Introduction: Difference at the "Origin," Instability at the "Source": Translation as Translingual Editing

And I returned, you might say, like a stranger to a world stranger than I. Everything was inconceivably familiar yet at the same time inconceivably distant—it's hard to explain. I don't mean the people. I expected to find them changed. But the books? How had even the books managed to change as they had?

—Vassilis Vassilikos (tr. Emmerich)[1]

This book has the perhaps immodest goal of challenging the time-honored tradition—long upheld by readers, reviewers, publishers, literary scholars, even many translators and scholars of translation—of referring to the objects of literary translation as if each were a known quantity, a singular entity whose lexical content is stable or fixed: "the original," "the Arabic original," "the original French text," "the source text," "Kafka's German," and so on. It is a truth now widely acknowledged (though at times still bemoaned) that a translation is in part the product of a particular individual's (or group of individuals') interpretation of a work she herself encountered in a different language (or languages).[2] Give seventy translators an identical swatch of text and, unless divinely inspired, they will produce seventy different translations that accord with their diverse understandings of what the text means, and of the relative importance of its various features. It is a truth less widely

[1] In keeping with the textual instability I discuss throughout this book, I have revised my translation here from the published version of 2002.

[2] To be honest, to call the interpretive nature of translation widely acknowledged may be wishful thinking on my part. While translators and scholars of translation are certainly aware of the interpretive work involved in the creation of any text in translation, many general readers, students, and even scholars of literature continue to see translation as a communicative endeavor, a (failed) transfer of an invariant meaning via the construction of textual equivalents. The tenacity of this flawed understanding of translation can be seen in the countless reviews, casual conversations, and classroom encounters that continually describe translation as loss—even, as I argue elsewhere in this book, in the recent popularity among literary scholars of the discourse of untranslatability, which likewise rests on the assumption that translation attempts a transfer of some semantic invariant. One of my goals in this book is to challenge this rhetoric of transfer, and to replace it with an understanding of translation, or at least literary translation, as interpretive iteration.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

acknowledged that most literary works exist in more (sometimes many more) than one textual form, even in the language(s) in which they were initially composed. German texts we complacently treat as Kafka's have been multiply mediated by numerous editors over the years, beginning with his friend Max Brod. The Arabic "original" of what many refer to in English as *The Thousand and One Nights* has a history of cross-lingual composition and circulation as complex as the stories it tells, including the translation into Arabic, and then back out again, of tales first published in eighteenth-century French. Virginia Woolf's novels, typeset and printed in both the U.K. and the U.S. from two separate sets of proofs, exhibit slight but (some would say) significant differences across these editions, complicating the task of a translator who seeks to settle on a "source text" for one of Woolf's works.

And yet when it comes to translation, we often revert to rhetoric that suggests that the changes supposedly wrought by translation are inflicted upon an otherwise stable source. Even in a post-poststructuralist intellectual environment that accepts textual instability and semantic indeterminacy as inherent to literary works, most readers, including literary scholars, continue to treat "originals" as categorically richer texts than translations, and to discuss the process of translation as if it began with a "source text" already in hand, and labored solely to create a text in another language to stand in that first text's stead. But the "source," the presumed object of translation, is not a stable ideal, not an inert gas but a volatile compound that experiences continual textual reconfigurations. The works we translate often exist in multiple manuscript, print, or digital forms. Excerpts of novels are published in magazines; authors revise for new printings or editions; poems or short stories appear online before a collection has even been planned; plays differ, lexically and otherwise, every time a new production is staged, and playscripts can differ along with them. The textual condition is one of variance, not stability. The process of translation both grapples with and extends that variance, defining the content and form of an "original" in the very act of creating yet another textual manifestation of a literary work in a new language. Translation may be conceived as a form of translingual editing, by which a translator both negotiates existing versions and creates a new one of her own, in a language other than that (or those) in which the work was first (or previously) articulated.

In order to give concrete shape to these fairly abstract claims, I begin with an origin story of my own for the preoccupations that gave rise to this book—a story that demonstrates the conceptual confusion that persists in our discussions of translation, by probing the difference at the origin I encountered during my first major project as a professional translator. The first book-length translation I was commissioned to complete was published

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

by Seven Stories in 2002 as *The Few Things I Know About Glafkos Thrassakis*. My contract with the press, which I had signed two years previously, required that I provide a "faithful rendition into idiomatic English" of "the work now entitled *Glafkos Thrassakis*" by Vassilis Vassilikos; my translation would "neither omit anything from the original text nor add anything to it, other than such modest verbal changes as are necessary in the translation into English." Following this phrase was an asterisk referring to a hand-typed addendum in the lower margin of that page, which stated that "the version of the text Karen Emmerich is to translate will be approximately 500 pages in length." The task of editing the "original text" down to that length would be shared by myself and another individual, also a translator from Greek.

From my current vantage point, even these few seemingly forthright sentences are rife with confusion and contradictions. The rhetoric of faithfulness, with its attendant prohibition against adding or subtracting and its grudging acceptance of only "modest verbal changes," is standard in the contracts U.S. and U.K. publishers ask translators to sign. References to this vague notion of faithfulness or accuracy crop up time and again in reviews and popular discussions of translated literature, and even in many translators' descriptions of the work they do. Yet this stance betrays a misconception as deep as it is widespread. Translation has no truck with modest changes. The entire translation is a text that didn't exist before: *all* the words are added; *all* the words are different. A translation adds a new iteration, in a different language, to the sum total of texts for a work. As the case of *Glafkos Thrassakis* will demonstrate, it can sometimes even be the catalyst for new textual iterations in the language in which it was first composed. Yet this is not the change most people are talking about when they say translations "change" originals. That "change," like the contractual prohibition against subtraction and addition, belies a mistaken understanding of translation that rests on a series of problematic assumptions: that translators are in the business of textual replication rather than textual proliferation; that this replication is a process by which meaning is transferred, to the extent possible, between texts; that readers who can understand both the "original" and the translation will be able to ascertain whether this invariant material has in fact made it through unscathed; and, most basically, that we can safely judge whether words or phrases in different languages are to be treated as "equivalent" to one another in a particular context, and perhaps independent of context.[3]

[3] Equivalence remains one of the most powerful and most contested paradigms for thinking about translation; a critique of the concept runs through this book. On the particular question of adding and subtracting, consider the following passage by Theo Hermans: "Timothy Buck tells us [in his critique of Helen Lowe-Porter's translations of Thomas Mann] unambiguously what he associates with 'faithful translation': the

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

Contrary to these assumptions, translation doesn't move an invariant semantic content across linguistic divides, like a freight train carrying a cargo of meaning to be unloaded on the far side of some clearly demarcated border. Rather, as Naoki Sakai (or Sakai Naoki) writes, translation seeks to "create continuity at the elusive point of discontinuity" (71) between languages whose boundaries are themselves unstable. Translation continues the iterative growth of a work in another language whose otherness *and* self-sameness are always provisional. Translation requires a complex set of interpretive decisions that are conditioned by the particular context in which a translator (or translators) is working. At least as regards the words and punctuation that comprise them, translations are radically different from the prior texts on which they are based. But the creation of difference is not synonymous with change. Translations are textual supplements; for most readers, they serve as substitutes for something written in a language they cannot access.[4] Translators use one or more texts for a work as the basis from which to formulate another text in another language. They decide what a work means (to them), how it means (to them), and which of its features (diction, syntax, linguistic register, rhythm, sound patterning, visual or material aspects, typographic form, and so on) are most important for the particular embodied interpretation they hope to share with others. They also decide how to account for those features in the new text they are writing. Even more basically, translators often decide—if sometimes unwittingly—what the "original" or the "source text" *is*, or at least what *their* original or source text will be. If one is to translate Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* (first published in installments in the *Review de Paris* in 1856, then in a two-volume bound edition in 1857, and in many additional editions since then, even just in French), one must decide which (singular or plural) of these many French texts one will use as one's "source." In some cases, the available versions will differ only a little; in other cases, they will differ quite a lot.

In our current moment, we might assume that translators of contemporary literature would be contractually obliged to translate the particular

translator should neither add nor subtract from the content of the original, respect the author's intentions and refrain from offering 'wild interpretations.' Could it be that his criticism of Helen Lowe-Porter's practice reveals little more than the clash between diverging conceptions of what translation is or should be? Is translation possible without adding or subtracting or interpreting, wildly or not, and who is to judge? What if we set this case against translations from other times and places in which the original content was added to or subtracted from, authorial intentions were violated and wild interpretations were rife—and the texts in question were still called 'translations'?" (Hermans 1999: 5).

[4] See David Bellos's excellent take-down of the cliché that "translation is no substitute for the original" in *Is That a Fish in Your Ear?* (37–9).

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

version of a work put into circulation by the publisher from whom the translation rights have been obtained. The example of my translation for Seven Stories calls even this into question. Contemporary contractual language in the Anglophone publishing world conflates "work" and "text" in such a way as to elide the existence of *multiple* textual or editorial manifestations of a given work.[5] As a consequence, contracts rarely specify that a particular edition should be followed—an oversight few but textual scholars are likely to notice, and which most translators are unlikely to consider significant to their task. With works that have entered the public domain, a choice between versions may make the process of settling on an "original" far more complicated—if, that is, a translator sees it as her decision to make. By the same token, even when specific texts have been assigned to a translator working on commission, some degree of what we generally call editing is often part of the translation process. My contract with Seven Stories makes the editorial aspect of the task of translation unusually explicit: though the two most recent Greek editions of the novel were over 750 pages long, I had agreed to translate an "original text" of no more than 500 pages. My contract called, in other words, for a "faithful rendition" that added and omitted nothing—yet it also required me to abridge the work's most current form by roughly one third.

