Translator Redactor: Literary Translation and the Limits of Interpretation

Master's Thesis
By Judith A. Deitch
For A.A. Foster
Leiden University, Linguistics
Translation in Theory and Practice
16 June 2016

Table of Contents

Introduction

0.1 *The place of literary translation within Translation Studies (TS)*

The study of the translation of works of literature has suffered under the institutionalization of Translation Studies by being sorted in with the translation of all other texts, or even more generally, all language use. Certain essential characteristics set off the translation of literature from the translation of other texts, and no matter how difficult the term "literature" is to define it necessarily deserves its own set of approaches within TS. As opposed to ephemeral texts of advertising or for other business purposes, legal or medical documents, technical data and manuals, or even the latest bestsellers or cookbooks, works of literature are 1) works of art that 2) demand close reading and withstand repeated study, 3) they are placed in the reader's hands in book form, therefore also indicating that 4) they display a substantial length, whether in prose or poetry collections. No reader picks up a magazine article on a recent political kafuffle or a government brochure with the same expectations as a reader picks up Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, and not only because the latter is "expressive" (an advertisement, legal plea or pop song may also express emotion), but because it belongs to the intellectual, artistic, and textual monuments of Western culture. The library or bookshop copy of *War and Peace*, or any other work of translated literature, does not try to appeal to every possible reader (unlike a No Smoking sign, store catalogue or television subtitling), in fact works of literary art in book form are selective in their readership—whereas a box of yogurt or arrears letter has to address the general public, wants to communicate (send a message that initiates and controls a certain response) in one reading, does not expect to be re-read or studied or appreciated as art, is ephemeral if not actually disposable, and often extremely brief. Most importantly, the work of art reveals the creative use of language, not the standardized use of language according to the norms, rules, or models of any particular historical period (and as T.S. Eliot said, art does not progress). Moreover, literary artists are the ones who actually create the language that then becomes current in general usage—one need only mention the name of Shakespeare and translations of the Bible here. Instead of literature being governed by norms or controlled by conventions, great works of art continually bend, extend and break such rules, inventing new language creatively. All great artists are experimenters.

Additional substantive criteria of literary works that differentiate them categorically from other "translated texts" (TT, a lowest common denominator term used in TS), are their participation in the relevant categories that make up the existing field of literary study: 1) genre,

2) period, 3) language, 4) culture, and 5) author. *War and Peace* is a novel of 19th century written in Russian about Russian culture by Leo Tolstoy. Each category invites further comparison and analysis, placing the work of literature firmly within a well-defined literary field that enhances reader understanding; thus a reader can be thinking immediately while reading this text of other novels, other works of 19th century literature, other works of Russian literature, features of Russian history and culture, and other works of Tolstoy. Such a literary context—a constellation of defining literary categories—forms a major aid to interpretation. However, none of these are relevant to the great mass of ephemeral texts or isolated examples of language use studied in TS and put into the same category as literary works—sometimes with an unsubstantiated claim to "interdisciplinarity"; in such ephemeral or popular texts for a mass audience, interpretation is minimal, whereas in a work of literature interpretation is a never-ending horizon.

Furthermore, it must be stated that it is unlikely that the English reader of a translation of a Russian novel will be conscious of such a category as "literature in translation." European literature, foreign literature, Russian literature, yes (and these categories, like those above, are aids to interpretation); but unless the particular reader has some pre-existing interest in translation, or the translation is a particularly poor one, it will not occur to an English reader to sort the work with other translated works or texts in general. An illustration here would be the pages of the *Times Literary Supplement* (*TLS*), the most widely-read and respected venue in the English-speaking world for literary reviews (literature largely understood). In their "Fiction" section—and in fact in every section of the journal—one will find both translated and English-language works; there is no separate section for translations. Furthermore, the number of translated books reviewed has increased greatly in recent years. English readers are highly cosmopolitan (despite or because of their inability to read in foreign languages) even as English has become the common second language for many other language groups in the world. This category "translated literature" as opposed to literature in "our own language," at least for English, is operative in the academy in departments of English, but is not in evidence in other readerships, nor is it a desirable or natural state of affairs (but to repeat, Russian or French or Spanish literature are relevant comparative categories, the point here is about something generalized). Furthermore, English authors from Chaucer to Carlyle and from George Eliot to Samuel Beckett were translators; European literature has always exerted a strong influence on English literature and vice versa—from *Robinson Crusoe* to *Pamela*. Such a classification

belonging to the institutionalization of English Studies, less for scholarly reasons and more to do with territorial demarcation, is mentioned here because it is one of the false assumptions operative in TS regarding literary translations, one that has been promoted by the Description or Manipulation School deriving from poly-systems theory.

0.2 *The Descriptive/Manipulation School vs. the hermeneutic approach*

The Description or Manipulation School (D/MS) deserves credit as the group of scholars in TS who have taken the most trouble to address literary translation directly within a larger framework. For example, Gideon Toury presents a flow-chart or algorithm of ordered rules governing the translation of a poem by James Joyce as the culmination of his "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies," which argues for turning TS into a systematic empirical science (1985). José Lambert and Herman van Gorp discuss and advocate a hypothetical scheme of basic parameters for "literary systems" derived from the poly-system hypothesis in order to move the study of literary translation away from the "merely intuitive" in their "On describing translations" (1985). James Holmes attempts to develop a multi-plane model for the process of poetry translation (also including a set of diagrams) in order to accommodate the "highly complex entities of the kind that 'literary texts' tend to be" in his "Describing Literary Translations: Models and Methods" (1988). However, in their proposed methodologies, these and other proponents of this school may be considered to have failed in serving the needs of literary translation for a number of reasons. The major problems with the D/MS of TS as a framework for studying and conducting literary translation have already been introduced. Primarily, these scholars ignore the creative dimension of language use of literary artists and translators in favor of the study of norms of language and norms of translation. Despite their many diagrams, D/MS, represented here by the work of Toury, Holmes, Lambert and Theo Hermans, has failed to formulate a theoretical/methodological framework that does justice to the literary aspects of literary translation—both in its study and in its execution. This failure can be further illustrated by pointing out two traits that run through their work. First, the desire to classify, schematize and systematize translation (also observable in other areas of TS), including an emphasis on how-to methodologies that schematize (literary) translation in diagram form. Concomitantly, while ostensibly discussing literary translation, they overwhelmingly incorporate it into larger, vaguer notions of translation *tout court*. None of their schemas do justice to literary translation, nor do

they move the understanding of translation past the very simple dichotomous distinction between source-oriented and target-oriented approaches, as if there were only two and not innumerable ways of translating a work of literature, and as if one translator only deploys a single technique absolutely consistently. Second, while grouping literature together with all other texts as forms of communication, they see literature and literary texts as systems governed by norms, rules and models. Hence Hermans, in "Norms and the Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework" (1996), states, "My basic assumption is that translation, like any other use of language, is a communicative act" (29). For him,

> Norms govern the mode of import of cultural products—for example, of the translation of literary texts….firstly, in the decision by the relevant agent in the receptor system whether or not to import a foreign-language text, or allow it to be imported; secondly, if it is decided to import, whether to translate…; and thirdly…how to approach the task, and how to see it through. (28)

According to this, D/MS can only help us understand why a translator decides to translate a work of literature (which would be according to sociological rules of consumerist commercial publishing and not for any personal, idiosyncratic reasons); as well as how to conduct translation (evidently a translator operates according to linguistic norms, an oft repeated dictum of this school that is left wholly unclear and excludes any personal creative approach to language or literature). Furthermore, according to Hermans, it is norms in translation that fix values, control agents, and determine what is correct (36-37). The pages of the *TLS* suggest otherwise, where good translations are frequently praised for inventiveness. Hermans, like his fellow D/MS practitioners, frustratingly provides no examples or illustrations to back up his claims. Thus Lambert and Van Gorp also promote norms as the way to understanding (literary) translation: "Our object is translated literature, that is to say, translational norms, models, behaviour and systems…"; moreover, they go on to say, "Even the distinction between literary and non-literary translation turns out to be a purely theoretical problem…" (45). Holmes introduces three sets of rules for the translation process in his "Two-map two-plane text-rank translation model" (Figure 3), yet also has to admit that the literary text is a much more complex entity (86), and that despite his four schematic diagrams with all their detail "in most cases there is little or no tangible evidence what has taken place in the translator's 'mind'" (88). Toury is responsible for launching the sociological concept of norms as a way of scientizing TS, seeing "translatorship" first and

foremost as playing a social role allotted by a community and therefore governed by norms ("The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation" in Venuti [2000]). The translator, it would seem, is controlled and limited in his/her "cognitive apparatus" by designated norms, not by any personal development of the mind or acquisition of knowledge through reading and study; instead, according to Toury, the norms that control the translator's cognition are acquired through socialization. In this essay, Toury divides the norms that serve as criteria in translation, and which operate in translations of all kinds, into preliminary norms (translation policy governing the choice of texts); operational norms (directing decisions made during translation itself); and textual-linguistic norms (the material selected to formulate the target text) (202-03). These overlap with the stages presented by Hermans above, but again there is a lack of demonstrations and examples.

D/MS has a poor track record in terms of generating increased knowledge of the subject. Their assumptions are not useful for understanding literary translation. The assumption, that the cognitive and interpretive process required for literary translation can be reduced to a schematized diagram fails to capture the essence of the literary because such writing cannot be reduced to a prescriptive schematic system, neither in the creation of original works of art nor in the translations of those works. All such schemas are overly simplistic and doomed to reduce literary artistic production to crude generalized processes. The assumption about "norms" is also fallacious. By seeing translation (which authors such as Ezra Pound and the German Romantics saw as *sui generis* [see Berman]) as governed by a set of "norms" in the same way as other sociological phenomenon governing behavior in conformist, consumerist modern societies, they fail to address what is specifically literary and what is specifically translational. The concept of norms, rules, conventions and models does not do justice to the tremendous effort and knowledge required in executing a high-level literary translation, which is far more than the selection of a text and the selection of words. For example, this essay is based in part on my own undertaking to translate a work of Constantijn Huygens, which has never been translated into English or into any other language besides Dutch although it is of great interest especially to art historians and could have been translated any time over the last 400 years. My selection is not governed by sociological norms but by personal interest and a desire to share knowledge with my colleagues and other readers. As a kind of reading and artistic writing/composition, translation demands multiple cognitive strategies all at once, and translation of a single work will require repeated,

numerous encounters (not a one-time procedure). Therefore, the translator is better prepared by forming a conceptual framework of the task rather than trying to follow a reductive abstract schema. The assumptions of D/MS fail because literary works do not get the proper attention they deserve as a different genus within the field of TS, as texts that do not aim at communication of data, nor simply at the expression of emotion, but that rather participate in the values and characteristics of art-forms (here there is a whole field which has gone before to define poetics and aesthetics starting in ancient Greece). Art is not governed by norms and rules, although conventions in literary writing help interpretation (as mentioned above, genre, period, author, and the like may be compared as aids to interpretation in any creative way the reader desires, but that does not make them "norms"). Bi-lingual dictionaries contain suggestions for translational usage (but again, not "norms"). Viewing literary works as texts that ought to be explained in conventional modern terms in order to communicate with the reader leads to terrible overwriting, over-interpretation, and other unnecessary interventionist distortions of the original work (not to mention the modern aesthetic of "dumbing down" which has led to the unfortunate re-working of such classic translations such as Rieu's *Iliad* where all "hard" words have to be removed, as if readers were incapable of learning or making inferences). Classification schemas—of which there is an overabundant proliferation within TS—are not useful for the translator of literature, who would be better off advising him/herself of the traditional categories still operative in literary study and studying previous translations. No translator is bound in any way by dictionary definitions, instead he/she is bound only by the imaginative and intellectual resources of the human mind they possess. Unfortunately, these D/MS authors also undermine their own propositions by not providing demonstrations, examples, proofs, applied analyses, or anything else to illustrate the usefulness of their frameworks. Moreover, the view of language as "facts" (Toury) and literature as nothing more than concentrated instances of language, is extremely simplistic. The advocacy of norms as the key to understanding translation has not led to effective results.

In contradistinction, the understanding of literary translation within TS would benefit from an elaboration of what has been called "the hermeneutic approach" (as a castigation by Lefevre). Interpretation is the key to understanding the translator's role, the reader's role, and the relation of translation to original. Above all, the translator must allow the reader to engage in his/her own private and personal act of interpretation—multiple acts of interpretation, in fact—

and enable such acts as much as possible. In this light, the hermeneutic approach (it can hardly be considered a school) is the one that provides the most fitting conceptual framework for literary translation. It helps a translator to understand what he/she is doing, how to direct his/her efforts, and what the result should accomplish.

If TS has applicability in guiding literary translators' awareness of their task, as well as in providing theoretical frameworks for analyzing the body of translated literary texts for comparative understanding, it needs to develop further insights into the relation between translation and interpretation. To say that translation is interpretation (reversing Roman Jakobson's dictum) is not to say that the translator composes some kind of parallel critical explanation, paraphrase, or personal interpretation as a substitute for the translated text; it means a high-level awareness of the literary nature of the work in hand and a safeguarding of the readerly processes of the TL reader. The hermeneutic approach to literary translation, as theorized by Walter Benjamin, Roman Jakobson, Jiří Levý, George Steiner, Jacques Derrida and Paul Ricoeur, foregrounds interpretation as a process of both the reader and translator, and the translator as reader; furthermore it encompasses an approach to literature as art. Such an approach aids understanding of translation in three important areas: 1) the role of interpretation, 2) the relation of the translation to the original, and 3) the task of the translator. The hermeneutic approach does not attempt to provide any kind of schematized methodology, typology, or how-to, or to fit translation within a scientific-linguistic framework; on the contrary, it is unapologetically philosophical-aesthetic. Yet it provides a useful conceptual framework that validates the hermeneutic inexhaustibility of the literary work, the creativity of the literary work, the translation's relation to a literary work's organic wholeness, the goal in positioning the translation with regard to a literary work's *Nachleben* and the creative labor of the translator.

