richness and power. Metaphors too can assume consistency and precision, and come to define with some fullness processes that, although they may be referred to as 'translation', do not follow the assumptions of translation rigidly conceived. Before we begin this exploration, though, I need to give some more attention to **metaphor**" (Reynolds 2011 p. 38)

Chapter 6 in Reynold's volume provides a well-furnished survey of the different metaphors that have been used to describe translation. Like other chapters in the volume, it shows the great detail and exhaustiveness with which the volume has been researched: it really is a great source book that can lead the reader with an interest in one particular translator, author, or aspect of translation into fruitful more detailed research. It is a sort of extremely well informed, well researched, rigorous and solid, guide to the different paths that can be taken up by those readers or scholars interested in the different aspects and agents involved in this subject. And his survey frequently dwells on particular case studies, a few lines, a particular poem, or a work, which Reynolds analyses in detail, and by doing so provides the reader with models of interpretation (which add up to the rich variety of case studies he offers his readers).

Metaphor is one of the key words here, if only because of its etymological affinity with translation, in sharing the concept of "carrying over" – because in this carrying over, in this establishment of analogies and comparisons, that both emphasise the difference and the

distance between the two terms, ideas, or artefacts in question both metaphor and translation can be taken as modes of perception, as means for the apprehension of the world, by comparing an unknown with what stands, or poses as its known equivalent, or approximation: and that analogy in turn modifies the original – this is why *metaphor* and *metaphorical* language is the essence of metaphysics (as Lorenzo Valla would have it): by means of a linguistic-pragmatic operation that establishes an analogy between a known thing (for instance the adjective “good”), we can turn it into something different, by adding a suffix –ness, *goodness*, and by doing so, we have created a transcendental idea, etc. (does this make any sense?) Check Valla, and check O. Paz for the idea of translation as epistemology, and other specialists for the idea of metaphor as a form of knowledge. In the following paragraph, Reynolds quotes Lakoff & Johnson’s famous volume on metaphor, as well as Derrida, in texts that evoke Waswo’s reading of Valla:

“In *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), Lakoff and Johnson proposed that ‘expressions like *wasting time, attacking positions, going our separate ways*, etc., are reflections of systematic metaphorical concepts that structure our actions and thoughts’. The metaphors we usually call ‘dead’ are in fact ‘alive’ in the most fundamental sense: they are metaphors we live by’ [NOTE 17 to p. 43: *Metaphors We Live By*, 1980, p. 55]. The claim has similarities to that made by Derrida, in ‘La mythologie blanche’ (1971), about **the roots of abstract words used by philosophers**: though superseded, the old meanings are never quite left behind, and exert an insidious metaphorical pressure: ‘le concept de concept ne peut pas ne pas retenir... le schème du geste de maîtrise, prenant-maintenant, comprenant et saisissant la chose comme un objet’ (‘the concept of concept cannot not retain the pattern of the gesture of mastery, taking-now-and-maintaining, comprehending and seizing the thing as an object’) [NOTE 18 to p. 43: Jacques Derrida, *Marges de la philosophie* (Paris, 1972), 267. The passage is translated in *Margins of Philosophy*, tr. Alan Bass, (Brighton, 1982), 224, but I have here given my own version]. Derrida’s claim is the more fluid and therefore the more persuasive, for Lakoff and Johnson do not offer any argument to support the metaphors (‘structure’, ‘systematic’) that structure and systematize their own discussion. Quite what it is for ‘war’ (one of their examples) to ‘structure’ a concept of argument, rather than—say—‘guiding’ or ‘influencing’ or ‘exerting pressure on’ it, is never made plain by them. In my own descriptions I will therefore aim for something more like Derrida’s apt tentativeness (‘retenir... le schème du geste’), while also relying on Lakoff and Johnson’s compelling innovation: their attention to groups of metaphors which reveal persistent habits of thought.” (Reynolds 2011 p. 43)

“... the perception which Derrida and Lakoff and Johnson all, broadly speaking, share—**that a metaphor can be a way, not just of saying something but also of doing and experiencing it—is the basis of my argument about translation**” (Reynolds 2011 pp. 43-4)

“The word ‘translation’ has been used to name more activities than can be reduced to that model; the metaphors adopted by translators delineate these various kinds of imaginative work” (Reynolds 2011 p. 44)

One would have thought that, given the fact that there is no lack of monographs and essays on the impact of the classics upon English literature (the list would be long to include here), founded on the solid tradition of studies of the classics that British academia has to offer, a volume with this title will have little new insights to offer. It is quite the opposite: by offering a series of case-studies summarily but effectively discussed in a series of short chapters discursively linked to each other—in a way that brings to the foreground the leitmotiv that

drives the whole book, and facilitates for the reader the pursuit of the author's argument, as it proceeds and evolves through the volume, Gillespie succeeds in providing new evidence of the close relation between translation and the English canon, and complicates the picture of the relation between the classics, translation, the English canon, and the multiple directions in which these three realms interact with each other, and with the agents that facilitated this most fruitful and fascinatingly complex of exchanges in western literature.

In the continuum / gradation that goes from translation *strictu sensu* to imitation, translation has been seen as the mechanistic transfer of semantic meaning, vs the more creative and hence more complex and interesting processes involved in imitation. Translation was thus methodologically classified in a corner, and we are now starting to see a movement in the opposite direction, by means of which, in parallel with an increased awareness of the centrality of translation in cultural and literary history, we are witnessing a counter attack by means of which translation is occupying the conceptual and methodological space that was before take up mostly by critically important terms such as *imitation*, *adaptation*, *influence*, and even *reading*. Translation as a critical concept is expanding its semantic field and reclaiming corpora whose right to analyse it is more successfully incorporating, etc.

“What follows in this chapter is a historical sketch designed to provide an overall context for the discussions of individual periods and works that follow. But **its further purpose is to suggest in brief compass the scale and centrality of translation from ancient Latin and Greek works in the literature of the anglophone world over the centuries. Its scale and centrality are the reasons why**, as I argue from various angles below, **a change in the way we write the history of this literature is needed**. As things currently stand, ‘translation’ is not a heading with a lot of entries below it in literary historian’s indexes. Within the current *Oxford English Literary History*, for example, the first volume to be published, on the period 1350-1547, offers four index entries on ‘translation’ to a 600-page study. **The work of Chaucer, who was thought or even by his contemporary Deschamps as a ‘grand translateur’, falls entirely within this period.** The *Cambridge Guide to Literature in English* has no entry for ‘translation’, though there are entries for ‘tragedy’, ‘epic’ and even ‘imitation’.

The activity of translation had, of course, been at the centre of western culture well before the arrival of the earliest forms of the English language. Translation was fundamental to Roman literature: it is taken for granted as much in modern as in ancient times that Latin letters grew expressly out of translations from works in the Greek epic and dramatic tradition. Livius Andronicus (c. 284-204 BCE), sometimes claimed as the ‘father of Roman literature’, introduced Greek writing to the Romans by translating the *Odyssey* into the Italian Saturnian metre and adapting Greek tragedy to the Roman stage. Others soon followed with closer or looser forms of translation and adaptation: Gnaeus Naevius with plays on the Trojan War; Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius with tragedy; Caecilius Statius with comedy. Translation, that is, had the effect of directly inaugurating Roman epic and drama at a time when these genres were barely emergent in their own right.” (Gillespie, 2011, pp. 1-2)

Gillespie’s first chapter (“Making the Classics Belong: A Historical Introduction”) offers an interesting introduction / survey of the role played by translation in the establishment of classical Roman and Latin canons, and also their impact upon western culture. This also

includes important references to the canonical texts from classical Rome which approached the theory of translation:

“As a cultural phenomenon in antiquity, the history of translation is every bit as diverse as it will later become in the anglophone world. Horace’s famous claim about rendering Greek lyrics into Latin (*Odes* 3.30.13) covers what is in almost every respect a different kind of thing from the exotic Latin framing by ‘Lucius Septimus’ of the Greek *Diaries of the Trojan War* by ‘Dictys’ **The Roman experience is likewise an emphatic but not unique instance of the centrality of translation. In the European Renaissance the medieval literary tradition was invigorated and the literary idiom much enriched by fresh contact with classical sources through translation and imitation, sometimes of a directly experimental kind.** It can be said without qualification that **in every phase of English literature, and for that matter many phases of other western literatures too, much of the innovative impulse comes directly or indirectly through translation from ancient Greek and Roman texts, and in some eras their impact is fundamental.** The effect is often one that is hidden or hard to discern, partly because of the frequent difficulty of determining whether originals or translations were being used in a given instance—did Shakespeare know Ovid’s Latin epic, Arthur Golding’s English *Metamorphoses*, or both? (The answer here happens to be ‘both’.)” (Gillespie, 2011, pp. 2-3)

It’s a good question what continuity might be said to exist in terms of individual translation practice between, say, Livius Andronicus’ Latin rendering of the *Odyssey* and a popular twentieth-century English version of the Homeric poem. In respect at least of how translation has been theorized in the West, continuity over the centuries has been ensured by the influential, though hardly extensive remarks on the subject by Cicero in *De oratore* and *De optimo genere oratorum*, Horace in the *Ars poetica*, Pliny the Younger in the letter *To Fuscus*, Quintilian in the *Institutio oratoria* and Aulus Gellius in the *Noctes Atticae* [NOTE 6 to p. 3: These texts are conveniently assembled in English translations in Weissbort and Eysteinson (2006), 20-33]. Much Renaissance thinking on translation was done around Horace’s and Cicero’s brief statements especially; their drift is against over-scrupulous, word-for-word translation [NOTE 7 to p. 3: For continental Renaissance translation theory derived from classical sources, see Renner (1989), esp. 261-326]. But Christianity has successfully intervened in this tradition, with St Jerome and St Augustine, in particular, battling over the translatability of the Word in a fourth-century controversy. Many of the subsequent striations of western theory derive from Augustine’s promotion of the idea of a single, true translation.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 3)

Like some chapters in Schurink, Gillespie points out the understudied relevance of proverbs, *adagia*, *sententiae* (*refranes*, in the Spanish tradition) and the role they played in the distribution of knowledge, as well as in multilingual education for young students in the Renaissance. This is indeed a subject worth further study: i.e. the fragmentation of classical and contemporary works (both of literature and also of other genres and disciplines) into collections of *adagia*, which were then circulated in bilingual editions, and used for language instruction, etc. Part of the daily routine of most young students across borders, these handbooks frequently reached continental scope (like other genres, cf. sentimental romance prose fiction) and constitute part of the much underresearched European network that sustained western culture and its literary canon. For too long literary and cultural history has focused on the big names (which is only natural) within its own national traditions (frequently underlining the national component in attitudes that verge on the jingoistic) to the detriment

of a proper analysis of the actual impact of these unifying transnational texts, and of the agents that produced and circulated second-rate, but highly distributed texts.

Gillespie successfully demonstrates that this is the case for near-contemporary poetry as well, not just for the literature of the past. He does so in his last chapter, which deals with a little known translation of Homer by Ted Hughes.

“My purpose here is not to deal with Hughes’s classicism in general. Far less is it possible to address the recent classical translation boom at large. Instead, this chapter calls attention to another dimension of this enduring interest of Huges’s, his version of a passage from the *Odyssey*. . . This translation, as far as is known, is Hughes’s earliest completed translation of any kind, and it si certainly his sole translation of Homer. It remains remarkably little noticed, which can be explained entirely by its publication history –or lack of one. The appearance of Hughes’s *Collected Poems* in 2003 made it readily available, but following its readon on BBC radio’s Third Programme in 1960 there was no print publication either in Hughes’s ensuing collections or at any other time during the following 42 years.

In previous chapters I have argued that English literary history should not confine itself to the record of familiar printed works because they do not reflect the full range of literary activity. Hughes’s early Homer translation allows a demonstration that against the run of expectation (for who would suppose a substantial composition by one of our highest-profile contemporary poets would fail to achieve print publication for nearly half a century?) such a generalization can be valid for writing of very recent times as well as of the more distant past (Hughes died in 1998). **Thus it presents a particular kind of reminder of the discrepancy between the place translation may have in the *oeuvres* of well-known writers and in the histories we construct.”** (Gillespie, 2011 p. 164)

There is a fundamental constellation of closely related phenomena that scholarship has failed to include in its accounts of the period, and they include educational theories and methods, in particular as regards rhetorical training / drills, and the system of double translation, the fragmentation and re-arrangement of classical (and other) knowledge through *adagia* and more popular *refrains*, early modern encyclopedism (see what you say about this in your review of Schurink), and translation itself. This is in part corroborated by Gillespie himself: “Such compilations—texts sometimes printed together with *Cato* include the provers of Publilius Syrius and the *Dicta sapientium*—wre in use on a scale out of all proportion to their barely perceptible profile today. Their users, we might bear in mind, will have included almost every historically identifiable male of Renaissance England. Much of Shakespeare’s experience of Latin writing, like that of all other sixteenth-century grammar school boys, thus came in the first instance not in the form of complete works of verse or prose but from such collections of *sententiae*, ‘dicta’, and the like, in which the Latin was foten accompanied by more or less literal English translations—the traces of which can sometimes be found in his own works” (Gillespie 2011 p. 11)

“At the most familiar level of classical learning, school texts often comprised translations of selections from suitable authors such as Aesop or Terence. These are easy to overlook. The translations are prosaic and, what (in aesthetic terms) is worse, they are often ‘grammatical’—that is, with the English syntax following the Latin for pedagogical purposes. In terms of readership and of publishing history, however, the scale involved was large. One famous compilation is by a schoolaster, **Nicholas**

Udall, whose *Flours for Latine Spekyng selected and gathered out of Terence, and the same translated into Englysshe*, first appeared in 1533. Another is *The Distichs of Cato*, used in England with the annotations of Erasmus, presented as an aid to Latin language learning in 1540 by Richard Taverner in a bilingual text reprinted in 1553, 1555, and 1562, then supplanted in 1577 by an anonymous version ‘newly englished to the comferte of all young schollers’, itself reprinted in 1584. ‘Cato’, as it was called, has been singled out as ‘*par excellence* the first of schoolbooks, and the elementary moral treatise of the Middle Ages’. It was edited, augmented, selected, and in time translated into a dozen European vernaculars, ‘first as a means to assist in the understanding of the original, or in verse, emulating the Latin in a modern language’. **Such compilations—texts sometimes printed together with *Cato* include the proverbs of Publilius Syrius and the *Dicta sapientium*—were in use on a scale out of all proportion to their barely perceptible profile today. Their users, we might bear in mind, will have included almost every historically identifiable male of Renaissance England. Much of Shakespeare’s experience of Latin writing, like that of all other sixteenth-century grammar school boys, thus came in the first instance not in the form of complete works of verse or prose but from such collections of *sententiae*, ‘dicta’, and the like, in which the Latin was often accompanied by more or less literal English translations—the traces of which can sometimes be found in his own works.” (Gillespie, 2011, pp. 7-8)**

Gillespie reminds his readers of facts that have more often than not either ignored, or given little or no importance, while they point out to the relevance and pervading presence of translation in the cultural and literary growth of England.

“One of the purposes of fresh translations is to broaden the range of what translators themselves wish to write about. This means, as Richard Stoneman puts it, that ‘even those works which to us read like a translation... in fact often diverge in directions the author himself wished to expand’. **Translators speak in the person of their authors. Sometimes it is the pressures of contemporary politics that make themselves felt, as in Thomas May’s version of Lucan’s *Pharsalia* (1627), which idealizes Pompey as a republican leader and regrets Rome’s drift into empire.** May’s dedications to the individual Books situate his work among a politically independent and hawkish nobility tending towards parliamentary opposition to royal policies. **May’s Latin and English verse are symbiotically related: he also composed in English couplets a continuation of Lucan’s epic down to the death of Caesar which, when later recast by him into hexameters, found its way into editions of the *Pharsalia*...** By this time [i.e. the mid 17th century] it was becoming common... for an English poet’s translation of individual short poems, selected according to his tastes and affinities, to appear within a miscellaneous collection of his original and translated verse, an arrangement foreshadowed in the innovative Jonson *Works* of 1616.” (Gillespie, 2011, pp. 10-11)

To complicate things further, these networks and the complex byways in which texts, cultural artefacts, and their agents interacted with each other were also enriched with the interconnections and the mutual influence that translators exerted upon each other:

“... translators are often deeply aware of their predecessors, and may seek deliberately to use and embody within their work the best parts of the tradition in which they can now see for the first time they stand [Gillespie is talking here about the 2nd half of the 17th and the early years of the 18th centuries]. Whereas his predecessors had stressed novelty and innovation, Dryden’s *Works of Virgil* draws on previous English Virgils repeatedly, attempting to fashion a kind of summation of English versions. The most recent editor of Dryden’s Virgil, William Frost, remarks the way **‘the neo-classical translators read, studied, and reacted to each other’s versions, borrowing lines or phrases from each other... and generally operating under the stimulus of an enterprise felt to be cumulative and mutual.’**” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 11)

Translation as *interpretation – hermeneusis*– Reynolds emphasises the importance of the reader, and also the potential for multiple interpretations of a text – and of course the power of the translator as a sort of *über-reader*.