Glafkos Thrassakis is an autobiographical novel (or, in my translation of Vassilikos's neologistic description, a "biogranovel, an autonovegraphy, a novistory")[6] that describes the experiences of leftist Greek intellectuals during the 1960s and 1970s. The novel's eponymous character, a writer who flees Greece during the dictatorship of 1967 to 1974 and returns after the junta's fall, is a kind of alter ego for Vassilikos. The work has seen many incarnations in Greek, evolving along with the author's life. The first seed for the character of Thrassakis appeared in a two-page vignette in a collection of short stories published in 1971. Then came an entire story in 1973, next a full-fledged volume in 1974. "I thought at the time it would end there," Vassilikos has written (in my translation of the Spanish version of what I assume to be an originally Greek text, included as an author's note to Ángel Peréz González's 2014 Spanish translation of the novel), "but that summer saw the fall of the colonels' junta and I decided to fictionalize my return to Greece after six and a half years of living in exile" (2014: 9). This fictionalization, in other words, unfolded in tandem with the return itself: Vassilikos both lived and wrote his sequel, which was followed a year later by yet

[5] The distinction between "work" and "text" is central to this book; see page 16 for definitions and further discussion of these terms.

[6] As quoted in my translator's note to the novel (Vassilikos 2002: vii). The Greek neologisms appear on the back cover of the Gnosi edition (Vassilikos 1988).

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

another. Not long afterward, a 620-page volume brought all three books of this makeshift trilogy under a single cover.[7] "To complete this historical tour," Vassilikos continues in his author's note to the Spanish translation, "I should add that Thrassakis visited me once more in 1978, when another book saw the light of day: the *Hidden Texts,* which later became *Roman Notebooks*." Both titles suggest that this latest book will give the reader access to the fictional Thrassakis's previously unpublished works, yet what it actually offers are only further rewritings: an unnamed narrator's descriptions and interpretations of stories whose texts the reader never sees. From that point on, no new books featuring Thrassakis were written—yet "various revisions" of the existing publications followed, "in which I personally reworked the material, the last time in 2008 in a *definitive* edition—if one can speak in such terms about a *work in progress* of this sort" (Vassilikos 2014: 10; italics in the Spanish).

My translation fell during the period of these "various revisions," which are far more extensive than Vassilikos's passing mention would suggest. In fact, my translation, though in a different language and not produced by the author, could be considered one such revision. Seven Stories had obtained translation rights from Livanis, whose 1996 edition included the *Roman Notebooks* and some other bits and pieces. Like the subsequent 2008 edition, the Livanis edition had been billed as "definitive" when it appeared, as had the previous (and substantially different) edition released by Gnosi in 1988. Before I even started working on the translation, Vassilikos told me he now preferred the 1988 version, which was by then long out of print. I tracked down a copy to bring to our first meeting in Athens, where we sat in a hotel bar and wondered how we would manage to turn a 763-page book into a 500-page one. In the end, Vassilikos decided that one large section of the book wasn't of a piece with the rest, and carefully tore that chunk of roughly 150 pages out of the copy I had been at such pains to procure. When I finally sat down at my desk to begin translating, the "original" before me was a physically altered copy of an out-of-print edition of a novel that had already appeared in numerous other versions in Greek. The book from which I was translating was therefore original in a different sense: one of a kind, an utterly unique object.

It was also still at least a hundred pages too long to please the American publisher. So, with occasional help from the individual mentioned in my contract, I continued to edit as I translated, making cuts that ranged from sentences to paragraphs to entire chapters. In creating my translation, I

[7] The precise dating and details of these publications remain obscure. Vassilikos refers in his author's note to a 580-page edition of the trilogy-in-the-making, but I was unable to verify the existence of such a volume.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

was thus envisioning and inventing new textual manifestations in English *and* Greek for this shape-shifting work. Yes, not only in English but in Greek, too: I edited this unique "original" as I went, crossing out passages and pages in order to make my copy of the Gnosi edition correspond with the translation I was producing, rather than the other way around. When the translation was ready, I sent it to Vassilikos, along with a list several pages long that catalogued all of these cuts; he read and approved the translation, and seemed to pay little attention to my meticulous documentation. Yet while the specific changes I'd made were less important to Vassilikos than the overall feel of the end product, the very existence of this edited English version did affect the subsequent editorial life of this work in Greek: when I saw him a few years later in Greece, Vassilikos told me that the publication of the U.S. edition had spurred him to rethink the book's structure once more. This reevaluation resulted in the third "definitive" edition of the novel, the one published in 2008.

Another six years later, Peréz González's *Lo poco que sé de Glafcos Zrasakis* was released. Judging from its title, which echoes that of the English translation (chosen not by me but by the American publisher), one might assume that the Spanish translator had followed my editorial decisions. But while he incorporated many of my cuts, his text reflects additional editorial work that makes his version unlike all other versions to date. Any attempt to compare Peréz González's Spanish text to my English text, or either of them to any of the several Greek texts a reader might find at a university library or bookstore in Greece, would quickly become an exercise in frustration. In the author's note published in the Spanish edition, Vassilikos makes the following (now, perhaps, to be expected) parting shot: "I consider the present edition the most representative of the work and it will remain as presented here in its reissue—this time final—in Greece in 2015" (2014: 10). If the most representative version to date is a translation that incorporates certain elements of a prior translation, whatever "final" version eventually appears in Greek (2015 came and went with no sign of it) will thus have been mediated by the editorial efforts of two translators, working in two separate languages and literary traditions, in collaboration with numerous named and unnamed individuals, at the behest of publishers who, though unable to read any of the Greek versions, had ideas of their own about the preferred textual makeup of this novel. So much for adding or omitting nothing; so much, indeed, for the notion of adhering to an "original."

Some of you may be surprised to learn of the extensive editorial interventions that went into the production of my translation. You may even be unsettled by the way a work from a supposedly minor language was reshaped to suit the demands of a trade publisher in the United States. In some ways,

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

this seems an apt example of what Lawrence Venuti has described as the "insidious domestication" in which translation can engage, the "reconstitution of a text in accordance with values, beliefs and representations that preexist it in the target language, always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality, always determining the production, circulation, and reception of texts."[8] The fact that Vassilikos was receptive to these edits doesn't necessarily make Venuti's concern any less valid.[9] Neither, I suspect, will it lessen the discomfort some readers may feel at the power vested in me as a translator of this work—a discomfort that may reflect, too, a belief that this is an exception to the rule of what translation is, or should be. But while extreme, the case of Glafkos Thrassakis and his many guises is not at all exceptional. On the contrary, it merely crystallizes issues that commonly arise from the textual instability of literary works, while highlighting the significant (if rarely acknowledged) role that translators, among others, play in shaping these works for new audiences. It is not an exaggeration to say that there is no translation without editing: each new textual manifestation of a work, including those in translation, embodies assumptions about what a work is and where its boundaries lie; each new iteration of a work, in the same language or in a different one, shifts those boundaries at least a little, and sometimes quite a lot. Each new published text in translation is both a translation *and* an edition. Editing and translating are mutually implicated interpretive practices that further the iterative growth of a work in the world.

In placing this argument at the center of *Literary Translation and the Making of Originals*, I hope to bring attention to aspects of translation that have long been elided in both scholarly and popular discussions. I also hope to encourage more translators and scholars of translation to consider the relevance to their task of aspects of literary production that those in other fields already take for granted. It is probably not news to a scholar of early Persian literature, for example, or a scholar working with born-digital primary sources, that translators may need to negotiate multiple versions of a given "original," or that a work of literature may comprise textual

[8] 1995: 16, 18. See also many of the essays in Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood's 2005 edited volume *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*, including Spivak's "Translating into English" (93–110). The politics of translating from languages with fewer users into the major languages of international commerce and culture are also central to Apter's 2013 *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*, though I take issue with Apter's reliance on the term "untranslatability," in that book and elsewhere. See footnote 2, as well as the last section of Chapter 5 for a critique of this term.

[9] Vassilikos, I should note, is not indiscriminately receptive to all translingual editing of his work: in the author's note from which I have been quoting, he takes the 1978 French translation, *Un poète est morte*, to task for having "butchered" his novel.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

manifestations in several languages. Valerie Henitiuk has written that, while translations "are routinely judged in terms of faithfulness to the original," "in the case of premodern literature, what is 'original' is far from self-evident"; the notion "of a sacralized, authoritative source text is obviously problematic when the only extant manuscripts date from centuries after composition and reveal variant textual traditions" (2007, 6). Ferial Ghazoul describes *Majnun Layla*, a work that circulated in many languages across Western and Central Asia over the course of several centuries, as a work with "no original text or authentic source," which "lies on the borderline between orature and literature," and whose fluidity "cancels out the categories of fidelity or infidelity that are so often used when discussing translation" (375). Ghazoul suggests that this work, whose identity is continually "preserved but modified, in a process one might call *textual becoming*—a textual identity in progress—rather than a *textual being*," therefore "poses a special problem in translation studies" (377). Rita Kothari's discussion of "everyday practices of translation" in contemporary India focuses on romances, detective novels, and so on, which are often not marked as translations and which routinely disregard the textual makeup of their presumed "sources." The "uninstitutionalized and popular practices" that Kothari groups together in this category of "unofficial and 'low-brow' translation activity" (both because of the genres in question and because of the modes of translating employed) "continue to escape the awareness of a fixed text" (262–5).

This last phrase may indicate just how entrenched the notion of translation as transfer is: even in a piece that opens our discussion of translation to include forms of cultural production for which stability is not the norm, Kothari refers to a "fixed text" as something of which one could have an "awareness"—in other words, as something that is indubitably there, whether or not we are aware of it. My argument is precisely the opposite: textual instability is there, whether or not we are aware of it. Instability is not limited to nonliterary texts, or quasiliterary texts, or works from ages past. It is not in fact the "special problem" Ghazoul suggests, but part and parcel of what translation *is*. High-brow and low-brow translations of high-brow and low-brow literature from various places and periods may differ in the norms of acceptability to which they adhere—but all engage in translingual editing, because all present new, translingual editions of extant and ever-growing works, to whose proliferative growth they also contribute.