The major problem with the hermeneutic approach is how to limit interpretation. If, according to George Steiner, all language is idiolect and every reading of a work of literature is different even for the same reader, and if the work of literature is likewise interpretatively inexhaustible, is it possible to recognize and control over-interpretation in the translated text? When has translational interpretation reached its outer limit? Or is the translator licensed to write anything he/she desires? And if not, what can the translator do with excess interpretive knowledge? After outlining the hermeneutic approach, the rest of this essay will attempt to circumscribe such limits using both the conceptual theoretical framework provided by the

hermeneutic approach, as well as offering a practical addition to the translator's task: the task of the editor. As a book editor, the translator has much at his/her disposal which can relieve the pressure to put every bit of interpretation into the translated text, something that leads to undue explicitation or otherwise can distort a skilled, successful rendering of the original work. The translator as editor acts as a guide and educator, rather than an explainer or communicator, and just as good guides and teachers provide additional materials and exercises and then stand back and let their subjects figure things out for themselves (for one only learns by making inferences and interpreting things on one's own and readers of translations should be allowed to learn through their reading), the editor-translator can both invite and fortify the reader's interpretation through the use of paratexts, which will not interfere with the reading experience of the body of the text. The translator-editor has a number of additional tasks added to the basic task of turning a literary work in one language into a literary work in a different language (as strenuous and rigorous as that may be, as demanding of imagination and intellect), but these editorial tasks can be defined more practically. One area of knowledge to be developed here is an awareness of the book culture and translation culture of both the SL and TL. If the literary translator envisages not the finished production of a text, but of a complete book, this will likewise suggest or provide limits to the process of interpretation. Therefore, this thesis advocates approaching literary translation with a solid awareness in both theory (Part I, the hermeneutic approach) and practice (Part II, the translator as editor).

Part I, Theory

The hemeneutic approach as conceptual framework for the literary translator

Introduction to Part I

As proposed in the introduction, literary translation must be regarded as a separate area within TS with its own parameters and requirements. More particularly, the translation of literary works foregrounds issues of interpretation in an urgent and immediate way. The best framework for literary translation is therefore provided by the hermeneutic approach, represented here by Walter Benjamin, Roman Jakobson, Jiří Levý, George Steiner, Jacques Derrida and Paul Ricoeur.[1] To my knowledge there is no general overview of this approach as relevant to literary translation. Therefore the purpose of this section is to set out a line of reasoning to which these representatives all concur and contribute ideas, and that develops the scope and theoretical range. According to these authors, interpretation *is* translation (which also means that translation *is* interpretation). Moreover, translation is the basis of *all* human cognitive experience, that means when we read, think, or take in ideas in any way we translate them in order to understand them. As explicitly put forward by Jakobson, and taken up by Steiner, Ricoeur and others, translation takes place whether one is interpreting in one's own language or in a second language. The professional literary inter-lingual translator has to develop powers of interpretation at a very high level. This is because interpretation and translation are difficult, given the nature of language itself, in addition to the superadded creative labor of understanding and creating meaning in two languages simultaneously. For, as Levý says, "The translator is first of all a reader" (27). The translator must think through and understand the literary work in one language as a reader, and simultaneously compose and write a literary work in another language informed by this understanding (even this statement sounds like a simplification). The translator is also a reader of his/her own translation at different stages. Therefore translation as interpretation must be carried out in a multi-level, on-going, dialectical process that demands intense (literary) awareness and consciousness.

For the current discussion, the hermeneutic approach presents three essential points making up a conceptual framework that forms a useful structure for the translator of literature.

---

[1] The ghost of Friedrich Schleiermacher haunts this theoretical approach, and the influence of Schleiermacher on Benjamin in particular requires a detailed commentary, which would help us moderns understand the latter's seminal essay.

First, it grounds translation in the commutability of interpretation and translation (1.1); second, it promotes an understanding of the original as a holistic work of art (1.2.1) whose existence is unfolding in time (its *Nachleben*, 1.2.2); third, it defines the translator's task as a certain kind labor, with a balance between creative freedom (1.3.1) and the constraints of linguistic hospitality (1.3.2). The latter aspect of the translator's labor is where the practical task of editing comes in as an extension of the translator's hospitality, to be discussed in Part II of this paper.

1.1 *Translation and interpretation*

Roman Jakobson's foundational notion that all interpretation is translation provides a solid ground for the hermeneutic approach because it validates, conversely, translation as interpretation; as the verb copula indicates in this case, the two terms are commutable. Given that, according to Jakobson, there is a continuum between intra-lingual and inter-lingual translation; we can infer from this a validation of the translator's task as an act of interpretation of the ST (inter-lingual), resulting in a product that will enable the reader's act of interpretation of the TT (intra-lingual). For Jakobson, there is no such thing as interpretation without translation: "No linguistic specimen may be interpreted by the science of language without a translation of its signs into other signs of the same system or into signs of another system" (234). In fact, this is an operation that informs all human cognitive experience, since "the cognitive level of language not only admits but directly requires recoding interpretation, i.e., translation" (236). More specifically, interpretation is concerned with the understanding of meaning: "the meaning of any linguistic sign is its translation into some further, alternative sign" (232-33). Having established the principle of interpretation as translation, it is clear that Jakobson does not see translation as a straightforward notion of linguistic equivalence, for meaning is not single, partially because the linguistic sign itself contains difference, variation, and relativity, which destabilize any simple solution in translation, but nonetheless once again make translation a touchstone for the very essence of language: "Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language" (233). Not only does this cardinal problem, the combination of variation and invariance in the sign, present multiplicities, inter-lingual translation cannot concern itself with meaning at the basic level of the sign alone because it must grasp and re-code much larger entities: "translation from one language into another substitutes messages in one language not for separate code-units but for entire messages in some other language…Thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two

different codes" (233). Such messages require high-level interpretation. Jakobson does not specify how large he thinks a message is; in the case of literature is a message an entire novel, poem, play, memoir or philosophical essay? The answer is likely yes, but surely in addition to all the smaller component parts that make up the whole—lines, paragraphs, chapters, scenes—for interpretation of a literary work must take place on many levels at once, certainly not one word after the other. In any case, for Jakobson inter-lingual translation is difficult: "Both the practice and theory of translation abound with intricacies" (234), making it a veritable "Gordian knot" (234).

Although he does not elaborate it, for Jakobson metalinguistic positioning is an aid in untying this complex knot and another basis for translation, since "[a] faculty of speaking a given language implies a faculty of talking about this language" (234). Not only can we talk about our own languages, we can learn to think and talk in other languages. Paul Ricoeur develops this concept further, making the link between inter-lingual translation and intra-lingual metalinguistic knowledge when he states that every speaker has the ability to learn and to use, not only his own language, but also languages other than his own (25). He places the issue of multiplicity of interpretation at the heart of linguistic experience itself, since it derives from a "substantial fact, characteristic of the use of our languages: it is always possible *to say the same thing in another way*" (25; emphasis in original). In addition to linguistic multiplicity, Ricoeur elaborates Jakobson's element of the variance/difference inherent in the linguistic sign by calling attention to the mysterious within the concept of invariance/equivalence itself. According to Ricoeur's hemeneutics, every language has a struggle with the secret, the hidden, the mysterious and incommunicable; languages also express "the other of what can be communicated" (32), thereby positing communication as a problem (rather than a given as in TS), which, in Western culture, goes back to Socrates and his refusal to reduce his ideas to writing. Moreover, as Ricoeur states, it is through translation that "we rediscover, within our linguistic community, the enigma of the same, of meaning itself…" (25). Meaning itself is enigmatic, therefore interpretation concerns this "enigma of the same" that in turn forms a "bridge" between internal translation and external translation, between intra-lingual and inter-lingual translation (25). If meaning within a single language is enigmatic (to somewhat simplify what Ricoeur is saying), how much more surprising then that this meaning can be revealed in a new way through a comparable linguistic form in a second language. Far from taking equivalence as the objective of the translator, language's

essential propensity for enigma and the highly complex relation between thought and language signal to Ricoeur that equivalence can never be found; equivalence is an act of becoming, always unfolding and never finally attained: "equivalence can only be sought, worked at, supposed" (35). In fact, according to Ricoeur, it is not equivalence between languages that allows for translation, but vice versa, it is translation that creates equivalence: "In actual fact, the…true nature of equivalence…is *produced* by translation rather than *presupposed* by it" (35; emphasis in original). Meaning, in both languages, is revealed by translation. Therefore, Jakobson's proposition that all cognition/interpretation is translation bestows upon inter-lingual translation another essential role— the development of languages, revealing new meanings and new enigmas within the SL itself, even as it constructs a network of what Ricoeur calls "the comparable" (discussed below). The hermeneutic work of inter-lingual translation in searching out meaning and coping with its enigmas, mysteries, and incommunicability, is summed up in a very straightforward way by Derrida in his reading of Walter Benjamin's seminal essay on translation: "it is difficult to translate and so to understand" (184), showing the commutability of these two terms by reversing Jakobson's dictum, putting translation before interpretation.

While Ricoeur approaches translation in an abstract philosophical way, George Steiner and Jiří Levý focus direct attention on the act of reading and the process of translation while reinforcing the idea that translation is interpretation. Steiner, however, pushes the boundaries yet further with regard to the slipperiness of language. For Steiner, language is not simply enigmatic or mysterious, it is not simply a question of the destabilizing variance/difference element within the semiotic sign, but more radically, language is changing every minute even for a single language user: "ordinary language is, literally at every moment, subject to mutation" (18). Steiner sees language as essentially destabilized and hence destabilizing of interpretation; as he asserts in a counterthrust to the proposed "science" of translation: "language is idiolectic" (294). He reiterates Jakobson's link between cognition and translation (without reference) by stating further, "Exactly the same model…is operative within a single language" (28). Whether inter-lingual or intra-lingual, translation is "a transformational process" which results in "interpretive transfer" (28). But for Steiner "interpretive transfer" is a never-ending process because language is radically disturbed by time—time is the barrier in the practice of translation/interpretation for both the reader and the translator. Steiner applies the dictum specifically to reading: "When we read or hear any language-statement from the past, be it Leviticus or last year's best-seller, we

translate" (28). Therefore we require reading aids and are always "preparing" to read an author—interpretation is always on-going and never final: "To read [a literary author] is, literally, to prepare to read them. But neither erudition nor industry make up the sum of insight, the intuitive thrust to the centre" (25). Although Steiner claims that translating an ephemeral text like a bill of lading is no different from translating a work of literature, nearly all his examples in a monograph of over 400 pages are literary (one also doubts that Steiner ever translated such a mundane specimen). Moreover, Steiner wrote the book following his experience in editing the *Penguin Book Modern Verse Translation* (1966), later reissued as *Poem Into Poem*, which clearly contributed to his thinking. Although he does refer to differences in the use of language by children and adults and men and women, for instance, in order to underscore the notion of idiolect (or in this case, sociolect), he offers very few, if any, examples of it; but, as already stated, numerous examples from the masterworks of Western literature. By personalizing language to such a high degree and adding the temporal element, so that even my own reading of a work of literature today will be different tomorrow, Steiner adds further support to Ricoeur's point about translational equivalence as something continually sought. Thus, not only is it, as Ricoeur says, always possible to *say* the same thing a different way, it is always possible, according to Steiner, to *read* and *interpret* the same thing a different way; "…each reading, each translation differs, each is undertaken from a distinctive angle of vision" (29). Language is a two-way street and even within the same community, as Ricoeur says, understanding requires at least two interlocutors (25). What Steiner adds, is that if these two interlocutors are separated by time and space—and the translator of Tolstoy, Huygens, Shakespeare or Plato can be hundreds if not thousands of years, and the same number of kilometers apart—the problem of "interpretive transfer" increases exponentially. (Actually, as I'm sure Steiner would admit, strict numerical data do not govern the relative "feel" of modernity or immediacy of a given author; Homer and Sophocles "feel" more "modern" to many readers than Richardson and Dickens. To Steiner any time lapse at all, even minutes, results in the destabilizing of language.) Given these intricacies, these enigmas, these barriers, the translator must approach his/her mission in a frame of mind equipped to encounter such difficulties. The obverse of this, the reward, is that the translator's interpretation, as Steiner says, "gives language life beyond the moment of utterance" (2), making a direct link to the original work of art's *Nachleben* and the desideratum of retranslation, to be discussed below.