[when discussing the influence of FitzGerald’s translation in some of Pound’s *Cantos*]: “... how much of FitzGerald stirs in these stanzas of *Cantos*? And the same question is at the heart of the writing that has nourished Pound: how much of Omar lives on in FitzGerald’s *Rubáiyát*? ... **the continuities** (if they are continuities) **that occur in translation and imitation must begin in the nebulous space of reading where**—as we saw in Chapter 14—**your identity to some extent dissolves into the book and the book partially dissolves into you.** In consequence—as I showed in Chapter 4—**the whatever-it-is that is brought across in translation must first have been found, i.e. partly invented, by the reader-and-translator; and the same is true of the whatever-it-is that is imitated in imitation.**” (Reynolds 2011 p. 270)

Now, this view can have to very different interpretations: in one we can think of the reader and the text from a historicist perspective and / or from an empirical perspective such as that provided by pragmatics and applied linguistics, cultural studies, etc. And then there is another more philosophical, metaphysical or neoplatonic, if you like, such as that sponsored by Benjamin in his famous essay, or by Muldoon, as quoted by Reynolds, and also Gadamer⁷²—views which are close to those of Octavio Paz.

“... for readers with good Latin or Greek, a translation could become a kind of commentary on its original, generating at the highest artistic pitch a complex intertextual play, as with Pope’s satirical *Imitations of Horace* (1733-8), which appeared with the Latin texts of the relevant epistles *en face*... [Before, and during **English Augustanism**] Translations... were meant as stylistic experiments, or as models for modes of English verse writing—in short, as making available for emulation and development some of the qualities of a classical text not yet assimilated to contemporary poetic possibility. Translators and theorists are perfectly explicit about this.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 12)

⁷² “Every translation is at the same time an interpretation. ... No one can doubt that what we are dealing with here is interpretation, and not simple reproduction. A new light falls on the text from the other language, and for the reader of it. ... Translation, like all interpretation, is a highlighting... Every translation that takes its task seriously is at once clearer and flatter than the original. Even if it is a masterly re-creation, it must lack some of the overtones that vibrate in the original. (In rare cases of masterly re-creation the loss can be made good or even mean a gain—think, for example, of how Baudelaire’s *Les fleurs du mal* seem to acquire an odd new vigour in Stefan George’s version.” (H. G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. W. Glen-Doepel, rev. by J. Weinsheimer & D.G. Marshall (1989), pp. 384-86, quoted by Reynolds 2011 pp. 62-3)

“... any translation can be read alongside its source as a work of criticism and interpretation: as Dante Gabriel Rossetti remarked in the Preface to his versions of early Italian poets, ‘translation remains perhaps the most direct form of commentary’ [NOTE 8 to p. 19: D.G. Rossetti (tr.), *The Early Italian Poets from Ciullo d’Alcamo to Dante Alighieri* (1861), viii]. Scholars will always be attracted to this way in which translations can be used: in *Translating Baudelaire* (2001), Scott himself deploys translation to open up the ambiguities in the French sources, to map their contours and make hearable their rhythms.” (Reynolds 2011 p. 19)

“The complexity and therefore the indeterminacy of literary texts are what make ordinary or ‘mere’ translation inadequate. And yet those same qualities are what make the vaunted ‘true’ or ‘good’ or ‘audible’ or ‘immediate’ translation possible. The explanation lies in an obvious fact: that it takes the mind’s ear of a reader to determine what a text is saying; the mind’s eye of a reader to limn its spirit or visualize its vision. **What literary translation captures is not simply in the source text but is brought into being by the continuous process of reading-and-making-sense-and-translating.** Translators, no more than readers, do not simply ‘read things in’ to their sources; but neither do they simply ‘read off’ from them. **Theory founders before the process by which sense—or whatever we should call it, ‘sense’ seeming too narrow a word—emerges from a text in collaboration with its readers.** But it is indisputable that the collaboration occurs. This whatever-it-is, brought into being by the process of reading-making-sense-translating, is what translators can feel that they are making ‘immediate’, or ‘audible’, or ‘giving’, or ‘carrying across.’” (Reynolds, 2011 pp. 29-30)

“This is what Walter Benjamin, in the 1923 essay ‘Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers’ that I mentioned in Chapter 1, said that literary translations should not aim for ‘Ähnlichkeit’ (‘alikness’ or ‘similarity’), but rather for a deeper connection which allows dissimilarity: ‘Verwandtschaft’ (‘kinship’). The desire for aliness stops short of what most matters in a literary text: it refuses to bite the lure to interpret which the literary by definition holds out.” (Reynolds 2011 p. 30)

“Muldoon has suggested that translators reach through the source to ‘some ur-poem’ of which ‘both ‘original poem’ and ‘poetic translation’ are manifestations’. He does not know, he says, of ‘another single metaphor that’s equal to the complexity of the activity of translation’ [NOTE 16 to p. 31: Paul Muldoon, *The End of the Poem: Oxford Lectures in Poetry* (Oxford, 2006), 195]. This metaphor allows him to feel that what is fundamentally the same energy from the ‘ur-poem’ can manifest itself in different ways.” (Reynolds 2011 pp. 30-31)

“‘Translation is a form of interpretation’, says Umberto Eco, echoing Roman Jakobson, for whom translation is ‘an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language’. The philosopher Karl Popper tells us that ‘every good translation is an *interpretation* of the original text’. We can read in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* that ‘every translation, of course, is an interpretation’, while a study of the Old Testament goes further: ‘it is a truism that any translation is an interpretation’ [NOTE 1 to p. 59: Umberto Eco, *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation* (2003), 5; Roman Jakobson, *Language in Literature*, ed. Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy (Cambridge, Mass. & London, 1987), 429; Karl Popper, *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography* (2002), 21; Raphael Lyne ‘Ovid in English Translation’, in Philip Hardie (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (Cambridge, 2002), 249-63, 260; Christianus Brekelmans, Magne Sæbø, and Menahem Haran, *Old Testaments: The History of Its*

Interpretation (1996), 87]. These different voices swell a chorus that has become all but universal in contemporary translation criticism. But what exactly does it mean?” (Reynolds, 2011, p. 59)

“To say that translation is a form of interpretation highlights some aspects of translation (for instance the meanings that seem to be ascribed to the source) and obscures others (for instance the translator’s self-expression through translating). This shows that Eco’s statement includes an unacknowledged strand of metaphor—the sort of thing that is obvious in statements like ‘life is a form of journey’. The same is true, and more emphatically, of those rephrasings which ditch the qualifier ‘a form of’. What is really meant by ‘any translation is an interpretation’ is: ‘let’s think of translation on the model of interpretation. Interpretation is a metaphor for translation just like those other metaphors—transcription, transposition, bridge-building, unbinding-within-bounds, nightmare, etc.—which we have already encountered”. (Reynolds 2011, p. 60)

“As a metaphor for translation, ‘interpretation’ is, then, both unavoidable and treacherous” (Reynolds 2011 p. 69)

On the scope of Gillespie’s volume—the second golden age of English classical translation. It is no wonder that **English Augustanism, in the cusp of the expansion of the British Empire, was preceded by this intense, systematic, and widespread campaign to appropriate the literary capital of Greece and Rome** (which went hand in hand with the neoclassical appropriation of its **art and architecture**, and with a renewed interest in Roman republicanism). A trading empire, went hand in hand with the advanced and sophisticated book market, a metropolis teeming with the hacks of Grub Street, and a consuming public eager to absorb the texts and the art objects that accorded them the status of New Roman citizens. In this regard, as the quotation from p. 32 shows, Pope and Dryden’s translations of the great epic poets of Rome and Greece—reinvented for the occasion—contributed the poetic language and the imperial-epic ethos that was an inherent part—alongside other cultural artefacts in architecture and the visual arts—of the new Augustan age, i.e. Britain’s translation of Empire. In the same way in which translators frequently use their originals as vehicles for their own agendas, British Augustanism used these translations as part of the new imperial garb the whole country had woven for itself:

“The period from Dryden’s first translations in the 1680s to Samuel Johnson’s death in 1784 has a good claim to be regarded, no less than the Renaissance, as **a golden age of English classical translation**—it is, in fact, at the core of the present book” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 12)

“Plainly, the eighteenth-century literary world is a translating culture, with the greatest prestige attaching to classical translation... This culture is one in which works of translation have full continuity with other literary output, so that it becomes common for writers to publish volumes of their ‘Poems and Translations’, while perhaps also contributing to joint translations... Widely read collections, such as poetic miscellanies, integrate translations in quantity into the material they print... It is [a culture] in which writers so far below the notice of literary history as to be virtually unheard of today could make handsome livings by translating...” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 13)

“We should... keep in mind—to sum up one of my themes in this chapter—the remarkable way in which Pope’s Homer and Dryden’s Virgil, so to say, *gave* Homer and Virgil to eighteenth-century English poetry, and in so doing established its foundations. In Douglas Knight’s words: “The stability and range, not only of Pope’s poetic world but of the Augustan world around it, are established in part by their ‘possession’ of the great heroic poets—an achievement impossible without the living knowledge, the living poetry of Dryden’s *Aeneid* or Pope’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 32)

And the imperial appropriation of Rome and Greece was preceded by a dramatic expansion in English vocabulary, the result of importing into the language the goods and the linguistic capital of others:

[In the Renaissance] “Questions about the procedures and purposes of translation are wrapped up with debates about linguistic assimilation. Two central issues structure these debates: the adequacy of English as a language of culture and knowledge, and the specific character of the English into which foreign (especially Latin) texts are translated. **English was often seen at this time (and far beyond) as an inadequate language, lacking both authority and copiousness, and translation was one way of putting right these shortcomings: the unprecedented expansion of English vocabulary in the hundred years from 1550 was largely the result of the effort to translate texts into English (literary texts, but also practical, religious and other kinds).** And this drive was, as Charles Barber makes clear in describing the expansion of English vocabulary in this period, ‘highly conscious’. Or, as Richard Foster Jones spells it out further, ‘the key to an understanding of the dominant attitude toward the vernacular... is found in the unhappy comparison with Latin and Greek and in the strong desire and earnest effort to educate the unlearned by translations and by original works written in English’” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 37)

Romanticism and English translation:

“In spite of the discouragement Romantic theories of original genius appear to give translation, and in spite of the promotion of alternative models... poets of the Romantic era were engaged in translating and otherwise reworking classical texts all the way across Europe. The most prominent English example is Shelley (1792-1822), who made direct versions of Euripides’ *Cyclops*, the *Homeric Hymns*, Theocritus and the *Symposium*, and modelled other works on Aeschylus and Bion” (Gillespie 2011 p. 14)

Another golden age of translation in English?

“Daniel Hooley is right to note that ‘for the sheer number and stylistic variety of its classical translations, the first half of [the 20th] century ranks with the Renaissance and the age of Pope’. It should give pause for thought that a much larger number of English translations from the classics were published in that century than any previous one” (Gillespie, 2011 p. 18)

On the scope and aims of Gillespie’s volume:

“If classical literature has been formative of western literary traditions, translations of it have probably been no less so. This is partly a practical matter: a writer cannot make use of a work she cannot read. But it is also a more subtle question of how the most ambitious translations make a text ‘available’ to the native tradition. Perhaps more than that: through translation, and only through translation, it can be argued, can a classic fully take its place within the vernacular culture, becoming an adoptive child, an immediate member of the family, rather than a distant (or dead) cousin—however deeply respected a distant cousin. In the aggregate, translations are crucial to the process of ‘making the classics belong’. Understanding how this occurs, which includes attending to the individual acts of translation which are fundamental to it, is one of the things this book is about.” (Gillespie, 2011 pp. 18-19)

An interesting paragraph on how to approach translation

“... perhaps the most interesting thing we can do is to ask **what are the conditions for creative engagement with a classical text**. This could be seen as a question about **how linguistic and cultural alterity may be processed**; hegemony and acculturation play out in many different ways. **Colonizing another culture imperialistically is one. Others include competing with another culture or with other versions of another culture. One might allow a foreign text to suggest new ways of inhabiting one’s own culture or use it to explore the fault-lines within one’s own identity. Appeal can be made to a work’s cultural authority; cultural authority can be faked by distortion or outright fabrication of sources.** All of these things can be found in the history of English engagements with classical texts in translation, and perhaps none is confined to one era”. (Gillespie, 2011 p. 21)

Very interesting: Dryden on Jonson

“**He invades Authours like a Monarch, and what would be theft in other Poets, is onely victory in him**’ [*Of Dramatic Poesy*; Druden (1956-2000), XVII, 57]. Between ‘plagiarism’ and ‘victory’, we might say, lies the creativity of translation. Is invasiveness a necessary part of that creativity?” (Gillespie 2011, p. 21)

On the continuum between “translation” and “imitation”, the difficulties in distinguishing them clearly (and on Dryden’s definitions), see Gillespie p. 22. This and the following page contain brief descriptions of the alternative strategies adopted by modern translators of classical authors, from the ‘homophonic’ versions of Catullus produced by Celia and Louis Zukofsky (1969), a version directed by “the reproduction of phonetic values”, to H.D.’s minimalist (or, rather, imagist) of certain Greek lyrics. Here Gillespie quotes a strikingly effective (and beautiful) rendering of the first chorus of Euripides’ *Iphigenia in Aulis*, by the eminent American modernist, H.D. (see p. 23). Gillespie has some interesting analysis of the influence of Pound’s strategies for translation (as influential as his poetry), and how translation and poetic invention seem to go hand in hand in Pound, or to supplant each other. Gillespie discusses the liminal space inhabited by translation, imitation, and poetic invention by using Pound’s *Homage to Sextus Propertius* as a case study (see pp. 22-24), to illustrate, *inter alia*, the fact that not infrequently, translators used their originals as vehicles to push their own agendas (political, religious, aesthetic, or whatever):

“Translations can make us feel freshly connected with works we thought had slipped below the horizon... The father-figure of Ezra Pound lies behind both the Zukofsky Catullus and H.D.’s Euripides. Few can have disagreed with George Steiner when, in

1966, he observed that Pound's translations had 'altered the definition and ideals of verse translation in the 20th century as surely as Pound's poetry has renewed or subverted English and American poetics'. One could go further and say that **in terms of his practice Pound brought translation and original writing together in such a way as to allow translation almost to be identified with the process of literary invention as such**. The message was not lost on Eliot. John Hollander points out that 'the job of the poet', in Eliot's seminal essay 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' is strangely that of an Ideal Translator'" (Gillespie, 2011, pp. 23-4)

"One of the main reasons for his influence is that Pound's translations push at the limits of what translation is or can be... Pound himself originally styled his *Homage to Sextus Propertius* (1919) a translation, but quickly abandoned the term when classical scholars began to challenge his credentials. The work was not printed in his *Collected Translations*... Eliot produced an alternative term for the *Homage* in his introduction to the *Selected Poems*: 'It is not a translation,' he wrote, 'it is a paraphrase, or till more truly (for the instructed) a *persona*'. What Eliot meant was that by filtering and emphasizing what he chose, Pound had made Propertius into a vehicle, a spokesman, for himself—by no means a new departure for a translator, as we have already seen. The characterization, typically of Eliot, gives much pause for thought, even if the term 'persona' has had its gloss dulled during its passage through a great many critical hands since he used it." (Gillespie, 2011 p. 24)

"For T.S. Eliot, discussing Pound, 'good translation is not merely translation, for the translator is giving the original through himself, and finding himself through the original' [NOTE 10 to p. 29: Ezra Pound, *Selected Poems*, ed. T.S. Eliot (1948), 13.]: the way to translate well, really to give readers the original, is by not doing mere translation. The same pattern of assertion is widespread among contemporary poets endeavouring to enforce a distinction between the 'versions' written by them and translation as it is otherwise practised" (Reynolds, 2011 p. 29)

Reynolds establishes a sort of genealogy, or a certain strand in the English tradition of translations (one of the things that Gillespie attempts to do with his own volume), that connects Dryden – Pound – Lowell, and he starts his chapter 9 ("Interpretation and 'Opening': Dryden, Chapman, and Early Translations from the Bible") with a quotation from Dryden's famous Preface to his *Ovid's Epistles* (1680). He also examines the prefatory poem that precedes Chapman's translation of the *Iliad* ('To the Reader', in the 1609 and 1611 editions), as well as Richard Rolle's translation of the Psalter (1340). Reynold's conclusions, as a result of his discussion of Rolle's translations of the Psalter, leads to the acknowledgement of the actual continuum that exists between literal translation and interpretation of the original text, a range that goes from the word-for-word translation to the subjective dimension injected into the text as this is appropriated by each of its readers. You might want to relate this idea of the 'opening up' of the text with the issue of common language and common sense. In this regard, look further into the preface to the English translation of Erasmus's paraphrase of the Gospel (1548).

