The Bilingual Text

History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation

Jan Walsh Hokenson

&

Marcella Munson

St. Jerome Publishing
Manchester, UK & Kinderhook (NY), USA

Published by
St. Jerome Publishing
2 Maple Road West, Brooklands
Manchester, M23 9HH, U. K.
Telephone +44 (0)161 973 9856
Fax +44 (0)161 905 3498
stjerome@compuserve.com
http://www.stjerome.co.uk

InTrans Publications
P. O. Box 467
Kinderhook, NY 12106, USA
Telephone (518) 758-1755
Fax (518) 758-6702

ISBN 978-1-900650-93-9 (pbk)

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
T. J. International Ltd, Cornwall, UK

Typeset by
Delta Typesetters, Cairo, Egypt
Email: hilali1945@yahoo.co.uk

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record of this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Hokenson, Jan.
The bilingual text : history and theory of literary self-translation
/ Jan Walsh Hokenson & Marcella Munson.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 1-900650-93-2 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Translating and interpreting. 2. Bilingualism and literature. 3.
Bilingual authors. I. Munson, Marcella. II. Title.
PN241.H57 2006
418'.02--dc22
2006032796

The Bilingual Text

Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson

Bilingual texts have been left outside the mainstream of both translation theory and literary history. Yet the tradition of the bilingual writer, moving between different sign systems and audiences to create a text in two languages, is a rich and venerable one, going back at least to the Middle Ages. The self-translated, bilingual text was commonplace in the mutlilingual world of medieval and early modern Europe, frequently bridging Latin and the vernaculars. While self-translation persisted among cultured elites, it diminished during the consolidation of the nation-states, in the long era of nationalistic monolingualism, only to resurge in the postcolonial era.

The Bilingual Text makes a first step toward providing the fields of translation studies and comparative literature with a comprehensive account of literary self-translation in the West. It tracks the shifting paradigms of bilinguality across the centuries and addresses the urgent questions that the bilingual text raises for translation theorists today: Is each part of the bilingual text a separate, original creation or is each incomplete without the other? Is self-translation a unique genre? Can either version be split off into a single language or literary tradition? How can two linguistic versions of a text be fitted into standard models of foreign and domestic texts and cultures?

Because such texts defeat standard categories of analysis, *The Bilingual Text* reverses the usual critical gaze, highlighting not dissimilarities but continuities across versions, allowing for dissimilarities within orders of correspondence, and englobing the literary as well as linguistic and cultural dimensions of the text. Emphasizing the arcs of historical change in concepts of language and translation that inform each case study, *The Bilingual Text* examines the perdurance of this phenomenon in Western societies and literatures.

Jan Walsh Hokenson studied literature and language at the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Paris, before receiving her PhD in literature from the University of California at Santa Cruz. Currently Professor of French and Comparative Literature at Florida Atlantic University, she is the author of *Japan, France, and East-West Aesthetics: French Literature, 1867-2000* (2004) and *The Idea of Comedy: History, Theory, Critique* (2006).

Marcella Munson is currently Head of French Studies and Assistant Professor of French and Comparative Literature at Florida Atlantic University. She received her PhD in French with an emphasis on medieval studies from the University of California at Los Angeles, and was a fellow of the UCLA Program in Critical Theory. She has published articles on verse narrative and epistolary prose in the medieval context, and is completing a book on late medieval authorship.

Acknowledgments

For allowing us to quote from their publications, we extend our gratitude to both Oxford University Press and to Éditions Champion, for permission to quote from texts by Charles d'Orléans, and to Western Michigan State University Press for permission to quote from texts by Étienne Dolet.

We would like to extend warmest thanks to the many friends and colleagues who have helped bring *The Bilingual Text* to completion:

For their invaluable help in resolving fine points of translations or literary history:

Konstantinos Nikoloutsos
John Leeds
Martha Mendoza
Evelyn Trotter
Angela Martin
Yolanda Gamboa
Brian McConnell
Prisca Augustyn
Galina Paramonova

For their expertise in translating too, plus their crucial moral or intellectual support:

Anthony Tamburri
Rita Copeland
Nora Erro-Peralta
Michael Horswell

For reading parts of early drafts and supporting this project from the beginning to the end:

Mona Baker
Ruby Cohn
Dominique Desanti

For generously endowing the annual Howard M. Rosenblatt Distinguished Lecture in Translation Studies at Florida Atlantic University, which has brought fine scholars to students and to us:

Laurie Rosenblatt and the Rosenblatt Family

And especially, for their long-suffering largesse and many timely sacrifices, our partners Sandra Norton and Benjamin Kolstad.

Dedication

This book is dedicated to the many archivists, manuscript illuminators, printers, booksellers, editors, and publishers who have through the centuries helped bring self-translators' work to the public.

Contents

Introduction

Aims and Terms

What is the bilingual text? Like Bacon's treatises or Nabokov's novels, the bilingual text is a self-translation, authored by a writer who can compose in different languages and who translates his or her texts from one language into another. Such self-translators have long been neglected in literary history and translation theory, and it is still often assumed that they are just rather idiosyncratic anomalies, mostly preening polyglots or maladaptive immigrants. Yet the tradition of the bilingual writer creating a single text in two languages, smoothly spanning different audiences, is a rich and venerable one, arising in Greco-Roman antiquity and thriving in the European Middle Ages and Renaissance. Self-translation was a common practice in the ambient translingual world of early modern Europe, when bilingualism was the norm, and writers increasingly translated between Latin and vernaculars.

While persisting among cultured elites, literary bilinguality and self-translation diminished during the consolidation of the nation-states. That historical reduction in the verbal compass is a familiar story. Yet even that narrative neglects the translative practice of explorers and colonizers encountering Asia and the Americas and translating their European texts for indigenous peoples or, conversely, their travel journals for readers in Europe. In the past century as well, wars and deportations propelled writers into new languages where many flourished as self-translators. More recently many post-colonials have challenged the dissymmetry of native and colonial languages by writing and translating in both, not unlike medievals addressing both Latin and vernacular audiences in the dual text.

Even as literary bilinguality continues proliferating in the postcolonial conditions of our times, it is usually forgotten that earlier ages too had their bilingual writers and – among that set – the subset of literary self-translators. Samuel Beckett, Rosario Ferré, Assia Djebar, and other modern self-translators were preceded by a distinguished lineage that includes such canonical figures as the poets John Donne, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, Étienne Dolet, and Charles d'Orléans, or more recent ancestors like Carlo Goldoni, Stefan George, and Guiseppe Ungaretti. A roll-call of self-translators would summon up the stellar figures of many literatures and languages.

Why, then, has this striking phenomenon of writers translating their work between two languages been so neglected? Beyond the literary functions of the bilingual text, why have theorists in translation studies and linguistics paid so little attention to this age-old practice of self-translators re-creating their own words, bridging both the source and target languages in the dual text?

There seem to be at least two reasons for the West's neglect of its self-translators. First, most obviously, the keepers of the canon rather strenuously insisted on the linguistic purity of its foundational figures, such as Chaucer and Dante, and they routinely ignored the founders' youthful translations of foreign texts. Erasing the founders' apprentice work in the process of constructing the unique national canon, nationalistic historians tarred all translation with the same brush. Yet as the poet Charles Tomlinson

has remarked in some dismay, to ignore Chaucer's translations from other authors is to see only half of Chaucer the writer, and that half dimly (Tomlinson 1989:259). It is clear that well before the German Romantics extolled the mother tongue in such decisive terms, leaving translation theory with some heavy baggage, Renaissance commentators had already cleared the way for the West's long embrace of nationalistic monolingualism. For centuries, theories of nation and genius erased the intercultural origins of literary innovation.

Second, concerning self-translators, the neglect of the bilingual text in translation theory as well as critical history stems rather more directly from the fact that the conceptual problems are daunting: Since the bilingual text exists in two language systems simultaneously, how do the monolingual categories of author and original apply? Self-translation, the specific ways in which bilinguals rewrite a text in the second language and adapt it to a different sign system laden with its own literary and philosophical traditions, escapes the categories of text theory, for the text is twinned.

For such reasons, the fields of translation studies and comparative literature lack a comprehensive account of self-translation in the West. The history of the subject has largely been buried in monographic studies of single writers or eras, with little theoretical development. Most critical reflection has come from medievalists and modernists, but in focusing on selected writers in those periods they are generally uninterested in larger issues of bilinguality in the full sweep of literary history and theory. Conversely, many scholars in postcolonial studies today are bringing bilinguality into focus as a cultural issue, chiefly one of subalternity in diglossic conditions, although without perhaps fully appreciating the wider, historical and intellectual currents that inform literary bilinguality and the specific challenges of self-translation. In linguistics and translation studies, the phenomenon is mentioned in passing, if at all.

Monolingual literary critics extol the writers' texts in one language while neglecting their work in the other, even as theorists in linguistics and translation studies tend to ignore self-translators altogether, in their consensual focus on cultural and linguistic difference. As several scholars have shown apropos of single writers, it has been difficult even to classify self-translation as a literary and cultural endeavor: Are the two texts both original creations? Is either text complete? Is self-translation a separate genre? Can either version belong within a single language or literary tradition? How can two linguistic versions of a text be commensurable? Ultimately, as Federman said of Beckett, "an urgent need exists . . . to arrive at an *aesthetic* of bilingualism and self-translating, or better yet at a *poetics* of such activities" (Federman 1987:9).

We propose to make a first step toward filling this gap in translation studies with *The Bilingual Text*. We believe that a brace scholars working together, integrating their insights in one overall perspective, can best articulate the necessary historical coverage and the conceptual paradigms as those evolve through the centuries. Our dual approach is premised on the conviction that no single comparatist engaged in translation studies can write the book that is needed on this subject. The period differences from medieval to modern are too great and the conceptual changes in notions of language and translation are too intricately bound up with period issues (such as those of God, person, author, text). We have jointly authored this study, just as we have developed a common lexicon and conceptual model of self-translation that we

use throughout the book for consistency and clarity.

It is not our goal, however, to posit a new theory of translation. We aim rather to offer a descriptive and analytical study of one neglected strand in translation history and theory, and to situate it conceptually within the ever widening field of translation studies. The field needs first of all an historically full account of literary bilinguality upon which theorists in linguistics and poetics may build. To the degree that we sketch the lineaments of a theoretical model of self-translation in the course of this study, it has been primarily for our own use in construing a complex history and, we hope, for the reader's better understanding of the uniquely bilingual text.

Our point of departure does entail certain assumptions and premises that the reader will find underlying the period histories and theoretical discussions in the following pages. Our thesis is that current concepts of bilingualism and translation are still largely the legacies of German Romantic philosophy of language. As several theorists have shown (Berman, Pym, Venuti), the critical categories of translation continue to reflect their origins in the German Romantics' notion of the specific *Wesen* or essence of a language as indissociable from its *Volk* or country, a concept that soon came to be identified with nation, amid competing ideologies of culture. The young German patriots' attack on French neoclassical aesthetics entailed sharply distinguishing the foreign and the domestic as monolingual poles. In 1813 Friedrich Schleiermacher pronounced the bilingual writer a flat impossibility: One can create original work, he said, only in the maternal tongue, which is indelibly alloyed with the egoic essence of genius, or else one writes "in defiance of nature and morality" (Schleiermacher 1997:236). In short, one *must* write in the language of one country, he contended, or else hang in the unpleasant middle [*in unerfreulicher Mitte*] (235). Centuries of medieval and Renaissance assumptions about the universality of the transcendent subject across languages, Latin and vernaculars, were thus displaced by the Romantic ideal of the mother tongue. Thereafter, in the troubled wake of linguistic nationalisms of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in canon formation as in comparative philology, this peculiar onus on the bilingual writer, as citizen of no language or perhaps traitor to two, has continued to taint critical reception of the bilingual texts – in both languages – and poses a unique problem to translation theory.

To bring even a few dozen of the self-translated texts of the past millennium together as an object of study, and trace their literary and cultural functions through changing contexts and historical moments, requires abandoning most pre-established models of translative practice. When Rémy Belleau or Stefan George writes a poem in French, and then writes it again in Latin or German, the standard binary model of author and translator collapses. Theoretical models of source and target languages also break down in the dual text by one hand, as do linguistic models of lexical equivalence, and foreign versus domestic culture. Literary critical models of a writer's (monolingual) style, and of translation as diminution and loss, a falling away from the original, similarly cannot serve. New categories of analysis must be developed, as extrapolated from the bilingual texts of self-translators through the centuries.

Bilingual self-translators produce two texts, often publish them under the same title, and usually consider them to be comparable versions. If they are, how do we define this overlap in literary critical terms, that is, measure the text's commensurability

across languages? To date most critics ably describe the dissimilarities between the two versions of a bilingual text, and they end up with an accurate list of details without (as most admit) really illuminating the phenomenon of duality. They reluctantly conclude that they must leave the question of the critical status of the bilingual text open, setting aside for the sake of analysis the extra-textual issues of bireferentiality, authorial status, and biculturality (as in Fitch 1988:229; Oustinoff 2001:277). By turning the critical and theoretical approach around, however, and seeking continuities across language versions, one can perhaps begin to circumscribe the bilingual text more clearly.

Bilingual analysis must therefore begin at a level more basic than current binary theoretical models of "gaps" between texts, languages, and cultures. One must start from a point closer to the common core of the bilingual text, that is, within the textual intersections and overlaps of versions. This critical locus of overlap and similarity, as opposed to dissimilarity, recalls Anthony Pym's notion of sociolinguistic "interculture". In his impatience with monolingual poles, Pym observes that real translators live and work not in a hypothetical gap between languages, between source and target cultures, but in the midst of them; they combine several languages and cultural competencies at once, and constitute a mid-zone of overlaps and intersections, being actively engaged in several cultures simultaneously. Hence every translator is "a minimal interculture" (1998:181). The self-translator in particular embodies such linguistic and cultural overlap par excellence, in person as in literature. Similarly helpful is Marilyn Gaddis Rose's concept of stereoscopic reading and the interliminal space between text and translation. Again, turning current critical practice around to investigate author as interculture and textual bilinguality as interliminality, will provide new means of analysis. Amplified to serve period histories, the critical method must also be interdisciplinary, tracing such issues through the wider cultural, historical, and philosophical currents of the periods.

Partly because cultures differ, and languages and audiences comport different literary and philosophical, stylistic and conceptual canonicities, these writers' deployment of genre (particularly in the Middle Ages and Renaissance) and style (particularly in the modern period) are essential factors in shaping the texts as partner versions. Navigating such issues for the bilingual text, our elementary definition of translation requires more cultural overlap than the standard split between source and target domains. It thus precedes, conceptually, oppositional notions of cultural contexts and textual diminution. Our working definition of translative continuity incorporates Andrei Federov's concept of "functional and stylistic correspondence" (quoted in Oseki-Dépré 1999:95). This functional paradigm allows for dissimilarities within orders of correspondence, and can englobe the literary as well as linguistic and cultural dimensions of the bilingual text. In their broadest senses, linguistic and cultural as well as literary, these concepts of the bilingual text as stereoscopic, the self-translator as sociolinguistic interculture, and self-translation as functional correspondence, serve as basis for developing the analyses, and linking the period histories along the theoretical arcs, in the following pages.

Other terms also thread their way through this study, by way of connecting what might at first seem like disparate practices or unlikely social contexts. As always, when

one set of models and spatial metaphors breaks down, foundering on new material, the theoretically minded critic casts about for new ones, both to help organize the material and to characterize it more clearly for readers. Having explicitly distanced ourselves from binary models of translation, and spatial metaphors of languages splayed across maps like spokes in geo-space, we have turned instead to non-spatial metaphors that might represent cultural amalgams and functional correspondence within orders of similarity. Therefore we have adopted the monetary metaphor that contemporary language historians often use. Lia Formigari remarks that "It is its capacity to abstract from the sensible world while maintaining its capacity to represent it that makes languages resemble money" (Formigari 1990:106). As tokens or representative signs of real values, especially in the proliferation of linguistic-economic metaphors from the1760s through the 1820s, languages and money both entail a kind of semiotic commerce, and there are frequent mentions of precious metals which are not the real referents of money but the signs of labor and industry (106-07).

Thus in 1816 Pietro Giordani wrote that dialects are like copper coins, necessary for everyday dealings within the city, but if the merchant wants to trade with Venice or Milan he will need gold and silver, just as the same holds true for the Venetian and Milanese merchants. All three must keep a complex store of dissimilar coins for similar ends of cultural commerce. "The same holds true for thoughts", said Giordani. "To communicate the lowest and most trivial thoughts the native idiom is sufficient for everyone; but if inhabitants of other cities are to understand us and we them, we must make use of the noble common language of Italy" (quoted in Formigari 1990:107). All these kinds of coins and words circulate within the same social spaces for different purposes. All can be differentiated yet they cohere as commensurate signs, whose values are really arbitrary and relational yet nevertheless fixed by custom. Note that this is a nineteenth-century, comparatively late figure for bilinguality as commerce in intercultural no less than symbolic capital.

This metaphor of languages as coins is useful to characterize the circulation of the bilingual text in different linguistic forms, within cultural circuits that might seem unique but in actuality overlap and inter-echo. It is in such ways that the same text operates in differential modes of cultural currency. Florins, pounds, pesos, and deutschmarks are in this sense comparable divergences in functional correspondence.

Although Saussure and Derrida have made the metaphor familiar in linguistics today, we develop the semiotic relations of money and language directly from medieval texts and translators. We have found that it is less useful to apply this thesis retroactively than to begin with Boethius, Dante, and Chaucer, and watch how the relationship between sounds and metals, words and coins, arises in the emergence from Platonism and circulates in the increasingly Aristotelian milieus of medieval Europe. By the fourteenth century serious philosophical questions are frequently presented through debates on systems of exchange, both verbal and economic, as Shoaf has shown in broad terms, in *Dante, Chaucer, and the Currency of the Word*, and Vance details in his study of Chaucer.

To keep self-translation in focus across changing contexts and periods, we have also adapted two other concepts for the interrelations of languages and audiences. We draw on Raymond Williams' model of cultures in time and Karlheinz Stierle's model

of vertical and horizontal *translatio*. Williams points out that at any one historical moment, a given culture will contain three types of elements: residual, dominant, and emergent (1996:121-27). This is a useful way to construe language change across the generations. It helps align the always shifting relations between the *lingua franca* or hegemonic language (Latin then French and now English), which is used to translate cultures into the dominant idiom, and the legacies and virtualities of other linguistic modes. The three degrees of emphasis, or intensity of presence in a given social context, underline a fact of cardinal importance for the bilingual text: these elements are all copresent. Historical overviews of monolingual literatures and cultural theory tend to downplay such crucial intersections in the actual life of a society and the experience of many writers.

Similarly, Stierle notes that the Western term *translatio* has a dual origin, and that it undergoes a significant shift of meaning in the Renaissance. As a Roman term, it migrated north with the imperial army, only to be absorbed into the spiritual imperium of the advancing Christian religion, which imposed Latin as the language required for theological and thereby intellectual discourse. Thus "*translatio*, where it first appears in the Middle Ages as a central category of political and cultural theory, almost exclusively refers to a model of verticality. One might say that the dominance of the axis of vertical translation is basic to the medieval conception of culture and cultural exchange in western Europe" (1996:56). Initially, *translatio* could designate both translation between languages and displacement in space (as in the *translatio imperii* of temporal power descending in time and space from Biblical lands to Greeks then to Romans and finally to Charlemagne, or as in translating a saint's relics from one site to another). In a parallel conception, *translatio studii* comes to signify the transplantation of the study of ancient wisdom from Greece to Rome and then Paris, the extreme western centre of Church learning.

In Stierle's model both types of lineage, those of political power and Latin linguistic primacy, entail vertical descendance from the top down. Gradually in interaction with Latin, most vernaculars developed separate terms for the two modes of space and language, that is, *translatio* and *traductio* (French and Italian, for instance, still broadly distinguish between the spatial *translation/traslazione* and the linguistic *traduction/traduzione*; 1996:56). Stierle shows how such writers as Chrétien de Troies and Marie de France, followed by Dante, Petrarch, and Montaigne, brought increasing pressures to bear on this vertical tree of knowledge in language, ultimately bringing it down. "The transition from a medieval to a postmedieval model of culture can be understood as a shift from vertical to horizontal dominance" (1996:56). The horizontal is the level zone of two-way interactions among Latin and vernacular cultures, "the copresence of worlds and discourses" (1996:65). Echoing such scholars as Ernst Robert Curtius and Glyn Norton, Stierle concludes that, most characteristic of what we call the Renaissance, as in Petrarch, this experience of simultaneous and equivalent pluralities of discourses, and all they comport, "begins the dominance of the horizontal over the vertical axis of *translatio*" (1996:65).

The two axes of vertical and horizontal interaction can also be discerned, in differing intensities, in medieval, early modern, modernist, postmodernist, and of course postcolonial relations between any monolingual standard and its various challengers.

The bilingual text thrives on the horizontal. Also, however, it is often *within* the text that many bilingual writers invoke just this sort of tension between discursive communities, as we will suggest apropos of specific texts. Both of these concepts, the triadic model of culture in time and the metaphor of horizontal-vertical axes, are helpful in tracing historical change – in the status of translation, as ancients are replaced by moderns or a new avant-garde arises, and in the always evolving philosophies of language and competing definitions of the bilingual person.

How do all these conceptual tools and abstract figures relate to real texts? By way of introduction, consider the case of Étienne Dolet's bilingual encomium for his son. He wrote two versions of his *Genethliacum* (1539), celebrating the birth of his son, in Latin and in French:

> His notis *securus ages*, nec territus ullo
> Portento, credes generari cuncta *sagacis*
> *Naturae vi praestante, imperioque stupendo*:
> Naturaeque eiusdem dissolvi omnia iussu . . .
>
> Par tel sçavoir tousjours *constant seras*;
> De monstre aulcun tu ne t'esmouveras:
> Mais tu croiras le tout faict par Nature
> (*Mere de tout, de Dieu puissance pure*)
> Et par icelle a sa fin tout venir . . .
>
> (quoted in Lloyd-Jones 1989:357; emphasis added)

Dolet's French text is gentle and orthodox, his Latin incisive and heretical. His *Natura* is a pagan wonder, imperious and awesome, whereas *La Nature* is a maternal fount of God. In Latin the writer wishes for his son the republican Roman value of security, in French the *romanz* virtue of constancy. In contrasting these versions, Kenneth Lloyd-Jones articulates exactly the kinds of questions the bilingual text poses: "Are we dealing here with stylistic differences occasioned by Dolet's rejection of anachronistic terminology, and therefore having more to do with semantic code than doctrinal conviction? Or are we dealing with a Ciceronian whose linguistic usage forces his thinking toward the paganization warned against by Erasmus? Or even with a free-thinker deliberately exploiting the linguistic ambiguities to propagate unorthodox views in one language that will be proffered in less exceptional tones in the other?" (1989:360).

Erasmus, who in the sixteenth century was considered a linguistic monstrosity because he wrote only in Latin, believed that Latin still housed universals. But he warned that if it were not updated and refined, it risked becoming a stiff, artificial instrument for modern sensibilities – and Christian faith. Dolet's bilingual texts hinge on this problem. The vertical and horizontal axes are clear: It is in Latin that the sheer power and wisdom of nature overwhelms the new father, who can invoke for his son the still living descendence of Roman values, while in the horizontal world of Christian vernacular French the more nurturing mother figure of nature, while equally powerful, sheds her imperial aspect to serve as feminine protectrice for the child. Thus

Lloyd-Jones' questions are all pertinent, but the overriding point is perhaps rather that Dolet negotiated two futures for his son under the aegis of both residual and recently dominant cultural heritages.

To pursue the case of bilingual *Genethliacum* for a moment, from dissimilarity into the richer realm of continuities, it was also at this time that Dolet published his manual on translation, *La maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre*/How to translate from one language into another (1540). He called for simple and common diction in the vernaculars, use of rare words only where necessary to enrich the poorer languages (echoing Cicero apropos of young Latin), and, in particular, respect for the "harmonie rhétorique" and "harmonie linguistique" appropriate to each language. The standard view today is that as a self-translator Dolet deliberately worked in different rhetorical registers as a matter of epistemological method, like many Renaissance writers, exploring his mind and his languages in "the chastening awareness that translation takes form in the interpretive activity of our thought" (Norton 1984:14). Quite so. But the striking similarities and overlaps in the two texts, as in the inter-echoing strains of paternal wonder, pride, and no little fear for his son, should weigh just as heavily, if not more, in any interpretive reconstruction of the writer as epistemologist. The texts coexist as mirror versions of their occasion, and it is only through stereoscopic reading of the two languages that we can apprehend – in full – the paternal ideas, thoughts, and emotions, and the intercultural conditions in which the texts arise. The divergences between security and constancy or imperious nature and motherly nature are partly those of the languages and their literary traditions (rhetorical harmonies) as the writer interpreted them. But it must be said that divergences are inextricable from the common core of Dolet's encomium, its irreducibly dual nature as text. Only in the play between both *distinguo* and *similitas* can the bilingual text reach full expression, in this case a bilingual Renaissance father's joy, as fully realized only in the interliminal space of reading bilingually.

Typically, Dolet's Latin is neglected in stock histories of French literature and culture. Concerning critical histories, it can be difficult even to locate bilingual versions in the monolingual foliage of standard critical accounts of European literatures. Often unwittingly, most still seek to reduce a literary or cultural history to one standard of originality, meaning linguistic purity in the past or cultural autonomy in the present. Modern editors in particular quietly set aside the extra-monolingual aspects of a text. This reduction in compass also is a familiar story. What is often not noticed is that the full panoply of multilingual effects is thereby lost, papered over in lingua-centric glosses. The colingual effect is a code-switching skill that is recurring in United States Latino literature in "Spanglish", for example, and in North African Franco-Arab texts. The dual perspective that such linguistic intersections produce in the reader can help illustrate how, in the bilingual text in two distinct linguistic versions, liminality becomes the prime space of reading. Colingual puns and wordplay are like a micro-step into the space between languages, the liminal no-man's-land where sounds and concepts, punned signs and signifieds collide in a way that is immensely difficult to describe. Colingual wordplay propels us into that space. It does not just traverse the space between languages, but it inhabits and animates it as the stereoscopic reading field. In the brief text "Pollito Chicken", by Puerto Rican writer Ana Lydia Vega, the

narrator says she would not be in New York "si a Mother no se lo ocurre la brilliant idea de emigrar. Se hubiera casado con algun drunken bastard de billar, de esos que . . . encierran a la fat ugly housewife en la casa . . . mientras ellos hacen pretty-body y le aplanan la calle a cualquier shameless bitch. No thanks" (Vega 1988:76).

To be sure, such colingual effects have often been invoked in Western literature, perhaps never more than in eras when Latin was still the lingua franca held in common with one's readers. The more conventional example is Andrew Marvell's "Horatian Ode" (1650). The line "[he] with his keener Eye/ the Axe's edge did try" overtly uses "axe" to invoke the Latin *acies*, meaning both line of sight and cutting edge. Colingual signalling thus redoubles the heroically "keener eye". To appreciate the bilingual text, however, now envision this one line amplified into an entire second version in Latin, a hypothetical translation by Marvell himself and entitled something like "Oda Horationis". That once tiny liminal space between two words becomes a vast and crucial one, a crossway where each text intersects with the other in multiply inter-echoing lexical and cultural registers. Quite like the single word "axe", but with immense semantic magnitude, the bilingual poem assumes two separate but equal modes of existence.

Equality, commensurability, equivalence in linguistics terms, this venerable translation standard is nowhere so problematic as in the bilingual text. It is also much contested in translation theory today. Many theorists continue to uphold it as the translator's sole if difficult aim. Others like Venuti have quite effectively challenged it as an outworn and never ethical ideal, properly measured only by ingesting the foreign into the domestic so thoroughly as to erase the original. Still others like Peter Fawcett, exasperated by the hunt for equivalence in what are clearly two different things, would like to discard the notion altogether but recognize that it is indelibly part of the analytic discourse (Fawcett 1997:52-63). We will explore this question case by case, testing such current assumptions against the evidence. It is advisable, in broaching this phenomenon of the bilingual text, to try to set preconceptions about equivalence aside, and to study each instance in its historical context. Contextual definitions of original and author, not to speak of text and signification, vary widely across the centuries, and each bilingual writer emerges into view amid many contentious discourses about what translation does indeed entail.

It is important to recognize at the outset, however, the full scope of this issue of bitextual relations, and why contemporary translation theory either avoids it or, in our view, falls short. Because his work has been most subject to theoretical discussion, Beckett's *Happy days/ Oh les beaux jours* (1961/1963) can serve in a prefatory way to introduce the kinds of limit-cases that defeat standard analysis. In this play, the cheerfully optimistic Winnie speaks in clichés and scraps of quotation, resilient in her appalling state, half buried in the earth. Winnie's English-specific clichés and eclectic intertexts cannot be rendered with standard dictionary-type transfers, for then the French audience would not experience the comic pathos and the horror of *French* cliché and literary memory deployed as palliative. Beckett constructed a comparable echoic system in French, thereby enhancing the difference between versions, so that similarly clawing ironies and complex puns would work in functional and stylistic correspondence.

Winnie mouths words and ideas more profound than she perhaps realizes, as Knowlson has noted. The allusive textual surface both comically undercuts her prattle and tragically ennobles it, as debris of ancient human heritage. From failing memory, Winnie garbles bits of Shakespeare, Milton, Herrick, Gray, the King James Bible, which Beckett alternately translates into French or replaces with bits from Racine, Hugo, Verlaine, the French Bible. Speaking to Willie, who remains silent and unseen, Winnie chatters:

> Well I admit it is a teaser. . . . just to know you are there within hearing and conceivably on the semi-alert is . . . er . . . paradise enow.
>
> simplement te savoir là à la portée de voix et sait-on jamais sur le demi-qui-vive, c'est pour moi . . . c'est mon coin d'azur.
>
> (*Happy Days/Oh les beaux jours*, 44-45; Beckett's ellipses)

The clichés and prattling tone are language-specific. Beckett's characteristic wordplays ("on the semi-alert"/ "sur le demi-qui-vive"), like his two Winnies, operate comically in cultural correspondence. For the irony of "paradise enow", a phrase from the *Rubáiyát*, he uses the irony of "coin d'azur", a phrase from Hugo, with the same conflictual, disconcerting function in both languages. Thus French Winnie speaks a very differently modelled discourse from her English counterpart, and the bilingual writer's characteristic differentials obtain. But in side-by-side productions, the stylistic and functional correspondences prevail: the two Winnies are unmistakably the same unique figure, valiantly resisting her plight in two languages.

What are we to make of this bitextual figure in theoretical terms? How can Beckett's Winnies and Dolet's Natures conjoin as a dually single creation by one hand? Only a few critics (such as Leonard Forster, Jane Miller, Michaël Oustinoff) have studied self-translation in three or more authors and languages, rarely with any historical coverage or theoretical development to speak of. Theoretical reflection on the bilingual text has been largely scattered and fragmentary. Commentators rightly hesitate to leap the divide between standard translation and this conceptually unwieldy practice of twin authorship. In his work on Beckett's fictions, however, Brian Fitch made one of the few efforts to invent a theoretical model. He argued that the English and French versions are so divergent that they cannot possibly give rise to the same experience of the fictive universe (Fitch 1988:60). Paradoxically, he found, the deviations are so great that the second text escapes all theoretical rubrics of standard translation, yet the similarities are so great that neither can it be called an autonomous creation (1988:78). As two "independent" texts in paradoxical "interdependence", the second text does not interpret the first so much as it "completes" it, or finishes it (1988:131, 227). To Fitch, then, the texts are alternative outcomes of the same textual productivity and, as such, "variants of something that has no tangible textual existence" (1988:135). Underlying this theory is the premise that any two languages are incommensurable verbal systems, as reflected in "the essential dissimilarity of the French and English languages, which means that, given that no two words taken from two different languages will cover an identical semantic field and possess exactly the same range of connotations, the *dissimilarities* between any translation and its original will always

be greater than their *similarities*" (Fitch 1988:226).

This is to assume, while tacitly positioning divergences as the object of study, that the bilingual writer seeks identical connotations when self-translating and that, because the effort is futile, the translated text will always be preponderantly dissimilar. Yet as the reader will see, not even in medieval times has the bilingual writer sought anything resembling the same range of connotations. On the contrary, the dissimilarities in languages surely prompted much of the medieval delight in the linguistic separation of genres and the Renaissance and seventeenth-century play with multilingualism at various courts and urban centres. When engaging in self-translation, those bilinguals thrived, as do the modernists, on devising textual means to use these dissimilarities creatively in twinning the text. Unlike Fitch, we find instead that Beckett as literary bilingual shares a great deal with his predecessors in this tradition and with his contemporaries, such as Giuseppe Ungaretti, Vladimir Nabokov, and Julien Green, who often volubly insisted on the commonality of their dual texts across linguistic differences. Fitch ended on paradox, concluding that the true middle zone can exist solely in the extra-linguistic, "common identity" of the author, who in turn can only be known by his linguistic constructions (1988:226). We seek to show instead that the interliminal space between linguistic versions need not be foreclosed by difference but may be opened up by it.

It is difficult to see how Fitch's model of the bilingual text illuminates the translative practice of Dolet or Beckett. To the degree that Dolet's French "completes" the Latin version, it may be true that we learn more about the "identity" of the writer, who in French certainly softens the voice of the rather more harsh Roman pater familias. But any two poems on his son, not necessarily self-translations, could achieve that effect, that is, merely give us more information to compare. Even in this case surely we learn less about some extra-linguistic identity outside the text than about internal descriptors relative to conventions. Had Dolet added an Italian version, and then a Dutch version, we would still remain within the circuits of language and be no closer to the author's identity, other than as a more accomplished virtuoso. Is it not rather *how* the two languages themselves interrelate as text that marks this duality?

Just as authorial identity is always conjectural and elusive, ultimately unknowable, so it seems evident that any literary text might be said to "complete" its predecessors, as Julia Kristeva suggested in positing intertextuality. Fitch's model might equally apply to Cervantes's *Don Quixote* and its reflexive successors, such as Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*, as two "versions" of *Don Quixote*, and indeed there is much to learn from the play of similarities and differences between those texts. It would be in an English version written by Cervantes himself, however, that we might come closer to the core of that novel by watching how the writer sets two entire linguistic systems in synch to construct and reconstruct the same fiction for different audiences. Insofar as cultural history conditions language, would the Don become more loutish in English, less dreamily idealistic? Would the Arab translator become an Irishman? These are the types of choices, matters of tone, figuration, and allusive register, that the bilingual text assumes and animates, as language.

The theoretical problem is not one of logical paradox (unless one is looking for authorial identity) but intertextual surplus. Many bilinguals have, in effect, turned

their Arabs into Irishmen, creating two figures for, in this case, the liar as unreliable transmitter of texts. The nub of the issue is their resemblance: two figures for the same thing, sameness being the order of correspondence, for comically faulty authority. There is little paradoxical in this once one grasps the principle of intertextuality as the interliminal space of reading. It is there, in comparative study, that we apprehend not the writer's identity overarching the texts but rather the tacit relations of the two texts as intercultural representations within a translingual zone of commonality.

Gayatri Spivak, theorist and translator, speaks of "the irreducible work of translation, not from language to language but from body to ethical semiosis, that incessant shuttle that is a 'life'" (Spivak 2003:13). Opening the space of that translative shuttle as the space of reading, she could be describing the bilingual text when she adds: "In the translation from *French* to *English* lies the disappeared history of distinctions in another space – made by the French and withdrawn by the English – full of the movement of languages and peoples still in historical sedimentation at the bottom, waiting for the real virtuality of our imagination" (2003:18). The bilingual text, from its two sides, directly opens out on that space, the interliminal region between languages, disclosing residues of the social and intellectual history that both systems now exhibit, in virtual overlap and intersection, through bilinguality. The single voice of standard second-hand translation silences that space. Intercultural self-translation constructs it stereoscopically as a unique reading field.

One recurrent question in such a study is the audience. How does one delimit, define, and, not least, interrelate the social groups being addressed by the bilingual text? Sometimes it is evident that they are largely two separate, monolingual groups, like Nabokov's Russian and English readers. As static rubrics, however, such binary linguistic definitions of audience mask significant factors of generational time and social space. Nabokov, for example, struggled to adapt his Oxbridge English to the American market, while his Russian was losing pace with a half century of change in his native country. His biographers show that he also chortled at the linguistic puzzles and puns between versions that would, he knew, fascinate and frustrate a third group, the significant spectrum of Anglo-Russian exiles and academic scholars who would help guarantee his posterity as a bilingual author of transnational fictions. In other cases, as in medieval and Renaissance texts, or postcolonial texts in the former colonies in Africa or Asia, diglossic conditions ensure bilingual readers, who can and do savor both versions. Thus in this study, the bilingual text requires a dialogic relation to audience as a relative concept for peoples and languages always shifting, often overlapping, along the axes of social change.

In the terms we use to explore such issues in the following pages, we have tried to avoid neologisms and hew to standard usage as much as possible, for clarity and the reader's convenience. We use the term "bilingual" to designate anyone who, in addition to speaking and writing one language idiomatically, has acquired a high degree of control over the spoken and written forms of a second language and (for the purposes of this book) has authored work in both languages. Measuring control is problematic but, at a minimum, as Suzanne Romaine puts it, bilingualism is the alternate use of two languages (1995:12). "Self-translator" indicates the bilingual writer who authors texts in one language and then translates them into the other. In

many instances, especially medieval and Renaissance texts, it is not known which was the language of the original or first composition, but in all cases the texts are the creations of the same writer. We use "translative" to designate the process of translation and "translation" to refer to the product itself.

The definition of "native" or "maternal" language was probably stable only intermittently, as in the early Renaissance to designate the native vernacular and then again between the French Revolution and the First World War, increasingly as a function of birthplace within a nation-state. We use the terms very loosely to indicate the language(s) acquired as an infant. The sequence of language acquisition, dating "first" and "second" languages, is often unknowable; just as medieval Church schools complicate chronology, so in every period vast numbers of people are bilingual from birth. Also, it is suggested today that one can grow up acquiring, say, German as a native language and yet, by molding oneself to the forms of that language, thereby lose inchoate, pre-linguistic forms of family ethnicity, regional mytho-poetic thinking, and so forth (a biographical sketch of this process appears in Jacques Derrida's *Le Monolinguisme de l'autre*). Such contemporary takes on infra-verbal experience, particularly in colonial subjects, resembles in several ways medieval and Renaissance notions of the subject's anchorage in a supra-verbal dimension. Then as now, linguistic determinists vigorously oppose such ideas, contending rather that language and being are one. Both groups agree that chronology is useful only to a point, and only generically; remarkable individuals like Gower or Beckett can swiftly acquire new languages even as adults. It is less the chronological sequence or the sociolinguistic definition of native and acquired languages that interests us than their performative aspects in the self-translated text. As in standard linguistics practice today, we adopt the distinction between the "bilinguality" of persons, readily code-switching between their languages, and the "bilingualism" of social groups in diglossic conditions, as in medieval London, Renaissance Florence, eighteenth-century Paris, or modern Cairo.

Overall, in the course of this project, we found ourselves juggling so many contradictory terms for various degrees of language competency that we have generated a composite set of umbrella terms to serve as general rubrics for distinguishing types of language use across periods and cultures. Our basic terminological distinctions will be used as an overall typology of bilinguality and bilingual texts, which we hope the reader will find useful.

Borrowing liberally from J. N. Adams in *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (2003) , and from Suzanne Romaine in *Bilingualism* (1995:11-25) and Daniel Baggioni in *Langues et nation en Europe* (1997:54-61), we have developed the following terminology for our purposes in *The Bilingual Text*, beginning with the broadest kinds of bilingualism and ending on the self-translator:

> An **ambient translingual** has been exposed to two or more languages in different settings, which may be either within a single social milieu (such as home and school) or across different milieus or even borders (such as through migration, exile, or travel). Ambient translinguals have different degrees of competency in these languages, may write in some, but usually only speak and write one language well.

A **diglossic** is a subset of ambient translingual for our purposes, and indicates chiefly oral use of two languages, without necessarily any competence in writing.
A **colingual** writes mixed-language texts, in which one language is clearly dominant, although code-switching is frequent within the text.
A **competent bilingual** is competent in two languages, able to write in both alternately and to reproduce standard or normative discourse.
An **idiomatic bilingual** writes in both languages with near-native handling of grammar, idioms, discursive registers, and stylistic and literary traditions.
A **multilingual** writes with competent or idiomatic skill in three or more languages.

Of course, at a basic level, the term "bilingual" might refer to people who speak one language at home and another at school or work. But when we refer to **bilingual writers** we mean quite specifically authors who compose texts in at least two different languages. Whereas for most people, one language is **dominant,** dominancy is difficult to determine in the case of writers who use both alternately. Accordingly, **self-translators** are idiomatic bilingual writers who have two literary languages: they compose texts in both languages, *and* they translate their texts between those languages. Thus **the bilingual text** refers to the self-translated text, existing in two languages and usually in two physical versions, with overlapping content. In the following pages, while focusing primarily on variants of the idiomatic bilingual's self-translations, we attempt to describe how all these types occur and interrelate in successive periods.

Concerning "culture", a term in such widespread use these days, we tend to share Pym's view that it can mean almost anything in contemporary theoretical discourse. We share his thesis that it is at "the points of resistance" between source and target languages, when translation flounders, that cultural difference might be grasped, and only then. We will return to this issue. But it is worth noting at the outset that whereas Pym's concept of points of resistance works quite well for standard, second-hand translation, it needs further refining for self-translators, who navigate all linguistic and socio-cultural barriers at will, with sometimes startling results.

Also, the term "literary" is used in these pages to denote a variety of textual practices. Given the medieval foundations of this study, we understand literary as a broad umbrella term encompassing at various times philosophical, political, and theological treatises, commentaries, letters. Certainly that compass also narrows in time, such that by our Part 3 the term refers solely to poetry, fiction, and drama. During most of the preceding centuries, however, there was a fine tension between poetic statement and systematic philosophy. Just as the pre-Socratics held that poetry and philosophy are the same thing, but Plato countered by severing philosophical truths from indulgent fictions, so there persists in the next millennium an uneasy relationship between the forms of intellectual inquiry, aligning on the one side such rhapsodes as Lucretius, De Meung, Pope, Voltaire, and on the other side more mathematically minded thinkers like Gerson, Descartes, Spinoza. We will recur to this point too, apropos of changing

philosophies of language, insofar as self-translators were often lively participants in the long Western tradition of debating the nature and purposes of human language, "literary" not least.

Concerning readership or the audiences for self-translations, it is important for a comprehensive study of the bilingual text to keep in mind the centrality of classical learning in legal, medical, philosophical training and thinking, as well as by 1560 the widening currents of humanism that gave fresh momentum to antique conceptions of universal values and the transcendent subject, in new dialogue with courtly and royal representations and claims. Bilinguals work in differential sign systems, and it is clear that they often excel at semiosis, swivelling between the mirrors of signifiers in ways that can be radically challenging to orthodoxy or whimsically gaming with it (sometimes perhaps both, as critics of Oresme's and Nabokov's texts suggest). What matters for the bilingual text as a translative phenomenon is the authority that the self-translator assumes over the semiotics of dual discourse. As a group, bilingual writers are intensely interested in language and its role in sociality or communication. Elizabeth Beaujour observes, "in many ways bilingual or polyglot writers have more in common with each other, whatever their national origins, than they do with monolinguals" (1995:37). She defines the bilingual writer's sense of free linguistic option as "a comparative three-dimensional insight into language, a type of stereolinguistic optic on communication the monolingual rarely experiences" (1995:37). As the bilingual text eventuates from priestly and courtly functions in the Middle Ages, from colonial functions in eighteenth-century encounters, or from grim soldierly functions in the trenches of World War I, such issues must come to the fore of theoretical reflection. The semiotics of the dual text always challenge audiences' interpretive procedures. Even as each version addresses its own audience, it also seeks out within them the bilinguals who can juggle both versions in the mind, perceiving how images and symbols are compromised by interliminality.

Finally, to engage with cultural productions across a millennium, we have limited our study to the West in geographical terms, and to the Middle Ages forward in chronological terms. Such limits seem necessary in order to keep the focus clear and the subject compassable. (Readers interested in Greek-Latin bilinguality in the ancient world should consult J. N. Adams, plus the essays edited by Adams, Janse, and Swain; on bilinguality in Asia, see Naranjana, Kachru, Liu, Befu). As we worked, it became clear that within this time span of 1100 through 2000, writers adopt the French language for literary self-translation with disproportionate frequency. Many historical factors weave into this choice of French as a literary language, such as the centrality of Paris in the medieval West, the diaspora of French Huguenots across Europe and the Americas, and the role of French as both *lingua franca* in the early modern world and, since the late seventeenth-century, a primary language of international diplomacy, plus its perdurance among global elites through the mid-twentieth century. Thus the reader will find disproportionate reference to writers in French-Latin, English-French, French-Russian, German-French, French-Czech, and so on, reflecting the linguistic and cultural prominence of French in the history of the West. In selecting specific bilingual figures for close study, we have aimed for representational rather than exhaustive coverage, by way of tracking such arcs of change.

We divide our text into three parts. The labels medieval, Renaissance, early modern, Romantic, modern, and postmodern, are of course relative terms, with their own histories and snares. They too instantiate the West's endless endeavor to construct its own cultural identities by reconfiguring its past. We use them as loose guidelines to distinguish the changing conditions under which bilingual texts arise. By way of tracking continuity, however, we also bridge them with four terms designating concepts that run through the history of this subject from the fourteenth through twenty-first centuries: *translatio*, *inventio*, *auctoritas*, *natio*.

Each part opens with an overview of cultural contexts and changing concepts of language and translation in different periods, before turning to specific self-translators working in those periods. Readers interested more in the linguistic than the literary aspects of this subject may find the case histories too detailed, just as readers with a more literary focus might find the overviews distracting. We have tried to strike a balance, in the firm belief that each perspective truly does enrich the other. For historical continuity, then, one can just read the overviews sequentially (sections A-B-C in each part) and then return to the case histories, which do not necessarily need to be read sequentially. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are our own.

Readers should also note that we have no grand narrative to propose. Rather we hope to place certain texts and concepts into an historical and formal relation, in order to show how the phenomenon of literary self-translation persists through different periods and languages.

Part I: Vulgar Tongues

Medieval and Renaissance Conditions (1100-1600)

A. Changing Concepts of Language and Translation

Jacob Burckhardt defined the Middle Ages not so much by what it made visible in terms of human achievement as for what it obscured, or failed to achieve: until the fourteenth century a new mental structure lay hidden "beneath a common veil . . . woven of faith, illusion, and childish prepossession, through which the world and history were seen clad in strange hues" (1954:100). In Burckhardt's highly influential reading of the period, patiently awaiting the West's discovery under this misty veil was nothing less than the Renaissance, that is, the full awareness of the individual *tel quel*, the individual who, in perceiving his (or her) self-conscious uniqueness was no longer merely aware of himself only as belonging to a larger, more general category, "as a member of a race, people, party, family, or corporation", but as a fully and self-reflexively conscious individual (1954:100). The Burckhardtian celebration of the Renaissance as light against dark, as Renaissance bright light finding voice against medieval murky darkness, is too familiar to rehearse here (for recent discussion, see Patterson 1990, 1996; Aers 1992:194-97; Kerrigan and Braden 1989:37-54). We should note, however, that as Lee Patterson and David Aers have shown, through the 1990s medieval scholars have continued to replicate Burkhardt's notion that before 1500 the individual thought of himself or herself only in terms of larger groups, thus internalizing Burckhardt's thesis of the "creation of the individual". Although medievalists have long chafed at Burckhardt's notion of the Renaissance "invention" of the individual, they have nevertheless tended to analyze medieval subjects in his terms of race, people, and social or political organization, thus in terms of the subject's relationship to *natio*, to state, and to their attendant linguistic structures (Aers 1992:194-97).

Concomitantly, scholars have found myriad "splits between outer realities and inner forms of being" (Aers 1992:186) in medieval texts ranging from the vernacular writings of Dante, Jean de Meung, and Chaucer, and in the Latinate context of catechism and Eucharistic recital. Given the keen interest of recent medieval scholarship and New Historicism in subject formation and the general means through which subjectivity is attained and presented, it is rather surprising that the pervasive bilingualism of the Middle Ages and early modern periods has not been foregrounded more frequently in discussions of the medieval subject. It is even more surprising that those looking for specific instances of subjective awareness through social practices of literature should routinely disregard the unique position and cultural function of the bilingual self-translator bridging linguistic communities.

One of the factors contributing to this critical blind spot is perhaps the rather limited scope of most recent linguistic studies of bilingualism. Although this area is under increasing investigation in contemporary linguistic theory, stimulated in large part by its growing impact on global capitalist culture, most studies sweep past the important precedent set in the medieval and Renaissance periods, peaks of both literary bilingualism and biculturalism. Yet in these periods, bi- or multi-lingualism was not the cultural exception but rather the norm, as such translation scholars as John Adams, Leonard Forster, and Rita Copeland have ably demonstrated. Indeed, as Adams and Forster both emphasize, medieval Latin, although a "dead" language,

long remained particularly well suited for the dissemination of all manner of subjects. Latin literary, scientific, ecclesiastic, and legal texts, among others, persisted through many centuries of continued use in contact with vernaculars. Latin remained a viable language for ecclesiastic rites long after its general deliquescence in Western culture. Sperone Speroni categorized it in 1542 as a "dead language" because of this dual trajectory, entailing a functional separation from the Western vernaculars in daily use (Baddeley 1993:43). These indelibly bilingual and even multilingual conditions, which were dominant in medieval and to a lesser extent Renaissance Europe, gave Latin the semantic and thematic flexibility in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to adapt itself to several different intellectual and professional domains and to accommodate many different textual forms. Indeed, only bilingualism enabled the eventual displacement (through replication) of Latin textual authority by the vernacular canon (Copeland 1991). Historians agree that ambient bilingualism and multilingualism were such pervasive linguistic modalities in these periods that the universality of Latin, as a learned language, provided antidotes to the "collective phenomenon" of language conflict among the vernaculars (Crespo 2000: 24), defining the semiotic constraints of the evolving vernacular forms (Kittay and Godzich 1987). Why, then, are there so few studies focusing on medieval or even Renaissance bilingual texts or translators?

One of the obvious difficulties in explicating translative bilingualism in the context of medieval concepts of language and self is that, as the continuing impact of Burckhardt suggests, our very categories of theoretical analysis are modern rationalistic ones, often more deeply rooted than we realize. To a large extent, medievalists are used to confronting this gap in analytical tools. Groundbreaking medieval translation studies by such scholars as Beer and Copeland have shown how the literary and historical specificity of the Middle Ages, however heterogeneous, requires conceptualizing medieval translation as cultural practice, and they have rigorously questioned the adequacy of modern translational terms. In response to postcolonial studies in particular, general translation theorists have also begun seeking ways around the rationalistic concepts that have long undergirded the field. Douglas Robinson on translative subjectivity explicitly rejects rationalist theories that attempt to explain translative production uniquely through the notion of a coherent, historically discrete consciousness, and instead adduces what he calls the "postrationalist" translative self. He likens this figure to Daniel Simeoni's concept of the "mosaic *habitus*", or the dual existence of the bilingual translator as one who exists both "inside" and "out": the term translator refers not simply to an individual with an active intellectual existence, but also to those material and social practices outside the individual and in which he or she actively participates (Robinson 2001:143). This is why, as we noted in the Introduction above, Pym's notion of the translator as performative, sociolinguistic "interculture" serves a history of bilingual production in the Middle Ages and Renaissance better than the standard contemporary demarcations of writers, languages, and texts. Interculture characterizes the major modes of bilingualism in the medieval and early modern periods: vernacular/Latin bilingualism, vernacular/vernacular bilingualism, and most salient for learned humanist culture, a Latin/Latin bilingualism in which different idioms of the same language transmit a very different cultural stance, and in which the identical word signifies entirely different sets of meanings. Erasmus, remarkable

or "monstrous" as he may have been for writing uniquely in Latin, shared common ground with other major humanists in this regard: a writer's knowledge of words was of primary consideration, and a knowledge of things largely secondary. It was from the *verba* that the *res* itself could be known.

This aspect of humanist thought positions itself deliberately against the theory of human language which guided the greater part of medieval intellectual thought: in the Aristotelian (and Scholastic) conception of language, it is the *res* and not the *verba* which is of fundamental importance. The two are linked through particular mental structures which serve as perceptional interface, and therefore it is not the word itself that is the proper subject of examination, but rather the mental concepts and/or events which mediate the interpretation of things (Moss 2003:89). Patristic criticism, following Aristotle, emphasizes the thing and not the word in looking to recover "a truthful meaning beyond the accidents of human linguistic multiplicity" (Copeland 1991:43). Medieval emphasis on *res* over *verba* helps explain why even though sociolinguistic conditions in the Middle Ages were dominantly bilingual, there is so little overt reference to the phenomenon in the tradition of patristic criticism and translation, where linguistic difference is de-emphasized and "target" and "source" material conflated in the immanence of the divine. Unity of meaning lies not in the particularity of any one language or linguistic articulation, but rather in the global truth which obtains through sacred history. Hence Augustine's view, presented in *De doctrina christiana*, that the Bible is a historical narrative that must be read literally, and only secondarily viewed as a repository for allegorical meaning (as in the later patristic tradition recognizing four levels of scriptural interpretation: literal, moral, allegorical, and spiritual). Augustine is clear: interpretive ambiguity must be guarded against, and he therefore takes great pains to differentiate between natural and conventional signs, the better to discuss the dangers that can arise from a reader's ignorance of the qualities of a sign. And if only Scripture is capable of being interpreted allegorically, as Augustine and Aquinas both asserted, then bilingual translative production of a medieval author working in genres associated with the vernacular is indeed difficult to classify. Here, as in so many other realms of literary development, Dante's role is crucial. In a famous letter to Cangrande della Scala he contextualizes his explanation of the polysemantic nature of his *Commedia* by drawing an explicit parallel between the four patristic senses in which Psalm 114 must be interpreted, and the many ways in which the *Commedia* is to be read. Dante thus radically expands the stable of linguistic symbols open to analysis to those outside the scriptural context. All poetry – indeed, all linguistic symbols – become fair game for literary interpretation, and the stakes of interlingual interpretation also become much greater.