Like Steiner, Jiří Levý also comes at interpretation/translation from the opposite direction in comparison to Jakobson and Ricoeur, but still ends up with the same conclusion. Levý begins by drawing attention to the gap between the original and its translation: since there is no complete semantic correspondence between the work and the translation, he states, "consequently, a linguistically correct translation is inadequate and an interpretation is required" (38). I would suggest the following analogy here: just as in written composition a list of grammatically correct sentences will not necessarily result in a coherent piece of writing, since you can have 100 grammatically correct sentences and make absolutely no sense, so a linguistically correct translation may likewise make absolutely no sense; meaning will be lacking if one denies or declines the labor of interpretation. Therefore, according to Levý, "every translation involves an interpretation which is clear or not so clear" (39). He develops the issue of interpretation by opposing literary translation to machine translation: where machine translation (MT) seeks to convert units at the simplest possible level, literary translation seeks to convert units at the highest possible level (13); "[a]bove all, MT cannot and does not seek to interpret meaning, so in MT part of the information can be lost, but none can be gained" (13). The issue of the reader's interpretation is also given importance in Levý's analysis by expanding an understanding of the process of reading cognition using the idea "concretization" derived from the phenomenologist philosopher Roman Ingarden. It is important to remember, as stated above, that "[t]he translator is first of all a reader" (27), therefore we must always have two readers in mind, the translator (reads both ST and TT) and the projected reader of the TT alone. The reader is an essential part of the equation. As Levý states, the text is realized "as a social fact, and produces an artistic effect, only when it is read…," a notion underscored by other hermeneutical thinkers who also affirm that no book exists anywhere except in the mind of the reader. How does this occur? The reader must interpret this social fact and artistic effect in a process that "results in a concretization by the reader" (27). Ingarden's concept of concretization, as explained in a note by editor Zuzana Jettmarová, directly attempts to address the problem of interpretation of the enigmatic elements of any text—the lacunae, the gaps in meaning, where such concretization is both the process and the result of interpretation. With concretization the recipient (reader/translator) fills in the spaces and resolves the indeterminacies through a dialectic of general and the unique (84), which I take to mean going back and forth between a more universalized meaning in the recipient's language store and a more singular meaning in the

textual situation at hand, until an understanding and acceptable interpretation is hit upon (a process which may occur, it should be noted, in seconds, making the Thinking Aloud Protocol [TAP] in TS a very crude index). In comparison, Steiner sees the reader's realization (both similar and different from Ingarden's concretization) as a form of mimetic re-creation: "Where the most thorough possible interpretation occurs…We re-enact, in the bounds of our own secondary but momentarily heightened educated consciousness, the creation by the artist. We retrace…the coming into form of the poem…a kind of finite mimesis…" (26). This dialectical/mimetic process, call it concretization or realization, is another indication of the kind of on-going effort and procedure the translator should expect to encounter and should be conceptually prepared for when embarking on a literary translation. Being equipped with an understanding of translation as interpretation in a difficult multi-level, multi-stage extended process of reading and writing, with an awareness of his/her own temporal and psychologically unique relation to language, and the need to negotiate the hermeneutic gaps and lacunae, demands a superadded form of consciousness (as Steiner suggests), a meta-consciousness beyond that demanded of the ordinary reader of a work of literature. This may be why the German Romantics and Ezra Pound thought of translation as *sui generis* ("translation is a *sui generis* form of criticism in that it lays bare the hidden structures of a text" [cited by Berman, 6-7]), rather than like something else or derivative of something else.

Having explored the expansion of the concept of translation as interpretation, which forms the foundation of the hermeneutic approach, it is necessary to circumscribe limits, lest it should be inferred that some kind of unlimited license follows from the translator's special awareness; that that is not the case follows from the ensuing consideration of the relation of the translation to the work of art and the translator's role, including the practical applications of editorship.

1.2 *Relation of translation to original*

1.2.1. The holistic quality of a work of art

Walter Benjamin's essay "The Task of the Translator" is the most important statement on translation of the twentieth century. Unfortunately, its ideas have not been absorbed by TS, most likely because they form a direct challenge to the very basis of the dominating notion in the field, that language and translation are forms of communication. Benjamin opposes this completely,

which can be understood more easily if one realizes that he is not talking about translation in general, but about the translation of the work of art, that is, of literature. The essay was first published as the introduction to his own facing-page translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens* (published in 1923), and while Baudelaire was an author much loved by early twentieth-century writers, it is often forgotten by modern readers that he lived and wrote in the 1840s, nearly one-hundred years before the 1920s. Benjamin worked on his translation for seven years. These facts inform his presentation of translation and are rather far from the assumptions of the institutional field of TS. Furthermore, there are several stylistic techniques that make the essay difficult to understand, among these the large number of rhetorical questions and the argument's dependence on metaphors and analogies. When early in the essay Benjamin writes, "What does a piece of literature communicate? Very little to the person who understands it. Essentially, it is neither communication nor statement" (29), he is rejecting any simplified notion of cognition as communication, particularly in the interpretation of a work of literature. A poem by Baudelaire does not "communicate," it does not send a literal message to a recipient, nor does the recipient find the meaning, interpret and understand the poem, in a passive process as receiver (the way the process of communication is diagrammed in the field of linguistics). Derrida in his reading of Benjamin's seminal essay further explains this idea: "Translation does not have as essential mission any communication. No more than the original…for a poetic text or a sacred text, communication is not the essential" (180). Rather, the intense labor of interpretation, as discussed above, applies here.

Benjamin is emphatic that his subject is art and repeats the word "art" four times in the first paragraph, twice in the first sentence and once each in the second and third sentence: "Nowhere, so far as a work of *art* or an *art* form is concerned….the very concept of an 'ideal' recipient is an evil in all discussions of *art* theory….It follows that *art* itself…" (29; emphasis added). The final sentence of the paragraph replaces the general term art with specific examples: poem, picture, and symphony (29). Therefore Benjamin is not addressing *all* forms of translation, but the translation of literary, philosophical, and religious texts. These literary artworks are conceived of as unified wholes, which he expresses in a number of metaphors. First, he ascribes a kind of life-force to works of literature and their translations using the analogy of a living organism: "Just as the expressions of life are very closely linked to the living creature without being of any significance to that creature, so does the translation proceed from the original…"

(31). This is further expressed by using the holistic metaphors of the fruit and its skin (37) and of a developing seed, which is why "in [the translation] the original grows" (36). How the original, a work of art similar to a holistic organism, "in continuing to exist…undergoes a change" (34) will be discussed further in the next section. Two more metaphors reinforce the holistic quality of the original work of art and the holistic relation of the translation to that work. The translation seen as a flowing royal robe adorning a king's body makes use of clothing imagery in a way that invokes the long tradition of Platonic philosophy, where the organic connection between body and soul is often given in this same imagery (the body is like a garment covering the soul; naturally medieval Kabbala absorbed this image). Here Benjamin cautions, however, that "a proper translation is transparent, it does not cover up the original, it does not stand in its light" (41). The robe immediately mutates into something transparent and the original into a light-giving source; this shows that these metaphors are aids to thinking through the *sui generis* nature of translation and may be transposed in order to do so. Another image of the whole, the amphora metaphor (or more exactly, the broken-amphora metaphor), is visually invoked by the careful layout of Benjamin's facing-page translation and must be a direct reference to it: "the shards of a pot…if they are to fit together, must correspond in the tiniest detail without needing to be identical, in the same way translation, rather than make itself resemble the sense of the original, must lovingly and precisely mimic the original's manner of meaning in its own language in such a way that as two shards recognizably form part of one vessel, both it and the original become recognizable as forming part of a greater language" (40). The beauty of this image also lies in the way it invokes an archaeological process, making translation an archaeology of knowledge of art, a heuristic as well as a hermeneutic. As mentioned above, literary translation is indeed a special kind of criticism.

In Jacques Derrida's reading of Benjamin's article, he also highlights the organic relation between two texts, two productions, two creations (179). As he goes on to say, the relation of the translating text to original is neither "*representative* or *reproductive*. Translation is neither an image nor a copy" (180; emphasis in original). The concept of the work of art and translation's relation to it in a holistic organic continuum offer a way of avoiding these terms and searching out others, but also of setting limits to interpretation. Translation as interpretation, therefore, does not really mean that it is whatever you make of it; on the contrary, it is not only difficult and demands a higher awareness to perform, but will likewise be guided by an attempt to realize the

loving and careful fitting together of shape with shape in order to create a new whole. No doubt, Benjamin chose to speak in metaphors and analogies for a reason, even though they may be frustrating for the more empirically oriented field of TS. However, we could here invoke Plato who very often brings his dialogues analytically to a point beyond which inductive logic will not carry the line of thought; at that point, if he does not suspend the argument in an *aporia*, he often uses a parable, myth or analogy. Such forms of thinking by analogy nonetheless carry analytic weight. As a part of the conceptual framework of the translator, maintaining the notion of creating a relation to the source whereby together they "belong to an organic whole," as Derrida puts it (193), and form a "symbolic complementarity" (201), is one way of setting limits to interpretation.

As mentioned above, Benjamin notes that in translation the original both continues to exist and "undergoes a change" (34). This should be glossed. Antoine Berman talks about translation as something that "potentiates" the original, it reveals something a mere reading or criticism cannot (6-7). I see this idea in Benjamin's intimation that the translation performs an Aristotelian process of actualization (in Aristotle's thinking, change happens when *potency* is *actualized*). In that regard, when Benjamin says, "Translation is a form" (30), I believe that he is invoking the notion of "form" in Aristotle's philosophy, and making translation the formal cause in Aristotle's four-fold causality, his philosophical system governing all natural processes of change (which is why it is essential to translate this word as "form" and not as "mode" as Larry Zohn does). In any case, "potentiating," that is, releasing the potency or power residing in the original, or actualizing the material of the original, inscribes translation within a conceptual frame that reinforces the holistic unity of both the source text and the enacted translation. It also sets up guiders for the translator, demanding that attention be focused on carrying out this process and not in pursuing his/her own personal goals. Another figure from Plato's Socrates is apposite here: the notion of the philosopher as a midwife helping his fellow citizens give birth to their thought. Translation is also maieutic, its purpose is to assist in birth or re-birth, in creation, as will be discussed further under *Nachleben*.

Levý, as always in this sequence of thinkers, has gone much further in working out the practical, concrete applications of abstract notions, such as organicism, to the translation of literature, but he does not leave the philosophical conceptual frame behind. That Levý considers the work of art likewise as having a holistic existence, one that must be apprehended, captured

and restylized by the translator (to use his three terms), is clear. Citing the critic Zenon Klemensiewicz, Levý states, "The original should be regarded as a system and not as a sum of elements, as an organic whole and not a mechanical collection of elements" (11). This has implications for the undertaking of the translator since a work of art is created when "a certain ideo-aesthetic content is realised in verbal material" (25), and the translator has to communicate the entire content (30). Here "communicate" is rendered more complex because it is put in the service of the ideo-aesthetic content, something that does not indicate a simple transfer from A to B. The first stage of translation Levý calls apprehension, which is clearly a form of interpretation; it is emphatically directed toward the work of art in its holistic unity, since, as he says, apprehension "facilitates appropriation of artistic wholes, i.e. of realities depicted in the work, such as characters, the relationships between them, the setting…and the author's ideological intention…" (34). It must be noted that reality in art does not entail simply finding the right linguistic equivalence for material objects (as is meant in TS by the misleading term *realia*), for it is easy to demonstrate to any first-year undergraduate that reality is more than the chair pushing against his or her backside (as one of my university teachers so memorably put it). Creating verisimilitude or truth-to-life in art is not a matter of reproduction or representation of material reality according to naive notions of realism; as Levý says, "Veracity in a work of art does not entail correspondence with reality; rather it entails capturing and conveying it" (61), that is, capturing and creating a life-like impression. Similarly, the requirement of veracity in translation practice is not in making "a naturalistic copy, …but [in] the communication of all the substantial attributes of the original to the reader" (61). This again sets limits. What those substantial attributes are, how that life-like impression is to be created, cannot be given in simplified instructions or based on any kind of mechanical, step-by-step process. Translation is a form of higher-order thinking requiring knowledge and informed by theoretical framing—it is a case of the architect vs. the carpenter, the abstract geometer vs. the skilled artisan, to return again to examples given by Plato's Socrates. We should note in Levý's comments an emphasis on both the artwork as a unified whole and the need for expert interpretation and understanding in order to apprehend the ideo-aesthetic content: "to translate a work of literature means to express it, maintaining the unity of its content and form, in different verbal material" (89). This imperative restricts the thoughtful translator. Moreover, Levý joins these two parts of the conceptual framework with Ingarden's philosophical notion of concretization, introduced above: "…what

should remain constant is not the realisation of the unity of content and form in that material, but its concretisation in the mind of the recipient…the semantic and aesthetic values the form has for the reader" (91). Awareness of the holistic quality of the work of literature and translation's relation to it helpfully inform the attitude of the literary translator and separate his/her labor from that of other translators and translation assignments.

1.2.2 The *Nachleben* and retranslation of literature

The notion of the work of art as having a life of its own—one that unfolds over decades, centuries, and even millennia, and is intersected and impacted by translation—is given an important place in the hermeneutic approach by including a view of the work's *Nachleben* and insisting on retranslation. These are two additional elements of the conceptual framework necessary for a literary translator.