A spate of recent scholarly engagements with news translation have described it as a form of "transediting" (Stetting, quoted in Valedon: 442) in which multiple sources may be "reshaped, edited, synthesized and transformed" (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009: 2) to produce a news item in another language, making it nearly impossible to trace a discrete source for any

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

given translation. This description is certainly true to the reality of translingual news production. Yet as Christina Schäffner points out, if the term "transediting" is used "as a substitute for and/or in opposition to the term translation, there is the danger that translation continues to be understood in a narrower sense of a purely word-for-word transfer process" (883). While the discussion of news translation falls outside the purview of my book, which focuses exclusively on the translation of literary texts, I join Schäffner in claiming that editorial work is involved in nearly all translation, in all genres. On the surface, this may not sound like an entirely new argument: translation scholars working in the tradition of the so-called manipulation school already view translation as one of many processes by which texts are shaped by political, social, and aesthetic agendas in the "receiving" culture. What my book contributes is a demonstration that translation doesn't just edit or manipulate some preexisting, stable "source," but rather continues a process of textual iteration already at work in the language of initial composition. André Lefevere's 1992, *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, gave translation pride of place among other forms of interpretive mediation that included editing, anthologization, literary criticism, reviewing, adaptation, and dramatic performance, yet Lefevere treated editing and translating largely as separate activities, one preceding the other.[10] Theo Hermans subsequently drew on Lefevere's work to further combat the contemporary understanding of equivalence as ahistorical and unhelpfully proscriptive. "What do we do, for example, with a translator like Antoine Houdar de la Motte," Hermans writes, borrowing an example from Lefevere's book, "who renders the *Iliad* into French at the beginning of the eighteenth century and blithely informs us in his preface that he, the 'mere translator', reduced Homer's twenty-four books to twelve," cutting out what Lefevere describes as "superfluous repetitions, trivial descriptions, anatomical detail and long speeches"? (Hermans 1999: 48).

Hermans argues against the notion of translation as transfer by referring to practices that allow for texts to be "reduced" or edited in translation. Yet the rhetoric of his passage does nothing to challenge the stability of "Homer's twenty-four books," elsewhere referred to as "Homer's original"—an "original" that was in fact composed over the course of centuries and arose in part from an oral tradition, whose authorship is the subject of much debate, and whose twenty-four books were editorial constructions of subsequent centuries rather than a mythical "Homer's" own. I certainly do not

[10] See also *The Manipulation of Literature* (1985), a collection of essays edited by Hermans, which introduced many of the theoretical concerns that would drive scholarship in the field in the years that followed.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

mean to suggest that Hermans believes the myth of Homer, or is ignorant of the textual history of the *Iliad*. On the contrary, I choose this example precisely because of Herman's astute description of translation as a form of translingual editing, to show how, even here, in the best of circumstances, the rhetoric employed to talk about supposed "originals" reinforces a distinction we already know is flawed, between the iterative work of translation and the supposedly textually consolidating work of canon formation. The textual complexities of "originals" have historically not been considered relevant to the translator's task, and are often glossed over even by those aiming to bring issues of textual instability in translation to our attention. If pushed on the issue, most scholars who write about "originals" and "source texts," about "Homer's original" or "Kafka's German," would likely acknowledge that such phrases are placeholders, and misleading ones at that. It is one goal of this book to push translators and translation scholars on the issue with more lasting, less localized results.

In arguing that translations further the iterative growth of a work in new languages, I also seek to intervene not only in the field of translation studies, but in that of textual scholarship. If translation studies has yet to grapple in a concentrated fashion with the consequences of the textual instability of nearly all objects of translation, the field of textual scholarship has likewise rarely recognized translation as a process that shakes the foundations of the editorial project as widely understood. Textual scholars have long been concerned primarily with the history of a work's production and transmission within a single language (usually its language of composition), or with constructing editorial forms that best represent a particular version or versions of that work. That might mean comparing all extant texts of a work to see which is a more likely representative of some lost "original," or determining whether rhetorical or grammatical punctuation should be used in a new edition of a nineteenth-century novel whose author likely would have expected a publisher to impose house style. Translation seems to stand in opposition to such projects, which focus on particular lexical, syntactic, or even typographic details in the language of a work's initial composition. Translation could in fact be considered the ultimate case in which a work of literature "survives" despite the wholesale replacement of one text with another that differs from it in constitutive ways, including the basic fact of its being written in a different language.

Yet just as translation is increasingly recognized as an interpretive activity that creates something "new and different" in another language (Venuti 2013: 10), so too is editing now seen to be an interpretive endeavor that doesn't restore a lost "original" but presents a new textual as well as bibliographic configuration of the work in question. In the words of Peter Shillingsburg,

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

"every attempt to edit a work, even when the aim of the edition was to restore earlier or more authorial or otherwise authentic readings, is not, in the end, an act of restoration but is instead a new creative act that merely adds to the accumulating stock of available editions" (2006: 7). Swap "edit" and "edition" for "translate" and "translation" and the sentence rings equally true. This argument is, moreover, not just a theoretical one: Shillingsburg offers specific policy recommendations, as it were, for how editors can make readers aware of the status of the text they are reading and the processes that shaped it. "The new text emerging as a result of editorial work," he writes, "should declare itself for what it is: a new iteration of some previous iteration as found in one previously existing physical object, or more" (19). Editors should, in other words, name and describe their sources, announce their methodology, and be forthright—in introductions and afterwords, or in supplementary articles and essays—about how their edition reflects their interpretation of the work in question and shapes others' interpretations in turn. While publishers rarely give translators space to discuss their approach, Shillingsburg's recommendations are very much in line with what many translators and scholars of translation would like to see happening in that domain as well.

Despite their lack of communication, the fields of translation studies and textual scholarship have recently been undergoing parallel shifts that involve similar reconfigurations of the metaphorical terrain onto which the activities of translating and editing are often mapped. In the wake of Venuti's enormously influential *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995), translation studies has exhibited an increasing concern with the marginalization of translators in the publishing industry and the academy. Many scholars have encouraged translation practices that seek to resist what Venuti calls the "hegemony of transparent discourse" (304) and to bring translators back into view, not just in book reviews and jacket copy, but within the texts of translations themselves. Likewise, a growing number of textual scholars seek to counteract what David Greetham calls the "disappearing act" by which editors have long been complicit in minimizing the visibility of their interventions into the texts they treat, and to focus readers' attention on the "phenomenologically fraught and powerful role" (1996: xiii) editors play in the formation of literary texts. Ever greater numbers of scholarly editors are eschewing the so-called eclectic method, with its customary emphasis on the author's supposed final intentions, in favor of methods that recognize the collaborative or social aspect of textual production and the validity of varying versions of works, while underscoring rather than obscuring the interpretive effort that goes into the preparation of both scholarly and popular editions.

This book seeks to consolidate, further, and enhance the rigor of the conceptual shifts taking place in these two fields by bringing them into

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

sustained and explicit contact—or rather, by demonstrating that, like translating and editing, they are already standing on much the same ground, however unstable that ground may be.[11] Textual scholars and translators have always been called upon to negotiate a tension between the one and the many, between the metaphysical and the material, between an understanding of the work as an abstract entity that exists independent of any one manifestation and a close-range focus on the materiality of textual production and circulation. This book presents translating and editing as mutually implicated processes whose points of divergence are also points of contact. I focus primarily on the ways in which those involved in extending the reach of literary works through the production and dissemination of translations—authors, translators, rights holders, agents, editors, publishers, scholars, and so on—both negotiate and further the textual instability that has always characterized literary works, even those from a time before the concept of "literature" existed. Not only do translators (often in collaboration, or contestation, with other individuals) choose between, consolidate, or otherwise negotiate the available versions of the works they translate, they also create others versions of those works, expanding a shelf (to paraphrase Shillingsburg's claim for scholarly editions) on which there will always be more room.[12]

Literary Translation and the Making of Originals questions the often unexamined assumption that the object of translation is a single, stable lexical entity whose existence predates the process of translation. I argue that each translator creates her own original, fixes a particular text as the "prior" text to be translated—fixes it sometimes before translating, and sometimes during and even by way of the process we tend to think of as "translation proper." So-called originals are not given but made, and translators are often party to that making. In saying this, I do not mean to claim that translations are original creative products "in their own right" (to borrow that common phrase of backhanded praise). This may be true, but it is incidental to what this book is about. And if it is true, it is so only insofar as *any* text can be called an "original" creative product: "originals," too, are shaped by generic conventions and a nearly infinite list of ghostly "sources." My point, on the contrary, is that a particular text becomes an "original" only when

[11] Esther Allen, too, points to the fact that translation "can and does" involve the activities Greetham includes in his definition of textual scholarship ("the discovery, description, transcription, editing, glossing, annotating and commenting upon texts," quoted in Allen: 210). Gary Taylor, meanwhile, views editing and translating as parallel modes of "regulated transformation" (citing Derrida), and even suggests that we reconceptualize editorial theory "as a special subset of translation theory" (99).

[12] Shillingsburg (1996: 114): "each new scholarly edition, unless carelessly produced, extends the shelf on which there is still space."

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

another, derivative text comes along to *make* it so. Thus while I invoke the language of originals and sources throughout this book, I do so largely to contest the understanding of translation that these terms represent. One of my central goals in challenging the assumption that a stable original preexists the process of translation is precisely to make us more aware of the assumptions embedded in the language we use to talk about the objects and products of translation.[13] An "original" is distinct from a "copy." The adjective "original" stands in counterpoint to "derivative," "imitative," "banal." In common parlance, translations are derivative, while the texts we translate are originals, no matter how derivative, imitative, or banal those prior texts may be. The very idea of a textual "origin" or "source" not only ignores the many sources upon which an "original" may itself rest, but rhetorically strips translations of *their* potential for what we conventionally (if problematically) call "originality."

Translations *are* derivative, of course—but so are so-called originals. If we begin to recognize the extent to which translations are not only shaped by but also shape those "originals," we may finally be able to let go of the rhetoric and ideology of faithfulness, and to replace an outdated understanding of translation as a transfer or transmission of some semantic invariant with a more reasonable understanding of translation as a further textual extension of an already unstable literary work. As a consequence, we may also become more open to experimental forms of translation we have tended to dismiss as not really translation, or other forms we have yet to encounter or conceive—forms that may currently be hidden in plain sight.

Unexceptional editing

Works of literature almost always exist in multiple forms even in the language in which they are first composed. These forms are shaped, directly or indirectly, not only by those named as their authors, but by patrons, amanuenses, scribes, editors, publishers, typesetters, designers, and so on, not to mention the histories of literary production that precede the particular works in question. The longer a work survives and the more widely it is distributed, the greater the number of forms it is likely to take. My university library currently has seventy-nine different holdings for *Robinson Crusoe* in

[13] For excellent reflections on the metaphorical language we use to talk about translation, see Gambier and van Doorslaer's *The Metalanguage of Translation* (2009), and James St. André's edited volume *Thinking through Translation with Metaphors* (2010), particularly Maria Tymoczko's contribution, as well as Chamberlain (1988) and Michael Emmerich (2013).