Despite such important advances in our understanding of medieval literacy, linguistic thought, and sign theory, medieval scholarship is still rather at pains to come to agreement on the basic terminology that best refers to medieval linguistic conditions. The critical lexicon is vague, when not contradictory. Gilbert Ouy, one of the few scholars to concentrate explicitly on the composition and status of the bilingual text in the Middle Ages, concludes bluntly that "le phénomène du bilinguisme médiéval n'a été jusqu'ici que très insuffisamment étudié" (Ouy 1998:ix), for two reasons: in part because the conceptual category of bilingualism is so difficult to pin down in this

period generally, and in part because so few author/translators can be said conclusively to fit whatever rubric is being used. In the case of Nicole Oresme, for example, scholars have long attributed the French translation of his Latin text *De moneta* to him, but not because his name graces any of the extant French manuscripts. Rather, as Claire Richter Sherman notes, reference to the French version of the *De moneta* as "his treatise" in Oresme's *Ethiques* and *Politiques* points to Oresme as the author of both versions (Sherman 1995:338; n. 9). Describing the difficulty scholars face in even identifying medieval bilingualism, Ouy openly acknowledges the complex linguistic reality of the medieval period: the unequal development of written forms of Romance vernaculars in relation to long-established Latin, new Latin idioms and the creation of different models of literacy under the influence of scholasticism, shifting fault lines of genre and form, the variable status of written and oral language production in a myriad of social communities, and the lack of a clear correlation between political boundaries and spoken or written vernaculars. On this latter point, Ouy notes that although we may easily refer to bilingual (self-translated) medieval texts written in "French", this written French in no way resembled the maternal language of a Jean Gerson or a Jean de Montreuil in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries; he even goes so far as to posit trilingual conditions by the late fourteenth century (Ouy 1986). In such conditions, Ouy adduces only Jean Gerson and Jean de Montreuil as clear primary examples of medieval bilingualism (Ouy 1998:xi). Indeed, linguists note that it is only quite late, from 1530 on in the French context, that we begin to find texts making consistent reference not to French as a *langage*, a term connoting a dialect with local or regional application, but rather as a *langue*, connoting universal application. Similarly, the year 1530 signals the end of a "first phase" of orthographic modernization undertaken by Renaissance humanists, and also signals the clear separation of neo-Latin from the vernacular (Baddeley 1993:53-54).

Thus, in lively lexical disputes, some scholars of medieval translation adopt the rubric "territorial multilingualism" (or bilingualism), since it implies close contact among different languages within a single politico-geographic area, and the mutual modification of each language through close contact with the others (Crespo 2000:27-28) – an important nuance which the simple term "bilingualism" does not capture quite so readily. Little wonder, then, that scholars have recurred to a profusion of terms in an effort to describe the medieval linguistic environment, including Mary Louise Pratt's "contact zones", intended to define colonialism's particular asymmetries (see Coldiron 2003:335 for further discussion of the influence of colonial contact theory, and Pratt's in particular, on medieval translation theory). Daniel Baggioni, in his useful study *Langues et nations en Europe*, summarizes much of this terminological debate by navigating between colingualism, diglossia, plurilingualism, multilingualism, and bilingualism. Yet despite the importance he places on bilingualism for an enhanced understanding of language and cultural activity in the Middle Ages, Baggioni, like many sociolinguists, follows traditional models of bilingualism by defining it as a condition that obtains when two languages being brought into contact enjoy "equivalent" cultural status. Bilingual equivalence is thus opposed to diglossia, where each of the two languages in cultural contact fulfills a different "function" and holds a status "unequal" to the other language (Baggioni 1997:55). This traditional understanding

of bilingualism raises important questions, however, when Baggioni and others turn to the context of the Middle Ages. How equivalent or commensurate is in fact the cultural status of rapidly and unevenly developing vernacular languages – languages wherein written codes were lagging far behind oral usage – and the long-established Latin, used in the same contexts and through similar methods, during a span of many hundreds of years?

As Baggioni's chart of the emergence of national languages shows, in most areas of Europe there was anywhere from a one-century gap (Spain) to a six-century gap (the British Isles) between the appearance of the first written texts in the vernacular and the creation of the first grammars of those vernaculars (Baggioni 1997:63-64). To chart such matters gives visible confirmation of what the detailed analysis of medieval texts also tells us: it takes centuries for the standardization of European vernaculars to begin, over which time Latin as learned language remains fairly stable in comparison, particularly because it continues to thrive in ecclesiastical contexts and to be used in certain professions (such as law) where codified formulae retain currency. It also remains stable because it was explicitly articulated as the universal language par excellence, the language whose very grammar was thought to be based on a logical correspondence between ideas and the universal linguistic structures used to represent them. (So universally perceived was the semantic content of Latin, in sixteenth-century France, that as major a figure as Théodore de Bèze, in the *Dialogue de l'ortografe*, advocates keeping the practice of having grammars commonly explain the written vernacular not by referencing the phonemic oral equivalent, but rather by citing the equivalent Latin words; see Baddeley 1993:24.) The vernaculars, by contrast, were theorized as contingent, relative, shifting – and therefore generally unsuited for any discussion of universal truths. How, then, to compare the relative status of the vernacular and Latin? Which cultural context(s) should form the basis for the analysis? Must bilingualism necessarily be equated, as sociolinguistic models require, with "equivalency" of linguistic and/or cultural fluency? Moreover, if the bilingual author, medieval or otherwise, can be said to have a "mother tongue", does it automatically follow that all other languages he or she might use will be of unequal status? Finally, how do we measure the relative status of two languages when cultural and linguistic "exchange" is not taking place in marketplace or monastery, nor between author and translator, but instead in the person of the bilingual author? We will return to these questions in a moment, after considering concepts of the medieval and Renaissance "self" or consciousness as defined and articulated through language.

Leonard Forster, whose short study *The Poet's Tongues* (1970) was one of the first to focus explicitly on literary multilingualism in Europe, including the medieval and early modern periods, explicitly rejects the notion, both theoretical and historical, of language as key to social identity. Historians theorizing the development of the European nation-state support Forster's thesis. Although the terms *natio* and *status* appear with increasing frequency from the twelfth century onward in medieval texts, their definition varies widely in different sociopolitical contexts, as medieval historian Bernard Guenée has shown. The *natio* was associated in the French context primarily with political, religious, and historical factors, in the Italian city-state with historical factors, and in the Germanic context primarily with linguistic factors (Guenée 1981:30).

Varying relationships with papal and imperial power also led to vastly different degrees of linguistic cohesion in different political states. In the case of medieval England, given the tumultuous political history and diverse socio-geographic conditions, it is difficult to define the average individual in relation to a single dominant language, let alone that of a collective (Crespo 2000; Kristol 2000). Language alone does not make a political subject. Instead, as Forster points out, citing H. J. Chaytor's classic study *From Script to Print*, the medieval and early modern periods tended to conceptualize language as a tool to be used in particular circumstances or for particular topics, with Latin as the primary and most respectable tool, and this instrumental view of language remained the dominant attitude until the Renaissance, when it was challenged. In England, it was Richard Stanyhurst who, in the introduction to his 1582 translation of the first four books of the *Aeneid*, commented that Virgil "dooth laboure, in telling as yt were a *Cantorburye tale*, too ferret owt the secretes of *Nature*, with woordes so fitlye coucht" (quoted in Brittan 2003:79). With a single deft comparison between Virgil's foundational text and Chaucer's vernacular touchstone, Stanyhurst establishes English on a par with Latin. Further, he emphasizes the Renaissance notion of linguistic relativity: to each culture its form of expression, its proper language for expressing general cultural truths. In France, the challenge to Latin hegemony was undertaken more broadly by the Pléiade, whose members explicated their literary production by positing strong and necessary links between political fealty and linguistic identity. Ronsard, central figure of the Pléiade, articulates this challenge in the preface of his influential *Abbregé de l'Art Poëtique François* (1565):

> Mais aujourd'hui, pource que nostre France n'obeist qu'à un seul roy, nous sommes contraincts, si nous voulons parvenir à quelque honneur, de parler son langage; autrement nostre labeur, tant fust-il honorable et parfaict, seroit estimé peu de chose ou (peult estre) totalement Mesprisé. (1995:200)
>
> (But today, because France answers only to a single king, we are obliged to speak his language if we want to gain honor [in the literary realm]. Otherwise, honorable and perfect though our efforts might be, they would be considered paltry or [even perhaps] entirely devalued.)

Ronsard's spirited advocacy of literary production in French has two goals. First, it will displace the elite's perception of Italian as the most influential poetic language having the strongest tie to the classical Latin poets, and it will open the way for creating the Pléiadic ideal of a richer and more poetically attuned vernacular. Second, it will establish a direct response to changing political circumstances (Hampton 2001). And although we cannot read this preface without acknowledging the influence Ronsard's royalist ties must have played in its production, we must nevertheless recognize this statement as indicative of a turning point in European literary history. Ronsard insists on the linguistic loyalty of those poets who would write in the French vernacular, a vernacular to be considered "leur proper terre" precisely because it is that of their political state. In the French context, this politico-linguistic claim for the vernacular knows no precedent. In previous centuries such a direct equation was simply not possible, in the welter of politico-linguistic multicultures.

Like Ouy and Guenée, other scholars too, studying the historical, social, and literary conditions of bilingualism, similarly call upon us to question longstanding assumptions, implicit and explicit, about the social identity of the bilingual individual navigating Latin and different vernaculars. James Adams, for example, shows that critics' privileging of certain categories of bilingual text (such as epitaphs or other public inscriptions) has meant isolating categories of bilinguals (primarily the élite) and thereby erasing others (such as merchants, whose bilingualism was less likely to perdure through written evidence). Forster echoes Adams's insistence that "bilingual does not automatically assume highly educated" (Forster 1970:13) in citing the broad popularity of macaronic verse as a typical indicator of literary situations whose mores (comic in this case) presume a bilingual and bicultural audience. Like Forster, Adams also rejects the premise that in order to be considered bilingual, a medieval person must demonstrate conclusively "balanced" or even "dominant" bilingualism between a vernacular and Latin, chiefly because "setting up degrees of linguistic competence in a dead language is out of the question, and even in spoken modern languages is problematic" (Adams 2003:8). In order not to cut too wide a linguistic swath in his definition of bilingualism, Adams places the outer boundary for defining it as "actual 'performance', or anecdotes about performance", that is, written textual production as indisputable evidence (Adams 2003:8). Applying standard socio-linguistic assumptions in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, then, Adams and Forster develop wider models of bilingualism and the bilingual individual, in order to demarcate the idea (implicit in Forster, explicit in Adams) that bilingual texts often served not simply as a means of gaining a wider audience, but more importantly as a powerful tool through which individuals could create and assert multiple cultural identities in highly variable and complex ways (see Adams 2003:356-83).

Given that medieval and Renaissance culture was anything but monolithic, traditional translative models of dominance or source/target dichotomies clearly cannot account for medieval translation culture. Such standard models cannot theorize the complex case of the bilingual translator in whose person two cultures, two languages, and two translative *habitus* are united. The far broader and more complex status of bilingual translation in the Middle Ages and Renaissance requires emphasizing the flexibility of the bilingual translator's sociolinguistic existence, identity, and textual production, as well as the close ties between translative activity and the decisive socio-political impact of print culture on Western Europe.

B. Between Antiqui and Moderni: Medieval Bilingual Cultural Centres

Just as bilingualism in the context of medieval textual production eludes ready labels and analysis, so too do standard medieval notions of interlingual translation. Translation was not conceived of in the Middle Ages as a single practice, but instead as a loose nexus of practices involving sets of universal commonplaces inherited from the *auctores* (notably Cicero, and Horace as popularized through Jerome), in which the figure of the translator was often allied with the rhetor or orator. Latin terms for the

translator are revealing: he is often referred to as *interpres*, yet this term also denotes one who glosses a text (*glossator*) or one who engages in exegesis (*expositor*).

The medieval lexicon entails a profound separation between *poeta* or "literary" practice, and exegesis – notably not the modern distinction between the creation of a second text and the commentary on a received text (Copeland 1991:176). Medieval translation challenges our modern paradigms through its emphasis on generational transition or evolution (*translatio*), rather than sameness or equivalency: the point was not to produce an identical text in a different language, but instead to produce a "new" text that would prompt a revaluation of the *auctoritas* on which the new is based. Thus for translation theorists, the medieval period can serve as liminal case for reexamining several basic assumptions.

In order to characterize translation practices in the long medieval period, we cannot rely solely on the traditional distinction between literal versus loose translation (as implied in Horace's *fidus interpres*), or notions of translation as displacement; we must instead examine the verbal axes along which the Middle Ages situated translation practices. The academic discourses of *inventio* (rhetoric) and *enarratio* (grammar) play a crucial role, quite like the terms *auctor* and *auctoritas*, *inventio*, and *imitatio*. Acknowledging the developmental stages of the various vernacular languages is also essential, insofar as the chronologies across medieval Europe are never neatly aligned.

Medieval translation, Rita Copeland proposes, can be broadly situated through several profound paradoxes, the most important of which is a simultaneous continuity with and rupture from past textual practices (Copeland 1989). In this amalgamated yet dual way, medieval translation illustrates translation theory's outer boundaries, as Pym argues in *Method in Translation History* when he describes the medieval period as replete with "problematic cases . . . which constitute a minefield for any exclusive definition of translation" (Pym 1998:63). As Jeanette Beer says, "at no time in the history of the West has translation played a more vital role than in the Middle Ages" (Beer 1989:1), yet it is nevertheless a formidable task to reconcile the difficulties of identifying medieval translation with the pressing need to include it in theories of medieval textual production and reception.

As we have mentioned, the difficulty in framing translation in the Middle Ages stems from both cultural and lexical factors. Not only was there no set of universal terms for discussing interlingual translation per se, as distinct from other textual practices, but there were also no definitive manuals on the topic. Even a basic definition of the "Middle Ages" as a discrete period governed by a specific set of literary and linguistic conditions proves difficult at best: how can we summarize a period which in the context of European vernacular literary production spans some six centuries, and which witnesses the coming-into-being of the written Romance vernaculars? Case studies concentrating on specific moments in medieval translation history (specific cultural interfaces, literary documents, and historical figures) are of particular importance for precisely this reason. Without recourse to particular textual practices in particular textual moments, we run the danger of subsuming "a millennium of translative vitality as one thousand years of non-translation" (Beer 1989:2; cited also in Pym 1998:63).

A. J. Minnis's landmark study *Medieval Theory of Authorship* (1988) articulates the dangers of subsuming medieval literary theory and praxis under one theoretical rubric, typically by focusing on major shifts in language theories that were an outgrowth of thirteenth-century scholasticism's reaction against the (proto)humanistic landscape of the previous century. Minnis's close analysis of the changing figure of the medieval *auctor* demonstrates the dramatic influence of scholastic Scriptural exegesis in the thirteenth century; transposition of *auctoritas* (*translatio auctoritatis*, Minnis calls it) from divine to human arenas made it newly possible for authors writing in the vernacular to ennoble their own literary activities, many of which were based implicitly or explicitly on translation (Minnis 1988:viii). As Minnis's neologism suggests, the broader concept of *translatio* informed every aspect of medieval textual production. But we must approach this term with caution, since *translatio* means both more, and less, than what we call translation today. While *translatio* could refer to translation, so too did the Latin terms *conversio* and *interpretatio*, the latter of which tended to be defined explicitly by later grammarians as interlingual translation (Copeland 1991:89).

Taken more broadly, the term *translatio,* as part of the formula *translatio imperii et studii*, guided political ideology in the Middle Ages as transference of political and cultural authority from one polity – or, in the later Middle Ages, from one language – to another. *Translatio studii* was a powerful ideological concept, in no small part because it marked the transposition of the political authority of the ancient empire onto Christian Rome. When the concept gains widespread currency in medieval European historiography (from the ninth century onward), the term gains an additional dimension: the original concept of *translatio*, with its explicit temporal dimension and intertextual connection to the divine "transfer of empire" described in the Book of Daniel, will eventually be called upon to justify the vernacular's incursion into realms of authority previously marked by the use of Latin, with enormous consequences for medieval textual practices (Nichols 1983:9). This is, as Copeland notes, because *translatio studii* as a conceptual act initially centres around Latin, "the language of the *antiqui*" and one whose "linguistic presence signifies a symbolic order of history . . . participat[ing] in the myth of temporal and spatial coherence" (Copeland 1991:104). Notions of temporality inherent in *translatio* thus underscore the importance of universal sacred history as a structuring concept in the Middle Ages – both knowledge and power transmit from one culture to another consecutively. As we noted in our Introduction, the term *translatio* signals both the spatial movement through which sociopolitical translocation is achieved, as well as the linguistic movement effecting this translocation: the *translatio imperii* of temporal power descending in time and space (and language) from Biblical lands to Greeks then to Romans and finally to Charlemagne; and the *translatio studii* of spatial and linguistic transplantation of the study of ancient wisdom from Greece to Rome and then Paris, the extreme western centre of Church learning. Since, as Curtius notes, it is largely the Latin of the Bible and the Church fathers that will become the language of medieval learning, and it is largely the Christian transcendence of pre-Christian Rome that will form the central backdrop for the medieval term *translatio* (Curtius 1953:30), we should situate medieval *translatio* on a vertical axis whose antipodes (divine law and human action)

communicate through the medium of Latin.

The term *translatio* undergoes a significant shift of meaning in the Renaissance, for the translations being effected are no longer purely "vertical" (mediated primarily through the Church's authority and grounded in Latin) or purely spatial. Rather, *translatio*, allied with a vernacularizing shift in cultural influence and textual authority, gains what we might call horizontal breadth. With the Reformation as backdrop, new lines of cultural and religious power are drawn between an ever growing number of vernacular languages, literatures, and polities (English, French, Italian, and Spanish prime among them) – and Latin no longer provides an immediate link between vernacular languages. Rather, vernacular languages and cultures can themselves possess authority. In the context of Renaissance poetics and translation theory, Glyn Norton has noted the role played by *convenance* with its "dual yet related meanings of appropriateness and the harmonizing, quasi-spatial concept of balance and integration between two or more parts" in the concept of *translatio* (Norton 1984:116). But let us return to the later Middle Ages for a moment: the displacement of Latin as the erstwhile unique linguistic medium of *translatio* begins in earnest in the thirteenth century, aided by the highly influential vernacular production of such foundational authors as Dante and Chaucer. And in the fourteenth century it will find explicit visual acknowledgment in frontispieces of translated texts.

One of the most famous, and most striking, such examples is the frontispiece to Nicole Oresme's translation of Aristotle's *Ethiques* (c. 1370-1372). The image depicts not simply the moment when the patron orders the translation made from an authoritative text and when the translator hands the finished translation to the patron (in this case Charles V), but also the journey taken by the translator and his aide carrying the text. As Bérier says, *translatio* thus illustrated proves itself to be deeply embedded in the concept of *auctoritas* (political, linguistic, literary, and cultural) and in the activity of three individual actors: the patron-ruler, the clerc, and the clerc's assistant (Bérier 1988:222). Behind all three of these figures stands the original *auctor* who guarantees the work. Yet the translator holds a role of no small privilege and *auctoritas* as well, for in translating a text for the prince, the translator is publicly transformed into a princely teacher and intellectual guide. Oresme chose just such a frontispiece for his patron: it encodes the translator-author as public authority allied with the monarchy, and justifies the authorial incursion into the translatively twinned realm of vernacular and Latinate literary production.

That neither medieval Latin nor the medieval vernaculars possessed one unified action or single term for what we refer to today as the activity of interlingual translation points to radical differences between medieval and modern conceptions of authorship and textual authority. As Minnis points out, one cannot understand medieval authorship without recognizing that there are multiple levels of *auctoritas* in medieval culture. *Auctoritas* was linked to the term *auctor*, which in itself united four main concepts: authority, unity, action, and authenticity (Minnis 1988:10). But *auctoritas* also referred to a specific passage from the work of an *auctor*. True *auctoritas* could only be attributed to a work if the text were named by a verified *auctor*. The *auctor* as foundational figure, known collectively as the *auctores*, was a universally accepted classical authority whose works governed a particular scholastic

discipline. Dialectic's *auctores* included Boethius and Aristotle, medicine's included Galen, rhetoric's included Cicero. The goal of a formal medieval education was thus to understand, explicate, and imitate the *auctores* through the painstaking study of every detail of their texts – including letters and individual units of sound, individual words, the larger units of meanings those words formed, verse structure, figures of speech, symbolism, and historical context (Curtius 1953:48-54). Formal classroom study of the *auctores*' texts thereby formed the bedrock of medieval education, and this practice, which stretched from the bilingual context of late antiquity through the increasingly vernacular culture of the fifteenth century, posited the intellectual activity of interlingual translation as central to medieval pedagogy. University curricula rely increasingly on the labor of translators and their texts, and by the thirteenth century Bologna and Paris are two major poles of European translative activity.

The thirteenth-century increase in translative activity brings about a major shift in conceptions of *auctor* and *auctoritas* with important implications for theories of translation. Such theologians as Saint Bonaventure, in seeking to pin down the nature of the author's *auctoritas*, begin to define his activity against that of the *scriptor*, the *compilator*, and the *commentator* (Minnis 1988:94). Of these four models of textual production, only the *auctor* can truly be said to create; his (or her) text therefore possesses a high *auctoritas* second only to that of the original *auctor* – God. In Saint Bonaventure's analysis, then, compilator or commentator represents a third level of *auctor*: he (or she) who assembles the ideas of the human, not the divine, *auctor*. The implications for translation are profound: in a system in which only divine authorship is conceptualized as absolute, the translator has much less need to translate word for word, to remain "servile to the literalities of a text" (Beer 1989:2). Damian-Grint notes in this context the changing sense of the Old French verb *translater* in the twelfth century: it became used not simply to mean "compile" or "correctly interpret", but also to signal a shift from one language into another. Through the new valance of the term *translater*, we can see the *clerici* emerging as a new and powerful cultural agent of translation and vernacularization (Damian-Grint 1999:28) – and, we might add, of a Latin/vernacular bilingualism which such translative terms as the Italian *volgarizzamenti* ("texts translated into the vernacular") or the Spanish *rromançar* and *vulgarizar* ("to render in the vernacular") explicitly encoded (Bérier 1988:232; Pym 2000:112).

Who were the *clerici*? From the twelfth century "Renaissance" on in Northern Europe, and from the thirteenth century on in Spain (where the influence of scientific and philosophical Islamic textual culture had greater influence), the study of Latin through *grammatica* and *rhetorica* gains ground through a new type of intellectual. These young boys would leave their families to attend universities in major cities like Bologna, Paris, Oxford, and Valencia, urban areas that were often important centres of translative activity. At university, they were trained to write and speak exclusively in Latin. The *clerici* therefore formed a distinct bilingually literate social class with the much-needed ability to communicate across geographic distance. The need to communicate across extended geographic space was the precondition of their existence, and it gave medieval Latin two clear goals in this regard: to help unite the *clerici* inside the West's cultural borders, and to bring Western religious values to those outside

them. As early as 1248 Pope Innocent IV informed the chancellor of the University of Paris of his interest in convening in Paris a group of young scholars who knew Arabic and other "oriental" languages; these youths were to be given scholarships and were expected to become missionaries after their studies (Di Stefano 1970:31). Whether this papal edict had more weight behind it than the letter from Philippe-Auguste asking for the establishment of the Collège de Constantinople at the University of Paris, is rather doubtful; as Di Stefano points out, Philippe-Auguste's Collège had only one student as of 1362 (1970:31); the 1312 request by the Council of Vienna to establish specific university chairs for "oriental" languages throughout the West, with key seats in Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca, suggests that Innocent IV's wish had not materialized (1970:34). Nevertheless, the perceived utility of the *clerici*, and their use of Latin as language of universal learning, was clear. From every aspect, the existence of this new professional class was predicated on conditions of linguistic and geographic dispersion that rigorous training in a universal language such as Latin was intended to overcome. The *clerici* were a major tool through which socio-cultural change was, by the fourteenth century, being channeled through particular venues, such as the political court and the university (McGuire 2004).

Just as the initial development of the clerkly class in the late twelfth century manifested important changes in the context of the late medieval university (McGuire 2004; Bérier 1988:232), it also entailed changes in the linguistic status of learned readers. From the late thirteenth through the fourteenth centuries, the number of translations in circulation increases dramatically across Europe, fueled by the professional activity of the *clerici*. Yet if translation as critical practice is on the rise as early as the twelfth century, why is it that the clearest cases of bilingual translation date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and not earlier, when the rise of the clerkly class first begins? This might at first seem paradoxical. But scholars note that as vernacular languages become more established and more texts become widely available in the vernacular, thanks in large part to the activities of the *clerici*, the vernaculars themselves are greatly enriched. It is thus only over the centuries that they become better able to translate, render, and respond to the literary conditions of Latin texts. And ironically, as the vernaculars become better tools for translation, they pave the way both for increasing reliance on monolingualism inside certain textual communities, and for the "false bilingualism" of the scholastics (deemed false because the Latin idiom spoken was simply calqued on the Romance vernaculars). Such calqued linguistic conditions were deplored by the early humanists, and even by such later humanists as Louis Meigret. In 1542 he favored jettisoning the old "latinizing" French orthography, which lent itself to "superstition", in favor of a new orthographic system (of which Ronsard was a key proponent) which, in insisting on the "Frenchness" of French and the "Latinity" of neo-Latin, would provide the "lumière" more conducive to rational thought (quoted in Baddeley 1993:9).

Although certain textual communities increasingly relied on monolingualism by the end of the fourteenth century, a recent study of bilingualism in English-language scientific and medical texts, produced between 1375 and 1475, offers concrete proof of at least "a century of bilingual readership" in the English university context (Voigts 1996:814). Such studies thus confirm the importance of Latin-English code-switching

as a linguistic strategy by which many bilingual authors could assert their bilingualism and inscribe their participation in scientific circles (Voigts 1996:818). The relatively large number of these manuscripts points to the rather sudden appearance of such liminally bilingual texts, and yet we still are far from knowing much about bilingualism and bilingual writing in the late medieval context. Even in the medieval grammar school and university, environments in which Latin was the sole language to be spoken, there are unanswered questions. The use of vernaculars as curricular languages in medieval universities was not a given, yet we cannot assume that simply because rulebooks are silent on this matter, instruction in the vernacular did not occur. Ouy eloquently explores this problem through the figure of Jean Gerson (1363-1429), chancellor of the University of Paris and one of the most prominent theologians of his day. Fiercely committed to political and educational reform, Gerson, like others of his time, saw a desperate need for a new group of priests trained in bilingual literacy; their (Latin-French) bilingualism, Gerson considered, would enable them to minister to unlettered parishioners. Although explicit rules of conduct forbade young students (*grammatici*) training in university to speak French to one another, Ouy points out that records from the college library at the Parisian abbey of Saint Victor indicate that there were many books in French shelved next to the books intended for preachers (Ouy 1998:xiii), presumably to allow young preachers in training to develop sermons in the vernacular. Notably, later generations of humanists also struggled with the challenges posed by this ambient bilingualism: as Louis Meigret wrote in 1542, "Nous escriuons vng langage qui n'est point en vsage, et vsons d'une langue qui n'a point d'vsage d'escriture en France"/ We write in one language that is no longer in use, and use [speak in] another language that is not written in France (quoted in Baddeley 1993:23).

We should add that Gerson himself, recipient of a solid "early humanist" education, preached in both French and Latin, the better to guide France's elite on such pressing topics as political and moral reform. Indeed, Gerson was often invited to preach to the royal court, and also became an active participant in France's first public debate on literary morality, the famous Quarrel of the Rose (1401-03), in which he and Christine de Pizan exchanged epistolary polemics with early humanists Jean de Montreuil and Pierre and Gontier Col (Gerson, Montreuil, and the Cols write in Latin, Christine de Pizan in French). The debate will stretch on for several years with no clear end until Christine de Pizan interpellates the authority of the royal court. She renders the debate as literary object through a presentation manuscript (the Harley 4431) dedicated to Queen Isabeau. Inside the presentation manuscript, two letters written by Christine to the queen and the provost of Paris, Guillaume de Tygnonville, further frame the debate as text. Christine's message is pointed: political *auctoritas* guarantees its textual counterpart.

Christine's strategies in this particular literary debate reflect a significant change occurring not just in France, but in other areas of Europe as well: the transition of the vernacular into a medium of *translatio studii* through explicit and deliberate "material identification with royal power" (Copeland 1991:135). Such identification is often

achieved through invoking translation patronage, and although the fourteenth century is most commonly associated with this practice (as in the case of Charles V of France), there are equally clear and dramatic cases of overt political patronage of translation into the vernacular dating back to earlier centuries. One of the most important is surely that of Alfonso X of Castile (1221-1284) and his significant sponsorship of translations from primarily Greek and Arabic into Castilian, but sometimes also into Latin and French. The translations effected from Greek and Arabic into Castilian were of special consequence for European intellectual currents since they made available for the first time to European scholars a considerable body of scientific and philosophical knowledge; indeed, these translations fueled the intellectual dominance of the universities in Europe (and in the context of the Reformation's insistence on Biblical philology, would ultimately hasten the decline of Latin's universality and claim to authority). As Pym notes, Alfonso's patronage, insisting as it did on the Castilian vernacular as primary translative medium, differed significantly from the aegis of the Church (Pym 2000:61). In underscoring the role that "nation-building" must well have played in the development of Alfonso's translative patronage, Pym affirms the close ties between the advancement of the vernaculars and the inexorable unification of secular political powers in Europe. Thus to focus selectively on target-audience access to texts is to reduce considerably the compass of medieval translative practices.

Any overview of translation and bilingualism in the Middle Ages must highlight the incursion of the vernacular languages into realms previously dominated by Latin. But although the vernacular literatures expanded rapidly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, this enlarged vernacular terrain does not mean that the use of Latin declined precipitously, or even substantially, in the Middle Ages. As many scholars have noted, clerks almost certainly wrote more frequently in Latin than in French, and almost certainly felt more comfortable doing so (Baddeley 1993:23; Ouy 1998: x). It was not until 1539, after all, that French was mandated to replace Latin as the language of court law under Francis I. The Middle Ages were clearly witness to a long-standing and deep coexistence of the two literary cultures, vulgar and Latin. We might therefore suppose that bilingual translation was far more common than has been generally accepted or acknowledged. That there are so few verifiable cases of bilingual texts in the Middle Ages is certainly due in part to our own difficulties in defining translation per se (as opposed to code-switching, or glossing) on the one hand, and attributing a bilingual translation to any one individual on the other hand. Thus the clear, unambiguous and substantial examples of the medieval bilingual text date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, such as Jean Gerson's *Opus tripertitum*/*Triparti* (1404-05), or the French-English poetry of Charles d'Orléans (1415-1440). To compound matters, the medieval emphasis placed on translation as source-oriented and *auctor*-based means that, in such an environment, it is only when vernacular production gains sufficient *auctoritas* from its contact with Latin that bilingual translation as cultural model will become widely viable. In the Renaissance, by contrast, with greater emphasis on audience reception and with vernacular languages in later stages of development, bilingual translation (meaning specifically the creation of a text and its subsequent translation into a different language by the same hand) can be verified with far greater frequency.

C. Romancing Latin: Renaissance Vernaculars

In the Renaissance, the overt rhetorical rejection of the more recent medieval past in favor of a distant and idealized one, is of course a bedrock element of the Renaissance's emerging self-identity, and was the founding concept of Burckhardt's Renaissance individualism. Yet although the Renaissance positions itself explicitly against the medieval period, there are, as many scholars have observed, striking continuities between the two (on periodization, see Besserman's anthology of essays). Chief among these points of continuity is the bilingual linguistic matrix of the humanists, who continued the medieval practice of using Latin as a primary language in various intellectual and professional circles, notably in universities and grammar schools, in law, in medicine, and in theology. But Renaissance bilingualism did not resemble medieval. Early humanists had been openly frustrated by the old "forced bilingualism . . . in which the primacy of the first language was merely camouflaged" (Moss 2003:2). Young students of *grammatica*, they complained, learned to communicate not through an integral and coherent Latin but through a Latin that, in its disregard of classical parameters, had grown away from classical standards to become a separate and often unwieldy idiom. By the late fourteenth century, scholastic Latin, with its peculiarities of vocabulary and syntax, had become "a tool fit for a purpose rather than a verbal environment in which to live" (Moss 2003:3). Early Florentine humanists therefore set about positing Ciceronian Latin as the language that schoolboys should not simply emulate but breathe in; that Cicero should serve as a model for scholars became, of course, a major point of contention in later humanist culture, with Erasmus among the most vocal critics. In Florence, students were expected to compile their own monolingual phrase books in which each locution, culled from classical sources rather than patristic texts, was related to others through intricate webs of meaning. The six-volume *Elegantiae linguae latinae* of Lorenzo Valla (published in both Paris and Rome in 1471) was the crowning example of such a book. Thus the pedagogical goal for humanists was nothing short of "true" bilingualism, with Valla, Budet, and Dolet as its exemplars. Yet this new model of bilingualism, on which the hegemony of humanist culture would rest and which would gain currency through a process described succinctly by Moss as the Renaissance "Latin language turn", did not win dominance immediately. In the early sixteenth century, there were still frequent points of contact between the "old" (scholastic) Latin idiom and the "new" (Ciceronian) idiom of the humanists – indeed, we may even speak of commonplace trilingualism if we tally scholastic Latin and classical Latin along with an author's vernacular. By the middle of the sixteenth century, however, humanist Latin had clearly overtaken "medieval" Latin as the universal standard in school curricula, although the utility of the latter was still widely recognized. Only at the end of the century was scholastic Latin deemed so marginal and "barbarous" as to be nearly indecipherable.

Several other important distinctions must be drawn between medieval and Renaissance models of bilingualism. Concerning the primacy of Latin in both periods, it had almost exclusive currency as universal learned language from 1100 to the beginning of the fifteenth century; more importantly, it was by far the most frequent sourcebook language. But beginning in the last decade of the fourteenth century, Latin was joined

by Greek (and to a much lesser extent Hebrew) as components of the humanist curriculum in Italy. The advent of Greek into Italian humanist circles was heralded by Manuel Chrysoloras, who had been invited to teach classical Greek in Florence. As a result many Italian elites began journeying to Constantinople to learn Greek. By the sixteenth century, thanks to such scholarly exchanges, the universal impact of Greek source-text expansion could be felt in Western culture. In 1529, for example, Geoffroy Tory writes that Latin is "beaucoup moindre en toute sorte de perfection" than either Greek or Hebrew, the latter being "plus fertile, abundante et florissante" (quoted in Baddeley 1993:57) – and from a humanist perspective, more useful for the revision of sacred texts. Latin, useful as a learned lingua franca in the realm of Biblical translation, nevertheless lacked the originary authority of Greek and Hebrew.

The study of Greek brought with it new forms of translation and translative ideals, rendering the *verba* of more importance than the *res*. It changed the model of the ideal scholar, insofar as in humanist circles, reading knowledge of Greek became a highly prized element of educational reform, for it gave theologians the ability to use Greek source texts to full advantage. There arose in intellectual milieus a flourishing market for translation "cribs", translations of Greek texts which, rendered as literally as possible, would enable a scholar to compare his own Latin translation of a Greek text with another person's. Indeed, the very ideal of theological scholarship shifted to accommodate the new influx of Greek source texts. The ideal theologian was now one who could consult the Greek originals, who could and would grapple with the form and syntax of Greek itself. In Erasmus's own words, the ideal scholar was bilingual, able to negotiate linguistic *tournures* in both languages (Latin and Greek). Notably, though, despite Greek's great utility to theologians, this linguistic skill remained a largely superficial one; Erasmus himself lamented that his translative task was all too important since it was the only way through which many scholars would have meaningful access to the Greek (Botley 2004:175).

Greek was not the only new addition to intellectual linguistic repertoires. Economic expansion and far-flung trade routes steadily expanded linguistic horizons, and travel to the "New World" brought Europeans into contact with such "new" languages as Quechua, as well as such "old" languages as Hebrew (Hebrew being of particular interest to many humanists not least because of the notion that it was a potential "originary" language that might have spawned all others). As the borders of the known world widened, interest in studying the sheer diversity of known languages grew. In this domain, too, Italy was in the European linguistic vanguard: several universities in Italy were the first to establish centres for the study of "oriental" languages (including Hebrew and Arabic) under the aegis of the Church. Although many scholars rightly emphasize the motive of disseminating Christianity over mere linguistic curiosity as a primary reason for elites to travel to other countries (Percival 1986:60), it is nevertheless true that exposure to these "new" languages made possible rapid developments in comparative philology and resulted in the rediscovery of major texts. This is another point of continuity with medieval culture: even as Protestantism openly challenges the Church's interpretive authority, the Church, through its organization of centres for the study of such languages as Hebrew and Arabic, still retains a primary role in articulating and directing language pedagogy, theory, and practice. The case

of Hispania is particularly interesting in this regard, for it demonstrates the extreme complexities of the translative inter- and intra-cultural negotiation process. As Pym notes in his detailed study of translation in the Hispanic context, the missionary translators and linguists, seeking to restructure particular semantic fields in native languages, defended the legitimacy of translating between Amerindian languages (such as Quechua and Nahuatl) and Latin or Castilian (Pym 2000:162). In doing so, they valorized the notion of linguistic pluralism.

Such pluralism is a hallmark of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century intellectual thought. It extends also into literary production, as Terence Cave's analysis of cornucopic abundance shows. Although it still had a place of great importance in the intellectual life of Western Europe, with the rapid influx of new languages into the universities of Europe in the beginning of the sixteenth century, Latin no longer held monolithic sway inside the international scholarly community. It was no longer seen as coterminous with an entire intellectual discipline (*grammatica*), but instead functioned primarily as a practical and eloquent tool in which an international intellectual community could ground its discourse (Moss 2003:143). Thus this period sees the development of several acute translative paradoxes centring around Latinity. The first involves the role of Latin as universal language. On one hand, the Renaissance, if we can speak so broadly of such a complex period, codes Latin as a key language enabling universal translation and comprehension in the face of the burgeoning growth of vernacular languages. On the other hand, literary movements arising in countries with a long history of unified political rule (such as France) place growing emphasis upon one's "maternal language" as the language in which literary material should be produced so as to render the vernacular worthy of conveying refined literary thought. In England, the importance of the vernacular was such that by the beginning of the sixteenth century, standard approaches to teaching Latin grammar included using vernacular-based examples to help students grasp parts of speech. Lily's *Short Introduction of Grammar* (1540) was one of the first texts to popularize this approach, and in becoming England's "standard grammar" (for much of the early modern period), it "created a grammatical metalanguage for English long before other European languages possessed one" (Law 2003:198). As Baddeley notes, this may well be because English, a Germanic language, did not have such difficulty dissociating itself from written Latin (1993:366). Glyn Norton emphasizes this paradoxical moment as one in which "antiquity, dead, interred, poignantly removed in time, remains in conversational touch with a present drawn into an ongoing dialogue with textual artefacts" (1984:2). Anthony Pym sees a similar paradox at the heart of the "untenable" contradiction between the idea that indigenous populations in the New World needed Castilian and Latin theological terms to achieve linguistic clarity, and the concomitant idea that Amerindian languages were inherently valuable and merited translative effort (Pym 2000:162). Less far afield, this dialogic tension is clearly embodied not just in the English classroom, but in the theories and writings of the Florentine humanists, the remarkable body of poetry produced by the Pléiadists in France, and even in the violent and protracted wars of religion that dominate the second half of the sixteenth century in France. In many Protestant communities, there was considerable demand for pedagogical reform that would champion the teaching of native vernaculars.

Second, such dialogic tension is also embodied in the larger Renaissance philological revolution, as focused both on "a discourse of purgation and return to an idealized prior state of things" (Waswo 1999:27). This was a conflictual drive toward both linguistic change and linguistic stability: the humanists' impetus towards linguistic purification is apparent in their avowed goal to rid Latin of its medieval linguistic barbarisms and excesses by having young scholars learn a stable and "pure" Latin calqued on that of ancient poets, and the Hispanic missionary linguists' also analyzed Amerindian languages through the lens of linguistic *pureza* – a standard, not coincidentally, also applied to Castilian Spanish (Pym 2000:150-51). Such focus on linguistic "purity" belied worries about changing linguistic systems and practices. The close attention paid by humanists to language as a primary vehicle of cultural and political values reflected critical appraisal of historical and contemporary social systems. It also reflected the historical contingency of linguistic expression itself.

Of course, it was not simply language but written language that was perceived as the clearest point of articulation for cultural values. If language as social practice is what subtends culture, then language itself must change not simply in response to changing social situations, but also in response to specific historical circumstances. Lorenzo Valla doggedly pursued this chain of ideas in his *Elegantiae* (1440), a detailed analysis of historical Latin usage in which he demonstrates that there is no separation between the word and what it means, since the word means simply what it is pressed into service to mean in a given social context. That is, Valla shows the relativity of meaning in Latin, its dynamism as a linguistic system. The impact of this precept is tremendous: classical Latin, although perceived as monolithic, is in fact highly variable. And if Latin follows this model, then surely the vernacular languages must as well.

From this context stems a broader model of translation as an activity which not only presents an author's words, but also imports, de facto, larger cultural (and material) frameworks as well. The European offshoots of Florentine humanist culture itself illustrate this model, which maintained a certain cultural authority and provided an overarching sense of cultural and intellectual unification throughout western Europe, but nevertheless found different articulations in different geographic regions. Humanism came late to the Iberian peninsula, for example with the first translation of Plato into Castilian appearing in 1455.

Such issues subtend the close ties between humanism and Renaissance poetic practice. As Glyn Norton shows, the earlier humanist texts of such authors as Salutati and Bruni offered "a kind of rehearsal of the issues and patterns of dialogue between theorist and textual past" that later poets and poetic theorists would use. Poetry held a highly privileged position in the world of Renaissance bilingual translation because, as Forster notes, Renaissance poetic practice entailed extreme "multilingual flexibility", as enhanced by the universality of Latin. By the end of the fifteenth century, the Western poetic tradition was largely unified and internationalized through a tightly delineated set of Latinate tropes and topoi, as outlined by Curtius in his formative study of the vernacular West's Latin heritage. But the unifying power of the Latin

tradition perhaps obscures the sense in which, as Forster puts it, "the whole vast Latin literature of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance is polyglot poetry, and ought to be considered from that point of view" (Forster 1970:19). By the fourteenth century the polyglot roots of medieval Latinity are becoming visible. Latin tropes, transferred to the vernacular context and radically reshaped, occur in new contexts. Concomitantly, secular texts become more and more frequently the object of translation, and thus extreme literalism in translation need no longer be the explicit and sole goal.

By the mid-sixteenth century, Étienne Dolet, French humanist and author of the remarkable text *La Maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre* (1540), strongly opposes word-for-word translation. The translator must perfectly understand both *sens* and *matiere* of the author so as to guard against "obscure" or slavishly literal translation that would detract from the author's ideas and the quality of the language itself. Understanding both the *sens* and the *matiere* requires of a translator one distinct quality: she or he must "entendre parfaictement le sens de l'autheur qu'il tourne d'une langue en aultre" (1950:81). By having equal command over the two languages involved in the translative act, Dolet's model translator is of necessity coequally bilingual. There are several crucial points in Dolet's prescription: First, it is not simply to the *sens* of the author, but also to the language as a collective body of knowledge and expression, that the translator must be faithful. Second, the "author" – implying his larger corpus of textual production, general style, linguistic preferences, and cultural context – becomes the nexus of translative meaning. And third, translation inherently privileges the vernacular "langue maternelle". Dolet is emphatic: just as the classical authors were exemplars of eloquence in their maternal language, so must vernacular poets be. It is because of this text that Dolet, "homme de bon jugement en nostre vulgaire" (Du Bellay 2003:60), is chosen by Du Bellay as the capstone figure at the end of the first book of his *Deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse*. The *Deffense* was widely received as the manifesto of "Pléiade" literary theory. In bringing Dolet's name and work directly to bear on his own authorial text, in explicit defense of his own writing project against "ceux qui penseront que je soye trop grand admirateur de ma Langue" (Du Bellay 2003:59), Du Bellay was showing no small amount of courage, since the *Deffense* appeared just three years after Dolet was burned at the stake, for seeming to condone atheism in a translation.

Dolet produces his treatise during the peak of translation activity in Renaissance France (1530-1570), a time when a second generation of humanist scholars brought Greek and Latin texts into vernacular translation to make them available to a far broader literary public. Marot, Montaigne, Du Bellay, and Calvin are just some of the major Renaissance literary figures who translated in this context. Concerning such writers, one reason for critics' neglect of the bilingual text in these years may be that not all self-translated texts are visible as such. Translation was such a common activity, and knowledge of Latin so widespread, that many cases of bilingual translation have simply been overlooked or miscatalogued by later scholars. Also, in the complex web of textual operations associated with the term *imitatio*, it can encompass the Renaissance practice of poetic imitation or *aemulatio* in which the

status *and* style of the writer as re-writer is always emphasized; the author's text was assumed to be predicated upon pre-established models (see Lecointe on style and its relation to Renaissance poetic subjectivity). Sidney describes the poetic imitative practice of his time as "an art of imitation", after the Aristotelian precept of mimesis. In much Renaissance poetic theory, then, translation explicitly involved imitation and it was "necessarily invested with the tensions of all other imitative writing" (Worth-Stylianou 1988:134). Imitation was a dominant metaphor for the act of translation itself, and the term "imitation" referred less to a stable and singular interpretive act than to an activity through which the author could establish a unique identity (Bizer 1995:33). Many Renaissance authors wax eloquent on this point. The humanist Angelo Poliziano says, "non enim sum Cicero; me tamen, ut opinor, exprimo" / for I am not Cicero; however, through the same text I express myself (quoted in Bizer 1995:34). Joachim Du Bellay says, "si par la lecture des bons livres je me suis imprimé quelques traictz en la fantaisie qui après . . . me coulent beaucoup plus facilement en la plume qu'ilz ne me reviennent en la memorie, doibt-on pour ceste raison les appeler pieces rapportées?" / If, upon reading some good books, I imprinted several passages in my imagination that afterwards come much more easily to me as I write than they do to my memory, must one for this reason call them borrowed passages? (quoted in Bizer 1995:57). For Renaissance poets working under the model of *imitatio*, like the medieval poets working under the model of *translatio*, individual literary creation is, by definition, calqued on that of past authors and cultures. Thus the figure of the medieval and Renaissance bilingual writer, as self-translator, offers a unique field for examining the period relations between self and authority, language and culture. The following case studies reveal the extent to which self-translators in these periods elided translative theories of *imitatio* and *translatio* by focusing the act of translation in the single individual.

The ever increasing translative activity in the Renaissance highlighted the widening gap between various vernacular cultures, on the one hand, and a classical Latin past on the other, between rapidly changing linguistic form and the great languages of antiquity, between the need to valorize one's own literary vernacular and the need to calque it on the "superior" cultures of the past. The fact that the Renaissance literary practice of imitation necessarily entails a self-reflexive awareness of the poetic act is nowhere so clear as in self-translation. Out of this active awareness will come not only the philosophy of Pascal and Descartes, the doubting subject as the nexus of knowledge formation, but also the Enlightenment's concern with universally valid systems of cataloguing human self and activity, with ongoing implications for the bilingual text in translation theory.

The following section moves into close readings of medieval and Renaissance self-translations. Each case of self-translation is of course unique, and bound to certain period constraints. Yet in sequential treatment they show how each writer within such delimitations finds his or her own modes of functional correspondence, that is, of redirecting the text for reception by the second reading (or performance) culture.

To forego such specifics, however, and continue following this overview of changing concepts of language and translation into the early modern period, the reader can go directly to the opening section of Part 2.

D. Self-Translations

(1) Coin of the Realm: Nicole Oresme

Despite Nicole Oresme's key role in Charles V's extensive vernacular translation program, we know relatively little about him as an historical figure. Born around 1320, most likely near Caen, his name first appears on the roll of student fellowship-holders at the Collège de Navarre around 1348. Because the college was formally subsidized by the crown, and was intended to serve those students who would otherwise not be able to pay for their studies, historians have inferred that Oresme came from a family of extremely modest means, although no records confirm this. Even the spelling of his family name is uncertain; there exist a handful of variants of which Nicole Oresme is merely the most widely received. Yet these and a few other facts have allowed historians to sketch a probable portrait of his early professional life (see Gillard 1990).

Oresme's career began in earnest with his appointment as Grand Master of the college of Navarre at the University of Paris in 1356. From this, we can infer that he had most likely earned the title of doctor of theology by that time. He quickly gained theological prominence: in 1362 he accepted the Deanship of Rouen, and in 1363 was sent on an official mission to the pontifical court in Avignon. By this time, he was clearly playing a major role in Charles V's administration, although again, uncertainty persists: was he "merely" Charles's official secretary? or also an official (or unofficial) advisor, preceptor, or chaplain? Historians cannot be sure, but we do know that Oresme had significant access to the royal family in 1359 and 1360 when, besides signing a royal act, he was sent by the king to receive a loan from the city of Rouen (Sherman 1995:15). These years also see Oresme gain prominence in the field of translation, and it is extremely likely that he accomplished his translations of Aristotle's works while living on an official pension provided by Charles V. Although this activity most likely required him to maintain an active presence in Paris, once he became bishop of Lisieux in 1377 he began spending more time in that city, where he died in 1382 (see Neveux1990 on Oresme's life).

The uncertainty shrouding the details of Oresme's biography extends to his translation activity as well. As Lucien Gillard notes, certain translations which were previously attributed to him are no longer certain to be his, and vice-versa (1990:195). One of Oresme's most debated works in this context is his *De moneta* (c. 1356), the first medieval treatise dedicated entirely to economics. That Oresme wrote the two Latin versions is not in question; what is less certain, however (although accepted by many scholars), is Oresme's authorship of the French translation of the *De moneta*. Of the several French manuscripts we have (whose dates of composition vary), three different titles circulate: *Du changement des monnaies et de la variation faite par les rois*/ On the exchange of coinage and variations thereof done by kings; *De l'origine, nature, droit, et mutations des monnaies*/ On the origin, nature, and law of coinage, and on changes thereto; and the *Traictié de la première invention des monnaies et des causes de variation d'icelles*/ On the initial invention of coinage and the reasons for variations therein (Gillard 1990:196). Scholars today favor the third variant, known more simply as the *Traictié des monnoies*, whose dates of composition might have

been anywhere from 1358 and 1366 (Lefèvre 1990:191, n. 1).

Evidence of Oresme's authorship of the *Traictié* is adduced from three primary factors. The first is a line of commentary inserted inside Oresme's translations of Aristotle's *Ethiques* and *Politiques*. The relevant line in the *Politiques* reads, "Car monnoie est une mesure en commutation dez choses que l'en vent et achate, et le cours de la monnoie est aussi comme une regle et une lay . . . Et tout ce appert plus a plein ou Traictey que je fis de mutations de monnoie"/ Because coinage is a way of equilibrating things that are bought and sold, and the circulation of coinage resembles a rule and a law . . . And all this is mentioned in the Treatise that I have done on changes in coinage (1956:64). A parallel line in the *Ethiques* has Oresme claiming authorship of a French "traictie" on coinage. As John Parker notes, since Oresme's manuscripts usually refer to works by their original titles rendered in the language of textual composition, such remarks therefore seem to provide substantial proof of his French-version authorship (cited in Sherman 1995:338 n. 9).

The second piece of evidence adduced for Oresme's self-translation of the *Traictié des monnoies* is, similarly, one sole line, this time added to the "Conclusion du Translateur" in the French version. The first few clauses in the relevant Latin passage read: "Haec igitur, ut praemisi, sine assertione dicta sint cum correctione prudentum. Nam, secundum Aristotelem, civilia negotia plerumque dubia et incerta" (Oresme 1864: CXXXIX) / All this, as I said before, is tentative and subject to correction by experts. For, as Aristotle says, "Civil matters are usually doubtful and uncertain" (Oresme 1956:47-48). An addition to the French version highlights the crucial act of noble patronage, and thus also the strong connections being forged between royal power and vernacular translations: "Les choses cy dessus premises soient dictes sans assertion ou affirmation et à la correction des saiges et prudens hommes, *et mesmement de vous, mon très chier et honnoré seigneur, qui en la plupart d'icelles vous congnoissez et estes expert*" (Oresme 1864: LXXXVI; our emphasis) / The aforementioned premises are said with neither assertion nor affirmation, and await the correction of wise and prudent men, *and especially of you, my dear and honored lord, [you] who know and are an expert in the majority of these issues*. This addendum has long been taken to refer to Charles V, and offers yet another piece of compelling internal textual evidence that Oresme did in fact author the *Traictié*.

The third piece of evidence cited for Oresme's self-translation of the *De moneta* lies outside the text, and adduces the Latin-vernacular self-translative precedent set by the "reworking" into French of his earlier Latin treatise, the *Tractatus contra astrologos iudicarios* (c. 1357). The French version, titled *Le Livre de divinacions*, presents itself as if it were a "simple" vernacular version of the *Tractatus*, yet it substantially reframes the Latin text while adding considerable new material which has no equivalent in the Latin (Lejbowicz 1990:145). Oresme's bilingual text thus sharply foregrounds the issue of translative commensurability – a common function of medieval bilingual texts, since in the Middle Ages Latin and the vernacular languages are not at similar stages of development, and since the goal of the *auctor* is to build on past forms of knowledge. Serge Lusignan, in this context, has identified Oresme's vernacular translation as part of a much longer "difficile passage vers le français"/ difficult journey towards French (Lusignan 1987:94) – the journey being

the long process through which Latin literary dominance comes to be challenged by vernacular forms of literary authority. Thus, although the Oresme's vernacular *Livre de divinacions* cannot be said to be a simple "translation" of the *Tractatus*, but instead an "adaptation française assez libre" (Lejbowicz 1990:130), the difficulty experienced by the author in effecting the translation is indicative of the strongly diglossic literary conditions of the Middle Ages.