"In the introduction to [Lowell's] *Imitations* there is no mention of Ezra Pound, Lowell's obvious precursor (as we will see in Chapter 23). It is Dryden whose name pops up, casually, as though it is taken for granted that he is the obvious person to refer to. **Dryden supplied the title of Lowell's book; and what goes on within its covers is thoroughly in Dryden's debt as well, for his theory and practice of translation searched the borderlands between interpretation and invention,**

between catching ‘the tone’ and creating ‘a tone’. Dryden’s sense of the shiftingness of the ground in this area can be seen even in his famous tripartite definition of translation, in the Preface to *Ovid’s Epistles* (1680)

All translation I suppose may be reduced to these three heads.

*First, that of **metaphrase**, or turning an author word by word, and line by line, from one language into another. Thus, or near this manner, was Hoace his Art of Poetry translated by Ben Jonson. The second way is that of **paraphrase**, or translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered. Such is Mr Waller’s translation of Virgil’s Fourth Aeneid. The third way is that of **imitation**, where the translator (if now he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original, to run division on the ground-work as he pleases. Such is Mr. Cowley’s practice in turning two Odes of Pindar, and one of Horace, into English.*

[NOTE 2 to p. 73: John Dryden, *The Poems*, ed. Paul Hammond and David Hopkins, 5 vols (1995-2005), I, 384-5]

This explanatory structure underlies Lowell’s threefold gradation of ‘literal meaning’, ‘the tone’, and ‘a tone’, though the nuances are different. For Dryden, even more than for Lowell, the announced categories cannot but blur.”

(Reynolds 2011 p. 73)

“The tentativeness of these definitions shows **Dryden’s** honesty as a critic: unlike some of the modern theorists I mentioned in Part I, he does not squeeze the complexities of actual writing to fit his categories. But it also **owes something to earlier discussions by which he was influenced, especially the searching epistle ‘To the Reader’ with which George Chapman prefaced the 1609 and 1611 editions of his translation from the *Iliad*. Chapman rejects ‘word-for-word traductions’ on the usual grounds of ungainliness:**

... they lose
The free grade of their naturall Dialect
And shame their authors with a forced Glose

And he deprecates no less any translators who would take ‘more licence from the words than may expresse / Their full compression and make cleare the Author’. Chapman’s own translation, or ‘conversion’, he says, ‘much abates / The licence they take’. And yet Chapman cannot, any more than Dryden, fix a firm distinction between the kind of translation he professes and those he deplores. For he too feels that some freeing-up has to be done by a translator: the ‘compression’ of words needs ‘expressing’, just as Dryden’s paraphrast is alloed to ‘amplify’ and perhaps even ‘vary’ the original’s ‘sense’. Some ‘periphraes’, Chapman says, are ‘needful’—and ‘periphraes’, defined by Puttenham (in 1589) as ‘circumloquotion’, implies, if anything, more expansion than ‘paraphraes’: it is a ‘great aid to *Prolixity*’, Pope was later to point out in *Peri Bathous* (1727). Chapman is especially exercised by the example

of those ‘Commentars’—editors and annotators—who have tried to ‘showe’ Homer, but in the wrong way:

**They fail’d to search his deep and tresurous hart.
The cause was since they wanted the fit key
Of Nature, in their down-right strength of Art,
With Poesie to open Poesie—**

Chapman’s hostility towards these scholars must have been fuelled by a feeling of indebtedness for, **like almost every early-modern translator from Greek, he needed the crutch of parallel text Latin translation and notes**: principally the ‘traduction’ derived from **Andreas Divus** and the exposition reiterated from the 12th-c. commentator **Eustathius** which were found in the edition by Spondanus that he mainly used. As Phyllis Bartlett has made plain, explanations from Spondanus are brought into the first, partial printing of Chapman’s translation, the *Seaven Bookes of the Iliades* (1598), but then are often excised from it in rewriting, only then occasionally to creep back in.” (Reynolds 2011, pp. 74-5)

“Throughout the early history of the Englishing of the Bible, doctrinal and political anxieties had pressed in on matters of linguistic detail. During the 1380s and 1390s, probably in Oxford, followers of Wycliffe engaged in intense translatory work on the Bible, establishing the source text, translating more or less word for word, and then revising their first efforts into a more comprehensible and elegant English [NOTE 23 to p. 78: Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988), 238-47]. The Prologue to the fully revised translation of the 1390s reflects on this process, and sums it up in what was to become an influential justification of ‘opening’:

The beste translating is, out of Latyn into English, to translate aftir the sentence, and not oneli after the wordis, so that the sentence be as opin either openere in English as in Latyn, and go not fer from the lettre; and if the lettre mai not be suid in the translating, let the sentence evere be hool and open, for the wordis owen to serve to the entent and sentence [NOTE 24 to p. 78: Anne Hudson, ed. *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings* (Cambridge, 1978), 68]”

(Reynolds, 2011, p. 78)

“In the case of the Wycliffite Bible, it was not any linguistic detail that led to official condemnation, but rather the further ‘opening’ caused by the circulation of the translated texts. As David Lawton has put it, ‘the question is not what? (An English Bible) but who? (who owns it?)’ [NOTE 26 to p. 79: David Lawton, “The Bible”, in France and Gillespie (gen. eds.), *The Oxford History of Literary Translation into English*, I, 193-233, 223]. With his *Constitutions* of 1409, Archbishop Arundel not only banned unauthorized translation but restricted the preaching and discussion of Christian texts: thereafter, the ‘symples men’ whom the Wycliffites had in view could be found guilty of heresy for possessing a Bible translation, even though Henry VI himself owned one [NOTE 27 to p. 79: Lawton, “The Bible”, 223, 200; Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, 82]. **Nevertheless, echoes of the Wycliffites’ unease about the first stage of ‘opening’ the ‘letter’ are discernible in many subsequent Bibles, where little added words like ‘while’ were marked in parentheses, as by Coverdale, or italics, as in both the Geneva Bible of 1560 and the Authorized Version. And the sensitivities hereabouts were well grounded →→→ for the**

nub of Luther's attack on the Roman Catholic Church was enclosed in just such a tiny explanatory adjustment: the insertion of 'allein', 'alone', before the word 'Glauben', 'faith', in Romans 3.28, translated in the Authorized Version as 'a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law'. Luther protested that he had merely →→→ opened 'the sense of the text' ('die meinung des text') into the sort of German that is in 'daily use' ('teglischen brauch')" (Reynolds 2011 p. 79)

"Luther was a startlingly vigorous and confident translator, 'as familiar with or even as rude to the Bible'—in Diarmaid MacCulloch's view—"as with the most intimate of old friends'. **The typographical conventions adopted by Coverdale and the others** express a more tentative attitude: they draw attention to the element of interpretation that is inherent in their translations (and in all translation, as we have seen). By so doing, they make visible a radical uncertainty as to where the boundary of translation lies. The words in parentheses or italics were necessary to 'open' the text, and so were in that respect its most crucial elements, the words that really did the work of translating. And yet, for exactly that reason, they introduced an unignorable difference from the source, and so had to be marked out from the words that were felt to be translation rigidly conceived.

The paradox appears in perhaps its purest form in the Wycliffites' 'major precursor', Richard Rolle's translation of the Psalter (1340):

*In the translacioun .i. folow the lettere as mykyl as .i. may. And thare. i. fynd na propire ynglis. i. folow the wit of the worde, swa that thai shall red it thaim thare noght dred errynge. In expounynge. i. fologh haly doctours. for it may come in som envyous man hand that kenaves noght what he sould say, that wil say that. i. wist noght what i.sayd, and swa doe harme til hym. and til othere. [NOTE 31 to p. 80: Richard Rolle, *The Psalter or Psalms of David and Certain Canticles with a Translation and Exposition in English* by Richard Rolle of Hampole, ed. Rev. H. R. Bramley (Oxford, 1884), 4-5. 'Major precursors' is David Lawton's phrase, "The Bible", 229]*

Rolle's text includes an explanatory commentary: this is what he refers to when he talks of 'expounynge', in contrast to 'the translacioun'. Yet the distinction wobbles in just the same way as in all the later texts we have explored. 'Translacioun' requires Rolle to depart from 'the lettere' and 'folow the wit of the worde'. This cannot but bring in the possibility of 'errynge'; the need for 'expounynge', with the help of holy doctors, at once becomes evident. In the text itself, 'translacioun' and 'expounynge' become even harder to separate." (Reynolds, 2011 p. 80)

"Like all the texts we have explored, Rolle's Psalter reveals uncertainty about the boundaries between translation and 'expounynge' or interpretation. Translation is itself an 'expounynge'. Even the strictest possible following of 'the wordis' or of 'the lettere' is also translation of the 'wit' or 'sentence': there are always choices to be made about which of the possible 'literal' meanings is the most relevant. Yet it is everywhere recognized that this sort of translation misses something: it is a 'forced Glose', it is like dancing on ropes with fettered legs. **The first step into 'opening' which is a 'word-for-word' translation therefore asks for the further opening of 'sense-for-sense', that is, a translation which**

gives more attention to each word's place in the surrounding texture. And this kind of translation blurs into the further opening of commentary, and then the yet further openings of application to people's lives, the spread of both illumination and dissent. Translation is inextricably part of this avalanche of 'opening'; and yet, as Coverdale's parentheses and the 1611 italics and the uncertainties of all the discussions show, it has also to be held separate from it. For if it cannot be, it risks losing its status as truly representing the text which all these other openings are openings of." (Reynolds, 2011 p. 81)

"By the late sixteenth century a new piece of terminology had arrived in English to describe the sort of writing that Rolle had called 'expounyng'. It was 'paraphrase', the word that Dryden was later to adopt for his preferred style, not of 'expounyng', but of translating. Yet this word too, no less than 'open', was dogged by ambiguity.

'Paraphrase' came into English via awareness, and translation, of Erasmus's paraphrases of the New Testament. The paraphrases, in Latin, were written to accompany a Latin translation: when both translation and paraphrase were brought into English (by a group of translators who included Princess Mary Tudor), generic and terminological confusion ensued. The prefatory material to the 1548 *First tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the Newe Testamente* at first seems wholly clear:

*A paraphrase is a plain setting forth of a text or sentence more at large, with such circumstance of moe and other wordes, as ma make the sentence open, cleare, plaine, & familiar, whiche otherwise shold perchaunce seme bare, vnfruitful harde, straunge rough, obscure, & derke to be vnderstanded of any that were... vnlearned. [NOTE 1 to p. 82: Desiderius Erasmus, *First tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the Newe Testamente*, tr. Nicholas Udall et al. (1548) f. xiiii r]*

Just like Rolle's 'expounyng', Erasmus's paraphrase offers an informed and sympathetic reading of the Bible text, 'opening' it by sketching in context, extrapolating feelings and motivations, and clarifying doctrinal consequences." (Reynolds 2011 p. 82)

"On the one hand, translation merges with paraphrase because it begins the process of opening which paraphrase continues; on the other, it has to be kept separate from paraphrase if it is to stand in for the text which the paraphrase is a paraphrase of. The tension here is just the same as in Rolle's Psalter.

Back in the prefatory material, the strain becomes impossible to manage. The word 'paraphrase' balloons to include translation too:

... in this English paraphrase the translatoours haue of purpose studied rather to write a plain stile, then to vse their elegancie of speche, partely because there cannot in al pointes be expressed in the English tongue the grace that is in the laten... & partely because there was a special regarde to be had to the rude and vnlettered people, who perchaunce through default of atteigning to the high stile, should also thereby haue been defrauded of the profit and fruit of vnderstanding the sence, which thing that they might doe, was the onely purpose why it was first translated, and now by the kinges most excellent Maiestie willed to be read. [NOTE 3 to p. 83: Ibid., f. xiiii v]"

The translation into English has been done mainly for those who are ‘rude and vnlettered’ (i.e. cannot read Latin); and English is felt to be in itself a rather unsophisticated language. So the description of translation as something that makes ‘plain’ and supplies understanding, overlaps with the definition of paraphrase that had been given only a page before. When Erasmus’s Latin has been ‘translated’ it becomes ‘this English paraphrase’.

As the word ‘paraphrase’ settled into English usage, it developed a new implication. The ‘opening’ of a Christian text to believers could include making it readily applicable to their lives in the present.” (Reynolds 2011 p. 83)

“In the preface to *Ovid’s Epistles*, Dryden had tried to discipline paraphrase’s drift towards liberty by giving it a stipulative definition. He had distinguished it from ‘imitation’, and from ‘metaphrase’—itself in fact just as blurry a term, although a less common one. He had asserted that ‘the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered’. But, as we have seen, the confidence of these distinctions wobbles even in Dryden’s critical prose. **In his practice of translation (or is it paraphrase?—or is it something else... ?), the ambiguities we have explored nourish some of his most searching verse.**” (Reynolds 2011 p. 87)

That fabulous expression coined by Chapman that describes poetic, or creative translation of poetry (as opposed to prose commentary), with the words: “With Poesie to open Poesie”, leads Reynolds on to the metaphor of translation as an opening: he discusses Bible translation (where translation also amounts to opening up, or liberating, cf. Enzinas’s “Habla Dios”: here translation is spiritual liberation, and through personal spiritual fulfillment and liberation, it would also eventually entail aspirations to political liberation too) – and this opening up of the text for the reader, leads in turn back to the concept of translation as interpretation:

“Wanting to distinguish translation from the explanation offered by commentary, and yet at the same time including explanation among the translator’s aims, Chapman recognizes the conflict that is glossed over by modern critics who equate translation and interpretation. His perplexity has its roots far back in the beginnings of translation into English; especially **in translation from the Bible where ‘open’ had become a charged word. ‘Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light’ wrote the translators of the Authorized Version in 1611. Translation illuminates, obviously, by making the Bible available to people who do not know Latin or Greek or Hebrew; and it joins with the technology of printing to spread the word among a wide readership.** A century and a half earlier, Caxton had been inseparably a printer and a translator, for he had had to transate it in order to meet the new demand for books. And in 1535, Miles Coverdale, in the Prologue to his own translation of the Bible, gave thanks to God ‘that he hath opened vnto his church the gyfte of interpretacyon & of pryntyng’.” (Reynolds 2011 p. 76)

“By ‘interpretacyon’, Coverdale means both the interpetation that is part of translation, and the interpretation by lay readers that translation makes possible. Both are implied when he says tat, with so many people now endeavouring

to interpret scripture, ‘every one doth his best to be nyest the marke’: it is ‘lyke as whan man are shutynge [shooting] together’. **So ‘opening’, in the context of the Bible, has multiple and intermingled denotations: translation, the circulation of books, and the processes of interpretation through which Protestant readers open the text further for themselves, discovering its truths in line with their consciences and bringing them to bear on the conduct of their lives.**” (Reynolds 2011 pp. 76-77)