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

English, including the first printing of 1719 (whose title was in fact *The life and strange surprising adventures of Robinson Crusoe, of York, mariner, Who lived eight and twenty years, all alone in an un-inhabited island on the coast of America, near the mouth of the great river of Oroonoque; Having been cast on shore by shipwreck, wherein all the men perished but himself. With an account how he was at last as strangely deliver'd by pyrates. Written by himself*); four additional printings of that edition that appeared within the year; and numerous subsequent editions, some illustrated, some abridged, some (particularly those intended for young readers) illustrated *and* abridged, some facsimiles of earlier editions, some digitally available, published under widely varying titles and often supplemented by editorial paratext of various sorts. Then there are the translations (into twenty-two languages, including Esperanto) and the continuations (two by Defoe and many more by others); the translations of the continuations; the adaptations, literary and filmic; a comic opera, the libretto for which has also been translated numerous times; scores for pantomimes and children's songs; and so on. *Robinson Crusoe* is a tree whose branches beget branches that themselves beget others.

If you think I've chosen an isolated example—admittedly a bit extreme—to prove my case, I invite you to walk over to your bookshelf. Try to find a work of literature for which you are entirely sure that the text in the book on your shelf is the only text there is: no hardcover or paperback or digital edition that might differ from it, either lexically or bibliographically, no excerpts in anthologies or internet prepublications, no audiobooks, no abridgements, no scholarly editions bristling with annotations, no revised versions or as-yet-undiscovered manuscripts. You may find such a work, but I very much doubt it. When we introduce the specter of translation into the mix, the number of potential texts becomes, for all intents and purposes, infinite. Each of the many textual manifestations of a work in its language of composition could potentially become an object of translation. Likewise, each version of the work in another language will not only be the product of a translator's (or translators') interpretive efforts, but will take shape in an edition of its own—or many editions over time, particularly if the translation achieves a canonical status. The widespread practice of so-called relay translation (a term that houses an embedded spatial metaphor of translation as transfer), in which a translation serves as an intermediary text for another translation of the same work in a third language, demonstrates that translations can in fact be objects of further translation, notwithstanding Walter Benjamin's thoughts on the matter.[14] Each of these cases demonstrates the

[14] The relevant passage from Benjamin's "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers" reads, in Stephen Rendall's translation ("The Translator's Task"): "The more distinctive the work, the more

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

fundamental theoretical tension between the one and the many that we encounter when talking about works of literature: we often operate as if works were singular, unified entities, though they in fact assume multiple textual forms that are often quite different from one another.

In distinguishing between *work* and *text*, I am drawing on the usage of those terms in contemporary Anglophone textual scholarship. A work, Shillingsburg writes, is a "product of the imagination" that can take shape in many versions corresponding to different moments in the work's development; a text is "the actual order of words and punctuation contained in any one physical form, such as a manuscript, proof, or book," or in digital or oral forms.[15] When encountering, interpreting, and discussing particular textual instantiations of literary works, many readers, including the professional readers of the academy, tend to overlook both the contingency of those texts and the ways in which they have been editorially shaped by any number of hands. In a 1958 lecture, textual scholar Fredson Bowers complained that "many a literary critic has investigated the past ownership and mechanical condition of his second-hand automobile, or the pedigree and training of his dog, more thoroughly than he has looked into the qualifications of the text on which his critical theories rest" (5). Bowers was speaking at a time

it remains translatable, in the very fleeting nature of its contact with sense. This is of course true only of original works. Translations, on the contrary, prove to be untranslatable not because the sense weighs on them heavily, but rather because it attaches to them all too fleetingly" (2012: 83).

[15] See Shillingsburg (1996: 42, 46) for these quotations. Shillingsburg is trying in this passage to encourage greater uniformity among scholars' usages of terms that have historically been quite slippery. While my own use of *work* and *text* corresponds fairly closely to what he proposes, there are some crucial differences, arising first and foremost from my attempt to open up the "work" to accommodate *translingual* versions, i.e., translations in other languages. The definitions Shillingsburg offers focus explicitly on authorial intent: a "version" of the work is not only "one specific form of the work," but "the [form] the author intended at some particular moment in time" (44), while each text "represents more or less well or completely a version of the work" (46), i.e., an authorially-intended form. While Shillingsburg recognizes the sociological nature of textual production and the plurality of individuals whose work contributes to the existence and circulation of texts for a work, his schema may need to be tweaked in order to accommodate the confluence of authorial and translatorial intention that translation seems to involve. I note, too, that the desire among textual scholars for a clear distinction between "work" and "text" is complicated by the nearly opposite definitions of *oeuvre* and *texte* given by Roland Barthes in *De l'oeuvre au texte* (translated by Richard Howard as "From Work to Text," Barthes 1986), which greatly influenced the use of these terms by subsequent literary scholars. For further discussions of twentieth-century developments in textual scholarship and the ontology of the work and the text, see McGann (1983); Tanselle (1989); and Groden (1991). See also Cohen (1991) for a number of excellent essays on the role of theory in textual editing, and the paradigm shift in the field of textual scholarship. These books, while now a few decades old, remain key contributions to a field of whose advances many literary critics and translation scholars remain only marginally aware.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

when New Criticism, infused with ideas from the Russian formalists that encouraged a focus on the mechanics of a text in isolation from its history of production and circulation, held sway in Anglo-American literary studies, and when the rift between textual scholars and literary critics was growing ever deeper. Textual scholars largely focused their efforts on attempts to reconstruct lost or never-fully-realized texts corresponding to an author's "final intentions" for a work. Meanwhile, literary scholars—unschooled in the specialized labor of scholarly editing and trained by the era's dominant methodologies of reading to treat a text as an autonomous entity ready for the hermeneutic touch—often took for granted the reliability of the texts on which they based their interpretations. In other words, scholarly editors downplayed the interpretive nature of their work, while literary critics treated textual scholarship as a "preliminary operation" by which a text was fixed that they could proceed to interpret.[16]

On the whole, Bowers' caustic description of literary critics' disinterest in the editorial history of the texts and works they treat may still hold true. Just as academics in any number of fields routinely decline to cite translators when quoting works in translation ("According to Jacques Derrida," "As Karl Marx writes," or, "In the words of Walter Benjamin," followed by words for which Derrida or Marx or Benjamin can be held only partly responsible), literary scholars, while certainly aware that editing happens, often proceed with the work of interpretation as if it didn't. This may be particularly frustrating to those in the field of textual scholarship, which in the past several decades has undergone what George Bornstein calls a "sea change" in its conception of its own goals and purpose; in the methodology by which editions are constructed; and in the tools editors use to make editorial activity visible within editions themselves. The notion of textual finality has been undone by the recognition that works often exist "in several versions no one of which can be said to constitute the 'final' one" (McGann 1983: 32). An author's "intention to *mean*" has been judged ultimately unrecoverable. And while her "intention to *do*," i.e., to put certain words to paper, "may be at least partially recoverable from the signs written," that intention is often qualified by the author's explicit or implicit expectations about what others would do with her text, including publishers, editors, copyeditors, and designers, all involved in the process of bringing a piece of writing into print or digital form (Shillingsburg 1996: 34). Scholars such as Shillingsburg, Bornstein, Jerome McGann, and D. F. McKenzie have thus dismissed the notion that a quest for authorial intentions should necessarily drive editorial

[16] The phrase "preliminary operation" dates at least to Austin Warren and René Wellek's *Theory of Literature*, first published in 1949.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

activity, promoting instead an understanding of literary creation as a social rather than a solitary endeavor. While an author's intentions still figure as one factor among many to be taken into consideration during the process of constructing an edition, these scholars also recognize the legitimacy of various versions, the importance of actors other than the author, and even the significance of what McGann calls the "bibliographical code" (1998: 123), a set of nontextual elements including page design, the incorporation of illustrations or images, binding, page size, paper weight, and so on, all of which affect a reader's experience of a work. Web platforms and digital devices offer still other nontextual elements that likewise affect the reading experience.

This fundamental reexamination of the nature of the literary work and its relationship to its various texts has, meanwhile, encouraged editors to reconsider the structure and purpose of the editions they produce. As Philip Cohen and David Jackson note, "an editor's assumptions regarding literary ontology … determine the stages of the editorial process as well as the form of the edition itself" (104); a change in our understanding of what a work is and how (not what) it means necessitates a new set of editorial methodologies that better account for these new conceptual frameworks and interpretive priorities. Recent decades have thus seen a flood of new editions, print and electronic, that seek to represent more adequately both the textual mutability of literary works and the potential significance of elements that had previously been overlooked, including the visual and material aspects of texts.[17] This proliferation of new editorial forms, including an increasing array of digital archives and editions, invites literary critics, in turn, to explore a diverse set of intellectual arguments that treat instability as a central aspect of the textual condition, and of the particular works they choose to discuss. Moreover, since the creation of an edition is itself an act of criticism, textual scholars continue to urge students of literature at all levels, from undergraduates to senior scholars, to equip themselves with basic information about the composition and publication history of the texts they interpret, and to cultivate a sufficient understanding of editorial methodology so as to "read" not just the text at hand but also the edition that gives it shape.