As established above, Benjamin attributes a life force to works of literature. Developing the organic metaphor he states, "Translation therefore transplants the original…" (37), indicating that translation brings the life of a work forward in time. He develops this notion further by linking life and history, stating that "life is attributed to everything that possesses a history" (31-32). A work of literature is always available for transplantation in the new soil of the present, he seems to be saying, for having its life extended through translation; moreover, works of art are dignified by having a history. Translation, therefore, has a special place in extending a work's life "in the objective sense," since in translations "the life of the original attains its (ever-renewed) latest, most comprehensive development" (32). The role of translation in the unfolding history of the work of art, in literary study commonly referred to as its *Nachleben*, Benjamin revises to an even higher level by invoking a mystical relation to the Word at the end of the essay (41), and by punning on the German word *Leben* early on in the essay. Here he states that translation proceeds not from the work's life, but from its survival (*Überleben*), "…it denotes the stage of the original's continued existence (*Fortleben*)" (31). In Derrida's reading of Benjamin, where he too puns on the word "survival" in French (which makes it a kind of living above, *sur-vive*), the translation contributes to a work's reception by enabling the original to live on and transform itself (188): "The original gives itself in modifying itself; this gift is not an object given; it lives and lives on in mutation" (183). He too has recourse to mystical, sacred language in order to express the complex relation between the translation and the *Nachleben* of the original: "In a

mode that is solely anticipatory, annunciatory, almost prophetic, translation renders *present* an affinity that is never present in this presentation…" (187). In a further development of Benjamin, Derrida sees translation in terms of Kant's sublime, as "a presentation inadequate to that which is nevertheless presented" (187), a highly estimable characterization indeed of something that is often anxious about its own inferiority.

Steiner, with his emphatic inclusion of the time element, naturally also gives translation an essential role in the continued existence of literary works, but goes even further in asserting that translation is foundational to the building of civilization itself. Thereby, he too elevates translation to a prominent place within Western culture. Steiner starts with translation as interpretation, which carries language forward in time, using the metaphor of life as Benjamin does: "`Interpretation' [is] that which gives language life beyond the moment and place of immediate utterance or translation" (27). He then moves to the absolute necessity of intra-lingual translation for works of art: "Literature…has no chance of life outside constant translation within its own language. Art dies when we lose or ignore the conventions by which it can be read, by which its semantic statement can be carried over into our own idiom…". Finally, in this same passage, with the unspoken understanding that literature and art are essential for civilization, he claims the necessity of translation for the flourishing of sophisticated human cultures: "In short, the existence of art and literature…depend on a never-ending, though very often unconscious, act of internal translation. It is no overstatement to say that we possess civilization because we have learnt to translate out of time" (30/31). However, if we are operating within the category of civilization, then we must necessarily have moved out of the realm of internal translation and therefore be just as much dependent, if not more, on external translation. It is not only the Renaissance that is unimaginable without translation, but the intellectual basis of current modern political, scientific, social and aesthetic thought would be unthinkable without the translation of texts of Greek antiquity, the French Enlightenment, and 19th-century Germany, to name just three bodies of foreign-language cultural material. Nor should it be forgotten that some English cultural masterpieces, such as Thomas More's *Utopia* and Isaac Newton's *De Principia*, were originally written in Latin and require inter-lingual translation.

It is commonly asserted in TS that there is no one way to translate a text. However, it is left at this vague level. The proponents of the hermeneutic approach give this vague notion concrete form by positively insisting on the desirability of retranslation of literary works.

Retranslation is the logical outcome, in fact, of the line of reasoning of the preceding discussion. Retranslation unites the concept of the never-ending interpretation of the holistic work of art to its *Nachleben*. The most enduring monuments of translation in Western culture, such as the King James Version of the Bible, were not one-off translations, but rested on the efforts of predecessors. In much of the KJV it is William Tyndale's wording that rings out, collated and revised and compared with the readings of subsequent translators by the committee who compiled this unsurpassable work of literary art and monument of civilization. And lest we should fall into the trap of thinking that retranslation is restricted to the modernization of works, bringing the language "up-to-date" in order that readers need not work hard to understand or be confronted with any word or term they do not know the meaning of, it would be well to remember that this in itself is a chosen aesthetic value and not absolute. The 20th-century translator of Suetonius for the Loeb series praises the Elizabethan Philemon Holland as the greatest translator of that Roman author; and Steiner praises an early 20th-century translator of Plotinus as the greatest translator of that Greek author. Retranslation does not mean that some invisible hand is making each translation progressively better. In art there is no progress, as T.S. Eliot says. That is not to deny that critical mass is essential for good translations: that really excellent translations will only occur where many minds have worked over a text.

That translation is interpretation, as established above, leads naturally to the idea that retranslations are desirable. As Derrida says in his reading of Benjamin, a text can always be re-interpreted, and in fact this is a hallmark of an original work: "One recognizes a core (the original as such) by the fact that it can bear further translation and retranslating" (192). For Steiner, picking up the idea that literature has no life outside of constant translation, every generation interprets and therefore translates a different way: "As Dilthey was probably the first to emphasize, every act of understanding is itself involved in history…each age translates anew, …interpretation…is always reinterpretation, both of the original and of the intervening body of commentary" (249). Steiner's comments link the history of interpretation to Benjamin's notion of the history of the work itself. Furthermore, Steiner envisions the communal labor of translation as cumulative as well as distinctive, each generation having access to more and more knowledge about the source text.

In his analysis Levý often makes us of the analogy between theatrical acting (particularly the Stanislavski method) and translation, therefore it is natural for him to link them with regard to

retranslation. His thinking follows Steiner's remarkably closely, although his book was written before: "Just as there is no definitive, once and for all actor's interpretation of *Hamlet*, so there is no definitive translation conception. Every new interpretation is a fresh response to the work and through the work it also expresses the translator's attitude to the contemporary national cultural-political scene" (73). Retranslation offers a school for translators, guidelines, models and possibilities to be followed, rejected or reworked: "as in acting, each new translator takes account of previous interpretations, learning from his predecessors' experience and possibly also succumbing to the same pitfalls" (75).

For Ricoeur retranslation is not only for the professional translator, it is a task for every reader. Since translation is, on one level, "the critical reading of a few…specialists," because as already stated, the translator is first of all a reader, translation is also, on another level, that which the capable reader redoes for his own purposes (7). Retranslation is an exercise in doubling the work of the translator—"retranslate after the translator," Ricoeur says (10), a dictum that accords well with the foundational idea of translation as interpretation and the never-ending process of understanding a literary work. Ricoeur also provides a place for professional retranslation; in fact, as he argues, the work of translation shows itself most clearly in retranslation: "And the only way of criticizing a translation…is to suggest another supposed, alleged, better or different one" (1998: 22). He hints at Steiner's notion that translation is a ground for civilization when he says, "the *work* of translation, …shows itself most clearly in the phenomenon of re-translation which one observes at the level of humanity's great texts…" (34; emphasis in original), hence not just translation but retranslation structures modern cultures, whether they are aware of it or not. But Ricoeur reverses the sequence between internal and external translation, putting inter-lingual translation first: this phenomenon of retranslation is not limited to the Bible, Plato and Shakespeare, for "[n]or do we stop retranslating within the same cultural zone" (34).

The literary translator is well advised to have the concept of retranslation solidly built into his/her conceptual framework. On the one hand, this license's consultation and collaboration with others, living or dead, for as the great English translator of Russian Robert Chandler says, translators should consult their predecessors.[2] On the other hand, it relativizes the translator's

[2] "All translations credited to myself are the product of greater or lesser degrees of collaboration with my wife Elizabeth, with the many people who have checked through drafts, and—in the case of earlier and better known stories—with previous translators. Many translators avoid looking at the work of their predecessors; others evidently do look but are ashamed to admit it. This is

own efforts, since they provide a ground for further reworking in a continual chain of interpretations as translations. Therefore, retranslation can be guard against the egotism of the translator. In the consultation of predecessors the translator must be on-guard to avoid *inscribing* a translation choice based strictly on the novelty of a reading, and, likewise, on-guard against the egotism of *rejecting* a predecessor's choice as a matter of course.

1.3 *The task of the translator*

1.3.1 Creative language use

The literary translator, in order to overcome the interpretive lacunae in every text, will need to actually create not only language, but a complete work of art; in doing so, the translator must become an author too. The proponents of the hermeneutic approach mandate the translator in the creative use of language and so welcome strangeness, but they also link creativity with the work's organic wholeness, which in turn limits interpretation. These principles impact the working methods of the translator. The concept of linguistic strangeness finds theoretical grounding in the early twentieth-century Russian Formalists' theory that art should defamiliarize the familiar and that literary language is a language apart from the everyday (see the work of Viktor Shklovsky). Defamiliarization or "making strange" is one of the ways art gives us new insight and perspective, transcends the mundane, and enhances our (ethical) imaginations. By licensing the translator's creativity, moreover, the translator must be prepared to develop new literary and linguistic forms (the opposite, it should be noted, of the DS/MS drive for norms). Creativity should not be focused on meaning alone: the sound in literary translation is of the utmost importance and something the translator is working at in every revision of the TT. Ricoeur is one of the few who directly addresses this issue: "translating the isolated meaning means repudiating an achievement of contemporary semiotics, the unity of meaning and sound"; instead there should be "some talk of tone, of savour, of rhythm, of spacing, of silence between words, of metrics and of rhyme" (38). Thus creative language use is demanded of the translator on different levels.

---

surprising: in most fields of human endeavour ignorance of previous work in a given field is considered unacceptable. I have many times been saved from a misunderstanding, or helped towards a more satisfactory rendering, by looking at earlier translations—especially those of the often underrated Constance Garnett." Chandler, xviii.

Roman Jakobson may be considered to have been a member of the Russian Formalist school in his younger days; he also wrote avant-garde works and translated poetry. Clearly, these experiences gave him a deeper understanding of literature and led him to endorse the creativity of the translator. In his essay, the idea that "on the level of interlingual translation, there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units…" (233) accords with the principle that the linguistic sign contains both equivalence and difference; furthermore, the lack of full equivalence leads to the conclusion that "[o]nly creative transposition is possible" in intra-lingual, inter-lingual, or inter-semiotic translation (238). The translator, therefore, cannot merely follow some kind of normative procedure. Jakobson further licenses the "creative transposition" of the translator in his arguments against untranslatability, something he categorically rejects. As he asserts, "All cognitive experience and its classification is conveyable in any existing language. Whenever there is deficiency, terminology may be qualified and amplified by loanwords or loan-translations, neologisms or semantic shifts, and finally, by circumlocutions" (234). Translators therefore have to creatively deploy such techniques, but all languages provide enough material for translators to work with in order to convey cognitive experience. In fact, Jakobson is a translational optimist, believing that every problem can find a creative solution and that there are no objective, external linguistic boundaries to translation: "No lack of grammatical device in the language translated into makes impossible a literal translation of the entire conceptual information contained in the original" (235). Finally, Jakobson implicates the creativity of both reader and translator when he discredits the naïve-realism approach to language in a counterthrust to Bertrand Russell, who claimed that it is impossible to understand "cheese" unless one has had an experience of "cheese" (232). Here Jakobson makes a point of supreme relevance for the translation of imaginative literature: "We never 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" (232). Jakobson's remark is apt and convincing, the powers of the human imagination extend far beyond simple epistemological correspondences with material existence. Therefore, it would be well for the literary translator not to be excessively solicitous of the reader and underestimate that person's imagination and powers of interpretation; such a misplaced concern results in over-interpretation. The fictional worlds of the literary—Keats's "realms of gold"—admit of extensive travels among the unfamiliar and even the fantastical, where the

recipient's mind is capable of "concretization" of the most singular, outlandish, and peculiar scenes and situations (a faculty exploited by modern advertising). Moreover, readers of literature can quite easily manage and learn to relish vocabulary that is strange, arcane, difficult, or obscure. Until very recently almost all children in Western culture were exposed to the strange language of the Hebrew Bible and New Testament in translation, without knowing what many words, phrases, and parables meant. Literature by its very nature provides material to ponder. The translator needs to avoid what Coleridge calls "anxious grasping after fact." Jakobson's pointed remarks indicate that readers have already been inducted into the strange and defamiliarizing world of literature and myth, and he gives a direct admonition to literary translators to make creative use of their linguistic faculties without shutting down or blocking readers' abilities to make creative use of theirs.

Steiner goes even further in this regard to categorically reject the desirability of serving the reader by massaging the text, watering down lexical choices, or filling in gaps and elisions in meaning. In the Western tradition, the rhetorical idea that language is more persuasive if the audience figures things out for itself and makes connections between ideas in their own minds is a principle that goes back to Cicero and Quintilian. Granting the reader's right to interpretation for Steiner is something assumed and rests on the already stated principle that language is subject to mutation at every moment. And since all language is idiolectic, as he asserts, "The concept of a normal or standard idiom is a statistically-based fiction…" (46), hence norms simply do not exist. Instead, "language is intuitive," it is "instantaneously creative," and this, I conclude, mandates the use of the translator's intuitions and creativity. Just as, in Steiner's words, we are always preparing to read a great author (25), a translator is always preparing to translate. He/she can develop powers of intuition by reading and studying more, since intuition is based on knowledge and experience. In addition, language itself is creative of thought and feeling, as Steiner argues (citing Croce): language acts on, expands, and alters "the potential of thought and sensibility" (244), reinforcing an idea (stated by Ricoeur above) that the relation between language and thought is complex. In the current discussion, the idea of expanding the reader's mind may remind us that the continuous flow of the literary work, the context created in it and by it, the "fictional world," is what carries the reader along while also, at the same time, extending and altering that person's potential for thought and sensibility. Reading should change a person by informing and enlarging powers of perception, and the reading of a translation in particular

should expand the reader's knowledge of the source culture. Creativity and strangeness have an important place in this regard.