“For Protestants, then, translation enabled also an ‘opening’ of the power structures of the Church. In consequence, the *via media* pursued by the Anglican translators of 1611, as they gathered and adjusted all the work done by Tyndale and his successors, was inseparably linguistic and doctrinal:

Wee haue on the one side auoided the scrupulositie of the Puritanes, who leaue the olde Ecclesiasticall words, and betake them to other, as when they put washing for Baptisme, and Congregation in stead of Church: as also on the other side we haue shunned the obscuritie of the Papists, in their Azimes, Tuike, Rational, Holocausts, Præpuce, Pasche, and a number of such like, whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sence, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may bee kept from being vnderstood

Done ‘by his Maiesties speciall Comandement’ and ‘appointed to be read in Churches’—as the title page announces—the **1611 translation at once ‘opens’ the Bible and encloses it in an English ecclesiastical tradition.**” (Reynolds 2011 p. 78)

Reynolds devotes three whole chapters to Dryden (two of them to his translation of the *Aeneid*), and in them he carefully analyses the relation between the rhetorical and stylistic aspects of the translation in parallel with their equivalents or counterparts in the original (both in terms of content and style). His conclusion is both that translation is not interpretation, but that translation and interpretation are “inseparably and agonistically intertwined”

“As translated by Dryden, the episode of Dido and Aeneas plays out a struggle that occurs in every word of his translation: of interpreting and getting wrong; of ‘opening’ and the element of misrepresentation which it inevitably creates. This text is refutation of the idea that translation ‘is’ interpretation; and a brilliant and heartfelt exploration of the ways in which translation and interpretation are nevertheless inseparably and agonistically intertwined.” (Reynolds 2011 p. 118)

Chapter 14 in Reynolds explores the idea of translating an author, which he does with detail, by looking at this idea as it appears in Dryden, Sir Thomas Hoby, Sir John Denham, among others. The detail with which this idea is explored in several authors and works, and how it is continued in chapter 15 (titled “The Author as Intimate”) proves the careful survey conducted by Reynolds: his book is a veritable catalogue of case studies (as I think I have mentioned elsewhere) which are analysed with sharp linguistic / philological perception, as well as with the sensitivity of an excellent and seasoned reader of poetry, who can actually read between and beyond the lines, into the universe of discourse of both texts, etc., all of it seasoned with an impressive array of secondary literature from a large variety of fields. In this respect, the opening chapters of the volume set the tone and the method from the very outset. In doing so, Reynolds explores the different nuances and faces of this many-sided

phenomenon that is poetic translation into English, and its tradition. He does so by pursuing some of the most common metaphors of translation to be found in English and in other languages. After the introductory chapters, which as I have just said address the different linguistic and philosophical / epistemological theories of translation, Reynolds illustrates the list of translatorial metaphors he is pursuing with a rich kaleidoscope of English translations most of them from the Classics, and in particular, from the epic poems of Virgil and Homer, which constitute perhaps the main bulk of his analysis, peppered with references to other poems. The book ends with a chapter devoted to Golding's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and with a discussion of metamorphosis as another metaphor for translation (he refers to the famous translation by Dryden of *Metamorphoses* Book XV, "On the Pythagorean Philosophy", published in Dryden's *Fables* (1700), see Reynolds 2011 p. 287). This protean concept of literary canons as an ever-changing substance or artefact somehow endowed with a living force is certainly a suggestive image that starts to express its fluent complexity, its multidirectional processes. As is the case in the rest of the volume, this chapter analyses a large variety of texts and authors who somehow use this metaphor in their poetry and their translations. The whole book as the author himself describes his task, is a map of the varieties of translation to be found in English, with the additional advantage that it is not a mere superficial description of poetic forms: it digs deeper than that, thanks to the erudition and the keen acumen of its author as a seasoned reader of poetry

"As we have seen, metaphors of translation release writers from the tyranny of 'translation rigidly conceived'. They open un, and define, different imaginative practices which enable poets to create translations that are poems. **One view of what I have been doing in this book might be that I have mapped varieties of translatory 'freedom'. And certainly that is part of it.**" (Reynolds. 2011 p. 301)

"The metaphors that I have pursued have emerged out of the particular translations that we have read. Sometimes a guiding metaphor has been made explicit in a poet's self-description, sometimes not. Often it has been suggested by the text that is being translated. Of course, in identifying and drawing out each metaphor I must have done some interpretive moulding of my own. Nothing I have advanced in this book is 'objective': I am not putting forward what some scholars of translation think is needed—a 'theory' that can be 'tested' and thereby proved or disproved. **Such a theory would inevitably falsify the processes of reading and interpreting which are matters, not of observation and proof, but of perception, imagining, judgment, and persuasion. What I have above all wished to demonstrate in this book is that poem-translations are not objects to be analysed and categorised but texts that reward the intuitive and responsive activity of READING. To other readers of translations, I have offered, not a theoretical paradigm, but tactics of interpretation—metaphors to look out for—which I hope may be pursued and elaborated through texts other than those I have read within these pages.**" (Reynolds, 2011 p. 302)

"Not promulgating a theory, this book has not recounted a history either. There have been various organizing contours. The argument has to some extent followed lines of indebtedness from one poet-translator to another: Lowell to Dryden; Pound to Browning. And it has, to some extent, traced successive versions of the same text: the *Iliad* from Pope to Logue. But these particular, partial principles of organization are both subordinate to the larger endeavour, which has been to group the texts discussed according to similarity of guiding metaphor." (Reynolds, 2011 p. 302)

“... the book does—I think—have implications for literary history. I have arranged acts of translation across time, according to a pattern which emerged from them, rather than being brought to them preformatted as chronology. Of course, **the texts have figured as they have been taken by translators who are historically situated. But the texts have, in return, exerted their own pressure on each historical situation, changing it. It is in the nature of translation to mess with literary history in this way. Translation allows a text from one culture to become active again—to be written again—in another culture centuries or millennia later. Other works too can take on new life, of course: they can be rediscovered, or exert new influence. But translations have a unique power to create folds in literary space and time.**” (Reynolds 2011 p. 303)

The voice of the author comes across as a vastly read scholar, and an unusually perceptive reader of poetry who can find analogies across works and authors, periods and styles and bring them together between the hard covers of his book. His analytic palette goes from Homer to Chaucer, and from Virgil to Dryden, and then all the way up to the late 20th-century Christopher Logue’s free translation of Homer, with incursions into Byron, Keats, Pound or Heaney’s *Beowulf*. In spite of the subtle distinctions he seeks to establish (or argue against), such as paraphrase, imitation, translation, free translation, interpretation, etc. his acumen as a sharp and sensitive alert reader eventually *de facto* lead him to acknowledge the continuity that exists between the composition, the translation / interpretation and the reading of poetry, like three graces dancing in circle, impossible to separate from each other. The reader of this volume, if he or she is a well-read poetry aficionado, will go away with the impression that he has confirmed what his intuition told him all the way: that poetic canons (literary canons, in general, but poetry in particular) are built up through creative and interpretive, imitative and allusive, processes in which translation and the constellation of epistemological cognates that are part of this cluster described above, plays a fundamental role. And one not explored with the depth, sensibility and detail that it deserves. Reynold’s volume is an important contribution to a proper understanding of what translation means for English poetry.

The story that Reynolds tells us here is in a way an account of our growing distance from the classics (in spite of the fact that translations reveal the existing distance as much as they try to bridge it). And in this respect, there is a certain poignancy, a rather revealing evidence, in being aware of the fact that for Dryden Latin was very close to his own linguistic experience when he translated Virgil, whereas Logue translated Homer without any knowledge of Greek, just by examining a large variety other translations, transliterations, word-for-word renderings, etc.

“As I am arguing throughout this book, the metaphors with which the translation of poetry is conceived take on strength and energy when they interact with or derive from metaphors in the text that is being translated. Dryden’s imagination was especially exercised in ‘opening’ the *Aeneid* because in the *Aeneid* itself—as he saw it—much ‘opening’ occurs. But friendship was not so pervasive in the poems that were being translated; and it is simply not so fundamental a topic of Western poetry as the **other sources of metaphor that we will go on to investigate—desire and passion; perspective; death and rebirth.**” (Reynolds 2011 p. 134)

“For Comber, Pound’s choice of ‘life/death pieces’ reveals his wish to prevent the classics from becoming mere objects of scholarship, and thus to keep them alive as a stimulus for poetry. ‘The focus’—Comber proposes—‘is now on a vital struggle

between a dying, fading tradition and a living continuity. ‘My job’ said Pound, ‘was to bring a dead man to life, to present a living figure’. Pound did certainly feel that he was engaged in such a struggle, more so than earlier poets because, as the twentieth century dawned, Latin was sinking into the unhappy status of a ‘dead language’. Dryden’s Latin had been as fluent as his English, or nearly so. To make Virgil speak modern English was, for him, less a resurrection than the transfer of a liveliness still present in the Latin: as I suggested at the start of this chapter, it was not so much that the classics were already dead as that they risked being killed by bad translations. The phrase ‘a dead language’ seems to have gained currency during the eighteenth century when Dr Johnson was one of the people who used it. But he did so (on at least one occasion) when discussing a poem written in Latin by Addison—a sign that Latin was still not yet so very dead; and of course Johnson himself wrote Latin verse. Even for Tennyson and Browning, Latin would have had an air of familiarity which had vanished from the world in which Pound moved.” (Reynolds 2011 p. 256)

“As we have seen in all the chapters that have gone before, ‘translation rigidly conceived’ is too narrow a metaphor for the imaginative work that goes on in the practice of poetry translation. **The metaphors that have guided my discussion are brought in by poets as more sympathetic shapes for their activities. But all these metaphors, whether left inexplicit (as with Logue’s ‘zoom’) or thoroughly theorized (as with Dryden’s ‘opening’), →→→are still abstractions from the multifarious processes they partly guide ←←←.** What is true, to varying degrees, of all the texts I have discussed is made blatant, and revelled in, by Pound in ‘Homage to Sextus Propertius’. The explicit metaphors of ‘presenting’ and ‘bringing to life’ will do as rough summing-up, or as labels for what was perhaps an initial intention. But **when they are brought into contact with the texture of Pound’s poetry of translation, they stretch, proliferate, and turn back on themselves. The wish to make ‘present’ brings with it an awareness of loss.** The desire to being ‘a dead man to life’ spreads into an enjoyment of kinds of textual ‘liveliness’ which go beyond and even contradicts the personality that was meant to be resurrected.” (Reynolds 2011 pp. 266-67)

“**This variety of the poetry of translation, in which metaphors of translation arise and then disintegrate, allows Pound to explore ideas about selfhood and the passing of time that mattered also to other modernist texts that are not translations.** Subjectivity, in the ‘Homage’, is no less internally divided than in ‘The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock’; time passes no more consistently than in *Mrs Dalloway*. But **cultural circumstances are only part of the explanation. As we have seen, the metaphors of ‘opening’, ‘desire’, and ‘landscape’ (and other, narrower metaphors connected to them) all harmonize with translation because they include an awareness of, respectively, change, absence, and distance.** But ‘life’ and ‘presence’ are so much at odds with the nature of the text, and especially of translated text, that their role as metaphors of translation will inevitably be agonistic: the push to achieve ‘life’ will come up against the failure to achieve it; what is made ‘present’ will meet what has been lost. The idea that he was pursuing ‘life’ and ‘presence’ helped Pound to be so responsive to Propertius’s Latin; **but those metaphors gave way before the multifarious suggestiveness of what he found there to respond to. As we are about to see, it is not only in Modernist texts that metaphors of translation fracture and fragment.**” (Reynolds 2011 p. 267)

Reynolds moves on then to link FitzGerald's *Rubáiyát* with Pound, who admired this translation / appropriation:

“Pound admired FitzGerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* (1859). It was, he wrote in the late 1920s, ‘the only good poem of the time that has gone to the people’. What is more, ‘it is called, and is to a great extent, a trans- or mistranslation’: the claim of kinship with his own enterprise of ‘trans-or mistranslation’ is clear.” (Reynolds 2011 p. 268)

[when discussing the influence of FitzGerald's translation in some of Pound's *Cantos*]: “... how much of FitzGerald stirs in these stanzas of *Cantos*? And the same question is at the heart of the writing that has nourished Pound: how much of Omar lives on in FitzGerald's *Rubáiyát*? ... **the continuities** (if they are continuities) **that occur in translation and imitation must begin in the nebulous space of reading where**—as we saw in Chapter 14—**your identity to some extent dissolves into the book and the book partially dissolves into you**. In consequence—as I showed in Chapter 4—**the whatever-it-is that is brought across in translation must first have been found, i.e. partly invented, by the reader-and-translator; and the same is true of the whatever-it-is that is imitated in imitation.**” (Reynolds 2011 p. 270)

“**All the metaphors of translation discussed in this book are narrower than the texts that they inhabit.** ‘Opening’ is not the whole story of Dryden's *Aeneis*; ‘to bring a dead man to life’ was not the sum total of Pound's endeavour in *Homage to Sextus Propertius*. **But what is unusual about FitzGerald's *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* is the degree to which it dissolves even those various and fleeting metaphors that were in the environs of its creation.** It is neither ‘literal’ nor ‘unliteral’. The metaphor of ‘friendship’ does not take us very far towards understanding it; and neither does the idea of its being ‘re-cast’ in FitzGerald's ‘Likeness’. Its ‘transfusions’ are multiple and intermingling; it is not even unequivocally ‘alive’. **More so than better scholars, more so than greater poets, FitzGerald opened his imagination and his language to the stimulus that came to him from Omar and the result asks to be interpreted with the same receptive hesitation.** This translation, more than perhaps any other, leaves you wondering what ‘translation’ means.” (Reynolds, 2011 p. 286)

Gillespie concludes his survey of Pound and HD's versions of the classics with the following brilliant paragraph on creative translation (“a translation which creates new possibilities or begets new works”), where he describes how a certain translation (like Pound's Propertius, or a couple of other examples Gillespie provides) can bring the author back to life, make him relevant again in the new language and for the new audiences (even though the translation may not meet the requirements of academic specialists in the original period and the original author). This in turn leads to a fundamental conclusion for Gillespie, which informs the purpose and the rationale of his volume (conveyed in the subtitle *Towards a New Literary History*): “**And this is why, for me, the impact translations have on the literature of the receiving language is an integral part of any study of them**”. The result is that we can indeed write a new literary (and cultural) history that situates translation (qua transfer and communication) at its center. In the same way as canons frequently rely on a series of misreadings, a new literary and cultural history could amount to a cartography of translations and mistranslations, etc. The whole chapter is very effective, and its main argument is

deployed with vigour and through the use of convincing examples to make and illustrate Gillespie's points.

“Writers as well as readers can be shown to engage with a given classic far more intensively once a translation accords it a vigorous vernacular existence. Others respond to Propertius after Pound has opened up the poems... While in Britain Latin editions had been freely available for many years, readerly interest in Lucretius is exponentially greater after the capable complete translation of Thomas Creech (1683) and the poetically impressive selection by Dryden (1685). But what is more, succeeding generations of poets too—poets of the stature of Pope and Gray—can be shown to draw on these translations, particularly Dryden's. **That seems a workable definition of a creative translation: a translations which creates new possibilities or begets new works.** What else would a translation create, other than itself?

→→→ **And this is why, for me, the impact translations have on the literature of the receiving language is an integral part of any study of them.** The impact of classical translation on English writing has taken many forms. Let us sample them, for they are only now coming to be appreciated.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 29)

“History shows that **many kinds and degrees of ‘mistranslation’ can be productive, as can faked translations and invented classics.** A whole classical Greek poet, Anacreon, claimed a prominent place in English and continental verse through an extensive tradition of translation dating from the time of Ronsard, then in England via Thomas Stanley and (once again) Cowley, even though not one of his genuine works was available [NOTE 43 to p. 30: The original Anacreon of Teos, if he existed, was widely imitated by Hellenistic and Byzantine Greek writers. The collection of some 60 post-classical lyrics known as *Anacreontea* was first printed by Henri Estienne in 1554].” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 30)

“More than this: rather than simply incorporating foreign literary models in order to complement the native tradition, early modern translations were often a site for literary experiment, provoking controversy and stimulating reflection on vernacular practice. Classical works and their vernacular descendants forced a reassessment of the literary system, in terms of centre and beyond. Chapter 3 will outline how early modern translations of the classics even had the effect of forging a new past for English poetry. And, through the process of cultural negotiations often deliberately initiated by translators, the received tradition might be as much transformed as the receiving one.