[17] Chapter 3 of this book will discuss a number of editions of Emily Dickinson's work that seek to do just this. I cannot hope to give a representative list of examples here, but a few might include the Rossetti Archive, McGann's hypermedia archive of the writings and images of Dante Gabriel Rossetti; Morris Eaves's digital archive of the work of William Blake; the Homer Multitext Project, an open source project to offer digital editions of extant manuscripts; and Jack Stillinger's 1995 *Coleridge and Textual Instability: The Multiple Versions of the Major Poems*, which includes an edition of Coleridge's best known poems, an account of his process of self-revision, and a critical text about how such texts should be presented.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

In many realms, scholarly editing has historically been a cross-lingual endeavor: think of the centuries of classical Chinese texts given scholarly apparatuses in other languages in Asia, or the long-lived European habit of writing textual apparatus in Latin, or the use of Hebrew as an interlanguage by scholars of ancient Semitic languages. Yet even as the modern field of textual scholarship moves outward from its nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century fixation on authorial origins and intent, contemporary discussions of textual theory and editorial methodology continue to be deeply rooted in single-language literary traditions, exhibiting what Conor Fahy calls a form of intellectual "national isolationism" (401). Moreover, we rarely think of books in translation as translingual editions of works (a fact that, in my view, shows rather surprisingly just how much their own thing we think translations are). A translation is widely understood to be a derivative text that both embodies a particular interpretation and also contributes to what Walter Benjamin famously called the "*Fortleben*" of an "original," its "afterlife," or "continuing life," or "surviving life" (depending on which English version of Benjamin you read).[18] Yet a translation is also widely understood as contributing to that ongoing life not by *living* it but by *pointing* to it; translations continue to be considered "no substitute for the original," even if, as David Bellos points out, that is precisely how translations often function.[19] All the *Crime and Punishment*s and *Crimen y castigo*s and *Verbrechen und Strafe*s in the world, while giving us wonderful ways to spend long, lazy afternoons, seem inevitably, inexorably also to disclose their own crimes of murdering

[18] Or, of course, any number of translations of this word in the many languages that host interpretive iterations of Benjamin's piece. (The three English terms come from the translations by Rendall [2012], Zohn [2004], and Hynd and Volk [1968].) For a field putatively concerned with cross-linguistic networks of meaning, translation studies as practiced in the United States and Europe has done a very poor job of considering the fact that many of its key terms may not resonate in languages spoken outside these locations. In fact, even within the Western European context the presumption of equivalence between key terms in various languages is highly problematic. As Robert Young has pointed out, much translation theory "assumes that there is a unitary global concept for practices called (in English) translation": the field proceeds as if "there is in fact an equivalence among the terms 'translation,' 'traduction,' 'Übersetzung,' and so on" (2014: 51)—not to mention the many other words in languages primarily spoken outside Europe. Maria Tymoczko has described translation as a cross-cultural "cluster concept" comprised of a "wide range and variation of conceptualizations, ideas, norms, practices, and histories," attention to which, she hopes, will "[begin] to open up the domain of translation far beyond the ideas of transfer, fidelity, and so-called equivalence that have been valorized in Eurocentric cultures" (2014: 168; see also Tymoczko 2010). See also Ricci on Java conceptions of activities akin to translation, and how recentering the discipline elsewhere might lead to *different* descriptions and conceptions of what these activities are.

[19] Bellos (2011: 37). See also footnote 4.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

this or that aspect of a Russian text or texts we ourselves cannot read—the dreaded "violence" of translation, which many scholars treat as if it were something more than metaphor.[20] The commonplace insistence on an ideal of translational "fidelity" means that promiscuity is for originals alone; the last thing we want is for a translation to go messing around with an unstable text, much less with several at once.

Translation's deictic gesture seems, in a way, to roll readers right back to 1958: when it comes to texts in translation, our understanding of textual instability as a basic characteristic of literary works flies out the window, and we revert to speaking of an "original" or "source text" as if it were a stable entity whose self-sameness could be taken for granted. While we recognize that a given work of literature can give rise to multiple translations, we are less willing to admit that a translator might, in the course of her work, need to negotiate the existence of multiple texts for that work, or even engage in the editorial finessing of a new so-called original. In other words, with regard to translation, the understanding of textual scholarship as a preliminary operation seems alive and well: we may recognize semantic multiplicity as an unavoidable feature of language, and thus the "source text" as open to any number of interpretations, but the actual words of that source are often assumed to be more or less fixed, even by scholars of translation. Yet this assumption simply ignores the reality of the textual condition. If we can't count on a work being lexically stable even as a theoretical ideal, and if any new edition of a work in its language of composition presents not a definitive text but an interpretation of the materials at hand—if, that is, the "afterlife" begins not with the translation but with those "originals" themselves—translators are suddenly faced with the problem of how to arrive at a "source text" to begin with, and how to adjudicate between potentially conflicting versions or editorial presentations of a work in the language from which they are translating.

Textual instability is the rule rather than the exception. The more a translator digs into the composition and publication history of a work, the more likely she is to find entirely new sets of choices to be made concerning the constitution of her "original" and how to present it to a new set of readers. Like editors, translators shape the forms in which readers encounter literary works. The editions they help to create are based on existing shapes, but also give new and different shapes to those works, ones that help define for a new readership what and how those works mean, and even what they are, where their margins lie. The more aware of

[20] See Douglas Robinson's chapter on Philip Lewis in *What is Translation?* (1997) for a remarkable contestation of the rhetoric of violence in translation studies.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

this we are, the more concertedly and creatively we may try to make our readers cognizant of some of the many decisions that comprise the process of translation, and the construction of the edition that presents our "final" product—whose shape, of course, may change as our translations, too, enter new printings, new media, new contexts of reception, and are perhaps even taken up and revised or responded to by subsequent generations of translators, editors, or both.[21] Inviting readers to recognize how translation both negotiates and contributes to the textual instability of literary works can also help us combat more effectively the mistaken idea that translation involves a transfer of some invariant "meaning." After all, the fact that translations rarely have only one possible source not only makes such a transfer impossible, it also makes word-level comparisons between a translation and an assumed original both practically and conceptually problematic.[22]

The convoluted translingual publication history of Vassilikos's novel is certainly a case in point. And while it may be an extreme case, extreme is not the same as exceptional. Among the several books I have translated, of poetry and prose, I am hard pressed to find a single one for which a stable text could be said to exist in Greek. Conversations with others

[21] Consider, for instance, D. J. Enright's editing of Terrence Kilmartin's reworking of C. K. Scott Montcrieff's translations of Proust. Likewise, the first time I read the poetry of C. P. Cavafy was in Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard's translations, as published by Princeton University Press in 1992. However, the instructor of the course I was taking preferred the slightly different translations in the 1972 edition, and asked us to laboriously "correct" some of the translations in our copies of the 1992 edition, which was subsequently followed by another edition in 2009. When readers refer to the "Keeley and Sherrard translation" of a particular poem by Cavafy, they may not know just how many such translations are currently in circulation, both in printed books and in online citations, as on the English-language website of the Cavafy Archive (www.cavafy.com). In other words, translations need be no more stable than "originals" in their published forms.

[22] In his landmark *Descriptive Translation Studies–and beyond* (2012; 1st edn 1995), Gideon Toury noted that, any time we hope to investigate a translator's choices by comparing a source text with a translation, we first have to determine what source was used, since "a multitude of candidates for a source text may exist" (74). Toury's methodology for determining a source rested, paradoxically, on comparing the translation with potential sources. There are several problems with this approach. First of all, the source may not be publicly available—it may, for instance, exist in a unique copy on the translator's shelf, as with my altered Gnosi edition of Vassilikos's novel. Second, the translator might have drawn on multiple sources, in one or more than one language. More importantly, the kind of comparison Toury suggests would likely enable one to determine only between sources that differ quite radically, rather than sources with subtle differences in wording. Likewise, this comparative method seems to rest on an assumption of a lexical transfer of content, in which every word of a source could be accounted for. See Chapter 5 for a contestation of this notion.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

in the translation community have shown that my experiences are not uncommon.[23] Translators frequently work with living authors who see a translation as an opportunity to revisit a work, tailoring content for an audience abroad or revising a book according to their own changed aesthetic sensibilities. A translator is likely to read the text or texts she is working with as closely as anyone ever will, and her response to textual details (including, at times, factual errors) can elicit changes from an author, even to a book that is already in print. Particularly in an age of digital communication, many translators are in close contact with authors, who often alter texts or rewrite passages as a result of queries, though these revised "originals" may never see the light of day outside of an email thread.[24] Collections of poems or books of short stories in translation often include pieces from several extant volumes, and may even present newly written pieces that have yet to be published in the language from which they are being translated. It is in fact not uncommon for works of literature to circulate first in translation, sometimes because publication in an author's country of birth or residence is made impossible by social or political circumstances. If these works subsequently appear in their language of initial composition, the forms may differ from those that were translated. Works may appear in censored forms

[23] To give just one example, a recent panel entitled "Translation as Collaboration" at the 2016 conference of the Association of Writers and Writing Programs featured four translators: Kareem James Abu-Zaid, Edward Gauvin, Shabnam Nadiya, and myself. All of us discussed instances in which our translation work intersected with what might more commonly be understood as editorial work, usually but not always in collaboration with the author.

[24] One consequence is that readers of translated texts who can compare a translation to its presumed original can't ever be sure that the text they have before them is in fact the text on which the translation was based. See, for instance, Madeline Levine's review of Bill Johnston's translation of Magdalena Tulli's *In Red*, in which she wonders why "the entire third paragraph of the Polish original, almost a page long, does not appear in the translation. There is no indication on the copyright page or elsewhere in the Archipelago edition that *In Red* was not translated directly from the 1968 edition, yet here and there one finds in the English version minor changes in descriptions and even entire sentences that do not appear in the Polish. Since it is inconceivable that Johnston would have decided to exercise his creative talents by adding to the original, one can only conclude that Tulli saw the English translation as her opportunity to revise her novel a decade after its publication. It would have been interesting to be told when and why she made the changes" (82). Levine is generous enough with Johnston to assume—correctly, as I learned from a personal conversation with Johnston himself—that he was working from an edited text by Tulli. One can, however, imagine a situation in which a reviewer might not be so generous, and might blame the translator for any perceived divergences in the texts. Levin's "generosity" also rests both on the assumption that translation performs a recognizable transfer of content, and that the exercise of a translator's "creative talents" will properly adhere to certain limitations upon which we agree: it is "inconceivable" that this respected translator would "add" to the text. See also footnote 3 on adding and subtracting.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

in one place and in noncensored (or differently censored) forms elsewhere, even in a single language; translations, too, often pass under a censor's pen. In these and many other circumstances, line-by-line comparisons—or, at least, comparisons that seek to evaluate the success of a particular translation by tracing its supposed similarity to the textual configuration of a "source"—are rendered futile. (They are often misguided to begin with, since such comparisons are usually based on an understanding of translation as semantic transfer that does not hold up under scrutiny.)