The prologue to the *Livre de divinacions* begins by explaining that in writing "ce livret, par experience, par auctoritez, par raison humaine" (Oresme 1864:50) / this little book, from experience, from human reason, and from authority (1864:51), he wishes to warn those in power that such dubious arts as astrology and necromancy are "plus perilleuse a personnes d'estat comme sont princes et seigneurs auxquels appartient le gouvernement publique" (1864:50) / most dangerous to those of high estate, such as princes and lords to whom appertains the government of the commonwealth (Coopland 1952:51). Thus he suggests that it is his audience, rather than his subject matter, that has determined Oresme's new choice of language: "Et pour ce ay ja compose ce livret en francois affin que gens lays le puissent entendre . . . Et autrefois ay je escript en latin de ceste matiere" (1864:50) / Hence I have written this little book in French so that laymen may understand it . . . At a former time I wrote in Latin on this matter" (Coopland 1952:51). Clearly to Oresme, not only is thorough treatment of this important topic warranted, but it can only be accomplished through dual presentation in Latin and the vernacular. By the fourteenth century, as Sherman and others have noted, the bilingual text plays an ever more crucial role in a widening range of increasingly secularized intellectual domains previously dominated by Latin.

At the end of this prefatory passage, Oresme acknowledges that his choice of vernacular translation is not without controversy; he asks his audience to excuse his "rude maniere de parler"/ rough manner of expression, and he thus seems to openly admit what scholars such as Ouy have long suspected: not only was the vernacular not the primary language used by members of the clergy as late as the fourteenth century, but the clergy never received any formal instruction in French – as Oresme himself says, "je n'ay pas aprins de (estre) acoustume de riens baillier ou escripre en francois" (1864:50) / I have never learned or been used to set forth or write anything in French (Coopland 1952:51). Yet although *clerici* might not often have written in French, this does not mean that they did not, or could not. Sylvie Lefèvre's analysis of Oresme's prologue to the *Livre de divinacions* underscores this point: the prologue, and in particular the rather extensive explanation for the language of composition, proves the extent to which bilingual (and even trilingual) conditions pervaded intellectual milieus in the late Middle Ages. In this context, she argues, the phrase "rude maniere de parler" refers neither to any imperfection (real or perceived) in Oresme's vernacular translation, nor to any inability to write in French on Oresme's part, but rather to a frequently-referenced literary humility topos (Lefèvre 1990:178). In evoking it, Oresme inscribes his text in the forms and customs of vernacular textual culture.

Lefèvre might have also noted that Nicole Oresme's vernacular self-translation depends fundamentally on previous foundational instances of bilingual (Latin-vernacular) cultural transposition: in translating the *De Caelo et mundo*, as well as the *Ethiques* and the *Politiques*, Oresme relied on Latin versions of Aristotle prepared by

Robert Grosseteste (c. 1168-1253) toward the end of his life. We know that the *Ethics* in particular had a rich translation history, having been translated into Arabic around 1243 in Spain, then into Italian and French (Quillet 1988:82); what makes this history more interesting is that Grosseteste himself was a bilingual self-translator. A Greek scholar, he also knew French quite well (possibly from having taught theology in Paris), and some Hebrew. Grosseteste was best known for being the instigator of the scientific tradition in the English context, as chancellor of Oxford University; besides producing scientific treatises, including *De sphera*/On the sphere and *De iride*/On the rainbow, he also produced the *Chasteau d'Amour*, a French romance religious in nature. An early Scholastic, Grosseteste was one of the first to fully embrace the Aristotelean idea of scientific dialectic beginning with the particular at one pole, and moving toward the universal at the other. For Grosseteste, as for Aristotle, the universal is separate from the particular, yet is still related to it. Thus Oresme's vivid interest in Aristotlean thought (represented in scientific treatises and mathematical theories) provides a sharp line of continuity with Grosseteste and earlier Scholastics, a line of continuity made possible by the bilingual conditions that spanned the centuries between 1100 and 1400.

Recent medieval scholarship has begun to focus more closely on the bilingual conditions in which *clerici* such as Oresme lived and worked (Lusignan 1987; Ouy 1998). Yet the many substantive difficulties (biographical and literary) in identifying the self-translated text still hamper any clear identification of medieval and early modern bilingual writers, and are doubtless a major reason for the dearth of identified cases. With Nicole Oresme, the uncertainties of his self-translation are perhaps magnified by the copiousness and prominence of his other, more straightforward translative activity centring on the works of Aristotle (the *Ethiques* around 1370, the *Politiques* around 1374, and *De Caelo et mundo* around 1377). These translations, as scholars have pointed out, clearly participate in a larger cultural movement of translation of *auctoritas*, in which classical culture is appropriated by royal patrons and other audiences in the secular realm, and in which vernacular languages become capable of representing and transmitting abstract ideas (Sherman 1995:3). Latin-vernacular translation gains prominence in the thirteenth century, and begins to reach full fruition in the fourteenth. This movement provides a sharp break with previous medieval models of presentation and collation of knowledge, for with the rendering of texts in the vernacular, knowledge that in previous generations was the (nearly) exclusive Latinate province of *clerici* and university schools becomes the province of secular audiences. In this context we must remember Oresme's key role as advisor (official or unofficial) to Charles V: scholars such as Sherman and Lefevre have recently pointed to the burgeoning state administrative apparatus as an important element in the increasing late-medieval demand for vernacular translations of authoritative texts, such as Aristotle's (Lusignan 1987:94).

Nicole Oresme's two instances of Latin-vernacular self-translation, the *De moneta*/*Traictié des monnoies* and the *Tractatus contra judicarios* / *Livre de divinacions* have much to tell us about which philosophical debates in the fourteenth century were the most pertinent in secular intellectual milieus, such as the royal court. Given the tremendous political, economic, and social upheaval of the Hundred Years' War, and

the need for strong military and economic leadership, it is not surprising that these two treatises, aimed at educating the Dauphin Charles, were chosen by Oresme for translation into the vernacular. To fully understand the importance of the *De moneta* and its French translation in particular, we must first understand its political and social context.

The year 1356, in which Nicole Oresme became allied with the court of Charles V, marked a low point in the political fortunes of the new Valois dynasty that had succeeded the last Capetian king (Charles IV) in 1328. With John the Good's capture by the English after the Battle of Poitiers, an event which marked the end of the first phase of Hundred Years' War, the leadership of France fell to the eighteen-year-old Dauphin. The threat of civil war loomed large, in part because of the acute financial crisis provoked by the need to raise ransom for this captured king. Fiscal crisis was hastened by the method chosen to achieve financial solvency and ransom the king: repeated debasement of currency (Rolnick et al. 1996; Mayhew 1974). This strategy was a veritable hallmark of fourteenth century royal economics: in France alone, debasement occurred during widespread periods, including from 1295 to 1306, 1326 to 1329, 1337 to 1343, and 1346 to 1360, for a total of 85 individual coinage reevaluations over 65 years. Some historians estimate that the value of royal coinage plummeted by 50% in the years immediately prior to the publication of *De moneta* (Menut 1970:180). By 1355, the acute financial crisis led to a series of meetings of the Estates General in which the need for political and monetary reform of the monarchy was the central topic. Concerning the nature of coin debasement, in France, as in England, one never saw the debasement of just one coin; rather, the value of all coins of that same metal was also changed (Mate 1969). Since the whole denomination structure for a given metal would be changed proportionately during a debasement, we can, in the French context, construe debasement as a global operation on currency. Coins could be debased either by the creation of a new type of coin, or through a change in the weight or fineness (ratio of metals) in an existing coin. Any changes made to the weight or fineness were most often marked by a change in coin design, however slight; this was to ensure that debasement would not be carried out secretly. There were, however, five times when debasement was not signalled by such a change, and all occurred in the two-year span between 1359 and 1360, precisely the period when the French translation of Nicole Oresme's *De moneta* and its French translation appear.

It is under these particular circumstances of extreme civil, political, and economic instability, around 1356 or 1357, that Nicole Oresme writes the *De moneta*. Historians generally accept that Oresme's suggestions for reforming currency were followed in December 1360 by John the Good. Moreover, Emile Bridrey (1906) has pointed out that the phrasing in preambles to a series of royal ordinances dealing with financial policy derives from key terms used by Oresme in *De moneta* and its French translation. The *De moneta* is thus generally credited for establishing the policy of monetary stability favored by Charles V. It is written, its author tells us, from an explicitly Aristotelian perspective, and states as its principal task the total unification of public opinion on the use and function of money. So oriented, this text seeks to make itself profitable not only to princes and their subjects, but indeed to the entire *res publica*. Oresme specifies clearly that coinage is not the property of the sovereign, but instead

belongs to the entire community, and therefore cannot be altered at the wish of the sovereign without consent of the entire community (through the estates). Further, a change (*mutation*) in money should never be made, unless it serves the obvious advantage of the whole community (*communitatis*) (13). Oresme thus borrows heavily from both the *Nichomachean Ethics* and the *Politics*; the latter, in making a clear distinction between tyranny and monarchy, warns that power should never be unduly concentrated in any one segment of the community. It is largely on the authority of these Aristotelian roots and explicit references to "les raisons d'Aristote" that Oresme produces the vernacular *Traictié des monnoies* (Wolowski 1864:II).

Although Oresme perceived a clear political need for a vernacular translation of his *De moneta*, his project was nevertheless certainly made more difficult by the lack of commensurability between the two languages, and the subsequent difficulty of his self-translative task. Oresme openly lamented the differential status of French and Latin in the prologue to the *Livre de Ethiques*, where he states that "l'en ne pourroit translater proprement tout latin en françois" / one cannot properly translate all Latin into French (Oresme 1970:100; qtd. in Quillet 1988:82), primarily because of a marked absence of necessary critical terminology in French. To confront this problem, Oresme and other translators employed various methods in their vernacular translations, including longer phrases, additional glossing, circumlocutions, doubling-up of terms (two or more vernacular terms to explain one Latin term), and neologisms (Lusignan 1987:95). The latter was a favored technique of Oresme, who also noted with dismay, in the "Excusacion" in front of his *Ethiques* and *Politiques*, that political science as a field lagged particularly far behind other areas of study, in designating a critical vocabulary in the vernacular (Quillet 1988:82).

We can gain a much fuller understanding of the sea changes taking place between Latin and vernacular models of *translatio* and *auctoritas* in fourteenth-century Europe, and the role of the bilingual text in this process, by turning to the *Traictié*'s "Prologue du Translateur". Here Oresme justifies his, and his text's, incursion into realms previously held by Latin. The two versions (Latin and French) of the prologue are largely comparable, but the French contains additions at the beginning and end. The amplified beginning to the French reads: "Veritate manifestata, cedat oppinio veritati. Qui est à dire, en françois, que quant verité est manifestée, toute oppinion doit cesser et donner lieu à vérité. Et cestui dit ay amené à mon propos. . ." / Which is to say, in French, that when truth is made manifest, all opinion must cease and make way for truth. This said, I have led up to my subject . . . (Oresme 1864:I). Notably, the Latin phrase frames the entire vernacular text. In choosing to open with an untranslated Latin sentence, Oresme signals to his readers (royal and otherwise) several key points. First, he reminds his readers that although the text is a vernacular translation provided to enable their comprehension, he as translator is the active intellectual agent who accomplished that task, and in whom the nexus of Latinate-vernacular *translatio* resides. Although the text is intended for the king, the king does not fully inhabit both Latin and vernacular spheres; only the translator does. Oresme also makes a corollary point: just as the translator's role should not be rendered invisible, the Latin text itself must be borne in mind, too; it still resonates in particular ways, which now, unlike perhaps in previous centuries, need glossing. The content of the Latin phrase itself signifies here: *Veritas*,

supreme philosophical value, is allied with the notion of *manifestatio* and thus also immanence, both philosophical and spiritual. *Veritas* is starkly contrasted with mere opinion which, through force of comparison, is relegated to the secular realm where it does not participate directly in divine truth, but must await the translative process to be made clear. Oresme can cleverly elide the question of whether opinion is collective or singular; by suggesting that it is effectively both, his prologue can be taken as a sharp warning for the intellectual secular community at large, and a veiled personal rebuke for the ruler as individual (in particular, the young Charles who unwisely allowed repeated currency debasement to ransom John the Good).

The other major point of the *Traictié*'s "Prologue du Translateur" comes at the end of the prologue, in a passage addressing France's contemporary fiscal and political crises, where Oresme cites the "grant besoing"/ great need (1864:II) that exists to stabilize the currency, and the "grant vitupère et déshonneur au prince"/ great blame and dishonor to the prince (1864:III) that shoddy fiscal policy encourages. Oresme predicts not only that the sovereign's authority will weaken, but more drastically, that "la désertion et confusion totalle du bien universel de son royaume et pays"/ the abandonment and total confusion of the universal good from his kingdom and country (1864:III) will result. Oresme enters into specific details about the status of gold and silver in France, noting also that the danger of losing vast quantities of precious ("noble") metals to "pays voisins" (neighboring countries) is a real possibility. This drain or "evacuacion de matières" would have serious consequences, for it is through such operations that "changeurs et banquiers" (money-changers and bankers) might gain an unfair advantage – they will know those regions where the price of gold is higher and lower, and manipulate exchange rates accordingly, "par secrètes cautelles" (1864:III). And when the prince goes to "remestre ordre en sa monnoie", he will be unable to do so, since those with secret knowledge will have made it impossible. In depicting bankers and money-changers as agents of secret knowledge, Oresme's text implicitly reinforces the function of the self-translator as one who also possesses the ability to render invisible knowledge visible, but solely for the good of the *res publica*, rather than to its detriment. Indeed, a third passage added to the *Traictié* underscores this function of the self-translator as a kind of loyal public servant:

> Et combien que à moy n'appartient d'en faire la querelle, actendu que je suis le moindre et le plus ignare et inscient de tous, toutesfois soit cestuy advertissement entendu et pris pour le bon couraige et vouloir que j'ay au bien universel, et ne m'en soit imputé aucune téméraire opprobre par les lisans, je en supplie. (1864:VII)
>
> (And indeed it is not my place to take part in this quarrel, given that I am the least worthy and most ignorant of all; however, let this warning be heard and taken as a sign of the good courage and goodwill that I hold for the universal good, and in reading these [words] let me not be accused of inflicting excessive dishonor, I pray.)

In invoking the standard humility topos, Oresme seeks to justify his incursion into the "querelle" over royal fiscal policy. Notably, the "querelle" is both philosophical

debate and a literary form, and the term again positions the translator as one who serves the "bien universel". The prologue transmits the self-translator's *auctoritas* through text, and redirects the patron (or ruler) to the careful act of reading ("par les lisans") – a strategy also replicated in the prologues of his *Ethiques* and *Politiques*. But unlike the frontispiece to Oresme's translation of Aristotle's *Ethiques*, in which translator, aide, and actor combine in the text to present a wealth of knowledge to the patron-ruler, here the translator-Oresme is also the author-Oresme. Lacking formal prior *auctoritas* on which to rest the precise form of his text, Oresme's emphasis on the urgency of France's current fiscal situation, with its potential for great violence and social upheaval, works to justify his authorial/translative boldness. It also enacts his connection with Aristotelean conceptions of scientific reasoning in which one moves from the specific case to the general rule. In considering France's specific situation in the Prologue and then deriving general principles of fiscal solvency from it, Oresme is being a good Aristotelean, as well as a good political advisor. The strategy of moving from the particular to the universal, and from Latinate models of authority to a vernacular medium, is also one that later authors and princely advisors such as Christine de Pizan will emulate.

Of course, in the Aristotelian context, the fiscal practices of the later Middle Ages related directly to ethical questions about usury, just prices, and the equitable distribution of wealth in society (Reiss and Hinderliter 1979). Oresme's treatise addressed itself specifically to the dubious practice by the prince of "mutation", or altering the value of currencies. Yet not coincidentally, the fourteenth century was also one in which, as Eugene Vance has shown in the context of Oresme's *De moneta*, serious ontological and metaphysical questions on the nature and function of signs (verbal and otherwise) were debated, despite the dominance of the trivium (Vance 1979:19). Chaucer, Dante, Jean de Meung, and other vernacular poets of the Middle Ages translated abstract semiological problems into human terms, and were sensitive to historical and ideological dimensions of sign-making with particular reference to money as sign; poetry becomes a literary theater for problems of signification and interpretation (see also Shoaf 1983). We will recall, Vance reminds us, that Dante in particular had written explicitly on ethical problems of money and wealth; in the *Inferno*, he tellingly places usurers in the same circle as rhetoricians and sodomites: "their common denominator is that each has subverted a medium of exchange (language, sexuality, money)" (Vance 1979:21). The *De moneta* / *Traictié* therefore reflects not just upon medieval economic modes of exchange and equivalency, but also upon other modes of exchange or translation as well; it speaks not simply to what appropriate monetary translation might be, but also to what appropriate poetico-linguistic translation and valuation, or devaluation, is, and what the role of the translator should be. In particular, his citation of Scholastic critiques of economic debasement enables Oresme to foreground the nature and practice of monarchic imperialism and linguistic translation. Medieval Scholasticism commonly held that the system of language was capable of interpreting all other sign systems, and that analogies were comparisons not between things but between each other, that is, systems of formal and general relationships (Vance 1979:19). It is not surprising, then, that the exposition of monetary principles coincided with the elaboration of certain aspects of rhetorical theory.

Shoaf has shown that these simultaneous and reflexive movements are closely related to each other within their contexts in medieval culture (Shoaf 1983).

Oresme's *De moneta* interests the scholar of medieval poetics or translation theory, then, not simply for its subject matter and explicit discussion of translational matters, but also for the theory and praxis of self-translation as a crucial component of fourteenth-century intellectual and political history. We have already cited one of the hallmarks of this history: the extremely rapid increase in translations from Latin into the vernacular, and the development of modern languages as instruments of abstract and scientific thought. How do the analogies developed in the *De moneta* between ways of perceiving and expressing the evolution of monetary policy, relate to the broader development of rhetorical practice and theory in the fourteenth century?

Vance has noted that in vernacular poetry of the fourteenth century there is increasing thematic emphasis on exchange. This is not attention to objects to be exchanged, but to the various media of exchange itself, and poets articulate similar hierarchical structures in literature. As Philippe Contamine's recent work on medieval economic practices has shown, the French economic landscape was strongly marked by bi- and even trimetallic monetary systems (gold, silver, copper) which became hierarchical indicators of the exchange value of various services. Rhetorical theory too saw a new emphasis on a hierarchy of styles (high, middle, low), separate and distinct modes of expressing not values but meanings. In this context, the first chapter of *De moneta* takes on particular resonance. Entitled 'Why Money Was Invented', it opens with an extended discussion of economic translatability:

> Quando diuidebat Altissimus getes, quando separabat filios Adam, constituit terminos populorum. Inde *multiplicati* sunt homines super terram, et possessiones prout expediebat diuise sunt. Ex hoc autem contigit, quod unus habuit de una re ultra suam necesitatem, alius uero de eadem habuit parum aut nichil . . . Une eciam regio superhabundauit in uno, et defecit in alio. Ceperunt ergo homines mercari sine moneta . . . Sed cum in huiusmodi permutacione et transportacione rerum multe difficultates acciderent, *sutilitati* sunt homines usum inuenire monete, que esset instrumentum permutandi adinuicem *naturales diuicias*, quibus de per se subuenitur humane necessitati. (Oresme 1956:I.4)

> (Men were *multiplied* [se multiplièrent] on the earth, and possessions were divided to the best advantage. The result of this was that one man had more than he needed of one commodity, while another had little or none of it […] One country abounded in one thing, and lacked another. Men therefore began to trade by barter […] But as this exchange and transport of commodities gave rise to many inconveniences, men were *subtle* [subtilz] enough to devise the use of money to be the instrument for exchanging *natural riches* [naturelles richesses].) (Oresme 1956:I.4)

Here Oresme presents the paradox of money: it is both a useful and a necessary substance, yet it is a human creation and thus entails the ever present dangers inherent in any act of exchange or translation – indeed, money's very existence is necessitated by extreme post-lapsarian fragmentation at the topographical, economic, and political

levels. Money as a human creation is therefore contrasted sharply with the "natural riches" of God's creation. More essentially, money represents humans' capacity for *subtilitas*, and Oresme's language suggests a link between economic and rhetorical *subtilitas* – a link which the self-translator circumvents through the singular presence of the translator.

Oresme further highlights the danger of humans' economic and rhetorical "subtilitas" in the context of post-lapsarian fragmentation when he equates the creation of money with the sowing of death and misfortune, by quoting Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: "Effodiuntur opes, irritamenta malorum, / iamque nocens ferrum ferroque nocencius aurum/ prodierat"/ "From earth we mine a source of future ill, / First iron and then gold, more deadly still" (1956, I.5). Indeed, Eugene Vance has traced a tight analogy between Oresme's censure of the prince who devalues gold currency for his own profit and those poets who use the high style. To medieval rhetoricians, the high style is a kind of art of inflation, and by the fourteenth century, to such poets as Chaucer and Dante, the concept of high style had come to imply a notion of class decorum and abundance, as mere ornamentation.

For Oresme, gold coins, high and "noble" though their metal might be, could only possess symbolic, and even arbitrary, value; let us recall Oresme's insistence that "money does not relieve the necessities of life, but is an instrument artificially invented for the easier exchange of natural riches" (1956:I, 3-5). In his Latin, even the very names of coins are "impropria", or "accidentalia seu denominatiua a loco, a figura, ab actore, uel aliquo tali modo"/ "not 'proper', but instead "accidental or denominative from a place, a design or an author(ity), or in some other way" (1956, IV.9). Oresme's French version is not as stark on this point, and does not follow the same structure. The *Traitié* calls the names of coins not "impropria", but rather "noms propres accidentaulx ou dénommez du lieu, de la figure, du facteur ou de telle aultre manière"/ proper nouns which are accidental or named after a place, a person, a factor or in some other way (1864:XIX). Such a translative shift might have helped avoid angering a ruler whose face and name were imprinted on coins of his realm.

Oresme as translator also demonstrates empirically the frail relationship between verbal signifiers and what they signify. Such a relativizing of meaning is indispensable both to the process of trade and to the process of translation, as the homology between verbal and monetary signs in the Middle Ages suggests. Vance reminds us that from Priscian and Boethius on, "The word as *vox* is a substance that has material reality, and the utterance of the word, a sentence (*oratio*), constitutes an accident in which the substance takes form. A word has both substance and form, then, but it is by virtue of the form that the word signifies something else and conveys that meaning within language as a *system* of signs" (Vance 1979:26). Oresme invokes this conception in his notion of the coin as sign, as both form and matter since, like verbal signs, monetary signs must be uniform and repeatable, abundant and interchangeable, and must above all show the impression of their "device", or royal authority.

For Oresme, the coin belongs to the prince because it bears his likeness. In keeping with medieval sign theory, the coin can be read as a text in which the sign (the coin itself) and the referent (the value set by the prince) coincide. Money therefore serves as a measure of value only because it represents – both directly and indirectly

– the prince's authority, and through him, that of God. For Oresme, the impress of the coin is sacred and guarantees its truth. If the prince were to change the material value without changing the face value, he would be lying. It is, above all, as a sign that the coin is important: the sign system bears a direct and constant relationship to the object or intention with which they coincide. By the end of the thirteenth century, however, and especially in large trading centres like Flanders, there was not sufficient money in circulation to satisfy the demands of a growing market. This circumstance was a trigger for the economic problems to which Oresme sought solutions. His proposals seem to ride a fine line between feudal notions of seignorage and "modern" economic principles. Oresme realizes that money is something more than a mere measure of value; it has a value of its own. The notion of money thus is coded as a form of socialized discourse: precisely the fact that it has a value separable from its role as a measure, explains why the prince must allow no change of weight or alloy. To the extent that the sign participates in the *logos* it is sacred and therefore not to be altered; thus the relationship between metallic content and face value must also remain absolutely constant (Vance 1979:26).

Indeed, we find Oresme stating that coins should be "sterile", that is, they should not be multiplied unnaturally:

> Naturale enim est quibusdam naturalibus diuiciis se multiplicare, sicut cerealia grana. . . sed monstruosum est et contra naturam quod res infecunda pariat, quod res sterilis a tota specie fructificet uel multiplicetur ex se, cuiusmodi est pecunia. (1956:25)
>
> (The Johnson translation of the Latin reads: For it is natural for certain natural riches to multiply, like grains of corn . . . But it is monstrous and unnatural that an unfruitful thing should bear, that a thing specifically sterile, such as money, should bear fruit and multiply of itself.) (1956:25)
>
> Chose naturelle est de multiplier et assembler aucunes naturelles Richesses, si comme, grains, blez, fromens et champs, que comme ilz sont bien semez et bien cultivez . . . mais, chose monstrueuse est et contre nature que la chose non apte à porter enfante, ne que la chose stérile et seiche de toute espèce fructifie ou multiplie de soy mesme, si comme est pecune ou monnoie. (1864:XLVIII)
>
> (Literally, the French reads: It is natural for certain natural riches to cohere and multiply, such as grains, corn, wheat and [other] crops, as when they are well sown and well cultivated . . . but it is monstrous and unnatural when something not suited for bearing fruit, such as money or coins, bears fruit and multiplies on its own.)

Oresme's typical translative techniques are evident in this passage. Vernacular terms proliferate, and thus we get "multiplier et assembler" for *se multiplicare*, "sterile et seiche" for *sterilis*, "grains, blez, fromens et champs" for *cerealia grana*, and "pecune ou monnoie" for *pecunia*. Money as object is explicitly paired with quickly multiplying crops, and thus its status as physical object is reinforced. The doubling (and in one case, quadrupling) of vernacular terms further underscores the notion of rapid multiplication.

Oresme's amplifying technique of self-translation, then, reinforces money's dual status as material, created object (with tangible physical presence), on the one hand, and on the other as mere sign, having only metaphorical existence, which fully in Augustinian terms is not to be enjoyed for its own sake, but instead to be put to good and practical use. Medieval readings of the Bible warned against usury and misuse of these monetary signs to obscure their nominative value. The translator's role in guarding against misuse of both money (his subject) and words (his medium of translative exchange) is a vital one. For the monetary sign to remain in constant correlation with an absolute value, it must be guaranteed both by the sovereign and by the translator. For a translator of Aristotle, the professional charge is indeed heavy: to render such an *auctor* as Aristotle in the vernacular requires diligence even as these acts of vernacular *translatio* provide him a means of claiming specifically for French culture the exclusive means of interpreting these authoritative sources.

In this context, the concluding chapter (26) of the *De moneta* / *Traitié des monnoies* takes on fresh importance. In both the Latin and French versions, the kingdom of France is metaphorically allied with its currency, and will suffer the same fate. With debasement would come a "regime tyrannique" (regimen tyrannicum), and "ideo, si regia proles a pristina uirtute degeneret, proculdubio regnum perdet" (1956:47) / therefore if the royal house decline from its ancient virtue, it will certainly lose the kingdom (1956:47). Yet right up to the end, the French reveals a different aspect of the metaphorical operation of patronage, (vernacular) translation, text, and coin: "pour ce, se la royalle sequelle de France delinque de sa première vertu, sans nulle doubte, elle perdra son royaume *et sera translatée en autre main*" (1864:LXXXIV; our emphasis). The vernacular addition is stunning: if the coinage is devalued, the kingdom of France will be *translatée* into other hands. Literally, of course, it merely suggests that France will be ruled by a foreign prince. Yet the term *translater*, meaning as it does both spatial and linguistic shift, brings language, political lineage, and geographical polis into tight confluence. Rita Copeland has shown that fourteenth-century French "authorizes itself through a material identification with royal power" (1991:135). Oresme's self-translation of the *De moneta* explicitly encodes that material identification by establishing intricate analogies between prince and coins, translation and polis, Latin and French.

Amid the fourteenth-century political debate surrounding *la mutacion de monnaie*, so often devalued to support prolonged warfare and princely ransoms, Oresme writes his *De moneta* as a critical typology of monetary debasement, in which stability is the highest virtue, and then translates it by his own hand. By insisting on the independent existence of each text, Latin and French, Oresme reenacts textually his primary concern with correct proportional relationships in currency or monetary signs. The expression "translatée en autre main" might well suggest that, in offering the French prince a treatise on the dangers of monetary debasement, modelled not on classical *auctoritas* but on his own Latin text, Oresme's new politics of vernacular translation elevate the self-translator as guarantor of both Latinate *auctoritas* and new models of vernacular authority, to guarantee true parity of signs, both linguistic and monetary.

(2) Vernacular Doubles and Literary Subjectivity: Charles d'Orléans

Charles d'Orléans (1396-1465) was one of the most celebrated fifteenth-century French poets and European bilinguals. His famed French-English bilingualism followed directly from historical circumstance and exalted political lineage: grandson of Charles V, son of Louis d'Orléans and Valentina Visconti, Charles was by far the most valuable of the hostages taken by the English after the decisive French defeat at Agincourt. Held in captivity by the English for twenty-five years, from 1415 until 1440, Charles spent most of his adult life away from his native France, corresponding with friends, family, and potential political allies, such as the Duke of Burgundy, through sporadic letters written in verse, and producing copious amounts of lyric poetry in both French and English.

Charles is recognized in French literary anthologies today for his "masterful" deployment of the *ballade* and other *formes fixes* of French lyric poetry, and he is also frequently identified as a foundational figure in the specifically French practice of medieval lyric (Kay et al. 2003:154). Yet Charles is also one of the most heavily debated translative figures in the European canon. Although he produced poetry in two versions, French and English, only recently were his English poems generally acknowledged to be products of his own hand (on this long critical debate, see Steele and Day 1941/1946:xix-xxix; Goodrich 1967:35-43; Coldiron 2000:94-111). Although he is viewed as a seminal figure in the French medieval lyric tradition, scholarly research on his work has not been as abundant as one might expect, and critics have, until quite recently, tended to examine either his French or his English texts, rarely both side by side. Why has he not been the object of more critical attention in the French context, and why has he been almost entirely obscured in the English? These questions intersect with other, still unresolved questions concerning period issues: to what extent is Charles a "medieval" poet, continuing old poetic practices, and to what extent is he a poet of the "new", that is, is he a medieval poet or a Renaissance one, or some amalgam of the two? As an important transitional figure and prominent self-translator, Charles bridged two political cultures, lived in two languages, and straddled two literary eras. Moreover, he is one of the earliest verifiable examples of vernacular-vernacular self-translation (rather than Latin-vernacular). He is also one of the most problematic, for as we shall see, troubled discussion of his bilingualism accompanied his texts from the moment of their production. Thus his case also entails historical issues in the reception of bilingual literary texts.

Charles's place in contemporary anthologies, as foundational in French, has brought critical reception of his texts full circle. During his own lifetime, he was widely celebrated for his poetic activity in both France and England. And as Coldiron reminds us, his French poems were often printed, including one early edition in 1509, with subsequent flurries of editions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (1740, 1778, 1842, 1874, and 1896), culminating with the still-standard critical edition established by Henri Champion in 1923 (Coldiron 2000). Yet Charles was not always perceived as a paragon of French virtue, literary or political. In his (French) political poems written in England, he seems to take first the side of France, then of England. The texts were particularly troubling to later editors, such as Champion himself. The

famed French historian Michelet saw Charles, with his "chant d'avril et d'alouette", as an exemplary historico-poetic figure embodying the best qualities of the late medieval and early Renaissance period in French history (quoted in Goodrich 1967:15). In contrast, Champion openly favored Charles's later "Renaissance" poems, written exclusively in France and in French, in which his old age was heavily thematized, his poetic voice more satiric, and his politics seemingly more straightforward.

Champollion-Figeac's prefatory comments to his 1842 edition of Charles's French poems were an earlier, and particularly noteworthy, attempt to resolve the critical tension inhering in his foreign residence, bilinguality, and "ambiguous" politics. Charles is explicitly compared to Voltaire who, not coincidentally, had also lived in England and also occasionally foregrounded his French-English bilingualism in his texts. In comparing Charles d'Orléans to Voltaire, French Enlightenment master of ironic wit and social commentary, Champollion-Figeac subtly encourages Charles's nineteenth-century readers to interpret the quality of Charles's verse less in terms of political purity than as a function of his pure, and inherently French, intellectual "style", characterized by "grâce" and "bon goût", a style implicitly capable of transcending all cultural locality (quoted in Goodrich 1967:15). Champollion-Figeac thus positions Charles not simply as inheritor of France's distinguished lyric past, but also as an important precursor of France's leading role in European Enlightenment thought.

More recently, Coldiron has sought to reposition Charles d'Orléans in the context of bilingual translation. In *Canon, Period, and the Poetry of Charles of Orleans* (2000) Coldiron concludes that his canonical marginalization was the result of his profoundly, and "trebly liminal" status – a triadic indeterminacy of historical period and political alliance, language, and genre (2000:108). As Coldiron points out, the nineteenth century brought renewed attention to Charles's poetry in the French context, culminating in the next century with Champion's still-definitive 1923 critical edition of the French poems. But in England, following some attention to Charles's English poems in the eighteenth century, tighter editorial practice in the nineteenth century worked to exclude Charles from the English literary canon. In England:

> Romantic standards for poetic originality attach themselves . . . to English nationalism: since the poems are "only" translations, not original in the Coleridgian sense, and maybe not even written by the prince in question, who was French anyway, nineteenth-century critics could justifiably exclude them. Add Burckhardt's foundational definitions of "Renaissance", influential "medievalist" notions about the courtly and the chivalrous . . . and the sum is an end-of-century periodization that places Charles d'Orléans as a medieval poet because of his birthdate; a nationalism that places him as a French poet because of his birthplace; and a literary aesthetic and theory that dismiss even self-translations as nonoriginal poems. Three strikes and Charles is out of the English canon. (Coldiron 2000:108)

Amidst these kinds of critical jockeying, Charles's linguistic indeterminacy proves to be in many ways the most troubling factor of all, chiefly because his self-translated lyric production occurs in two vernacular languages, and thus is more easily read as a split participation in two distinct contemporary linguistic and political worlds.

Charles produced a large body of bilingual lyric poetry, a total of 141 poems, including an extended series of ballades and chansons. When copied into manuscripts, these texts were sorted by language as two single-author books of lyric poetry. The English manuscript is the first such book of lyric poetry in English; it is also the only known copy of his English verse, and is currently housed at the British Library (BL MS Harley 682). The French manuscript (one of many extant copies) is in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (MSS BnF fr. 25458), and was his private copy, said never to have left his side. From these manuscripts Charles's poems were eventually published.

Charles's self-translated bilingual poetry is indeed notable for twinning two European vernaculars as the two linguistic poles of the translative process, and leaving aside Latin altogether. Coldiron notes the explicit challenge to classic medieval models of *translatio* that this choice of languages poses: not only is the vertical (human-divine) dimension obviated in favor of what Stierle calls the horizontal axis of coequal vernaculars, but *translatio* itself is replaced with Renaissance *imitatio* (Coldiron 2000:9). Charles's contemporaries and subsequent readers and editors were always acutely aware of his inscription in the political events of his day; current scholars are no different. That Charles's English literary production would most likely never have occurred had he not been captured at Agincourt, singular emblem of the acute late-medieval political strife between France and England, merely accentuates this. Thus the foundational historical moment of Charles's texts, and the material conditions of their production, are riven with nascent nationalist overtones that had the effect of marginalizing him from both cultures. In his own day, his very bilingualism was seen as a political phenomenon and potential weapon, a matter for deep concern on the part of the English, and many in Henry VI's top political circles did not want him freed precisely because Charles spoke English well and was versed in English culture (Steele and Day 1941/1946:xiv). Surely Champion's concern over Charles's political ambiguity in his earlier lyric work similarly reflects political tension in Europe following the Great War. Current scholarship on Charles continues to address his bilingualism as a point of contention and a theoretical challenge (Arn 2000; Coldiron 2000).

Against the backdrop of such political and linguistic tension, Charles's bilingualism had particularly strong consequences in his use of specific genres. Courtly lyric, his preferred mode, was at its zenith in France during his lifetime. He freely sampled the wide variety of *formes fixes* available to a poet at that time (that is, such "fixed" lyric poetic and musical forms of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as the rondeau, virelai, chant royal, and ballade), eventually settling on the ballade. The ballade was itself indeterminate in two crucial ways: the term could refer to a variety of poetic forms whose general structure was three stanzas (normally *huitains*) followed by an *envoi* addressed to the ballade's recipient; more importantly, this genre belongs neither entirely to the Middle Ages nor to the Renaissance but spans the periods. From this observation, Coldiron develops more potentially productive ways of placing Charles on the literary continuum between medieval and Renaissance poetics, with Charles's bilingualism generating what she terms "polyvocality for the poetic persona" (Coldiron 2000:183) through new possibilities of expression in polyglot,

bilingual, and macaronic verse. Charles often produced macaronic verse, as in a letter-poem written to the Duke of Orleans in which a young newlywed receives advice in both Latin and French. Each language fragment entails a different perspective on the rights and obligations of the husband. Such mixed phrases as "abusez nimis en mesnage"/ abuse no one in the household, and "sagaciter menez l'ouvrage"/ conduct the affair wisely, bring Latin and French semantic networks into vibrant macaronic play (quoted in Goodrich 1967:50). Whereas the Latin terms emphasize the union (sexual and legal) of two individuals ("nimis", "coitu", "conjunx", for example), each one is consistently brought into sharp relief through contact with the French. The latter codes not simply the collective aspect of the marriage bond under feudalism ("mesnage", or the household over which one has dominion, and "heritaige", one's legal inheritance and the extended patronymic family line), but also, and most crucially, the ambiguated pleasures, physical and idealized, embodied in the French literary tradition of *fin'amor* (as invoked through the terms "amours", "joyeux" and "loiaulx"). In turn, the French tradition of *fin'amor* with its inscription in feudal dynamics, is informed by the Latin: husband and wife are not simply two people who might attempt to navigate the dynamics of courtly love, inscribed as they are in the vertical hierarchy of political feudalism, but they are also beholden to the spiritual and legal demands of the church, as marked by the Latin.

Charles's bilingual poetic texts posed a challenge to dominant Renaissance literary theory, which would write off the *formes fixes*, so prolific in the Middle Ages, as relics of past lyric calcification, waning poetic force, and burdensome medieval rigidity, in no way a match for the new poetic revolution. Du Bellay's 1549 literary manifesto *La Deffense et Illustration de la langue françoyse* epitomizes this critical view, and specifically cites Charles's preferred genres as prime illustrations of the decay of literary form and function in the Middle Ages. Yet the bilingual *forme fixe* troubles this critical assessment. Whereas the *formes fixes* in the French context were already deeply inscribed in dominant literary tradition (poets Guillaume de Machaut and Christine de Pizan had already produced single-author books of lyric poetry), in one of Charles's two vernacular languages (English) the *forme fixe* is instead accomplishing something entirely new in his time: never before in the English lyric tradition had a single-author book of lyric poetry been produced. To insist on the medieval "oldness" of the *forme fixe* in Charles's case, through a French lens, is thus to fail to see an important mark of historical difference, as enacted in bilinguality, and also to undervalue the singularity of Charles's literary intertext that cites authors and genres from both the French and English lyric traditions.

Such critical neglect of the bilingual context of this poet, partly through misconstrued assumptions about period and genre, continue today. The *Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* (2000) takes his French poetic production as "the final flowering . . . of the late medieval French rondeau and ballade", the last breath of the *formes fixes* before the Pléiadic poetic revolution (Scholar 2000:257). This standard critical appreciation of Charles, which foregrounds him both in the Middle Ages and in French, has important theoretical and practical consequences for the reception of his translations. To presuppose that Charles belongs entirely to an old medieval poetic tradition, in its "final flowering" at the time of his career, also presupposes

that his French texts are the ones of primary significance, at best supplemented, at worst complicated beyond recognition, by their English translations. The *New Oxford Companion to Literature in French* is more generous in defining Charles's "medieval" use of the ballade and rondeau as "masterly" and identifying his lasting contribution to French poetics as something more than a last gasp of poetic expression. In this assessment, Charles's contribution involves the "centering of the poetic enterprise on self-exploration; like Villon's or Machaut's, Charles's poetic *je* is one of the pioneers of the landscape of the self" (France 2000:154). The "self" is thus foregrounded, and Charles's poetic practice is notable for heralding a new subject position, a new subjectivity – the uniquely French self. Yet although the article takes care to code Charles's vocabulary as "wide", and his "shifts of register, his conversational syntax, his use of proverbs or technical terminologies" as conveying "an impression of ease and intimacy", there is no mention of the medievalists' critical debate over authorship – that is, the strong possibility, at the time of publication, that Charles also wrote and translated in English, or the fact that many of the elements specifically highlighted are far more easily perceived in his English poems than in his French ones, particularly "conversational syntax" and "shifts of register" (France 2000:154). Thus, despite focus on the modernist critical paradigm of subjectivity, these accounts continue to foreground the problematic critical view that Charles enfigures an unbroken poetic lineage with such earlier French poets as Guillaume de Machaut, Alain de Chartier, Eustache Deschamps, and Christine de Pizan, and should therefore be read as a French poet of the distinctly medieval tradition. Such critical appraisals of Charles also lend implicit weight to the once dominant view that Charles was not, could not have been, the author of the English translations of his poems.

On the issue of his English authorship, studies of Charles d'Orléans have undergone a sea change since 1946 when Steele and Day laid out, in the face of tremendous critical skepticism, their proof for attributing English authorship to him. While earlier generations of scholars tended to skirt the issue of Charles's status as bilingual author, or, in the case of French scholarship, to deny his English authorship entirely, more recent studies seeking to prove Charles's English authorship through close comparative thematic analysis have openly proclaimed his status as a French/English bilingual and identified him as the author of the English poems. Informed by a series of influential works by Fox (1969; 2000), Goodrich (1976), and Arn (1983; 1990; 1993), Coldiron's important study is a good example of this recent trend in historical and critical studies that re-positions Charles in his bilingual literary context. Where the authorship question is still not entirely accepted (in certain Continental, and specifically French critical circles), the terms of the dismissal are revealing. As Arn summarizes it, both Poirion and Stemmler have argued for Charles's non-authorship of the English on linguistic grounds: the English poems suggest, in these readings, that the poet simply did not know French well enough to translate accurately and correctly, to avoid slavish and inelegant word-for-word translation. A generation earlier, Goodrich (1967), tracing the same history, outlined Cigada's and Poirion's refusal of English authorship on the grounds not simply that the French is "logical" and the English "obscure, faulty, and upon occasion linguistically insignificant", but also that the two poems are not commensurate, and that therefore this cannot even be a question of translation per se

(1967:30-31). Goodrich herself did not challenge their sense that two different poetic identities are at work; instead, she used what she saw as a thematic balance in the poet's "conception of himself as two separate persons" as proof of his authorship of *both* sets of poems (1967:39).

Goodrich has not been alone in basing this critical move on the duality of the poetic persona. Many critical interpretations of Charles focus on the narrative *je*, or the poetic self or persona (among other terms), as the key to affirming or denying Charles's authorship of the English. In a great many critical studies, construction of Charles's self is foregrounded and, moreover, ascribed a strong dualistic split. In Kay, Cave, and Bowie's 2003 literary history, Charles's poetic persona survives in "a wistful, melancholic universe, where the self, distantly haunted by death and suffering, wisps away into semi-allegorical transfigurations . . . as if permanently alienated from its own sensibility" (2003:71). For Fein, the allegorization of Charles's *cuer* serves as both "a refinement of *je*" and as a sort of mirror onto which the concerns of the self can be transposed (1983:34). In the French critical context, and no doubt informed by Poirion's famous denial of Charles's English authorship, Galderisi has recently found Charles's "moi multiple" to be located not in the split between French and English poetic expression (thus neatly obviating the issue of whether or not Charles was or was not the author of the English poems), but instead in the "diachronesthétique" distance between the two French halves of Charles's self, composed on the one hand of "les modèles linguistiques et littéraires de sa jeunesse", and on the other by Charles's "later" French that came about as a process of lengthy linguistic separation, poetic evolution, and temporal distance from his "native" land (Galderisi 2000:82). In this argument, Charles's split self is composed of two specifically French essences: a youthful French which blossomed into a more poetically remarkable one. As Charles's *langue maternelle* became ever more distant from the originary language of his youth, it also became more flexible, more easily apprehended as poetic object, and ultimately better capable of embodying certain linguistic aspects of his English surroundings. A remarkable critical twist operates here: if Charles came to embody any traces of "Englishness", this argument suggests, it is because he was entirely French (Galderisi 2000:81-83). In being exiled from France and therefore from himself, Charles became closer to his French roots; only thus was he capable of effectively encoding what Poirion called his poetic "secrète pensée" (Poirion 1978:287). Coldiron's equally complex view of Charles's poetic interiority, as we have seen, is also focused around such terms as the "polyvocality" of "linguistic flux and multiple possibility" (2000:183), and "a dual subjectivity" formed in large part through Charles's "dual sociopolitical position of guest-and-captive" (2000:185). Goodrich's earlier argument went even further in this vein, suggesting that the two selves seen clearly in Charles's poetry (and more strongly in the English than in the French) are signs that he in fact intended his poetry to address two distinct audiences, contain two distinct readings, and make reference to two different personal and political identities (1967:149).

Several critical assumptions unite all these arguments. Foremost is the unstated premise that the self is constituted by, in, and through language. More specifically, the self is constituted through a vernacular idiom that consciously establishes itself in a politically meaningful context through opposition to other specifically vernacular

idioms. Finally, the self is always a split one – sometimes dually fragmented, sometimes multiplicatively so, but always with the assumption that there is an original and originary "self" whose initial unity or capacity for self-recognition has been lost, seriously called into question by experience in a second language and culture, or flatly denied for political, psychological, or literary reasons; Cholakian's 1984 study offers just such a reading of psychic deflection in Charles's French metaphors. But are such bedrock assumptions valid? One should question whether, in the early fifteenth century, there is in fact a tight and formal equivalency between conceptions of the self and the particular vernacular one speaks, or between a particular political state (such as France or England) and a particular vernacular idiom. What do we make of the fact, for example, that Charles's writings are overtly tinged by "orléanismes" and that he does not write in the French of the Île-de-France? And in what terms might we code notions of selfhood in the medieval period? In particular, why is it so often one's spoken idiom that is seen as the most, or one of the most, full expressions of selfhood? Recent postcolonial theory has shown how class, gender, and political situation are important determinants in the making of the subject, and we might reference this in pointing out the formative duality of Charles's status as both prisoner and nobleman. But what do we make of language, literary form, and genre in an era when philosophies of the self follow certain formal conventions, and there is a sense in which the self is articulated and understood chiefly through formal poetic, literary, or philosophical structures? Rita Copeland shows quite succinctly the importance of the medieval encyclopedia as tool enabling construction, discussion, and apprehension of the medieval self as a knowing subject in dynamic formation, through interaction with the genre, rather than already "known" in any stable way (Copeland 2006).

Leonard Forster's study of multilingualism through a variety of historical periods hints at such radical differences in medieval, early modern, and modern attitudes towards the self, language use, and literary genre, but he does not pursue the matter. Yet Charles d'Orléans serves as an ideal example of such period complexities: his willingness to write poetry in English after France's military defeat at their hands certainly does suggest that, as Forster notes, "linguistic loyalty", and indeed, linguistic identity, did not mean then what they might now (Forster 1970:19). For one thing, medieval European royal lineages were of necessity supranational, just as they continue to be today, and Charles, a Visconti and an Orléans, is an excellent case in point. Our rather nationalistic notions of "linguistic loyalty" must also be complicated, in this case, by the recognition that writing poetry in English may have been one way for Charles to claim functional kinship with his captors – in this light, his literary and linguistic bilingualism may have entailed clear notions of political expediency (Coldiron 2000:23). In either case, however, Forster's central point that language is a social tool, to be taken up under different circumstances and for different purposes even by the same individual, still stands. For Forster, that Charles was able to produce poetry in a "foreign" tongue also proves the universalizing power of Latin poetic topoi as undergirding most medieval vernacular production. We might also note here another of Coldiron's perceptive observations, running counter to much of the previous scholarship on Charles, that the poet is not seeking to import wholesale French poetic forms into his English lyric. Rather, in each body of poetry distinct

lyric traditions are called upon to accomplish different tasks. In this sense, Charles's translations are not about "influence" (Coldiron 2000:5). But even less are they about loyalty to one's *natio*.

Indeed, lest we think that Charles's texts enjoyed only vernacular reception in both England and France, we should note that Latin formed a third translative medium of Charles's work, although not in his own hand. His French works were rendered in Latin, apparently at his own request, by his humanist secretary Antonio Astesano whose acquaintance he had made while in captivity; the text was then copied by a professional scribe and lavishly illuminated (Coldiron 2000:116, 119-20). This one careful and comprehensive translation into Latin survives in a single presentation manuscript (Grenoble Ms. 873), if indeed others were ever produced. The Latin translation is unusual, Coldiron says, insofar as it does not seem to be simply an attempt to "hedge its bets in [two] traditions" (2000:114), in order to guarantee a permanent readership (2000:116), and because its organization, which differs considerably from either autograph manuscript, "more resembles a product of a Renaissance poet seeking architectural decorum, proportion, and coherence" than of "medieval compilers seeking to enumerate, organize, or cross-reference their contents" (2000:115). It is also noteworthy because it puts Charles in the position of both author and patron with regard to Antonio and Nicholas Astesano, respectively the translator and (presumed) scribe of the extant Latin translation. In any case, the Latin is clearly not the final or consistent translative idiom.

Nor, arguably, can we construe either French or English as the primary language of composition, as Charles's stylistics in both languages affirm. The issue of stylistics has long been a central element in critical interpretation of his work: Charles could not have written the English poems, so the dominant scholarly arguments went, because the translations are not "equivalent"; they resemble instead what Venuti called "foreignizing" translations, that is, adaptive and recreative. Arn, foregrounding the issue of equivalency in her analysis of several of Charles's French/English poems, concludes that he is not interested in establishing equivalent versions, but rather in engaging in new types of word play and sound matching. She thus answers those critics who would argue against English authorship simply on the grounds of stylistic incommensurability, by adducing a broader conception of style as bilingual. The critical approach grounded in stylistics richly rewards careful attention to poetic detail. Thus in Ballade 32, one of Charles's earliest extant bilingual compositions, the text is rendered in octosyllabic French and decasyllabic English. The second stanza reads as follows:

> Pour ce, vueilliez vous acquittier
> De mon cueur que vous ay donné,
> Humblement vous en vueil prier,
> En le gardant en loyauté
> Soubz clef de Bonne Voulenté,
> Comme j'ay fait, de ma puissance,
> Le vostre que tiens enfermé
> Ou coffre de ma souvenance. (1982: v. 17-24)

> (Literally, the French reads: Please free yourself from the debt / Of my heart that I gave to you, / Humbly I beg you / In keeping it so loyally / Under key of Good Intentions, / As did I, with my strength, / With yours that I [still] hold closed in / The box of my memory.)

Charles's English version reads:

> So quytith yow if hit be yowre plesere
> To my poore hert which y haue geue yow fre
> In my most humbil wise y yow requere
> To kepe in trouthe how in an holow tre
> Nay vndir kay of faithfull*e* volunte
> As y haue yowris doon to my puysshaunce
> Thus kepe and shall*e* in absent yow lade
> Within the Cofir of my remembraunce (1941: v. 1179-1186)

> (Modernized, the Middle English reads: So take your leave, if you wish / Of my poor heart which I freely gave you / In my most humble manner I ask you / To keep it in trust – how? in a hollow tree? – / No, under key of good faith / As I have done with yours, to the best of my ability / Thus I shall keep it, in your absence, / In the box of my memory.)

The striking differences are typical of Charles's work between French and English. The French tends toward abstraction and allegory, the English toward concreteness, colloquialisms, and dialogic questions. Arn theorizes several aspects of poetic production through this and similar examples, positing that the additional syllables in English give Charles "more space in which to get out of rephrasing difficulties" (Arn 1994:127). Arn also suggests that the tendency in the English texts toward concrete referent and colorful rhetorical interjection allows the author to make sure he has transposed his meaning into the second language, that is, it is an effect of the status of English as "second language" for Charles (Arn 1994:128). Concerning whether the stylistic effects always hold true in Charles's self-translations, note that in this particular example the French expression *garder soubz clef*, although a fixed and verbally compact expression, already evokes concreteness both in its object referent (*clef*) and the object's relationship to a preposition of location (that is, the potentially concrete physical placement of the object being kept *soubz clef*). In contrast, the English expression *kepe in trouthe* has no such inherent concreteness, since *Trouthe* (truth or trust) is an abstract notion with no concrete referent. It does not therefore follow that the "filling-out" performed by the poet in the rest of the line ("how in an holow tre") is merely an attempt to make the correct decasyllabic count. Rather, the balance of the line suggests specific (and humorous) recognition that the French and English expressions under consideration are not coequal, and perhaps even that coequal translation between the two languages is not the poet's aim. Indeed, one can read the rhetorical question in the English poem in two ways: from the perspective of the lover who wants to know the particular circumstances under which love once thought to be equally shared is now dishonored, or from the perspective of the curious poet-linguist who, inhabiting a new medium of linguistic expression, consciously

seeks a concrete referent for the English verb *kepe*. The poems' lack of "equivalency", then, supports the position of Charles as author of both versions. A native English speaker might readily find few equivalents for the French, whereas a French speaker and avid poet coming to English as a new poetic language might well engage in such skilled linguistic deviation in poetic re-creation. In fact, the next line in English seems to enforce this perspective, for in offering a detailed response ("Nay vnder kay of faithfull*e* volunte") to the rhetorical question, the English poem also offers a strategy for introducing our misplaced French element: *clef*. In English, the expression *kepe in trouthe* does not readily evoke the referent *kay*, and if the poet is to transpose the metaphor that dominates the French version, it must be deliberately introduced. Its presence in the English poem thus comes as something of a linguistic surprise, much like the idea that a heart supposedly cherished by a beloved might be stored in a hollow tree. Not only do the dialogic interjection and the actual content of the rhetorical question render this surprise forcefully, they thus also translate the fearful anguish that results in the poet's presumed geographic and affective distance from the absent loved one. Just as the tree is hollow, so are the metaphors of poetic *fin'amor* similarly vacated: Charles's tree is no symbol of verdant spring and young love, but instead a sterile parallel to the "cofir" (box, chest) of the poet's "remembraunce". In poetic elision with the hollow tree, the poet's own "cofir of my remembraunce" also is hollowed by absence and rejection; it is made to enshrine the loved one's profound (and implicitly permanent) absence, and thus comes to function more like a reliquary than like a simple strongbox. The bilingual poet transposes the thematics of absence, crucial to both versions, in more concrete form in the English.