Benjamin also makes a claim for the creativity of the translator in giving him/her a role as the co-writer of the new work. Simply stated, the translator is an author. This rests on the hermeneutical concept that the essence of a work of literature, as he says, "is seen universally as the incomprehensible, mysterious, 'writerly' component…The part that the translator can reproduce only by—becoming a writer himself…" (30). Here is another very important concept for literary translation that must be taken to heart: the translator is also a creative writer and is therefore responsible for the creation and cohesion of all the elements of the translation, just as the original writer was responsible for those things in the source text. Like Jakobson, Benjamin seems also to think (despite his endorsement of untranslatability elsewhere in the essay) that every language can express all cognitive experience, but he goes further, saying that this is in fact what connects them and so makes translation possible: "languages are not 'foreign' to one another but instead are *a priori* and regardless of any historical links related to one another in what they are trying to say" (33). Languages intend meaning in the same way as a kind of dynamic vector rather than as an assortment of fixed objects, and thus it is the task of the translator to recreate what this intention is.

In his reading of Benjamin, Derrida too inscribes the need to for the "acknowledgement of some originality in the translation" (196), which leads to the need to create new, unfamiliar forms. He grants a freedom to the translator, who must eventually transgress "the limits of the translating language, [and] in transforming it in turn, must extend, enlarge, and make language grow" (189). In historical process over time, the defamiliarized will become common currency, just as Shakespeare's made up lines and phrases or the peculiarities of the KJV have become fixtures in modern English. Building on Steiner's comment above, then, as reading and language expand the human mind, so the translator expands language; this is a continuous cultural cycle.

In Ricoeur's thinking, too, translation creates language by seeking out that equivalence between languages which can, however, never be attained. Translators are understood to be creators because, he says, "In actual fact, the…true nature of equivalence…is *produced* by translation rather than *presupposed* by it" (35; emphasis in original). Hence, Ricoeur proposes, "we solved the mystery of equivalence by constructing it," making translation a "construction of the comparable" (37). These are both ways of exceeding limits. In producing equivalence and

constructing a comparable linguistic structure, the translator will have to work creatively starting from his/her source of knowledge and intuition, not, as is often assumed, from the lexical unit: "…the work of the translator does not move from the word to the sentence, to the text, to the cultural group, but conversely: absorbing vast interpretations of the spirit of a culture, the translator comes down again from the text, to the sentence and to the word" (31). Ricoeur here perceptively reverses the problem of literal translation and indicates that every translation really starts from extra-textual understanding and the flexible application of knowledge. Interpretation is primary, but for all these theorists, language itself mandates the creative process. Thus when Ricoeur says, "A good translation can aim only at a supposed *equivalence* that is founded on a demonstrable *identity* of meaning" (22; emphasis in original), invoking again the model of a dynamic vector of intention, we can understand this "identity of meaning" between languages as akin to Benjamin's *a priori* relation and Jakobson's conveyability of all cognitive experience; it is the ground of what Ricoeur calls "the very fact of translation" (13).

Jiří Levý offers the most extensive analysis of the translator's creativity. First, for Levý, "The translator is *an author*…whose poetics can be studied…" (14; emphasis added). Translation is (or should attain to) an art, and so just as the original author gives "an artistic stylisation of reality," the translator should give "an artistic re-stylisation of the source" (47). The translator's creativity is primarily engaged in lexical choices (in order to "enrich [the TL] culture by domesticating exoticisms as well as by creating neologisms" [76]), and style (the translator needs "the gift of style…above all" [47]). In fact, the translator may need to invent or promote new genres, means of expression and stylistic values not yet evolved in the TL literature. Levý elevates, dignifies, and increases the responsibility accruing to the translator as author by saying that "[t]ranslation is…an *original creative process* taking place in a given linguistic environment" (57; emphasis added). As such, the "artistic dimension of [the translator's] activity goes beyond the mere practical application of contrastive grammar or stylistics" (57) (i.e., norms), in fact it is in mastering the use of inventiveness and choice that the translator reaches "the point at which craft becomes art" (55). Second, then, inventiveness and choice in translation are the key techniques Levý would have the translator deploy as author. Creativity entails choosing from among alternative forms: "The greater the set of possible alternatives, the greater the translator's opportunity for creativity… particularly in the case of more complex expressions and higher-order units, there is more choice" (55). Moreover, these choices among alternatives

are posited in contradistinction to translation norms, since "stereotyped solutions in certain situations are the result of limited creativity" (53). But true creativity also means setting limits to inventiveness, it "entails subordinating inventiveness to selectivity, the capability of being selectively inventive" (55). Third, on what basis does the translator effect this? It takes a combination of knowledge and intuition: in order to cope with the great variety of expressive means and make the appropriate choices requires "vivid linguistic imagination" (55). The creative powers of the imagination used to interpret the ST are essential: "The gift of imagination is vital in translators…The main difference between creative and mechanical translators is that *en route* from the original to the translation creative translators are able to imagine the realities they are expressing, reading beyond the text to identify the characters, situations, and ideas that lie behind it, whereas non-creative translators merely perceive the text mechanically and merely translate the words" (34). It is not surprising that creativity ultimately rests on powers of interpretation for "[t]he better the translator's understanding of the work, the more pre-determined is the choice of translation solutions, and the greater the translator's artistic and linguistic talent, the more refined the available means enabling him to arrive at this appropriate interpretation" (56). Creativity therefore depends on imagination and interpretation, both in reading the ST and writing the TT, and is limited by being selectively inventive. An additional limitation is formed by taking the *reader's* right to interpretation and imagination into account. Here Levý again effectively uses a theatre analogy: just as a set designer takes into account the audience's perspective, so the translator must take the different acquired knowledge and aesthetic experience possessed by the readers of the TT into account, while still preserving the "semantic and aesthetic values" and conveying them creatively.

Rem tene, verba sequentur (grasp the subject and the words will follow). Cato the Elder's motto succinctly summarizes the approach every author needs to take towards his/her task. Good authors must do much more than pick the right word, and likewise the translator as author must do much more than pick the right word. Creativity is an essential part of the translator's task that both licenses translation with tremendous freedom but, at the same time, restricts translation by setting limits. These limits are inherent in the *sui generis* nature of translation, which itself is not mimetic in a primary but in a secondary way; it must, nonetheless, create a fictional world for readers to inhabit.

1.3.2 The translator's labor and linguistic hospitality

From the foregoing discussion it will be clear that the literary translator requires a highly developed sense of awareness of what it is he/she is doing. For Berman, the ethics of translation require an "analytic of translation," where the translator subjects him/herself to (psycho)analysis using the same ascetic and self-scrutinizing operation (6). The project of translating a literary work will be an arduous one. This follows from the fundamental notion that hermeneutics is difficult, even the interpretation of a work in one's native tongue, but that that difficulty is magnified by the demand for creative transposition in order to solve translation problems and reduce them to writing (and, since Pliny, it has been noted that the translator is a special kind of hermeneut who is only allowed one solution per problem).

The hermeneutical imperative and creative mandate, however, do not license unlimited manipulation of the ST. Limits to balance these freedoms have already been suggested, as when the translator, in carefully "constructing the comparable" with attention to the holistic unity of the original, must fit the original in such a way that together ST and TT form an organic whole. This, too, requires arduous (mental) labor and at the same time excludes parody, pastiche, and other forms that damage, distort, or do violence to the ST in the creation of a new work, for the latter would neither respect the organic unity of the original nor form a new organic unity with it in translation. This part of the conceptual framework acts as a guard against over-interpretation and undue explicitation—the "helpful" filling in of interpretive lacunae and gaps in order to supposedly serve the reader, where the translator shows off his/her understanding of the meaning, but by doing so actually blocks the reader's ability to interpret and "concretize" the work for him/herself. As Levý says, the freedom of interpretation in translation is subject to similar constraints as those imposed on interpretation in literary criticism: there is no place for subjective notions (44). Above all, the translator will have to be highly self-aware in order to, according to Levý, "not impose his personal conception, either ideological or artistic, on the original text" (47). Furthermore, he corroborates Berman's notion of self-scrutiny when he says that "translation requires not only a more in-depth understanding but above all a more conscious understanding" (32).

That translation is a form of labor for theorists of the hermeneutic approach is given primacy through the choice of the word "Aufgabe" in the title of Benjamin's seminal essay—"Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers"—which can mean task, assignment, problem, but also giving up.

Derrida makes a point, in this regard, of differentiating the translator from translation when he sharply observes, "Benjamin situates the *problem*, in the sense of that which is precisely *before oneself* as a task, as the problem of the translator and not that of translation…Benjamin does not say the task or the problem of translation" (179; emphasis in original). These remarks serve to foreground the position of the person translating, the role that one is taking up, and therefore the kind of awareness, preparation, and commitment required for it. Like the scribes who copy sacred texts, the literary translator must embark on his/her undertaking in the right frame of mind, then the task itself will become a limit and set restrictions, as the translator submits to serving the *Nachleben* of the original work. For Steiner, fulfilling the "never-ending task of the translator" (48) means laboring to read and grasp poetry and philosophy, but ultimately it "is to undertake an elaborate, finally 'undecidable' task of semantic reconstruction" (242-3). At this point, the translator must give him/herself over to the notion that retranslations of his/her translation will follow. The translator's work of transmitting literature will not be done in one translation.

Ricoeur, like Steiner, advances the idea of labor in the ever-seeking of equivalence and the notion that in translation, work advances with some acceptance of loss (3). But he also understands labor in a different way and not just as arduous exertion, ignoring Derrida's caveat: "Translation is definitely a task, then, not in the sense of a restricting obligation, but in the sense of *the thing to be done* so that human action can simply continue…" (19; emphasis in original). Ricoeur reminds us in his essay that translation has been a fact of Western culture and literary history at least since Herodotus visited Egypt, and no matter how difficult it is to theorize, there is always the simple fact of its abundant existence. Therefore, while "translation remains a risky operation always in search of its theory" (14), this is counterbalanced by the sheer fact of translation. He seems to imply that translation is essential to and has been practiced by all cultures as part of their survival, and, I would add, translation lies at the point of origin of Western literature whether we consider Ancient Israel's translations of Near Eastern love poetry in the *Song of Songs* or the influences of Asian literature on Pythagoras and Plato. Here, as in every great age of translation, in every historical translation movement, Steiner's remark about the Renaissance obtains: "A common humanity made translation possible" (246). Steiner's claim that translation is essential to civilization, stated above, focuses on the result, but this comment points to a comparable cultural basis for translation that goes along with Benjamin's claim that

languages themselves have such an *a priori* relation. Translation is the task, the labor, the thing to be done, and in being done has made a tremendous contribution to human cultural undertakings.

In another gesture, an allusion perhaps to the wanderings of Homer's Odysseus and his reception by King Alcinous, Ricoeur invents the wonderful metaphor of translation as a form of "linguistic hospitality"—"where the pleasure of dwelling in the other's language is balanced by pleasure of receiving the foreign word at home" (10). This lifts the labor of translation above the mundane and balances it with a reward and a limitation. First, translation is a source of pleasure, an idea not often encountered in TS literature, but one that may be collated with the loving attitude Benjamin inscribes in the metaphor of piecing together the broken amphora ("lovingly and precisely mimic the original's manner of meaning in its own language"). Second, being conscious of the linguistic Other means practicing a form of respect for that Other without leveling, erasing or disabling difference. To the contrary, for "linguistic hospitality" to make any sense strangeness and foreignness must be preserved, there must be an actual encounter with this Other and that must be preserved by the translator. It has been said that self-awareness is awareness of the Other. The many aspects of the labor of the translator balance his/her intuitive and creative freedoms and thereby set limits to interpretation.

There is another kind of very practical work which enhances, extends and sets limits to the translator's task: the task of editing. Steiner is one of the few theorists who recognizes the translator's and the reader's need to apply the work of study to the task of interpretation: "both the 'external' and 'internal' translator…have recourse to lexica, historical grammars, glossaries of particular periods, professions, or social milieux, dictionaries of argot, manuals of technical terminology. In either case the means of penetration are a complex aggregate of knowledge, familiarity, and re-creative intuition" (28). However, no one, to my knowledge, except A. Schlegel, remarks on the need of the translator to supply paratexts for TL readers in order to enhance and enable their reading experience. The second part of this study will consider just what such a practical dimension can offer the translator. *Translator redactor*, the translator as editor, affords some compensation to the unavoidable role of betrayer, the traditional *translator traductor*, who is bound to face the loss of meaning in the final text. How editorial decisions and the compiling of paratexts can restore lost meaning is the topic of the next section.

Part II, Practice

The literary translator as editor and the limits of interpretation

Introduction to Part II

As stated in the Introduction and Part I, based on the thinking of the hermeneutic approach, the *reader* of any literary translation is also an interpreter and interpretive translator of the text. As such, the reader's right to undertake this task as fully as possible must be safeguarded. It is a basic cognitive fact that readers educate themselves by reading, and are, moreover, capable of taking in quite a high percentage of material that exceeds their understanding, often holding it in reserve until further reading clarifies its meaning. The reader is a self-tutor, and the human mind is hard-wired for making inferences—this is how we learn. Therefore, the inexhaustible process of interpreting a literary work includes the intra-lingual reader of the TT, it is not just an admonition to the inter-lingual translator of the ST.