Consider Alex Zucker's *City Sister Silver*, released by Catbird Press in 2000, a masterful and inventive translation of Jáchym Topol's *Sestra*, which was published in the Czech Republic first in 1994 and again, in revised form, in 1996. Zucker began translating the novel before the revised text was published, and therefore worked from the first edition. Topol reportedly gave him free rein to edit the book as he saw fit, on the assumption that an English-language audience would be less tolerant of culturally specific material than those able to read the book in Czech. Zucker cut a total of about twenty pages, in passages ranging from less than a paragraph to several pages in length. Yet for readers who might want to read a translation of the entire first edition, Zucker and his publisher made most of those deleted passages available on the Catbird Press website as a downloadable file.[25] The 1994 and 1996 Czech versions and the 2000 English print version are thus all quite differently configured, while the textual instability manifested by Zucker's print-plus-digital translation mimics or extends the instability of the Czech. Given that his translator's note to the book makes his interventions clear, Zucker's approach to his task as translator-editor seems in keeping with Shillingsburg's desire that editors disclose their sources and editorial methodology, and also "prepare an apparatus that will make the edition useful to persons wishing that another orientation had been employed" (1996: 26). Zucker's solution to this editorial conundrum points toward the ever more significant role that supplementary texts may play in providing readers with information about the translations before them. While translators are rarely given adequate space to discuss their work within the covers of a printed book, the increasing popularity of digital platforms may enable translators to make hitherto "invisible" aspects of their task more accessible to readers in other forms and contexts.[26]

[25] For excised passages of at least a paragraph in length, see http://www.catbirdpress.com/firstchaps/cuts.htm (last accessed 7 May 2017). I am grateful to Alex Zucker for talking to me about this project, and to Michelle Woods for sharing with me an unpublished lecture, "Translating Topol: Kafka, the Holocaust, and Humor."

[26] Karin Littau likewise suggests that hypertext might be used as a tool to present "variant translations," thus "confront[ing] its readers with the very impossibility of a definitive

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

Decisions regarding the makeup of an "original" can seem even more weighty when one is translating a work by a deceased author who cannot be consulted for assistance or approval. With such works, it may be tempting for translators to hew as closely as possible to the editorial choices of others. After all, works often find their way into print via the painstaking efforts of trained scholars whose expertise differs greatly from that of most translators. Bernhard Echte and Werner Morlang spent years deciphering Robert Walser's Mikrogramme, or "microscripts"—whose penciled letters are barely a millimeter high, such that an entire story can be squeezed into the blank space on a calling card—for their six-volume German-language edition of Walser's later works.[27] If potential translators had to decipher these scripts anew, or if every translator of Kafka's unfinished novel *Der Verschollene* (which Max Brod titled *Amerika* for its first posthumous German-language publication in 1927, and which has since been published in several editions that differ significantly from Brod's) had to decide how to order the chapters, or if translators of *Gilgamesh* had to visit the cuneiform collections of countless museums all over the world in order to piece together an "original," those works might never be translated at all. Many of the examples I discuss in this book are works scholars have spent decades studying, editing, and writing about; these scholars can, even in absentia, serve as collaborators of sorts.

By the same token, the existence of multiple editions for works such as *Gilgamesh* or Kafka's novels means that translators may have to choose between them. Even for works that are not fragmentary or unfinished, works whose textual makeup hasn't been subject to much-publicized contestation, the decision to use a particular edition or editions as the basis for a translation can entail significant intellectual and interpretive positioning. In translating the book-length early poems of Greek poet Eleni Vakalo, I had to negotiate the extensive differences between the first editions, whose visual aspects were designed by the poet herself, and the more commercially available collected edition of her work—also produced during her lifetime, but edited and designed by others—whose pages and spreads looked radically different. My decision to follow the bibliographic organization of the first editions was based on extensive research in the poet's archive, and on an interpretive claim that the collected edition failed to

translation, and therefore also with the impossibility of the closure of the original" (91). Littau argues against the notion of the "faithful translation" and the "blind acceptance of the 'supremacy of the original'" by reconceptualizing translation "as the re-writing of an already pluralized 'original'" (81).

[27] See Walser (2011) for an edited selection of texts based on these transcriptions, with images of selected manuscripts. See also Walser (2010) for Susan Bernofsky's translation of a smaller selection of these texts; this edition also includes images of the manuscripts.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

account for aspects of these works that I considered crucial to their mode of meaning; my translations thus present embodied interpretations of what *and* how these poems mean.[28] This kind of research is not generally considered part of the translator's task, though it may feel like a natural step for some translators who are also literary scholars, and who see their translation work as part and parcel of a broader intellectual engagement with a field of study that often involves archival research. However, given the dearth of visible public engagement with the role of textual and bibliographic instability in translation, many translators may be less attuned to the fact that determinations regarding the textual makeup of "originals" are an inevitable part of the process of translation—that, in other words, they themselves are often already making these decisions by their de facto endorsement of the prior editorial choices of others. Translators may have little sense that a choice between editions, for instance, may be theirs to make.

And of course that choice is *not* always theirs, and certainly not solely theirs. For premodern and early modern works circulating in the public domain, long-standing editorial convention has often given a remarkably stable lexical form to a particular text or set of texts, which is then replicated across editions, albeit in different bibliographic forms. Translators of Aeschylus, Homer, Dante, or Murasaki Shikibu may not feel they are in a position to question the texts before them, or at least not beyond certain words or passages that scholars already consider contested variants. And yet those texts don't simply appear out of the blue; they are, rather, consolidated by literary or textual traditions, by historical circumstances and processes of canon formation that involve the actions of countless individuals, ourselves included (as translators, editors, readers, writers, teachers). For modern and contemporary works, on the other hand, such decisions may not fall within a translator's legal purview. Many editorial decisions are made or preempted by those who hold the translation rights to particular works, and are inscribed in the contracts translators sign before they even start working; other decisions are manifested in the interventions, sometimes unwelcome, of in-house editors who often have the final say.[29] Publishers,

[28] The translations, which embody my argument about the importance of the visual aspect of these texts, were published by Ugly Duckling Presse as *Before Lyricism* (2017). For a scholarly version of this argument, see Karen Emmerich (2013).

[29] See Marilyn Booth's "Translator v. author" (2015), which treats her experience of having an author and editor overrule her own wishes regarding a translation she produced. See also Eva Hemmungs Wirtén's discussion (2011: 38–56) of Tiina Nunnally's decision to withdraw her name from the U.K. edition of Peter Hoeg's *Smilla's Sense of Snow* over objections to the author's and editor's interventions into her translation; the translation was published under the pseudonym "F. David." For one almost comical example of what it might look like for a translator to incorporate a sense of the textual history

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

especially trade publishers, rarely give (or perhaps even think to give) translators the purview to make basic decisions about "sources," or about the forms of the translations they produce; they also rarely give translators space to discuss their methodology or approach in notes or introductions, thus depriving readers of one opportunity to gain at least a rudimentary sense of the complex processes that have produced the text before them. Translations, we are often told, don't sell, and the more a publisher can do to help a reader overlook the fact that the text they are reading is a translation, the better. Yet in a cultural moment in which forms of citational composition such as the remix, the mashup, the retweet, and the annotated share have become deeply embedded in everyday popular practice, publishers may find that their attempts to protect the supposed authorial purity of the work of literature by downplaying the visibility of translation is no longer quite so necessary, desirable, or even relevant to the way many readers want to read.

Translation is, indeed, an exemplary case of divided authority. And if more and more of us are now willing to treat textual production as a collective enterprise for works in the languages in which they were first composed, the time has surely come for us to recognize the translator's role not just in interpreting a "source text," but in determining what that text is, and in shaping the edition that will present her translation to the world. This recognition may, in turn, help us to understand that translations are not mere derivative works beholden to (yet always failing to adequately represent) a single, stable "original." They are, instead, textual iterations of a work in another language—translingual editions that both represent a work and add to it, extending the growth of that work in new interpretive forms.

of a work into the resulting translation, see Manuel Portela's two-volume Portuguese-language translation of Laurence Sterne's *Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*, which attempts to imitate the minutest of visual and material details of the first bound edition of the novel. In an essay discussing the challenges of this self-assigned task of "fidelity" to a particular physical manifestation of Sterne's book, Portela notes that the typographical aspect and historical context of this work "face the translator with a number of editorial dilemmas," since "it is often impossible to distinguish between the typographical and the semantic element" (290). There is, too, Sterne's own injunction that future editors "do not presume to alter or transpose one Word, nor rectify one false Spelling, nor so much as add or diminish one Comma or Title, in or to my Romance" (295). Of course, the translation replaces *all* the words of Sterne's text. Yet Portela also attempts to replicate, to the extent possible, the visual and material aspects of the first edition, much to his publisher's exasperation: "my suggestion of actually marbling the paper so that we would have different patterns in each of the 2,000 copies raised serious doubts about my sanity as a translator" (304).

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

Editing, translation, and the ongoing configuration of the literary work

The task of textual scholarship presupposes the fundamental textual instability of literary works. It also implicitly challenges conventional understandings of the task of translation, and invites us to expand our conception of that task: one cannot think of translation as a transfer of invariant content if one recognizes variation and variability as constituent elements of "originals" themselves. By the same token, translation is a process that challenges textual scholars' traditional focus on the material history of works in a single language, and calls into question some of the most basic premises of scholarly editing as currently understood. That may, in fact, be one reason why textual scholars have been so hesitant to address translation in their work—or at least this was Peter Shillingsburg's supposition over twenty years ago, in a challenge to the field that has yet to be taken up:

> What then IS the work itself and how do texts contain or convey or represent the work itself? […] When does a work, through change, cease to be a work? What happens to the work if not only the physical document is changed but the linguistic text is substituted? Let us consider a transferal of works of literary art in which no attempt is made to transmit images either visual or aural, transmuting them into something like a total reincarnation—translations. I have often wondered why textual theorists have not explored the relation of translated texts to their originals with the same dedication that they have explored the relation of a transmitted text to its originals. For a while I thought it must have to do with an exaggeration of editorial disdain for the interference of publisher's editors. If a text can be corrupted by a compositor simply by repunctuating a text or by an editor merely regularizing the grammar or level of diction, then surely a translation, in which every word is different, is beneath our contemplation.
>
> I begin to think, however, that the real reason lies in a fear of the results of such an investigation. If we find that the work of art lives in the translation, how can we defend the idea that a novel with changed punctuation or a few altered words, where ninety-nine percent of the text is the same, is a ruined, corrupted wreck? An idea develops from this question: perhaps the work is not made up of any particular words but, finding its expression in words of a variety of texts, the work is a spiritual presence that lives through earthen vessels and transcends the limitations of any particular embodiment of it. This does not mean there cannot be bad translations or bad editions through which it might be

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

> difficult to encounter the "real presence" of the work, but such an idea is consonant with the popular perception that a book like *Moby-Dick* is so great in size and spirit that, as a friend elegantly suggested, "whole hunks of it could be hacked out and it would still be *Moby-Dick*" (1993: 43).

