

Introduction

In the field of translation studies, the term “post-translation studies” has been introduced to try to expand the kinds of texts and objects that scholars examine. The name was coined by Siri Nergaard and Stephano Arduini in “Translation: A New Paradigm” (2011), the introduction to the first issue of a new journal called *Translation*, founded in 2011. They wrote, “We propose the inauguration of a transdisciplinary research field with translation as an interpretive as well as an operative tool. We imagine a sort of new era that could be termed post-translation studies, where translation is viewed as fundamentally transdisciplinary, mobile, and open-ended” (2011: 8). They go on to suggest that the field open itself to investigations of translation from outside the discipline—from art, architecture, ethnography, memory studies, landscape, psychology, semiotics, philosophy, economics, gender studies, race, class, and ethnic studies. In *Death of a Discipline* (2003), Gayatri Spivak discussed opening up the field of comparative literature, which she viewed as Eurocentric and based on outdated comparative literary studies. Instead she called for a broader array of disciplinary investigations, which necessarily included gender, minority, and Third World discourses and their translation. In a similar fashion, some scholars find the field of translation studies too narrow, text-centric, and based upon European definitions and models derived in the 1970s and early 1980s. Research on translational phenomena need not be inscribed within a single discipline. Rather, translation phenomena appear in all languages, major and minor discourses, and in many forms of communication, not just written texts. These elements need to be allowed to flourish, inform, and instruct. Additionally, Nergaard and Arduini suggest that investigators be open to poststructuralist theory, gender, and border studies, demonstrating more attention to the happenings along the edges and interstices than what is going on in the center or mainstream. Their journal reflects that interest. Special issues of the journal *Translation* are forthcoming on the question of memory, edited by Bella Brodzki and Cristina Demaria; on space, edited by Sherry Simon; on conflict, edited by Emily Apter and Mona Baker; and economics, edited by Naoki Sakai and Jon Solomon. The shift in focus from

2 Introduction

translation as the center of a single discipline, to multidisciplinary analyses shows how translations impact many disciplines and signifies a new direction for the field. In addition, the discourse on translation from the *outside* field can help scholars better analyze the translational phenomena considered from within.

In my view, this post-translation concept is very helpful. The field of translation studies has accomplished a lot in the past 30 years, mapping out a disciplinary territory, developing translation histories in a variety of nations, coming up with better methodologies for better analyzing translations, and conducting important sociological work on the role of the translator. However, in many ways, the field strikes me as still restricted, primarily focused on written texts and two-way comparisons, and neglecting pre- and post-translation conditions and effects. Scholars have documented *how* texts differ and have shown that translators often make changes, adapt, and rewrite, but explaining *why* remains problematic. Additionally, many texts that are not referred to as translations but instead are often called rewritings, adaptations, or furtherings contain translational elements. In many cases, those borderline cases may tell us more about the nature of translation than the central paradigm. While scholars in the field largely dismantled traditional ideas of the translator's fidelity and pointed out degrees of difference, they have been less successful in the analysis of social and psychological reception matters or explored longer-term post-translation repercussions of translated texts.

While many translators strive for an accurate or acceptable reading of a text in one language to another, seeing their task as a craft and playing matching and mapping games, most translators I know translate because they want to *introduce a new idea* or aesthetic form into a culture. The revolutionary war leaders of the Americas were not translating Locke, Rousseau, or Montaigne because they wanted scholars at Harvard to review favorably their translations in learned journals; no, they wanted to introduce new ideas regarding democratic systems and human rights into their cultures that were not free and were still governed by European powers. Many of the translators cared little what the university professors thought about their translations; they wanted common men and women—farmers, sailors, shopkeepers, and craftspeople—to read their translations and think about and incorporate into their beliefs the new ideas being introduced. The purpose was not to better represent European texts but to *change* the receiving culture, to alter the way people think about politics, liberty, individual freedom, and their relationship to the absent monarchy. Which comes first, the pen or the sword? In many cases, more often than not, changing peoples' ideas about governing systems comes first, and the revolutionary fervor later. Indeed, the subsequent revolution in art, politics, literature, science, or any disciplinary analysis, may be interpreted as post-translation effects.

We see such a pattern of translation playing a major role in instituting cultural change frequently: the Germans translating Shakespeare as a way

to break the hegemony of French theater in eighteenth-century Germany; Mao Zedong translating and adapting Marx and Engels to fit the Chinese situation, in which there was not a critical mass of working class to rebel against a capitalist society, but there was a massive peasant class that could be mobilized; Ezra Pound translating Tang dynasty poets in China to introduce a new way of imagining into American poetry, thereby changing the landscape of modern English-language poetry; Latin American revolutionaries translating Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin to help proclaim independence from the Spanish crown; Robert Bly translating European and Latin American poets to introduce surrealism into the American verse forms, thereby changing the landscape of North American verse; or Gary Snyder translating Native American poetry for ecological reasons in the hope of saving the planet. During World War II, when the American SOS (precursor to the CIA) landed in Vietnam to recruit a Vietnamese guerilla by the name of Ho Chi Minh to help fight against the Japanese, when they found him in the jungles of Northern Vietnam close to the Chinese border, he was not training a band of fighters, but translating the works of Lenin into Vietnamese. The post-translation repercussions are well known to all. Finding better methods to describe, inventory, or assess translations does not help measure whether or not the ideas contained within are understood and incorporated into the belief systems of the receiving cultures. This book serves as a call to begin that process.