Due to misguided notions about making things easier for the reader, modern translators often limit the reader's ability to interpret the text by making translational choices that obscure or block reader interpretation. Nida, in his theorizing of the translation of the Christian Bible, for example, is pleased to find equivalences in TL cultures to substitute and replace material items in the ST; by doing so, however, he blocks his readers' ability to learn about the SL culture and more importantly, to learn to interpret the work on their own, especially in its interconnected wholeness. For example, when Nida makes a substitution for the phrase "white as snow" in his translation of the Hebrew Bible for an African tribe where snow is unknown, translating the phrase as "white as an egret feather," he is preventing both learning about the SL culture and blocking related contextualized interpretation of other passages in the Bible. As far as untranslatability is concerned, according to Jakobson such a thing does not exist, it is a question of the translator's creativity in creating a word for snow should such a material item not be represented already in the TL; as he aptly puts it, we never consumed ambrosia and we never met a god—surely stranger things than snow in Africa. Even a cursory consideration of the history of a language such as English also immediately exposes the fact that languages absorb words for previously unknown or strange material items at a terrific rate. In connection with learning about a work via interpretation of other passages, it should be known that, for the complex compilation of Judaeo-Christian Scriptural texts (the word Bible is from the plural form, *biblos*, hence

"Books" rather than "Book"), a traditional strategy is to interpret *Torah betoch Torah*, that is, to use another passage in the work to illuminate the meaning of that being studied. This traditional Jewish method was also carried over into Christian hermeneutics, and in fact is a primary method in the interpretation of any work of literature: the reader is enlightened when he/she compares a different passage, line, chapter, or verse. Internal comparison of passages is an important element in performing analysis by close reading. We can ask questions of texts, and our understanding proceeds and develops by comparison. By changing "snow" to "egret feather" Nida is preventing the reader of the translation from learning what snow is and from accessing related ideas or passages—other references to snow, other references to water or melting, other references to something extremely rare, for snow is not a common material item in Near Eastern cultures, then as now most inhabitants of the Near East had themselves never seen snow, and yet the original author or authors of the ST chose this unusual, uncommon feature for the metaphor "white as snow." Moreover, Nida's "feather" sets up a kind of interpretive interference by creating false connections between this passage and other lines or verses where there are legitimate references to feathers, wings or birds in the ST. Such interference results in a terrible distortion of the ST and more ink would have to be spilled in order to set the wrong connections right than there would be in preserving "snow" and letting the reader remain in a quandary about what it is. As the hermeneutic approach makes absolutely clear, no text worthy of the name literature can ever be completely interpreted anyway, certainly not by one reader or in one reading. Therefore, translating literature by "bringing the text to the reader" often results in a blockage of the reader's ability to interpret the text on his/her own; it blocks the ability to learn about the text, both to make sense of it as a whole and by relating and comparing different passages, which forms one of the primary aids to interpretation. It also prevents learning about the SL culture. Surely, then, such a practice cannot be considered a successful strategy from the point of view of pedagogy.

In practical terms, the bare text of the inter-lingual translation of a literary work cannot be made to carry the entire burden of interpretation on its own. One expedient is to place some of that burden into the apparatus accompanying the conceived book, as opposed to the translator limiting his/her attention to the verbal content of the text alone. The translator as book editor who envisions a complete material item in the hands of the reader, and not simply the words that make up the translated portion of the text, has many additional means at his/her disposal to "bring the text to the reader" that do not, at the same time, block the reader's ability to interpret, learn, and

gain insight on his/her own. In fact, such paratexts do the opposite: they enhance the reader's interpretation with maximal freedom by leaving the access of auxiliary resources entirely up to the reader him/herself. A map, glossary of names, wordlist, subject index, preface, or chronology of life and works of the author may be used for "consultation reading" at will, offering much to the reader who desires to pursue his/her own private interpretive transformation of the work.

2.1 *The literary translator as book compiler*

Gerard Genette's classic *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretations* (first published as *Seuils* in 1987) is, as he says himself, only an introductory exploration of this concept and certainly not the last word on it. Although its focus is on books of the 19th and 20th centuries published in French, it nonetheless provides some useful theoretical underpinnings for the present study. Genette defines paratextuality, according to the author of the English foreword Richard Macksey, as liminal devices and conventions (texts) that mediate the book to the reader and are placed both within the book (peritexts) and outside it (epitexts). The current discussion therefore technically only focuses on peritexts, but I will continue to use the more general term paratexts. In his previous work *Palimsestes*, which addresses a general poetics of transtextuality, Genette differentiates paratextuality, according to Macksey, from four other types in a five element schema of ascending abstraction: intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality, and architextuality (xviii-xix). Where does translation fit in this schema or in relation to paratextuality? In *Paratexts*, Genette himself states that he has consciously excluded translation, which he does in fact see as a form of paratextuality, because it is simply too big a topic (405); it is for the same reason, he says, that he also does not treat serial publication and illustration.

A theoretical foundation for Genette's notion of paratexts, again according to Macksey, is the definition of a literary work as something "rigorously intentional"—the work is "an intentional aesthetic object" (xvii). Thus Genette limits his thinking to works of literature as the material basis for his study, which accords well with the ideas put forward by the proponents of the hermeneutic approach in Part I of this study as well as my own in the Introduction. Moreover, he supports the idea attributed to Levý above, that such works do not exist except in the mind of the reader—a work of literature must be *actualized*—an idea given support by Steiner, Berman, Benjamin and the others. Furthermore, also in support of Steiner, Genette finds that readers too have a share in the process of creating the "intentional aesthetic object" because one never reads

the same book twice; Macksey quotes Genette here: “The work is never reducible to its immanent object, because its being is inseparable from its action” (xvii). In addition, just as Derrida refers to translation as making something present, Genette sees the paratext as having the same purpose: paratexts present the text, make it present, and ensure the text’s presence in the world (Genette 1). And in his conclusion Genette writes, the paratext “provides a kind of canal lock between the ideal and relatively immutable identity of the text and the empirical (sociohistorical) reality of the text’s public…Or, if you prefer, the paratext provides the airlock that helps the reader pass without too much respiratory difficulty from one world to the other…” (408). Interestingly, Genette states that books choose their readers and paratexts play an important role in this process. For example, the chief function of the original authorial preface, he says, is “to ensure that the text is read properly” (197); this statement carries two distinguishable points: 1) to get the book read, 2) to get the book read properly (197). That the authorial preface provides information and guidance on how to read the book leads back to the notion of books choosing their readers, because guiding the reader means situating him/her and thus determining who he/she is (209; 212). As well as guidance and selection, the purpose of the preface is to promote the text: this entails, for an authorial preface, putting a high value on the subject matter and arguing its usefulness (in order to avoid self-praise) (198; 200), while for an allographic preface (written by someone other than the author), high praise of the text becomes a recommendation and information becomes a presentation (264-65). This is because for an allographic preface the function of recommending, Genette says, is usually implicit in the fact that it is not the author speaking but another who is promoting the text to a third party. As will have been evident by his focus on functionality and pragmatics expressed in this discussion of the preface, with its emphasis on promotion, guidance and selection, Genette pays little attention to the hermeneutical and interpretive role of paratexts. This is something I would like to consider in the following discussion. In this section I will make specific reference to the example of my translation of Constantijn Huygens’s prose autobiography.

2.1.1 Book culture

Two aspects of book culture the translator needs to be informed and consciously aware of in selecting and preparing paratexts are the material forms books take, in both the SL and TL cultures, and readership in those cultures. The translator needs to be consciously aware of what

readers are used to seeing and holding in their hands when they pick up a book in each of the two book cultures he/she is negotiating and the differences between them. For example, Dutch books often make greater use of creativity in graphic design than English (art) books—from colors and letter type to graphic use of text and illustrations. For example, a recent book on the painters of the Laren school uses two different fonts in two different colors, one for the captions (blue) and one for the body of the text (black); it also uses a rainbow of pastel tints in bold block type for the table of contents and the end-papers are a rich saffron gold. Such adventurousness would not be found in English art books. Another Dutch example is a recent edition and translation of an ancient Egyptian text: the entire book is done in turquoise and sienna brown (printed either blue on brown or brown on blue), and some pages are more or less empty with only a few lines of text. This does not look like any English language book I have ever seen. English books, on the other hand, especially literature, have much more in the way of apparatus. Readers of classic English novels (but not the latest crop of fiction), for example, are used to and expect introductions, notes, and other explanatory material to be provided (a book-cultural convention which has expanded in the last several decades). This practice follows Steiner's admonition that, with historical time lapse, intra-lingual readers must work harder to interpret and understand texts in their own language. Such reading aids fulfill this necessary pedagogical function, leaving the reader free to consult them at will. There are numerous examples of this practice in the Oxford World's Classics and Penguin Classics series—from Austen to Woolf, and from Catullus to Proust.[3] But providing paratexts in Dutch novels, whether in one's own language or in translation, is generally frowned upon or seen as too scholastic in Dutch book culture. For example, the translation of *Don Quixote* by Barber van der Pol eschews paratexts which the translator, in her own words, sees as too academic, preferring rather to put her expert knowledge into the publication of articles. However, this means that readers must go in search of such aids to interpretation. A recent edition of Couperus's *Eline Vere* provides no notes explaining the many references to opera, for example, but in a short afterword enlightens the reader by explaining that the drug, which eventually leads to Eline's death, is an opiate. Such information might be more useful in an endnote early in the book so that the modern reader can be thinking about the broader implications and the author's handling of this element with more specificity.

[3] In order to get a sense of how wide spread the reading of literature in translation is in university classrooms in the English-speaking world, I have provided an appendix with a preliminary list of the texts in translation I have taught over my 16 years of teaching experience in Canada.

This last example raises a second important issue that accompanies the material and physical form of the work and that is the question of readership. Since, as Genette maintains, books select their readers and it is the purview of paratexts to aid in this process, the translator must give full attention to the issue of what readerships he/she wishes to target. In Dutch book culture, works of literature are generally pitched at a general or common reader, who wants to access the text as leisure occupation without having to work at the meaning; the Dutch reader's skills in interpretation are assumed to be already sufficiently formed for any work of literature by a process of general cultural education. However, as general cultural forming falls behind and focuses more and more only on contemporary issues, this means that Dutch readers are ill-equipped to interpret older works of literature, with the result that these works are no longer read, familiar, or even widely available. Furthermore, material book presentation affects readership. One of the reasons English books contain so many paratexts is that there is a different expectation about readerships. Most English readers of works of literature are university educated, hence they have learned to navigate through endnotes and introductions; they are more aware of their own literary and cultural history and therefore more open to expanding their knowledge; since they are less able to read in other languages this makes the English reader more curious about the different worlds of the past; and many works of literature in the Penguin and Oxford World's Classics series, or comparable series, target college and university students, and therefore will be used in a context where the text will be studied, rather than read only as a leisure activity, under the tutelage of a live teacher. Nonetheless, every reader is a self-tutor and no one can understand any text unless he/she reads it for herself. Summaries, synopsies, lectures, seminars, film versions, or hearsay cannot make up for the reader's self-tutoring.

Some emphasis has been placed in TS on making the translator aware of what would be familiar to the original readers and what then needs to be explained to the TT readers (e.g. Lambert and Van Gorp). However, it is easy to make facile assumptions about what original readers would have known, and moreover such groups are never homogeneous or single. For example, it is often said that Constantijn Huygens only wrote his unfinished prose autobiography for his children and progeny because he addresses them directly in the text (but often, be it noted, with the word *posteritas* which may have wider connotations), and he never had it published. However, he preserved it and annotated it at a later date or dates, adding marginalia with specific dates and intertextual references. The manuscript as we have it was begun in 1629 and completed

in 1631, showing that he had not lost interest in it over a several year hiatus. He also makes references to other readers in the text—both by flattery/praise (e.g. those who are more expert in matters of visual art) and by insult/blame (e.g. petty-minded schoolmasters). In addition, we can never limit our notion of readership to those who are specifically addressed in the text. Huygens is promoting educational reforms based on the pedagogical innovations of his father—clearly he had the objective of disseminating those ideas more widely. Then again, he makes a record of his family in such a way as to make a claim for their status within Dutch Renaissance society, thereby also promoting his family name—a very useful undertaking for a courtier. Thirdly, writing in Latin he is participating in and addressing an international European audience, a male audience, and numerous references to Classical culture reinforce such a shared background. Finally, he also promotes Dutch art and artists in a 20-page section of the text clearly aimed at a wider Dutch and European readership of those with an interest in these new, widely available material objects.

In the two existing translations into Dutch of the prose autobiography, the two translators have taken quite different approaches to their task with a specific readership in mind. Kan has attempted to preserve the long periods of the original Latin as much as possible and give some flavor of the original. As he himself says, his strategy was according to the axiom: "Zoo woordelijk als mogelijk, zoo letterlijk als noodig is" (125). Therefore he sees his readership as educated Dutch readers who are willing to encounter the strangeness of Renaissance prose in their reading, and his translation is, to this day, praised by such Dutch readers. Heesakkers, on the other hand, has clearly translated for a common reader by breaking up the long periods into shorter, easy-to-read sentences, disentangling convoluted syntax, and substituting words and terms with modern words and terms. This is clearly a strategy of "bringing the text to the reader." However, both editions do make use of paratexts in order to give the reader access to data about the wealth of historical persons mentioned, references to Classical culture, phrases in Greek, and more. For example, in his 1946 translation, A.H. Kan, with the help of G. Kamphuis, provides six black-and-white illustrations (portraits of Constantijn, his mother, father and brother). Following the translation (*Levensbeschrijving*), he presents the following paratexts: *Ter toelichting*, which gives textual-bibliographic information, a brief discussion of Huygens's life and works, and an analysis of his character; *Torrentius*, a short discussion of this controversial painter, for whom only one single canvas survives, the rest having been burnt; *Constantijn Huygens als*

kunstcriticus, a short discussion of that topic (by Kamphuis); a section called *Aanteekeningen* (sic) consisting of 34 pages of endnotes, dealing mostly with names of the many people mentioned, but also providing within the endnotes a family tree, indications of which words are marginalia in the MS, sources of Classical references, and even points in the text which Kan himself could not understand. Finally, he also gives a *Register op de autobiographie van Constantijn Huijgens* (sic), listing the many names of both ancient and modern characters mentioned in the text. C.L. Heesakkers in his 1987 translation in the Griffioen series put out by the publisher Querido, which also includes texts by Coornhert, Bredero, and Belle van Zuylen, to name a few, provides a table of contents listing the titles he gave to his own textual divisions with their page numbers, as a paratext before the translation. Following the translation he provides: a six-page *Nawoord* with historical-biographical context for the time of writing and some interpretation of the text, highlighting the author's techniques; *Verantwoording*, which takes care of textual-bibliographical data, acknowledgements, the translator's strategy, and a brief bibliography; 15 pages of endnotes (*Aantekeningen*); and an *index nominum* (*Register van door Huygens genoemde personen*). Heesakkers's paratexts are much more streamlined and easily accessible at a glance than those of Kan, whose text (as was mentioned before) is also harder to read because it is entirely continuous with approximately one paragraph break per page. These paratexts express the realization by both translators that modern Dutch readers will be aided in their interpretations by additional information.