Similarly, Ballade 60, in which the poet muses on the death of his beloved, thematizes the loss of love through death. When compared side by side, the French and English versions of Ballade 60 disclose differences in poetic agency: whereas the narrator of the French poem is hailed by the personified abstraction of Souvenir in the first line ("Quant Souvenir me ramentoit"), the English version has the narrator actively contemplating events in his own memory ("When y revolue in my remembraunce"). A similar shift occurs in lines three and four: the French narrative voice remembers the lady "que mon cueur appeloit / Sa seule Dame souveraine" whereas the English remembers "hir y callid myn hert hool plesaunce". The lady in both poems is the fountain from whom all goodness once flowed. As critics have pointed out, in general Charles's English narrator tends to be the active subject doing the reflecting, whereas the French narrator tends to be fragmented through such metonymic or abstract structures as "mon cueur" and "Souvenir". This ballade is no exception. What has not been noticed in this bilingual text, however, is how Charles inter-relates the act of reading, the specificity of medieval genre, and the structure of the narrative self differently in English than in French. This tight confluence occurs in the second stanza:

> Ou vieil temps grant renom couroit
> De Creseide, Yseud, Elaine
> Et maintes autres qu'on nommoit
> Parfaittes en beauté haultaine.
> Mais, au derrain, en son demaine

> La Mort les prist piteusement;
> Par quoy puis veoir clerement
> Ce monde n'est que chose vaine. (1923: v. 9-16)
>
> (Literally, the French reads: In olden times many people knew the renown / of Criseyde, Iseut, and Elaine / And many others that were called / Perfect in exalted beauty. / But in the end, in his domain / Regrettably, Death took them / From which we can clearly see/ That this world is but a vain thing.)

Charles's English reads as follows:

> In tyme a-past ther ran gret renomaunce
> Of dido cresseid Alcest and Eleyne
> And many moo as fynde we in romaunce
> That were of bewte huge and welbesayne
> But in the ende allas to thynke agayne
> How deth hem slew and sleth moo day bi day
> Hit doth me wel aduert this may y say
> That this world nys but even a thyng in vayne (1941: v. 2206-2213)

Both French and English second stanzas are framed by loose reference to a past era (much in the manner of Villon's *neiges d'antan*). The first stanza's evocation of the "fressh fountayne" or "vraye fontaine" so typical of courtly romance further evokes an indeterminate past strongly informed by *fin'amor*. In Charles's French version, this "vieil temps" is thickened through the explicit evocation of Cressida, Iseut, Helen, and "maintes autres" heralded for their physical perfection. In the English version, however, although he adds Dido, the "tyme a-past" is not defined solely in relation to female literary figures evoked simply by name. Instead, the poetic "tyme a-past" is coded as an explicitly literary one, for these are women that "fynde we in romaunce".

The term *romaunce* might at first glance seem merely a convenient, if literal, poetic solution to the rather standard French expression *grant renom couroit*. The *gret renomaunce* is a clear transposition of *renom*, and the French lexicon is thus transposed to the English. But there is another important consideration here: as Curtius reminds us, the term *romaunce* refers both to language (the vernaculars as a collective unity, as opposed to Latin itself) and also, in Old French (and soon in the context of other European vernaculars as well), to the literary genre of romance (Curtius 1953:31-32). Thus, whereas the French poem merely catalogs female literary figures generically as ones whom, simply, "on nommoit", the English specifies that these women are named not just in vernacular narratives, but specifically in romances. The contrastive effect is striking: far more than the French, Charles's English poems highlight issues of literary heritage and vernacularization. The figure of Cressida should draw our attention most particularly in this context, for although she appears early on in the French literary tradition (in Benoît de Sainte-Maure's twelfth-century *Roman de Troie*, and from there to the Italian literary context through Boccaccio), by far the

most famous vernacular presentation of Cressida was of course Chaucer's thirteenth-century *Troilus and Criseyde*. Cressida's focal appearance in both Charles's French and English lists of notable literary loves, along with the explicit citation of verse romance in the English version of his ballade, would suggest that he did indeed look to English literary tradition and find it contiguous with French vernacular literary production. As both Arn and Coldiron note, Charles was not effecting an entirely new poetic project; rather, Chaucer before him had translated French courtly lyrics into English, and Charles may well have seen himself as a cultural envoy, an agent of cultural transmission in both directions. Goodrich suggests that perhaps Chaucer was Charles's English textbook, and that after 1440, presumably under the influence of new literary models such as Chaucer, Charles abandoned the poetics of "courtly love" (Goodrich 1967:46, 48). Although Arn contended that in Charles's day "no Frenchman wrote poetry in English for aesthetic or social reasons", in that English would not have been perceived by a French speaker as a prestigious literary language (Arn 1994:126), it seems obvious that Charles's overt invocation of literary generics in his self-translation into English suggests, at a minimum, that the poet is deliberately positioning his text in the aesthetic field of the second language. Thus, to split poetic production into halves of literary subjectivity, as a simple dualism, is to reduce considerably, if not radically, not only the common stylistic properties but also the generic grounds interwoven in his French and English literary production.

This grafting of the two literary traditions, of *fin'amor* on Chaucerian romance, is confirmed by ample evidence of the impact that Chaucer had on Charles's work. The whole of Ballade 99, for which, notably, there is no French equivalent, forms a thematic nexus with Chaucer's *The Book of the Duchess* (ca. 1368), Chaucer's earliest major poem, written most likely at the request of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, in commemoration of his wife's death. The signal moment of Chaucerian intertextuality in the ballade comes with Charles's line "For sorow is y and y am he", in overt paraphrase of Chaucer's "For y am sorwe, and sorwe ys y" (see Goodrich 1967:42). This moment of intertextuality helps explicate Charles's treatment of the genre of romance. *The Book of the Duchess*, informed heavily by the medieval genre of dream *visio*, is a triple mise-en-abime whose pivot is the romance. At the beginning of the *Duchess*, we find a poet-narrator, suffering from insomnia, who asks one of his servants to "reche me a book" (1987: v. 47). The book that comes to hand, it turns out, is a romance containing amazing tales, in particular that of Ceyx and Alcyone. As the poet-narrator reads about Alcyone, she who was drawn into sleep to be able to discover what happened to her husband, so too does Chaucer's speaker-poet find himself falling asleep. When he awakens inside his dream, he is in an elaborate chamber decorated with all the signs of springtime and courtly love so typical of French romance. But beyond the physical cues of romance, the narrator-dreamer finds the whole of the French *Romance of the Rose*, "both text and glose" (1987: v. 333), painted on the walls of the chamber. Thus in this third level of the mise-en-abime, the *Rose* is itself a dream *visio* whose narrator finds himself dreaming about a dream that he had five years earlier. Like the French *Rose* narrator, Chaucer's poet-dreamer then leaves the chamber, although instead of finding the garden of *Déduit* (earthly pleasures) in wandering through verdant woods, he instead discovers a knight dressed in black, leaning against a tree, who tells the

dreamer that nothing may jolt him out of his sorrow, "for y am sorwe, and sorwe ys y" (1987: v. 597). By the end of the poem the dreamer has discovered the source of the sorrow: the knight is grieving for his dead beloved, and warns the dreamer that Fortune has played the knight for a fool, and she will do so for all men. The hunting signal sounds, and the dreamer is pulled away from the knight, only to find himself in his own bedroom, with the open romance still in his hands.

In Chaucer, then, the act of reading is foregrounded as that which transmits human experience and comprehension (whether affective, literary, or philosophical, as in the Boethian intertext of *consolatio*); concomitantly, it is the poet-narrator who transmits this received knowledge. This is not just any act of reading, but one centring on the romance (both genre and text) as framing key aspects of the human experience. Also, both joy and sadness as lived experience comprise the theme of the written text, and both are necessary for true understanding of the ways of the world, and of fickle Fortune in particular. Indeed, this lived experience is the hub of the poetic construct; without it, the narrator's text would not have been created. Finally, the act of reading is not sufficient unto itself; rather, the transmission of affect through reading (here, the reading of romance) rightly stimulates the creation of another poetic text. Chaucer explicitly foregrounds this premise in *The Book of the Duchess*: in the opening lines, the "I, that made this book" (1987: v. 96) comments before falling asleep that "to rede hir [Alcyone's] sorwe" (1987: v. 98) so moved him so that "I ferde the worse al the morwe" (1987: v. 99). It is a dual sorrow prompting the creation of the text: one literary (Alcyone), and one historical (the Black Knight). By setting the stage for the power of the text to move the reader, Chaucer's narrator informs his reader that such a reaction after reading about the sorrow of the Black Knight is not only appropriate, but necessary.

This is the Chaucerian text, and the particular line, that Charles invokes as indicative of his own writing project, signalled in "For sorow is y and y am he". Here Charles's poet-narrator effectively elides two key identities: Chaucer's narrator-poet, for whom reading romance enables a philosophical encounter, and Chaucer's knight-poet, source of affective sorrow within a romance. Chaucer's knight-poet and Charles's poetic persona both resemble the living dead; while Chaucer's knight-poet's "spirites wexen dede" (1987: v. 489), Charles's narrator-poet's "karkes" (carcass) is "enfeblisshed" (enfeebled) and the "gost dispeyrid" (the spirit gone). A similar Chaucerian connection between death and the reading of romance is worked in another of Charles's bilingual poems, Ballade 8, in which he writes that sleep brings no respite from his worries or fears, or even from death. Even in sleep, "For all*e* the nyght myn hert aredith round / As in the romaunce of plesaunt pancer / … / This is my slepe y-falle into decay" / For the entire night my heart reads bits and pieces / As from the romance of pleasant thought / … / This is what my sleep is like; I fall into decay (1946, v. 414-415, 419). The French reads: "Car toute la nuit mon cueur lit / Ou rommant de Plaisant Penser, / … / Ainsi je laisse le [mon cuer] dormir" / Because all night long my heart reads / From the romance of Pleasant Thought / … / Thus I let [my heart] sleep (1946, v. 3-4, 8). As in other of Charles's bilingual texts, the French version presents the heart and the poetic self as isolated from one another, with the personified heart setting the rules by which Charles's poetic persona must live. Thus

the French heart achieves sleep through reading, thanks to the actions of the narrator-poet who "laisse le dormir". In contrast, the English version presents a heart and a poetic self who are equally fitful: the persona admits that "to haue my rest y kan in no manere" (1946, v. 2), due to his heart which continually "aredith round". Here, the act of sleep itself is not simply the heart's, but the narrator's: "this is *my* slepe *y*-falle into decay" (emphasis ours). The English version of the French Ballade 8 would also seem to have taken a page from Chaucer. Such literary identification makes a good deal of sense in the case of a bilingual poet who has stepped away from his "first" language of literary production to write in Chaucer's language.

Modern definitions of bilingualism, eliding as they do consideration of form and genre, cannot fully encompass this medieval phenomenon. Charles's French versions reflect the French literary heritage, whereas his English versions add Chaucerian intertexts to ground the second-language versions in the same way, while interlacing references to both traditions. To apprehend Charles's bilingual poetic production requires reading both sets of poems in the comparative context, with particular attention to period issues, developments in medieval English poetics, and the relationship between English and French literary forms. As Coldiron noted, Charles's deviation from the medieval model of *translatio* is substantial, for the ideal intertext is no longer the vertical *auctoritas* of Latinity. Rather, the vernacular, and even the vernacular self, is seen to serve equally well (2000:20). Concerning the broad thematics of remembrance, both affective and literary, Mary Carruthers has observed that the notion of memory (*memoria*) is profoundly implicated in medieval literary production (1990: 259). Drawing upon public norms, memory is a cultural modality that conditions culture and enables certain actions, authorial and otherwise. Memory also has a clearly discernible material role, one of which is the production of the medieval author's book. As we have seen in the bilingual ballades, authorial memory is a more accurate or effective term than subjectivity and its theoretical variants, especially in the context of a poet who, in filtering the French lyric tradition of *fin'amor* so clearly through Chaucer into his own English, enfigures the poetic self in terms of the "Cofir of my remembraunce".

This bilingual poet, then, clearly partakes of both old and new, both dominant medieval poetic practices and emergent Renaissance notions of valorizing the vernaculars. It is only in his self-translations, however, that the copresence of such diverse impulses is fully evident. For Charles d'Orléans, to work in both languages was to conjoin both literary traditions of lyric poetry in the bilingual text, making them work together in fresh ways in each language. Authorial *memoria* is a single amalgam, perhaps two parts French *fin'amor* and two parts English Chaucer, but in any case a single locus, the storehouse that is at once the *coffre* and *cofir* of literary memory as poetic voice. There is no reason in this case, as in so many others, to posit bilinguality as bi-personality. On the contrary, as Ballade 60 suggests, the poet commands the two languages as a dual literary heritage, which can be seen to culminate together, blended, in any single language version of his texts. In French, *fin'amor* is informed by Chaucer; in English, romance is informed by *fin'amor*, along an ever dual trajectory towards the Renaissance.

(3) The Translative Poetics of the Florilegian Self: Rémy Belleau

To consider the role of self-translation in Renaissance poetic production requires focusing on Latin-vernacular bilinguality. One major figure in this practice was Rémy Belleau (1528-1577), a Latin-French self-translator, a member of Ronsard's inner literary circle, and also a formal member of the "Pléiade". In the Pléiade group, a whole new set of poetic and translative concerns crystallized around the well-known figures of Ronsard and Joachim Du Bellay. Belleau participated actively in the literary debates of his day, and his name appears more than thirty times in the first (1560) edition of Ronsard's complete works, a rather remarkable number of citations for a poet who does not receive much critical attention today. Described even by his contemporaries as the poet of pastoral "douceur", rather than most Pléiade poets' energetic *fureur* or poetic *nouveauté*, Belleau was not one of the most elite poets in Ronsard's circle, yet he played an important role.

Belleau's literary production, like that of most poets of his era, includes both poetic authorship as well as translation. The most active and prolific translator of all of Ronsard's group, he produced several translations, including his first literary work, the first French translation of Anacreon's verse (*Odes d'Anacréon Teïen*, 1556). Belleau's interest in Greek and Latin texts reflects the strongly bilingual intellectual environment that shaped him: it was his humanist education at the Collège de Boncourt that introduced him to Ronsard, du Bellay, and Baïf. While the latter were being tutored by the famous humanist Jean Dorat, Belleau's group, which included La Péruse and Jacques Grévin, were tutored by humanist Marc Antoine Muret (Weber 1955:74). These two groups of students would later unite to form the Brigade, a term first used by Ronsard in *Les Bacchanales* to describe his up-and-coming literary "compaings". In the original "constellation" of seven companions singled out by Ronsard as the "Brigade", Belleau is notably absent; only upon the death of La Péruse did he become identified as part of the group. And importantly, given the premium placed upon poetic creation following the model of Renaissance *imitatio* discussed above, it was his translation of *Anacréon*, rather than his own poetry, that guaranteed him entry to this rather avant-garde group.

Belleau's translation of *Anacréon* also furnishes the only context in which Ronsard ever used the term "pléiade". The label first appears in the short verse text ("Elégie de Pierre de Ronsard à Ivles Gassot Secretaire du Roy") with which he introduces Belleau's *Anacréon*. Midway through the piece, Ronsard explicitly addresses Belleau while also evoking France as source and site of poetic tradition blending both classical and contemporary vernacular literary culture: "Te conceuant, Belleau, qui vins en la brigade / Des bons, pour accomplir la feptième Pléiade:" / Evoking you, Belleau, who join the Brigade / Of talented authors to make the seventh [star of the] Pléiade (Belleau 1867:9). Although Ronsard never used "pléiade" again in his writings, the term was quickly ironized, as in Henri Estienne's *Apologie pour Hérodote* where he coins the neologism "pléiadiser" to mean "contrepéter le language de messieurs les poètes de la pléiade"/ to contradict the [poetic] language of the good sirs of the Pléiade. Even today the term "pléiade" is debated in critical circles. Many scholars rightly point out that to insist on this label is to erroneously posit for this rather heterogeneous

group a common set of well-articulated goals, whereas the Brigade was a loose-knit intellectual gathering or circle, in many ways a precursor of the literary salons of the next two centuries.

The Brigade, as loose-knit as it may have been in terms of consistent poetic practice, nevertheless shared an important intellectual element: a humanist education which focused on creating connections between classical texts and vernacular ones. Indeed, French neo-Latin poetic production reaches its zenith at midcentury, roughly 1548 to 1560, and thus coincides exactly with the beginnings of Ronsard's Brigade. Ian McFarlane notes that what was in fact a "symbiosis" between Latinity and vernacular poetic production has been obscured by our critical focus, and the Brigade's own theoretical focus, on vernacular poetic activity (McFarlane 1980:7). But if we were to step back from our tight focus on such canonical texts as Ronsard's *Amours* or Du Bellay's *Regrets* and instead focus out toward other elements, we would see that poetic achievement in the sixteenth century was largely bilingual, and frequently collective (such as *tumuli*, collections of verse honoring someone who was recently deceased, which flourished in this period). Poets included shorter pieces in the front matter of other poets' published works, and this prefatory material was often bilingual (McFarlane 1980: 8). Humanist authors such as Étienne Dolet promoted the idea that one could and should make one's literary mark in both Latin and the vernacular. As neo-Latin literary culture spread throughout the rest of Western Europe, bilingual poetic activity became more and more visible. It also became institutionalized: many European courts offered official appointments to poets for vernacular and Latin literary production. In France, Ronsard is undoubtedly the most famous vernacular poet laureate, but he also had a Latin counterpart in Jean Dorat, Charles IX's *poeta regius* who produced copious amounts of Greek and Latin verse.

Although Belleau first entered the literary sphere with a translation of an ancient author, he is perhaps best known for his pastoral work *La Bergerie*. Published first in 1565 and then reworked substantially again in 1572, it is a loose collection of pastoral verse (sonnets, odes, hymns) interspersed with brief prose passages, and modelled after major medieval Italian texts, such as the pastoral *Arcadia* by Jacopo Sannazaro which was translated into French in 1544. Many of his fellow poets were similarly inspired by the pastoral genre; Ronsard publishes in 1564 a collection of pastoral verse called *Élégies, mascarades et bergeries*.

Belleau's poetic activity is sharply marked by the Renaissance ideals of collective effort, *imitatio*, and Latin-vernacular bilingualism. The publication history of his major works reflects this: his 1556 *Anacréon* included Latin translations by Belleau of three of Ronsard's poems. One year after the reworking of his most famous poetic text, however, Belleau extends the reach of his translative capacity, for a revised version of *La Bergerie* includes Latin self-translations of three of his own French sonnets ("Quand ie presse en baisant", "Ce begayant parler", and "Mouches qui maçonnez"). Given pastoral verse's inscription in official court poetics, and given Charles IX's strong interest in things classical, it is perhaps not surprising that Belleau took it upon himself to render some of his French poems from *La Bergerie* into Latin: reworking French sonnets into Latin, still generally perceived as a "langue éternelle", would allow for their circulation in a wider, pan-European poetic context, ensuring that they

would be known to a broader audience, and would perdure (Bizer 1995a:119). In this regard, Henri Weber has noted that several of Ronsard's professors at the Collège Royal made sure to translate his odes into Latin so that these texts, and their author, would become known outside France (Weber 1955: 75). More importantly, however, such self-translative activity is not too far removed from the Renaissance poetic model of *imitatio* in which poets drew explicit inspiration from classical verse and rendered a new version in various European vernaculars (primarily Italian, Spanish, French, and English). With the line between imitation and translation not always clear-cut, translating one's own poems may well have been seen as a double act of poetic creation. And besides being a clever poetic means to provide some relief from the considerable poetic shadow cast by Ronsard, it also surely indicated a new degreee of authorial self-confidence on Belleau's part (Bizer 1995a:110, 131).

Both of these aspects can be seen in Belleau's self-translation of the poem "Mouches qui massonnez les voûtes encirees". Belleau's French sonnet closely parallels one of Ronsard's own sonnets ("Aus mouches a miel"), and both poems have a common source in the Latin poem "Basium XIX" by Jean Second (see Bizer 1995a and b for a side-by-side comparison of all three texts). Both Ronsard and Belleau, in the tradition of *imitatio*, drew poetic inspiration from a Latinate source. However, while Ronsard's poetic production rests in the realm of the vernacular, Belleau translates his original French text back into Latin, and through this process, says Bizer, finds "sa propre esthétique et poétique" (Bizer 1995a: 110). In this three-stage sequence (Latin "source" text to vernacular to Latin "target" text) the poet is inscribed in the process of *variatio* and *imitatio*. His own work becomes a proper subject of poetic imitation. The formal discrepancies between the French and Latin versions of the poems, as Bizer notes, have much to tell us about the poet's stance toward larger poetic practices. In almost every case, the Latin poems are longer, whereas the French poems hew to the classic sonnet form, with the result that it is in the Latin versions that Belleau most dramatically extends his poetic reach and finds a new poetic style (Bizer 1995a: 132). Similarly, among other strong differences between the two versions, the French texts are rather unremarkable, following for the most part a highly codified poetic vocabulary and sidestepping any modestly creative neologisms of the sort that Du Bellay's *Deffense et Illustration de la langue françoyse* endorsed for linguistic enrichment of the vernacular. Belleau's French poems do not break new ground, but his Latin poems on whole display a much denser network of poetic allusion and a much richer vocabulary. The reputation he earned as the poet of bucolic verse would thus seem to be based on his French poetry, rather than on his Latin. Although Belleau gained his widespread literary reputation for his production in French, few critics have even addressed his Latin poems. Yet it is this dual nature of poetic production in the sixteenth century that reveals a great deal about conceptions of poetic inspiration and labor, and poetic identity, in the ambient translingual worlds of the Renaissance.

One of the few theoretical points of commonality among the members of Ronsard's group was the *Deffence et illustration de la langue françoise* (1549). Known today as the "pléiadic" manifesto on language and poetic activity, its central points focus on an explicit reworking of earlier notions of *translatio studii*. Du Bellay bemoans the current state of the French language, and exhorts his fellow poets to come to its

defense. For French to grow into a robust literary language, poets must compose in French, not in Latin. Only in this way can the French language inherit (and surpass) the greatness of previous poetic cultures: the Greeks, the Romans, and the medieval Italians (Dante, Petrarch, and the like). French poets must therefore set to work expanding the language, emphasizing its "Frenchness", and through various linguistic means, including the invention of vernacular-based neologisms, make it more capaciously poetic. To this end, "failed" medieval genres (such as the *formes fixes* of the ballade, rondeau, and chant royal) must be extirpated in favor of a return to classical genres (ode, eclogue, and elegy chief among them), or even successful "Italianized" genres (such as the sonnet). While the *Deffense* recommends specifically vernacular innovation (closely allied with *imitatio*) based on ancient poetic forms, this is not, as Weber has shown, a major innovation in poetic theory. Rather, the decisive move is the refusal to use the most recent, medieval vernacular French poets and lyric forms (with the notable exception of Jean de Meung's *Roman de la Rose*) in favor of genres inherited from the ancients, and occasionally, as in the case of the sonnet, transmitted via recent Italian vernacular poetic activity. Valerie Worth-Stylianou notes that in the *Deffense* the translator-poet Étienne Dolet is presented as "un homme de bon jugement en nostre vulgaire", with no mention of his previous neo-Latin writing (quoted in Worth-Stylianou 1988: 40).

In extolling poetic production in the French vernacular so as to render it better able to produce poetry of lasting value, the *Deffense* emphasizes the poet himself as active agent of poetic creation. The premise is clear: the poet is one who possesses a single or primary language that is "la sienne" and through which all of his poetic work will be accomplished. Other languages are notably still useful to the extent that the poet can borrow sentences and words from a foreign language, and appropriate them. Du Bellay further foregrounds the importance of bilingual poetic reception in noting that imitation taking place without a classical model and "en une mesme Langue" is "odieuse" and to be avoided at all costs. On this point, Weber exults that translation is being devalued to promote the "genius" of each language: "La discipline philologique de l'humanisme a fait découvrir aux poètes de la Pléiade l'originalité foncière de chaque langue, son *intraduisible* génie, elle lui permet de constater par là même l'insuffisance de toute traduction"/ The philological discipline of humanism allowed the poets of the Pléïade to discover the fundamental originality, the *untranslatable* genius, of each language; through this [realization], it also allowed him to discover the insufficiency of all translations (Weber 1955:118, emphasis added). Yet translation, however insufficient, plays a crucial role in Pléiade poetics, for without it the act of poetic creation as *imitatio* is infertile. Thus Du Bellay focuses attention on the "native" or primary language of the poet who must nevertheless draw inspiration from elsewhere. As he says, "il est impossible de rendre [une idée] avecques la mesme grace dont l'autheur en a usé: d'autant que chacune Langue a je ne scay quoy propre seulement à elle, dont si vous efforcez exprimer le naïf en une autre Langue, observant la loy de traduyre . . . vostre diction sera contrainte, froide, & de mauvaise grace"/ It is impossible to render an idea with the same grace as did the author: all the more since each language has a certain undefinable quality unique to it, if you attempt to express an idea naturally in another language, by following standard rules

of translation . . . your diction will be stilted, cold, and ungraceful (quoted in Weber 1955:119). Other authors, such as Jacques Gohorry in the preface to his translation of Livy's *Decades* (*Ab urbe condita*) (1548), suggest much the same thing; as Gohorry says, "chacune [langue] a sa proprieté (qu'on appelle phrase) laquelle une autre ne sauroit exprimer & rendre au naif" / Each language has its own qualities which another would not be able to express in natural language (quoted in Norton 1984:233). Norton argues that for the modern reader such translation terms are "all the more disconcerting because they fail . . . to deal with the actual production of the translative text and its segmentation into componential parts. Their orientation is retrograde, a way perhaps of reminding us as readers that if we accept the postulate of proprietary autonomy among languages, then translation must end up denying itself" (Norton 1984:233-34). Having extrapolated from such texts a critical paradox between the primacy of the vernacular and the encomium of translation as necessary for its enrichment, modern scholars thus find this model of translation "disconcerting". But is not this model of translation disconcerting only for the modern reader?

Ronsard, for his part, zeroes in on this translative paradox when he writes in the preface to his unfinished *Franciade* (1572): "Je te conseille d'apprendre diligemment la langue grecque et latine, voire italienne et espagnole; puis, quand tu les sçauras parfaitement, te retirer en ton enseigne comme un bon soldat, et composer en ta langue maternelle" / I advise you to learn Greek and Latin, even Italian and Spanish, diligently; then, when you know them perfectly, to wrap your battle standard around you like a good soldier, and compose in your maternal language (1858:III.34). Ronsard even goes so far to say that it is a crime of *lèse majesté* to abandon the "flourishing" language of one's country at the expense of the dying "cendre" or ash of the ancients. The sixteenth-century poet thus becomes a foot soldier in a poetic and linguistic revolution being played out on a national stage.

Ronsard was not greatly exaggerating in coding the poet as professional soldier, since members of the French nobility did not highly value poetic activity. The poet was seen as a sort of intellectual laborer, one who literally had to work to earn a living (much like the professional soldier). Indeed, many major poets worked for important political or religious figures − Du Bellay, who became his cardinal cousin's secretary and accompanied him to Rome, is the best-known example. Belleau too performed political service by taking up arms on behalf of the duke of Guise, eventually also the marquis d'Elbeuf. When Belleau became attached to d'Elbeuf's court at Joinville soon thereafter, having gained an official patron, it became his duty to reflect the changing social hierarchies and priorities at his patron's court. Realities of professional patronage thus reinforced a sharp social division between poets and courtiers, with poets functioning as laborers, albeit ones whose tools were pen, ink and paper rather than gun, plow, or forge. Ronsard's model of the poet as soldier also draws an explicit comparison between current and past poetic practice: contemporary poets must work harder than the ancients did, for the latter had the advantage of speaking "même langage que les laboureurs, valets et châmbrieres" / the same language as day laborers, valets, and chambermaids (1858:III.35). Not only must Ronsard's contemporaries learn their own vernacular language, then, but they must also connect with their own nation's patrimony and current conditions, linguistic, political, and otherwise.

Such remarks as Ronsard's bring us closer to the difference between translation and imitation. Translation involves close approximation of the "mere" language of a text, whereas imitation must also replicate the original in a new cultural context, specifically the cultural "warmth" in contrast (one supposes) to the "diction froide" of the original. Weber rightly notes that imitation, the highest poetic ideal for the Renaissance, thus has a "double pénétration: celle d'une civilisation et d'un style" / a dual influence: that of a civilization and of a style (Weber 1955:119). This dual aim is the actual context of Du Bellay's oft-quoted lines from "A une dame": "J'ay oublié l'art de Petrarquizer, / Je veulx d'Amour franchement deviser, / Sans vous flatter, & sans me deguizer" / I have forgotten the art of petrarchizing [creating Petrarchan verse] / I want to converse openly with love / Without flattering you, or hiding myself (1993: v. 1-3). Du Bellay's long study of Petrarch has enabled him to internalize the Italian's verse to such a degree that he can draw imitative inspiration from it while nevertheless interpreting his "own" culture's language and values (indeed, to have forgotten something, one must first have known it). Du Bellay's formulation presupposes that poetic identity, although built of knowledge gleaned from past cultures, finds active expression only in one primary "voice", language, and culture. The terms "franchement" and "deguizer" amplify this notion. In "franchement", the poet openly seeks a fresh literary representation of Love with new linguistic and cultural points of reference. In "deguizer" he suggests that the poetic ideal is that which allows the poet to be present without disguise, in his primary essence. The role of self-translation in such a poetics is not immediately clear; by playing upon and through two languages and two cultures, the poet might well seem to us to run the risk of disguising himself in both rather than revealing himself in one. Nothing in the *Deffense* suggests how the poet might deal with this prior duality in constructing a singular "voice".

Ronsard amplifies the troubling spectre of literary profusion in his elegy to the king's secretary, which introduces and frames Belleau's translation of *Anacréon*:

> Non, ie ne me deuls pas q'vne telle abondance
> D'escrivains auiourd'huy fourmille en nostre France :
> Mais certes ie me deuls que tous n'escriuent bien,
> Sans gaster ainfi l'ancre & la lampe pour rien.
> Ie diray, sans mentir, que la plus part ressemble
> Aux grenouilles de mars, que le Printemps assemble . . .
>
> (Ronsard 1878:1 v. 1-6)
>
> (No, I do not mourn the fact that an abundance / Of writers today swarm like ants in our France: / But I certainly regret that they do not all write well, / And [thus] waste ink and candlelight for nothing. / I must say, without lying, that the majority of them resemble / The frogs of May which springtime brings together …)

The degraded condition of French poetics is put in evidence through the metaphor of Nature's troubling (and ultimately fruitless) abundance: an anthill of writers "fourmille[nt]" and accomplish nothing but wasted resources. Even though Ronsard says it is not the quantity of French authors he mourns, but rather the quality of their

writing, the verb "fourmiller" denies any relationship with privileged intellectual activity. Ronsard's striking simile dramatizes his belief that most French vernacular writers are more appropriately viewed as frogs, distinctly base creatures which seem driven to produce or croak not by innate creative forces but by the exterior clock or influence of springtime. Abundance does not guarantee high poetic quality or productivity. It seems likely that the sudden spike of uneven translation activity in the fifteenth century is also being evoked in this comic note from the leader of the Pléiade.

More seriously, the passage suggests that the natural world is a rather fragmented backdrop against which such globally unifying notions as "langue maternelle" and "nation" are being painted. Nature, with her writerly frogs of March, is immediately juxtaposed with the more serene "France mère" who has produced "vne moiffon d'enfans" (the first members of Ronsard's circle) and, now that she is "fertile", has also conceived Belleau, who will "vien[t] en la brigade" in order to become "la septieme Pleiade" (Ronsard 1878:1. v. 46). Belleau himself will inherit France's fecundity, for he will "[fait] enfanter choses toutes nouelles / Sans imiter que toy". Indeed, as Joukovsky notes, Belleau's entire *Bergerie* explicitly thematizes "la nature féconde", fertile nature closely allied with peace (1878:13). Ronsard posits Belleau as a poet who writes "sans imiter que toy", who will only imitate France, and therefore only French poetic ideals. Ronsard thus positions Belleau against those poets who "en mesme langage / Enfuyuent les premiers par faute de courage" / in the same language / Flee the first by lack of courage (Ronsard 1878:1. v. 54-55). Belleau's engagement with French as a literary language has enhanced French, Ronsard says, and he concludes that a "si mignard ouurage" will come to have a key place in the French literary pantheon. Thus Belleau, under the protective wing of Ronsard, publishes *La Bergerie*, his first "proper" poetic creation, exclusively in French, rather than in Latin.

A brief look at a pair of Belleau's self-translated poems (one in French and one in Latin) can shed light on several issues in Renaissance poetics: the figure of the poet, the relationship between the individual poet and the larger cultural collective, the balance between poetic inspiration on the one hand and poetic labor on the other, and the role of genre and style in creating poetic identity in the bilingual text.

The following poems are particularly salient examples of self-translation in the context of Renaissance poetics, and both employ the beehive as privileged metaphor for poetic production. Although the texts follow Virgil and other classical authors in deploying bees' industrious honey-making and honeycomb-building as a metaphor for poetic creation, they do so in quite different ways, with important results for the articulation of poetic activity itself. Both poems belong to the poetic genre of the "baiser", a genre first developed by Italian humanists in the context of neo-Latin poetry, and subsequently expanded in the vernacular realm by Ronsard (Weber 1955:369-70). This genre focuses on rendering in a more concrete and immediate way the rather distant relationship with the beloved characteristic of the Petrarchan sonnet (92). Its traditional sources are Ovid and Catullus, although as we shall see, Virgil's *Georgics* and Seneca's famous *Ad Lucilium* (Letter 84) are also touchstones in these texts. The French text has no title other than the first line of the poem:

Mouches qui massonnez les voûtes encirees
De vos palais dorez, & qui dés le matin
Volez de mont en mont pour effleurer le thyn,
Et suçoter des fleurs les odeurs sauourees :
Dressez vos ailerons sur les leures sucrees
De ma belle maistresse, & baisant son tetin
Sur sa bouche pillez le plus riche butin
Que vous chargeastes onc sur vos ailes dorees.
Là trouuerez vn air embalmè de senteurs,
Vn lac comblé de miel, vne moisson d'odeurs :
Mais gardez-vous aussi des embuches cruelles.
Car de sa bouche il sort vn brasier allumé,
Et de souspirs aardens vn escadron armé,
Et pource que gardez-vous de n'y brusler vos ailes.

(O bees, who build the waxy arches / Of your golden palaces, and who in the morning / Fly from peak to peak to deflower the thyme / and suck the sweet scents of the flowers: / Raise your wings against the sweetened lures / Of my beautiful mistress, and, kissing her breast, / From her mouth pillage the richest booty / Which you will bear upon your golden wings. / There [at my mistress' mouth] you will find air perfumed with sweetest scents, / A lake filled with honey, a harvest of fragrances. / But beware also her cruel ruses. / From her mouth emerges a lit fire, / From her passionate sighs emerges an armed squadron. / Because of these [dangers], be careful not to burn your wings; our literal translation.)

AD APES

Arte laboratas doctae componere cellas
Florilegiae volucres, doctae fragrantia mella
Stipare, & flores summos libare paritae,
Cerea Daedaleo sub fornice fingitis antra,
Rara fauis, laqueata, leui discrimine ducta,
Quasque humana negat solertia, proditis artes,
Si tamen ignoratis vbi bene fundat odores
Terra suos, teneras quibus aut in montibus herbas,
Quisue locus claudat diuinis nectaris amnes,
Labra meae Dominae petite, hic confusa virescit
Florum laeta seges, Casiaeque, Crocique, Thymique,
Hinc mellis currunt latices, hinc manat odorum
Hesperidum quicquid vobis iolaria fundunt,
Quicquid odoriferi pestana rosaria Veris.
Cautius at, moneo, roseis confidite labris :
Nam flamma vt cineri, labris supposta, periclum est
Vstulet vt pennas, ipsam quae absumeret Aetnam
Ne dum vos, imis penitus grassata medullis.

(To the Bees: // Well taught by Art to build elaborate cells, / To store the fragrant honey, tightly-packed, / You blossom-busy bees were born to taste / The

> noblest flowers and, about the hive, / To fashion waxy caverns in an arch / So finely coffered, with so light a touch, / That, were it matched with Daedalus' own, / Would beggar human ingenuity. / If, however, somehow you've forgot, / Where Earth pours out her perfumes, where she strews / Her softest hillside herbs, or in what place / Conceals her holy nectar, then attend: / Go seek my Mistress' lips! For there you'll find / A gay bouquet of flowers in fullest bloom, / There saffron, thyme, there cinnamon, and thence / The streams of honey, thence the dew that drips / From violet and primrose, and the scent, / The honey-gold aroma of the Spring. / But I warn you: With greater care than on the rose itself, / To cast yourselves upon those rosy lips. / As flame in embers lurks, so therein hides / A heat that could consume the fieriest things, / And much more yours the danger, that it may / Quite waste your inmost hearts – and singe your wings.)

Even on a strictly formal level, the differences are striking. The French poem follows the classic sonnet form of fourteen alexandrine lines in two quatrains and two tercets. The French form thus pays careful attention to the formal poetic ideals laid out for the French vernacular by Du Bellay's *Deffense*. The Latin, on the other hand, in eighteen lines, follows a different metrical pattern. In the French version, the bees, evoked by the abbreviated "mouches" (referring to "mouches à miel", or "honey flies"), are first described in the activity of building their hives and gathering from nature the materials they need to build these "golden palaces", noteworthy for their distinct arches made of wax. With the structural aspect of the beehive thus foregrounded, the term "massonnez" links the bees' activity to that of human builders and master craftsmen. The term "voûte" bridges diverse realms through multidirectional associations: the architectural, the natural as in the ceiling of caves, and the divine as in the "vault" of heaven. The French version thus underscores the bees' capacity to cross between the natural and the artificial or constructed. Indeed, the rest of the first quatrain is dedicated to a description of the bees' seemingly fluid relationship with the landscape: they are free to fly from place to place as they pursue their activities of "effleurer" and "suçoter", capturing the essence of the natural world and transporting it back to their constructed homes – for subsequent potential consumption by humans, we should add. Indeed, this chain of transmission from pastoral landscape to bees to poet, and the notion that the bees are in some way being asked to imitate previous actions undertaken by the poet, allows the verbs to carry a heightened erotic charge as the poem advances into the second quatrain.

The Latin text stretches these four lines into six, and the poet addresses the bees specifically (as already signalled in the title "Ad Apes"). But here it is specifically the bees' *techne*, or the bees as technicians, that is foregrounded, and they are mentioned by name (*apes*) only in the poem's title. Instead, initially, the poet refers to them twice as "doctae". The bees' knowledge, as in the French, centres on architectural structures (*cellas*) that are worked (*laboratas*) by the bees' art (*arte*), but the Latin poem suddenly veers off in a different direction in line 3 with the evocation of the honeycomb itself (*favis*), as opposed to the golden palaces of the French. The Latin honeycomb is comprised of waxy rooms (*cerea antra*) which are cleverly brought back into the

realm of human architecture through their placement underneath the Daedalic arch (*Daedaleo sub fornice*). This association continues in the next line comparing the honeycomb to a paneled ceiling (*laqueata*). The important reference to Daedalus positions bees' activity at the origin of all architectural fashioning and creation, and it evokes Petrarch's early humanism as intertext, since Petrarch overtly claims Daedalus as his protector in the fourth eclogue of his *Bucolicum Carmen* (Bizer 1995a:141). It also echoes a favorite passage in Book IV of Virgil's *Georgics*; as Virgil says, while the young bees flit from flower to flower, the elder bees are in charge of constructing the honeycomb (*daedala fingere tecta*). Thus, whereas Belleau's French presents bees' floral wanderings and architectural predilections as two rather separate aspects of their nature, his Latin text emphasizes that both aspects of apiary activity are complementary, and are in fact signs of the unity of the bees' society. Virgilian intertext makes this point clearly, insofar as Book IV of the *Georgics* specifies that bees are unique in holding common possessions, including that which is typically most private: home and family or children. Moreover, bees enjoy a single unified country in Virgil and follow common laws. The bees' world is portrayed as a unified and orderly national society: "solae communis natos, consortia tecta / urbis habent, magnisque agitant sub legibus aevum, / et patriam solae et certos novere penatis" (1916:II.iv.153-55) / with each bee in the society knowing his or her own station and hewing to it. Virgil's terms "communis natos" and "patriam", evoked through this apiary intertextuality in Belleau, provide a significant counterpart to Ronsard's evocation of disunified and past-centred poetic activity at the expense of French vernacular production as *lèse-majesté*. Belleau may also be invoking the wax that served as a metaphor of infinite linguistic variation for Quintilian (Bizer 1995a:142). In Belleau's own Latin, the bees' collectivity, ordered around the strict but harmonious organization of the waxy cells, contrasts sharply with Ronsard's wasteful vernacular frogs of spring.

Belleau's Latin text makes yet another essential point that his French does not: humans' practical knowledge (*humana solertia*) flatly denies (*negat*) the acquired cultural wisdom of the bees (*proditis artes*). Is this an echo of the Pléiadic dismissal of Latin writing and insistence on vernacular production? In any event, the Latin narrator positions not just himself but all human knowledge against the bees' activities, to conclude by suggesting that, compared to the bees' collective nature, human nature does not as readily maintain collective cultural wisdom.

The French narrator gives the bees an explicit command to gird themselves for an encounter with his mistress. The poet-narrator orders the bees to prepare their wings (*dressez vos ailerons*) against the sweet traps (*leures sucrees*) of the mistress; and to plunder the sweetness they find on her body (*pillez le plus riche butin*). The vocabulary is notably militaristic: "pillez" and "butin" in particular have bellicose semantic fields. When coupled with the erotic scene of the woman's supine body, signalled by her nipple (*tetin*) and mouth (*bouche*), the effect is disconcerting − the bees are to profit from this "raid" and carry away the riches they have found. As Braybrook notes, Belleau presents his reader with a "femme morcelée" whose isolated body parts to be conquered complicate any notion of calm sensuousness (Braybrook 1988:178). Demerson describes this martial tone, which he also reads in Belleau's *Epithalames*, as "la *fureur* érotique" (erotic furor) in which fire is a frequent turbulent element, used

to reproduce the disequilibrium preceding the birth of an orderly and peaceful world (Demerson 1998:196-97). Yet in Belleau's French, the intertext is not Virgil but Ovid, famed master of the military "art" of love. These militaristic overtones continue into later stages of the French sonnet as well, when the bees are again given a command in the imperative. The command is twice repeated: watch out (*gardez-vous*) for the dangers attending this mission. The woman's body is host to a series of cruel ruses (*embuches cruelles*) relating either to her mouth (from which fire comes), or her sighs (from which an entire squadron springs forth), in both cases referencing the mouth as site of not simply erotic pleasure, but also verbal production. Is the military nature of the bees' raid justified by the cruelty and violence of the woman, or are in fact the woman's "embuches" themselves a defense against just such militaristic raids? Ambiguating the erotic, the bees are "wing" soldiers in the process of creation, the production of honey. The metaphor of architectural activity, in this sojourn to the beloved at the behest of the poet-narrator, extends the bees' activity into the poetic realm in emphatic tones.

The Latin text works a more complicated relationship between bees and poet, and poet and woman, where definitions of art and knowledge play an overt role. The Latin poem introduces a startling new possibility: that the bees, despite their extreme technical prowess, do not possess (*ignoratis*) the specific knowledge they would need in order to find the purest source of pleasure. As in the French, it is through metaphoric extension that the pleasure becomes appropriate for both bee and poet: perfumed smells (*odorat*), tender shoots (*teneras herbas*), crops of flowers (*florum*). Again, in Latin Belleau explicitly references Book IV of Virgil's Georgics: all three flowers evoked by Belleau's Latin are familiar from Virgil. Belleau's Latin, like his French text, also entails an imperative, but *petitē* (seek out) is much gentler than the French *pillez* (plunder), and does not foreclose the possibility of willing collaboration on the part of the woman. Similarly, the dangers the Latin bees risk in approaching the woman are presented not as military certainties but as possibilities that might surface if the bees themselves were to sting her − through the verb *absumeret* in the imperfect subjunctive, indicating virtuality rather than certainty, and the more neutral *peric[u]lum* est and the evocation of *cineri*, or ashes, to describe the heat beneath the dormant surface of the lips.

As in the French version's distinct *cruelles* or *escadron armé*, to further code the unpredictable nature of the woman the French narrator relies on additional metaphors of labor. Yasmin Haskell points out in her study of the bee metaphor in Jesuit Latin didactic poetry, that the bees "combine divinely inspired artistry and diligent labour" (Haskell 2003:124) Thus partly through the poems' Virgilian intertext on bees, in reading bilingually it becomes clear that neither of these texts focuses so much on the poet-narrator's relationship to his mistress as on various types of industry, creative and mechanical, poetic and architectural. Moreover, in Virgil, love in the apiary context was explicitly turned toward work. Virgil specifies that bees do not participate in conjugal relations (*neque concubitu indulgent*) or in forms of passionate love (*nec corpora segnes in Venerem solvunt*). Instead, bees reproduce asexually (*aut fetus nixubus edunt; verum ipsae e foliis natos et suavibus herbis ore legunt*). Intertextually, then, it is logical that, since sexual pleasure is not, according to Virgil, part of bees'

nature, Belleau's narrator must tell them where to find the beloved mistress.

The French narrator is the directing agent, the Latin one a helper. In both cases, what the poet-narrator sows is speech (he gives suggestions, information, or orders), and he perhaps stands to reap the tangible benefits of it all when the bees have accomplished their mission. Haskell notes that for seventeenth-century Jesuits as for sixteenth-century poets, one of the most crucial problems posed by the *Georgics* is that of physical labor (*labor improbus*) which may indeed conuqer all ills (*omnia vincit*), but which an educated author would be loathe to undertake (Haskell 2003:32). She specifies several linguistic maneuvers through which direct evocation of physical work was avoided in Jesuit didactic texts. Belleau's use of bees as a third party to whom the text is directly addressed entails just such a strategy.

In the Latin poem, the distinct cells created by the honeycomb, coupled with the insistence that there are some types of knowledge the bees themselves do not possess, highlight the exchange of knowledge and its retention in memory, as well as the translative process through which such cultural exchanges occur. In discussing Étienne Dolet's treatise on translation, Glyn Norton describes Dolet as constructing a dual linguistic space "compartmentalized into two semi-autonomous zones, each inhabited by an overseer, the one with fiduciary allegiance to the other. Like two parallel texts, they each retain their own idealized space, separate and detached from each other; they are destined to be different" (Norton 1984:233). This description of translative space, as evoked by the bilingual Dolet, recalls the structure of Belleau's Latin honey-comb whose spaces are kept quite distinct yet linked by the bees as a communal whole. From classical antiquity forward the word *cella* means cell or storeroom, hence also honeycomb, but also by extension, as Mary Carruthers has shown, a bookstall, thesaurus, pigeonhole for letters, or even memory itself (1990:36-37). Thus the word *cella* resonates dually in Belleau's first Latin line, "Arte laboratas doctae componere cellas" / Oh learned ones, you arrange the chambers worked by your art. In the neo-Latin Renaissance context of the poem, the chambers are not only the honeycombs but also words, phrases, images, books; and thus the art that works their arrangement is literary in nature, and the learned ones doing the collecting and arranging are no longer mere bees but poets themselves (including the poet-narrator addressing the group of bees − or fellow writers). The second line of the Latin text reinforces this association, for "florilegae volucres, doctae" similarly invokes not simply learned flying ones who "cull the flowers" but also learned scholars who in flitting from flower to flower (or text to text) succeed in compiling the very book of memory itself, as well as the anthologized collections of classical poetry on which so much humanist learning was predicated: the florilegium (Bizer 1995b:203).

There hardly seems a more appropriate choice of topic for a sixteenth-century poetic self-translation than such structures of memory, language, and poetic invention as coterminous with the natural world and human culture. The "Argument du Premier Livre" of Ronsard's *Franciade*, written by Amadis Jamin, secretary to the king, capitalizes on this same apiary connection, presenting "l'autheur" as "Il [qui] ressemble à l'abeille, laquelle tire son profit de toutes les fleurs pour en faire son miel; aussi, sans jurer en l'imitation d'un des anciens plus que des autres, il considere ce qui est en eux de meilleur, de quoy il enrichit . . . nostre langue françoise" / the author . . . he

[who] resembles the bee that takes his profit from all the flowers to make his honey; similarly, without swearing by the imitation of one of the ancient poets more than any of the others, he considers what is the best in them, from which he [then] enriches . . . our French language (Ronsard 1858:41). Belleau's poem enacts this brilliantly. Through the metaphor of bees and their labor, Belleau's two poems both encode several elementary dialogic structures in Renaissance poetic thought and practice: the dichotomy between "rational" (rule-governed) invention versus "irrational" (divinely-inspired) furor, the need to distinguish between art and artifice, and the extent to which the poet allies himself with either of these topoi. This bilingual text thus enacts what Bizer has termed the metalanguage of Renaissance imitation (1995a:144), and what Lecointe has identified as "l'idéal d'un style personnel" (1993:573-705), that which might help us negotiate between the shoals of the problematic category of the individual subject or "personne" on the one hand, and conventional rhetoric, "une rhétorique des 'effets'", on the other (1993:573). If we had only the French poem, we would be unable to access Belleau's wider perspectives on the role of memory, as amplified in "Mouches qui massonnez" / Ad Apes, and on the capacity of a poet to distinguish between art and artifice, between sterile imitation and productive *imitatio*. Ronsard would perhaps have preferred the monolingual horizon. But we do have Belleau's Latin poem, which dramatizes, contrastively, how the narrative stance in the French poem unfolds in a rather more aggressive vernacular in which creative construction is predicated on violence and gender division, and in which the classical interface is largely absent, or at least obscured. It is his Latin poem that foregrounds Virgil's text, the trope of poetic memory, and the metaphor of literary construction as apiary *cella*. Belleau widens the compass of the poetic voice through new models of imitation that self-translation enables. In so doing, he reopens the classical legacy through "modern" bilingual production.

Part 2: The Widening Compass of the Vernaculars

Early Modern Conditions (1600-1800)

A. Changing Concepts of Language and Translation

The gap between Latin and vernacular cultures had deepened considerably by the seventeenth century. While the oldest nation-states were consolidating their administrative structures in the capital cities, and printing presses and commercial book marketing increasingly clustered in these urban centres, the linguistic diversity of peoples remained a practical problem. Beyond the capitals, in rural areas most classroom instruction and church preaching were done in the local dialects. Merchants and travellers often resorted to Latin when far from home, but Latin was rapidly losing currency as a common medium of communication. In letters from Germany, the Englishman John Pell reported in 1654 that he tried to speak Latin to an elderly German official, who retorted that he hadn't spoken Latin in fifty years, so they ended up in a "motley dialogue" of Latin and the German's High Dutch (Salmon 1988:3). Another Englishman trying to use his Oxford Latin during travels in Poland and Sweden, Richard Carew, thought it would be useful where "wanting the native Language of those Countreys, I was often inforced to use the help of the Latin Tongue", only to discover that his bookish Latin was useless there (Salmon 1988:3-4). At midcentury, journeying southward from Paris, Racine writes to La Fontaine that once he gets past Lyon he can scarcely understand anyone in the welter of local idioms; yet meanwhile Pierre Bayle writes from exile in Holland that in the major cities all across Europe, French is replacing Latin as the language of the elite, French is becoming the second language of educated people, and in Holland alone there are ten French schools for every Latin school (Lough 1978:69-70). Indeed in most countries, although typically over half the population is still illiterate, the "national" language is replacing Latin as the language of learning, abetted by French, even as the poorer classes remain isolated in regional dialects. In many places for a while, particularly in Romance-language monarchies like France and Spain, the Counter-Reformation produced decrees establishing compulsory elementary education, yet this was most often merely an effort to reaffirm Catholic education, still in the local dialect rather than a leading vernacular language (see Berdichevsky 2004:103-115; and Lough 1978:71).

But it is clear that the reading public is widening out from the court elite to new audiences and additional types of readers. Already some comic writers begin assailing both Latin and Greek as dead languages, readable only to the king's ministers. In the 1660s in his *Le Parnasse réformé*, Guéret chastises Ronsard's Pléiade poets for having been so infatuated with their allusions to Homer and Pindar they forgot that many readers no longer knew Greek or even Latin – especially women! Writers today, he said, writing for new audiences, must try not to embarrass their readers, male and female, who have little Latin and less Greek (Lough 1978:135-36). The emphasis on women in such writings is partly due to their growing role in cultural politics through the *salon* movement, as well as the burgeoning popularity of the novel as a genre, for audiences both aristocratic and increasingly bourgeois.

Yet it is important to recognise that throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the greater part of the rural populations of Europe spoke not the "national" language but only a local dialect. Italy was riven into mutually unintelligible language groups in such areas as Sicily, Naples, Venice, and the Alpine regions, just as the

Norwegian territories were split into two varieties of Norwegian, Nynorsk and Dano-Norwegian (Berdichevsky 2004:55). As late as 1794 in France, as the Abbot Grégoire complained to the Revolutionary Convention, "We can affirm without exaggeration that at least six million Frenchmen, mainly in the countryside, do not know the national language [*la langue nationale*]; that an equal number are incapable of following a sustained conversation, and finally that the number of those who speak it purely does not exceed three million, and the number of those who can write it correctly is probably even less" (quoted in Lough 1978:164). Talleyrand had already reported as a "striking singularity" the fact that the French language is a prized acquisition abroad but still often an insurmountable barrier to communication in France itself.