To measure the success or failure of the ideas or the aesthetics of a translation, one has to look *beyond* translation and to begin to examine the cultural changes that take place *after* the translation, hence the move toward a post-translation analysis. If the Bible were translated into a new culture, did people convert to Christianity or were new churches built in subsequent years? If the translation Enlightenment philosophy introduced ideas of individual liberty, were despotic leaders deposed, new constitutions written, and people granted the right to vote? If new verse forms were introduced, did the conventions of poetry in the receiving cultures change for the next generation of “original” writers? If a feminist text were introduced into a culture with severe restrictions on women, did the dress codes, voting rights, driving rights, daycare availability, and job opportunities in the receiving culture change over the next decade? Sometimes the analysis of textual matters is not enough. I suggest that scholars in the future analyze both the initial reception of the translated text and the post-translation repercussions generated in the receiving culture over subsequent years. What are the changes in poetry and politics, art and architecture, education and the environment, and what role do translations play in effecting those changes? I argue that in conducting such an analysis, scholars will find that translation is not merely a footnote to history, but one of the most vital forces available to introducing new ways of thinking and inducing significant cultural change.

The other direction post-translation studies is moving, which is a bit deceptive given the “post” in its name, is taking a more detailed look at

4 Introduction

pre-translation culture that conditions not only the production of translated texts but *original* writing as well. Post-translation studies examines those conditions, socio-political and linguistic, that *create an environment* in which highly innovative, original writing can flourish. Thus, an original work, such as a Shakespeare play or a Proust novel, as I argue later in this book, can, in certain circumstances, be viewed as a *post-translation* effect. Often the very translation or multilingual environment serves as a stimulant for introducing new ideas or forms. Why does a writer such as the English playwright Ben Jonson (1572–1637), translator of Horace, succeed during the late Elizabethan Age in England? Why does an interest in World Literature emerge in late eighteenth-century Germany? What factors lead to a Czech Renaissance in the nineteenth century? Why did China open its doors for a flood of Western literary and social science texts in the early twentieth century? The polysystem theory suggestion that translation flourishes in weak or emerging cultures provides some explanation, but I suggest that the reasons are much more complex. It is not just that a vacuum exists and translations enter freely and uncritically. No, the cultural conditions are more complicated, sometimes involving a few strong individuals who champion translation, or a repressed linguistic minority breaking free, or a flourishing period of trade and expansion leading to an influx of foreign products and means of expression. Sometimes nation-states accept the fact that two or more linguistic groups must co-exist and allow for translation, such as in Belgium or Switzerland. Sometimes a repressed minority rises and forces the government's hand, as seen in Quebec and more recently in Catalonia. Much more work needs to be done on the environments in which translations flourish and why, and much more attention needs to be paid to those operating at the margins and linguistic minorities, facilitating not just linguistic communication, but economic and political cohesion as well.

Some of the pre- and post-translation investigations have begun. Gayatri Spivak teaches Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* to students at Columbia University, but she also adapts the text and conducts microeconomic courses for teachers in tribal and women's communities in impoverished villages in Bengal. Bible translators are perhaps the most aggressive regarding modifying a text to affect religious change. In poorer countries of Africa, Doctors without Borders cannot deliver health care or save lives without Translators without Borders, moving strategies of community translation and interpreting to the fore. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) regularly translate material for community education in villages in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, and rewrite the texts to the educational and technical levels of their audiences. Interpreters and social workers are flocking to refugee camps in the Middle East to try to help relieve the plight of displaced peoples, but also to negotiate immigration rights and smooth transitions to more stable cultures.

Certainly the forces of globalization—mass media, new media, the Internet, and improved transportation infrastructures—have facilitated international communication. So too have the *goals* of translation shifted.

The aim of a new generation of translators is less to achieve linguistic accuracy and more to facilitate communication, open avenues for advancement, and to change the way many think about majority and minority encounters. Sales of religious texts have never been higher, and I would suggest it is *less* about the rigor of the translation—and if this new wave of Bible translation is indicative, the quality has never been lower, or shall I say more distant—and *more* about the spiritual rewards perceived to be contained within. Even news organizations are getting into the act, translating and rewriting in very politicized fashion in order less to communicate cultural difference and more to persuade viewers regarding the viewpoints held by the institutions for whom they work. Education, or re-education, has always been a motivating factor for translators. In this new global age, conditions have never been so fertile for growth in translation, but I suggest that so too has the *nature* of translation changed with the age, as has the media through which translations travel.

Some argue that studying pre-translation, translation, and post-translation texts would expand the field too much, and there is certainly some truth in that claim. However, I maintain that the cultural context for translation can tell us much about the translation itself. Further, many different kinds of texts contain translational elements that are seldom considered. To conduct such an analysis, translation studies scholars of necessity need to bring in academics from other disciplines such as politics, sociology, anthropology, and psychology; from linguistics and literary studies, cultural studies, gender, race, and class studies, to be able to see and measure the translational effects. Indeed, nearly *every* discipline derives from and depends upon translation, a dependency that will only increase in the future. Contemporary and increasingly interdisciplinary studies of translation suggest that the borders transgressed in translation tend to be more multiple and permeable than traditionally conceived. It can be argued that from this perspective, I am taking the idea of post-translation to the extreme, but in this book I ask, what if we erase the border completely and rethink translation as an always-ongoing process of *every* communication? What if translation becomes viewed less as a temporal act carried out between languages and cultures and instead as a *precondition* underlying the languages and cultures upon which communication is based? What if we consider the political, social, and economic structures as built upon translation? What if we view the landscape—the parks, buildings, roads, memorials, churches, schools, and government organizations—not as solely monocultural, but also as a product of post-translation effects?