Classical translation has been decisive in the formation of vernacular literary canons. In English, the key works of translation were by 1800 established as integral parts of the English literary canon itself, as we shall see in Chapter 7. Their proud inclusion in the several large-scale editions of ‘the English poets’ from the late eighteenth century onwards bespeaks a situation partly resembling that of Roman culture, in which translation helps create a national literature of universal aspirations. **Johnson takes occasion in his *Lives of the English Poets* (1779-81) to comment on the rare examples of English poets who are *not* translators.** Classical translations could even be said to act sometimes to suppress native writing: it is often remarked how Dryden and Pope failed to write epics of their ‘own’ while producing highly successful versions of Virgil and Homer. But to make so stark and simple a

distinction between translated and original works, and to use the word ‘failed’ in this connection, is to accept post-Romantic priorities. We should remember that Dryden’s Virgil was in his own age felt to be a greater achievement than any of his original works.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 31)

Gillespie’s proposal to come up with a new literary history includes his outline of an English tradition of classical translation:

“This outline implies an unexpected continuity in the appreciation of earlier English classical translations, particularly among English poets. Poets of one generation react against their immediate predecessors to strike out anew. But that effect is temporary, and in no way prevents their participation in the longer-term community of English followers of Homer or Ovid or Virgil. Indeed, they have no choice, for, as I will suggest later, **the most powerful English readings and realizations of classical texts**, such as (in Chapter 4) North’s and Shakespeare’s of Plutarch’s *Lives*, or (in Chapter 10) Dryden’s Lucretius and Virgil, **have a tendency both to create and to delimit future possibilities for readers and writers at large. This ‘participation’ also means feeling free to emulate and borrow from previous translations, whether locally for a handy rhyme or strategically for one’s whole approach. All of this makes it possible, in spite of the ever-shifting priorities in English writers’ receptions of ancient Greek and Latin texts, to speak of a tradition in English classical translation—a tradition which for most purposes gets under way in the sixteenth century.**” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 35)

Chapter six focuses on the all-important question of literary canons, and the role played by translation in their origins and development—with a twist (since the classical canon, originally the source of legitimacy and literary capital transferred to the new canon, “was reciprocally affected” (p. 93). In chapter 7 Gillespie concludes with the example of Dryden’s abundant translations, and how they changed the English poetic canon (a very good example, which Gillespie handles rather convincingly: see the conclusions below).

“In Chapter 6 we saw how translations can promulgate, and perhaps even help establish, an aesthetic, as well as reflect one. Chapter 7 considers another way in which translation can impact on a literary culture. If we look back also to Chapter 3, on the Renaissance, we may begin to speculate that translation has as much potential as any other kind of writing to exert pressure on such a culture and to redirect it. The emphasis there was on how writers saw their surroundings—how, for example, translations forged (as I put it) a new past for English poetry. **A canon is never constructed by writers alone, and we move in what follows between writers’ preceptions and those of readers.**

Here I will suggest that at the time the modern English poetic and dramatic canon was emerging, perceived relationships between English and classical poetry were the crucial ones, and that translation mediated between the two. **As we would expect to find, the vernacular canon appropriated some of the prestige of the classics. But the classical canon was reciprocally affected by such developments.** Hence I will touch also on the contribution of, for example, Pope’s work to the growing status of the Homeric epics. Even today, the shape of classical literature looks different from different geographical standpoints around the globe. The reasons are of course many, but among them, it could easily be argued, are the respective vernacular translations of the past which became, and those more recent vernacular

translations which are still becoming, part of the experience of classical texts in different world cultures. In Chapter 10 I will suggest how much more than occasionally translations have mediated ancient texts to readers, to writers, and even to classical scholars.” (Gillespie, 2011 p. 93)

“In his essay “Tradition and the Individual Talent”, T.S. Eliot outlines how a significant new work’s arrival in a literature causes a reassessment of a large number of previous works in English, but translations can have this effect too. This is at its most obvious in cases where the work has not been translated previously... [But] Even where a work has been previously translated, a fresh version can place it in a strong new light, and thus have an equally pronounced effect. Pope’s *Iliad* was not the first in English, but from the start, readers clearly looked to it for things they did not find, or had not found, in previous versions. Still more pertinently in the present context, they looked to it for things they did not find in native English poetry. Pope’s translations expressed the ideals and passion which Augustan literature found it impossible to realize successfully in any other literary form. Or, as John Barnard puts it, ‘the *Iliad*’s intellectual energy, its heroic scope, and its epic grandeur provide the positive scale in Pope’s imaginative world’. **Johnson records how the *Iliad* ‘took possession of the publick ear; the vulgar was enamoured of the poem, and the learned wondered at the translation’. Its far-reaching effects on the perceptions of the English canon included, for example, an upturn in the value of Milton’s stock, as Pope’s text and notes revealed strong affinities both local and general between the leading Greek and the leading English epic poet. Its far-reaching effects on future English writing are also glanced at by Johnson, who observes: ‘[Pope’s] version may be said to have tuned the English tongue, for since its appearance no writer, however deficient in other powers, has wanted melody’**” (Gillespie, 2011 pp. 96-7)

“While Dryden is probably the first major writer to be fully conversant with the content of the English poetic tradition that precedes him, the mystical line of poetic descent in which he offers to take his place is importantly not a purely English one. It goes back all the way to the start of the western canon in Homer, whom, against all expectation, Dryden has found ‘more accordingly to my Genius’, than Virgil, and translations from whose *Iliad* are given pride of place in his collection. And **the metaphors of transmigration and transfusion are most often used in this period**, as by Landsowne, in connection with cross-cultural, especially classical-vernacular, exchange.” (Gillespie, 2011 p. 102)

Where does all this leave the poetic canon? Dryden’s own translating work, he makes clear, has led him to conceive differently of both the ancients and the moderns: Chaucer vis-à-vis Boccaccio, Homer vis-à-vis Virgil, or (another kind of example) Chapman, earlier disparaged by Dryden as a translator of Homer, but who, contrastingly, Dryden draws upon in his late Homeric excerpts. **These perceptions are embodied and expressed in his translations, a body of work which will be read and reprinted throughout the eighteenth century, which readers regularly describe as eye-opening and which has the strongest possible effects on succeeding English writers.** In sum, as a modern successor, Charles Tomlinson, has remarked, **this greatest of English translators, ‘through his versions of Ovid, Homer, Chaucer, Lucretius, Juvenal, and Virgil, permanently changed the scope of English poetry itself.** To take these claims seriously is to entertain the notion that in this period the activity of translation, especially from Latin and Greek,

is quite expressly the animating power in the English poetic tradition, and the decisive influence on canon formation.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 103)

In chapter 3, Gillespie mentions the interesting case of Ovid in English, which gives him the opportunity to dwell on translations that begot other translations and original poems, and also started a tradition in English translation (i.e. translations of Ovid) – **English Ovidianism**

“Because of his wide appeal Ovid is revisited and replayed in many different ways by English writers, his works having a place in theatre and prose contexts as well as a more substantial one in poetic responses. He is mediated through Marlowe as well as others: **enough copies of Marlowe’s *Elegies* survived the bonfire for his contemporaries to echo his Ovidian translations in their own productions, and it seems to have been Marlowe’s book itself that prompted several of them to publish collections of love poems titled ‘elegies’ in the mid-1590s...** English Ovidianism is in one of its aspects a tradition, enduring over many years, of cross-fertilization between his translators, imitators and other ‘respondents’. For example, by the time Shakespeare used a couplet from the *Amores* (1.15.35-6) as the epigraph to *Venus and Adonis*, it is more than likely he had read Marlowe’s version of that collection. Or there is Shakespeare’s much-discussed relation to Golding’s and other English Ovids in the playlet of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Golding’s Ovid is ‘undoubtedly a monument’, Raphael Lyne writes, a work which, because he makes Ovid think in term of English scenes and details as well as giving him a full-flavoured English idiom, sits well with ‘the ambitions on behalf of their native tongue shared by many renaissance writers.’ Sandys’s succeeding translation of 1621-32, mostly carried out in Virginia while Sandys was working as Treasurer of the struggling Jamestown colony, could be presented as both a national triumph and a triumph for the English language, as by Michael Drayton in his commendatory verses.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 39)

Gillespie also describes the paths and the legacy of the *beatus ille* trope in English translation (in Horace, Martial, Seneca, Claudian, Virgil, etc.):

“We might say... that a collective enterprise gets under way, a shared effort to make English, and to make contemporary, the concerns of these Latin poems. The contemporary angles are implied in the lives and times of the translators, from Sir Thomas Wyatt, precariously placed at the Henrician Court in the mid-sixteenth century, to Cowley and others who lived through the Civil War in the seventeenth. **One way of demonstrating the collective nature of the enterprise is by showing that English poets develop from each other over time a vocabulary for englishing these poems and passages.**” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 41)

“It is nothing new to say that the words and phrases used by their predecessors are one of the fundamental forms in which a tradition can present itself to poets, and in which they may embrace it. What we have just seen shows, more specifically, that the English translation of classical verse sponsored its own traditions. Here we make contact with another distinctive feature of classical translation, for whereas successive vernacular translators tend to turn to new sources, especially contemporary foreign writings, each generation of English poets retranslates the classics in the light of changing circumstances. What we have just seen also suggests something more unexpected: that **in this context the borders between individual classical texts,**

and again between translations and original English verse, are of little account.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 44)

In his chapter 6 (“Statius and the Aesthetics of Eighteenth-Century Poetry”), Gillespie traces the irregular fortunes of Statius in the English tradition of translations from the classics.

“Two of the greatest poets of the Middle Ages became perhaps Statius’ best-known disciples in any period. Dante puts him in Purgatory, attributing to him a hidden Christianity and showing himself elsewhere, as C.S. Lewis has it, ‘steeped in the text of the *Thebaid*’” (Gillespie 2011 p. 78)

“Chaucer’s use of Statius effects the Latin poet’s entry into the English tradition, not least in that Chaucer’s name is regularly invoked by the early translators in support of a high valuation of the *Thebaid*.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 79)

“The age of Chaucer is followed by new phases of interest in Statius, reflecting different priorities into the Renaissance... Hence it is surprising that no formal translation from Statius (or at least the *Thebaid*) appears in English until the middle of the seventeenth century.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 79)

“No doubt it was less often prescribed than Virgil, but this scarcely means it was unfamiliar to post-medieval readers. There were cheap editions of Statius such as the widely dispersed Amsterdam 1624 (and reprints), and he appears in standard compilations such as the *Corpus omnium veterum poetarum latinorum*, [Jonson’s copy is now in the British Library, shelfmark 11352.e.8] a copy of the second edition of which (Geneva, 1611) was owned by Ben Jonson. Moreover, the first English translation of the *Thebaid* was written by a schoolmaster ‘for a help to my scholars’, with ‘marginal explications of the Poetick story’, or as we might say today ‘notes for use in schools’. The schoolmaster, Thomas Stephens, is an otherwise unknown figure whose *Thebaid* 1-5 seems to have attracted little attention from his contemporaries... The translation, though containing some more fluent passages, is generally in crude, halting couplets... This was the version that excited the young Pope’s interest in Statius... though his influence on Pope’s own version of Book 1 was not extensive, Pope evidently consulted him and may be said to have ‘honoured the old schoolmaster posthumously by becoming his brightest pupil’” (Gillespie 2011 p. 80)

The *Thebaid* was again translated in 1660 by Sir Robert Howard, whom Gillespie describes as “a gifted dilettante, not a scholar, and ultimately his work on Statius looks curiously tangential to his several careers as playwright, courtier and financial wheeler-dealer” (p. 81). Statius reputation grew over the course of the final years of the 17th century, and during the 18th century too, with Pope as one of his most famous translators: the end result of Pope’s endeavour was an epic poem in line with the Augustan poetics of the time. Pope transformed the poem, the style, and avoided indecorous passages or instances of bathos:

“At any rate, Pope’s *Thebaid* clearly assimilated Statius to an English Augustan poetic, decisively so for later translators, many of whom are Pope followers or protégés... In a word, Pope’s rendering of Statius presents the *Thebaid* as though its poetic were in close proximity to the greater ‘old Latin poets’, especially Virgil and Ovid. As the Twickenham editors’ notes indicate, it owes more frequent debts to Dryden’s *Aeneis* than to any other poem, and Pope ‘also, in the turns and ingenuities of his language, often recalls Ovid’.

Yet this is not by any means simply to say that Pope misrepresent Statius, just as he does not simply misrepresent Homer; for the *Thebaid* itself is, and was in Pope's time, well recognized to be heavily allusive (especially in descriptive passages and similes), and the writers most heavily alluded to are probably Virgil and Ovid. Close local comparisons of a kind beyond the scope of the present discussion would be needed to explore this area fully where Pope's translation is concerned." (Gillespie, 2011 p. 86)

"A small spate of Statius translations follows Pope's publication, with six further renderings of parts of the *Thebaid* in the next 25 years." (Gillespie, 2011, p. 87)

"By half a century after his *Thebaid*, Pope seems to have helped create a taste for Statius by which he himself stands reproved." (Gillespie, 2011, p. 91)

Chapter 8 in Gillespie's volume deals with a rather obscure topic, and very much underexplored field, i.e. manuscript translations "in the Long Eighteenth Century", with a focus on formal verse satire. In the same way as the focus on obscure, relatively unknown, second-rate agents and translators in Schurink's volume contributes to unveil the true dimension of the literary and material infrastructure of the Tudor canon of translation, Gillespie's survey of manuscript translations in the 18th century exemplifies the kind of insight to be gained from focusing our attention on the backstage, as it were, that sustains the big names and the central texts in the canon. As we do so, we shall certainly view our canons, our literary history, under new, fresh light.

"In this chapter, which may be the first critical discussion of its kind—of a range of surviving manuscript English translations of classical literary texts—I cannot hope to do more than begin to indicate the interest and the implications of the type of material involved." (Gillespie, 2011 p. 107)

"Manuscript evidence thus supplements and modifies our sense of the place classical satire has in English poets' work. The texts thus recovered are part of the story of English literary translation, part of English literary history. They do not show only 'what might have happened': they did happen, and in several cases they throw a strong light on the reception of canonical English writers and works. Where literary history in a still wider sense is concerned, they help to demonstrate the existence of a manuscript writing culture of much greater reach and professionalism than we have been accustomed to imagine. My self-imposed restriction of these illustrations to the genre of formal verse satire should at this point be underlined: unprinted manuscript translations of classical texts belonging to shorter forms such as epigrams or Horatian odes are actually much thicker on the ground, at least in terms of surviving copies.