In general, the rise of the vernaculars in the early modern period, like the rise of the bourgeoisie, is such a familiar aspect of Western history that it does not need emphasis here. What matters for self-translation and the fortunes of the bilingual text, however, is that in the course of the seventeenth and especially the eighteenth centuries in Europe, changing concepts of the vernacular reflect both increasingly secular theories of the word as well as increasingly political disputes about literacy and class, during the difficult and often violent extension of the democratic franchise. The political functions of the vernacular became an indelible part of their use in literature no less than in other domains.

Medieval writers had distinguished between the *litteratus*, having a clerical education in Latin, and the *illitteratus*, uneducated in the classical languages, and this understanding of literacy only gradually broke down; it is not until the nineteenth century that the concept of vernacular literacy becomes fully dominant. As late as 1755, for instance, in the Preface to his *Dictionary of the English Language*, Samuel Johnson inveighs against "illiterate writers," meaning those who use English words improperly for want of knowing their Greek and Latin origins. Nicholas McDowell points out that Johnson links "non-classically based English" to sexual impropriety as well as social leveling. "The class-based politics of Johnson's position are transparent. Uneducated writers can become famous because their use of an uncouth vernacular appeals to an illiterate and irrational public who know no better" (McDowell 2004:39).

All through the long, slow vernacularization of Europe runs this tension between a classically based view of the vernacular and a socio-political view of it as signalling emancipation from that history – and from similar kinds of aristocratic restraints. In many parts of Europe and the Americas, writers who self-translated between a classical and a modern language often found themselves addressing antagonistic audiences. Much depended on how the politics of vernacularization were being implemented, or exploited. As the Reformation and Counter-Reformation advanced, critiques by Protestants inevitably embraced the entire Latinate culture of the Roman Church, often oddly echoing other anti-classical arguments for the vernacular. Dissenting religious pressures on Latin, whether promoting it from the pulpit or seeking to displace it from religious service altogether, continued to intensify throughout this period. Still, as Walter Ong has shown, it was not by chance that Latin was nevertheless preserved by the leaders of almost every language faction as the purview of the elite: even among Puritans in England, "in helping to maintain the closed male environment the psychological role of Latin should not be underestimated. It was the language of those

on the 'inside', and thus learning Latin at even an infra-university level was the first step toward initiation into the closed world" (Ong 1971:121).

Even as the classical languages thus became a site of contestation, so too by 1600 "vernacular" was already a loaded term which, not unlike Renaissance "Latin" in the recent past, could designate a broad range of linguistic and political associations and degrees of specificity. Indeed the triangulation inherent in the term "vernacular," as either a noble offspring of classical roots, a haughty pejorative for non-Latin languages, or an enthusiastic banner of progress, was certainly not new, and should not be construed as unique to early modernity. Even to identify which vernacular language dominated in a given region had never been a simple matter. In England after the Norman Conquest, for example, when the ruling elites spoke French, Middle English yielded primacy for a time to Anglo-Norman in vernacular literary circles. Recalling the former strife between *langue d'oc* and *langue d'oïl* in France, in the still nascent struggles to determine a national language it was common for two or more vernaculars to be vying for primacy, like Castilian and Catalan in Spain, and comparably competing vernaculars elsewhere. Amid such conditions, in a given nation-state in the seventeenth century, the decline of Latin in public affairs and the rise of the national vernacular was not a binary process of substitution, like a see-saw. Rather it was everywhere a messy competition on the ground. Along that horizontal level where social, economic, and political pressures imposed new kinds of roles on the vulgar tongues, two of the most visible sites of conflict were the classroom and the pulpit.

In England John Brinsley, a teacher in the Leicestershire grammar schools (i.e., schools teaching Latin grammar), brought a new kind of systematic approach to Latin language pedagogy, as Vivian Salmon has shown, even as he urged that the vernacular be included in the nation's curricula, for three reasons: "first, it was the language most used by all sorts and conditions of men, 'our owne natiue tongue'; secondly, its purity and elegance were 'a chiefe part of the honour of our nation', which all Englishmen should try to advance; thirdly, because – of all those who are educated – only a few, by comparison with those who follow other callings, go on to university. English will be more valuable than Latin for those who do not become scholars"; to clinch the argument (in 1612), this Puritan scholar added that the parents of children trained in the vernacular could "hear their children read a part of the Bible daily" (Salmon 1988:40-41). As the Renaissance practice of teaching Latin grammar as the basis for all instruction and knowledge became ever more contested in the seventeenth century, such pressures from proponents of the vernaculars grew in strength and numbers. Also in England, the classical languages seemed to be overtaken by modernity in another domain as well, when they proved to be of little use on the job market. Robert Wild's verse broadsheet *Alas poore Scholler, whither wilt thou goe* (1641) mocks his grammar-school and Cambridge education as serio-comic vanities in a world convulsed by civil war: "I've rent my Plush and Sattin,/ And now am fit to begg/ In *Hebrew*, *Greeke*, and *Lattin*" (quoted in McDowell 2004:57).

Wild was a comic jester promoting pedagogical reform for broader political aims, as part of "English radical tradition, stretching back to the 1640s, of opposition to a classically based language that facilitated and maintained the power of an educated elite, enabling that elite to rule over society by dividing in on the grounds of literacy"

(McDowell 2004:57). At his trial for treason in 1649 John Lilburne refused to plead because his indictment was in Latin, which he said he could not read, and he in turn orally indicted the whole English legal system for using French and Latin, and thus manifesting the foreign influence that has been corrupting "the ancient democratic liberties of the English" since the Norman Conquest (McDowell 2004:42). Curiously, vigorous opponents to this libertarian view of languages, like Thomas Hobbes and Samuel Johnson in the next century, who so eloquently defended England's need for "a classically based literary or polite language", were often of the same social class as their opponents, far from the noble or aristocratic birth imputed to the Latinist camp; as Raymond Williams has shown, admitted to the intellectual elite without the ticket of appropriate social credentials, they defended Latin and a classically based vernacular with inordinate frequency and vigor (Williams 1989:250).

The proliferating vernacular Bibles played a lesser role in shaping literary self-translators' work than educational policies and practice. Yet throughout the seventeenth century the lively (and too often deadly) politics of Bible translation brought about significant shifts in the literary field as well, as in the very public debates about whether translators can rely on the Latin Bible or should go back to Greek and Hebrew texts, as Luther demanded. Like Luther for his German Bible (1522, 1534) though less openly, the King James translators consulted the Greek, among other sources, including Erasmus' Greek New Testament (1516), for their own vernacular Bible (1611). By 1620, on the Protestant premise that "the emancipation of the individual's soul lies in the possibility of reading the Bible in one's native tongue", vernacular Bibles had appeared in English, Danish, Swedish, Dutch, French, Czech (Barnstone 1993:200), among other languages.

At the same time, the quantity of comprehensive translations from Greek literature had been steadily increasing since about 1530, as new manuscripts became accessible. Throughout the seventeenth century the term "classical" as a literary rubric was thus growing in range and magnitude (even the professional actors of the *commedia dell'arte* were plundering the classics for their improvisations), while the learned elite continued debating whether any of the vulgar languages could ever communicate the wealth of eloquence and learning in the majestic texts of the *antiqui*. Where it focused on translation, the notorious seventeenth-century quarrel between the ancients and the moderns was a sometimes fierce wrangle between those writers who wanted to preserve the primacy of Latin and Greek languages and literatures, both as legacies and as ongoing models for universal humanity, and others who considered the vulgar languages to be the better instruments for modern needs. As Robert J. Nelson puts it, in his concise summary of this complex, transnational dispute, "the Quarrel was the polemical apogee of a tension inherent in Renaissance humanism. The Ancients identified humanism with the uncritical and adulatory transmission of antiquity within fairly delimited literary bounds – humanism with an authoritarian and, largely, aristocratic face. The Moderns identified it as the springboard for critical examination of ancient or modern literature *and* life – humanism with a libertarian and, potentially, democratic face" (Nelson 1989:365). Spilling over into the eighteenth century, these kinds of political subtexts run through many ostensibly linguistic and literary disputes of the day. As Renaissance Latin dominance leveled out, amid ever strengthening

competition among the national vernaculars and regional languages, the defenders of the ancients lost increasingly more partisans through the eighteenth century.

B. A Modern Lingua Franca and the Robes of Thought

Concurrently, translation between the vernaculars was becoming ever more common as well as remunerative, in the newly transnational conditions of the commercial book trade. To broach the sweeping, pan-European impact of the Petrarchan sonnet, for instance, or the Homeric epic or the Theocritean pastoral, is to see how the Greek models work their way northward through intricate chains of inter-vernacular translation history and book circulation. The practice of using French translations of the classics for retranslating into another vernacular, although not new in the seventeenth century (William Caxton had printed his English version of a French *Aeneid* in 1491), received such fresh momentum in these decades that it would persist through the nineteenth century. Plutarch's biographical sketches, for example, were translated into French by Jacques Amyot as *Vies des homes illustres* in 1559-65, and it was that French text that Thomas North translated for his English version and published as Plutarch's *Lives* (1579), which was in turn the 'Plutarch' that Shakespeare used for his plays. It was through such French mediation or interface, as the practice is now called, that much eighteenth-century British philosophy and literature were translated into German, including the works of Locke and Pope.

Similarly, self-translation in this period so often involves French as one of the bilingual writer's languages because French was in many aspects a lingua franca of the early modern era. Frederick the Great wrote (in French) that "French books are spreading so universally that their language is replacing that of the Latins, and at the present time whoever knows French can travel everywhere in Europe without needing an interpreter" (quoted in Lough 1978:165). Such different figures as Leibniz and Catherine the Great wrote in French. Edward Gibbon first published in French (*Essai sur l'étude de la littérature*, London, 1761) before composing his monumental *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* in English. The Academy of Berlin and the Academy of Saint Petersburg both published their proceedings in French. For its prize for the best essay of 1784 the Berlin academy proposed the topic "Qu'est-ce qui a fait de la langue française la langue universelle de l'Europe?"/What is it that has made French the universal language of Europe? Rivarol's famous study entitled *l'Universalité de la langue française* (1784) originated from that contest, although he had to share the prize with a German scholar on the same subject. In his award-winning panegyrics, Rivarol proclaimed that "ce n'est plus la langue française, c'est la langue humaine"/ it is not longer the French language, it is the human language (see Freeman 2003, for a discussion of both the German and French essays).

In Germany indeed the sharp linguistic division between the courtly nobility, who generally spoke French, and the German-speaking middle class, left the vernacular writers in a more precarious position than in many other parts of Europe. Norbert Elias has shown that, through the eighteenth century, French was esteemed chiefly because it entailed "the specific mental orientation and ideals of a courtly-absolutist

society" (Elias 2000:15). Leibniz spoke and wrote French or Latin, but he rarely spoke German. Speaking German in the early modern period usually meant garnishing it with French, Elias reports: Eleazar de Mauvillon, in his *Lettres françoises et germaniques* (1740), wrote that "It is only a few years since one did not say four words of German without two of French" (Elias 2000:11). As for German, he added, each regional group thinks they speak it best, be they Saxons, Austrians, Brandenburgers, or Swiss. Forty years later Frederick the Great writes in *De la littérature allemande* (1780) that German breaks down into as many dialects as there are provinces, and similarly laments the rude and barabaric state of the German vernacular (compared to its French counterpart). But as Elias points out, the great surge of German philosophy, drama, and poetry that so swiftly made German an international literary language was already underway at that time. Perhaps chiefly because their aesthetic traditions were French, neither commentator could discern how rapidly the German vernacular was becoming more rich and supple.

Concerning the chronology or the life-span of this new lingua franca supervening over Latin, Lough claims that French was at the height of its sway as an international language in the eighteenth century, in Europe and the Americas and Asia, then rapidly declined in the wake of the Napoleonic wars in Europe and the expulsion of France from North American and India; thus French was deprived of the chance to become a universal tongue. Yet more recent scholars have shown that French was still considered an essential acquisition by all sorts of educated bourgeois as well as aristocratic men and women, well into the nineteenth and even into the twentieth century (see for example Cohen 1996). For the history of self-translation, it is important to note that as French persisted among cultured elites, so did the long-standing European practice of using *French* translations of ancient and modern texts for retranslating into English, German, Italian, Spanish, and other vernaculars (only in the twentieth century did English replace French in this role). Beginning centuries earlier, as we have seen, this practice, or commercial strategy, arising from sheer expediency as much as from the social prestige of the language, also helps explain why the later Romantic reaction against the "French" manner of translating actually targeted the Gallic modes of translative practice in many other vernaculars as well.

The French language also attained a certain socio-political ascendancy over other vernaculars through the glamour and sheer power of the court of Louis XIV. It is often forgotten that in the tumultuous seventeenth century, several courts in exile took up residence in France, not least the English during their civil war, and that leading literary figures in several languages thus came into close contact with the thriving French translation business that shuttled between Paris and Versailles. In general, as is well known, the "French" translative practice was considered more loose and free, less servile and literal, than other burgeoning national traditions of translations (see Berman 1984). French neoclassical standards of the time required formal rigor and affective power, but only as functions of reasoned proportions on the one hand, and, most especially, aesthetic pleasure. French translative practice was thus fully in step with the dominant poetics, based on strict standards of taste and decorum and "classique" reason, clarity, and harmony. Often to foreigners' dismay, Paris translators enshrined the principle of *la belle infidèle*, the unfaithful translation whose literary

beauties seduce the reader into foregoing mere accuracy, in preference for elegance and nobility of style. Much ink in prefaces and commentaries went to defend this liberal version, or adaptation, as more suited to domestic manners and taste than the author's original and quite foreign text, with its crudeness, oddity, or other unpalatable or improper things. Anne Dacier, French translator of Plautus, Terence, and Homer, thus could not bring herself to speak of anything so crude as Homer's image of the goddess Hera's "cow's eyes," which she deleted (see Oseki-Dépré 1999:30-39, on Dacier and prescriptive eighteenth-century translation theories; and Mounin's now classic study *Les Belle infidèles*, 1955). Texts in other vernaculars received similar treatment. Marie Jeanne Riccoboni, a prolific novelist and friend of Carlo Goldoni (see below), changed the impecunious military officer into an aristocrat, and his sergeant into a lieutenant, when she translated or adapted Fielding's *Amelia* into French (1769).

Jean Chapelain (1595-1674) is another good example of this normative French and European translative practice in the mid-seventeenth century, translating Mateo Alemán's picaresque novel *Guzmán de Alfarache* in 1619-1620. In his preface Chapelain regrets that translation is a necessity among moderns (the ancients could read everything in the original languages), particularly because many translators are more ignorant of the vernacular language than they might seem. For his part, he is delighted to render such a bestseller from Spain ("25 licensed editions") though he must adapt, if not transform it for the Paris audience: "I often found myself constrained to abridge useless things [e.g., seeming digressions] and add necessary ones, above all in the relationships between judgments, which are quite disconnected in the original and hold together rather well in my copy" (151). He has "remedied" errors, added explanatory footnotes, and sought "equivalent proverbs", generally transforming the structure and most constituent elements of the text.

A more breathtaking version of this viewpoint is Nicolas d'Ablancourt's statement in 1654, in his dedication to his Lucian, that "I do not always bind myself either to the words or to the reasoning of this author; and I adjust things to our manner and style with his goal in mind. Different times demand different reasoning as well as words" (d'Ablancourt, Robinson 1997:158). The particularly French note, redolent of French neoclassical aesthetics, is struck when he adds, "I only translate those harangues directly that are fit to assume the airs of eloquence" (1997:161). D'Ablancourt's English counterpart was probably Abraham Cowley, the royalist poet and translator who made Pindar sound like an English metaphysical poet (notably John Donne), in conceits so elaborate that they enraged John Dryden.

Still, even in France this free or "liberal" concept of translation did not go unchallenged. When Gaspard Bachet de Méziriac addressed the new Académie Française on the subject of translation (*De la traduction*, 1635), for example, he chastised translators who took too many liberties. Flatly contradicting Du Bellay and the Pléiade call to freely adapt the ancients to the modern vernacular, and countering the dominant poetics of translation as domestication of the foreign, de Méziriac acknowledged that texts must not offend readers. But he insisted that the translator be faithful (*fidèle*), pitching his argument on the old medieval categories of *auctor* and *sensus*: "si quelqu'un aspire à la louange que mérite une fidèle traduction, il faut qu'il observe

exactement ces trois points; qu'il n'ajoute rien à ce que dit son Auteur, qu'il n'en retranche rien, et qu'il n'y apporte aucun changement qui puisse altérer le sens"/ if someone aspires to the praise that a faithful translation merits, he must follow exactly these three points; let him add nothing to what his Author says, subtract nothing, and bring not the least change that might alter the sense (spelling modernised; Bachet de Méziriac 1998:8). Similarly, commentators in Latin as well, like Pierre-Daniel Huet in *De interpretatione* (1661), urged more deference toward the original, and even the Port Royal authorities demanded that their translators pay close attention to literal renderings (see Ballard 1992).

For the most part, however, foreign exiles in Paris, such as the English writer-translators Abraham Cowley, John Denham, and Thomas Hobbes, returned home with a renewed conviction that translation from the foreign should be designed more to enrich the national language and literature than to serve a foreign author. In England one of the most interesting quarrels about translative practice pits Cowley, Denham, and others, against John Dryden and, in the next century, Alexander Tytler. What seemed at the time like a vast ideological split looks in retrospect more like a slow evolution from one concept of translation toward another. Echoing such French translators as d'Ablancourt, particularly his defense of "the liberties I took" (d'Ablancourt, Robinson 1997:60) and his encomium of the lofty role of the translator who transforms the original to enrich and glorify the vernacular, Denham proclaims that "If Virgil must needs speak English, it were fit he should speak not only as a man of this Nation, but as a man of this age" (preface to his *The Destruction of Troy*, 1656; Robinson 1997:156). Indeed, as his (typically early modern) nationalist verve intensifies, Denham is certain that this "disguise I have put upon him . . . may become him better than that fool's-coat wherein the French and Italian have of late presented him" (1997:156). If Denham seeks to serve his own nation even more than his translative models served theirs, he also wants to be praised for doing a better job of rendering his author – who may be freely embellished in translation, he admits, but, nevertheless, if the ideas "are not his own conceptions, they are at least the results of them" (1997:156).

For his part, John Dryden termed all such "libertine" ways of rendering, whether foreign or English, mere "imitation". As a leading poet who had also translated Homer and Virgil, Dryden tried to navigate a middle way between the two camps, loosely characterized as libertines and literalists, or "steer betwixt the two extremes". In his Dedication of his *Aeneis* (1697), he seemed to do so by praising the strengths of both translative strategies while noting their weaknesses, and coming down on the central proposition that the translator must compromise, that is, respect the spirit if not the letter of the original while fitting it into the aesthetic standards of his vernacular at the present time.

Dryden thus situates himself in a long lineage of translators since the Middle Ages, most recently d'Ablancourt and Cowley, who hold that substantive changes in a text can serve to improve the original for one's contemporary readers, and yet still render the text faithfully. He casts his thesis in a unique vocabulary (the spectrum of fidelity runs from literal metaphrase to paraphrase to free imitation), by way of updating the age-old practice of transformative translations. Still, as though upending tradition for a moment to insert a new stone foundation, Dryden lays an early modern basis for

this practice by tacitly insisting on its rationalist premises. To Dryden adaptations are mere changes of dress that do not affect the essential, rational and universal essence of the work. Thus in the preface to his *Ovid's Epistles* (1680), Dryden states his aim "to vary but the dress, not to alter or destroy the substance": "thought, if it be translated truly, cannot be lost in another language, but the words that convey it to our understanding (which are the image and ornament of that thought) may be so ill chosen as to make it appear in an unhandsome dress, and rob it of its native lustre" (Dryden, Robinson 1997:174). Words as "the more outward ornaments" matter less than the author's "Sence", which includes what later generations term style, "his particular turn of thoughts, and of expression, which are the characters that distinguish, and as it were individuate him from all other writers" (1997:173).

Such notions of the translator's latitude, which had gradually been ever more restricted since Cowley's time, are eventually codified in Alexander Tytler's influential *Essay on the Principles of Translation* (1791). Tytler too chides translators like Cowley, Denham, and others who take too many liberties, particularly those who make Virgil sound like the *Evening Post*. He directs the translator to respect the original text – spirit and letter, "ideas" and "style" – as much as possible, in order to replicate its ease, its aesthetics, and above all its ideas and style: "the translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas [and the 'sentiments'] of the original work", and "the style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original" (Tytler, Robinson 1997:209). This is to reverse the libertine relation to the foreign text (indeed the "admirable versions" of "D'Ablancourt, an author otherwise of very high merit", sacrifice both sense and manner to audience taste; 1997:212). Tytler's marked precedence of the original over its translation, which is emphatically subordinated, situates the original text as the arch value in the translative process. But like Dryden's ostensible compromise, the reversal is not so neat. Because Tytler also wants translation to produce an equivalent effect in readers of both languages, he insists that "the translation shall have all the ease of original composition" (1997:209). On the one hand, Tytler discerns that "a good translator must be able to discover at once the true character of his author's style" and remain true to both sense and manner (1997:210), but on the other hand such fidelity fails if it reproduces blemishes or signs of halting and foreignness, which it is also presumably the translator's task to identify and delete.

One of the precepts of such translation commentaries in the early modern period is that "Rhetorick" or "Stile" is the verbal clothing of "Thought", that is, the robes with which the mind dresses itself for outward expression. Minds are alike. It is expressions that differ, among all the young vernaculars. Indeed the eighteenth century, in many different cities and languages, sees one of the earliest widespread efforts to define the "principles" of translation along basically rationalist, scientific lines. Such endeavors as Tytler's *Principles* arise in part from the still ongoing devolution of language from sacred to secular, but they are no less engaged with philosophical and psychological debates about the nature of thought and communication. Not unlike Tytler in English, the philosopher and Greco-Roman translator Charles Batteux states in French, in his *Principes de littérature* (1747-48), that "we must preserve the figures and forms of the thoughts, because the thoughts are the same in all minds: they are capable of

taking everywhere the same arrangement, the same configuration, the same attitude" (Batteux, Robinson 1997:198).

That concept of universal human thought as capable of existing unanchored in time and cultural space, notably transcending language differences, explains why "ideas may, without ceasing to be the same, be presented under different forms, and be compounded or decompounded in the words used to express them. They may be presented by way of verb, of adjective, of substantive, of adverb" (Batteux, Robinson 1997:198), for they remain pristine human thought transcending mere linguistic forms. Thus in *The Idler* in 1759 Samuel Johnson thunders that the best translator, as Dryden knew, "changes nothing but the language" (Johnson, Robinson 1997:205). Like Dryden in the previous century, who had proclaimed that writers and translators must plunder abroad "for the enrichment of our native language", Johnson later in *Lives of the English Poets* (1779-1781) notes the French rivalry but dismisses it: "from such rivals little can be feared" (1997:206). By the end of the eighteenth century when the *belles infidèles* were flourishing, Johnson speaks for the mainstream, or the dominant concept of language in translation, when he nearly chortles that many translators of the previous century were too poor in spirit to translate well, "and, therefore, translated literally, that their fidelity might shelter their insipidity or harshness" (1997:205).

We should note that throughout the early modern period, faithfulness to the foreign author or fidelity to the original text is clearly not considered to be impossible. But in each generation that much-vaunted virtue is compromised, insofar as other values or cultural priorities supervene to relegate it to secondary or tertiary status. The normative figure during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is the translator as creator of a new work, imitating the original *auctor* but freely exercising his (rarely her) literary skill in his own language. Degrees of freedom or "Gallic" libertinage may diminish over time, but by the end of the Enlightenment it was still a rare translator who produced even a fairly close translation of the original, in our contemporary understanding of those terms. The translations by Tytler and Batteux, for example, two of the sternest exponents of this Enlightenment concept of liberality, would be quickly rejected today if submitted to an editor or publisher, who would find them inordinately free and transformative by contemporary standards. The early modern translation was largely intended to serve several agendas, from those of nascent *natio* and canon to the translator's own literary standing as writer or imitator, for the roles remained mixed.

Meanwhile in many parts of seventeenth-century Europe, the centres of translative activity begin a permanent shift away from the royal courts and into the universities and, increasingly, into the hands of professional printers and booksellers. The eighteenth century sees a rather scruffy class of pirate-translators arise amid the flourishing, pan-European book market linking the major cities, often still competing with royal figures. In Stockholm, for example, one of the leading translators to bring Latin classics into the foundations of the national literature was Erik Schroderus (1570-1647), who was both an official royal translator, censor at the royal printing office, and also by 1630 head of his own printing business in the city. By the eighteenth century, like many vernaculars, Swedish had been immensely strengthened by three events: the printing of the vernacular or Vasa Bible (1541) which standardized the written

language, the rapid strengthening of Swedish as a major translating language after the Reformation (when the preponderance of translative activity entailed putting not Latin but German religious texts into Swedish), and the establishment of a national academy founded in part to advance the national language (1786). In Sweden by 1800 most of the lively market in translating contemporary French and English novels was dominated by self-employed professionals (see Wollin 2001). In general, during the expansion of political states and their overseas empires, translation was widely promoted to advance the nation, both by enriching the national language with new words, and by educating ever more of the people through the study of translated classical texts and contemporary texts from other vernaculars.

Similarly throughout eighteenth-century Europe, censorship continued to control the titles and numbers of books printed, but with only sporadic success. When conditions worsened under absolute monarchy, writers in France or Germany could still publish in the thriving book centres of Amsterdam, Geneva, or London. In such highly politicized printing conditions, texts and their translations circulated in unlikely and often clandestine ways, smuggled over borders, too often bartered for a song, very often hidden behind fake printers' imprints. It was not long before unauthorized translations plagued writers in every language. The most notorious case was Voltaire, who spent a few years in political exile in England: "Voltaire, for instance, while he found it prudent to publish his *Lettres philosophiques* first in an English translation and then follow it up with the French text in a London edition with a Basle imprint, also arranged for a French edition to be produced surreptitiously in Rouen, one which was immediately copied, again on the quiet, by two different Paris booksellers" (Lough 1978:176). The last volumes of the *Encyclopédie* were secretly printed in Paris under the fake imprint of "Samuel Fauche de Neuchâtel". Writers with less financial acumen than Voltaire rarely came out of such conditions even one cent to the good. Most lost not only money but all control over the printing history of their work, even in their native language.

Some of these problems were legalistic ones. Printers in France, for example, had permanent proprietary rights over *any* book they printed. Diderot fought this practice, without notable success, even as David Hume was urging Rousseau to come to London where booksellers paid writers a decent living (Lough 1978:194, 200). Most such problems arose from the rich and growing international market for printed books, which sold so well that it was worth a bit of fraud to cash in on the book trade. Booksellers in several vernaculars besides French were surprisingly successful in the new commercial markets for translations (so ably satirized by the penniless Cervantes in *Don Quijote* II.62). Just as the early sixteenth century had seen an immense output of translations from the ancient world, so the early modern period saw a vast outpouring of translations from French, English, Italian, and Spanish, then also German after the Reformation. Tension quickly arose between writers who clung to Latin as the finest medium of eloquence and learning, and the book trade that was veering so decisively away from classical languages. In Paris in 1665, for example, Father Nicolas Rapin published his Latin poem *Hortorum Libri IV*, even as the poet-translator Jean Chapelain was crowing that Paris printers are more and more reluctant to publish

Latin translations: "ils ne prêtent l'oreille qu'à des traductions en langue vulgaire"/ they only want to hear about translations in the vulgar tongue (Lough 1978:73).

Yet we should also note that in contrast to such heady success and confidence in the vernaculars, it was still fairly routine in the seventeenth century for major vernacular texts of the time to be translated *into* Latin, usually by professional translators and academics but also by other writers. Charles Rollin put many contemporary French poets into Latin, and in England where writers vied to translate Milton and Pope into Latin, well into the eighteenth century their poetic texts continued to appear in different Latin versions. "In literature the idea persisted in some quarters that writing in the vernaculars was like writing in sand, whereas writing in Latin was like working in marble" (Lonsdale 2001:65). Through at least 1750, as Lonsdale says, to present a poet in Latin was to reveal him to the world as a great, that is, a universal writer for all people and all time.

This condition also meant that several writers continued composing directly in Latin. In England alone, Sir Thomas More wrote his *Utopia* (1516) in Latin, as did William Camden his *Britannia* (1587). John Skelton (1460-1529) wrote several texts in Latin. The poet Abraham Cowley (1618-1667) produced a vast amount of work in Latin, even as he was translating other writers' texts from English and other vernaculars into Latin. Francis Bacon (1561-1626) wrote at least half his corpus first in Latin, as did Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) in composing most of his texts. Andrew Marvell (1621-1678) wrote in Greek and Latin as well as English. Many writers of course translated from the Latin, as in earlier periods, and now regularly from other vernaculars as well, such as Dryden (Ovid, Virgil) or Aphra Benn (La Rochefoucauld, Fontanelle), or even the sometime poet Queen Elizabeth I (some Boethius, some Horace).

Among the many writers who were bilingual in Latin-English, those who translated their own work include the major political theorists Bacon and Hobbes. Bacon seems to have written alternately in Latin or English, and self-translated in both directions, although sometimes with a long lag between publication of the two versions. The English version of his ten *Essays* appeared in London in 1597, but the Latin only posthumously in 1638; his major English text, *The Advancement of Learning*, came out in 1605, his Latin translation only in 1623. But Bacon was adamant about getting each of his texts into Latin eventually because, as he wrote in the Dedication of both the Latin and English version of the *Essays*, "I do conceive that the Latin volume of them (being in the universal language) may last as long as books last"/ "Etenim in bona spe sum volumen earum in Latinam (linguam scilicet universalem) versum posse durare, quamdiu libri et literae durent" (quoted in Binns 1990:252). Bacon echoes several vernacular writers across Europe in stressing that Latin is the universal *and* eternal language, in which his texts will not only live a long life but also escape the vagaries of the still evolving vernacular. By contrast Hobbes composed most of his texts on political theory first in Latin and then rather quickly translated them himself into English; the exception was his monumental book on civil government, *Leviathan* (1651), which he published in English before translating into Latin. Because of the work's religious and political views, Hobbes ultimately had to publish the Latin version in Amsterdam (1688). Translator of Thucydides as well as both epics of Homer,

the theoretician also sometimes worked with Bacon to jointly translate many of the latter's other essays into Latin.

Across the Channel, the French philosopher René Descartes (1596-1650) disagreed intellectually with Bacon and Hobbes on fundamental points, yet he shared their commitment both to Latin as the shared medium of thinkers across Europe and, at the same time, to composition in the modern vernacular. He wrote original work in Latin and then in French (the *Regulae ad directionem ingenii*, 1628, is followed by the *Discours de la méthode* in 1637), and vice versa (the *Meditationes de Prima Philosophia*, 1641, is followed by *Les Passions de l'âme*, 1649). By contrast, following Bacon and Hobbes, many leading political theorists in Europe, such as Montesquieu in the eighteenth century, write nothing whatsoever in Latin. Indeed Montesquieu mocks the "Ancients" who claim Latin is still a living language: In *Les Lettres persanes* (1721) a swaggering savant, foolishly proud of his new translation of Horace, is told that translations of the ancients are like copper coins (*monnaies de cuivre*), a devalued currency of Greco-Roman ideas now two thousand years old, good only for the general population, whereas an efficient thinker needs gold, the living vernacular in which he can think efficiently (Letter 128). At a similar moment along the arc of vernacularization, as inter-vernacular translation becomes more common, such poets as Elizabeth Carter (1717-1806), the prominent translator of Epictetus, publish their own poems in bilingual format, in her case with French translations *en face* (1796).

Another important factor in these early modern language disputes, one that filters through the work of nearly all self-translators of the period, is royal aegis, or most often its opposite, royal exile. The royal courts in this period exert a kind of gravitational pull that continues to affect translation history, although in this age of absolute monarchies there are also strong effects from royal expulsions, banishments, and exile. Conditions of exile run through translation history of the early modern era like a leitmotiv. Just as the translators accompanying the exiled English court to Paris in the seventeenth century helped shape British translation history in part through their experience of the French practice, so a few decades later the French king's revocation of the legal protection of Protestants (1686) dispersed massive numbers of French Huguenots across Europe, with many settling in England. The impact on English translating practices and markets was immense. We owe the important French-English dictionary, *The Compleat French Master* (1694), for example, to the exile of Huguenot Abel Boyer (1667-1729). Similarly in Spain, after the Jews were expelled (1492), many fled to Constantinople and to Italy (settling in Venice and Ferrara), where from the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries several exiled scholars produced translations of great reach and influence, including "the Ferrara Bible" or "Spanish Bible of exile" (1553). This sacred text, now stripped of Christic and Mariological interpretation, "went all over Europe and even to the community in Cairo and served as a gloss for those Sephardic Jews who could still decipher Hebrew" (Barnstone 1993:196). When the political tables turned, some 4,000 Spanish Jesuits, exiled in 1767, settled in Italy and regularly sent back translations of Latin and Italian literatures in Castilian, thus opening the way for an Italian presence in the Spanish Golden Age. Again within a few years, following the restoration of absolute monarchy in Spain, many liberal writers and translators fled to exile in London during the 1820s, just as French

Huguenots had done in the seventeenth century (on Spanish exiles, see Pym 2001:556-67). There geo-linguistic currents of exile were rarely one-way. Exiles often returned home again, or at least published new work there, deepening the channels of exchange in literary poetics no less than translative practices.

C. Encountering the Languages of the Americas

In the new world of the Americas, however, translating conditions were quite different, generating different kinds of translators, texts, and concepts of the translator's role. While Europeans marveled at wondrous tales of strange lands and heathen people, there were some important distinctions between such entities as "New England" and "New Spain". The Spanish presence, largely in Mexico and points south, was closely managed by the royal court at Madrid, and its managerial class was as aristocratic as in other colonial enterprises but distinctly Old World Catholic. But the largely Protestant undertakings in points north entailed a sometimes fervent hope that the centre of Christianity might be moving in the seventeenth century from the decadent Old World to the New. As Anne C. Myles says, echoing the standard view today, the colonialists' goal of Indian conversions was not their ultimate aim, insofar as "it also existed as part of a larger religio-historical vision, the *translatio imperii et studii* . . . For Protestants, while the idea of the Roman imperium no longer applied directly, the vision persisted in the idea of the shifting dynamic center of the Christian world. From an English Puritan perspective, this center had moved to England's churches; if civilization could be brought to America, this locus would be extended or even – the most thrilling possibility for New Englanders – relocated altogether" (Myles 2000:93). This rather millennial notion, as many scholars have shown, threads into the foundations of Protestant American translative practice.

One premise underlying all such colonialist aspiration, Christian and other, is the primacy of language in civilizing the human being and thereafter in saving souls. As Stephen J. Greenblatt first put it, the practical tenet of both modes of colonial conquest, south and north, was in fact "linguistic colonialism": descending among naked savages, one brought language, and therewith civilization, and thereby the Christian religion, to peoples who had none (Greenblatt 1976:562). In the Americas, the medieval formula of *translatio imperii* (see our Introduction, above) is transposed from a geo-political plane to a geo-religious one, but the centres of power remain just as clear. They are also just as dependent on translation, in both senses, logistic and linguistic, to succeed.

In both northern and southern regions, interpretive strategies were often brutal. One common way to communicate with indigenous peoples was to capture one of them, force him (usually a boy) to learn the captor's vernacular, then return to the native village and use him as interpreter. Baldly stated, colonial language immersion was "accomplished in large part through kidnapping," as Karttunen says, although he adds that the opposite sometimes occurred, when Europeans found themselves cut off, in "involuntary isolation among the indigenes" (Karttunen 2000:215). Many settlers, traders, and travellers probably learned native languages rather well, although the

record is scant. Most clearly relied on interpreters who had varying levels of linguistic ability, commitment to exact communication, and candor. Louise M. Burkhart has tracked a case of Nahuatl translators in Mexico around 1600 who would seem to have done a fair rendering into Nahuatl of a Spanish play (based on a Bible scene), that was frequently performed during Holy Week. Burkhart notes that it is the oldest extant dramatic script in a Native-American language, and that the friar in whose collection the manuscript was found clearly believed it to reflect Christian belief and practice. When the manuscript was examined closely by this bilingual, Nahuatl-speaking scholar, it became obvious that the translator subverted many of the liminal Christian teachings by reworking them into Nahuatl cultural categories, asserting native ideas and values to "encode validations of native cultural practices" (Burkhart 2000:87). As Burkhart concludes, "This presumes a critical evaluation of the text, decisions regarding how best to adjust it to the interpreter's ends, and strategies for implementing those changes in the process of producing the translation" (2000:87).

Had they known the extent to which such subversive translative techniques pervaded the colonialist enterprise in the Americas, friars and preachers might have been aghast. And yet ironically, it seems that Native-American translators in such conditions were actually practicing the kind of "liberal" translating that d'Ablancourt and Dryden had praised and that Europeans in early modern Europe had enshrined as normative procedure, when not high art. Liberally, inexactly adapting Virgil to early modern English culture or Ovid to Versailles is not such a great remove from adapting the Spanish Bible to Nahuatl culture in Mexico. In both cases the translator adapts the text to fit the receiving culture's conventions. The primary difference, of course, is that the primitive American translator had no permission, no license granted from the civilized world, to do so.

"Primitive" remained an important category of description in the encounter between Europeans and the hundreds of new languages in the Americas. Although overland travel to Asia had brought familiarity with some Asian languages in earlier periods, the seaborne empires of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries revealed an entirely new half of the world extending from the Arctic circle to Tierra del Fuego. The diversity of peoples and speech was astonishing, chiefly because it did not fit into the dominant rubrics of theological and philosophical concepts of language, especially the widespread scientific project of the European seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to find a perfect language. As Gray puts it, such a language "would be to general thought and communication what numbers were to mathematics . . . It would allow truths to reveal themselves . . . without being obscured by the various failings of human speech or differences of human culture", adding that "the idea was that such a system, much like Roman or Arabic numerals, could eliminate the need for translation, at least in written discourse" (Gray 2000:7-8). Extending from Bacon's mistrust of the relation between words and things to later, almost mystical quests for the pure sign system or *ars signorum*, the early modern desire to identify the first, or the most universal, or the purest language, was a complex endeavor running through many fields of inquiry (see the discussion by Law 1988:129-175). But it was soon obvious that the discovery of so many new languages in the Americas, not only in different writing systems but also in total isolation from each other, "made it necessary to rethink the theory of an

original language common to all mankind" (Lerner 2000:282).

For a man emerging from the vertical world of Renaissance Latin, the sheer multiplicity was staggering: "What mortal intellect could understand so great a diversity of tongues, of habits, of customs, in the men of these Indies?" (quoted in Lerner 2000:283). The isomorphic relation between language and reality, as validated by the "universal" structures of Greek and Latin (such as nouns as distinct from verbs), and thereby the assumption of one divine truth underlying diversity, seemed to break down in the face of these strange scripts. One solution was to label them savage or primitive, as an early stage in the evolution toward the civilised linguistic state. Another was to erase them, as degenerate or deviant abnormalities.

As Rüdiger Schreyer has shown, evidence adduced in the early modern era about "uncivilised" uses of language in Europe had mostly come from feral or deaf children. Rather suddenly the plethora of new information about American "savage" languages, chiefly in missionaries' accounts and travellers' reports, was being collected, translated, and published for reader's fascinated study, by such compilers as Richard Eden (1521-1576), Richard Hakluyt (1552-1616), Samuel Purchas (1575-1626), and Charles de Brosses (1709-1777). Philosophers of language made Amerindian languages fit into their schema of linguistic progress from primitive simplicity to Latinate sophistication, whereas theologians defended the Biblical principle of monogenesis. Both schools of thought used the "savage" languages to prove the opposite case: "The orthodox Christian theory clung to the concept of a monogenetic, divine, and perfect language, confused at Babel and deteriorating ever since. The (r)evolutionary new theory argued for linguistic progress from unstructured simplicity to structured complexity" (Schreyer 2000:319). John Locke in his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1689) had described language as human communication and as a society's means for the transmission of knowledge, that is, basically as a social construct changing in time and circumstance, rather than a universally signifying mechanism for transmitting eternal truths. He did not mention primitive languages, nor did Bernard Mandeville in his *Fable of the Bees* (1729), which pursued this secular line of reasoning about languages as the products of social requirements, perfected by people for the common good. Gradually this loosely progressivist, social view came into increasing conflict with the residually medieval Christian view of linguistic change as decay, the continual falling away from the lost perfection of Eden, and the scattering of Babel. As Schreyer shows, reference to particular "wild languages" was absent in Locke (1632-1704), Condillac (1715-1780), and Mandeville (1670-1733), but it increased rapidly in the works of language theorists Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1788), Lord Mondobbo (1714-1799), and Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803). "Whoever would trace human nature up to its source, must study very diligently the manners of barbarous nations," wrote Lord Mondobbo, for man in the state of nature speaks language in the state of nature, and primitives' speech can teach us about the origins and essence of language itself (see Schreyer's discussion of these theorists relative to "savage" languages, 2000:317-20).

Not surprisingly, thinkers from opposing theological and secular philosophical domains did not align neatly on either side of this question. In the sixteenth century the ordinances of the Council of Trent had "expressly favored the use of vernacular

languages (*vulgares linguas*) for religious instruction of the people and ordered publication of catechisms in them. This policy indirectly encouraged evangelization in the Native American languages that were deemed the most important numerically" (Lerner 2000:285). But the result was that in tandem the Spanish royal court and Church favored only certain indigenous languages (such as Nahuatl in Mexico, and in South America Guaraní and Quechua) for preservation, as useful means of evangelization and agricultural instruction, and worked vigorously to eradicate the others.

In Europe meanwhile, since the first grammars of European vernaculars, dating from the sixteenth century, "were modelled mostly after Latin grammar, it was hardly surprising that the Latin framework was used to describe New World languages" (Jooken 2000:298-299). Just as Latin-based grammars continued to be used in Europe through the eighteenth century to teach the vernaculars, such as modern Italian to a French schoolboy, so the interpretation of these new languages from the Americas was filtered through the "universal properties" of Latin, and found wanting in both sophistication and substance. The results are amusing today, but they matter less than the early modern linguists' concept of their task: Presuming the Latin lineage of French, La Salle de l'Étang introduced his French eighteenth-century grammar of the Indian language Galibi (*Dictionnaire Galibi*, 1763), for example, saying, "What can be easier? We will briefly explain the principles of the French language, and afterwards apply them to the language of the Galibis" (Jooken 2000:299). Any features of Galibi that differed from Latin or French were simply omitted from La Salle de l'Étang's dictionary and accompanying essay, as irrelevant. In one respect, then, even in the close study of these new vernaculars by their European interpreters, the gulf was clearly widening between their inherited assumptions and the actual cultural differences that people were encountering all around them in travel in both the Old and New Worlds. The universalist perspective required either questioning one's world view or severely blinkering it. La Salle de l'Étang was not unusual in the latter course, concluding that the primitive "Galibis have nothing in their language that makes distinctions of gender, of number, and of case, for which there should be six in the declensions of each word" (Jooken 2000:300). To have found rational structures in the New World languages would have overturned too many Old World premises about human nature and the divine order of history and language.

From Spain in the eighteenth century, the language policy of the Bourbons and Charles III increasingly enforced Spanish upon the peoples of New Spain, both by expelling the Jesuits from the Americas (they had insisted on the local vernacular for instruction and confession) and by decreeing in 1770 that "Spanish" (Castilian) would be the language in force. Still, as printing presses were being established on the south as much as on the north coast of the Americas, multiple copies of bi- and trilingual dictionaries were not uncommon by 1800 (Lerner describes the first printed texts in New Spain, 2000:288-290). Originally for use in oral interpretation, bilingual Euro-Amerindian dictionaries rapidly increased in lexical coverage, soon becoming writers' tools as well.

Many different kinds of interface occurred between all these different groups of Europeans and Americans, north and south. Interpreters and translators were an essential part of the encounter, and remained so for several hundred years. Historians

in turn relied on their work, very often, in compiling later histories. In New England, for example, as Robert Blair St. George says, early English colonial history begins around 1620 when the first accounts by colonial settlers are written, "but early colonial history for Mohegan or Pequot peoples in Connecticut did not begin in earnest until after 1750, when the letters of [indigenous interpreter-translators] Joseph Johnson and Samson Occum and the writings of Samuel Apess open ambivalent native subject positions to view" (St. George 2000:15). Because even self-translation in the Americas was predominantly oral, most records of it are lost. Literary self-translation, on the other hand, while it continues to occur from Latin to vernaculars, is also increasingly inter-vernacular and, in both modes, often bridges audiences in Europe and the Americas. These early modern bilingual texts continue to show the typical divergence between versions addressed to different audiences.

For example, although it was not widely known at the time in Europe or America, the very popular *Letters of an American Farmer* (London, 1782-1787) were actually the work of a Frenchman recently arrived in America, Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur (Michel Guillaume Jean de Crèvecoeur, 1735-1813), speaking through the voice of Joseph, his fictional "American farmer". When he returned to Paris in 1781, Crèvecoeur published his translation (and amplification) of his American text in French as *Lettres d'un cultivateur américain depuis l'année 1770 jusqu'à 1781* (1784-1787). Still considered today one of the keystones of United States literature, this text was, in the early modern welter of new cultural spaces and languages, the work of a Frenchman. He seemed, in English, anti-royalist and sympathetic with the colonists, but in his later self-translation he somewhat dropped the guise of "American farmer" and, overall, seemed rather more sympathetic to the British (see Cook 1996; Ruttenberg 1998; and the biography of Crèvecoeur by Allen and Asselineau 1987). Such early modern self-translation, as in the bilingual texts studied below by John Donne and Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz in poetry of the seventeenth century, and Carlo Goldoni in theatre of the eighteenth century, faced a new kind of challenge in addressing world-spanning audiences.

The following section moves into close readings of early modern self-translations. We again remind the reader that while each case of self-translation is unique, and bound to certain period constraints, in sequential treatment they show how each writer within such delimitations finds his or her own modes of functional correspondence, that is, of redirecting the text for reception by the second reading (or performance) culture.

To forego such specifics, and continue following this overview of changing concepts of language and translation into the Romantic period, however, the reader can go directly to the opening section of Part 3.

D. Self-Translators

(1) Satiric Voices in Bilinguality: John Donne

The seventeenth century, partly through the new translations of Aristotle, Galen, and Pliny, saw the beginnings of the scientific investigation of nature that inform the

poetics of two bilingual writers of this era, John Donne in England (1572-1631) and Sor Juana de la Cruz (1648?-1695) in Mexico or "New Spain". While the Golden Age was waning in Spain, in England scientific thought was gaining new ascendance. Francis Bacon's Latin treatise *Novum Organum* (1620) helped advance the empirical methods that had been instated by Copernicus in the 1520s and that were being promoted in both Latin and the vernaculars by such figures as the Italian Galileo Galilei on the mathematical laws of gravity, the German Johannes Kepler on the universe as heliocentric, and the Englishman William Harvey on the human body itself as a circulating system of blood. Meanwhile the Reformation, similarly whetted by translations of the Bible into several vernaculars, challenged papal jurisdiction even as it leveled still more than in earlier periods the once vertical hierarchy of languages. The King James translators, for instance, wrote in the preface to their translation of the Bible that there is "No cause why the word translated should be denied to be the word" (1951:xxiii). In London the energetic Tudor translators provided access to whole other vernacular worlds, as in Florio's version of Montaigne that percolates through Shakespeare's tragedies and comedies. Travel journals, exoticist fictions, and fictive utopias proliferated, often eventuating from the same publishers of the new scientific treatises and the print news pamphlets. Amid widening strands of literary neoclassicism, a new kind of "metaphysical" poetry arose, designed to compare human emotional experience with astronomy, music, medicine, geography, as well as with Christian theology and neoplatonic philosophy, to demonstrate the universal harmony of all things in man and nature. Elaborate correspondences or conceits were detailed through systematic sets of far-reaching metaphors spanning theology and the new sciences.

Donne and Sor Juana participate fully in this rather heady mix of science and poetics, although both writers demurred from the empirical consensus at significant points. Donne worried that the once secure natural order of the cosmos had fragmented, in the search for new kinds of organization and interpretation, in a cacophony of individualistic "pieces" ("Tis all in pieces, all coherence gone", *The First Anniversary*, 1611). He often satirized, as in his "Progress of the Soule" (1601) on the migration of the soul of Eve's apple through the bodies of different heretics. Sor Juana tended rather to ironise. Both writers, the Anglican priest and the Catholic nun, wrote a body of work that modern critics tend to divide into two parts, splitting their secular (even erotic) texts from their religious texts, largely because they both enjoyed the pleasures of life before taking religious vows, suffering personal reverses, and ending in renewed commitment to (they agreed) a merciful God. Critically, such division obscures the greater resemblances that suffuse all their work in different times and genres. Ecstasy in love, whether entailing explicit sexual delight in Donne or implicit erotic undertones in Sor Juana, shapes their best known texts in either mode, where both poets work rather ambidextrously to transpose emotional figures and registers into divine realms of spirit and formal theology. The result, known as metaphysical verse in English and *barroco* in Spanish, is highly sensual and extravagantly intellectual in tropes and effects, as in Donne's phrase "canonized for love" (*The Canonization*), notably by "love (whose soul is sense)" (*A Valediction: Forbidden Mourning*). The sensual transmutes to the spiritual – though still within the realm of mortal pleasure for Donne, and in

the earthly domain of the knowing mind for Sor Juana. In this they differ from both the dominant church traditions of mystic verse and the scientific materialism of their intellectual contemporaries. Donne's injunction to "batter my heart, three-personed God" (*Divine Meditations*) is echoed in Sor Juana's reference to herself as "Esclava del Trino Dios"/slave of the triune God (see below).

Much of their work, especially Sor Juana's, incorporates the neoplatonic precept that poetic writing transcends the world of appearances and thereby imitates divine truth directly. The human mind can apprehend the truths of *realia*, through reason, but only the neoplatonic poet can transcend ordinary reason through hermetic symbolism (such as the light of truth, or the chariot of the soul). Clearly, scientific materialism serves these early modern writers as an important pathway for the mind's knowledge of the world, but only as antechamber or threshold for further journeying toward higher "spheres". In these two ecclesiastical poets in particular, the highest and lowest domains can conjoin in the sweet mysteries of the lover's body, for example, where the flesh is never without faint allusion to the Incarnation, in hermetic polyphonics. Both writers are Latin-vernacular bilinguals, in the residual mode of bilinguality characterizing this first half of the early modern period.

Donne was born into a family of successful Catholic merchants in England. When his father, who had been a member of the Ironmongers' Company, died in 1576, Donne's mother (distantly related to Sir Thomas More) married a Catholic doctor named John Syminges, who would become president of the Royal College of Physicians. Following an early education by Catholic tutors, Donne went to Oxford University (notably to Hart Hall, which welcomed Catholics), yet he never received his Oxford degree, since he refused to sign the oath of allegiance to the English crown, thus preserving his strong Catholic beliefs. Some time after 1591, he was in London at Lincoln's Inn, the centre for legal study, which also admitted Catholics. There is no evidence that he ever intended to take up a legal career, and he spent his time in London social life. He frequented the theatre and certain neoclassical literary circles, and in these years he produced abundant literary work, chiefly satires, verse letters, elegies, and epigrams. After joining naval expeditions against Spain in the 1590s, he became Sir Thomas Egerton's secretary around 1597, but this career was brought to a crashing halt when he eloped in 1601 with Ann More, a 17-year-old cousin of Sir Egerton. With his financial resources exhausted, Donne relied increasingly on other literary patrons, and his remarkable verse satires ensured his place in the turn-of-the-century London literary scene around 1600. His writing during roughly 1605-1611 engaged with moral and theological controversies of the day. Although he had long argued against sectarianism of any sort, he also feared for the immortality of his soul, as in many of the *Holy Sonnets* from 1608 to 1610. Urged by royal patrons to enter the ministry, he took holy orders in 1615, became an Anglican priest, was named a royal chaplain, and eventually served as Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, from 1621 until his death.

Despite his strong friendship with Ben Jonson and his other links with English seventeenth-century neoclassicism, in his writings Donne established a distinct voice by veering off from then standard literary models. In his satires in particular, Donne often chose to imitate classical authors, such as Juvenal, rather than medieval satirists

in the manner of such contemporaries as Spenser. Although best known today as a metaphysical poet, Donne was a noted theological writer in prose, and indeed his prime self-translated text is a prose work on theological matters as embodied in certain historical figures.

Donne's first extended works in prose include the *Biathanatos: A Declaration of that Paradoxe . . . that Selfe-homicide is not so naturally a Sinne, that it may never be otherwise* (1607-1608?), the *Pseudo-Martyr* (1610), and the self-translated *Conclaue Ignati* / *Ignatius his Conclave* (1611). Of these three works, the *Pseudo-Martyr* sets out to show that those Catholics who promulgate resistance to swearing the oath of fealty to King James will not in fact earn a true martyr's crown, but will instead, in denying the rightful rule of England's lawful king, be committing a social form of suicide. Explicitly dedicated to James I of England, the text can surely be credited with bringing Donne to the sudden attention of the king, and also earning him the long-delayed degree from Oxford.