In this passage—whose "earthen vessel" and metaphysical understanding of the work as a "spiritual presence" subject to "total reincarnation" are strikingly reminiscent of Walter Benjamin's "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers" (translated by Stephen Rendall as "The Translator's Task")—Shillingsburg identifies the distinction between work and text as a fact crucial for editing and translating alike. It is this very distinction between the abstract entity of the work and the physical embodiment of a particular text that allows a work of literature to survive (as we often say) in a translation, in which all the words and punctuation are different from those of the text that has been translated. A work, once it enters the world, is subject to the textual condition, one of variance, difference, proliferation, and iterative growth, including growth in new linguistic contexts. Negotiating the tension between work and text, in and between languages (another embedded spatial metaphor), thus involves the underlying question of the relationship of the one to the many: how different can two texts be before we cease to see them as iterations of the same work? How much of *Moby-Dick* can we sacrifice to the abridger's scalpel, saw, or scimitar? Is *Moby-Dick* still *Moby-Dick* in Urdu?

In drawing a parallel between "transmitted" and "translated" texts, Shillingsburg admits the possibility that a work can be "transfer[red]" in other languages (a choice of terms informed by an assumption of equivalence that I would contest). Yes, *Moby-Dick* in Urdu is still *Moby-Dick*. But Shillingsburg also makes clear that many of his colleagues may not share this view. Their apparent discomfort with translations stems, he suggests, from a sense that the very fact of translation might call into question the conceptual foundations and methodology of scholarly editing as currently practiced. The common use of the term "survival" I noted above reflects an anxiety that a work might, in fact, escape an author's (or editor's) control—that it might *not* survive, and that we as readers may never know the difference. In other words, despite the widespread, if recent, acknowledgment in the field that the role of the editor is not to fix a definitive text that reflects an author's "final intentions" but to facilitate the continual creation of new, interpretive texts for existing works, many textual scholars may not be willing to conceive of a translation as a translingual edition of a given work. And if we face this kind of resistance within a scholarly community that largely accepts the sociological nature of textual production, it may take a concerted and coordinated effort to get general readers to reconceive of translation as an activity that, like editing,

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

shapes the ideas readers form about a particular work by shaping the form of an inherently unstable "original." We will have to counter the lingering belief among readers of all stripes in the primacy of so-called creative literature—an internalization of the image of the poetic genius whose original, self-expressive works can arise only from the ultimate source of a solitary writer.

The widespread, unqualified use of the term "original" implies a hierarchy between writing and translating that has real consequences in the realms of publishing and academia alike. This distinction between a stable "original" and a contingent, "derivative" translation also underlies many of the other metaphors that inform discussions of translation: figures of transfer, transmission, reproduction, preservation, damage, destruction, distortion, and of course the dreaded "loss" all suggest that the object of translation has a fixed identity that precedes the moment of translation. As I have been arguing, however, the fluid textual identity of the work is by no means a special problem that we face when dealing with translations; it is a fundamental aspect of the textual condition. "Developments in textual bibliography," as David Schalkwyk has written, "indicate that it is no longer feasible to posit a single, authoritative text that is a representation of its author's intention" (230). Echoing Benjamin's observation that the process of linguistic change transforms literary works even in the language of their composition, Schalkwyk notes that even were we to have a stable text in our hands, "its iterations across time bring *inevitable* alterations or transformations"; time is always a work's "primary translator" (232). Schalkwyk is writing here about the plays of Shakespeare, a figure so central to the Western literary canon that claims regarding his works' untranslatability approach the status of cliché. Yet Shakespeare's plays are also the best known examples in the English-language literary tradition of works whose contested texts and lack of authorial signature make the project of settling on a single authorial "original" an impossibility. Schalkwyk thus contests the very notion of Shakespeare's untranslatability by pointing out that, since we cannot determine precisely what the "Shakespeare text" *is*, the assumption that there is some invariant to be transferred via a paradigm of equivalence—an assumption on which the notion of untranslatability rests—simply makes no sense.

Textual instability is not an exception to the rule but an underlying condition that translators can choose either to engage or to ignore. So, too, is translation a simple fact of the world that textual scholars can choose either to engage or to ignore. Shillingsburg's insights into the elasticity and resilience of the work—its ability to survive "whole chunks" being removed or one entire text being replaced by another in a different language—find expansion in Schalkwyk's description of what he would like for us to make

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

of Shakespeare's oeuvre: instead of "jealously limiting the Shakespearean text (or 'Shakespeare') to those structures of signs that are either confined to a single language or reduced to the spirit of a particular person […] we could, following recent translation theory, encompass within the name 'Shakespeare' *all* the translations of the texts collected under that name" (232). Schalkwyk is drawing here on Patrick O'Neill's fascinating work on translations of James Joyce, in which O'Neill promotes the idea of a translingual, polyglot "*Joyce*" (author-function rather than author) whose works are to be located not in a single, stable text but in an ever-growing corpus of versions—including those in other languages, over which authority is manifestly shared. Like Shillingsburg, O'Neill acknowledges that individual translations can be, in part or in whole, "seriously inadequate or even unambiguously wrong." Yet even bad translations, he argues, can teach us things about the work in question, and can "contribute in a decidedly interesting fashion" to the "extension" of a literary work that is "still under multilingual construction."[30] Translation, for O'Neill as for Schalkwyk—and certainly for me—is best described not in terms of loss but in terms of perpetual, if uneven, growth and gain.[31]

[30] Stefan Helgesson, too, urges us to consider literature in translation as a "serial collective endeavor" (320) that involves not only authors and translators but publishers, editors, critics, and so on, all of whom "contribute to the collective labour of publicly constituting the literary work" (322). See also Isabel Hofmeyr's *The Portable Bunyan: A Transnational History of* The Pilgrim's Progress (2004), which considers this work both in its many rewritings in English and in innumerable translations largely in Africa in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Another important recent contribution to this conversation comes in Rebecca Walkowitz's *Born Translated: The Contemporary Novel in an Age of World Literature* (2015). Recognizing the distinction between work and text—or, in her discussion, work and book—she asks, "How many books constitute the work? Does the work consist of an edition in one language? Or does it consist of all editions, including those that may be produced in the future?" (46). Yet while Walkowitz is ostensibly writing about the transformation of literary works into world literature via translation, she, too, treats "originals" as stable objects of translation. Moreover, for a work of scholarship nominally interested in translation, *Born Translated* engages very little with the process or products of translation, or with the practitioners who engage in it. Although she presents translation as a site of "global collaborations" (98), and refers repeatedly to the collaboration between author and translator, her book in fact effaces translation itself—or, rather, folds the work of translation into the figure of the author, by looking primarily at best-selling books originally written in English *as if* they involved translation. The only time a translator is mentioned in her book is in a quote from a text by Ishiguro. For a strong critique of Walkowitz's project, see Venuti (2016).

[31] More recently, in a book on translations of Kafka, O'Neill argues for a concept he calls "macrotextuality": "any literary work potentially or actually involves both an original text and a macrotext that is made up of that text *and* all its translations." The related concept of "transtextuality" recognizes that "the original text is in principle always *extended* by its individual and cumulative translations" (2014: 9). O'Neill's attempt to compile a comprehensive description of this "worldwide Kafka *system*" (3) becomes a kind of genetic criticism in reverse, which examines the transformations wrought by a

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

This book furthers the discussion of translation as a continual reconfiguration of a work by recognizing, not eliding, the instability of so-called originals. The stress I place on the overlap between translation and textual scholarship will, I hope, allow readers to develop greater nuance in the ways they talk about both the objects and the products of translation. *Literary Translation and the Making of Originals* owes a great debt to the many other scholars of translation who have challenged paradigms of transfer and equivalence alike, and who have championed the notion that translation is an essentially interpretative endeavor. But it comes at the central issue from a different angle: by questioning the fixity of the "original" itself. Like any new edition of a work in its language of composition, each published translation is also a translingual edition, a further iteration of the work. A translator certainly can, and often does, choose to focus her interpretation on a single text—yet that text is rarely the only one the translator *could* have chosen. Whether or not these decisions are consciously made, and whether or not the translator is the one to make them, the process of bringing translated texts the world almost always entails negotiating between multiple versions of a work to be translated; determining what elements of a text or texts (lexical, visual, material, paratextual, and so on) will be considered; and shaping a new version and print or digital edition of the work in its new linguistic context. In representing more adequately what translation does, and in raising awareness even among translators of the implications of textual instability for their task, this book may encourage us to translate differently—to expand our notion of what translation can do, and to imagine modes of translating that break the mold in which the reigning (if often disguised) discourse of originality and derivation seems to have trapped us.