There is, of course, a connection between the length of time it has taken for these and other unprinted translations to be brought to light, and the secondary place translation has for so long been accorded in the *oeuvres* of English poets. The high premium placed on both 'originality' and 'individuality' has a double depressing effect on valuations of anonymous translations in particular. Looking in other directions, however, allows one to point to a range of positive developments. To go no further than one of the Latin sources mentioned above, the last 15 years have seen the first complete printings of the Lucretius translations of both Evelyn and Hutchinson, with a more elaborate edition of the latter to come. Digitization facilitates fuller

cataloguing of English literary manuscripts and the online presentation of manuscript material. We may hope that these straws in the wind will precede substantial further work in other genres, periods, and repositories than those this chapter has visited.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 122)

Chapter 9 in Gillespie’s volume also deals with a little known text, by a major author, Wordsworth’s unpublished translation of a satire by Juvenal. In this chapter Gillespie seeks to explore the intersection between the original text, the translation and the translator, our perception of the translation, and, most importantly, how our perception / reception of the translated text can “inform our understanding of Juvenal (and other satirists) too”. As he does so, he also explores how poets can edit their own canon, and thus fashion their own poetic personae, the sort of figure they intend to cut in literary history. In sum the chapter brings together some of the agents and coordinates that contribute (in varying proportion and degrees, depending on each case) to mould literary canons. The chapter also reveals Wordsworth’s little known production as a translator of classical poetry, which includes poems by Catullus, Horace, Lucretius and Virgil (an “extensive ... translation of the *Aeneid*”, dating from 1823), no less. The whole book is a revealing testimony to the pervasive influence of the classics in previous and current stages of our canon—a fact that current ignorance has tended to obliterate. Gillespie’s volume is a timely reminder that we do need to reassess the impact of the classics upon literary canons. Gillespie show how, by imitating / translating Juvenal, Wordsworth somehow liberated it from a critically calcified neoclassical reading. Viewing W from the perspective of this translation simultaneously links and situates him within the sort of poetics that constituted a starting point, or the background out of which W worked, and also provides a fresh reassessment of what Juvenal means for us today, as well as what his place within the canon of English translations is, etc.:

“... satire ... is one genre which Restoration and 18th-c. writers took particularly to their hearts... this is highly relevant to the Wordsworth text we are about to examine, because that text, composed but not completed in 1795-7, is on the cusp of two eras in English literary history as conventionally narrated. Thus the place of satire within the output of the ‘Romantic’ generation is one of my concerns here; but the priorities of our own time, including our own understanding of how satire works, are another. **Our reception of Wordsworth’s reception of Juvenal**, if that inelegant expression will pass, **can inform our understanding of Juvenal (and other satirists) too.**” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 123)

“The shadowy status of this translation in the Wordsworth corpus raises questions about the reception of both Juvenal and Wordsworth. What difference might it have made to Juvenal’s reception had it been published? What difference does it make now? And how, on the other side, does it affect our understanding of Wordsworth and of the literary history of his era? These are different but related questions. **If today we call Wordsworth a ‘Romantic’, a member of a school we oppose to that of his ‘neoclassical’ predecessors, one reason is that, perhaps partly following his own lead, we have been willing to play down his links to classical Greek and Roman poets (the latter being the stronger).** No effort was needed to overlook his work on Juvenal: its demotion in his lifetime and its obscurity ever since is an orientation of **the record which in later life he himself wished when he asked for the manuscripts to be destroyed. But it remains the case that over a period of around two years at a crucial point in his development, Wordsworth was apparently planning to appear in print as an imitator of Juvenal, as a Juvenalian satirist.**” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 124)

“Let us first rehearse a little of what we know about W’s responses to the classics. As well as of Juvenal, W is a translator (in some cases at length, in others only briefly) of Catullus, Horace, Lucretius and Virgil, though one is not unlikely to see any of these translations figuring in modern selections of his verse or in syllabi for courses on it.”

Wordsworth *translates* Juvenal’s Rome into his London in the *Prelude*:

“W’s long-term familiarity with Juvenal, as with many other Latin classics of verse and prose, can be taken for granted. It would also be wrong to assume this familiarity had no identifiable effect on W’s own poetic output. That W is not known as a verse satirist does not prevent him responding to Juvenal in his verse itself. To go no further than *The Prelude*, Juvenal’s descriptions of Roma had long been prototypical for all such cityscapes, and some of the well-known depictions of the hustle and bustle of London life in Book VII draw more or less inevitably on Satires 1 and 3. We can also go well beyond these canonical Latin poets in summarizing W’s classical affiliations...

This information is not obscure; nor would it be true to say that literary historians have ignored or overlooked it. The received account is that it is simply of limited significance: these points of contact represent early educational or self-educational exercises, or reflect transient early tastes, rather than W’s ‘real’ affinities.” (Gillespie 2011 p. 125)

“Yet these engagements (such as **W’s extensive 1823 translation from the *Aeneid***) persist well into the poet’s maturity. It is unclear, too, why W’s ‘own’ voice must be contradistinguished from classical voices: some recent criticism has, on the contrary, suggested how classical voices may be said to *merge* with W’s voice. **What W ‘moves away from’ is less classicism than the neoclassicism of 18th-c. English poets**, and even this is seriously qualified in practice, as we shall see in both this chapter and the next. Yet the received account prevails; in Robin Dix’s words, ‘there is still a reluctance to abandon the notion that W challenged the classicizing tendencies of his predecessors’” (Gillespie, 2011 126)

“The Wordsworth-Wrangham imitation of Juvenal 8 is certainly a modernization of the Latin poem. It is certainly outspoken and indignant. It does name a handful of extremely prominent public contemporaries. But the only currently available presentation of it, by turning it into a satire in which ‘most of the figures are identified boldly by name or by implication’ (Cornell 787), and much of the ‘interest’ of which in fact revolves around such identifications, has made it harder for us to hear W’s dialogue with Juvenal. W’s imitation has more to tell us about Juvenal than this, because it is in these respects much more like Juvenal than its editors allow.” (Gillespie 2011 p. 139)

“To return, then, to my opening questions about what difference this imitation makes to the reception of Juvenal and of Wordsworth. **In imitating Juvenal at all, in selecting a classical Roman model, W presents by no means his most familiar face—but one we ignore at the risk of complacency. Since this imitation can be seen as the early manifestation of a long-term aspect of W’s work (his classicism), its appearance in print in or near his lifetime might very possibly have made the other manifestations fall into place within a coherent (and**

durable) new view of the corpus. While we sometimes speak casually of ‘rewriting history’, its concrete hardens quickly, and something like a full-scale paradigm shift can be required if categories as venerable as ‘neoclassical’ and ‘Romantic’ are to undergo any genuine consideration, however vaguely or pluralistically we use them.

In imitating Juvenal in this particular fashion, W’s version challenges us again, to say how we see Juvenal, and how we suppose Juvenalian satire works. Is it by lashing out at egregious individual exemplars, or by exaggeration to the point of fantasy, or perhaps more performatively, by creating strategies that force the reader’s reflection or point at the reader’s implication? The Wordsworth Juvenal imitation might not be a polished poem, but it is already more than a mere occasion to lampoon individuals by ventriloquizing Juvenal. That is to say, W can be seen engaging in a dialogue with Juvenal, working with the conscious manoeuvres the Latin poem enacts. This makes the imitation, for us, a way of reading Juvenal.

Finally, the sudden, and therefore highly visible, assimilation of W’s Juvenal to currently dominant interpretative modes and models provides a consciousness-raising moment for all those ambitious of interpreting formal verse satires whether ancient or modern. In the previous chapter I tried to suggest how revealing the recovery of lost translations and imitations can be in itself. In this case, the reception such a recovered text has been accorded proves equally thought-provoking” (Gillespie 2011 p. 141)

The translation was a joint project, undertaken with Francis Wrangham (a Cambridge friend), and with a couple of lines penned by Robert Southey, and the style is “very clearly English Augustan” (it uses, for instance, heroic couplets). It would be interesting to compare this verse form used for Juvenal, with the sort of form used for W’s translation of the *Aeneid* (it appears he also used heroic couplets, as late as 1823, see Bruce E. Graver, “Wordsworth and the Language of Epic: The Translation of the *Aeneid*”, *Studies in Philology*, 83:3 (1986) pp. 261-285). Bruce E. Graver, by the way, is also the editor of Wordsworth’s translations of the *Aeneid*, but also of his intralinguistic translation / modernization of Chaucer: an activity that reveals W as an active agent in the update of English poetry, and the consolidation of its poetic canon as he simultaneously sought to situate himself within it through these translations (a most interesting case here). See William Wordsworth, *Translations of Chaucer and Virgil*. Ed. Bruce E. Graver. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1998. W’s case is further proof that like Spenser, as demonstrated by Hadfield, or Marlowe, or Dryden, or Pope, etc., Wordsworth used translation as a sort of rehearsal exercise, a practical way of rehearsing his style as he also absorbed the lessons from classics, a way of responding to them.

Another modern case of intracultural / intracanonial translation would be Seamus Heaney’s rendering of *Beowulf* in current English: this is an interesting case to compare with Hughes’s Englishing of ancient Greek heroic verse. Different versions of heroic poetry: the heroic and the techniques and strategies used to translate the hero in a non-heroic age (which turns the hero into an oddity).

Towards the end of his volume / as he approaches the conclusion to his volume, Gillespie examines the accumulated evidence to demonstrate the solid English tradition / canon of translated poetry, made up of translated texts which (more than their Latin or Greek originals) were used as sources by the new generations of poets that were seeking to anchor

their work / situate their own poetic corpora within the bounds of this tradition, who sought to establish a dialogue with the originals through the translations / adaptations into English—in doing this, the English tradition creates its own canon of classical authors in translation: a corpus of poetic texts which constitutes a significant part of the English poetic corpus—which is what Gillespie set out to demonstrate in the first place. Thus chapter 10 demonstrates how W's translations of the *Aeneid* and of Lucretius were mediated by Dryden (and in particular, by his desire to improve upon Dryden's translation of the original:

“In earlier chapters we have seen numerous examples of English poets assimilating, developing and creatively reusing vocabulary, verse forms and other elements first made available to them through classical translations. This chapter goes further. It suggests that the primary means of access English poets have to ancient writers *always* tends to be through the translations of previous English poets (rather than through Latin or Greek texts). Second, it proposes that historical English translations have been influential on interpretation of ancient works much more widely, inflecting readings by those we might assume, and who would themselves provably expect, to be capable of more independent responses, unmediated by translations of the past. In this chapter illustrations will be supplied by three kinds of ‘respondent’: one poet (Wordsworth), one poet-critic (Arnold), and one classical scholar (H.A.J. Munro).” (Gillespie 2011, p. 150)

“But what form, so to speak, did W's Lucretius come in? As we saw in Chapter 9, W was trained in Latin to the comparatively high standards of university men of his time, and obviously considered himself competent to translate Virgil. Yet it seems not to have been primarily the Latin of Lucretius himself that was stored in his memory (though some of that may have stuck too). **Instead, episodes like his poem on the newborn babe show that it was largely to Dryden's Lucretius that W's thoughts turned**—and in a long-term way.

W. was not formally a translator of Lucretius, but his late, abandoned *Aeneid* translation was referred to in Chapter 8. This will enable us to inspect what is in some ways an even stronger demonstration of the ‘persistence’ of an earlier translation in the work of a later poet. Once again the earlier translation in question is Dryden's, and the reason the demonstration is so powerful is that **it was precisely the aim of W's fresh attempt on the *Aeneid* to avoid what he saw as Dryden's inappropriate approach to Virgil.** W's comments survive in a series of letters of 1823-4: ‘When I read Virgil in the original,’ he writes, ‘I am moved; but not so much by the translations; and I cannot but think this owing to a defect in the diction; which I have endeavoured to supply.’ He is anxious that his rendering ‘should have far more the *genuine* ornaments of Virgil than my predecessors’, among whom he singles out Dryden, who ‘has been very careless of these, and profuse of his own, which seem to me very rarely to harmonize with those of Virgil’. Not only has Dryden taken far too many ‘liberties’, he has failed to capture Virgil's ‘tenderness’; Wordsworth aims, he says, to produce something ‘to a certain degree *affecting*, which Dryden's [*Aeneis*] is not to me in the least.’” (Gillespie 2011 pp. 152-3)

Next Gillespie sets out to demonstrate that M. Arnold's *Lucretian* moments are mediated by Dryden's Lucretius (in spite of the fact that Arnold famously disparaged Dryden and Pope as “classics of our prose”). Dryden also mediates between Lucretius and one of the most

famous scholarly translations, that by H.A.J. Munro—certainly unanimously acclaimed in the 19th century.

“Dryden’s translation, these echoes imply, was mediating Lucretius both as the *De rerum natura* presented itself to Arnold, and as Arnold presented it to his audience. In a moment, we will see that other kinds of evidence also make this proposition appear entirely plausible” (Gillespie 2011 p. 158)

“Such documentary detail as is required here is inherently awkward to amass and to present, but enough has now been produced, I hope, to show that Munro as well as Wordsworth and Arnold received Lucretius through the powerful English poetic handling of John Dryden” (Gillespie, 2011 p. 161)

“My examples in this chapter have spanned only about half a century, from W to Munro. Perhaps contemporary tastes happened to combine with the priorities of the book trade to promote Dryden’s classical translations—perhaps, in other words, the effect we have noted was temporary? While it’s true that there was much publishing of the classics of English literature for the nineteenth-century market, what Arnold and W have to say about Dryden critically would in fact imply the opposite: that it is despite and not because of the critical *Zeitgeist* that his influence exerts itself. Moreover, it can easily be shown that Dryden’s shadow casts itself over much wider spaces.” (Gillespie 2011, p. 161)

“The Drydenian cast of the *De rerum natura* for 19th-c. English readers, no matter how professional their relation to Latin literature, is manifest. When a recent scholar claims Munro’s edition and prose translation were ‘crucial’ in ‘making both Lucretius’s poetry and his philosophy more immediately accessible to a wider audience’, he is no doubt thinking of the admiration Munro’s work elicited. But there is a serious lack of perspective here, because Dryden’s excerpts had long ago familiarized Lucretius to English-speaking readers, and continued to perform this function through the 19th century. On the basis of what we have seen of that century in this chapter we can go further still, and say that Dryden’s Lucretius was an unavoidable part of the experience of the *De rerum natura* for anglophone readers.” (Gillespie 2011 p. 162)

In his last chapter, Gillespie focuses on a more recent case, Ted Hughes’s Homer, and as he does so, he lists the growing list of practising poets who have also engaged themselves in translations from the classics

“Ted Hughes is one of several poets of his generation to take a pronounced interest in translating (‘adapting’, ‘imitating’) the Latin and Greek classics of dramatic and non-dramatic verse. Before his time this had not happened on any scale in English poetry for many decades. But as we travel deeper into the twenty-first century, verse translation in English, from postclassical as well as classical sources, almost begins to resemble the English Renaissance translating tradition in its scope and scale. Not only does it connect senior figures such as Ciaran Carson, Tony Harrison, Seamus Heaney, Brendan Kennelly, Edwin Morgan, Peter Porter and C.K. Stead; from younger generations may be mentioned others: say, Liz Lockhead, Derek Mahon and Tom Paulin. I am thinking here not of specialist translators, but of writers whose *original* verse is normally considered their principal work—though in some cases,

including Hughes's, translation seems increasingly to have become the main thing as their careers went on" (Gillespie, 2011, p. 163)

"My purpose here is not to deal with Hughes's classicism in general. Far less is it possible to address the recent classical translation boom at large. Instead, this chapter calls attention to another dimension of this enduring interest of Hughes's, his version of a passage from the *Odyssey*... This translation, as far as is known, is Hughes's earliest completed translation of any kind, and it is certainly his sole translation of Homer. It remains remarkably little noticed, which can be explained entirely by its publication history—or lack of one. The appearance of Hughes's *Collected Poems* in 2003 made it readily available, but following its reading on BBC radio's Third Programme in 1960 there was no print publication either in Hughes's ensuing collections or at any other time during the following 42 years.