How did Donne, in less than twenty years, transform from the staunch Catholic, refusing to sign the oath of monarchical allegiance, into the author of two tremendously influential anti-Catholic tracts, both the *Pseudo-Martyr* and the self-translated *Conclaue Ignati* / *Ignatius His Conclave*–one of the most spirited and public literary attacks against the Jesuits? In these years in Counter-Reformation England, there were strong theological reasons for Donne's anger with the Catholic Church and with the Jesuits in particular. Donne lays these out in the *Pseudo-Martyr*'s nearly four hundred pages of text. He focuses primarily on what he calls the Jesuit's insistence on slavish, even blind adherence to non-authoritative doctrine established late in the Church's history, though he also decries the glorification of and "blind Obedience" to the pope as threatening to deflect the true believer away from the centrality of Christic sacrifice. Fluent in canon law and patristic sources, the *Pseudo-Martyr* is, without question, a serious intellectual work. In contrast, Donne's second major prose critique of the Jesuits, published anonymously as *Conclaue Ignati: Siue eivus In Nvperis Inferni Comitiis Inthronisatio* (1611), is no less learned, yet significantly more comic. Its most recent critical editor, T. S. Healy, even goes so far as to say that as a "light-hearted booklet" it is at odds with the magisterial text that precedes it (Healy 1969:xviii). Yet both the *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Conclaue Ignati* participate in the contemporary debate over royal supremacy that pitted King James and his cabinet against Cardinal Robert Bellarmine and other Jesuit royal detractors in England. Healy adduces the debate between James I and Cardinal Bellarmine to resolve the apparent contradiction in Donne's sudden Anglicanism. He argues that Donne's text (both the Latin and English versions) is "a series of deliberate feints and glancing blows, not a direct assault on Bellarmine or defence of James. . . all the major issues are touched, but each of them is mocked and distorted in the process. Even the art of controversy itself is mocked" (1969:xxiv). The anonymous self-translation, published as *Ignatius his Conclaue: or His Inthronisation in a late Election in Hell,* appeared only a few months after the *Pseudo-Martyr*. Thus many critics speculate that this text was written in only six weeks, and probably at the king's request. The *Conclaue/Conclave* shows many signs of high-level, possibly royal patronage, and indeed Healy notes that in order to write it Donne needed access to a contemporary and extensive library of Catholic theology:

of the 56 direct citations in the text, 37 are from books published after 1600, and 18 of those were published in 1609 or 1610, leading Healy to conclude that this must have been, in seventeenth-century conditions, a "controversial library", surely one with "quasi-official" patronage (1969:xxix). The fact that Donne wrote first in Latin also suggests a learned target audience: "Certainly the only audience capable of seeing the finesse of Donne's satire would have found the Latin a natural form" (1969: xxvii). We should also note that the *Conclaue Ignati* was reprinted in 1626, right at the beginning of the new reign (of a Catholic queen), and again in 1634, upon the arrival of papal observer Gregorio Panzini in London.

The *Conclaue*/*Conclave* is focused on a dream *visio*: the narrator has a vision of Hell, where he navigates through chamber after chamber, only to suddenly discover a secret chamber that Lucifer has reserved for "innovators". While the narrator looks on, Lucifer is interviewing Copernicus, Paraclesus, Columbus, Philip Neri, Machiavelli, and Ignatius of Loyola, to determine which one would make the best assistant for him. As a whole, the satire revolves around Ignatius's attempts to downplay the innovations of the others, or to co-opt them into Jesuit achievement. Lucifer himself is alarmed at the extent of Ignatius's ambition, although he also recognizes that Machiavelli is perhaps the most serious contender (Machiavelli, noted for his brutal appraisal of political power, had by then become a stock villain on the Elizabethan stage). In the wide diversity of "innovators" presented for satiric scrutiny, Donne reveals his conservative posture toward the Jesuits, for whom he reserves his most pointedly comic notes, while dazzling the reader with the depth and breadth of his philosophical and scientific engagements. The scientific dimensions of his satire are particularly remarkable in that Donne profiles the ideas not only of Copernicus, but also those of Kepler and even Galileo, whose *Siderus Nuncius* had been published in Venice only months before the appearance of the *Conclaue*.

Although not as intellectually weighty as the *Pseudo-Martyr* or his later sermons, the *Conclaue* is an important text in Donne's prose canon and in cultural histories of the period. As a bilingual text, moreover, the *Conclaue* helped secure Donne's status as a major Latinist, even as the immediate appearance of the *Conclave* in Donne's English translation confirmed his (and the text's) central position in the contemporary debates about royal versus papal authority. The sheer speed in producing the English version suggests that it was overtly aimed to further general awareness and understanding of Donne's argument by doubling its audience in the public controversy. Technically, however, both language versions were published anonymously, with no indication of author, place, or date. Healy, as editor of the now standard bilingual critical edition of Donne's text, notes that the title *Conclaue Ignati* first appears on the Stationers' Register in 1611, and that five months later, an English copy appears on the same register. Healy finds that nevertheless the *Conclaue* was most likely written in 1610, for it makes reference not only to Galileo's 1610 text, but also to the assassination of Henri IV on May 14 of that year. Given the ostensible anonymity of both versions and the "greater rhetorical polish" of the Latin, as Healy calls it, he considers the question of whether Donne actually authored the English translation, and ends accepting the collective judgment of past centuries of Donne scholarship that Donne did in fact do so (1969:xiii). This is still the universally accepted critical

view today, and although we endorse it, Healy's points justifying bilingual authorship merit further consideration.

Healy draws his evidence from two sources: external historical evidence, chiefly claims made by his son, and textual attribution assigned by Donne's own contemporaries; and internal evidence, chiefly matters of style. On Donne's bilingual style, Healy's comments are framed by the curious observation that "it is difficult to translate one's own prose" (1969:xiii). While it is unclear why it might be more difficult to translate one's prose than one's verse (indeed, one might well conclude just the opposite, given the demands of neoclassical verse form), Healy is assigning much critical weight to Donne's intellectual capacity in Latin and his presumed familiarity with the Latin version of the text. Healy concludes that Donne is likely to have thought or visualized each sentence in Latin, rather than in English; thus "When [Donne] came to translate [*Conclaue Ignati*], he faced the usual problems of fitting into English a work which had been both thought and written in Latin. Perhaps because of this, he felt free in his translation to change and expand the text", and Healy appends "a complete list of the differences between the two versions" in an appendix (1969:xiii). As in many, if not most, studies of bilingual texts, Healy bases his conclusions on questions of difference, while neglecting to consider similarity, and his catalogue of differences between the two language versions plays a determinate role in his attribution of the English version to Donne. He finds considerable measures of internal coherence or equivalency within each version, despite several seemingly incommensurate aspects (changes and expansions) between the two versions. He also tracks his measures of internal coherence or equivalency in lexical terms beyond the text, outwards from the two language versions to other works of Donne's: "ideas, phrases, and sometimes whole sentences" from the English version can be seen in other of his works, which both predate and postdate the Latin publication (1969:xiv). In this analysis, Donne's entire corpus becomes the stylistic proving ground for bilingual self-translation.

In highlighting the question of textual manipulation, that is, the degree to which Donne "felt free in his translation to change and expand a text", Healy encounters one of the linguistic aspects most deeply embedded in Reformation and Counter-Reformation debates: the extent to which the Bible was to be interpreted as grounded in historical context, or as an historically unmoored text, a purely spiritual instrument for attaining salvation. As is well known, it is particularly in this era that the Bible became a testing ground for many sorts of clashes between scientific or empirical viewpoints and religious truths knowable only through faith. For Calvin and Luther both, the verdict was evident: no manipulation of Biblical text was acceptable. Yet such humanists as Valla and Erasmus founded their understanding of the Bible on philological study, as historical contingency. Little by little, others began to declare that the Bible should be opened up to examination, to testing by natural laws and scientific analysis and investigation.

Donne's position along this divide is rather difficult to discern. For Donne, following Augustinian tradition, memory is the primary seat of self-knowledge. Insofar as we can know God, we can do so only through self- knowledge. Augustine had posited memory as coming directly from God, and he drew a tight distinction in the *De Trinitate* between *scientia* (rational judgments on the act of God) and *sapientia*

(delight in the grace of God). Donne's writings seem to bridge the Augustinian model of knowledge and other, both earlier and later literary models of selfhood in which the self, governed by the rational soul, is incapable of perfect knowledge. It is in this context that the poet cites the trope of the Tower of Babel:

> They who did labour Babels tower to 'erect
> Might have considered, that for that effect,
> All this whole solid Earth could not allow
> Nor furnish forth materials enow;
> And that this Center, to raise such a place,
> Was far too little, to have been the Base.
> (*First Anniversary*, 417-422; quoted in Allen 1949:482; Anselment 1971:188)

This figure of the Tower of Babel refers to more than the pride of man in his quest for ultimate knowledge of God. In the seventeenth century, it was also commonly thought that the Tower of Babel had been built in an attempt to immortalize the names of the builders who were erecting it to ward off the effects of another flood (Anselment 1971). Thus, in Donne's stanza, the failure of the project is not simply one of mathematical impossibility (there not being enough physical material to reach heaven). Instead Donne uses the Tower to reconfigure the entire earth itself, as the seemingly solid but insufficient centre-base of this scene of humans' quest for knowledge, in raising the tower. Donne mocks the vanity of the effort to use "the whole solid earth" as the (terrestrial) grounds of human knowledge, and prideful construction. The conditional "might have considered" underscores human ignorance, and indeed it is rational thought itself that has proved insufficient to raise human intelligence and learning up to the level of divine intelligence. That the Tower of Babel resulted in the hopeless fragmentation of human language also implicates language itself as insufficient to grasp the ultimate unity of the divine. All human "materials" are "far too little". One implication is that whether the Bible be read in Latin or in the English of King James's court, no matter: careful study of the text may enable one's scriptural authority, but cannot gain one entrance to divine truth.

It is in this conceptual context that Donne deploys the figure of Copernicus in his bilingual text. Eloquently addressing Lucifer, the astronomer announces, "Is sum, qui tui misertus, in centrum mundi detrusi, te una cum tuo ergastulo, hac terra, ad coelos ita evexi, ut nec Deo liceat sua vindicta frui" / I am he who, pitying thee who wert thrust into the Centre of the world, raysed both thee, and thy prison, the Earth, up into the Heavens; so as by my meanes God doth not enjoy his revenge upon thee (1969:12.30-31, 14.1-2; 15). This role as deflector of God's revenge, and as virtually cosmic actor, is a noble one indeed. Having "raysed" the earth to orbit the sun, Donne's bilingual Copernicus can pity Lucifer as his inferior.

Here in the halls of Hell, Copernicus is the first of the "innovators" Lucifer encountered, and in the rebels' debate, vying for Lucifer's throne, the wily Ignatius quickly discerns that Copernicus is no real match for him. Donne's narrator clearly conveys sympathy for Copernicus, as critics have noted, and it seems clear to the reader that

Copernicus may well have been right in his theory that the planets revolve around the sun; Donne even hints that there were other thinkers before Copernicus working towards the same conclusion. Long considered a mere prop for his satirical attack on the Jesuits (Coffin 1958:201), Donne's use of astronomy in this text has received new attention in recent years. Through the Copernicus figure and his tropes of astronomy, Donne navigates the rather perilous shoals of new scientific truth. Hassel concludes that, for Donne, the real sin was not the establishment of new scientific truths, but rather the human tendency to be "overconfident in the permanence of these new worldly truths" (Hassel 1971:329). To examine is not heretical; to seek truth through science rather than faith, however, is. Only a union of the two might bring about permanent correspondence between the realms.

Another vision-scene in Donne's *Conclaue*/*Conclave* animates such theological precepts even more vividly, reprising the Tower of Babel in serio-comic, satirical critique. The narrator cries out:

> O eximios & incredibiles *Hypercriticos*! Qui non ex fragmentis marmoreis, sed ex ipsis Inferni Archivis, ex ipsa *Luciferi*, *Papae*, *Ignatii*, virorum vere aequivicorum mente, linguam *Turris Babylonicae* diu obrutam, iterum resuscitarunt. (1969:26: 12-16)

> O wonderfull, and incredible *Hypercritiques*, who, not out of marble fragments, but out of the secretest Records of Hell itselfe: that is, out of the minds of *Lucifer*, the *Pope*, and *Ignatius*, (persons truly equivocall) have raised to life againe the language of the Tower of *Babel*, too long concealed, and brought us againe from understanding one another. (1969:27: 16-20)

The narrator imagines these figures, whom he is watching debate in Hell, as striving in their debate to raise a new Tower of Babel – once again not an actual tower, but a conceptual one. He stresses that this is not a Babelian tower built from marble blocks (*fragmentis marmoreis*/ marble fragments). Rather this tower is a construction of ideas: these are the infernal ideas recorded in the archives of Hell and gleaned from the minds of Satan, the Pope, and Ignatius of Loyola. These figures have brought the *linguam* of the tower back to life: they are all, in other words, seeking to challenge divine knowledge and only producing confusion. The English version intensifies the bare Latin "Inferni Archivi" as "*secretest* Records of Hell", more overtly deriding these Jesuitical thinkers as scheming conspirators. In English Donne also amplifies the effects of this infernal kind of thinking when he adds the phrase "and brought us againe from understanding one another", a dire act in the Bible and no less destructive in Donne's version of contemporary history.

In several such ways, Donne positions his English version of the *Conclaue* as a rather more vigorous condemnation of these "Hypercritiques". In both versions, however, Donne's satire aims at unmasking Jesuitical thought as a new Tower of Babel that will end badly. The fact that the infernal figures tend to speak in one voice, as though trying to reimpose the one *linguam* of ancient times, from the era before the tower was destroyed, allows Donne to suggest yet another preposterous aspect

of their thought, and another retrograde motion. Indeed the bilingual text itself, by speaking to these issues in two languages, tacitly refutes the "infernal" conspiracy that seeks to silence dissent.

(2) Naming the Nun of New Spain: Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz

Although she was renowned throughout Spain and Latin America as "the tenth muse" of the New World, there is a great deal about Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz that is still not known, beginning with the date of her birth and the identity of her father, in a culture intently focused on patrilineage. Born illegitimate, around 1648, to a landowning *criolla* woman (that is, of Spanish descendants but born in Mexico) and a Basque nobleman of some sort, who deserted the family soon thereafter, she seems to have been christened Juana Inés Ramíriz de Asbaje. She was an extraordinarily precocious child, reading her way through her grandfather's library and inveigling her brother's governess to teach her Latin before the age of ten. Transported from the countryside to Mexico City, perhaps rejected by her mother, she quickly won the esteem and almost lifelong protection of successive Viceroys and high court officials, becoming the friend and confidant of a series of Vicereines as well as a favorite of university and church authorities. "Rumors flew of an ability never yet seen in one of so few years", wrote a contemporary (quoted in Paz 1982:87). This "marvel of intelligence and learning" lived at court until the age of twenty, amid balls and parties, producing volumes of occasional court and church poetry as well as plays. That she was a brilliant figure at the viceregal court is well established, and seems to have resulted from the sunny, even laughing gaiety and wit with which she charmed the nobility and engaged noted authorities in erudite conversations and debates, even as her earliest poetic texts were highly praised for their mastery of baroque conception and form. Then, not yet twenty-one, after a brief foray into a rigid Carmelite convent, in 1669 she took her vows in the less austere Hieronymite order of San Jerónimo and spent the rest of her life in the convent of Santa Paula. Though cloistered, in the locutory of her convent she continued to receive visitors from the courts of Mexico City and Madrid, amid spirited discussions of literary affairs. In the later republican upheavals, convent archives were destroyed, along with her voluminous correspondence, so her side of the fierce quarrels, and the repression she later suffered as a writer, is conjectural.

It seems clear that she entered the convent for lack of other options, as Octavio Paz says, being without "a dowry, a father, and a name" (Paz 1982:102). In her own words in the later *Respuesta*, the convent was "the least unsuitable and the most honorable" course she could select, insofar as even her passion for learning could not get her admitted to the university as a woman, whereas the convent would allow her "the freedom of my studies", and, in particular, "given the total antipathy I felt toward marriage" (quoted in Schons 1927:45). For a woman of the seventeenth century who loved learning, and shunned the subservience of domestic life, this was a rational more than a religious decision. Though her early work lacks any marked spiritual strain, there is no doubt that her faith was strong and sustaining. Sor Juana is often called "the first feminist of America", as Dorothy Schons says, because so much of her work centres on female figures in history, mythology, and theology, and because

she so fervently advocated the education of women, her own above all. A poet of the late baroque generation following Góngora, Quevedo, and Calderón, she published the first major collection of her poetry in Madrid in 1689, with the help of powerful patrons and admirers, plus two other long poetic texts by 1690. It was in that year that she was caught in a quarrel between two rival high church officials, perhaps rather imprudently intervening to support the Bishop of Puebla, an old acquaintance, over the new Archbishop of Mexico, a rather choleric and imperious man who despised the theater, secular literature, and especially women (who must never touch his food, he said; if women walked on the bricks in his hallway, the bricks must be removed; Schons 1927:41). This is the man she indirectly attacked, in a published letter to the bishop, undoubtedly on behalf of her sex and of her own literary writings. Fierce polemics ensued from church pulpits, and amid growing public hostility she published her response, a vigorous and unrepentant defense of women's right to knowledge rather than the compliant retreat expected of a mere nun, even one so famous by then as Sor Juana (*Respuesta a sor Filotea de la Cruz*, 1691). Astonishingly, she stood her ground through 1692, producing a flood tide of poetry and new dramatic work, including a second major collection published in Seville that included her best known poetic text, *Primero sueño* (1692). But she was rapidly losing her protectors, including her spiritual director, who was replaced by a censor of the Inquisition. Defeated, surely frightened, she agreed in 1694 to retake her vows (that is, erase her first twenty-five years of convent life) and rededicate herself to the church, surrendering all her books and scientific and musical instruments, only to die in an epidemic a year later, at about age forty-six. A third volume of work, including the *Respuesta*, was published posthumously in Madrid in 1700. She was largely forgotten until the late nineteenth century, perhaps both because of church opprobrium and because as a writer she remains difficult to classify. As Karl Vossler said in the 1930s about the *Primero sueño*, "The cosmic poem of the Mexican nun was, historically, both late and premature: a late fruit of the baroque and the jubilant precursor of the Enlightenment" (quoted in Paz 1982:380).

Excepting the occasional poems and the three *autos sacramentales* or church mystery plays, it is not possible to date Sor Juana's texts, since the chronology is unknown and her poetic methods and thematics are fairly consistent over the decades. In the baroque manner, all her poetry builds from elaborate metaphors, tight formal structures, intricate ornament and embellishment; she often makes the text hinge on dislocated syntax, displaced adjectives, multidirectional reflexives and subjunctives. Two thirds of her work is occasioned or commissioned. Half is court poetry, that is, portrait poems and Petrarchan courtly love sonnets, amatory and even erotic verse in the baroque tradition and its conventional formulas, which she deploys with sure delight in elaborate paradoxes and metric patternings (rarely rhyme). In an often virulently misogynistic culture, a great deal of her work entails situating women in the world of the intellect or the mind. The love poems, for example, like all her texts configured from stock conventions, invert hierarchies and radically complicate voice, beginning with the anomaly that the love poet is a woman; the female figures often think (*si piensa*), deliberating on love, returning pain for pain, sorrow for sorrow, often enthralled but rarely able to command love or reciprocity. In a literary culture still

steeped in hermetic neoplatonism, her religious texts build syncretically by weaving and interlacing analogies, very often through blending classical myth into Catholic theology. Such texts often verge on heresy, insofar as the poet boldly feminizes both secular and sacred history, and, moreover, leaves the poetic voice – which has been dazzled by a perception of absolute knowledge or by a felt experience of the sacred – unknowing, and left, perhaps lost, without celestial or human guides, yet nevertheless exultant in the human realm.

The *Primero sueño*/First Dream, for example, is an intricate dream text: as a body sleeps, the anonymous soul ascends over all the earth, over the Egyptian, hieroglyphic realms uniting Isis, the Virgin Mary, and Saint Catherine of Egypt as three heroines of light, epitomized in Diana as Divine Light, superseded by the Father of Light or Christian Divinity; through ever complicating webs of theologies and geometric figurations of sciences, the soul attains a vertiginous moment of perception into pure or absolute knowledge, then Aurora or daylight breaks and the body as "I" awakens, without revelation. For the reader, however, there is a distinct and (surely in 1692) shocking revelation that the speaker/soul of this cosmic voyage is a woman, in the closing line: "quedando a luz más cierta/ el Mundo iluminado, y yo despierta"/leaving the World illumined by a more certain light, and me [feminine] awake" (Cruz 1996:201). As Stephanie Merrim has pointed out, Aurora, the dawn light supervening over Night, is also feminine (Merrim 1999:209). The standard dream text, including saints' and churchwomens' versions ending in union with the godhead, has become something quite different. It ends in a typically ambiguous microdrama of gendering that seems orthodox but, at more subtle levels, also seems to edge into heresy.

As in her self-translations, there seem to be two types of heretical risk-taking in Sor Juana's work, functions of theology and gender. Her critics remain divided in their interpretations of these issues, in texts that seem so lucid yet ultimately opaque. Paz dismisses the feminine pronominal participle at the end of the *Primero sueño* as an irrelevance, in a text about the human mind journeying toward knowledge. Merrim construes it as revealing the optic and the crux of the entire text. In her study of gendering in Sor Juana's work in the context of early modern women's writing, Merrim concludes that unlike many of her contemporaries Sor Juana seeks not to assert women's difference from men but "to *negate* their difference, to introject or appropriate the masculine realm for the feminine and to place them on the same continuum" (1991c:23). Rightly, Merrim notes that, even in the courtly love poems, the woman is "the locus of reason in the wars of love" (1991c:24), and surely also "a showcase of Sor Juana's own lucid reasoning" (1991c:25). This striking identification of woman with reason, rather than more conventionally with the senses, threads through her verse as a theological notion as well; in one text she asks whether, since all souls are rational, women's souls are not like men's ("¿No tienen alma racional como los hombres?" quoted in Merrim 1991c:40n). This concept is probably what also underlies her frequent references to the *mujer varonil* or manly woman. The theological effects are dual. On the one hand, Sor Juana "dedicates herself to the quest for knowledge, philosophical and scientific; her quest involves a more absolute understanding of the real, rather than its progressive mystical negation" (Merrim 1991c:27). On the other

hand, where most women's religious writings presented themselves as handmaidens to the divine, "Sor Juana audaciously equates herself with Christ" (1991c:27), as offspring of God and martyr. Thus in the course of *Primero sueño*, during that long and intricate voyage of the soul through the domains of learning (in tropes of medicine, biology, geometry, architecture, orbiting heavenly bodies, and music), at one point apropos of the three heroines of light the poet says, "De una mujer se convencen/ todos los Sabios de Egipto,/ para prueba de que el sexo/ no es esencia en lo entendido"/All the Sages of Egypt are convinced by a woman that gender is not of the essence in matters of the intelligence (quoted in Merrim 1991b:118).

Two additional aspects of her work pertain to her methods of self-translation. First, all her texts are variously configured around the poetic voice, as feminine. Second, thus centred on herself, the texts are often sewn with covert allusions to the fame of Sor Juana herself. In ecclesiastic circles, she was called "Madre Juana" (as in the Jesuit Juan de Oviedo's letter discussing her: "Father Antonio forbade Mother Juana from the decent exercise of Poetry", quoted in Schons 1927:47). In literary circles, she was called the Phoenix of New Spain, both as the creator of a new Mexican national poetry and as a *rara avis* of several sorts. Her critics often echo this figure: "Engaging with her iconic status as a rara avis, Sor Juana not only drew attention to her incongruity but in her poetic self-representations also developed something of an iconography of anomaly", of her self as male and female, of her fame as both a radiant phoenix and a bizarre monster as a learned woman and a writer; "She is not unmindful of the benefits that accrue to her position as a rara avis, which makes her sui generis ('tengo solamente yo/ de ser todo mi linaje,' I have only I as my whole lineage" (Merrim 1999:31).

This is the broad ecclesiastical and socio-cultural context for her self-translation of her Latin "Epigramma" into Castilian Spanish.

EPIGRAMMA

Nomine materno, mutata parte, Camilla
dicitur, ut Triviam, digna ministra, colat.
Totum nomen ego, Triados quae Ancilla, Parentis
muto: tota in Ave vertitur Heva mihi.
Nec mutasse satis nomen; mutasse Parentem
gaudeo: me prolem Gratia mater habet.
Namque Annae sum nata, *dedit cui Gratia nomen:*
Gratia cui Proles, *cui* sine labe *genus*;
Flos *idem* humano generi, *vivum* Decus. Inde
pro Ancilla, Matrem me vocat ipse Deus.

ESTOS CINCO DÍSTICOS, TRADUCIDOS EN CINCO COPLAS CASTELLANAS

El nombre materno tuvo
Camila mudado en parte,

para que a la Trivia Diosa
dignamente ministrase.
Yo, Esclava del Trino Dios,
todo el nombre de la Madre
mudo, y todo para mí
el EVA se vuelve en AVE.
Ni bastó mudar el nombre;
alégrome que mudase
a la Madre, y que la Gracia
por hija me señalase.

Hija de Ana soy, a quien
la Gracia dio nombre grande:
a quien dio Prole fecunda,
a quien Género impecable.

De aquí me ha venido el ser
Flor del humano linaje,
vivo Honor; y que de Esclava,
Madre el mismo Dios me llame. (Cruz, *Obras completas*, 78-79)

(The Latin reads literally: Epigram// By [her] maternal name, changed in part, Camilla/ is called, so as to serve the Trivia as a worthy servant./ I [who am] Servant of the Triad, change the entire name of the Family: the entire Eve changes for me into Bird./ It is not enough to have changed the name; I rejoice in having changed Parentage: mother Grace has me as offspring./ For surely, I am a child of Anna to whom she gave the name Grace: Grace to whom Offspring, to whom lineage without blemish; /the very same Flower for humankind, a living beauty [was given]. Thereafter, instead of Servant, God himself calls me Mother.)

(The Spanish reads literally: These Five Distiches, Translated into Five Castilian Stanzas// The maternal name/ Camilla was changed in part,/ so that the Trivia Goddess / [might be] worthily honored.// I, Slave of the Triune God,/ change the whole name of the Mother,/ and all through me/ the EVE turns into BIRD [and HAIL].// Nor was it sufficient to change the name;/ I rejoice that it might change/ to the Mother, and that Grace/ might single me out as daughter.// Daughter of Anna am I, to whom/ Grace gave a great name:/ to whom fertile Descendants,/ to whom sinless Humanity [she gave].// Thereafter to me has come all being/ Flower of the human lineage,/ [which] I live [to] Honor; and instead of Slave,/ may the same God call me Mother.)

Both texts hinge upon the poet's dual identification with the Latin figure Camilla, as Virgil's warrior queen in the *Aeneid*, and with the Catholic figure Mary, as daughter of Anna and mother of Christ or God. Both texts magnify name change, and both do so by sweeping pagan womanhood into sacred history, as channeled through the poet's own being. The Latin is terse, in five distiches almost without rhyme, and the Spanish is exactly twice as long, in five stanzas, without patterned rhyme. The

language is ordinary, but the syntax is so intricately dislocated that, as usual in Sor Juana's poetry, it is difficult to disengage the spine of meaning, which runs along different axes of reference and association. The tone moves from objective or neutral into impassioned glorification.

The story of Camilla occurs only in Virgil, and Sor Juana's point of departure is a line from Virgil's Book XI: "matrisque vocavit/nomine Casmillae, mutata parte, Camillam"/[her father] called her, from her mother's name Casmillae, changed in part, Camilla (1934:2.542-543). When she was an infant, and her father was carrying her in flight from war, in order to save her from an engulfing river he tied her to a javelin, dedicated her life to Diana the Trivia goddess, and hurled her into the air; the javelin landed in a meadow and preserved the child, whom her father then raised in the woods, among animals, where she was a great huntress, like her patron Diana. She becomes a leader of a Volscian army, indeed once "reginam Volsci" (801), fighting Aeneas's forces; Camilla is called "aspera virgo" (664), dedicated to her maidenhood ("virginitatis amorem", 583), also "Amazon" (648), wearing the "arma Dianae" (652) and leading a troop of Amazons or "tumultu feminea" (663). She kills so many warriors in this battle that another prays to Apollo for help, and the god grants him her death. Diana avenges her death, but it turns the tide of the battle. We should note that Diana was traditionally, and well into the seventeenth century, known as the Trivia or three-part goddess of women (combining Artemis, Hecate, and Proserpine), associated with fertility, especially children and childbirth.

In both texts Sor Juana develops a slight reference in Virgil, concerning a small modification in a daughter's name, into a cosmic figure for the evolution of pagan history into Christian, into universal salvation history, and for a parallel transformation of herself from divine servant to mother of God. The conceptual sweep builds from minute lexical shifts that converge, across swiveling verb tenses and moods, into massive figures for the feminine relation to the divine.

In the Latin, Sor Juana's Camilla, while carrying the Virgilian overtones of the manly queen, is positioned first as a daughter who underwent a change of name, then as worthy servant of Diana or the Trivia. Then the poet aligns her with "I" who, as servant of the Trinity, changes her entire family name, implying the name of all the human family. Eve as the mother of humanity has turned into the bird or phoenix that is Sor Juana; *avis* in the nominative means bird, while also suggesting the *Ave Maria, gratia plena* of church liturgy. The "I" of the poet rejoices in changing her very parentage to Mother Grace, that is, to Anna as the mother of Mary and now of her as well. Moreover through Anna/Grace/Mary humanity was given (via Christ) new lineage, a kind of immaculate generation (purified of the sin of the Fall). This new name of Grace, which the poet appropriates to position herself as sister to Mary, remarkably not to Christ, thus conjoins three figures in the maternal function. All the characteristics the poet might share with Camilla, such as name change by the father, are transfigured into Catholic mothers and daughters, and the generative function is surely poetic, situating the "I" as the Virgil of Catholic New Spain.

Only in the Spanish does the term "Honor" appear, and only in the Spanish are the full resources of feminine endings exploited to amplify the thematics of name and family. The Spanish is more tentative, however, casting the bold Latin claims into a virtual, conjectural space where the flat statement 'God calls me mother' (*vocat*) becomes

'may he call me mother' *(me llame*). Latin perfects become Spanish subjunctives. 'I rejoice in having changed parentage' becomes 'I rejoice that it might change.' Christ as the flower for new human lineage remains a striking image in both languages, but the Spanish renders 'without blemish' as 'sinless' (*impecable*). Rather similarly, the Spanish bird as *AVE* more directly echoes church liturgy, just as the generic 'beauty' (*Decus*) is specified as *Honor*, the value so crucial to the Hispanic context of family name. The poet has inverted it, however, and only in stereoscopic reading of the two texts can we see the poet transmuting it into a beauteous sense of service to God, as more honorable than service to a family name – which in any case the poet has changed. The seventeenth-century reader surely saw in this text the phoenix-nun stepping out of the entire social framework of family, and illegitimacy, as well as the ecclesiastical framework of patriarchal authority, to exalt herself as creator – and as recognized as such by God himself. Lifting herself into the company of Anna and Mary, as into the literary realm of Virgil, she reworks the conventional hierarchies in radical ways. Indeed, *mutata in parte*, Sor Juana never specifies the name of God or Christ, exalting only women figures of divinity, and her own name.

There are several ways to read this bilingual text, however, and to gloss any text by Sor Juana is to curtail its scope. The change from Latin to Spanish certainly entails transposing the theological axis of the text into the semantic field of New Spain. The reference to family and lineage, as culminating in *Honor*, resonates dually in her Spanish: family honor is invoked, only as being already annulled, having been transfigured into the greater honor (and name) of serving the holy family, and notably its women, as servitor and peer. It is cosmic female lineage that absorbs the world and the poet into it. Emphasizing female agency in general terms, Sor Juana reassigns Eve, omitting her doctrinal association with the Fall and with destruction, to production: the generative principle that is Eve, mother of humanity, transforms into the magnified figure of Grace, in one continuous lineage that positions the rara avis as maternal phoenix renewing female divinity while engendering new life, and presumably texts. Sor Juana's play of signs, however, is not used to construct the usual vertical hierarchy, where pagan signs are mere prefigurations of Christian truths. Instead her Camilla as servant of Diana is a touchstone, perhaps also a peer, in a parallel order of signs for women's service and divinity; nothing in her text negates or disdains the Latin women.

Sor Juana also worked from Spanish into Latin. In another poetic series (*Décima*/ *Juana*/ *Versíon*), she presents a short Latin poem that her title indicates was a gift to her, and that she then translated into Latin. But there is reason to doubt that the "gift" was written by anyone but this singular poet (the stylistic features resemble her own). Moreover, the genre was Spanish (the *décima*, a stanza of ten octosyllabic lines), not classical. Also, following her translation as "Versión de la Madre Juana", she appends yet another Latin version, labeled simply "Otra" or other. Thus the entire triadic text comes to look a lot like her own work. Space precludes our reprinting the three versions here (see her *Obras completas*, Cruz 1996:125-26). All three are metaphysical micro-dramas of "Anima Verbo"/"el Alma el Verbo"/the Soul the Word, as implanted in the body, but now leaving in death. The rhythm is cut by the cry "Sed heu!"/ "¡Ay!" in all three versions. But only in the Spanish are the lips (*labios*) termed

wise (*sabios*), in their role of speaking forgiveness of sins. That is, in Spanish the body more openly assumes the priestly role of absolution over the departing spirit (which remains commensurate in all three versions as *Spiritum*/*Espíritu*).

To Sor Juana, Latin-vernacular self-translation in both directions seems to have served chiefly to provide two different semantic fields for exploring her thematics of women's place in Catholic theology, allowing her to bend familiar Church Latin tropes to new Hispanic and new gender contexts. There is no mistaking the obstreperous voice of the speaker, uniquely bold in both languages.

(3) Theatres of Translation: Carlo Goldoni

The Franco-Italian Carlo Goldoni (1707-1793), one of the most prolific playwrights of the late *commedia dell'arte* tradition, was also a leading bilingual literary figure of the eighteenth century. Goldoni's literary production was claimed in his lifetime by both a "homeland" (he was born in Venice) and an "adopted country" (he died in France, after living almost thirty years in and around Paris). Goldoni's father, part of the professional lower-middle class in Venice, wanted his son to become a physician like himself, but the boy eventually became a lawyer. That very useful profession provided him with steady income in his early years as a playwright, and bought him the time to compose comic scenarios and at least one fully articulated comic script (*La Donna di garbo*) by 1743. For years after becoming an official playwright to several Italian theatre companies, Goldoni picked up his legal work occasionally, during lulls in his playwrighting career, and when he needed additional income.

Generations of critics have commented on Goldoni's extreme productivity. Despite his late start as a professional playwright, he wrote some 212 plays and individual scenarios – by any measure, a breathtaking volume of work. In part this large literary legacy reflects his commitment to reforming the *commedia* practice of working with a mere two-page script, on average, for several hours of performance. His reform involved the addition of several new elements. First and foremost, the basic script was to be written by the playwright himself, thus limiting the improvisational elements traditionally interjected by the performers. Second, the script was to favor realistic (as opposed to heavily codified) language and action, with the goal of having both action and language represent contemporary social reality, and carry the moral thrust of the play. On this latter point, Goldoni was explicit: the script was not to be structured around ornate word play or puns, but instead around "authentic" social interactions. The goal of theatre was thus to amuse the audience with depictions of its own actions and social status and concerns, and not to provide sheer comic escape. Goldoni knew that such reforms would take a good deal of time to accomplish. Indeed, his *Mémoires* clearly describe the extent to which the Italian actors in Venice had come to rely on improvisation; similarly, upon his arrival in Paris in 1762, Goldoni quickly realized that any plan to alter significantly the conventional mechanisms and schedules by which actors performed would have to be phased in over time (Goldoni 1926:367).

Goldoni's ambitious theatrical reforms, begun in Italy and carried into his French career, have earned him a lasting place in drama history as an element of Italy's "nuovo teatro nazionale" (Petronio 1960:85; cited in Theile 1983:402). During his

lifetime they also produced several enemies in the world of theatre. In Italy, chief among these was the celebrated Carlo Gozzi, literary reactionary and leading member of the Accademia dei Granelleschi in Venice, a learned society whose chief focus was the preservation of Italian stylistic cohesion and purity. Like most such groups, they revered the "purità" of the traditional genres in their original state. Confronted with Goldoni's drive for reformation and an authorial *commedia*, the Accademia, and Gozzi foremost, undertook nothing less than the restoration of the original *commedia dell'arte*. Yet its form had changed substantially over several hundred years of theatre history. Originating in sixteenth-century Naples, the *commedia dell'arte* was a professional company of travelling actors who played stock characters (braggart, charlatan, ingénue) in masks and stereotyped costumes, as well as regional dialects (Venetian, Napolitan, Tuscan) – and in some cases, as in the figure of the Captain, even a different language (Spanish), with much dupery and slapstick. Indeed, comic multilingualism was at the origin of this theatrical form: the first *commedia* actors studied Greek and Latin, plus any modern languages (or dialects thereof) that they might need to know for their parts or performances, and even searched out choice quotes from Greek and Latin sources for the longer improvisational scenes which were a *commedia* hallmark. By the eighteenth century, sharp debate over the future direction of "proper" comedy in the Italian theatre was commonplace during Goldoni's early Italian career. In Italy as in France and England, the canonical "national" comic tradition, usually a form of farce like the *commedia*, was being eclipsed by the growth of "bourgeois" theatre, which often served as a point around which national identity was explicitly articulated.

It is unknown whether Goldoni relished the opportunity to leave Italy in 1762, at the age of 53, to go to France as the official house dramatist (*Directeur des Spectacles*) of the Comédie-Italienne, or whether he was forced to seek work outside Italy because of the conflicts with Gozzi. Many critics who favor the latter interpretation find the self-portrait presented in his *Mémoires* to be an idealized view of his earlier career as valiant reformist of the Italian comic stage (his *Mémoires* were written in French some twenty-five years after his departure from Italy, from 1783-1787). Whatever the facts, the most important result is the impact that this bilingual literary figure had on the wider European stage.

In Paris the Comédie-Italienne was a crucial component of French national theatre. A formally established company, officially sponsored by the French crown like several other theatres, it manifested the importance of Italian theatre in Parisian culture, in France, and in Europe more broadly (see, for example, Theile 1993 on Goldoni in the German context). *Commedia* troupes had for over a century been traveling around Europe, performing in royal courts and major public venues, earning high regard even in Paris, an important centre of European literary and artistic culture, and *commedia* performances were a staple of the Comédie-Italienne.

Concerning the languages of performance, most *commedia* representations in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century France entailed multilingual performances, with some scenes being performed uniquely in Italian, but most performed largely in French with just a few words, phrases, or dramatic moments rendered in Italian. Also, paralleling Franco-Italian cultural relations, over the course of the eighteenth

century both the Comédie-Italienne's name and its mission evolved substantially, as theatre reforms took certain directions, and the tastes of audiences changed. The Comédie-Italienne had been a free-standing theatre in Paris since 1715 (Luigi Riccoboni had come from Italy to establish it). In 1762 the Comédie-Italienne was blended into the Opéra-Comique to become one single institution. In 1769 the company jettisoned comedies performed in French – even those written by the famed Marivaux – to begin performing comic scenes exclusively in Italian. In 1779 Italian-language comic performances gave way once again to more elaborate French-language comedies. In 1793, the year of Goldoni's death, the Comédie-Italienne too vanished forever (at least in name), becoming the Théâtre National de l'Opéra-Comique, which is still a thriving centre of dramatic art today. This arc from Italian to Franco-Italian then French reflects the course of French fascination with things Italian at the end of the early modern period.

In the few short months that it took Goldoni to travel from Italy to France, the amalgamation of the Comédie-Italienne and the Opéra-Comique had already occurred. It is clear that he immediately grasped the political conflict inherent in his new assignment as the Comédie-Italienne's chief playwright: "the new branch gained ground on the old, and the Italians, hitherto the sole support of this theatre, became only the accessories of the entertainment" (*Memoirs*; Goldoni 1923:358). Despite the momentous implications of this change in the Paris theatre scene, Goldoni was still optimistic about the state of Italian theatre in France: "I even imagined that my countrymen would consider their honour at stake, would vie in emulation with their new comrades, and I supposed them perfectly enabled to sustain the conflict" (1923:358). His optimism was soon shaken, though, when he discovered that many of the Italian actors were still thoroughly accustomed to the old comedic conventions, such as improvisation in the lack of written scripts, and in at least a few cases, so accustomed to speaking French that their Italian no longer sounded convincing. By 1751, for example, the critic Maillet-Duclairon noted that Italian actors have had to give up the traditional comedic mixing of dialects in their performances, both to be intelligible to the French-speaking public, and to appeal to its manners (Smith 1964:217, 38n). Another eighteenth-century theatre critic, Friedrich Grimm, opined that one Italian company had botched its presentation of a Goldoni play in Italian largely because the actors had been living so long in France that they had lost their linguistic fluency in Italian (Smith 1964:219).

The nationalistic tensions fracturing the Parisian theatre scene throw into sharp relief the complex role played by Goldoni in late eighteenth-century theatre, as both the living confluence of two major European theatrical traditions, and as one of European theatre's outstanding bilingual figures. Moreover his literary bilinguality was not only notable during Goldoni's lifetime, but was also applauded. Specifically, his entry into bilingual literary production was the triumphant performance on November 4, 1771, in Paris, at the Salle des Machines in the Tuileries, of his original French play *Le Bourru bienfaisant*/The Surly Benefactor, followed by another performance the following day at Fontainebleau. Goldoni's translation, and subsequent publication of *Il Burbero di buon cuore* in 1789 (published at Veuve Duchesne, in Paris) came some eight years after the original performance. The great Parisian success of

Le Bourru prompted Goldoni to write, again in French, *L'Avare fastueux* in 1772. When performed for the royal court at Fontainebleau several years later, however, on November 14, 1776, it was not well received. Like *Le Bourru*, Goldoni's self-translated text, his other French work also has clear Moliéresque overtones, and also instantiates his commitment to literary production not only in the French language, but also in the larger Franco-European context of "modern" theatre.

Goldoni's inscription in the national French tradition was well established in his lifetime. His *Mémoires* tell us that the honor of being offered admission to the "national spectacle" that was theatre in Paris "was the more flattering for me as nobody could then have foreseen that I would one day be enrolled in the catalogue of their authors" (Goldoni 1926). Despite some critics' doubts about the veracity of Goldoni's *Mémoires* (there is a gap of nearly a quarter century between most of the events described and the writing of the *Mémoires*, and Goldoni earned money from pre-established subscriptions, including one from the French crown), in fact Goldoni was not exaggerating when he wrote of his presence in the "catalogue" of French national authors. In 1794, the year after his death, in the throes of the Revolution, one of his two French-language plays was chosen by the Committee of Public Safety to be shown at a special revolutionary performance. Held at the new (renamed) Théâtre de l'Egalité, the festival featured patriotic displays of song, dance, and theatre. For this momentous event, two plays were performed: Louis François Archambault's *La Parfaite égalité* and Goldoni's original French play *Le Bourru bienfaisant*. According to the *Moniteur* of June 30, 1794, as the festival closed the audience chanted, "Vive à jamais la république" / Long live the republic! (Hyslop 1945:353). Also in 1794, Goldoni bequeathed the rights to this same play, and all the proceeds stemming from productions of it, to the state-sponsored Comédie-Française. Today, Goldoni's inscription in the French national catalogue, through the rolls of the Comédie Française, is yet more remarkable when we consider that it is not simply his works in French but also those in Italian that the French tradition lays claim to: his works in Italian because so many of them were produced during his tenure at the Comédie-Italienne, and his two works in French not simply because a French-bankrolled playwright wrote them, but rather because the Italian playwright wrote them himself, in French.

Few critics have undertaken side-by-side analyses of Goldoni's French-to-Italian literary self-translation. Those who have commented on his multilingualism tend to do so in rather negative terms, focusing, for example, on Italian "interference" with the French, or vice-versa (see Bosco 1993); and one even describes the entire literary trajectory of this "trilingue" author (Venetian, Italian, French) as being marked by "aspetti più massici e talora patologici" / very ponderous and at times pathological aspects (Folena 1983:383; cited in Luciani 2003:248). We have already encountered this sort of quasi-medical diagnosis of the split, semi-diseased subjectivity of the bilingual writer, apropos of Charles d'Orléans for example, and we will see it again.

Yet we have the luxury of knowing some of Goldoni's own thoughts on his literary production in his new language of French. His *Mémoires* exude confidence in his suitability to the task, and they include anecdote after anecdote in which Goldoni, fresh upon his arrival on French soil, is keen to undertake etymological discussions in multiple languages. Nevertheless, Goldoni also often remarks on the need

to improve his French, acknowledging that at the time of his appointment at the Comédie-Italienne "my ear was not yet familiarized with the French language; I lost a great deal in company, and still more at the theatre" (Goldoni 1926:368). Regarding his lack of skill in French, he says of his first playgoing experience in Paris, mere weeks after his arrival, that "Fortunately, I was acquainted with [the play]" (1926:369). Not surprisingly, then, some three years later Goldoni's ear is still adjusting to French. Another oft-cited anecdote from the *Mémoires* recounts how, upon taking his lunch-time tutorial leave from Madame Adelaïde (the sister of Louis XV, who was taking Italian lessons from Goldoni), he fails to interpret her "À tantôt" as a sign that she will see him again in a few hours, rather than in just a few moments; in waiting several hours for her he misses lunch entirely, and the two have a good laugh after the fact. As he later reminds himself, "There are both French and Italian terms which bear a resemblance to one another, and yet have quite a different meaning" (*Mémoires*, Goldoni 1926:382). As a writer, moreover, "I saw that my muse in a French dress had not that fire, that grace and facility, which an author acquires in his youth, and brings to perfection in his mature years" (1926:411).

But of course it was not only words that had different meaning. In the theatre, Goldoni knew that he needed familiarity with both the French language and with the audience's tastes. Requesting four months' reprieve from his new duties as playwright so that he might ascertain and assimilate the preferences of his new French audiences, Goldoni began attending Parisian theatre incessantly. The first French play he saw performed was Molière's *Le Misanthrope* (1666) and although it gave him "infinite pleasure", he did not understand all that the actors said. Yet he left the theatre that night "enchanted" and setting two ideals for himself: "either to be able to compose pieces for French actors, or to see my countrymen capable of imitating them. Which would be the most difficult to realize?" (*Memoirs*, Goldoni 1926:369). His project of writing a play entirely in French would finally be achieved nine years later, with that widely-acclaimed performance in 1771. That Goldoni had such drive to prove his capacity in French is not surprising in view of the leading role of the French language in European artistic, intellectual, and diplomatic circles; the fact that Italian *commedia* was losing currency as a freestanding traditional dramatic form also must have played an important part in this decision. Goldoni expresses some surprise upon his arrival in France that "the study of foreign languages is not considered one of the necessary branches of education at the court of France, but as an amusement conceded to those who are desirous of it, and capable of profiting by it" (*Memoirs*, Goldoni 1926:393). Moving rather quickly into the inner circles of both court and theatre milieus, he saw himself as living in the "home" of French as the universal language of the educated elite in Europe.

Goldoni himself had relatively strong confidence in his ability to produce a play in this second language, one which would not be simply comprehensible but also befitting both language and "taste". In his letter of March 16, 1771 to Voltaire, he nevertheless recognizes the unpredictability of audience reaction: "J'ai consulté quelques uns de mes amis, et on me flatte que mon François peut passer. . . . Je tâcherai de Vous l'envoyer avant que de l'exposer au public" / I have consulted several friends, and they compliment me by telling me that my French will be acceptable. . . . I will try

to send [the script] to you before showing it to the public" (Ortolani 1936:365). Not surprisingly, at least one contemporary doubted the quality of his French. During a much anticipated meeting with Rousseau, Goldoni explained his current project of writing in French for the stage, and Rousseau retorted that disaster will strike when *Le Bourru* is performed in public: "I know the taste of both the Italians and the French; they are too dissimilar; and, with your permission, your age is not the time to begin to write and to compose in a foreign language" (*Mémoires*, Goldoni 1926:420). Rousseau proved to be quite wrong in his estimation. And if Goldoni's *Mémoires* are to be believed, the Venetian had already understood the need to render not simply words, but also style, themes, and contemporary contexts, quite clearly. In one passage in his *Mémoires*, where he castigates the translator of one his earlier Italian plays, Goldoni writes that "in rendering the text word for word, [the translator] has fallen into the inconvenience of a trite and insipid style . . . To give us a knowledge of the literature of another country, the thoughts, imagery, and erudition must be transferred; but then the phrases and style must be adapted to the taste of the nation into whose language the translation is made" (*Mémoires*, Goldoni 1926:396). Thus, as translation scholars from Adams to Forster have noted, absolute fluency in both languages should not be considered requisite in the definition of bilingualism before 1800, nor, we can add, in the production of a self-translated literary work. Yet many studies of Goldoni still question the commensurability of his languages and even condemn his translative practice, even though he meets quite well his eighteenth-century standard, as one early twentieth century biographer put it in qualifying *Il Burbero* as "a transl., or rather a version" (Chatfield-Taylor 1913:628). Thus in the age of the *belle infidèle*, the self-translator too reflects the translative poetics of his time.

Goldoni himself has much to say on the topic of translation, both his own and others'. Well before the publication of *Le Bourru bienfaisant*, he had tried his hand at translating scenes from some of his comedies, but came away each time with a keen sense of frustration. The reader of Goldoni's works, including his *Mémoires*, gets the clear sense that his self-appointed task of writing a play in French is intended not primarily to exercise his linguistic capacity in French, nor even to declare further solidarity with the French national tradition, but chiefly to prove his skill as a playwright in the eyes of those who could not understand Italian. In other words, he wants both Italian and French people to hear his "true" voice on stage. This concern is also evident in the anecdote mentioned above, in which he chastised a translator for bungling the job. The mistranslation occurs in a particularly crucial context: a collected anthology published in 1783, in which a translated excerpt of Goldoni's *La Donna di Garbo* appears. This anthology was one of the main factors bringing Goldoni to the attention of the French theatre-going public, and that is chiefly why the mistranslation so irritated him.

Goldoni was also sensitive to questions raised by his critics regarding the production of the outstandingly successful *Le Bourru*. Was this an "original" version, conceived in French, or was it a mere translation either of a previously-existing Italian comedy or a new Italian play? Goldoni commented at length in his *Mémoires*:

> Some said it was one of my Italian comedies; others thought I had written it in Italian and translated it into French. The collection of my works may convince the former of the contrary, and I shall now proceed to undeceive the latter; if there still be any who retain that opinion. I not only composed my piece in French, but I thought in the French manner when engaged in it. It has the stamp of its origin in the thoughts, in the imagery, in the manner, and in the style.

He added that others in Italy have made two additional translations:

> they are not badly executed on the whole, but they do not resemble the original. I have myself endeavoured, for my own amusement, to translate some of the scenes, but I felt all the ungratefulness of the task, and the difficulty of success. There are certain phrases and modes of speaking which lose all their spirit in translation. (1926:417)

Goldoni did go on to complete his own translation within a few years. In these passages, his comments identify French language and literary culture as the points of "origin" from which the play's tone, character types, and subject matter emerge. The "uniqueness" of this particular environment thus explains the "difficulty of success" that he as self-translator faced, and that temporarily defeated his translative project. When Goldoni finally does achieve his self-translation of *Le Bourru*, he describes it as being necessarily unique – as of course it is – since the roles of both author and translator are collapsed into a single person. The preface of *Il Burbero*, "L'Autore a chi legge"/The Author to the reader, signals this concept of the text quite clearly: although the two Italian translations already circulating in Italy are most probably "buone", still, in Goldoni's estimation, "Io ho avuto nel farla un avvantaggio sopra degli altri; un semplice traduttore non osa scostarsi, nelle difficoltà, dal senso litterale; io padrone dell'opera mia, ho potuto di quando in quando cambiar le frasi, per meglio appropriarle al gusto, e all'uso della mia nazione"/I nevertheless had an advantage in this regard over others: a mere translator would not have dared, even in the face of difficulty, to sidestep the literal sense; but I, as the author of my own work, was able to change words, the better to conform to the taste and customs of my nation (*Mémoires*, Goldoni 2003:257).

The dedicatory epistle of *Le Bourru* stands in strong contrast to the preface of *Il Burbero*. In the former Goldoni places the (French) work immediately under French royal patronage – specifically Madame Marie Adelaïde de France, sister of Louis XV – instead of addressing it to a broad and anonymous "a chi legge". As Luciani notes, the generic address "ribadisce la fedeltà ai principi del suo teatro"/confirms his faithfulness to his theatrical principles (2003:249). The French preface further invokes France as a great nation, and Goldoni takes pains to inscribe himself in that space: "Aussi-tôt que j'ai vu la France, je l'ai admirée, je l'ai aimée, et je n'aurois pu la quitter, qu'avec le plus grand regret"/Upon seeing France, I esteemed her, I adored her, and I could only have left her with the greatest difficulty (*Mémoires*, Goldoni 2003:121). The French preface places the text under the aegis of the French royal house, at whose pleasure Goldoni served during his entire career in France, and emphasizes the personal ties

that bound the author to the French monarchic state. Although the Italian preface also invokes the ties between Goldoni and Madame Marie Adelaïde through the citation of the "circonstanza singolare" of their "amicizia", the Italian preface nevertheless invokes a wider Italian readership ("mei Compatrioti") while tacitly eliciting both an Italian and a French audience (Luciani 2003:257). The royal patronage of *Le Bourru bienfaisant* is also explicit through its initial performance setting, after having been shown the night before (November 3rd) in front of a small, select audience in Paris, and dedicated to Madame Marie Adelaïde, sister of Louis XV.

The play's structure is typical of what Diderot termed "tragédie bourgeoise" in his *Entretiens sur le fils naturel* (1757), and what Voltaire termed "comédie larmoyante" in his preface to *Nanine* (1750), that is, serio-comic plays featuring middle-class characters. In 1762, nine years before the acclaimed performance of *Le Bourru*, the word "drame" was officially entered into the fourth edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, and the genre is most often called the *drame bourgeois* by theatre scholars. Goldoni himself would have been familiar with all these terms. As a "genre sérieux", the *drame bourgeois* had a limited span of popularity (in France, at least), signalled by many critics as the span between the portrayal of *Le fils naturel* in 1757, and its spectacular flop in 1771. The *drame bourgeois* usually focused on a single protagonist who represents a certain social type. Adding the genre to comedy, Goldoni focuses his play on the *bourru* or *burbero*, a middle-aged well-to-do bourgeois (Monsieur Géronte/Geronte). He lives with his niece and nephew, and the latter's wife. The action or intrigue is familiar from many canonical European comedies, especially Molière's. In the opening scenes, the nephew is horrified to find himself destitute (through his own fault, since he led his wife to believe he was wealthy so she has quite reasonably spent everything) and he is determined to send his sister Angélique (Angelica, in Italian) to a convent rather than try to come up with a dowry for her marriage to the young man she loves. Kindly (but gruff) bumbling Géronte knows nothing of all this, especially the young lovers' desires. Nephew and wife (in French Monsieur and Madame Dalancour, in Italian Leandro and Constanza Dalancour) are balanced by suitor (Valere/Valerio) and governess (Marton/Marta). Of course, the wife has no idea of what is happening: she is privy neither to her husband's financial straits, nor to his plan to put his sister in a convent (temporarily, at least) until money for a dowry can be acquired. Indeed, Madame Dalancour and Angélique are close confidantes before the misunderstandings begin to accrue, with the former being the only member of the household (besides Marton) to know of Angélique and Valere's love for each other. Not even the eminently reasonable and observant Dorval, M. Géronte's close friend who serves as a convenient foil for Géronte's frustration, discerns this liaison.