In her book *Translating Montreal: Episodes in the Life of a Divided City* (2006), Sherry Simon questions the limits of traditional translation definitions and goes further, also focusing on the *cultural conditions conducive to translation*, such as the multicultural life of the city of Montreal and the hybrid forms of communication that take place there. She looks not just at translation in a synchronic sense, but also at the conditions *before* and *after*

6 Introduction

translation. Indicative of post-disciplinary translation studies, she offers a new definition: “I give translation an *expanded* definition in this book: writing that is inspired by the encounter with other tongues, including the effects of creative interference” (Simon 2006: 17, emphasis added). Simon analyzes translational and multilingual markers located all over the city: in creative writing, theater, art, and architecture, as well as the monuments, museums, churches, schools, stores, courts, even the signage in the streets, all of which offer a palimpsest of semiotic and translational elements that she felt were very positive and productive for artistic creation. She offers several new categories for translation analysis in the age of post-translation studies, including “transfiguration,” “furtherings,” and “creative interference” (Simon 2006: 120–40).

Simon has gone on to write a new book *Cities in Translation: Intersections of Language and Memory* (2012) in which she expands upon that notion, viewing translation in many places as the cultural foundation upon which *all* cultural constructions are founded. Some of the cities Simon discusses include Montreal, Trieste, Calcutta, Barcelona, Dhaka, and Manila, and again she looks at the translational nature of the post-translation forms in a variety of fields, including creative writing, art, and architecture. Plurilingualism is seen as a positive force: accents, code-switching, translations are enriching and facilitating. Translators are viewed as *cultural heroes*, ensuring the circulation of ideas and as agents initiating new forms of expression and ideas. Translators transform social and literary relations: major literary figures emerge, such as Nicole Brossard inventing a polyvalent feminist language in Montreal; Franz Kafka inventing German prose in Prague; and Paul Celan inventing a haunting multilingual poetic language in Czernowitz. Simon’s list is persuasive: without translational culture as a foundation, no Tagore without multilingual Calcutta, no Joyce without Trieste, no Brossard without Montreal.

For example, in her discussion of the town of Czernowitz, Sherry Simon discusses the name changes from Tcernauti (Romanian), through Chernivtsi (Ukrainian) to the Western Czernowitz (Austrian), which linguistically and culturally represent the palimpsest of the urban area. Many times the paths that translators travel are of forced displacement, which evolves in a writer such as Celan to a national and international displacement. Celan’s German is ripe with indications of such alienation and dislocation, full of overtones of the Yiddish, Romanian, Ukrainian, French, and Russian languages he was familiar with, which continued in often suppressed fashions in his city. Sometimes the loss of culture is present by its very absence. Citing the Romanian/French/Quebec translation studies scholar Alexis Nouss [Nuselovic], author of *Paul Celan* (2010), Simon writes, “In Celan’s poetry, the German language is shaped by other languages—and in this way distance, absence and loss become a mode of enunciation. The German language has survived, but it is now a ‘meta-German,’ a ‘counter language,’ a creation of ‘uber-setzung,’ a passage to the other side of history” (Simon

2012: 16; see also Nouss 2010: 38). Here Simon is talking about a singular language (German) that is layered on top of earlier languages, cultures, and community references, a monolingual language full of losses and absences, many captured hauntingly in Celan's writing/translating, the German language created in and by translation.

Rethinking translation, not as a short-term product or a process, but as a cultural condition underlying communication, or as a long-term cultural repercussion emerging after a translation, is, I admit, difficult, and certainly Simon's Celan example is particularly hard to comprehend. In such an analysis, "originals" and "translations" merge and distinctions between "home" and "foreign" tend to disappear. Premodern, modern, and postmodern forms are fluid. Indeed, the entire system of discourse upon which translations are described dissipates. What is it like to think of translation without a native language or homeland? How do people who have immigrated, emigrated, been displaced, absorbed, and expatriated conceive of translation? What are the allegiances of the young to nation-states and national languages? Despite the progressive nature of the new cultural studies programs, hyphenated designations describing the "new" subjects have never been enjoyed by those to whom the terms have been applied: the so-called Asian-American, Afro-American, Amer-Indian peoples have invariably found such labels limiting and discriminatory. Most just want to be referred to as everyday people. No "we" and no "they"; just the same for everyone.

The good news is that new categories of thought are emerging, internalizing the above system of distinctions and generating new ones, with highly creative results. In my research, which is derived from studying translation within the borders of the United States, but also influenced by ideas from abroad, I have found productive concepts generated by Latin American scholars, including Fernando Ortiz's concept of "transculturation," Octavio Paz's use of translation as "transformation" and "recreation," and especially Haroldo de Campos's various neologisms, including "transcreation," "trans-textualization," "transparaization," "transillumination," and most provocatively, "transluciferation mefistofáustica." All of these neologisms allow for a certain degree of rewriting, often paying particular attention to the peoples and languages of the receiving culture. Thus, in this book, I loosely use the term "rewriting" to refer to such transgressive approaches. While many of these conceptual terms have been deemed marginal and exceptions to "standard" translation, I suggest that the margins may be larger than the center, that the exceptions may outnumber the norm, and that all translators transform texts to varying degrees.