In previous chapters I have argued that English literary history should not confine itself to the record of familiar printed works because they do not reflect the full range of literary activity. Hughes's early Homer translation allows a demonstration that against the run of expectation (for who would suppose a substantial composition by one of our highest-profile contemporary poets would fail to achieve print publication for nearly half a century?) such a generalization can be valid for writing of very recent times as well as of the more distant past (Hughes died in 1998). **Thus it presents a particular kind of reminder of the discrepancy between the place translation may have in the *oeuvres* of well-known writers and in the histories we construct.**" (Gillespie, 2011 p. 164)

In approaching the work of Hughes, Gillespie sets out to discuss the two alternatives that translators are presented with: updating the original text and transmuting it by bringing it closer to the language of the translator's day, or the opposite, i.e. pushing the target language towards a reproduction of the diction, style, etc. of the original. A most interesting debate this will prove to be. He compares Hughes's translation as an example of the latter, and Robert Fitzgerald's as a case for the former—a contrast which Gillespie summarizes in a brilliant short paragraph (see below) which summarizes two of the main choices that translators must confront when bracing themselves for the task of presenting a fresh text for their readers:

"Finally, this chapter broaches a fresh issue, one concerning the options available to a translator. Hughes himself evidently tented to view the translator's choices, at the date of this work, in terms of the binary familiar since at least the time of Schleiermacher: **translators can either stay put and pull the foreign text towards their own language and culture, or bridge the distance by moving as far as possible towards the foreign work** [NOTE 5 to p. 165: Schleiermacher expounded his thesis in his lecture of 1813 'On the Different Methods of Translating'. For relevant excerpts in translation, see Lefevre (1992); for discussion, Pym (1995)]. Hughes's preference was for the latter; below, I contrast his approach with that of Robert Fitzgerald, thus illustrating, I hope, exactly what effects it has for the translator to favour each tactic. But it should be added that there are perhaps no absolutes in this perennial debate. Hughes, as we shall see, is explicit that the reason for moving towards the foreign, even for embracing the 'oddity and struggling dumbness of a word for word version', is specifically to 'to make our own imagination jump' and force us to leave behind 'our familiar abstractions'. Yet these are exactly

the sort of reasons other translators would give for adopting the opposite approach, and making their author (as Dryden put it in connection with Virgil) ‘speak such *English*, as he wou’d himself have spoken, if he had been born in *England*, and in this present Age” (Gillespie 2011 p. 165)

“Fitzgerald places Odysseus in his world while Hughes aims for an imaginative jump into the Homeric world. Fitzgerald moves Homer towards him, while Hughes tries to allow Homer to exert the pull.” (Gillespie 2011, p. 165)

“I have suggested in the course of this book that successful translations have the character of a meeting or dialogue between writers rather than of ventriloquism in either direction. What previous discussion there has been of Hughes’s Homer seems to imply that Hughes fell into the trap of making Homer speak his own thoughts, whereas I’d say it’s Fitzgerald who most seriously risks ventriloquy. The danger on the other side is that of failing to connect Homer to the present. But finally, and more widely, these two translations seem to show the permanence of this dilemma. We can recognize that, while still enjoying what both Chapman and Pope, both Hughes and Fitzgerald, have to offer.” (Gillespie, 2011, p. 176)

Reynolds, Chapter 1, “The Scope of Translation”. From the outset Reynolds quotes Derrida in combination with volumes on translation penned from the perspective of applied linguistics, which provides a foretaste of the sort of scope the volume will display in its approaches to translation

“As a linguistic or philosophical description of what happens in translation, ‘carrying across’ has obvious shortcomings. In 1965, J.C. Catford attacked the idea that translation might involve the ‘transference of meaning from one set of patterned symbols... into another’. Jacques Derrida, too, argues sharply against what he calls the ‘classical model’ of translation as a “‘transfer’ of pure signifieds”—a conception which, he suggests, underlies the whole endeavour of ‘philosophy’ in Western culture, and which he claims ‘prevailed up until Benjamin perhaps’... Many other thinkers have followed similar lines, and I will return to their arguments in later chapters. Yet, as we will see, the image of ‘carrying across’ is remarkably difficult to shake off: even theorists who reject it (even Derrida himself) rely on it at other points in their arguments.” (Reynolds, 2011 pp. 3-4)

“This habit of self-contradiction is not as stymieing as it may seem. For the idea of translation as ‘carrying across’ needs to be framed, not as a proposition that defines translation, but as a metaphor for it. And metaphors, of course, offer only provisional and angled images of what they are metaphors for... [...] The picture that lurks within the word ‘translation’ offers a way of looking at what happens in translation between languages. And that picture is only partial and pragmatic, in some ways illuminating, in others not. The word ‘translation’, then, includes within itself a metaphor for translation, the metaphor of ‘carrying across” (Reynolds, 2011 p. 4)

“As we will see, translation between languages is a complex, varied, and unpredictable imaginative enterprise which cannot satisfactorily be reduced to theoretical description. But it can partially and loosely be grasped with metaphors: ‘carrying

across' is by no means the only one available, though it is the most insistent. **Discussions of the translation of literature—and especially poetry—have, throughout history, been remarkably fertile in metaphors for translation. Derrida's 'classical model' has not been so dominant as, in the fury of argument, he perhaps makes it seem.**" (Reynolds, 2011 p. 4)

In the paragraphs that follow this one, Reynolds discusses several usages and meanings, metaphorical and literal, of the word 'translation', mainly in English, but also in other languages, with a view, *inter alia*, to undermining the oversimplification by Derrida of the object of his critique (i.e. the carrying over of pure signifieds). Reynolds successfully demonstrates that in the history and range of actual usages of the term, and of the processes and activities of the translator, a much less simplistic, a much richer and complex set of meanings and nuances were actually in play.

"As I have suggested (and as we will see further in chapters to come), the metaphor of carrying across is only a rough approximation to what goes on in the translation of any text. **But it is especially literary texts and, among them, especially poems, that give rise to different practices and images of rewording across languages. To the metaphor of 'carrying across' that squats within the word 'translation' poet-translators oppose other metaphors that better describe what they feel themselves to be doing. These metaphors are not just different ways of describing a single activity. Arm in arm with the pragmatic business of creating an English text that somehow stands for a foreign one, and underneath the corresponding umbrella term 'translation', there flourish different imaginative processes which have been shaped, and can be named, by different metaphors.**" (Reynolds. 2011 p. 6)

Reynold's declared purpose is to explore the different metaphors used by poet-translators, and to look into what these metaphors tell us about the process of translation, as well as about poetry and poetics...

"**In this book, I trace some of the metaphors that have been most powerfully operative in the history of poetry translation into English:** 'translation as interpretation' and as 'opening'; as 'friendship', 'desire', and 'passion'; as 'adhesion'; as 'taking a view', as 'moving across a landscape', and as 'zoom'; as 'loss', 'death', 'resurrection', and 'metamorphosis'. **All poem-translations, I will argue, take shape according to some distinguishable metaphor or metaphors, whether knowingly or not** (almost always, a metaphor plays out through a poem-translation in ways that are not always wholly under the translator's control). It follows from my argument—though I do not pursue this implication in detail—that **translation in general embraces a range of metaphors, of which 'translation as carrying across'—translation rigidly conceived—is only one.** The conventions which govern non-literary translation—of instruction manuals or news articles, for instance—are particular, institutionalized examples" (Reynolds 2011 pp. 6-7)

"**No more than 'translation as carrying across', none of the other metaphors I will explore offers a perfect model of the process of translation to which it is attached. In consequence, many poem-translations adopt two or more metaphors, each supplementing or contesting or undermining the other:** the instances I explore in Chapters 8 to 25 become more involved as the discussion

advances. **This complexity is a reason for putting poetry-translation at the heart of any understanding of translation in general. Since poetry is routinely taken to be supremely difficult to translate, it can look like a marginal case when people think about translation per se. But in fact it is when translation is most under pressure that it is most self-questioning, and therefore most revealing.**" (Reynolds 2011 p. 7)

"There are historical reasons why some metaphors flourish more at some times than at others: I will endeavour to sketch these in. But there is another, more important limb to my argument. Strangely often, **we will discover that the metaphor or metaphors that define an act of translation emerge out of the text that is being translated.** Dryden thinks of himself as 'opening' Virgil's *Aeneid* into English because he thinks of the *Aeneid* as showing how destiny is 'opened' into history. Byron, faced with Canto 5 of Dante's *Inferno*, translates after the metaphor of 'translation as passion' because passion is at the heart of the text he is translating. **We will explore many other examples of translators seeing 'doubles of translation'—as I call them—in their source texts, and having their practice affected accordingly. This creative interaction between the source text and the way it is translated does not always occur in the translation of poetry: not every 'poem-translation' is a 'poem of translation'. But when it does, it gives rise to texts that have a particular aesthetic charge, and which—for that reason—subject the idea of 'translation' to especially vigorous redefinition. This is what I call 'the poetry of translation'" (Reynolds 2011 7)**

With the expression "the poetry of translation", Reynolds refers to his subject, the focus of his essay, and he means by it those poems that evince a "creative interaction between the source text and the way it is translated", i.e. those poems in which a certain perceived quality, which is deemed to be inherent to its original concept of nature by the translator, also informs the translation itself. Reynolds thinks that this lends these particular poems an "aesthetic charge" that redefines and provides depth and complexity to the concept of 'translation'. We will see how the concept develops through the case studies that Reynolds will survey in his volume.⁷³ In his introduction he briefly surveys some cases—some of which, in particular Walter Pater's, Paul Valéry's (who postulate a duality thought / language, in which language translates thought) and closer to us in time, George Steiner's (who equals translation and communication),⁷⁴ resemble Octavio Paz's view of translation (which is more cosmic, ontic, and transcendental, as it were, since all *creation* and everything, universally, is taken to be a signifier of sorts that stands for something else), to wit:

⁷³ Towards the end of part I of his volume, which serves the purpose of a long and densely illustrated introduction, full of primary and secondary sources, Reynolds refers again to this concept:

"... I am aware of many brilliant poetic translations which are not (so far as I can see) amenable to being read in the way I have been proposing and am about to pursue... This is one more indication that I am not offering a 'theory of translation' (since such a theory must leave so much that is interesting unexplored). **Not every poem-translation is a poem of translation:** as we have seen, 'translation' is a loose term for different kinds of imaginative work, and the poetry of translation is only one of the sorts of writing that are done in its name. Nevertheless, it is an important one, for, as we will see, **many of the translations that have established themselves as great poems in English literature have been energized and shaped by metaphors projected by their sources. When translation is doubled in this way, it can turn into a particularly complex and subtle kind of writing about all those relationships and processes—from friendship and desire to death and rebirth—which become metaphors for translation, and which are shaped by the metaphor of translation in their turn. This is the poetry of translation.**" (Reynolds, 2011, pp. 54-55)

⁷⁴ Translation and communication are indeed closely related, as you mention in other parts of your review, in particular as regards the role that translation plays (together with other processes and other agents) in the articulation, classification and transmission / sharing of knowledge: a clear case in point is early modern encyclopedism.

“Not long after Johnson, the metaphorical energies of ‘translation’ and ‘translate’ began to push in a new direction. When Coleridge criticized ‘Mr. Pope and his followers’ in *Biographia Literaria* (1817), he suggested that their writings were ‘characterized not so much by poetic thoughts, as by thoughts *translated* into the language of poetry’. **This was part of his and Wordsworth’s attack on what they took to be the ‘artificiality’ of 18th-c. ‘poetic diction’. Coleridge’s idea seems to have been that the lesser, unpoetic thoughts first took mental form in plain words—perhaps as prose—and were only then embellished into verse.**⁷⁵ The fact that Pope was famous, not only as a poet, but as the poet-translator of Homer, has an obvious influence on this conception: it is as though Pope’s other verse has been infected by the habit of translation so that it, too, is not pure poetry. For Coleridge, then, ‘translation’ can describe a kind of writing that involves the transformation of words into other words as part of a continuous, if misguided, process of composition.” (Reynolds, 2011 pp. 7-8)

“Other writers during Coleridge’s lifetime used the word for various different ways in which thoughts might come out into language: the trend was fuelled (as Antoine Berman has shown in *L’Epreuve de l’étranger* [1984]) by much speculation on the part of the German romantics. For **William Hazlitt**, not unusually taking the opposite line from Coleridge, **‘translation’ was a mark of genius: Shakespeare’s language, he says, is ‘hieroglyphical. It translates thoughts into visible images’**. **Thomas Carlyle addressed the same topic twenty years later but took ‘translation’ to suggest creative compromise**. Shakespeare was constrained by having to write for the Globe: he was like a sculptor who ‘cannot set his own free Thought before us; but his Thought as he could translate it into the stone that was given’. **When Walter Pater adopted the word, in 1889, he used it in a looser sense again: ‘translation’ was what happened when anyone uttered anything: ‘all language involves translation from inward to outward’**” (Reynolds 2011 p. 8)

“Though it loosens as it spreads, the word retains some flavour of translation between languages. But it is hard to judge how much of one. In Pater’s case [who defines translation as “what happened when anyone uttered anything: ‘all language involves translation from inward to outward’”], ‘translation’ cannot be used so vaguely as to mean just ‘change’ or ‘movement’: if it were, the remark would be inane. But neither can it mean exactly the same as when we talk of translation from English to Italian: if it did, it would commit Pater to denying the existence of any difference at all between language and thought. The French word ‘traduction’ was developing in a similar way at about the same time: Paul Valéry, writing in his *Cahiers* a decade or so after Pater, probed the slippages of meaning which resulted. What we usually call thought, he said, is still only a language, although a very unusual one (“ce qu’on appelle ordinairement *pensée* n’est encore qu’une langue. À vrai dire très particulière”). **But where does translation in and out of it start? And what is translated? (‘mais où commence la traduction? Et quoi est traduit?’)**. Valéry’s questions are still relevant to cultural theory today, where—as Sherry Simon has remarked—**‘translation’ is most often used ‘as a metaphor... to stand for the difficulty of access to language, of a sense of exclusion from the codes of the powerful’**. So, **‘migrants strive to ‘translate’ their past into the present’, and women to “translate themselves’ into the language of patriarchy’**. These recent usages

⁷⁵ In this case, *translation* has pejorative overtones, indicating that something is second-hand, inauthentic, and separated from the original, in other words, what Coleridge misses in Pope and his followers is the union of language, thought, and feeling that he would like to see at the heart of true poetry, as opposed to *translated*, adulterated poetry.

convey an awareness that culture is text and that identity is constructed through language; but they tend not, any more than their nineteenth-century precursor, to hold themselves at all strictly to the model of translation-between-languages. The word ‘translate’ sometimes means ‘express again in different words’—and sometimes just ‘express’” (Reynolds 2011 8-9)

“The same metaphorical drift occurs in George Steiner’s *After Babel* (1975; third edition 1998). ‘Translation is formally and pragmatically implicit in every act of communication’, he declares: ‘to understand is to decipher. To hear significance is to translate’. In short: ‘*human communication equals translation*’. The phrases sound as though they are announcing a scientific discovery: *water equals H₂O*. But even in these initial formulations the words struggle against the symmetries that Steiner would press them into. He wants us to see no distinction that matters between deciphering—e.g. from the dots and dashes of morse code into the letters that they represent—and translation between languages: but in fact you can know no English whatsoever and still be able to decipher morse code into the letters of English words. **If understanding an utterance really ‘equals’ translating it, then the language of the utterance must be turned into some different language of the mind**⁷⁶. Of course, to explain an utterance you have to use other words which in turn have to be explained, etc.: in that sense the arrival of the signified is, as Derrida said, endlessly deferred. But the doomed quest for the Final Signified is not the same as the everyday pragmatic apprehension of meaning, the *getting someone’s point*, the *seeing what they are on about*. If you think that this kind of understanding is in fact ‘translation’ you come up against Valéry’s problem of how the postulated language-in-the-mind can in its turn be understood. The structure is endlessly recursive.” (Reynolds 2011 9)

“... to say that what happens within a language is never ‘translation’ is to attribute a specious transparency to people’s everyday endeavours to be understood and to understand. As we have established, the claim that ‘*human communication equals*

⁷⁶ Exactly: and if not language, a cognitive / neuronal web / system, which consists both of the software (as it were) wired into our brain, and also of the *data*, i.e. the memory storage that constitutes our subjective self, and which contains all the associations, emotional impulses, etc. that we associate with words and the things and experiences they evoke in our subjective memory, which is the result of our social self too—as language itself; in this regard, communication would need to *translate* impulses or bits of information between different semiotic systems indeed; it is all much more complex than Reynolds would have us believe with his morse example, which oversimplifies the question.