The readership for my English translation is quite a bit more scholastic than the Dutch common reader, since the text is of first importance to art historians worldwide. In addition, it would make an excellent text for university and college classroom instruction, while not excluding a common reader with particular interests (but excluding the common reader of best-sellers, the lowest common denominator). The English readership therefore consciously includes art historians and students of art history, particularly of the Northern Renaissance; Renaissance scholars and their students in other sub-fields (e.g. literature, rhetoric); general readers and museum patrons with an interest in the Renaissance; readers of any level with an interest in memoirs; readers of any level with an interest in the history of education. In sum, many readerships are possible—both within and outside the academy—and not every paratext will be of interest to every group or at every reading. In line with the remarks about retranslation above, I have learned enormously from my Dutch predecessors and could not have undertaken this

translation without the aid of their translations, although I also re-evaluate their translation choices and sometimes interpret and translate differently. On the other hand, it would be impossible to retranslate the text solely on the basis of one of the Dutch translations, ignoring the original Latin. Like Kan I try to preserve the longer periods and archaic euphuistic word patterns: English readers of Shakespeare will be comfortable with such historicized mannerism. In addition, English with its large Latinate lexicon often supplies cognates for Latin words that are unavailable in Dutch, therefore I have the chance of echoing the original word sounds more closely. I am indebted to Heesakkers's readings in interpreting the text, and will carry over his textual divisions.

2.1.2 Form and formatting

As Genette says, books select their readers and therefore must be selective in what they present. The translator-editor should consider such issues of form as size, length, price, overall sequence, chapters and other divisions, as well as stylistic questions of formatting. The translator-editor should have specific, physical models and/or examples in both source and target culture in mind, or in hand, from which may be departed creatively. Some questions to consider are as follows: 1) Is it large or small book? A coffee table folio or *vade mecum*? Is it light-weight or scholarly? 2) How long will it be, both with and without apparatus? 3) Is it expensive or reasonably priced? What quality of paper should it have? 4) What kind of apparatus does it need? (to be discussed further below) 5)What kind of letter type? What size? And other issues of graphic design such as illustrations, endpapers, cover image, preferred colors, size of images, or figures. Further, the translator-editor should consider what the table of contents looks like (the content and order of items, i.e. the overall sequence of the book at a glance), and how the text will be divided into chapters and/or other divisions, including titles and sub-titles of chapters. Is the chosen book to be a continuous text, a collection, compilation or an anthology? An abridgement or selection?

In the case of the Huygens's autobiography, Heesakkers's neat divisions of the continuous manuscript text into 48 separate short chapters or essays makes the work much more readable than Kan's or the Latin MS transcription by Worp. These short sections are rationally based on indications in the text itself, since while Huygens's MS text is continuous it is actually composed in short essay-style units and he often ties units together by various discursive signals

(such as referring back to the previous section and/or anticipating the following one). Heesakkers's divisions are extremely helpful to the reader because they allow one to read the text selectively, in non-chronological order; to find one's way in the text easily; to read short sections instead of embarking on one continual text of over 100 pages with few paragraph breaks (which is tiring to start out); and to see how different essays or chapters are related to each other and form larger parts (for example, 28 through 34 deal with Dutch painters of the time, a consciously constructed unit within the text). The titles Heesakkers has given to these "chapters" makes it easy to consult different sections, dip into the book, and select and read at random. In sum, here we see the practice of the translator-editor at its best, enhancing his readers' ease of accessibility by adjusting matters of formatting. For the English translation I certainly intend to carry over this precedent, although I may change Heesakkers's chapter titles somewhat.

Other stylistic issues of formatting for the translator-editor to consider may include: referencing conventions (style guide); paragraphing; line spacing (e.g. a short text may be 1.5 spaced); numbering (page numbering, chapter, paragraph, section numbering); notational conventions (numbering, asterisks, endnotes, footnotes); spelling conventions (e.g. UK / US English); punctuation; capitalization; and use of italics. All of these aspects of formatting orient the reader and contribute to the experiencing and interpretation of the content and, in the same way as Genette's paratexts, guide the reader and define and determine readership at the same time. It is part of the translator-editor's task in practice to have thought about issues of form and present any preferences to the publisher.

2.1.3 Apparatus

The translator-editor must ask: what kind of apparatus does the book need? These are the paratexts proper. After perusal of my own library of translations (see Appendix I for an excerpt), I have devised the following list of the kind of paratextual resources available to a translator-editor, which may used to further enable the reader's interpretation. This is meant to be an exhaustive checklist, but to be employed selectively and creatively:

- text for cover (front and back)
- title
- title page; half-title
- series information (the reader may benefit from being referred to another related work)

- acknowledgements (a personalized view of the process of putting the book together)
- preface or foreword (prelims initially orient the reader but may be consulted at any time)
- afterword (can suggest larger contexts; may be invited from well-known scholars)
- introduction(s) (may be written by the translator or invited from well-known scholars)
- running titles (help the reader keep his/her place in the text; indicate the section and subject)
- section headnotes, introductions, or synopses (orient the reader to specific sections or chapters)
- note on the text (base text, edition, MS, stemmata, etc.)
- translator's note (for complex/recurring items that cannot be glossed in a note, or the translator's strategy)
- bibliography/selected further reading (to guide the reader to further study in the field)
- chronology (allows the reader to place the work and author historically)
- biography (oriented to readers without the historical background of the SL culture)
- maps (educate and orient readers historically, spatially and geographically)
- genealogical table
- illustrations (faces, scenes, contemporary artworks, items mentioned in the text)
- figures (tables, graphs, schematic diagrams, etc.)
- textual notes (to be discussed below)
- explanatory notes (to be discussed below)
- footnotes/endnotes
- wordlist/glossary
- glossary or index of names and/or places
- subject index
- contributors' biographies
- references

By utilizing a selection of such accompanying paratexts and attending to issues of form and formatting, the translator can make up for loss of knowledge and information in the translation, while also taking into consideration differences in book cultures between the SL and TL. The *translator traductor* (translator as betrayer) may be transformed into *translator redactor* (translator as editor). The specific uses and differences between selected paratexts will now be discussed.

2.2 *The translator as scholar-annotator*

In addition to being a book compiler, focusing largely on form, the literary translator should concern him/herself with the content of the apparatus. These have been further sub-divided here according to the tasks of the scholar-annotator (2.2) and the tasks of the analyst- or critic-commentator (2.3). The difference between these two roles depends on the kind of knowledge required and the degree of explicit interpretation in the paratext in question: an annotator simply provides and juxtaposes data for further interpretation; a commentator provides interpreted data or an interpretation directly related and linked to the text. For example, a note explaining a historical or cultural item or practice which is recorded by the editor-translator without being directly linked to the text as an explicit interpretation is here defined as an annotation rather than a comment. The annotator juxtaposes text or other material for the reader to link into the text on his/her own. Comment, on the other hand, presents an interpretation, opinion, or position on an issue that is open to other interpretations and that the reader may accept or re-evaluate. Most notes will be annotational, and the translator must rigorously control the commentary notes in order not to try to heavily influence the reader's interpretation. In the capacity of scholar-annotator, it behooves the translator to have or obtain a good grasp of the historical context in which the ST was written and into which it sought to insert itself; more literary considerations (e.g. genre, themes, intertextual references, national literary history) come under the heading of comment, being much more interpretive than factual. The translator may have to read up on certain aspects of history as suggested by the text including political, intellectual, material, cultural, military, and so on. In addition to annotational notes, the scholar-annotator must select and create other paratexts that are juxtaposed to the text; these could include maps; chronologies of the author's life, works, and historical/cultural events; genealogical tables; *index nominum* for historical personages or Classical literary allusions; subject indexes; and illustrations. The reader can access this material whenever he/she pleases, repeatedly, or not at all.

2.2.1 Paratexts devised by the translator as scholar-annotator

The translator can play an important role in introducing historical knowledge to TL readers who may be unfamiliar with broad outlines as well as fine details. This means obtaining a command of the general way a culture's history is viewed internally (e.g. how the Dutch view their own

history), but also meshing this view with the general way the TL culture sees history and sees this particular SL culture (e.g. how the Anglo-Saxon world views history, what it knows about Dutch history). Only aspects that are relevant to the translation should be undertaken, although historical context is certainly relevant. The translator-editor will need to sift out what would add to the reader's interpretation and study up on the pertinent subjects.

For the translation of Huygens prose autobiography four main historical sub-fields need consideration: 1) political and military history; 2) art history; 3) history of education; 4) history of science.

In terms of political and military history, it can be assumed that (unlike Dutch readers) the English reader has practically no knowledge of the Dutch Revolt, the 80 Years' War, or the division of the Low Countries into North and South. Even such references as father Christiaan Huygens's relations to the House of Orange will not be absorbed by an English reader without some pointing out. By not knowing such things, the English reader is disadvantaged with regard to his/her task of interpretation. However, once such a reader is made aware of the political situation then references to cities under siege, refugees, or young men being cut down in battle can be easily slotted in and these would not need any gloss. A well-constructed and positioned introduction will limit overuse of annotational notes. Huygens use of terminology from the Roman Republic is carefully chosen, for example the word "republic" itself occurs frequently in the text. In this light, some of the most difficult terms to translate are the geographical names for the political entities: *Belgiae, Batavia, patria, republica*. Particularly the first two, which Kan and Heesakkers have both translated as "the Netherlands," thereby obscuring Huygens's perspective on the only recent division of his country and the expectation and longing for reunification, need to be conveyed somehow to English readers (and to Dutch readers in my opinion). However, one cannot translate *Belgiae* as "Belgium," since that is the name of a modern political entity. Such information, no matter how the translator decides to translate it, should be explained in the translator's note since it affects numerous places in the text. In addition, the translator can guide and aid the reader by the inclusion of 1) maps which give an indication of geographical divisions and locations mentioned in the text (such as Breda where Huygens was stationed at the time of writing); 2) a chronology of political events, which a reader with knowledge of the period in English history can easily use comparatively; 3) a genealogical table of the Huygens's family, to

help the reader to follow the opening genealogical chapters, to contextualize the whole goal of educational writing, and to pursue further study of this family.

In terms of art history, an *index nomimum* will streamline the explanation of the numerous names of artists (and other figures of the time). Further, the translator might consider whether some background needs to be given in an introduction on the tradition of art in the Low Countries and the Northern Renaissance, especially in distinction to Italian Renaissance art. This information can also be included in a chronology. Huygens refers to this North-South competition himself and is clearly making a plea for the equal status of the artists of his fatherland. What is less clear is terminology for certain material and technical items (*tabula* and *tabella* can be work of art, painting, canvas) and these translation choices will need a translator's note, as will issues around new and existing techniques (etching, engraving, painting, water paints, oil paints). It may not be possible to translate these terms consistently, hence the specialized reader needs to be alerted to the issue.

In terms of the history of education, the non-specialist in Renaissance studies will benefit from some background in medieval and Renaissance schooling, since Huygens launches many critiques of the traditional educational system while promoting his father's innovative methods. Continuous references to certain concepts are thematic, and anything thematic is the purview of the analyst-commentator, but some idea of the process and goals of Renaissance schooling, the kinds of schoolbooks used, and so on, might be helpful for the reader in order to put together many disparate parts of the text into a unified thematic whole as an aid to interpretation. Under this heading may also be included the dominant role of the Classics and how they were "reborn" in this period in the intellectual revolution of the Renaissance.

In terms of the history of science, it may be assumed that readers in England especially will be fascinated by references to the *camera obscura*, Huygens's view of Bacon and Drebbel, and in general his attitude towards the rise of empirical science. Here is an opportunity to promote a greater understanding among English readers about the close contacts between England and the Seven United Provinces in the 17th century, and moreover the role of Huygens's son Christiaan as one of the greatest scientists of the period. In this way, the reading of one translation can, as Levý says, pave the way for other translations to follow, and can open an avenue for readers to explore in their own self-study by pointing out historical connections of which they were hitherto unaware. The chronology of Huygens's life and works set against

scientific and artistic developments of the day would be a great aid to readers, allowing them to really bring home the significance of the author's life within their own frameworks of understanding. Any number of illustrations would, of course, also be pertinent in this regard—from the Rembrandt painting of penitent Judas described in detail by Huygens to Drebbel's telescope.