Young people using new media have taken such "rewriting" processes to new heights: authoring blogs, spinning the news, adapting music and film, creating YouTube pastiches, devouring comics, playing games, expanding upon original characters in fan fiction, and crowd-sourcing translations, all taking standard texts, regardless of the original language, and rewriting them in new terms and genres. If European musicians want to riff on American

8 Introduction

jazz, they can adapt the “original” (which has probably undergone numerous versions already in source and target cultures) or merely consult any number of renditions already “translated” in their particular cultures. Or if an Asian theater director wants to produce a European classic, say by Goethe or Shakespeare, learning the source language is often optional, as many translations, productions, adaptations, films, abridgements, and educational versions saturate the receiving culture. Many systems of authority—publishing companies, governments, churches, established journals, and professional organizations—are being bypassed, breaking apart old structures that lent authority (and copyright legislation) to authors and translators and instead putting the power in the hands of a new and open generation. Indeed, there is a process of democratization going on in the translation industry, one that I find liberating. Small presses, Internet sites, and crowd-sourcing platforms proliferate. The description that works best for me is one in which translation is seen not as an uncritical form of importing a text from the outside, but rather listening to the outside and then drawing upon inward reserves and experiences from within each individual’s experiences and multicultural heritage. Translation originates from abroad, yes, but it also resonates from within. In this context, translation is viewed as part of the very living substance of both the source and target text—a living, malleable, formable matter. Instead of thinking in terms of the self and other, in which the “other” is translated into the “same,” instead of thinking in terms of the source and the receiver, instead of thinking in terms of the native and the immigrant being labeled “different” or “foreign,” I suggest that we rethink translation by getting rid of the many dichotomies and reimagining the cultural foundation in terms of all peoples being rewriters.

Today, I suggest that scholars broaden their categorical thinking and learn from youthful discoveries, postmodern approaches, postcolonial evolutions, transnational migrations, and psychoanalytical investigations to see how such non-translational discourses and interdisciplinary fields inform translation studies. The intersections may be revealing. What if indigenous and immigrant struggles with adaptation, assimilation, and resistance were viewed not as the exception, but as *central* to cultural production? In this new global age, I suggest we all live in a translational culture, or better said, translational cultures, always in an ongoing process of movement and maneuvering, invariably traversing boundaries, changing and adapting as needed, buying, consuming, borrowing, interpreting, and translating. I argue that rather than thinking about translation as a somewhat secondary process of ferrying ideas across borders, we instead think about translation as one of the most important processes that can lead to revitalizing culture, a proactive force that continually introduces new ideas, forms or expressions, and pathways for change.

In this book, the theories underlying this investigation are multiple and admittedly eclectic. In *L'illusion de la fin* or *The Illusion of the End*, Jean Baudrillard suggests the current age is characterized by a period of

“rewriting everything.” (1994 [1992]: 12). Roland Barthes posited “The Death of the Author” (1968) and in “Des tours de Babel” (1985), Derrida locates original writing in an unlimited process of semiosis. All writing is increasingly viewed as a form of rewriting. While I plan to go into more detail in the chapters that follow, for those who know my work, concepts from deconstruction have been influential. Derrida’s dismantling of the power and prestige of the original, directly and indirectly, figures prominently. As is well known in translation studies circles, in “Des tours de Babel” in which he discusses Benjamin’s “The Task of the Translator” (1968a [1955]), Derrida destabilizes any concept of original writing, suggesting instead every text is a translation or better said a translation of a translation (of a translation). Derrida argues that no original can exist without its “other,” in this case a multilingual yet untranslated voice, just as throughout his work, he cannot think of similitude without difference, presence without absence, truth without fiction, semantics without polysemy, a cure without poison, hospitality without hostility, or, repeatedly, an author without translation. Original texts, Derrida supposes, always carry with them their silent, deferred twin, the translational other, that unseen, unheard but always ongoing process of translation that occurs beneath the surface. In *Monolingualism of the Other; or the Prosthesis of Origin* (1998 [1996]), Derrida writes:

—*We only ever speak one language ...*
(yes, but)

—*We never speak only one language...*

is not only the very law of what is called translation. It would also be the law itself as translation.

(Derrida 1998 [1996]:10, italics in original)

The kind of translation to which Derrida is referring is not the kind studied by translation studies scholars. Rather, it is a much deeper foundational *pre-original* condition located at the very roots of culture (see Gentzler 2008: 29–31). Perhaps the Simon example about the multilingual site of the city of Czernowitz comes closer to Derrida’s definition. Translation is viewed as always present but nevertheless as an out-of-sight ongoing process, one that is admittedly difficult to discern, but one that Latin American immigrants to North America or North African immigrants to Europe only know too well. Derrida’s definition has frustrated translation studies scholars over the years as this form of translation does not appear (at least on the surface) in any empirical text. Rather, as soon as a translator decides on one word, phrase, or concept, this ineffable translational aspect disappears, slipping away as the selected term or phrase crystallizes. Derrida posits the necessity of the possible-impossible nature of writing that always contains the forbidden yet nevertheless indirectly present nature of translation.