It is in this spirit that I offer a series of case studies in the chapters that follow. Chapter 1, "'A message from the antediluvian age': The Modern Construction of the Ancient *Epic of Gilgamesh*," considers the ways in which the material instability of the Gilgamesh tale affects and is affected by the task of translation. For many ancient works, standard texts were established long ago, and are now largely taken for granted even by specialists. This may, in fact, be a good working definition of a "standard text:" one that is taken for granted even by specialists. However, the work we now know as *The Epic of*

body of translingual renderings of an "original text." While I find O'Neill's work exciting, I also am wary of his continued reliance on the term "original text," compounded by phrases such as "Kafka's original text" or "Kafka's German"—a particularly fraught statement with regard to this writer, most of whose works were famously unfinished at the time of his death. O'Neill's methodology of comparing lines from Kafka's novels to multiple translations across languages yields interesting results, but also elides the editorial construction of those works in German.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

Gilgamesh is not one of those works. After a history of textual transmission that spanned several languages and at least a millennium and a half, in which stories of an ancient king named Gilgamesh (or, in the earliest versions, Bilgamesh) were told and retold, toward the end of the first millennium B.C.E. the languages and scripts in which they circulated passed into disuse, and the stories, too, faded from cultural consciousness. Only in the mid-nineteenth century, 2,000 years later, did stories of this king resurface, thanks to a number of pioneering Assyriologists whose project of recovery and decipherment was wrapped up in Orientalist thinking and politics of the time. Modern editions tend to present texts based on a twelve-tablet redaction dating to sometime between 1300 and 1000 B.C.E. In addition to the vast historical range of material witnesses to this "standard" Akkadian version, numerous fragments have been discovered elsewhere in the Middle East, composed in other languages or other historical and geographical versions of the "same" language. Likewise, even the "standard" text can't be traced to any *particular* twelve tables, but can only be guessed at on the basis of countless fragments. This chapter explores how modern editions negotiate the question of how to represent a work comprised by such a wide range of linguistic and textual manifestations. Even more crucially, however, I question the mechanisms by which we have come to "know" not only what the text of this epic is, but what the symbols that comprise its language mean. I propose that the very process of deciphering a lost, ancient language in an unknown script involves assigning phonetic and semantic equivalents on the level of the symbol and the word; I explore the role bilingual dictionaries play in structuring the terms of equivalence between ancient and modern languages and their surrounding cultures.

Chapter 2, "'Monuments of the Word': Translation and the Textualization of Modern Greek Folk Songs," addresses the challenges that works of orature, characterized by variation and ephemerality, pose to editors and translators alike. The chapter focuses on the editorial construction through translation of a corpus of modern Greek folk songs. It begins with Claude Fauriel's 1824 bilingual *Chants populaires de la Grèce modern* (*Folk songs of modern Greece*), produced by a French scholar who never traveled to the lands that would later become Greece, and who compiled his material largely through conversation and correspondence with literate Greeks living in Europe, themselves at a distance from the populations whose cultural production the collection supposedly represented. The very year after Fauriel's collection appeared, it was translated into English by Charles Sheridan, a vociferous supporter of the cause of Greek independence. Both of these volumes proved instrumental in garnering European support for the Greek revolution against the Ottoman Empire; they also laid the

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

ideological and practical foundation for a canon of modern Greek literature by linking a supposedly oral "past" with a literate present and providing a set of texts for literate Greeks to reproduce, comment upon, and use as inspiration for written works of their own. In examining how later Greek editions—which framed the songs in terms of political and cultural debates then taking place among Greek intellectuals—made use of the texts and even paratexts of these foreign editions, this chapter explores the role translation has played in shaping some of the foundational texts of a supposedly national literature.

If these first two chapters treat the editorial consolidation of texts for works with no recognizable author, whose numerous versions straddle languages and cover vast swathes of both geography and time, Chapter 3, "On Manuscripts, Type-Translation, and Translation (Im?)proper: Emily Dickinson and the Translation of Scriptural Form," turns to a poet whose work is often seen as bound up with her biography—or at least with the myth of the poet as a New England recluse, for whom poetry was not a public but a private affair. This chapter traces the posthumous editorial history of Dickinson's poetry and considers the consequences for translation of the ongoing scholarly debate over how to best represent Dickinson's idiosyncratic textual and scriptural forms in print, a debate prompted in large part by the 1981 publication of a two-volume facsimile edition of her "manuscript books." Discourse around these issues is steeped in the trope of translation: many scholars contend that to read Dickinson in a standard print edition (or, now, digital transcription) is to read her in translation—and, moreover, in a translation that fails to account for the potential significance of such elements as her handwriting, her unorthodox lineation and punctuation, and the pervasive presence of variants. This rhetorical use of the term "translation," I argue, reifies Dickinson's manuscripts in such a way as to disallow, on a conceptual level, translations of the poems in other languages. While I contest this implicit rejection of the possibility of interlingual translation, I also draw on the interest in the visual and material details of Dickinson's manuscripts to encourage a more capacious approach to translating those important aspects of literary works. The last section of the chapter turns to the work of poet and artist Jen Bervin, whose *Dickinson Composites* offers a model, or at least an inspiration, for a visually oriented translation we have yet to see.

Like Dickinson, Alexandrian Greek poet C. P. Cavafy chose not to circulate his work in conventionally printed editions during his lifetime; unlike Dickinson, however, he shared his writings with a remarkable number of readers, in unique collections of individually printed poems which he compiled by hand and distributed through a network of friends

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

and acquaintances. My fourth chapter, "The Unfinished Afterlives of C. P. Cavafy," explores the effect Cavafy's mode of selective self-publication had on the posthumous circulation of his work in Greek and in translation. I focus on a group of poems Cavafy never had printed, thirty-four poems found in varying states of completion in the poet's archive after his death. While my chapter on Dickinson touches only briefly on the complications that arise when attempting to translate textual variants, Chapter 4 takes the translation of variants as its central concern. Does an edition of an unfinished poem in its language of composition need to account for all textual variants present in the manuscripts? If so, should a translation be held to the same standard? How can one possibly represent variants in translation without reinforcing a mistaken understanding of translation as the production of word-level equivalence? This chapter approaches these questions by looking closely at three existing translations of a single "unfinished" poem, and how their translators approach the question of textual instability; it models a methodology of translation comparison that respects the interpretations of individual translators and questions the divide between "finished" and "unfinished" works, particularly in the case of writers who choose not to make their work commercially available.

The final chapter, "'The Bone-Yard, Babel Recombined': Jack Spicer and the Poetics of Citational Correspondence," takes a slight turn. Other chapters probe the ways translators negotiate, intervene in, and contribute to the unstable histories of literary works. Chapter 5 considers the boundary between writing and translation from a different angle, by treating both as ultimately citational practices. Rather than claiming originality for translations, I present "original writings" as themselves tissues of citation, explicit and implicit alike. At the same time, I make a case for more experimental modes of translation that move beyond notions of equivalence and transfer. This chapter focuses primarily on Jack Spicer's 1957 *After Lorca*, a book that combines translations of Federico García Lorca's poetry, pseudotranslations of nonexistent "originals" attributed to Lorca, and letters to the deceased Spanish poet that many scholars take to be Spicer's most cogent statements on poetics. Taking seriously Spicer's assertion that his "own" poems were written by "dictation"—a statement that abandons all claims to originality or authenticity not just for his translations but for his supposedly original writing as well—this chapter promotes translation as a form of creative work that, like other modes of writing, exists in dialogue (or in what Spicer calls "correspondence") not just with a single source but with an infinite number of sources, some traceable and others not. Spicer's work thus poses a challenge less to the assumed existence of a stable original than to the notion of stable authorial originality—a notion that underwrites many of

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

the assumptions that *Literary Translation and the Making of Originals* seeks to disrupt.

I end the book with a brief coda, "Toward a Pedagogy of Iterability," which argues for the importance of incorporating discussions of textual instability and translation into as many pedagogical contexts as possible. In his "Call to Action" at the end of *The Translator's Invisibility*, Venuti insists that "no translation should ever be taught as a transparent representation" of a "source-language text" (1995: 312). Yet as my book demonstrates, no "source-language text" is ever a transparent representation of a literary work, either. I thus follow André Lefevere in calling for pedagogical approaches that account for translation's status not only as an interpretive act, but as one form of rewriting among others.[32] The level of engagement with these issues can range from gestures as small as a recognition of editors and translators on syllabi and in audiovisual materials in the classroom, to entire courses devoted to modes of textual iteration. Such a focus—which I invite not only in literature classes but across the humanities and social sciences—can attune students to the mediated nature of the many texts they encounter, on a daily basis, both inside and outside the academic sphere. In raising the visibility of these forms of textual mediation, we may also begin to chip away at the unfortunate, arbitrary, and ultimately reversible disciplinary divides and divisions of labor that keep translators, scholars of translation, textual scholars, and literary critics apart.[33]

I end with this coda on pedagogy not only because of my commitment to promoting translation as a legitimate scholarly activity, but also because I believe that in order to gain acknowledgment for the practice of translation within the academic sphere we must raise both awareness of and respect for the products of translation at all levels, in disciplines across the university. Translators who are also academics are often expected to check their translator's hat each morning at the university gates—or, in the best case scenario, to wait until we have tenure to spend time on such a risky intellectual endeavor. We are advised to downplay our translation work in job materials and tenure files, since our temporal investment in translation is seen as taking away from our "real" work as scholars. Even most scholars of translation rarely draw explicitly on their translation work in writing about translation, though the knowledge they gain through their practice is, understandably, often at the core of their thinking on

[32] See the introduction to Lefevere (1992).

[33] This is, of course, a false distinction: by virtue of the extensive knowledge of the language, culture, and history of a place or places that translation entails, nonacademic translators can also be true independent scholars both of the sphere they translate from or within, and of translation itself.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.

this subject. To my mind, the academy's resistance to acknowledging the hard-earned knowledge, intellectual rigor, and compositional flexibility required to translate almost any text, from an internet meme to a scholarly article to a best-selling novel, does a vast disservice not only to translator-academics, but also to our fields. In promoting only a few acceptable forms of scholarly writing at the expense of others, including translations, we are depriving generations of scholars of all ranks—including our students, those most junior scholars among us—of the many philosophical, historical, art historical, literary, anthropological, and other texts that those of us with the necessary linguistic training and disciplinary knowledge could have been translating all along.

This introductory chapter and my closing coda argue explicitly for the importance of scholarship that draws on a committed practice of translation; the book as a whole seeks to embody and present some of the forms of knowledge that my practice as a translator has made possible. To my mind, this book could only have been written by someone for whom translation is an intellectual habit, a daily mode of thought. It is a risky book, for many reasons—including my choice to delve into time periods, works, and literary traditions with which I was, until undertaking this project, only glancingly familiar. I am sure that, despite my obsessive research, a multitude of errors of various sorts remain. But if translating has taught me anything, it is that generous, engaged, critical readers will often be found to correct, complicate, or build on whatever argument or interpretation one ventures to share. I hope this book will be so lucky.

Copyright © 2017. Bloomsbury Academic & Professional. All rights reserved.

Emmerich, Karen. Literary Translation and the Making of Originals, Bloomsbury Academic & Professional, 2017.
ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rmit/detail.action?docID=4931535.
Created from rmit on 2024-02-21 02:59:49.