2.2.2 Textual information

Depending on how scholarly the envisioned edition is, the translator-editor may need to include some information about the physical source of the text in a textual headnote, translator's preface, or textual notes (the latter, however, should be limited and never used to justify the translator's lexical choices). Since the "philological turn" of the 1990s, English academic readers are extremely interested in the textual origins of any edition. Here the translator as scholar should consider such things as the choice of the base text (if multiple originals are available, either in MS or print); issues of codicology or paleography; *editio princeps* and printing history; previous editions and translations; and things like amendments to spelling. Since there is only one MS of the Huygens's text there is no comparative codicology, however it is interesting to convey to readers the features of the MS and its use of marginalia (Huygens annotated after it was composed) and the dating of the text (he composed it in two periods, 1629 and 1631). All this textual background has already been studied by Worp in his transcription of the MS and revised by Kan and Heesakkers when preparing their translations. Another textual issue the translator will have to decide is how to render the occasional phrases in Greek given in the original: these may each require a textual note.

2.3 *The translator as analyst-commentator*

Literary translation is the closest form of close reading—all authors should realize that no one will ever read their works more closely than their translators. The translator is thus generating a large body of knowledge about the text while translating. This expert interpretation will include ideas about literary and literary-historical aspects that make the work an integrated organic whole—both internally in terms of themes, genre, style and intertextual references, and externally in terms of national literatures and canon, reading publics, the history of reception, and literary theories. Themes and thematic development are of the first importance under this heading

since they offer readers a direct step-up to a higher level of understanding. These would include the author's attitude towards the political, social and cultural *Zeitgeist*; cultural keywords, names and locations; inherited traditions and newly invented ones; the author's personal *focii*; in sum, a whole constellation of ideas that are much more explicitly interpretive than the material compiled by the scholar-annotator. Such information may be briefly presented in an introduction or preface or in explanatory notes. These more overtly interpretive paratexts discursively enlighten the reader rather than simply juxtaposing materials for him/her to consult. For example, for the Huygens's autobiography it will enhance the reader's understanding if he/she is alerted to some of the (Renaissance) themes that recur in the text such as art vs. nature, utility vs. pleasure, *otium* vs. *negotium*, youth vs. age, nature vs. nurture, ancient vs. modern, "true nobility," Fortune, talent and genius, book learning vs. practical experience, empirical observation, rhetoric and eloquence, The Courtier, and various references to Classical Greek and Roman authors. Second, but just as important as themes, are notions about literary form, about experimentation with genre and generic conventions, and how the literary work fits into a constellation of other works by European contemporaries or predecessors, by compatriots, and by the author him/herself. Huygens's autobiography is, I believe, one of the very first to take the modern form starting at birth and progressing through a person's life. There is certainly nothing in English like this from the period, and English academics must creatively stretch the fragmentary material that exists in partial diaries, travel accounts, and resorting in some instances to calling annotated almanacs, family bibles and other ephemera "autobiography" (see Adam Smyth 2010). Moreover, there is also nothing from Classical culture which approaches this modern autobiographical form—the closest thing is Augustine's *Confessions*, but this is a story of conversion and Huygens's is not. Interestingly, Huygens's first word is *commentarius* that seems to refer to the writings of Julius Caesar, which, however, are written in the third-person and do not begin at birth but rather are apologetics and political historical accounts, completely unlike the modern notion of autobiography. Pope Pius II's *commentarii* (considered pseudipigraphical) form perhaps a more rational model, and this work was in Huygens's library.[4] Some attention should also be given to Huygens's work as a kind of educational program in the tradition of Rudolph Agricola and

[4] Thanks to Tony Foster for mentioning the work by Pope Pius and to Ad Leerintveld for pointing out that CH owned a copy. Dr. Leerintveld has his own notions of the genre of the text which differ somewhat from my own.

Erasmus, Dutch Humanist predecessors who authored such pedagogical works. Comments on genre, which is never single, should be kept as brief and as light of interpretation as possible.

2.3.1 Paratexts devised by the translator as analyst-commentator

As already indicated above, the specific text forms of these paratexts include, first, introductions and prefaces, which may be authored by the translator and/or invited from high-standing scholars. As already mentioned, the preliminary matter may not necessarily be read first by the reader. The second paratextual form is the explanatory note. These should be kept to a minimum and only alert the reader if there is a crux or problem pertaining to a passage in the text, or if a little additional pointing out would really enable the reader's interpretation. Furthermore, such interpretations of themes and generic or literary issues may more efficiently be handled in introductions and prefaces, making such commentary notes briefer since they can refer to ideas presented more coherently there. The third form of paratext is the bibliography or selected further reading. If the translator approaches his/her reader not as an ingénue who needs spoon-feeding but as a near-equal, someone who is just as intelligent in general terms but perhaps lacks specific background at the moment of reading (but who may, of course, outstrip the translator in terms of knowledge by studying the text on their own), and who would like to pursue their personal understanding, then the translator-editor has an important task in sharing knowledge and orienting readers towards further study. Such is the generosity and interpretive hospitality the translator-editor offers to the reader, a kind of parallel to the linguistic hospitality the translator offers to the author of the source. The translator-editor must remember that the canon and national literature of the SL may be completely obscure to the reader of the TT, as is the case with Dutch-English translation. One cannot simply refer to famous Renaissance Dutch contemporary authors such as Marnix van St. Aldegonde or even Hugo de Groot without some explanation. References in the autobiography to John Donne and Francis Bacon, however, require no comment. The translator-editor must take on the perspective of the English reader, as Levý says, thinking as a set designer would of the effect of the work on the audience. And like a good teacher, he/she must point out the broad lineaments of the literary tradition as it is pertinent to the translated text. By accomplishing these things the translator will increase the reader's enjoyment of the text, enhancing the ability to interpret it on his/her own.

Part III, Conclusion
Theory + practice and the limits of interpretation

In this study I have endeavored to bring together theory (the hermeneutic approach to translation) with practice (the tasks of the translator-editor). All too often in TS, theory and practice are on separate paths. The study of literary translation must go beyond an emphasis on grammar, stylistics and other concerns at the micro-level of the text. Interpretation, directed study, acquired knowledge and literary-intellectual background, as well as the labor required for translation, must be given a more prominent place in how the field is taught. The segmentation of texts for translation is a horrible barrier that obscures the organic wholeness, the flow of sound from one sentence to the next, the recurrence of words and phrases or ideas in disjacent passages (whether on the next page or 10 or 100 pages further on), and the different ways of referring to or addressing thematic and generic conventions. Literary writing is like music that plays variations on a theme, and this is something of the utmost concern to the literary translator. The whole issue of sound in translation, which unfortunately falls outside the parameters of the present study, is crucial to convincing the reader, once he/she has picked up the work, to continue to read it. As with most fields in the Humanities, one cannot primarily give practical tips and teach how-to skills: what is required is the right conceptual framework, an understanding of the role one has taken on, and guidance in order to figure out on one's own how to attain the secret rewards of literary translation.

Proposal: In light of the findings of this thesis I would like to propose that the Masters, Linguistics: Translation in Theory and Practice at Leiden University allow students to execute and submit literary translations presented in full book editions as their Masters Thesis. Editions of texts have been accepted as Ph.D. and Master's theses at most English departments at universities in North America and the U.K. for many years. In more recent years, departments also have begun to accept creative works (a novel, a collection of poetry or short stories) as adequate for fulfilling the thesis requirement of the degree. Allowing a literary translation + edition in this program would combine the creativity of literary translation with the practical experience of translation of an entire work, in addition to demonstrating command of the scholarly-analytic capacity in preparing the apparatus and paratexts. Such students would end the program strong with an actual work that they could then attempt to get published, a kind of portfolio of results, giving them an advantage as they set out on their careers.

Bibliography

Primary Works

Huygens, Constantijn. "Fragment eener autobiografie van Constantijn Huygens." Ed. J.A. Worp. *Bijdragen en mededeelingen van het Historisch Genootschap*, deel 18 (1897): 1-124.

------. *De Jeugd van Constantijn Huygens door hemzelf beschreven.* Vertaald door A.H. Kan met een bijdrage van G. Kamphuis. Second printing. Rotterdam: Ad. Donker, 1971 [orig. publ. 1946].

------. *Mijn Jeugd*. Vertaald door C.L. Heesakkers. Amsterdam: Querido, 1987.

Secondary Works

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." Translated by Harry Zohn. In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000. 15-25 [orig. publ. 1923].

Berman, Antoine. *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany.* Translated by S. Heyvaert. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992 [orig. publ. 1984].

Chandler, Robert. "Note on the Translations." In *Russian Short Stories from Pushkin to Buida*. Edited by Robert Chandler. London: Penguin Books, 2005.

Derrida, Jacques. "Des Tours de Babel." Translated by Joseph F. Graham. In *Difference in Translation*. Edited and with an Introduction by Joseph F. Graham. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1985. 165-207.

Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Hermans, Theo. "Introduction: Translation Studies and a New Paradigm." In *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Edited by Theo Hermans. London: Croom Helm, 1985. 7-15.

------. "Norms and the Determination of Translation: A Theoretical Framework." In *Translation, Power, Subversion.* Edited by Román Álvarez and Carmen-África Vidal. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996. 25-51.

------. "Translation's Other." Inaugural Lecture delivered at University College London on 19 March 1996.

Holmes, James S. "Describing Literary Translations: Models and Methods" (1978). In *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988.

Jakobson, Roman. *On Language*. Edited by Linda R. Waugh and Monique Monville-Burston. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1990.

------. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *On Translation.* Edited by Reuben A. Brower. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1959. 232-39.

Lambert, José. "In quest of literary world maps" (1991). In *Functional Approaches to Culture and Translation*. Selected papers by José Lambert. Edited by Dirk Delabastita, Lieven D'hulst, and Reine Meylaerts. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2006. 63-74.

------. "Problems and challenges of translation in an age of new media and competing models" (1997). In *Functional Approaches to Culture and Translation*. Selected papers by José Lambert. Edited by Dirk Delabastita, Lieven D'hulst, and Reine Meylaerts. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2006. 131-45.

------. "Shifts, oppositions and goals in translation studies: towards a genealogy of concepts" (1991). In *Functional Approaches to Culture and Translation*. Selected papers by José Lambert. Edited by Dirk Delabastita, Lieven D'hulst, and Reine Meylaerts. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2006. 75-85.

------. "Translation, systems and research: the contribution of polysystem studies to translation studies" (1995). In *Functional Approaches to Culture and Translation*. Selected papers by José Lambert. Edited by Dirk Delabastita, Lieven D'hulst, and Reine Meylaerts. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2006. 105-130.

Lambert, José and Hendrik van Gorp. "On describing translations" (1985). In *Functional Approaches to Culture and Translation*. Selected papers by José Lambert. Edited by Dirk Delabastita, Lieven D'hulst, and Reine Meylaerts. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2006. 37-47.

Lefevere, André. *Translating Literature: Practice and theory in a comparative literature framework*. New York: MLA, 1992.

Levý, Jiři. *The Art of Translation*. Translated by Patrick Corness. Edited with a critical forward by Zuzana Jettmarová. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011 [orig. publ. 1963].

Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence." In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000. 119-125.

Ricoeur, Paul. *On Translation*. Translated by Eileen Brennan, with an introduction by Richard Kearney. London: Routledge, 2006 [orig. publ. 2004].

Steiner, George. *After Babel*. *Aspects of Language and Translation*. London: Oxford UP, 1975.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies—and beyond.* Revised edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012.

APPENDIX I
Translator Redactor: Literary translation and the limits of interpretation

Preliminary list of translated books and authors I have taught at York University (2001-2014), some in two or three different translations, some only selections.

Abelard. *Historia Calamitatem*.

Abelard and Heloise. *Letters.*

Aeschylus. *Oresteia*.

Apuleius. *The Golden Ass*.

Aristophanes. *Lysistrata*.

Augustine. *Confessions. De doctrina christiana*.

Augustus, *Res gestae*.

Beowulf.

Biblical texts (Genesis 1.1-3; Samson; Song of Songs)

Boethius. *Consolation of Philosophy*.

Catullus.

Chanson de Roland.

Champlain.

Christine de Pizan.

Colombus.

Condorcet. (excerpt)

Dante. *Vita Nuova. Divine Comedy*.

Descartes. (excerpt)

Egyptian literature.

Epic of Gilgamesh.

Erasmus. *Colloquies; De civilitate pueris*.

Euripides. *Bacchae. Helen*.

Herodotus. Histories.

Homer. *Iliad. Odyssey.*

Ignatius of Loyola.

Joinville. Crusade narratives.

Leonardo da Vinci. Notebooks.

Livy.

Locke, John. (excerpts)

Luther.

Machiavelli. *The Prince. The Mandrake Root.*

Marx and Engels. *Communist Manifesto*.

Montaigne. *Essays*.

More, Thomas. *Utopia*.

Old English poetry, prose. (Bede, "Dream of the Rood," etc.)

Ovid. *Ars amatoria. Metamorphoses. Amores*.

Petrarch. *Canzonere. Letter to Posterity. Ascent of Mt. Ventoux*.

Pico della Mirandola. Oration "on the Dignity of Man"

Plato. *Apology. Symposium.*

Plutarch. Lives (selections).

Propertius.

Pushkin. *Queen of Spades*.

Rabelais.

Rousseau. (excerpts)

Sophocles.

sources of Romeo and Juliet, and other Shakespeare plays (excerpts)

Strassburg, Gottfried von. *Tristan*

Suetonius.

Tacitus. *Agricola.*

Teresa of Avila.

Thucydides.

Troubadour poetry (exerpts)

Vasari.

Virgil. *Aeneid.*

Voltaire. *Candide.*