While Derrida's thinking about translation scares away some translation scholars, in many ways, his thinking about translation is hardly new to practicing translators. Every translator is faced with choices and has a myriad of options to draw upon from a multitude of linguistic possibilities from at least two and often more linguistic and cultural systems, all of which have advantages and disadvantages. Many translators feel that no translation is ever complete. For every single, monolingual word chosen, other alternatives are not selected and covered up. I suggest that rewriters, especially Third World writers translating/rewriting Western canonical works, or minority writers striving for acceptance under a dominant majority, have a sense of the deconstruction/reconstruction paradigm that both illuminates not just the translation process, but also the entire act of writing altogether. One of the reasons we see so many rewritings, adaptations, and furtherings in today's culture is that the translations to date have proven insufficient to the multiple possibilities offered by certain works. Today I suggest that all writing is rewriting, or better said, a rewriting of a rewriting of a rewriting, and translation—intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic—plays a significant role in that process.

To put it into psychological terms, the urge to rewrite is only natural. In the introduction to the anthology *Translation, Adaptation, and Transformation* (2012), Laurence Raw explores the psychological dimension to such underlying demands to rewrite and adapt. Going back to Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* (1913 [1899]), he sees translators as both trying to bring a foreign text across a linguistic border, but also subjecting themselves to a complex process of wish fulfillment (Freud 1913 [1899]: 154; Raw 2012: 8). Since the wish to be fulfilled frequently conceals hidden thoughts, translators tend to disguise their texts with unconscious obfuscations, a process of self-censorship. Raw suggests that translators construct such a façade, manifest everywhere in terms of their self-effacement, in a belief that they are better serving the source language text. Issues of fidelity to the foreign source text, which often close off many options and creative solutions, are deeply embedded. Perhaps a healthier model may be for the translator to "look beneath the source-text's surface," to discover other levels of meaning and then to create an image of that text that may better represent the whole (Raw 2012: 9). In short, Raw recognizes that a certain degree of rewriting is acceptable. Translators, however neutral and impersonal they strive to be, cannot help but resort to their creative drives, drawing on their emotions, attitudes, and associations as they attempt to better represent the original. Turning to Jean Piaget's *The Origin of Intelligence in the Child* (1953), Raw suggests that translators might enrich their understanding by *not* being afraid to adapt the text to a new environment. Just as when children encounter new words and ideas, they learn to organize the new knowledge in and around structures already available to them. Piaget argued that restructuring data in one's own terms could lead to increased understanding of structures not only of the child's language but also new structural

possibilities. Experimental processes, not copying or mimicry, are needed to allow for an open encounter with differences as well as the discovery of new terms with which to express that difference. Returning to Freudian terminology, the ego, as it were, establishes a defense mechanism that prohibits certain kinds of understanding of linguistic and cultural difference. Processes of rewriting and adaptation help break down such barriers, liberating the translator to limit the processes of repression and open the self up to forms of creativity and transformation that are not only fundamental to translation but allow the self to grow (Raw 2012: 10). Breaking the stranglehold of slavish adherence to the original text invariably results in *better* translations in many ways. Every translator, in a quite natural sense, consciously or unconsciously, engages in such rewriting practices.

Perhaps postmodern theory offers the best source for finding conceptual terms to articulate the ideas that follow in this book. While there are many versions of postmodern theory, if there is a unifying factor, it involves rewriting. This leads to a whole generation of postmodern theorists who conceive of every form of writing as a rewriting. For example, in *The Illusion of the End* (1994 [1992]), Jean Baudrillard discusses culture as experiencing the ever-increasing process of “agonizing revision,” “reviewing everything,” and “rewriting everything” (Baudrillard 1994 [1992]: 12). Further, in *Simulacres et simulation/Simulacra and Simulation* (Baudrillard 1994 [1981]: 12–15), Baudrillard suggested that all forms of writing create images, or better said, images of previous images—all regenerating upon each other to the point that the “original” disappears. While I do not agree with much of Baudrillard’s pessimistic view of the future, on the matter of rewriting he and I find consensus. Images of images, copies of copies, and although he does not mention translation specifically, translations of translations, build upon and inform each other not in a linear, but in a continual and mutually informing process. His theories challenge translation theories that posit sources and targets or senders and receivers. Texts, according to Baudrillard, *circulate* rather than originate; fixed target cultures or fixed receivers can never be located as such. Perhaps because we spend more time on the Internet and electronic texts have become easier to copy and paste, never before have art, music, film, and translations been easier to search, scan, reproduce, and send. There can be no doubt that taking an existing text and copying, pasting, tweaking, tweeting, cropping, and recaptioning have taken translation and rewriting to a new level. Future translation studies scholars are going to have to deal with such issues.