Elsewhere, Reynolds turns to quotations from cognitive linguistics to illustrate his discussion of the different metaphors used to describe translation or enrich its significance for individual translators: what Reynolds says here about the metaphors that seek to describe translation can also be applied to the cognitive processes and the different agents that take part in the process of translation:

“We must heed James St André’s reminder that ‘metaphors are not just interpretations; they themselves are also subject to (re-)interpretation’. To notice that translation is being understood in the image of—say—‘transcription’ is therefore only a first step: as we have seen, one needs then to explore what ‘transcription’ is being understood as and felt to imply. But we can take heart from a state of affairs that Gerard Steen, as a cognitive linguist, seems to lament: the lack of ‘a generally accepted procedure for deriving conceptual metaphors from linguistic metaphors’, so that inferring pathways in the mind from metaphors in language is ‘basically an art’ [NOTE 21 to p. 44:]. **As we endeavour to practise this art, we will give due recognition to the metaphors of translation that are explicit in prefaces and other critical writings; but we will also be struck by metaphors that may inhere in a translator’s practice but never quite reach the surface of expression.** Even when metaphors are made explicit, it is rare for them to be wholly under the translator’s control: none of them—save perhaps for ‘translation as carrying across’—has the clarity and obduracy of a ‘system’ or ‘structure’ but rather the diffuse sway of a ‘disposition’. And when they are left latent, or are barely hinted at, they need not therefore be the less revealing of the practice that gives rise to them and that they help define.” (Reynolds 2011 p. 44)

“... when a translation metaphor does have its origin, or part of its origin, elsewhere, it can still interact with similar images—doubles of translation—in the source text... [Besides genres] individual source texts can also exert a particular influence on what is done to them via the metaphors they hold out to translators” (Reynolds 2011 pp. 46-47)

translation’ is unsustainable. Nevertheless, communication is always shadowed by the possibility of having to translate.”⁷⁷

“When Steiner sets out to illustrate his claim, a reservation is silently introduced. It is no longer ‘every act of communication’, all ‘understanding’ and ‘hearing of significance’ that ‘is’ translation. Rather, ‘when we read or hear any language-statement from the past, be it Leviticus or last year’s best-seller, we translate’. Why ‘from the past’, all of a sudden? Of course, one might claim that by the time any words have travelled through our eyes or ears into our understandings they have reached us ‘from the past’; but this turns out not to be Steiner’s point. **His idea is rather that the passage of some unspecified length of time—more than a nanosecond but less than a year—creates a ‘barrier of distance’ which is ‘exactly the same’ as that created by the difference between languages.**” (Reynolds, 2011 p. 9)

“The word ‘translation’... veils distinctions that metaphors reveal and define... As we have begun to see, translation does more than ‘transfer significance’. Steiner’s definition, in one sense too vast, is in another respect too narrow. Translation stretches words, bridges times, mingles personal identities, and unsettles national languages. As it does so, it creates a distinctive medium in which connections between different places, times and people can be imagined, thought over, and felt through”. (Reynolds 2011 p. 11)

⁷⁷ I should say that human communication does not equal, but entails, among other processes, translation, understood as the decodification of the message received, and the codification of what we mean to say.

12 REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London & New York: Verso, 1991.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 'Thick Translation'. In Venuti, ed. 2004 pp. 389-401.
- Apter, Emily. 'Warped Speech: The Politics of Global Translation.' In *Beyond Dichotomies: Histories, Identities, Cultures and the Challenge of Globalization*, ed. Elizabeth Mudimbe-Boyi. Albany: SUNY Press, 2002, pp. 185-200.
- Apter, Emily. *Against World Literature. On the Politics of Untranslability*. London: Verso, 2013.
- Barsky, Robert. 'The Interpreter as Intercultural Agent in Convention Refugee Hearings'. *The Translator* 2(1996): 45-64.
- Bassnett, Susan & André Lefevere, eds. *Translation, History and Culture*. London & New York: Pinter, 1990.
- Beidelman, Thomas, ed. *The Translation of Cultures*. London: Tavistock, 1971.
- Berman, Antoine. *The experience of the foreign: culture and translation in romantic Germany*. [L'épreuve de l'étranger: culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique, Paris, 1984] English trans. by S. Heyvaert. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Berman, Antoine. 'Translation and the Trials of the Foreign'. Translated by L. Venuti. In Venuti, ed. 2004, pp. 276-289.
- Berman, Antoine. *Jacques Amyot, traducteur français*. Paris: Belin, 2012.
- Berman, Sandra & Michael Wood, eds. *Nation, Language and the Ethics of Translation*. Princeton, NJ & Oxford, UK: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Blanchot, Maurice. *The Unavowable Community*. Trans. P. Joris. Barrytown, NY: Station Hill Press, 1988.
- 'Translating' [1971], in *Friendship*. Trans. E. Rottenberg. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997, pp 57-61.
- Bloch, Ernst. *The Utopian Function of Art and Literature: Selected Essays*. Ed. and trans. J. Zipes and F. Mecklenburg. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1988.
- *Heritage of Our Times*. Trans. N. Plaice and S. Plaice. Oxford: Polity, 1991.
- Botley, Paul. *Latin Translation in the Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. London: Polity 2005.

- Budick, Sanford & Wolfgang Iser, eds. *The Translability of Cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Burke, Peter. *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Burke, Peter and Po-chia Hsia's *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, UK: The European Science Foundation & Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Calzada Pérez, M. ed. *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideology in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St Jerome, 2003.
- Cassin, Barbara, ed. *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon*. Translation edited by Emily Apter, Jacques Lezra and Michael Wood. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Chaume, F. 'Film studies and translation studies: Two disciplines at stake in audiovisual translation?'. *Meta* 49.1, 2004, pp. 12-24.
- Cohen, Margaret and Carolyn Dever, eds. *The Literary Channel: The Inter-National Invention of the Novel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Coldiron, A.E.B. *Printers without Borders. Translation and Textuality in the Renaissance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Contamine, Geneviève, ed. *Traduction et Traducteurs au Moyen Âge. Actes du colloque international du CNRS organisé à Paris, Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes les 26-28 mai 1986*. Paris: CNRS, 1989.
- Copenhaver, Brian P. "Translation, terminology and style in philosophical discourse", in Charles B. Schmitt & Quentin Skinner, eds. *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, CUP, 1988, pp. 77-110.
- Cortesi, Mariarosa. "La tecnica del tradurre presso gli umanisti", in *The Classical Tradition in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Proceedings of the first European Science Foundation Workshop on "The Reception of Classical Texts". Florence, Certosa del Galluzzo, 26-27 June 1992, edited by Claudio Leonardi & Birger Munk Olsen. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1995, pp. 143-169.
- Cortesi, Mariarosa, ed. *Tradurre dal greco in età umanistica*. Atti del Seminario di studio Firenze, Certosa del Galluzzo, 9 settembre 2005. Firenze: Sismel – Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2007.
- Danan, M. 'Dubbing as an Expression of Nationalism'. *Meta* 36, 1991, pp. 606-14.
- Delabastita, D. 'Translation and Mass Communication: Film and TV Translation as Evidence of Cultural Dynamics'. *Babel* 35:4, 1989, pp. 193-218.
- Derrida, Jacques. 'The Laws of Reflection: Nelson Mandela, In Admiration.' Trans. Mary Ann Caws and Isabelle Lorenz, in *For Nelson Mandela*. New York: Seaver Books, 1987, pp. 13-42.
- Derrida, Jacques. 'Onto-Theology of National-Humanism (Prolegomena to a Hypothesis)'. *Oxford Literary Review* 14.1-2, 1992, pp. 593-602.
- Easthope, Anthony. *Englishness and National Culture*. London & New York: Longman, 1999.
- Eco, Umberto. *The Search for the Perfect Language*. [*La ricerca de la lingua perfetta nella cultura europea*] Trans. James Fentress. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

- Eco, Umberto. *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2003. [Dire quasi la stessa cosa. Esperienze di traduzione. Milano: Bompiani, 2003]
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem". *Poetics Today* 2.4 (1990): 45-51.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin and foreword by Richard Macksey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Gillespie, Stuart. *English Translation and Classical Reception. Towards a New Literary History*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- Gouanvic, J.M. 'A Bourdieusian theory of translation, or the coincidence of practical instances: Field, "habitus", capital and illusio'. *The Translator* 11:2, 2005, pp. 147-66.
- Hatim, B. & I. Mason. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman, 1990.
- The Translator as Communicator*. London & New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Hayes, Julie Candler. *Translation, Subjectivity, and Culture in France and England, 1600-1800*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.
- Hugo, Victor. *Oeuvres Complètes: Critiqué*, ed. Jean –Pierre Reynaud. Paris: Laffont, 1985, vol. 11.
- Inghilleri, M. ed. *Bourdieu and the Sociology of Translation and Interpreting*. Special issue of *The Translator* 11.2, 2005.
- Jakobson, Roman. 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation'. In in Venuti, ed. 2004, pp. 138-143.
- Jameson, Frederick. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981.
- Lecerclé, Jean-Jacques. *The Violence of Language*. London & New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Lefevere, Andre. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London & New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Lezra, Jacques. 'Nationum Origo'. In Berman & Wood, eds. 2005, pp. 203-228.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988.
- Mayoral, R., D. Kelly & N. Gallardo. 'The concept of constrained translation: Non-linguistic perspectives of translation'. *Meta* 33.3, 1988, pp. 356-67.
- McMurrin, Mary Helen. *The Spread of Novels: Translation and Prose Fiction in the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Milton, J. and P. Bandia, eds. *Agents of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2009.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. [2001] 3rd ed. London & New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Norton, Glyn P. *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and its Humanist Antecedents*. Geneva: Droz, 1984.

- Pálsson, Gíslí ed. *Beyond Boundaries: Understanding Translation and Anthropological Discourse*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 1993.
- Pérez Fernández, José María. “Reasons of State for any Author’s Common Sense, Translation, and the International Republic of Letters”. In *A Maturing Market. The Iberian World in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Alexander S. Wilkinson and Alejandra Ulla Lorenzo (forthcoming in Brill, 2017) (<http://hdl.handle.net/10481/42923>)
- “The Domestication of Melibea: Recasting Spanish Characters for Early English Drama”. In *Beyond Spain’s Borders: Women Players in Early Modern National Theaters*. Ed. Anne J. Cruz and María Cristina Quintero. New York: Routledge, 2017, pp. 11-32.
- “Spanish Bawds and Quixotic Libraries: Adventures and Misadventures in Early English Hispanism and World Literature”. *Comparative Literature* (2016) 68(4): 370-388; doi:10.1215/00104124-3698467 (<http://hdl.handle.net/10481/40935>)
- “The Age of Exchange: Translation, News and the European Public Sphere in the 16th and the 17th Centuries”. *Images of Europe. Past, Present, Future. ISSEI 2014 - Conference Proceedings*, ed. Yolanda Espiña, pp. 40-53
- “Translation, Diplomacy and Espionage. New Insights into James Mabbe’s Career”. *Translation and Literature* 23.1 (2014): 1-22.
- “Andrés Laguna: Translation and the Early Modern Idea of Europe”. *Translation and Literature* 21.3 (2012): 299-318.
- Traducción y poética en Octavio Paz a través de sus versiones de John Donne (y 2). *Letral* 7 (2011): 77-101.
- Traducción y poética en Octavio Paz a través de sus versiones de John Donne (1). *Letral* 6 (2010): 70-90.
- “From Virtue to Compulsion: Epic, Translation and the Significance of Early Modern Blank Verse”. *Cahiers Elisabéthains* 75 (2009): 1-16.
- “Translation and Metrical Experimentation in Sixteenth Century English Poetry: The Case of Surrey’s Biblical Paraphrases”. *Cahiers Elisabéthains* 71 (2007): 1-13.
- Pérez Fernández, José María & Edward Wilson-Lee, eds. *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. ‘Linguistic Utopias’. In N. Fabb, D. Attridge, A. Durant and C. McCabe, eds. *The Linguistics of Writing: Arguments between Language and Literature*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987, pp. 48-66.
- Pym, Anthony. ‘Translation as a Transaction Cost’. *Meta* 40(4), 1995, pp. 594-605.
- Pym, Anthony. *Methods in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1998.
- Pym, Anthony. *The Moving Text: Localization, Translation and Distribution*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2004.
- Pym, Anthony. ‘On the social and cultural in translation studies’. Introduction to A. Pym, M. Shlesinger and Z. Jettmarová, eds. *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006, pp. 1-25.

- Reyer, Frederick. *Interpretatio: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1989.
- Renken, Arno. *La Représentation de l'étranger: Une réflexion hermeneutique sur la notion de traduction*. Lausanne: Centre de traduction littéraire, 2002.
- Reynolds, Matthew. *The Poetry of Translation. From Chaucer & Petrarch to Homer & Logue*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011.
- Robin, Diana. *Publishing Women. Salons, the Presses and the Counter-Reformation in Sixteenth Century in Italy*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Robinson, Douglas. *The Translator's Turn*. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.
- Robinson, Douglas. *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997a.
- Robinson, Douglas. 'Translation and the Repayment of Debt'. *Delos* 7.1-2 (April 1997): 10-22
- Robinson, D. *Performative Linguistics: Speaking and Translating as Doing Things with Words*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Rosenzweig, Franz. 'Die Schrift und Luther.' In Hans Joachim Störig, ed. *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969, pp. 194-222.
- Rossiter, William T. *Wyatt Abroad. Tudor Diplomacy and the Translation of Power*. Cambridge, UK: D.S. Brewer, 2014.
- Rubel, Paula G. & Abraham Rosman, eds. *Translating Cultures: Perspectives on Translation and Anthropology*. Oxford: Berg, 2003.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. 'On the different methods of translating', in Venuti, ed. 2004, pp. 43-63.
- Schurink, Fred, ed. *Tudor Translation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Sdun, Winfried. *Probleme und Theorien des Übersetzens in Deutschland vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Munich: Hueber, 1967
- Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London & New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Stockhorst, Stefanie. *Cultural Transfer through Translation. The Circulation of Enlightened Thought in Europe by Means of Translation*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010.
- Toury, Gideon. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute, 1980.
- Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.
- Tymoczko, M. 'Ideology and the position of the translator: In what sense is a translator "in between"?' in Calzada Pérez, ed. 2003, pp. 181-201.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. [1995] 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2008.

- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 'Translation, Community, Utopia'. In Venuti ed. 2004, pp. 482-502.
- Venuti, Lawrence, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Second edition. New York & London: Routledge, 2004.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 'Local Contingencies: Translation and National Identities'. In Berman & Wood, eds. 2005, pp. 177-202.
- Wolf, M. & A. Fukari, eds. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007.
- Wood, Michael. 'The Languages of Cinema'. In Sandra Berman & Michael Wood, eds. *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2005, pp. 79-88.

Material available for download

- Pérez Fernández, José María. 'Traducción y poética en Octavio Paz a través de sus versiones de John Donne' (part 1 [Letral](#) 5 (2010): 70-90 & part 2 [Letral](#) 7 (2011): 13-37).
- 'Andrés Laguna: Translation and the Early Modern Idea of Europe'. *Translation and Literature* 21 (2012): 299-318. Click [here](#) to download a preliminary version of this article from our institutional repository.
- Review of Fred Schurink, ed. *Tudor Translation* (London: Palgrave, 2011). *Translation and Literature* 22 (2013): 266-272. Click [here](#) to download a preliminary version of this article from our institutional repository.
- 'Translation and English Literary History' (a bibliographical essay which reviews the following volumes: Stuart Gillespie, *English Translation and Classical Reception: Towards a New Literary History* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), Matthew Reynolds, *The Poetry of Translation: From Chaucer & Petrarch to Homer & Logue* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011) & Fred Schurink, ed. *Tudor Translation* (London: Palgrave, 2011)). [Sendebare](#) 23 (2012), pp. 373-378. Click [here](#) to download a pdf copy.
- 'La Inadvertida Omnipresencia de la Traducción'. Reseña de *Is that a Fish in Your Ear. The Amazing Adventure of Translation*, de David Bellos (Londres: Penguin, 2012). *Sendebare* (n° 24, 2013). Click [here](#) to download a preliminary version.
- 'Translation, Diplomacy and Espionage: New Insights into James Mabbe's Career'. *Translation and Literature* (volume 23, part 1, Feb/March, 2014). Click [here](#) to download a preliminary version of this article from our institutional repository.
- [Los problemas de Villalobos: Medical Humanism, Translation and Early Modern Prose Fiction](#)'. A paper presented at the *Translation and the Circulation of Knowledge in Early Modern Science Colloquium*, at the Warburg Institute, London, Friday 28 June, 2013. You can also watch it [here](#).

- [‘Traducción Cultural y Relaciones Internacionales’](#). A lecture for the *Centro Mediterráneo*, University of Granada, July 2013.
- [‘The picaresque, translation, and the history of the novel’](#). A lecture for a seminar on *Intercultural Communication*, at the *Centro Mediterráneo*, University of Granada, June, 2013.