Géronte's misplaced animosity toward Madame Dalancour governs much of his behaviour, and his increasing impatience with the other characters (primarily Angélique and her brother) leads to yet more misunderstandings – as when Angélique is too shy to reveal the name of her suitor, and Géronte, taking it upon himself to discover his name, identifies the wrong man. Géronte's grumpiness leads to escalating misunderstandings, as does Madame Dalancour's good cheer, which her husband cannot bear to correct. These binary personalities provide the scaffolding

for much of the play which, unlike traditional *commedia*, is very much in the French early modern manner of both Molière and Marivaux. Goldoni borrows largely from Molière the notion of strong and recognizably contemporary character types whose personalities drive the action and are explicative of it. From Marivaux he borrows certain strings of comic errors and misapprehensions which, although not leading to radical reversals of fortune, or servant being mistaken for master, are another engine for the play's actions. Predictably, in the end all is righted, and equally predictably, Géronte is the last to grasp the full depth of the plot's twists and turns. The last scene provides the format for correcting all his misunderstandings: in asking Angélique's *prétendu*/*signor sposo* to step forward so that he may give his formal blessing to the couple and offer a dowry (since his nephew is unable to do so), he is shocked when Valere steps before him – and then again when he is told that Valere loves Angélique so much that he is offering to marry her even without a dowry. Dorval emphasizes that this indeed deserves to be ranked among the "belles choses"/"azioni nobili, e generose" of which Géronte is so fond. In making his climactic speech, Dorval stresses that Valere had more knowledge of the household's secrets, that "il a su les désastres de cette maison"/"egli intense I tristi avvenimenti de questa casa". Comically the *bourru*/*burbero* is the last to learn.

Goldoni's characters are thus a great deal more complex and multidimensional than those of traditional *commedia*. None is a stock character. Deriving them from recent French tradition, Goldoni further emphasizes their cultural specificity in his *Mémoires*: "The characters of Monsieur and Madame Delancour are conceived and executed with a delicacy which is only known in France; these are the two characters of my whole work which do me the greatest honour. A wife who ruins her husband without even suspecting it – a husband who deceives his wife through attachment – are beings who exist [here]" (*Memoirs*, Goldoni 1926:418). In Goldoni's Italian version, as one would expect in the case of characters tightly inscribed in a particular socio-cultural setting, he takes great care to recontextualize for an Italian public the social standing and family relations among the various characters. Geronte, for example, is qualified as a "cittadino", and his nephew, known to the French audience only by his family name, is cast-list in Italian by his first name "Leandro", and similarly specified, as "possessore della terra Dalancour, di cui porta il nome". Leandro's wife, in the French version only "Mde. Delancour", becomes Costanza in the Italian. Like her brother's, Angelica's social standing is also clarified for the Italian audience: she is both "nipote di Geronte, e sorella di Leandro con cui vive nella stessa casa di Geronte". Similarly specifying cultural etymologies, Goldoni amplfies Picard, Géronte's servant, as "della provincia di Picardia". The middle-class characters become Italians, but the servants remain French.

Goldoni's practice of cultural transposition is thus evident even before the characters begin to speak. The Italian *dramatis personae* contextualizes their social positions, and even the function and signification of their names. As Luciani says, this indication of social standing, and in particular "cittadino" for Geronte, "acquista una connotazione diversa presso il pubblico veneziano"/acquires a diverse connotation for the Venetian public as compared to Parisian French (Luciani 2003:248). Indeed, the station of a "cittadino" in the Venetian context is quite different from

that of a Parisian "citadin" or mere urban dweller, as Goldoni specifies in translating the social context of his characters and adding layers of interpretive complexity in doing so. The translation of names and titles is closely linked to this process. The most obvious change in names is that of the Dalancours, who become Leandro and Costanza Dalancour (without honorifics). In providing the audience (including the Italian reader of the published text) with the married couple's first names, Goldoni gives his Italian audience more information with which to interpret not simply his characters' roles in the plot, but also his play's relationship to two drama traditions: the French *drame bourgeois* and Italian *commedia dell'arte*. Costanza, who the entire world thinks is deliberately ruining her husband, is in fact proven to be the consummate faithful wife. Thus in *Le Bourru*/*Il Burbero* the shrewish wife of comic tradition is seriocomically transformed into a virtuous woman. Her husband Leandro is likewise transformed from one of many stock *inammorati* into a contented married man, indeed one who is strongly devoted to his wife. This seems a sly poke at the Italian comic past: just as a *commedia* scene traditionally needed two pairs of lovers in order to achieve balance, Goldoni dutifully furnishes his scene with two couples, but he has filtered one couple through the bourgeois institution of marriage. Indeed, his *Mémoires* confirm that Goldoni conceived the married Dalancours as the centrepiece of his play.

Act I, Scene I contains *in nuce* many of the characteristics of Goldoni's practice in moving from French to Italian. Valere and Angélique have been having a private meeting; Valere is reluctant to take his leave of Angélique, and both Angélique and Marton are trying to convince him to do so. Marton emphasizes that he must leave because to do otherwise would be to risk the wrath of Angélique's uncle, on whom their chances for happiness together depend. The French Marton emphasizes that Géronte's room is right next to where they are meeting, and a well-placed ellipsis lets the reader infer what the consequences of discovery would be. The Italian Marta, unlike the French, spells out the dire consequences in no uncertain terms: "voi sa-reste l'uno, e l'altro perduti"/you will both be lost (12). The French Valere says "Pardonnez-moi", but whether he is apologizing for his presence or debating the likelihood of Marton's interpretation of Géronte's possible actions is unclear. Valere does, however, emphasize that although "mon père étoit son ami"/my father was his friend (13), he nevertheless does not know Géronte personally. The Italian Valerio, on the other hand, is more openly incredulous, and clearly challenges Marta's reading of Geronte's character: "Non lo credo poi sì irragionevole"/I cannot believe him to be so irrational (12). The French Marton responds to the French *prétendu* philosophically with a clear and logical analysis of Géronte's character: "C'est un homme, monsieur, comme il n'y en a point"/He is a man, sir, like no others (14). She further classifies him as "bon" and "généreux" but also "fort brusque et très difficile"/quite abrupt and very difficult (13-14). The Italian Marta, however, gives as good as she gets, and grills Valerio in a string of questions unique to the Italian: "Avete mai parlato con esso lui? conoscete voi il suo carrattere, il suo naturale?"/ Have you ever spoken with him? Do you know his character, his natural way of being? (14) Valerio is forced to admit that he does not, his father's friendship notwithstanding. The line that is the more or less direct counterpart to the French Marton's rational explanation follows: "Il signor Geronte

è un uomo singolare, singolarissimo, di cui non si trova forse il compagno, è buono generoso, del miglior cuore del mondo, ma altrettanto aspro, e difficile"/Mister Geronte is a singular man, extremely singular, the likes of which have perhaps never been seen; he is kind and generous, with the best heart in the world, but equally brusque, and difficult (16). In such ways, Goldoni consistently amplifies and intensifies the French in his translation into Italian.

Pervading Goldoni's Italian version, such amplification often has the effect of clarifying the affective ties between characters, as in the decisive moment when the governess reveals the brother's plan to put his sister in a convent:

> Monsieur Dalancour est un homme ruiné, abymé; il a mangé tout son bien; et peut-être celui de sa soeur; il est perdu de dettes; Angélique lui pèse sur les bras; et pour s'en débarasser, il voudroit la mettre dans un couvent. (24)

> Leandro il signor Dalancour (*un poco caricato*) è un uomo rovinato, ha perduto il credito ha consummate tutte le sue facoltà, e forse quelle ancora di sua sorella, e non potendo darle la dote fuggirà le occasioni di mariatarla… e per dirvi tutto (*ad Angelica*) con ingenuità, con sincerità, con vera amicizia ho intenso parlare in maniera, che mi fa credere . . . Che credere? parliamo schietto. So che si pensa a mettervi in un ritiro" (26)

> (Literally, the French reads: Monsieur Dalancour is ruined, lost; he has consumed all his inheritance; and perhaps even that of his sister; he is lost in debt; Angélique weighs heavily on him, and to get rid of her he wishes to put her in a convent.

> Literally, the Italian reads: Leandro, inheritor of the Dalancour name [*with emphasis*], is a ruined man; he has lost his credit and has consumed his financial means, and perhaps even those of his sister, and being unable to provide the dowry [therefore] avoids the opportunity to marry her off… it is with candor, sincerity, and true friendship that I speak to you so strongly, to make myself believed. . . What to believe? Let's speak openly. He is thinking of putting you in a convent.)

Whereas the French Marton limits herself to a simple and concise explanation of the matter at hand, the Italian Marta rushes to assure her interlocutors (and Angélique primarily) that she is revealing this shameful information only because of her strong affection for her charge. Moreover, stage directions specify that the French Marton speak her entire piece *adressant la parole à Valere*/addressing her speech to Valere, while the Italian Marta must divert this crucial addition to her speech *ad Angelica*. With this change in primary auditor, the speech changes its focus from gossip to worried affection. As in thus reinforcing the Italian bonds between Marta and Angelica, Goldoni foreshadows another major translative shift in the Italian version.

In a comparable affective intensification, Goldoni's Italian characters give much more frequent and spirited ripostes in dialogue. Upon learning of the nephew's plans from the governess, the suitor in both languages is shocked:

> Comment! est-il possible? [Il] m'a toujours paru un garçon sage, honnête, vif, emporté même quelquefois; mais. . . (26)

> Come? è possible? Io conosco Leandro da molto tempo; io l'ho sempre trovato saggio ragionevole, onesto, qualche volta un poco vivo, ed ardente; ma… (28)

> (Literally, the French reads: What! Is it possible? I always thought [him] to be wise, honest, spirited, carried away from time to time; but ... Literally, the Italian reads: What? Is it possible? I have known Leandro for a long time; I have always found him to be wise and rational, and honest, although he has become a bit intense, and overeager; but…)

Although the suitor's reactions are quite similar in both langauges, the governess' response is markedly different in Italian. The French Marton responds with heavy irony: "Vif! oh, très vif!"/Spirited! oh, very spirited (27). The Italian Marta, on the other hand, amplifies spirit with ardor: "Un poco vivo? Un poco ardente?"/A bit intense? A bit overeager? (29). The contrast between "vif" and the redoubled "vivo" and "ardente" exemplifies how subtly Goldoni suggests that Leandro suffers specifically from an excess of passion for his wife. The Italian version transforms Valere's "sotte complaisance"/inane complacency for his wife's desires (31) into "la sua condiscendenza per le fantasie"/his compliance with [or even condescension to] her fantasies (33). This remark engenders debate among the Italian characters, with the lovers emphasizing the husband's devotion to his wife (implying that it would be worse if he were cheating on her), and the governess emphasizing the excesses of husbandly passion. The wife's "doux"/"dolce" character, "cela qui a séduit son mari"/that which has seduced her husband (34), becomes in Italian "quello zucchero, e quel miele, che hanno infatuato il marito" / that sugar, and that honey, which has infatuated the husband (36). Similar amplification in cultural shifts occurs when Marton gives Angélique the advice to go speak to her uncle and "ouvrez-lui votre coeur"/open your heart to him (4). The Italian Angelica is told to explain "il vostre cuore, la vostra passione, la vostra inclinazione"/your heart, your passion, your desires [for marriage] (4).

Despite the Italian amplification, both versions lead in parallel ways to a predictable scene of misunderstanding between uncle and niece. The terms used to discuss marriage are sharply marked in I.8 when uncle and niece speak in private about her concerns, but the niece's shyness and vague speech prevent her from acknowledging her *amoureux*, and force the uncle to try to clarify what she wants:

> Oui? Vous voulez vous marier, perdre la liberté, la tranquillité? Eh bien! Tant pis pour vous; oui, je vous marierai. (38)

> Ah! ah! volete maritarvi? Perder la libertà, la tranquillità? (*bruscamente*) Vi mariterò. (35)
>
> (Literally, the French reads: Yes? You want to get married, lose your freedom, your tranquillity? Very well! Too bad for you; yes, I will marry you off. Literally, the Italian reads: Ah! So! You want to marry? Lose your freedom, your tranquility? (*abruptly*) I will marry you off.)

The French Géronte expresses his own feelings on marriage, or perhaps also the traditional view of women in marriage, in this speech, whereas the Italian Géronte is a bit more circumspect (and unusually reductive in Italian); although he too is stunned that his niece wishes to "perder la libertà, la tranquilità", he omits the "tant pis" phrase and adds simply (albeit *bruscamente*) "Vi mariterò". Angélique is prompted to comment, perhaps in ironic French fashion, on her uncle's *charmant* (charming) nature, whereas the Italian Angelica says straightforwardly that her uncle's *collera* (fury) makes her sad. More forthright and in many cases less accusatory, the Italian characters seem to interact with more candor as well as open affection.

At the end of Act I, Scene 18, Angélique, who could not bring herself to speak her wishes to her uncle, despite Marton's admonitions, laments: "Ciel! Me voilà plus malheureuse que jamais; que vais-je devenir? Eh! ma chère Marton ne m'abandonnera pas"/Heavens! Here I am more unhappy than ever; what will come of me? Ah! my dear Marton will not abandon me (61). The Italian Angelica makes Marta's role in her life, and in the plot of the play, rather more explicit: "Eccomi più imbarazzata che mai. Ah! spero, che la mia cara Marta verrà in mio soccorso. Finirà ella l'opera ch'io ho sì mal principiata" (60) / Here I am more troubled than ever. Ah! I hope that my dear Marta will come to my aid. She will finish this project that I have so badly begun. Whereas Angélique's speech lacks an explicit sense of agency, Angelica mentions that she might need Marta's help to get out of her difficulties, but that it was nevertheless she who initiated things ("io ho si mal principiata"). As we will see, it is in this context of responsibility that the last line of the play's first scene takes on particular importance.

Earlier in that scene, Marton had been meeting with Valere and Angélique to discuss their future, and heard voices approaching. She ordered Valere to leave, explaining that the two lovers are "fous"/"pazzi" (crazy), and would bring about their own ruin. In both versions, the suitor is surprised and indignant, although more so in Italian – "Cosa . . . cosa incomprensibile!" (42) – than in the French – "Cela est inconcevable" (40). Marton's response in French is similarly more guarded, and shows more deference to Valere than does her Italian: "Allons, allons, monsieur: sortez vite"/Go, monsieur, go; leave quickly (41) "Orsù signor incomprensibile, partite"/All right, Master Incomprehensible, leave (43). Marton's French also explains cogently, if urgently, why Valere must do so: "n'exposez pas mademoiselle à se perdre dans l'esprit de son oncle, qui est le seul qui puisse lui faire du bien"/do not cause mademoiselle to lose her status in the eyes of her uncle, who is the only one who can do the right thing by her (41). Thus the French text explicitly links the lovers' fate to the actions

of the beneficent if grumpy uncle.

In contrast to the French, the Italian Marta adds a long tirade intended to achieve the departure of the unauthorized lover not through logic, but through antagonism, whether staged or real: "voi dovevate essere partito un'ora fa, ed è veramente incomprensibile, ch'io vi abbia sofferto, e che vi abbia detto tutte quelle cose, che senza volerlo mi sono uscite di bocca"/you should have left one hour ago, and it is truly unbelievable that I have had to suffer you, and that I must dictate to you in all aspects of this matter, that, without wanting it to, all this has escaped from my mouth (43). This speech in Italian establishes Marta as the character who sides with the young lovers; and, while the uncle is still good-hearted in this version, the script does not insist upon such qualities at this point.

The final sentence of the scene heightens these differences. The French reads, "J'entends du bruit; sortez vite" [Valere (*sort*)] / I hear noise; leave quickly [Valere leaves] (43-4), and the Italian specifies, "Voi mi fareste venir la rabbia (*spinge Valerio, ed egli parte*)/You are enraging me (*pushes Valerio, and he leaves*) (47). Moliéresque overtones suffuse both versions. We need only think of *Le Tartuffe*, in which the servant Dorine, alone on stage with the lovers Mariane and Valere, first physically unites then pushes them apart. In Goldoni's obvious borrowings, the structure of the scene (most essentially, the pivotal function of the foolish father/uncle's interference in his good daughter/niece's marriage hopes), the mediating role played by Marta, and even the young man's name, echo *Le Tartuffe* (1664-1669). We might expect Goldoni's French to have more in common with Molière's text than his Italian. Yet the Molière intertext is equally present in Marta's Italian tirade, in the frustration of the governess at the behaviour, both indecisive and disobedient, of the two lovers, her resort to certain gestures and manipulations to get her point across, and even her echoes of Dorine's repeated "J'enrage" ("Voi mi fareste venir la rabbia"). The following scene, discussed above, further reinforces this theatrical intertext when niece and governess speak privately, and Angélique asks Marton to address the topic of her marriage with her uncle, since she is too terrified of him to speak to him directly. Even the misunderstanding between uncle and niece reflects that of fulminating Orgon and his timid daughter Marianne.

Overall, Goldoni's French version is more formal, more precise, and more ironic than his translation, and contains fewer explicit explanations by the characters of their action and motive. It may be that Goldoni, writing in French, consciously follows in the footsteps of the great seventeenth-century Molière, who still dominated the European stage of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and whose *Le Misanthrope* was the first play Goldoni saw in France. To write French drama in the century after Molière, and before the sweeping literary changes that followed the Revolution, perhaps required rendering a plot with greater finesse in French, leaving more to the imagination. In Italian, on the other hand, Goldoni is more direct and takes greater care to make explicit the ties between characters, and the various strands of plot development. The Italian is also semantically richer. At the play's end, the uncle's good deed (allowing his niece to marry her lover, and even providing her dowry) provokes an outpouring of praise for him, which he immediately tries to stop: in the French, he accomplishes this with the repetition "Paix, paix, paix" (32).

Whereas Geronte's bellowed Italian (*grida forte*) is much richer, both in vocabulary and in tone: "Zitti, basta, tacete" (30) / Put a cork in it, enough, hold your tongue. The widely divergent verbs suggest more than Goldoni's colloquial competence in Italian. Goldoni closes his play with this comical string of loosely equivalent terms deriving from both informal and formal speech, yet in a play whose rigidly classical structure still evokes Molière and neoclassical poetics. Such verbal blends of discursive register, like the other patterns of amplification, reflect what might be called a felt sense of freedom in Italian which is missing from the French, either because of Molière's dominance as theatrical paradigm or the dominant structures of taste and decorum in French audiences, or indeed a certain persistent linguistic hesitance in French. Basically, the sense of French constraint seems to stem chiefly from the much tighter control of French codified poetics of the time, and from the heavy weight of Molière – in shaping both plots and audience expectations. The Franco-Italian writer conspicuously excludes French canonical rhyme and meter, while adapting inherited characters to updated social contexts, in both languages.

As a successful European dramatist, Goldoni's plays were swiftly translated into German for the very new Hamburger Nationaltheater, with its proud focus on the rising bourgeois class in Germany. The critic Gotthold Lessing, co-founder of the Nationaltheater and author of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (1767-68), a vibrant encomium of German-language bourgeois art, took Goldoni as model for the reformation of German theatre. Lessing wanted to jettison any aristocratic associations of drama (even the plays of courtly Molière) in favor of a freer model foregrounding bourgeois values (see Petronio 1957; Theile 1993). And Lessing himself translated one of Goldoni's plays (*L'erede fortunata*) in 1756. Goldoni's work also thrived on Europe's older stages. In straddling such earlier theatrical traditions as the populist *commedia* and the aristocratic plays of Molière, and such newer forms as nascent bourgeois drama (which was to have such a bright future in northern Europe in particular), Goldoni the "French" courtier survived even the Revolution. His dual heritage, as both a French author and an Italian one, also helped his transition from the France of Molière to playwright of the new revolutionary Republic.

Goldoni's bilingual text is a convenient place to stop for a moment to consider the state of criticism on such early modern self-translators. Like literary historians in general, drama historians too participate, albeit often wittingly, in the age-old debates about how such bilingual dramatists fit into the national canons of their two languages. Even figuring so late in the eighteenth century, a period whose historians are intently aware of ambient multilingualism in the major cities of Europe and the Americas, Goldoni is a typical example of the push-pull relations of two schools of critics among Italian- and French-language theorists. Certainly his prominence in both national canons is secure; he is given pride of place in standard encyclopedias of both literatures (such as the Bordas *Dictionnaire des littératures de language française* [1984], edited by Beaumarchais et al., and the Greenwood Dictionary of Italian Literature [1996] edited by the Bondanellas). It is rather the problem of his bilinguality that continues to pose difficulties for critics who step out beyond the parameters of nation and "Italian" or "French" canons to consider their interrelations in his texts.

Jonathan Cope has described how critics in Italian studies have moved Goldoni, partly under the impetus of Derridean deconstruction, out from under the baggage of Crocean aesthetics and Marxian economies and into his rightful station, "placing him centrally into the most experimental traditions of European drama" (Cope 1987:299). Around 1975 like many frothy comedies and bourgeois dramas of recent history, Goldoni's work was re-examined – in both countries – for its dark side, and revealed to be more complex than formalist critics had allowed, as in its tensions between gender roles, authority figures, or social classes. The bilingual issue, however, has tended to be either radically inflated or entirely erased from such discussions.

For example, echoing critics of several earlier bilingual writers, such as Charles d'Orléans, one of the leading revisionists in Goldoni studies, Franco Fido in *Da Venezia all'Europa: Prospettivi sull'ultimo Goldoni* (1984), theorizes that Goldoni had no country, belonged to no place, and wrote in "no language" but the meta-linguistic space of drama. Summarizing this strand of thought in Goldoni studies, Cope echoes Fido to the effect that, because Goldoni had left his native country and lived and worked in a new country and its language, "he never was precisely or primarily a Venetian playwright," and he inhabited neither Italy nor even France: "Neither the Pasquali 'Italian' [edition of his plays] nor the French *Mémoires* were written in a foreign or a native tongue by Goldoni. They were written in the space which is neither translation nor re-acculturation, similar to that between actor and role, between posing author and 'chi legge'" (Cope 1987:302). This is "the imaginative space between a presumably existent culture and the private fantasy whose expression provides its only verifiable existence" (1987:302). Positing a kind of meta-linguistic realm that we will see again in critical readings of bilingual writers, Cope argues without evidence that Goldoni did not acquire one new language but was dispossessed of two: "This was not a Conrad or a Nabokov pirating another language as a trophy. Goldoni . . . wrote in no language. He wrote from inside no society, evading, as he did, every effort to capture him from the time he was a Paduan student or a Pisan lawyer through the Parisian favorite" or *Le Bouru bienfaisant* (1987:302). That the bilingual writer cannot be 'captured' seems more problematic to his readers than it was to the author, but to Cope the problem is quite real: "He was in a cultural warp that we have not yet critically defined. But one needs anchorage, genre, place, pursuit even to begin. So Goldoni as the absent Venetian becomes the supreme avatar of the 'displaced' artist of eighteenth-century Europe. A mirror of nothing reflecting himself everywhere" (Cope 1987:302).

This might seem to be an extraordinarily rarefied view of bilinguality, and of course it is, but it is also an important statement of the critical practice that elevates the bilingual writer into a bodiless, mythic state that quite thoroughly escapes, by transcending, *both* nations' claims on him. Suggesting the kinds of arguments that will be applied to Beckett and other later authors, even the bilingual writer's thematic motifs about home and language are swept into the critical category of unanchored, meta-linguistic conditions. The utility of such a meta-linguistic state is not specified. Cope is more perspicacious than many critics in this vein, however, insofar as he specifies that, once one foregoes the category of nation, one is left with a kind of "cultural warp" that still needs critical definition.

The opposite of that particular plank of Goldoni studies, which we might call the culture warp or empty mirror, is the claim that the writer somehow betrays both nations. In this view, he does indeed belong to the national canon, but his native language became so corrupted that his status there is dubious at best; it is implied that the foreigners may lay claim to his or her works, if they wish, and good riddance. Since literary history is not self-service, however, the writer remains rather uneasily categorized as "national" in both canons, though encircled with caveats. Concerning Goldoni, for example, Gabriella Bosco in "Goldoni et le dragon" (1993) disagrees with the preponderance of Italian scholars when she finds Goldoni's Italian in his late plays to be "truffé de gallicismes de toute sorte"/ riddled with all sorts of Gallicisms (Bosco 1993:354). This is curious, she points out, in a writer whose French was just an acquired language, but the process is obvious: he began to write as a young man cloistered in the Venetian dialect while envious of French as "la langue étrangère par excellence", the language of the European cosmopolitan (1003:356). So when he moved into French, it was like passing into the other side of the mirror (1993:356): "Jamais la nouvelle langue ne l'éloignera du vénitien, qui restera la seule langue vraiment 'expressive' de Goldoni; par contre, le français empiètera petit à petit sur l'italien, et finira par le déformer"/the new language will never distance him from Venetian, which will remain Goldoni's only truly 'expressive' language; on the other hand, his French will encroach little by little on his Italian, and will end up deforming it (1993:356). Like many other critics grappling with the problematics of Goldoni's bilinguality, Bosco cites Gianfranco Folena's diagnosis of pathological language contamination (quoted above), to conclude that thus Goldoni's Italian had become "quasiment grotesque, sans qu'il le sache"/ almost grotesque, without his knowing it (1993:357). Still, she seems to be nearly alone in finding the Italian of his self-translated *Il Burbero di buon cuore* to have undergone linguistic "dégénération" (1993:357).

Striking a more balanced way between these two extreme views of the Italo-French writer, Hélène Colombani-Giaufret recognizes that Goldoni has become in critical circles "l'homme incommode"/ the inconvenient man (Colombani-Giaufret 1993; 337). Not only did he write in two languages, but he has a massive corpus of prefaces in Italian that he seems to have translated for integrating portions into his *Mémoires* in French (1993:337), so that one cannot even classify him in terms of the two mutually exclusive French rubrics of "mémorialiste" and "écrivain" (writer). She adds that, to these difficulties concerning the very status of the text, is added the usual suspicion – about the quality and thereby the literariness of the text – which dogs bilingual writers" ("qui s'attache aux écrivains bilingues"; 1993:338). For her part, she goes back to the historical documents to show that Goldoni's French was commended by his contemporaries, even praised (the eminent writer Palissot, for example, said Goldoni wrote his *Mémoires* in the very style that La Fontaine might have written his own); but in the nineteenth century that view changed, and Goldoni's French *and* his Italian were found wanting by speakers of those languages. Colombani-Giaufret points out how a certain severity toward Goldoni begins surfacing in nineteenth-century assessments, which often arose from ignorance of the strong fluctuation in linguistic norms that had run throughout Goldoni's life-span in Europe and begun stabilizing

only in the nineteenth century (1993:342). The capital fact to Colombani-Giaufret, in sifting such matters, is that in 1771 with a glittering audience of notable French figures, "Goldoni maîtrise si bien le français que Paris applaudit sans réserve et admire son style"/ Goldoni masters French so well that Paris applauds without reserve and admires his style (1993:343).

Colombani-Giaufret goes on to show that, lexicographically speaking, both the linguistic calibre and style of *each* language version of his works (plays and memoirs) are quite consistent. Translingual stylistic consistence may explain in part why Goldoni was so shocked, and apparently irate when another comic author proposed to translate his plays, saying that there was no problem with the Italian dialects because he had a servant who had been to Italy and therefore knew them all. Goldoni also registers shock at discovering that even an apparently able translator turns his Italian pleasantries into French platitudes. Thus, as he concludes in his *Mémoires*, "on ne peut pas faire connoître le génie de la littérature étrangère que par les pensées, par les images, par l'érudition; mais il faut rapprocher les phrases et le style de la nation pour laquelle on veut traduire . . . il ne faut pas traduire, il faut créer, il faut inventer"/ one cannot make the genius of a foreign literature known only through the thoughts, the images, the erudition; one must relate the phrasing to the style of the nation for which one is trying to translate . . . one must not translate, one must create, one must invent (Ortolani 1936:483; see the discussion of these precepts in Colombani-Giaufret 1993:346-347).

Goldoni thus insists on what later theorists will call cultural transposition or enculturation, and as we will see in the following section, in this concept of translation he positions himself closer to the modernists than to his contemporaries vaunting *belles infidèles*. Goldoni acknowledges the "nation" as an important category of description in translative practice, but unlike many of his contemporaries he subordinates it to the "style" of the national literature, that is, what we might call the literary idiolect of the vernacular. This is an aspect of his thought that merits more attention, particularly in the context of changing concepts of translation in the shift from early modern to Romantic conceptions. But Goldoni was ahead of his time, and quite soon the French Revolution and Napoleonic wars intensified the standing of the *natio* even in, perhaps especially in this sort of inter-vernacular translation.

Before turning to the German Romantics' concept of translation, in the next section, we should note one last point concerning the critical disputes over Goldoni's literary bilinguality. Gianfranco Folena has shown that critics in both camps tend to dismiss the memoirs, mainstream Italian critics because they are in Goldoni's French which is acceptable but at best "approssimativo", and many French critics because the memoirs are extraneous to his Franco-Italian dramatic works. To his credit, in close comparative readings Folena shows that Goldoni's Italian texts were indeed rich in Gallicisms, but of course so were many Venetian texts of the day as well as other Italian writings using intertexts from that "prestige" language of the eighteenth century. Rather like Fido and Cope, however, Folena then constructs a triangulated model wherein Goldoni's Italian texts and French texts together require a third domain, which Folena calls pre-grammatical; this is the stage when, in French, Goldoni in Venice had only read French books, creating in his mind an imaginary cultural space

where people (including him) spoke that bookish language (*pura parola*), and only gradually while in France did he actually acquire the real language.

Why this sort of abstract figure, or any such triangulation with an infra-linguistic state, is considered necessary, is never explained. But as we will see in critical readings of modernist self-translators as well, positing an abstract *tertium quid* seems to assuage a certain unease that results from failing to fit the writer entirely into any one familiar, national vernacular tradition. Colombani-Giaufret prefers a psychoanalytic triangle, suggesting that Goldoni's three languages were his maternal Venetian dialect, his paternal authorities in the literary canon of Italian, and thence the utopic language of French, in which he escaped censure and normative prescription of what constituted authentic discourse, leaving him free to create, as he so often insisted he must. The problem with such models is that they topple when the bilingual writer self-translates between languages, usually later in life, like Goldoni's translating in both directions, and in both genres of prose and drama. As usual the writer's two languages can be fitted into such models of psychic split, and Oedipal separation, in the way that medievalists often describe Charles d'Orléans as a split subject, as we have seen. But chronology complicates the picture, which really requires a subsequent model of "coming-home" to the first language and resuming it as a literary medium. As Colombani-Giaufret (1993) states, and as we will explore in the next section, one tacit premise of such concepts of bilinguality is that the writer is truly "expressive" only in the maternal language. More than metaphoric, such terms assume a substrate of German Romantic philosophy of language that still haunts, in these ways, much of our thinking about expressing the "self" in a second language.

Part 3: Facing Language

Romantic, Modern, and Contemporary Conditions (1800-2000)

A. Changing Concepts of Language and Translation

Most of us in translation work or theory go about our tasks unaware of how we have been shaped by events that occurred two hundred years ago. By the end of the early modern period, as we saw in Part 2, language had become the object of treatises and polemics in several European milieus. To be sure, the controversy about whether language is a natural endowment or a social convention had arisen among ancient Greeks, as in Plato's *Cratylus*, and was never resolved. But it was effectively reconfigured around the turn of the nineteenth century.

The basic question had always been how a language already constituted can then eventuate from human subjects using it for various ends. Is it God-given, thus innate in the human being, or acquired, that is, socially constructed and transmitted within communities? In counter-motion perhaps with the waning authority of the Church, the age-old disputes that we have seen recurring through the centuries come to focus around 1800 on philosophical debates about language on the one hand, and, on the other, emergent psycho-social aspects of *natio* that combine into the broad currents of historicist and evolutionist views that will come to characterize nineteenth-century thought in general. Language debates always echo concurrent movements in philosophy and other domains, such as theology or empirical science. By 1800 thinkers in many fields were theorizing "human nature", often by focusing on this problem of whether language is primarily an acquired instrument for socially communicating the (*a priori*) shared universals of human thought, or primarily the very means of producing human thought (*a posteriori*) in the individual as member of a linguistic community.

Through the eighteenth century, residual traces of medieval theology and Renaissance humanism continued to inform, though with less and less authority, notions of universals existing across all languages. As the onging utility of Latin-based primers suggests, the premise of a universal grammar inhering variously in all languages descended in part from the vertical axis of Latin as source of the European vernaculars, but in part also from notions of the person as receptacle, capable of receiving and transmitting equivalent languages. That forms of Renaissance genre play and macaronic verse persist through the early modern period dramatizes the sense of the joy, the lively pride in translative skill, and the sheer abundance of expressive modes available to the upright person in a still multilingual world:

> What Eloquence
> And forcing Rhet'rick must arise from hence?
> When ev'ry single thought might have the vse
> Of soe vvell furnish'd Wardrobes, and mighd chuse
> Figures that best befit itselve, to-day
> Walke out in such a sute, to morrow may
> It put on that, still vary'ing, as the sense
> Should prompt, decorums, or the audience.
>
> (Thomas Gawen [1632], quoted in Forster 1970:28)

How did the West move so quickly, it now seems, from this dominant model of expressive abundance to the modern model of the native language as sole true source of being and expression?

The first stages of this momentous change can be seen at the end of the eighteenth century. Many language historians have traced the multiple legacies of the Enlightenment in translation theory, and the changing history of concepts of language and translation among Romantics, Victorians, modernists, and their successors. This history has already been significantly redefined twice since 1930. Until recent decades, there was a standard, widely accepted historical narrative of the events spanning Romantics, moderns, and postmoderns. It traced a rather saltatory course of revolts and revolutions in philosophies of language reflecting, as often happens in theory, a certain view of political history. Then, beginning first in the 1960s and gathering steam in the 1990s, a revisionist account developed that challenged the historical accuracy of that narrative. The old texts were reread. Canonical quotations were reinserted in their contexts, where they came to look somewhat different. Figures that seemed familiar, like Locke or Condillac, disclosed unsuspected dimensions. The two accounts of philosophies of language and translation history often clash in the details, but they are not irreconcilable. The second one adumbrates the first largely by filling gaps in the record and by flattening radical innovations into sustained continuity with eighteenth-century thought.

In the standard account, the French Revolution is marked as a momentous upheaval that shattered the tenets of rationalism and launched Romanticism as reaction. Modernist language historians long upheld the image of philosophers of language swiftly abandoning the materialist empiricism of Locke and the Encyclopedists, with its premise that sensory experience conditions and constructs universal language. In this view, language was reconceived by German Romantic thinkers asserting the opposite: as Wilhelm von Humboldt put it, the individual has an internal predisposition for language, an *innere Sprachform* for creatively developing an expressive verbal medium in response to experience of the world; moreover this indissociably mental/verbal patterning differs between peoples in different regions of the world. Accordingly, it was held, for most of the nineteenth century the study of languages moved from the heart of universal intellectual life to the dusty archives of philologists scrutinizing dictionaries and grammars. When linguistic study had thus dwindled in scope and significance, in this standard account, the revolutionary work of Ferdinand de Saussure in 1916 changed everything. In his *Cours de linguistique générale* Saussure posited a new kind of structural linguistics to show that language works across multiple contexts independent of all its traditional referential functions with respect to the world and its traditional expressive functions with respect to the user: the relation of the signifier, or sign, to the signified is secondary, even formally arbitrary, since words take their meaning only from relations with one another, within a linguistic structure, not with respect to the world of referents. The words “slap” and “slip” or “down” and “dawn” mean by difference, by their internal difference within a sign system. Like pieces on a chessboard, he said, words are signs assuming meaning only through the unarticulated gaps between them, in their relative positions as signs in a transformable system or syntax. Public or communal language (*langue*) englobes

individual variants (*langages*) and, in both modes, meaning can arise only in words' differential relations.

Saussure's structuralist model of language study as semiotics, the study of signs in transformable systems, quickly spread to other disciplines. The intellectuals' embrace of his *Cours de linguistique générale* created what was called the linguistic turn in Western thought. The structuralist model of inter-referring signs seemed to exclude both subjectivity (language being an autonomous phenomenon that precludes uniquely particular, personal expression) and referentiality (words being signfiers with no fixed referents but signalling across the breaks and gaps in the semantic structure itself). When applied to historiography, the paradigm of signs circulating in closed systems was used to critique Enlightenment or "humanist" writings as a self-serving discourse of the elite, based on the exclusion of alterity – despite the foregrounding of alterity in many early modern texts, as we have seen. In anthropology, kinship relations were glossed semiotically as structures of exchange. In many disciplines, from political science to art history and aesthetics, the model of signs circulating systematically was also used to critique the "humanist" discourse of living authorities still dominant in those fields. More broadly, the grandiose nouns Man and Truth, among others, were leveled to outworn signs deployed in the discourses of the long dominant political class, as in the work of Michel Foucault on eighteenth-century political thought, or of the perennial Oedipal repression of desire in the individual, as in Jacques Lacan reprising Freud in structuralist terms. The psyche, the ideologies of government and gender, the belief system and the worldview, many modernist constructs fell under the postmodern Saussurean lens, where they appeared to be structured exactly like language, in semiotic terms, and to operate in the same exclusionary way. During roughly 1960 to 1980, French thinkers appropriated aspects of structural linguistics chiefly as a diagnostic tool for exposing the flaws (and the vanity) of the humanistic past. Their successors, especially in the United States, applied structuralist analysis to contemporary social problems, largely political ones of social exclusion, paying little attention to language itself as the originary paradigm of such structural relations.

The last part of this account is quite accurate. In manifold guise, the postulates of structuralist linguistics swept through the intellectual field of academic disciplines like a contestatory force, upending many unexamined assumptions and recalibrating patriarchal, Eurocentric perspectives on rulers and others, centers and margins, nouns and referents. Certainly, it was complemented and extended by many other events, not least postcolonial liberation movements and ethnic assertions across the globe. Gradually, however, as the various structuralisms' own premises came under scrutiny, the roots of this historical narrative seemed to have been tailored to the import of revolutionary semiotics more than to the actual past of the history of ideas about language.

Among the revisionist historians, Hans Aarsleff showed that recent notions of "Cartesian linguistics" as a purely rationalist theory of language oversimplified Descartes, who was much more deeply engaged with sensory experience than the post-Enlightenment account allowed. He argued that Saussure himself, through his long residence in Paris, was less a pioneer than a refiner of anterior language theory, indeed a direct inheritor of Hippolyte Taine's concept of signs and, through him, of

the French *idéologues* of the nineteenth century, and so on back to Condillac and to Locke himself. Semiotic theories of the signs circulating in discourse were shown to have been widespread across Europe and England in the eighteenth century (Formigari 1990). German Romantic thinkers were reread as close students of Enlightenment thought, indebted to Condillac while striking off on new ground (Ricken 1984), quite like Condillac building on Locke. Similarly in philosophy, in literary criticism and theory, and in aesthetics, while never denying the felt crisis of representation at the heart of modernism, scholars toward the end of the twentieth century began reconfiguring it in light of earlier periods, adducing even nineteenth-century realism as concordant with semiotic theses in its poetics of mythic signification. The term "beauty" reentered critical and philosophic discourse as a relative value among others in the long history of artistic production. Many aspects of the humanist legacy, not least the complex rationalism of Enlightenment writings, returned to the fore in new emphasis on ethics and cultural memory in moral and political philosophy. In one sense, public events overcame structuralisms' austere premises. Tribal wars, ethnic cleansings, religious fundamentalisms, the virtual realities constructed by electronic media, many factors came to displace the (by then shopworn and reductive) structural linguistic model of human experience, as a play of symbols for always already inaccessible realities. With new technologies to hand, such as computerized concordances, the field of poetics resumed comparative stylistics, seeking the individual writer's idiosyncratic use of language within the once purely structural, impersonal text. Around 1990, the postmodern interlude of structuralisms closed on the old questions: idea, belief, cognition, knowledge, predication, language, and human nature.

Thus, to adopt the revisionist account, it is now clear that well before the Romantics, as we saw in the last section, the ideological clashes between rationalist and empiricist philosophers of language were never neat. Empiricists like John Locke in England argued that sensual experience shapes perceptions into ideas, whereas rationalists like Descartes and the Encyclopedists argued that thought precedes language or expression. Descartes and the Port Royal grammarians certainly did seek a rational order underlying all languages. Yet even those groups increasingly distinguished that immutable universal grammar from what the *Encyclopédie* writers called "particular grammar": "particular grammar is the art of applying to the immutable general principles of written and spoken language the arbitrary conventions in common use of a particular language" (quoted in Law 2003:264). Taking into account the arbitrary, the local, the particular, what later theorists call the relativity of diverse language systems, rationalist theorists were not at all unaware of the need to complicate their position with such empirical, materialist concerns of real speakers and cultural differences. Similarly, the empiricists in the lineage of Locke and Diderot never ignored, indeed they often struggled with, the problem of how sensory perception could engender not just ideas for a world of universal signifieds but *also* different ideas in other languages. Romantics were aware that Locke, for example, had written about cultural difference in languages and that Condillac described the "genius" of individual languages (Locke wrote, "those of one Country, by their customs and manner of Life, have found occasion to make several complex Ideas, and give names to them, which others never collected into specifick Ideas"; quoted in Law 2003:264-65). The concept

of the uniformity of human nature through all times and places was never absolute; it assumed the rule of uniformity (in the essential nature of thought) as constant only through variety in expression (see Aarsleff 1982:159). On the brink of the nineteenth century, both theoretical positions shared the same aim of trying to elucidate the relations between mind and language, and thereby experience and knowledge. Both assumed reason as the primary human distinction, basis of all learning and history, and took as their common conceptual problem how reason worked through language. Their prior postulates about the origin and nature of languages (arising in Adamic man or in the Babel of confusion) long occluded their growing rapprochement around the issue of the origins and progress of diverse languages in different national cultures.

Kristeva has shown that the Renaissance notion of formal grammar transcending variability came to an impasse first in Descartes. Logic could show that modern languages share formal correspondants with Latin, but it could not discover the new laws governing emergent languages (1981:157). Descartes posited the existence of extra-linguistic human thought (in the realm of ideas) as wholly distinct from objects in the world (the realm of things). Language becomes a mediate mode, useless for knowing the world, and superfluous: the mind that attends words, not things, falls into error. His followers among the Port Royal grammarians stressed language as a human creation distinct from the higher realms of idea, judgment, *pensée*, though they too vacillated about how to equilibrate formal grammar and transcendental logic or the disconnection of content into rational categories. Like Locke, but with an evolutionist bent, Condillac speculated that language originally arose from the senses, from cries of alarm and so forth, and that these soon evolved into words as signs of states and thoughts. Thus, although "tout confirme donc que chaque langue exprime le caractère du peuple qui la parle", the result is merely ever greater variety in universal and natural signs (*Essai sur l'origine des connaissances humaines*, 1746-1754; quoted in Kristeva 1981:175). Cartesian rationalism and universalist models of thought and language are thus tempered and nuanced by increasing attention to the variability that is "natural" to human beings in time and place. The writers of the *Encyclopédie* in the eighteenth century inherited this rationalistic concept of language, with its premise that the rational rules underlying all languages gird universal order and help shape "human nature", though they also came to distrust universal models as somewhat reductive. The universalist problem was crucial to the changing concept of language. It led Diderot to wonder, in his *Lettre sur les sourds et muets* /Letter on the Deaf and Mute (1751), whether Cicero didn't have to formulate his thoughts first in the logical order of French (subject-verb-predicate) before speaking them in Latin. He concluded that, yes, given the rational nature of human thought, Cicero did just that. The fact that Diderot ends his treatise with a ringing endorsement of his native language suggests the kinds of complexity, cultural and epistemological, built into the concept of language at the end of the era of empiricism. As both Kristeva and Formigari point out, by the late eighteenth century the lexicon for describing language use had slid almost imperceptibly from "logical" to "natural". The lens was beginning to shift from a rational to a materialist view of both grammar and persons: the concept of grammar began devolving from abstract interchangeable signs to local material

references, even as the concept of persons was being displaced from universal man to local subjects.

It was already clear to empiricists and encyclopedists that, as Voltaire put it, languages were obviously not created by assemblies of logicians ("*Langues*", *Dictionnaire philosophique,* 1764). The once dominant universalist position, increasingly laced with anecdotal and speculative evidence of national linguistic differences, did not crumble, but it was certainly under siege. The *Encyclopédie* article on "*Langages*" cites "the Cartesian school" to state that all human souls and minds are of the same nature, and therefore the differences come from exterior influences. Just as all human bodies are formed of the same material but no two bodies are alike, so human languages have a mind (*esprit*) and a body, thought and sounds, a common objective and a universal instrument. Deriving these principles from universal human nature or *l'esprit humain*, the encyclopedist finds exactly the same relationships in the *esprit* of language between universals and particulars, generating both the genius of all the languages and the increasing difficulty of translating from one to another. Within a universalist model, this practical note of difficulty in the daily use of languages and translating, due to the tenacious linguistic differences arising from the national "caractère" of peoples, marks the article as already edging out of its Cartesian frame.

Concerning translation, then, it is now agreed that by 1800 the recent history of concepts of language entailed a dual legacy of shifting relations between the dominant doctrine of universals and the emergent concept of the native language as a unique social construction. The pendulum was swinging from a primarily epistemological concern, focusing on the linguistic sign, to a growing ontological emphasis on semantic reference. The long reign of logic had seemed to position early moderns as the direct descendants of Boethius and Augustine (language is the medium by which one thinks, and logic is the science of sound thinking). The concept of translation as *imitatio* had undergone surprisingly few changes over the centuries, largely refinements on the principle of free and easy transposition of linguistic signs between verbal systems, in the enthusiastic appropriation of the foreign into domestic codes. Fidelity and accuracy were not esteemed in a linguistic climate whose sovereign value was expressive *imitatio*, in the plundering of the cultural other for enriching the language and the culture of the ever more contrastively defined *natio* of nation-states. Just as Cicero called for orators to plunder Greek to the benefit of young Latin, so Dryden and Voltaire ingested Romans and other foreigners into neoclassical costumes and discourses. Nationalist politics played their part too in this translative practice of leveling linguistic and cultural differences to one local standard of normative taste and discursive register. Literary traditions also positioned translators as importers, channeling the texts of the Greco-Roman ideal as well as the incoming currents of the Spanish Golden Age or French neoclassicism, for a younger generation of writers to adapt and recreate for a local audience. In various capitals, generations of ancients and moderns jockeyed for primacy over the normative cultural standard, while rarely disputing the premise of translation as annexation.

In new nations in particular, as in nascent Germany and Italy, massively proliferating translations of foreign texts overtly served a socio-political agenda, as the proud ensign of linguistic and literary rivalry with the dominant languages and forms of

European poetics. The young Germans, conscious inheritors of Luther's audacity in having pitched his German Bible against the Latin of Rome, thundered against the hegemony of French neoclassical aesthetics and therewith, as it turned out, the whole superstructure of universals.

Translation had long been a part of the German return to medieval, folk, and antique sources. German baroque translators of French texts had always positioned them relative to the Greco-Roman ideal, not unlike early moderns elsewhere in Europe. Peculiar to the young German Romantics at the turn of the nineteenth century, however, was the legacy of Idealism from Kant and Fichte in philosophy. As they began developing their literary agenda for translation, as an agent for commingling poetry and philosophy in unique forms, their view of cultural alterity assumed important new dimensions. As Berman has shown, within the cultural field that the Germans called *Bildung* (culture and education), "the translations of the Romantics [took] on the conscious form of a *program*" (Berman 1984:13): as filtered through Kant, *Bildung* becomes a process of self-formation, through the experience of the alterity of the world (1984:44-45). Countering centuries of dominant thought premised on the universal subject, the Romantics held that each being begins without form, and finds its particular form, its unique essence, in an historical process of comparison and contrast, affirmation and negation, and progressive expansion (analogous to whole peoples' progress through historical epochs in the refinement of *natio* or *Volksgeist*), in continual interaction with others. Drawing upon such precursors as Vico and Herder, and emergent traces of such historicization of the vernacular in early moderns, as we have seen, this comparatist agenda aims to elucidate particularity, or individuation in time and socio-cultural history. Persons and languages, like ideas and like societies, evolve in time, and only through time (not from any universal substrate) will develop those characteristics that differentiate them from all others.

Thus Goethe elaborates the classical German theory of translation in the service of *Weltliteratur*, or translation not as annexation but as an opening out onto the world in order to distinguish foreign and non-foreign in oneself (or in one's language or national literature). Literatures are images of cultural others, which are not otherwise available for study, scrutiny, learning, *Bildung*. It is in this vein that Humboldt positions the translator as navigating midway between crude literalness and "French" effacement of the other: "the first requirement is simple fidelity. . . A necessary corollary to this conception is that a translation should have a certain coloring of strangeness over it . . . As long as one feels the foreign, but not the strangeness, the translation has reached the highest goal; but where strangeness appears as such, [and thus] probably obscures the foreign, the translator betrays that he is not up to his original" (Humboldt, preface to his *Agamemnon* [1816], quoted in Berman 1984:154). The fine line between the foreign (*das Fremde*) and strangeness (*die Fremdheit*) is prudently, if faintly drawn in order to constrain the translator from, in Humboldt's view, the excessive quirkiness of many contemporary translators. The point, however, is this new sense of the utility of the "strange" in the foreign to instruct and enrich, to demarcate the points of dissimilarity and new interface. The concept of language underlying such theses also shifts the ground from language as epistemological instrument of knowledge, to be deployed by the universal subject in articulating thought, to language as indissociable

from being, a kind of constituent element in consciousness of world and self. To Humboldt, "language is the means, if not absolute, at least sensible, by which man gives form simultaneously to himself and to the world, or rather becomes conscious of himself by projecting a world outside of himself" (quoted in Berman 1984:143). It is a short step from this nurturant notion of language as *innere Sprachforme,* shaping if not creating consciousness, to the encomium of the native tongue as the egoic essence of subjectivity.

The more radical Romantics, the Schlegels, Novalis, Schleiermacher, and others, elaborated a concept of translation explicitly based on a theory of subjectivity, in what Kristeva calls a vitalism of the logos as expressive activity (1981:201). From external universal forms for thought or ideas, accessible to all, language becomes an internal disposition of being itself, a function of inner being and intuition. In his influential essay of 1813, *Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens*/On the Different Methods of Translating, Schleiermacher agreed that translations should convey the foreign flavor of originals. But the line between foreign and domestic became almost a barricade to him, the irreducible divide between facile and authentic self. He noted that one's native language actually "binds cognition and imagination". In short, "it is impossible to think with complete clarity anything that lies beyond its boundaries" (Schleiermacher, Robinson 1997:227). Each person can have only one native language. Every noble, original, or significant utterance proceeds from one's "essence" (1997:228), as inextricably alloyed with one's particular language.

This tenet leads Schleiermacher and his compatriots to formulate the paradigm for translation that comes to dominate the nineteenth as well as twentieth century, by so radically splitting the linguistic multiculture of 1800 into halves: the foreign as one pole, exterior and other, and the domestic as its opposite, internally derived, infinitely supple, and uniquely authentic in subjective expression. The doctrine of human universals is by now long gone. Thus the bilingual writer, far from a normative figure, is a kind of freak. He or she practices:

> a wicked and magical art akin to [being] doubled, an attempt at once to flout the laws of nature and to perplex others. . . Writing in a foreign language is never original. . . [If] in defiance of nature and morality, a writer becomes a traitor to his native language by surrendering himself to another . . . he can no longer move about in that language . . . For if the distinctive mind of the author of a truly scholarly or artistic work is the mother, the native tongue, the language of the 'fatherland,' is the father. . . [For even] God and To Be, the primordial noun and verb. For even universals, no matter how far they lie beyond the realm of particulars, are illumined and coloured by language.
>
> (Schleiermacher, Robinson 1997:236)

Therefore, by so consistently blending foreign into domestic, all previous centuries and peoples have not really translated anything at all but merely practiced "imitation and paraphrase" (1997:238). One of this group's boldest strokes was to ask, "Who would maintain that anything had ever been truly translated into French, from either the classical or the Germanic languages?" (Schleiermacher, Robinson 1997:238).

Annexation had long erased true alterity, the very experience of foreignness.

As strands of these notions of the foreign and the native language enter the widening currents of European Romanticism, the concept of *translatio* clearly gets new definition and point. The French (actually pan-European) practice of displacing foreign with domestic figures and codes, making Catullus sound like a cad at Versailles, comes to be seen as "infidelity" to the text, indeed smacking of other kinds of Gallic infidelity. Fidelity accrues increasing overtones of faithfulness (*trueu* or even marital fidelity) to the foreign text. The monolingual premise, however, remains firm: only the native can translate the foreign into his or her maternal language (Humbolt), and only in the native language can one write truly (Schleiermacher).

This first major step into the subsequent era of monolingualism was a decisive one, marking real change in the relations of dominant and emergent elements in early modern concepts of language and translation. Following the general deliquescence of Latin after 1500, in literary circles, and the rise of French to gradually supplant it as an international literary language among educated elites, by the end of the eighteenth century it was artistically and intellectually commendable of the German August Schlegel to publish critical essays in French, or the Englishman William Beckford to write *Vathek* in French. But by the close of the nineteenth century it was scandalous of Oscar Wilde to betray his "nation" by writing *Salomé* in French (Forster 1970:54). The few nineteenth-century writers who switched literary languages, such as Adelbert von Chamisso or Joseph Conrad, were often welcomed in nationalistic terms, as in hailing Conrad for serving the "moral tradition" of English (Miller 1982:122-23; see below on Conrad). Subsequent theory of bilingualism and translation, as Pym observes, is still bedeviled by this conceptual chasm opened between "domestic" and "foreign" as monolingual poles. Criticism and historiography in the modern era develop in tandem with this effort to enshrine the national language as the space of originality and canonical production. For two hundred years now, as André Lefevere says, "Through the retrospective monololingualization of the West European literary system, based on the Romantic stress on the mother tongue as the primary material for literary creation, the original conglomerate of bilingual systems – in each of which texts were produced by the same writers in both Latin and another language – has been savagely amputated in order to make it conform to a poetics that rose to prominence under different ideological circumstances" (Lefèvre 1981:76). Those circumstances included intellectual and socio-political rivalry in the vernacularization of *natio*.