Derrida, Freud, and Baudrillard tend toward theoretical extremes. Translation and rewriting tend to be about making choices and stopping that endless chain of semiosis. While the *mise en abyme* may be attractive to poststructural thinkers, translators and rewriters work in more concrete situations. All translation is a decision-making process and generates results that can be studied about selection, foregrounding, highlighting, and emphasizing. In this book, I argue that *both* the awareness of that

unlimited semiotic chain *and* the act of choosing certain terms and forms of expression, despite awareness of their limitations, are the characteristics of translation in the twenty-first century. More in tune with my thinking about translation and rewriting, and indeed forming a basis for this book, is Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere's work on translation and rewriting. For example, in "Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The 'Cultural Turn' in Translation Studies" (1990), which serves as the introduction to their historical volume *Translation, History and Culture*, Bassnett and Lefevere wonder if anyone today actually reads *À la recherche du temps perdu*, either the French, which is seven volumes long and thousands of pages, or in translation, most of which are shortened or partial versions. Rather, they suggest, people are *more* familiar with abridged versions, excerpts in anthologies, and summaries. Non-professional contemporary readers are much more likely to have seen the movie *Swann in Love*, a mere excerpt of the first volume, and to think about the main character as looking more like the British actor Jeremy Irons, who played Swann in the 1984 Franco-German movie directed by Volker Schlöndorff. For Bassnett and Lefevere, this new form of translation—interlingual and intersemiotic; adapted and rewritten—is increasingly the trend, and they were more willing to branch out to consider adaptations in film, music, television, and theater. Bassnett and Lefevere felt that translation studies scholars needed to include rewriting in their corpora and consider both written translations as well as the circulating rewritings of those same texts. Narrow definitions of what constitutes a translation have hindered the field from following Bassnett and Lefevere, and it is time to begin that endeavor.

While translation studies scholars have not come up with a discourse with which to analyze such an expanded corpus, scholars in literary and cultural theory certainly have. I mention two in the Introduction who frequently resurface throughout this book. In *Palimpsests* (1997 [1982]), Gérald Genette discussed a variety of forms of rewriting and coined the term "hypertext" to refer to rewritings, which has assumed resonance for a new generation of scholars. In the introduction, Gerald Prince cites Genette as arguing that "any writing is rewriting" and that literature is always "in the second degree" (1997 [1982]: ix). Genette studied a variety of types of rewriting—from imitation, parody, pastiche, caricature, to even plagiarism—and various strategies employed—from translation, prosification, and versification, to transtylization, reduction, and augmentation. Every act of reading, of writing, of translation, involves acts of choosing certain elements, privileging certain ideas and forms of expression. He writes that even in a complete edition, many readers "pass (over)" certain parts, and this "spontaneous infidelity" alters the conception of the work. Genette, too, asks, "How many scrupulously read the *Recherche du temps perdu* from beginning to end?" (1997 [1982]: 230). He adds, "To read means to *choose*, for better or worse, and to choose means to *leave out*" (1997 [1982]: 230, emphasis in original). Genette was remarkably well read in

major and minor works of World Literature in French translation, citing illuminating examples from translations of Homer, Virgil, Cervantes, Jules Verne, Walter Scott, and James Fenimore Cooper by both great and lesser-known French translators.

Some have called Genette an “open structuralist” (1997 [1982]: ix), bridging the gap between poststructuralism and translation, always on the lookout for the relationships between the texts, how both writers and translators read and rewrite one another. Rather than focus on the “text itself” and its self-contained unity, he instead looked at “relations between texts” and “the ways they reread and rewrite one another” (1997 [1982]: ix) in a perpetual transtextual performance, how rewriters play with previous texts and reshape them into new images of their own. Unfortunately, Genette had little to say about translation itself, merely one short chapter of four pages out of a 490-page book. The chapter itself is not that informative, oscillating as it does between Maurice Blanchot’s concepts of untranslatability in “La Poésie de Mallarmé est-elle obscure?” (1943) and Eugene Nida’s concept of everything is translatable in his and Charles Taber’s *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969). Ironically, in subsequent chapters on other forms of rewriting, Genette comes closer to Bassnett and Lefevere’s definition. Further, in the process, he also provides a critical vocabulary for analysis for the multiple techniques of rewriting, which include transposition, transmetrification, transtylation, reduction, augmentation, abridgement, summary, commentary, continuation, and intervention, most of which are supported by examples drawn from translation.

Finally, in this book I often refer to the Canadian theorist Linda Hutcheon, who in *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006) discusses the new age of translation and rewriting. No longer content with a simple comparative analysis of a source text into target text or of a novel into a film, Hutcheon allows for TV, radio, music, opera, ballet, websites, video games, theme parks, YouTube and other forms of new media. She argues that *all* writing is a form of storytelling and that the storytellers are multiplying and finding new forms of outlet. Hutcheon explodes traditional definitions of and loyalties to fidelity and instead turns to forms of intertextuality to make her points. She even uses “adapted text” instead of “source text,” as all “originals” have already been adapted as well. In today’s world, viewers often *see* a production before they *read* the book. At some point, the two become indistinguishable. She becomes very interested in the different modes and how they interact, and in the *specific* processes of rewriting. She is also quite open to the collaborative and creative processes involved in rewriting and adaptation, as frequently original writers, translators, adapters, rewriters, and directors work in a more ensemble process.

In the second edition of *A Theory of Adaptation* (2012), rewritten and now co-authored with Siobhan O’Flynn, even more platforms and media are introduced, including iPads, iPhones, YouTube, fan culture, and social networking sites. Hutcheon and O’Flynn ask if the changes are one of

degree or of *kind*, coming down in favor of something *new* happening in many instances, such as in the art world where installations have become increasingly interactive. In “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction” (1968b [1955]), Walter Benjamin suggested that the aura of original had changed in the age of printing and mass reproduction. So too, do I argue, that the aura of translation has changed in the era of electronic reproduction. The new media not only alters how authors and translators write, translate, and rewrite stories, but also alters how readers and viewers navigate the rewritten text. Close-ups, cross-tracking, and links to tangential texts now allow readers to enter the text and to manipulate the reading process, turning receivers into authors or, better said, rewriters themselves. Questions of control, authorship, and authority are raised. Copying becomes a new form of creativity; modifying a text becomes a new form of authorship. New terms are needed, and Hutcheon and O’Flynn begin the process, such as introducing terms such as “transmedia producers” for what has hitherto been referred to as “authors” or even “adapters” (2012: 181–82). These are all matters with which translators are well familiar, but are also issues translation studies scholars have been slow to discern. I hope to begin such an engagement in the chapters that follow.

In the first chapter, “*A Midsummer Night’s Dream* in Germany,” I look at Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, suggesting that Shakespeare, too, was a rewriter from the beginning. Drawing material from Chaucer’s “A Knight’s Tale,” Theseus’s *Plutarch’s Lives*, Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Spenser’s *Fairie Queene*, and King James’s *Daemonology*, among other sources, Shakespeare crafted a play that is all about translation and transformation. Again, I look at the translational culture of Elizabethan England, a great age of translation there that served as a platform for Shakespeare’s work. I next look at translational elements within the play, of which there are many. Then I turn to the play’s first translations, some of which were co-terminus with the first productions in London, as the play traveled early and often to Holland, Germany, and Scandinavia, led by a group of traveling English players. The reception in northern Europe was crucial, as the play may have been performed more often abroad than in England. I suggest that the play, sometimes deemed unperformable by British critics, was kept alive via translation. Finally, I look at the post-translation rewritings of the play, which are considerable, including Mendelssohn’s *Overture*, Max Reinhardt’s theater productions in Germany and subsequent Hollywood film in the United States, and George Balanchine’s ballet, using Mendelssohn’s music, for the New York City Ballet.

In the second chapter “Postcolonial *Faust*,” I discuss all the creative neologisms for rewriting developed by the creative writers and translators in Brazil, suggesting that their various forms of cannibalizations of European texts serve as a kind of a model for new world and postcolonial translators, who were often more open and creative in their approach. First I look at the translation culture of the *Sturm und Drang* and later classical periods in

Germany, a prolific age of translation that preceded and/or was coterminous with Goethe's writing of *Faust*. Moreover, the German cultural inheritance was being formed by translation from Greek and Roman classics and from Central and Eastern European folklore, upon which Goethe drew heavily. Goethe himself constantly rewrote, making changes, additions, and deletions to the Faust legend, beginning with his *Urfaust* as early as 1772 and ending with *Faust II* in 1832, 60 years later. I then turn to the translation history of *Faust* into English, where there were dozens of translators. Finally, I discuss the post-translation repercussions, which again are multiple: the number of silent films during the early part of the twentieth century is astounding alone. Novel adaptations, music versions, and theater productions proliferate.

In the third chapter "Proust for everyday readers," I review Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere's work on translation and rewriting, which I argue has held up very well. Then I look at one of their chosen examples, Proust's *À la recherche du temps perdu*, which offers not only two superb translations into English, but also a marvelous series of rewritings in novels, films, theater, comics, and even art, including the Volker Schlöndorff film, through Harold Pinter's film script, and up to a series of paintings by Andy Warhol. In this chapter, I talk about pre-original culture and the international nature of the Belle Époque in Paris, which provided the cultural conditions for the emergence of a writer such as Proust, and the post-translation repercussions of the translations of Proust that have impacted any number of fields, including film, art, and especially creative writing. Finally, I look at the translational aspect of the original text, as Proust was constantly rewriting the text, cutting and pasting passages, adding new material, rephrasing old material, and circling from the end back to the beginning in terms of his aesthetic perspective. Proust was still revising right up until his death in 1922 and never had a chance to look at the proofs of the final three volumes, leaving it to his editors and heirs to put the last books in final form. As scholars issue new "final" versions of the originals, translators have to scramble to get the revised translations to capture a portion of the ever-growing market.

In the fourth chapter "*Hamlet* in China," I look at the two-way flow of ideas and prevalence of rewritings over translations in the contemporary world. *Hamlet* traveled to China first in 1904 with Lin Shu's "translations," which were characterized by two forms of rewriting: first, Lin Shu did not speak English, so a bilingual colleague read to him a sight translation of *Hamlet*, and then Lin Shu rewrote the story with Chinese characters, settings, beliefs, and prose style. Second, the version read out loud was not a translation of Shakespeare, but a translation of Charles and Mary Lamb's abridged version, primarily aimed at children. Thus, *Hamlet* arrived in China via a rewriting of a rewriting of an oral translation. Lin's translations were very popular, produced on the stage many times and issued in several editions, indeed, for many years being the only version available in China.

With the May Fourth Movement during the 1920s, new translations were issued, but the precedent of rewriting remained strong. Traditional Chinese predominates, and allusions to Chinese classics prevailed. Newer versions of *Hamlet* in China included multimedia versions such as *Hamlet, Hamlet*, performed in Hong Kong, reflecting both the classic image of English actors on video, and live Chinese actors interpreting the text on stage; and *Who Kills the King*, with three different styles—puppet show, Chinese opera, Western opera—and three different versions of the “To be, or not to be” soliloquy.

Let me now turn to the first chapter on the travels of Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, which took a long journey through Germany and across northern Europe and into Russia, before returning to Western cultural capitals such as Paris, New York, and eventually London. The play’s transformations were many, into vaudevillesque theater, a musical overture, a Russian ballet, and a German film, many of which became better known than the Shakespeare play itself. The analysis that follows includes sections on (a) the translational culture *preceding* the original; (b) the translational elements and themes *within* the text; (c) traditional translations; and (d) a post-translation analysis of rewritings and adaptations, some derived from the translations, but others based on intermediary forms of rewriting. This pattern of focusing on not just the translations of the text, but of the pre-translational culture giving rise to the original, the translational elements within a so-called monolingual text, translation proper, and the post-translation after-effects of translation continues in subsequent chapters on *Faust*, *À la recherche du temps perdu*, and *Hamlet* in China. The chapters are loosely organized around a chronological order, beginning with Elizabethan-Age British, followed by German romanticism, Belle Époque French, and twentieth-century Chinese modernization. While the texts themselves are “canonical,” the translations and rewritings are of every variety—from translations of “great books” editions, to counter-culture, cannibalized, postcolonial, and feminist contemporary versions.

Bibliography

- Barthes, Roland. 1968. “La mort de l’auteur.” *Manteia* 5. “The Death of the Author” (1977), trans. Stephen Heath, in Stephen Heath, ed. *Image-Music-Text*. London: Fontana, 42–48.
- Bassnett, Susan. 1980. *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere. 1990a. “Proust’s Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The ‘Cultural Turn’ in Translation Studies.” In Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, eds. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere, eds. 1990b. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 1994 [1981]. *Simulacres et simulation*. Paris: Éditions Galilée. *Simulacra and Simulation*, trans. Sheila Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Baudrillard, Jean. 1994 [1992]. *L'illusion de la fin*. Paris: Galilee. *The Illusion of the End*, trans. Chris Turner. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1968a [1955]. "The Task of the Translator," trans. Harry Zohn. *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken, 83–110.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1968b [1955]. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," trans. Harry Zohn, ed. Hannah Arendt. *Illuminations*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 217–52.
- Blanchot, Maurice. 1943. "La Poésie de Mallarmé est-elle obscure?" In *Faux Pas*. Paris: Gallimard, 125–39.
- Bloom, Harold. 1997 [1973]. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campos, Haroldo de. 1981. *Deus e o Diabo no Fausto de Goethe*. São Paulo: Perspective.
- Campos, Haroldo de. 1986. "The Rule of Anthropophagy: Europe under the Sign of Devoration," trans. María Tai Wolff. *Latin American Literary Review* 14(27): 48–60.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1985. "Des tours de Babel." In Joseph Graham, ed. *Difference and Translation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1992. *Acts of Literature*, ed. Derek Attridge. London: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1998 [1996]. *Le Monolinguisme de l'autre: ou la prothèse d'origine*. Paris: Galilée. *Monolingualism of the Other; or the Prosthesis of Origin*, trans. Patrick Mensah. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1913 [1899]. *The Interpretation of Dreams*, trans. James Strachey and Anna Freud. London: Hogarth Press.
- Genette, Gérard. 1997 [1982]. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Gentzler, Edwin. 1993. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.
- Gentzler, Edwin. 2008. *Translation and Identity in the Americas*. London: Routledge.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 2006. *A Theory of Adaptation*. London: Routledge.
- Hutcheon, Linda and Siobhan O'Flynn. 2012. *A Theory of Adaptation*, revised edn. London: Routledge.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1959. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In Reuben A. Brower, ed. *On Translation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 232–39.
- Kristal, Efraim. 2002. *Invisible Work: Borges and Translation*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Lecerclé, Jean-Jacques. 1990. *The Violence of Language*. London: Routledge.
- Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.
- Nergaard, Siri and Stephano Arduini. 2011. "Translation: A New Paradigm." *Translation: A Transdisciplinary Journal*, Inaugural Issue: 8–17.
- Nida, Eugene and Charles Taber. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nouss, Alexis. 2010. *Paul Celan, les lieux d'un déplacement*. Paris: Le Bord de l'eau.
- Piaget, Jean. 1967 [1953]. *The Origin of Intelligence in the Child*, trans. Margaret Cook. London: Routledge.
- Proust, Marcel. 1989 [1871–1922]. *À la recherche du temps perdu*, ed. Jean-Yves Tadié. Paris: Gallimard, Pléiade Editions.
- Raw, Laurence, ed. 2012. *Translation, Adaptation, and Transformation*. London: Continuum.

18 *Introduction*

- Shakespeare, William. 1978. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. Harold F. Brooks. London: Methuen.
- Simon, Sherry. 2006. *Translating Montreal: Episodes in the Life of a Divided City*. Montreal: McGill Queens University Press.
- Simon, Sherry. 2012. *Cities in Translation: Intersections of Language and Memory*. London: Routledge.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2003. *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia University Press.