Schleiermacher's premise of "One Country, One Language" (1997:235) exiled the bilingual writer to a no-man's land, a vacuous *Mitte* or zero-point empty of all originality of mind and expression, that is, subjectivity itself. Politically, or perhaps ethically, as Berman suggests, in the aftermath of the French Revolution the Romantics sought to replace relations of dominance between languages with relations of freedom (Berman 1984:150). The most far-reaching result of German philosophy of language and translation, however, was to replace Western universalist concepts with cultural specificities. *Natio* overtakes *translatio,* as national borders become cultural frontiers, even psychic containers for defining persons and subjectivity. The study of languages also is historicized as comparative philology then historical linguistics.

So one can view the concept of language in 1800 as a dual legacy of shifting

relations between (a) dominant epistemological emphasis focusing on the linguistic sign as variant of universal truths (thus readily accessible to translation because fidelity or accuracy is not at issue where the sovereign value is expressive *imitatio* in the enrichment of the vernacular by plundering the foreign), and (b) an emergent ontological concern with semantic reference and accordingly a growing interest in the cultural snarls of translation, and the increasingly relativistic notions of the subject as language-user.

The Romantics did not propose an explicit theory of language (which is, rather, immanent in their theory of poetry), but they situated the translator as both a cultural portal and a subjective gaze upon the other. August Schlegel is certain that "our intuitive sense . . . is only unfailing and unmediated in our native language", but translation enables us "to enter fully into the space of another", learn otherness, and return safely to one's autonomous subjectivity: "The ability to recognize oneself in the image of a foreigner is only truly praiseworthy when one has autonomy to retain in the process, and does in fact retain it" (Schlegel, Robinson 1997:218, 219).

It is from this standpoint, from within the native language, that Latin and the various vernaculars come to be seen loosely as equals, and the concept of translation too shifts from annexing the foreign to respecting it as other. The translator adjusts and adapts it with, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a growing sense of responsibility toward the cultural origins and textual forms of the original text. Following the Romantics, translation discourse thus centers ever more on the knotty issues of cross-cultural equivalencies and translative fidelity. August Schlegel said, "I have tried to render the nature of the original according to the impression it made on me. To try to smooth it over or to embellish it would be to destroy it" (quoted in Schulte and Biguenet 1992:4). Caveats about subjective impressions came thick and fast. By the end of the nineteenth century, Matthew Arnold echoes many thinkers (more empirically minded Anglo-Saxons in particular) who insisted that the translator must truly know the foreign language as well as current scholarship on the source-language culture and history. In disputing Newman's clumsily literal *Iliad*, which Newman insisted conveyed the strangeness of Homer's world, Arnold argued that the translator must also achieve a stylistic equivalence meeting aesthetic standards. He must satisfy scholars above all, by faithfully reproducing both the exact matter and the overall manner, both semantics and style or affect. Arnold had no doubt that the rare, gifted translator could achieve this dual fidelity. His premise is the same as Schleiermacher's concerning the radical alterity of the foreign and the utility of translation in expanding knowledge of the world. Arnold's urbane ideal translator was soon to became a vanishing species, but in the mid-nineteenth century Arnold could still presume the primacy of the Olympian translator over the mere materials of his languages.

Overall, the greatest posterity of German Romantic thinking on language and translation has been the enshrinement of the mother tongue as unique and absolute source of authentic thinking and writing. Concerning the bilingual text, however, in the long lineage descending from medieval bilinguals to modern ones, Schopenhauer is a distinguished ancestor. Although he worked in the mainstream of Romantic poetics of translation ("one thinks differently in every language", Schopenhauer, Robinson 1997:248), he more than most of his contemporaries was deeply engaged with the

dynamic relation of thought and language. Like his compatriots he noted that one must grasp "the *spirit* of the language" to understand the nation that speaks it, "for as style is to the mind of the individual, so is language to that of the nation" (1997:247). Underlying this shared notion is Schopenhauer's idea that translation opens new spaces in the individual, monolingual subject:

> In learning a language, therefore, the difficulty lies primarily in learning concepts for which the new language has words and our old language has none – at least no exact corresponding ones. That is why learning a foreign language means mapping out in one's mind hitherto uncharted conceptual spheres. . . It is only when one has correctly grasped the concepts signified in the foreign language by individual words, and can directly and immediately *think* the concept corresponding to every word – *not* when one has learned first to translate a word into one's native language and then to think the concept through the mediation of this signification, which does not always correspond to the original – it is only then, I say, that one has grasped the *spirit* of the language to be learned. (1997:247)

To Schopenhauer, it is obvious that "one has truly internalized a language when one can translate not books but oneself into it, and thus without losing one's individuality can communicate in it immediately" (1997:247). What is this supralinguistic individuality? It seems to be the thinking being that makes concepts: in the mind, in the experience of the foreign, "new concepts take shape" because foreign language "enhances the agility of our thinking by gradually dissociating the concept from the word" (1997:248). There is a kind of gnostic shape-changing in this process of expanding the mind through linguistic foreignness. We should note that the two rather Hegelian spirits that move through the mind as languages are dual essences of two *natios,* the thinker's own *natio* remaining as the primary habitus of subjective being.

The idea of genius subtends many such theses about translation in these decades. To Romantics in several parts of Europe, as to Schopenhauer, it is only the rare man of keen affective sensibility and high intelligence who can command more than one language – in England, to Shelley it was only poets, to Arnold only savants. Prosaic writers will be deaf to the sonorities, to the style, said Shelley: "It were as wise to cast a violet into a crucible that you might discover the formal principle of its colour and odour, as seek to transfuse from one language into another the creation of a poet. The plant must spring again from its seed, or it will bear no flower – and this is the burthen of the curse of Babel" (Shelley, Robinson 1997:244-45). The rare poetic genius might reseed the text in his language, but really the thing is impossible. Writers and native languages are symbiotic, more deeply interfused than any rational principle can detect, as in the interfusion of matter and colour. Germaine de Staël also argued for genius although she allowed that because it is rare, national literatures are too poor to forego the boon of "transporting from one language to another the masterpieces of the human intellect" (*De l'esprit des traduction*s [1816], 2: 294). She acknowledged the translative loss but, from her more residually internationalist standpoint, she concluded that stylistic borrowings from the foreign can reinvigorate the second

language, whose tired banalities are sure signs of decadence.

Thereafter, two dominant currents of thought in the nineteenth century shape notions of translation and bilinguality. Emphasis on history, from Hegel's historicization of being in time through Darwin's evolutionist thesis, and emphasis on the new sciences, meant that even positivist philosophers like Auguste Comte sought the underlying rules of social "order" or culture by isolating "psychic" factors rather than logical arrangements. Psychologies of language, like Steinthal's, tried to describe the relations of a people and its language, in a kind of ethno-psychology in which the person is necessarily still monolingual, and persons, exactly like their words, come into being through discourse. Thus the Encyclopedists' concept of language as universal signs loses its anchorage in pure logic to become embedded in the linguistic material of different languages. The laws of logic, as a universal human domain or faculty, are superseded by the laws of language itself, or linguistic principles of signification. Notions of the person deliquesce into ethno-psychological categories, cultural speakers in pre-established forms of discourse.

Translation tends to drop out of philosophical and then increasingly even linguistic studies as the nineteenth century moves toward the twentieth, and languages come to be viewed as communication systems based on the sign (as in Taine's *De l'intelligence* [1870/1888] or W. D. Whitney's *The Life and Growth of Language* [1875]). In much of the next century, the sign is taken up as primary object of study. For theorists like Benveniste in Paris or Jakobson in Prague, the social contexts of language-users remain important, and this persistent Romantic vein of thought about the interface between social structures and linguistic structures continues in evidence. But the soon dominant structuralist school of Saussure, including Benveniste as well, conceives linguistic structures as wholly abstracted from social settings and local reference; semantics, like subjectivity, is chiefly a byproduct of the symbolic operation of words. Each language is a concrete manifestation of its *natio* but it operates on and through persons as a mechanism of signification. Persons are thus linguistic structures too: "it can be seen that 'mental categories' and 'laws of thought' in large measure do nothing but reflect the organization and distribution of linguistic categories" (Benveniste 4-5). Particularly between the two World Wars, structuralists' frequent studies of "primitive" societies similarly enabled them to sidestep complex issues of modern subjectivity, by relegating it to one of many conceptual models generated by local systems of signification. Historical and psychological findings of past centuries are dismissed in this effort to show how human learning, discoveries, philosophies, and ideologies are all shaped (when not produced) by the conceptual system of the people elaborating them, indeed by pre-established mental categories acquired through language.

One reason for the long neglect of the bilingual text in twentieth-century critical thought is that it is clearly impossible for the bilingual person to be accommodated by the structuralist model – of either language or subjectivity. It is ironic that structuralist theorists were often bilingual themselves but, in seeking the impersonal laws governing linguistic material, they erased their own bilinguality, indeed themselves as persons using language. Benveniste, Saussure, Jakobson, Kristeva, and many others were bi- and even tri-lingual. In fact a biographical history of linguistic theorists would reveal many distinguished bilinguals (such as in the nineteenth century Otto Jespersen,

Franz Bopp, W. D. Whitney, Max Müller, Michel Bréal). Few were monolingual. Most lived and studied abroad at several points in their lives, and several emigrated to new lands where they taught in a new language, such as Müller at Oxford or Saussure at the Collège de France. In 1812, for example, when Franz Bopp went to Paris in order to study Sanskrit for five years with Antoine Léonard de Chézy, his classmates there included Humboldt and August Schlegel. Aside from working in French, Bopp wrote his influential book on Sanskrit grammar first in Latin (1829-32) then rewrote it in German (1834-61). Bréal went to Germany around 1855 to study with Bopp, then translated one of Bopp's books from German into French. (See Sebeok's *Portraits of Linguists*.) Granted, comparative philologists were studying grammar as abstracted from peoples, but later structuralists and semioticians like Jakobson, Benveniste, or Kristeva were more engaged with the social interfaces of mind and language. As a mode of thought, their own conceptual model of structural linguistics led them to look at societies as wholes, and at knowledge of self and world as local social construction, built on apriori ideological systems of impersonal signs. Their conceptual model of *langue* as autonomous structure swept the field of linguistics even as it largely excluded them as bilingual persons. (Only much later did such figures as Kristeva and Derrida describe their experience as foreigners in a language; see Epilogue, below.)

It is in these decades of 1930-60 that translation is deemed impossible too, since persons are functions of linguistic codes. Notoriously, translation theory splits off from practice, becoming a rarefied domain of theorists paying little attention to the actual work of real translators. Theory seems to take on a life of its own, far above the actual labors of translators producing new texts.

The abstracted nature of high modernist thought led language theory to focus on separating layers of signification, within the closed systems of discourse. As though adopting Augustine's metaphysics of the sign but foreclosing all outer reference, linguistic theories aimed rather at uncovering different levels of signalling. Husserl's phenomenology including signs without meaning, Saussure's chain of signifiers, Jakobson's more dynamic inter-chains of signifiers, all these models construed subjectivity itself as structured by, if not fused to, language. Pressures on these structuralist models of the person – not least from psychoanalysis – and the increasing recognition of pluralities of discourse within single languages, fueled emergent interest in semiotics, which seemed like a way to recoup mastery of the signifier and thus move language out of the materialist linguistic box, and back into the realms of subjectivity and metaphysics. Piaget, Freud, Lacan, Kristeva (before 1990), all explore a split in the individual subject ("the unconscious of the subject is the discourse of the other", Lacan, *Écrits*, 1977:55). But it is a split between un/conscious rather than between native/other languages, for the latter continue to elude the conceptual model of monolingual language, person, and text. To psychoanalysts, public language is only a secondary signifying system for the person; it is the anterior unconscious that, preceding acquisition of language, is "intra-linguistic" and can only be known through the rather hieroglyphic symbols in which it becomes manifest. This is to state, *pace* Saussure, that the subject as language-user retains a certain relative autonomy, in extra-linguistic dimensions of being. To psychoanalysts every discourse is a realization of subjectivity, quite personally so. Moreover, the subject makes himself or herself in

the process of enunciating self in discourse with other subjects. Personal discourse condenses and displaces subjectivity into signs more significant or laden with private meaning than their public signifieds or referents. This psychoanalytic model of the subject's personal discourses (notably plural now), formed deep in the unconscious and ramifying broadly out to social and metaphysical discourses, moves concepts of both language and translation back to the Cartesian grounds of the innate "I" and its infinite capacities of "self-translation" in language. This is the still markedly native language as sole verbal mode of expression of the self and of representation of the world.

This psychoanalytic view is not a return to the early modern image of autonomous subjects in an ordered and free society. But it shares their aim of showing language as rooted in the senses and in the expressive capacities of thinking subjects–perhaps not all master of the signifiers but potentially so, through the possibility of learning and the mastery of linguistics as an epistemological tool. Still, through the twentieth century, in all these theories, language was considered specific to a society. One premise is that the act of signifying *must* be generated by a subject bound within a particular signifying system. In general, structural linguists sought an ideal system for all languages, and psychoanalysis and semiotics countered with a model of pluralistic modes of signification in moments of social history. Neither model considered the person who combines systems, is embedded in two systems simultaneously, and daily signifies dually. Just as both psychoanalysis and semiotics look for erasures, that which signs repress, it is again ironic that bilingual theorists so often elided bilinguality as a category of social being.

B. Interfacing Concepts of Translation and Subjectivity

Every period redefines the inherited notions of the person, perhaps none more than the era of modernisms. Habermas in *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* describes the philosophy of subjectivity as a narrative arising in the Reformation and Renaissance and culminating in the Enlightenment, before disintegrating in the catastrophes of Romanticism and modernism. The death of Man as a cohesive universal ushers in the death of the author, the dispersal of the text into micro-discourses, and the fragmentation of the subject into micro-identities in agonistic relations. Through the late twentieth century, marxian socio-political thought on the subject was at odds with psychoanalytical thought, although both sought to locate any principle of cohesion or unity in the fragmented subject.

Bilinguality seems to be the one category of language-user that high modernist thought did not, indeed perhaps even refused to, consider. If theories of language elided the bilingual, so theories of subjectivity tended to assume a monolingual subject, indeed monolingualism as the very grounds of being. This is never stated, but it is axiomatic in these writings, where it is assumed like a fact of nature or of culture. One country, one subject.

In terms of the subject, one can see the arc of the long nineteenth century from 1770 to 1914 as the gradual crumbling of the universal subject, which was once

equally manifest in Latin and the vernaculars, into particular individuals in monolingual societies. That long devolution of Man into selves received further momentum from World Wars and waves of migrations until, in the break-up of religious and imperial authorities, each self becomes a subset of its society as a unique amalgam of intellectual and affective, individual and gendered, regional and ethnic discourses. Lawrence Friedman calls this process a leveling of the once vertical axis of hierarchically assigned roles into the new horizontal mode of negotiable roles, in which subjects become responsible for "making something" of themselves. Exterior constraints remain, to be sure, but "even the *illusion* of choice is of enormous social significance" (Friedman 1999:240).

Profiling the history of subjectivity as a concept in the twentieth century, Donald Hall states a now standard distinction. Identity is the series of traits, beliefs, and allegiances that cohere into a personality or social being, whereas subjectivity denotes reflection about identity, that is, self-consciousness. It is especially in the subject's effort to understand identity that epistemology is intercut with ontology (Hall 2004:3-4). The main lines of modernist thinking split the issue into halves. On the one hand are the socio-political perspectives, which come to shape several planks of translation theory; from this vantage, the question of subjectivity is framed collectively, as Hall says ("Is our social and individual existence determined by the ways we collectively organize knowledge?"). On the other hand are the socio-psychological perspectives, which also filter powerfully through translation theory; the question is framed individually ("how does an individual attain full subjective agency, or reflective consciousness of self and social potentialities?"). In both these broad types of modernist reflections on subjectivity, the monolinguality of the person is assumed like a fact of social life. Until the advent of postcolonial studies in the 1980s, the bilingual person is ignored, if noticed at all, as extraneous or indeed other. This is an important point: as Kristeva argues in *Étrangers à nous-mêmes*/ *Strangers to Ourselves* (1998), the modern foreigner is an invention of the French Revolution, when the Enlightenment concept of membership in humanity at large was superseded by the fact of national citizenship and rights under national law, as borders were fortified and psyches constrained to national identities (1998:151-181). The Pole and the Italian, the Frenchman and the German, were no longer seen as visitors from abroad, but as foreigners within the nation.

We are clearly, perhaps inexcusably oversimplifying a complex history in this profile of shifting paradigms of persons and nations. But we hope that at least these broad-brush outlines of cultural change will help sketch some significant backgrounds of the bilingual text in modernity. Before turning to bilinguality in literature, one further redefinition of subjectivity needs to be mentioned, by way of preface to late modern concepts of translation after 1950.

Within the Freudian model of the split subject, Lacan shifted the focus of psychoanalysis outward toward the social interface of mind and world. He looked at how social norms are constructed and sustained. In infancy one experiences discordant bits and pieces of tendencies that get unified in a "self" only by relation to an image imposed from outside, around which all the objects of one's world are structured. Language too is a developmental experience. The infant's formless preverbal fears and desires get soothed by acquiring language, but this nonverbal domain is thereby

repressed: "the form in which language is expressed itself defines subjectivity . . . I identify myself in language, but only by losing myself in it like an object" (*Écrits* 1977:85-86). One's language calms fragmentation and dispersal at first, even as it generates new gaps and breaks through its own forms of equivocation or unstable symbols. Subjectivity, then, cannot be defined by any principle of cohesion. It certainly cannot be described by language – which shapes but cannot contain it. Politically, as Žižek has shown, for Lacan the pre-ontological fear of fragmentation leads people to seek illusions of unified identity, in nationalist and ethnic labels, religious doctrines, and other containing structures or ideologies. Linguistically, this becomes a postmodern historicization of subjectivity in language that remains insistently within a monolingual model. To analyze a bicultural subject, a Lacanian would have to flatten bilinguality into a dual heritage of the same repressive patriarchal forms in two languages, presumably as full-blown schizophrenia. If, as in Foucault's model of discursive power relations, the subject is "constituted" through historically specific categories like truth, normality, knowledge, so the bilingual person would therefore have to be dually constituted by parallel sets of categories in two languages. In any case, however, the premise is again monolingual.

Not unlike the marxian, existentialist, and postcolonial models of subjectivity, these socio-psychological models are theses of refusal – to acquire agency, the subject must refuse to be this or that, to ingest dominant norms. Like Sartre on Hegel, or Lacan on Freud, Kristeva too deconstructs Lacan to posit subjectivity as endless making and remaking of oneself, while specifying agency as a recouping of pre-linguistic experience, embedded in deeper layers of averbal being. The important tenet is that there *is* pre-verbal knowledge, yet the subject is nevertheless as fragmented and unstable as language itself. In all these models, language is the primary mechanism of social normalization, yet it is also the primary locus of psychic fragmentation.

We should note here that, just as the hysteric in the nineteenth century then the neurotic in the twentieth seem to model the human condition, so the bilingual person might have served these models of subjectivity, as even more representative of psychic dispersion and as (in this modernist view) suffering a *double* lack of self, or identity, or any possible subjective agency over the chaos of its discourses. Nevertheless, by the end of the twentieth century, even as theorists of the human person were beginning to include heteroglossia in their analyses, thanks largely to postcolonial studies, other developments were at the same time actively disaggregating even these pluralistic models of the human. As Hall and others point out, studies of brain chemistry and physiology led philosophers to ask what consciousness can still be today. Not only does neuro-genetics locate specific sites in the brain for quite specific emotions, but silicon chips implanted in the brain and drugs injected into the bloodstream mean that certain categories of definition can no longer serve (intent, will, behaviour). In the domain of language, machine translation similarly pushes definitions of subjective agency up against new limits.

Insofar as an era's dominant models of literature, philosophy, and psychology always overlap, the concept of translation in the modern period splintered along these fault lines in the notions of language and person. In the decades when linguists were describing languages as systems of information transfer, literary texts posed theoretical

problems that were largely set aside, as a problematic subset of unique traits and aims. Roman Jakobson was unusual in focusing some of his work on those traits, on what he termed poeticity, following the Russian formalists on literariness and the Prague Circle of linguists on texts. Jakobson showed how literary metaphor and metonymy, for instance, organize literary discourse and function as linguistic elements achieving literary effects. He understood translation as effecting "two equivalent messages in two different [linguistic] codes", and he stressed that translating is, first, interpreting the original and then "recoding interpretation" (146, 149). Jakobson made translatability a conceptual problem, and a thorny issue that would plague later theorists: "poetry by definition is untranslatable. Only creative translation is possible" (151). His linguistic-literary categories of analysis were resumed in the virtual explosion of translation studies around 1980. A younger generation of theorists, trying to reconcile rarefied structuralist paradigms with the specific tasks of real translators, reexamined both the concept of translation as inherited from modernist linguistics and the long history of translative practice and commentary in the West. In general, as disciplines, linguistics and literature remained separate from each other, but in many schools of translation theory literature returned to the fore of theoretical reflection.

It is noteworthy that in Robinson's anthology of *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche* (1997), compiling the major commentaries on translation in the West over almost 1500 years, each commentator is talking about translating either biblical or literary texts. After Nietzsche, however, under the sway of linguistics, literature increasingly dropped out of the conversation about the nature of translation. As Barnstone found as late as 1993, "The mutual self-isolation of linguistic and philosophical studies on translation and the theory and practice of literary translators is absolute" (1993:223). Unlike pure linguistic concepts of translation as information transfer, which requires stable equivalencies between systems, literary traits even within one language are infinitely pliable, and always mutating in time and place, voice and genre, tropes and figures. Still, even in the early twentieth century, such issues in literary translation as a practical matter had continued to attract interest from writers and critics in the margins of modernist thought.

We hope we can safely assume that readers of this book are already familiar with the broad trends in translation studies and theories of the past fifty years. As background for self-translation, we would like to sketch just a few of them in order to introduce the kinds of theoretical problems that the modern bilingual text raises for contemporary translation theory in general.

One strand of theory, reprised in the twentieth century by Walter Benjamin and furthered by such writers as Jorge Luis Borges, Octavio Paz, Paul Ricoeur, and Jacques Derrida (pre-1996), entails an almost mystic recension of the relations between text and translation. It reprises the Augustinian sense of the sign as numinous, channeling God, and in effect it ascribes to language the divine attributes, particularly unknowability. In "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers"/The Task of the Translator (1923), Benjamin suggested that translations are the "afterlife" of a text in time. Translations actualize elements that were only virtual in the original. Moreover, all writing, whether original or translation, is virtual: both versions are fragments or shards, and together they posit, suggest, point towards a "pure language" that can never be materialized in words. This

notion reinserts the concept of universal language in modernist thought (often as a spiritual and even Kabbalistic kind of invisible plenitude at the heart of the material emptiness of mere signs). It goes against the grain of dominant linguistic models of translation, insofar as it conflates original and translation as two incomplete versions of the same thing, the same essence escaping form.

George Steiner in *After Babel* (1975) marks one end-point of this vein of German late Romanticism and hermeneutics, as well as the beginning of a new critical mode of assembling copious translation histories in order to demonstrate a thesis. To Steiner also "language is the true and only verifiable *a priori* framework of cognition", inhabiting us like a kind of "third universe" between the "empirical world" and the structures of consciousness (1975:81). But Steiner shifted the linguistic paradigm from signs to context. He insisted that each linguistic element of a language is "context-bound" (1975:113), culture is "dynamic mentalism" (1975:87), and translation is above all cultural transfer, "the transfer from one designative coherence to another" (1975:205). In the twentieth century, when even the concept of truth has moved from outer absolute to inner disposition, and language is construed as a transcription of the mechanics of the mind (1975:206), the translator is described as an aggressive artist plundering the original and manipulating the linguistic and affective resources of the second language to create a fully "literary" transfer of meaning. Thus for the resourceful person, no text is untranslatable because equivalencies between cultural and linguistic systems can always be found or created. Partly because of its Hegelian and sexist overtones, Steiner's thesis was not palatable to the subsequent mainstream of translation theorists, yet he marked out some significant free range for the translator's creativity within distinctively cultural constraints. His arch-example of a "good" translation, Pierre Leiris' French version of Gerard Manley Hopkins' "The Wreck of the Deutschland", can stand as threshhold to the theoretical snarls of the bilingual text. "Leyris's Hopkins puts the reader on the tantalizing verge of gaining insight into the processes – acoustic, tactile, hermeneutic – whereby the mind can pass from one language into another and then return" (Steiner 1975:413). It is only when interlineating the English and the French versions, Steiner says, that we can see how translation can "penetrate the barrier between languages" to suggest a common "core" of human feeling, which is normally unconscious. Note, however, that Steiner has moved from standard translation, as separate text, to interlinear translation, as constructed by the critic himself juxtaposing lines from the two published versions. Setting the lines into an adversarial relation, he tacitly positions the bilingual reader as the arch-value of the process, he who can witness translation as simultaneously loss and restitution. It is in this sense that Steiner's model ultimately moves translation toward the role of revealing what we do *not* know about ourselves, our culture, and even our own native language, but which the skilled translator can reveal (that is, normally, affective states). Note again that although he himself was trilingual and tricultural, Steiner's massive history contained no bilingual writers discussed as such, while subordinating linguistic to cultural issues.

In the 1970s and 1980s, even as the fields of cultural studies and postcolonial studies were dissecting the received idea of elite culture, the new discipline of translation studies proceeded along the same line in leveling "the triumphant culture", in

Gayatri Spivak's term, to just one among many types of second-language cultural context. Much high theory, and many titanic forebears like Arnold and Steiner, were set aside, in order to rethink translation as a practical matter, a set of actual practices that must be described afresh in pragmatic terms. Basic staples of translation discourse, such as linguistic equivalence and transfer, came under new scrutiny and gave way to new concepts and terms. For example, concerning untranslatability or the points of resistance between texts, the linguist Catford had suggested in 1965 that, in translating, there really can never be any transfer of meaning but only linguistic substitution; Bassnett and others in translation studies amplified that bare linguistic principle to a cultural standard: "Insofar as language is the primary modelling system within a culture, cultural untranslatability must be de facto implied in any process of translation" (Bassnett 1991:34). What had long been debated as a translative problem in verbal terms became projected onto the grid of comparative cultures, where the linguistic element became subordinated to the englobing cultural milieu. This was a great advance over the abstracted Saussurian model of language. It enabled significant new explorations. Equivalence, for example, ramified out to several new concepts: Nida posited a distinction between formal equivalence (in textual features) and dynamic equivalence (in responsive effects), Neubert explained equivalence as a quite loose "semiotic category", Baker theorized it as any two factors' "similarity", Durîŝin bracketed it with artistic procedures as bound to a specific "cultural-temporal" context. Others, like Snell-Hornby, Holmes, and Fawcett, deplored its persistence in translation theory, as a mere residue of mathematical thought and quite absurd in the realms of languages and aesthetic productions. However contested, equivalence in translation studies became a rich terrain for rethinking the basic assumptions of theory and practice.

One hallmark of translation studies to date has been this reductive tendency to conflate person and culture. It is, somewhat ironically, assumed that this culturolocation of the person (as writer, as reader) is the basic fact upon which to build the new rubrics and categories of analysis. And yet, as we suggested in the Introduction above, this is to elide the translator himself or herself, the very translative agent who lives and works in two cultures simultaneously. We will return to this point after looking briefly at two additional theses.

In 1995 Lawrence Venuti combined several such strands of thought in *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Surveying the translation canon since the Romans, he characterized all translation practice as either conventionally "domesticating" the text, annexing the foreign into the codes and ideologies of the new culture, or "foreignizing" it, highlighting the cultural otherness of the original text. Venuti proposed that the most effective translations not only preserve the experience of the foreign but stress and exaggerate it, however necessary to disturb the reader with its radical alterity. All translating risks doing violence to the original, but it must be recognized that translation is "a cultural political practice . . . varying with specific cultural and social formations at different historical moments" (Venuti 1995:19). When translating conveys cultural difference, "foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism" (1995:20). This is a large agenda, although Venuti sought through his

new category of foreignizing only "to develop a theory and practice of translation that resists dominant target-language cultural values so as to signify the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text" (1995:23). Still, any hint of shared human traits or experiences across languages is banished from this late Romantic thesis of absolute cultural relativity. Technically, as Venuti goes on to demonstrate, translation entails variants of what Philip Lewis had called "abusive fidelity"; it avoids conventional fluency (the invisibility of the translator in the transfer) and "challenges the target-language culture even as it enacts its own ethnocentric violence on the foreign text" (1995:24), through techniques of disruption, discontinuity, and so forth. Attacking "humanist" ways of reading, Venuti constructs his theory around one central point: "subjectivity is constituted by cultural and social determinants that are diverse and even conflicting, that mediate any language use, and that vary with every cultural formation and every historical moment" (1995:24). Conceptually, then, Venuti's very useful concept of foreignizing translative practice means that literary originals should be retranslated for every generation, so that foreign otherness may be experienced by reading subjects under new cultural conditions. Venuti positions the translator as a cultural ambassador, although the figure he cuts resembles less the diplomat than the court fool whose antic gestures and puns point to the singular oddities of the foreign visitor he is introducing.

Also in the 1990s postcolonial theorists began examining the layered cultures within ex-colonial societies, as in the diglossic nations of the Middle East or India, where indigenous and colonial languages interact. Glossing relations of dominance and submission, postcolonial translation theories and histories uncover the imperialistic subtexts of centuries of translation commentaries and practices, going back to Romans and medievals or out to distant former colonies. On postcolonial conditions, this is often a marxian reeexamination of economic bases and superstructures, viewed through the dissymmetries of diglossia in the colonial powers' empires. Scholars study how cultures reshape one another, how languages interact as sociolects, how the hyrbid that Anzaldúa calls a new *mestiza* culture develops to bridge cultural borderlands or enact linguistic diasporas. Because the postcolonial subject is riven in two, by having acquired and needing to use two "native" languages for different social roles, theorists at last recognize bilinguality as being, in this palimpsestic cultural context, a primary category of social existence. Translation theory is still grappling with these issues. For Homi Bhabha in *The Location of Culture* (1994), conventional translation is clearly impossible in these conditions; pure semantic transfer cannot be done in this "split-space of enunciation" (1994:38). Historical translation is viewed retrospectively as a tool of cultural conquest, having erased indigenous identities which must now be acknowledged, along with national rights and cultural practices. But like the Romantic *natio*, no single language can serve postcolonial riven, hybridized identities. Moreover, in mass migrations across the globe, the world population is becoming hybridized, in a global "translational culture" of migrants and mosaic subjects. Babha posits "an *inter*national culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the *diversity* of cultures, but on the inscription and articulations of culture's *hybridity*" (1994:38). The person now exists solely in the interstices of cultures and languages, and this in-between or third space is also the only possible site of translation; Bhabha adapts

Benjamin to emphasize the "irresolution" of translation or the untranslatability of all hybrid culture, which cannot be known by its languages but only conjectured, through the forms of its absence, as in Benjamin. The contemporary translator's task, which is quite specifically to articulate social difference both between and within cultures, becomes premonitory of all human tasks in the global future.

Thus after 1960 the concept of translation, never unitary in past centuries, splintered into so many pieces that it became a site of contestation, and it remains so. There is no need to rehearse here all the arguments and counter-arguments surrounding these five fairly representative modern and postmodern viewpoints. What matters for a history of the self-translated text in modernity is this increasingly intense focus on the native-language culture (even if construed as the indigenous-language buried culture) as the grounds of being: it is the source of identity (traits, beliefs, allegiances), the primary medium of self-reflection, and not least the linguistic material for self-construction and authentic communication. Translation remains, as it was to Schleiermacher, a unique portal to otherness, although otherness itself has become heavily nuanced in this period. By the end of the twentieth century, the two halves of the Romantic equation, writer and reader or translator, were no longer two national subjects in their two maternal languages, but two cultures. Bassnett calls this shift of paradigms, based on new uses of semiotics, "the cultural turn" in translation studies and theory (1991:13). Neubert calls it a three-stage shift from the linguistic paradigm to the textual paradigm (textworlds of two communicating cultures) to an interdisciplinary paradigm, where the translator's "knowledge profile" of both linguistic and cultural fields must be broad (Neubert 2000:19). Overall the shift entails new respect for both socio-linguistic diversity and for pluralistic readers.

By working within a given cultural compass, however, theorists still tend to ignore biculturality, or lives bridging whole national cultures, often ancient ones like Russian and French, or Danish and British. When they address the matter, twentieth-century translation theories generally stress *internal* bilinguality, as diglossia contained within the layered cultures of ex-colonial nations. Following calls for hybridized translation, if we can so call Venuti's model, hybridized culture is also being addressed as a contemporary reality and a theoretical problem in many domains. True biculturality, however, and most notably the bilingual writer who personally unites in himself or herself all these facets of subjectivity and culturality acquired through two wholly separate linguistic systems, still seems to elude the theoretical models. Yet at several points in modern history, the bilingual writer, living and working in two languages and cultures, was not particularly unusual.

Overall, since 1800 the concept of *natio* has devolved into culture. The shaping force of culture is conceived to be language, which remains the psycho-social ground from which monolingual literature arises, where it thrives, and from which it can be translated only with diminution and loss. That age-old premise still obtains today. To varying degrees, translators may signal respect for the socio-cultural whole that is a foreign text, and, it is generally agreed, they may introduce or create deliberately jarring notes by way of conveying alterity, but by 2000 it was clear that the cultural burdens of Babel were heavy indeed.

C. Language and Literature in Modernity

Around 1800 another linguistic current that received fresh momentum from the Romantics was the widespread emphasis on the languages of literature. Wordsworth and Coleridge in the preface to the *Lyrical Ballads* (1798), like Victor Hugo in *Les Contemplations* (1856), echo many Romantics in calling for a democratization of classical or "high" literary language, and for admitting common speech into literature. In the course of the nineteenth century, the great amalgamation of genres and forms that for centuries had all been assembled under the term "literature", including theological and philosophical texts among others, gradually disaggregated until the term designated chiefly the fictions of poetry, prose, and drama. The formative characteristic of the text was no longer its genre, as in earlier periods, but rather, in the new era of *Gesamtkunstwerke* or mixed genres, the individual writer's unique literary style. Nineteenth-century realists achieved the Romantic agenda for literary language in sometimes scandalous ways, rendering the speech of prostitutes and blacksmiths with the same seriousness as that of the higher classes. It is not only normative literary discourse that undergoes this kind of amplification into new registers and tonalities, but also language itself gradually becomes one of the topics of modernist literature. This kind of de-sacralization (to borrow Barthes' term) of literary language branches off into radical techniques of subversion, as in the surrealists' automatic writing, into more combinatory techniques of amplification, as in Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*, into material collage with photos and publicity posters, among other modes of decentering the legacy of the literary.

On the politics of modernisms, Raymond Williams notes that "language was being simultaneously identified with the blocking of 'true consciousness' and, to the extent that it could emancipate itself from its imprisoning everyday forms and, beyond that, from the received forms of 'literature', as itself the medium of the idealized 'pure consciousness'" (Williams 1996:73). He adds,

> there appear to be two basic contradictory attitudes towards language: that which, engaging with received form and the possibilities of new practice, treats language as material in a social process; and that other which, as in several avant-garde movements, sees it as blocking or making difficulties for authentic consciousness: 'the need for expression . . . born from the very impossibility of expression'; or what Artaud seems to mean when he writes: 'my thought abandons me at every step – from the simple fact of thought to the external fact of its materialization in words'. (1996:77)

Williams notes that one particular set of social processes, notably the widespread immigration of literary expatriates and exiles into the western European capital cities, underlies much of the production of multivocal, polyphonic, and dialogic forms of literary texts in the modernist period (1996:79). What had once been the experience of small minorities became a much more general process of mobility and dislocation; the old, relatively settled languages and literary forms, with their imposed national norms, came under review if not attack from the dynamic new languages, by perhaps

not yet post-national writers but already overtly "paranational", in Williams' terms (1996:79).

Williams' profile of the generative processes of multivocal texts in this period, stressing social conditions, can also help explain the resurgence of bilingual texts in modernity. Most modern dual-language texts, and most choices of writing languages, do not arise from purely artistic concerns or aesthetic decisions, but rather from the social displacement of writers into a second or third language amid political upheavals and exile. It is within this modernist literary context between the World Wars, when language is being reconceptualized as the medium of literature and many writers themselves are moving out of native languages into new ones, that the self-translated text begins to recur, perhaps more widely than at any time since the Renaissance.

Given translation theorists' unstated premise of the monolingual author, it is helpful to pause for a moment to recall the actual state of linguistic conditions in modern Europe at the turn of the twentieth century. Historians investigating the relations of *natio* and language generally break the centuries of a vernacular's development into stages, which can be dated: its emergence as the literary language, its first grammars, and the political consolidation of the nation-state structure (plus sometimes a later date for stabilization following periods of upheaval). Baggioni's chart of this chronology only for the thirty-six nations of modern Europe, for example, shows that most grammars appear in 1400-1700 but twenty-five of thirty-six "official" languages were adopted by nation-states only after 1800, and many only in the twentieth century (Baggioni 1997:63-64). Such charts flatten the ambilingual cultures of Europe, but they do indicate some of the dramas of linguistic history (such as the long suffrance of Celtic and Norwegian under the sway of Great Britain and Sweden), bringing to light the broad currents of political dominance and submission in the interrelations of the European languages. Nation is a relative term at best, particularly for the oldest states or earliest unified administrative structures, but after 1800 it becomes the common nexus of both socio-political and linguistic unification.

In Italy, for example, where Dante and Bembo had envisioned the Florentine vernacular becoming the language of the whole peninsula, administrative unification of Italy's many regions and peoples did not occur until 1861. The modern linguist Tullio De Mauro has estimated that only 2.5% of the population could use Italian at that time. Ascoli in his *Proemio* (1873) argued that the nations' sons should be "bilingui", encouraged to use both Italian and the "dialetto materno", for the greater good of the "facultà mentali della nazione" (quoted in Parry 2002:57). Standardization proceeded, however, although even today it is far from uniform. Mair Parry reports that in December 2000, only 73% of Italian citizens said they use Italian outside the home, 7% said they use Italian and a dialect, and 7% said they use only or mainly a dialect, with a significant percentage unknown (Parry 2002:31). In 1999 an Italian law recognized twelve "languages and cultures" (including Sicilian and Friulian but also French, German, and Greek), unleashing protests of all sorts. Current claims for official status within Italy include those on behalf of Arabic- and Tagalog-speakers arriving in the global waves of migrations.

Even officially bilingual nations, such as modern Belgium or Canada, as Romaine notes, may have fewer bilingual people than do many unilingual countries, insofar as

the government policy of upholding two languages is usually created to recognize and protect a linguistic minority (1995:24). In such cases the term bilingual is much more a political than a linguistic indicator. Most analysts of bilingualism are sociolinguists who examine the interrelations of languages within one society and usually one stratum of it, such as immigrant communities. But as Romaine concludes, statistical studies are not reliable, since, for example, people often self-identify with a language they might not really speak. Quantitative analyses of competence can mask real differences in how the languages are actually used: "the allocation of functions of the languages in society is normally imbalanced ", and one is "rarely fluent in both languages on all possible topics" (Romaine 1995:19). In short, "no society needs two languages for the same set of functions" (1995:19). Given the inherent connection between proficiency and function, then, "it is doubtful whether bilingualism per se can be measured apart from the situation in which it functions for a particular individual. . . The notion of balanced [competent or idiomatic] bilingualism is an ideal one, which is largely an artefact of the theoretical perspective which takes the monolingual as the point of reference" (Romaine 1995:19).

Something similar underlies the literary critical perspective on the bilingual text. There the assumption that one version is "original" and the other a lesser copy presumes a relation of dominance by the "mother tongue" or the "native language". Yet many sociolinguists today find even the concept of native language wholly insufficient for describing most bilinguals, and they prefer to work with such terms as first, second, or even "community" languages, although even the first/second distinction can be difficult to draw. UNESCO in 1953 recommended vernacular education for all children in "the mother tongue", as did the Directive of the Council of the European Community in 1977, concerning the schooling of immigrants' children, thus attempting to equilibrate "the culture of the country of origin . . . [and] the official languages of the host state" (see Romaine 1995:20-21). Many of these immigrant children within the European states later claimed the host language as their mother tongue, or the family language, or even both. Thus linguists came to acknowledge that, like *natio*, the concept of native language is relative at best and that, within one individual, it can also change in time.

It is important to recognize that for modern writers too the status of a native language, the exposure to other languages, the impact of a hegemonic language in school, and the decision to write in certain of those languages, are all often the result of material conditions and movements across linguistic fields, rather than any personal aesthetic aims or ideals. Many writers in the modern period have been forced to speak and write a hegemonic language at school while struggling to retain the community or heritage language used at home. Writers have also struggled within what linguists call the "internal colonialism" of European states relative to marginalized peoples, like Celts and Romani. The sociolinguistic conditions of almost any broad cultural space are rarely monolingual. In Spain, for example, Ferguson charted them as follows: 5L = 2Lmaj + 1Lmin + 2Lspec, or five languages including two major (Spanish and Catalán), one minor (Basque), and two of special status, notably one standard and one classical (French and Latin) (Ferguson 1966:311; quoted in Romaine 1995:26). Where is the mother tongue?

During World War I, Max Weber was emphatic: "Today, in the age of language conflicts, a shared common language is preeminently considered the normal basis of nationality" (quoted in Roth and Wittich 1968:385). For our purposes on the self-translated text, it is noteworthy that in this vein two of the most restrictive national policies regarding the mother tongue have been those of the United States and France. "In 1910 and 1920 the second generation [of immigrants in the United States] was classified by the mother tongue of the foreign born parent. In 1940, however, the mother tongue was taken to be the language spoken at home from earliest childhood" (Romaine 1995:27), that is, for English to be the native language the parent must have used it at home. In 1960 a French citizen who spoke French and Breton was considered to speak one language and one patois, thus remaining officially monolingual; true bilinguals were only those spoke two national languages. In a 1981 census, the citizens of India reported 107 mother tongues. The Indian government has now pared this to fifteen "major" languages, and assigns English "associate status" as the language most used in commercial communication. Eduardo Faingold has looked at the language policies of nations as enshrined in their constitutions, and finds, for example, that the 1994 constitution of the Republic of South Africa gives official status to eleven languages, and states that fifteen others are to be protected.

It is in such ways that the long movement of vernacularization that we have been tracing since medieval times gradually comes to focus on universalist grammars and vernacular schoolbooks and Bibles in the early modern period, and then moves, in modernity, into government in the form of the language policies of nation-states. As *natio*, in turn, comes under assault as a cohesive concept in the 1980s, and the layered nature of sociolinguistic conditions comes into view, bilingualism too becomes a more widely recognized phenomenon and a more complex linguistic and cultural category, one no longer dependent on theoretical, monolingual and rather nationalistic concepts of the mother tongue. Ultimately political ideology, having rather strenuously (and successfully) enforced the normative standard of the national language, fully in the tradition of *natio* as the lingual root of citizenship itself, loses its unitary cohesion, partly through the assertion of the national rights of other languages. French in Canada, Gaelic in Scotland, Irish in Ireland, even Breton in France, many once devalued languages gradually won political recognition in some of the oldest nation-states, even as literary texts in those languages had long been challenging the premises of the national canons.

Concerning literary bilinguality, the Romantics' legacy of identifying the specific essence of a language with "nation" or "*Volk*" developed, as we have seen, amid competing ideologies of culture. Forster, in his unprecedented study of bilingual writers across borders, still felt obliged to introduce his work in 1970 by countering this persistent assumption: "Since the Romantics we have all been brought up to believe that each language has its mystery and its soul, and that these are very sacred things, in whose name indeed much blood has been shed. . . if we put sentiment aside, there are very many people and very many situations for which different languages are simply tools appropriate to certain definite purposes, analogous to different stylistic levels within any one language" (Forster 1970:7). In the long nineteenth century it was indeed under the pressures of national revolutions and proliferating Romanticisms

that the venerable figure of the writer as active translator of multiple linguistic and literary traditions, ambassador of worlds past and present, was gradually erased, to be replaced by iconic figurations of the founders – Dante as founder of Italian literature, Chaucer of English, Luther of German, Christiern Pedersen of Danish, Pushkin of Russian, and so forth. Tomlinson adds that even the early writers' apprentice work as translators of foreign texts was quietly set aside by literary elites, as extraneous to the critical focus on national tradition (Tomlinson 1989:259).

Although ambient translingual writers continued producing translations long after the end of the *ancien régime*, and do so today – texts that the local critical establishment still tends to consider ancillary to their major work – it is clear that after about 1750 the Renaissance-style bilingual writer increasingly became an anomaly. Rare in the nineteenth century, even among so many ambient translinguals across Europe, the bilingual text resurged in the twentieth century in the wakes of increasingly pan-European wars. Displaced modernist writers in several languages were making a scant living through their translations, and several were turning to self-translation rather than adopting the by then standard practice of allowing their publishers to secure foreign rights and translators. Also it should be evident that such modernist self-translators were out of step with contemporary currents in criticism and theory, by working so far from the normative linguistic models of monolingual text and subjectivity. During twentieth-century clashes and reconfigurations of political empires, hundreds of writers were displaced into second languages, and many went on to distinguish themselves in the literature of adoption. Even in the modern diasporas, however, few writers continued working in both languages to develop a bilingual canon. Following the imperial powers' wars in the first half of the century, it was chiefly in the post-war colonies themselves that the diglossic conditions of colonialism produced a generation of self-consciously bilingual writers; they helped initiate new critical reflection on these issues, but they rarely translated their work between their languages. By 2000, when faced with the rare case of a novel "translated by the author", most readers had forgotten that earlier periods too had their bilingual Nabokov or Beckett, writers working ambidextrously in two languages across two national "cultures" in the ambient translingual worlds of medieval and early modern Europe. Today, in large part, as Pym has said, postcolonial and translation studies notwithstanding, our contemporary critical categories for bilingualism, nation, and translation, are still largely the legacies of this Romantic dualism of binary or even confrontational thought, structured around monolingual poles. Conceptions of domestic and foreign, native and other, original and imitation, are still threaded with Schleiermacher's notion that to write in a second language is to betray the maternal tongue and the essence of genius, "in defiance of nature and morality" (Schleiermacher, Robinson 1997:236).

By wide consensus in several domains, then, it has been difficult to classify literary self-translators in the analytic categories of modern criticism. In consonance with the linguistic quest for impersonal structures, modernist criticism too sought to isolate and typify – often with impetus from the new anthropologies and psychoanalysis – archetypal literary plots and characters obtaining across genres and languages. Where one might have expected closer attention to writers bridging those languages, such theorists as Northrop Frye and his dominant school of archetypal critics flattened

even bilingual authors out to the root level of common ritual and myth.

When thus sliced into monolingual canons, and leveled to extra-lingual archetypes, the bilingual writers themselves often protested. Many resisted volubly. "I *am* literature", said Franz Kafka, elevating his work above his nationality as a Yiddish- and Czech- and German-speaking Jew in Prague who chose to write in German (Miller 1982:116). "My country is the Portuguese language", wrote Ferdando Pessoa (42; quoted in Picon 1982:33). Claiming that "literature" was his passport, Nabokov lamented that "Nobody can decide if I'm a middle-aged American writer or an old Russian writer – or an ageless international freak". As a self-translator who transposed all his own texts between Russian and English, he deplored such "pigeon-holing" (*Strong Opinions,* 1973:106). Fitch has shown that, for the most part, while they acknowledge his bilingual canon, Beckett's Anglo-American readers tend to consider him an Irish writer and read only the English texts, just as French critics read him like a French writer, and neither group tends to read the "other" texts nor to consult the abundant criticism of Beckett published in the other language. Thus, Fitch concludes, they derive different notions of Beckett the writer ("the anglophone Existentialist writer and the francophone New Novelist", 1988:16). Franco-American Julian Green similarly inhabits half his literary corpus as "Julian", the other half as "Julien", and each is ascribed distinctive characteristics and literary agendas. Before the first World War, in France Giuseppe Ungaretti was considered an Italian poet writing in French, and, in Italy, a French Symbolist of Italian heritage. Grayson has observed that Nabokov's Russian readers see him as the literary descendant of Pushkin, whom he revered, while most Anglo-Americans, reading the texts in Nabokov's English, view him as a modernist wordsmith in the lineage of Joyce. Conversely, some Puerto Ricans consider Rosario Ferré a mainland American writer because she also writes in English, yet to most U.S. critics she is a Puerto Rican writer because she also writes in Spanish. When interpreting the work of these bilingual self-translators, the critic's native language usually determines the horizon. Yet to stop short in this way is to ignore not only half the writers' work but also the liminal spaces between, where they have done some of their most creative work in the translative process.

The few scholars to address these issues diachronically, beyond single-writer studies, such as Forster in *The Poet's Tongues* and Michaël Oustinoff in *Bilingualisme d'écriture et auto-traduction* (2001), tend to take a philological approach to what strikes us as the more essentially literary problem of a single text self-translated in two languages. These modernist writers in particular occupy a unique position in world literature. They span two literatures while refusing anchorage in either one. Their practice of self-translation between languages, the specific ways in which they recreate a text in the second language and adapt it to a new sign system laden with its own literary and philosophical traditions, escapes the binary categories of text theory and diverges radically from literary norms: here the translator *is* the author, the translation is an original, the foreign is the domestic, and vice versa. The by now solid national literary traditions and cultural resonance are invoked, as usual in a single-language text, only to be amplified with echoes and allusions to the other canonical tradition and cultural space.

Historically, the nineteenth century produced few bilingual texts, although ambient

translingualism was still the norm among aristocrats and scholars. Queen Victoria, for example, spoke German until the age of three, then acquired English and French. Social displacement on the large modernist scale certainly began with the French Revolution, but it was slow to spread. Most émigrés and refugees adopted the language of the host country, such as Adelbert von Chamisso (1781-1838) and Joseph Conrad (1857-1924). Born of noble French parents in Champagne, Chamisso began writing poetic texts in French, fled to Berlin in 1796, adopted German as his literary language, and became an esteemed lyric poet and novelist in Germany, authoring his best known text, the novel *Peter Schlemihl*, in 1813 (see Valérie André). In Berdyczów in Poland (now Ukraine), Conrad's aristocratic father, who had been a poet and a translator of French and English literature into Polish, was deported for anti-tsarist acitivities, and the boy was soon an orphan, living briefly with an uncle in Cracow and then with a tutor in Switzerland. After four years as a seaman in the French merchant navy, living and working in French, he avoided French conscription by spending the next sixteen years on British ships, becoming a British citizen in 1886. Settling in England in 1894, he made the decision to write in English rather than in French for his literary work (on his many languages, see John Batchelor; on language "contamination" in Conrad's texts, see Watts 1982:33). When asked why Conrad opted for English over French, his close friend Ford Maddox Ford replied, with unshakable Edwardian certainty:

> He was a Pole whose first other language was French. I remember remarking to André Chevrillon how surprising a choice it was on Conrad's part to write in English, especially since he was so clearly a student of the French masters. And I remember the reply, to the effect that it wasn't at all surprising, since Conrad's work couldn't have been written in French. M. Chevrillon, with the authority of a perfect bilingual, went on to explain in terms of the characteristics of the two languages why it had to be English. Conrad's themes and interests demanded the concreteness and action – the dramatic energy – of English. We might go further and say that Conrad chose to write his novels in English for the same reason that led him to become a British Master Mariner . . . Here, then, we have a master of the English language, who chose it for its distinctive qualities and because of the moral tradition associated with it.
>
> (quoted in Miller 1982:122-23)

It is quite possible that Conrad did choose English for the moral aspects of its literary canon, but Ford and his interlocutor are more interesting for framing the subject in nationalistic terms. By the early twentieth century, even an ambient translingual–whose thick Polish accent often made him unintelligible even to his English wife–was stoutly claimed for the national tradition, indeed for its essence, in this case moral. Both Chamisso and Conrad translated some of their work, though not so fully as to develop a bilingual canon in the nationalistic climate.

Thereafter, the history of bilingual writers in the twentieth century reads like a military epic. Invasions, totalitarian regimes, foreign occupations, pogroms and deportations, propelled whole schools of writers into flight and exile. Russian Bolshevism, Italian Fascism, German Naziism, Spanish Franquism, Soviet Communism

and U.S. Anti-Communism, seemed to sweep through the European nations – apparently so stable in 1900 – with unprecedented reach and violence, effecting tectonic displacements of literary languages in both hemispheres. The first stage of European modernist linguistic upheavals seemed new; it would not be recognized until the second, post-1945 stage that colonial subjects had been experiencing such linguistic displacements for many generations.

Young authors who had just begun publishing novels or poetry in their homeland, or seeing their first plays produced in the national theatres, swiftly found themselves elsewhere, in another culture and a different language. Even where exile communities persisted for decades, as in Berlin, Paris, New York, and Mexico City, the wrenching choice was to write in the maternal language (the language of "a dead civilization", said Nabokov) or move on, abandon the entire linguistic matrix of one's past experience and, in the psychoanalytic century, the corresponding "maternal" forms of the unconscious itself. Aristocrats' children had been educated in several languages, usually including French plus German or English, but many lower middle-class children had also acquired both the native language or an ethnic variant, plus the language of a hegemonic culture, such as German in Central Europe or English in Latin America. Not unlike medievals and early moderns, who experienced the vertical pressures of Latin while developing their vernaculars, whole peoples during the modern era experienced similar pressures from the vertical dominance of an imperial vernacular, while trying to preserve their native languages and dialects from erasure by governments, school curricula, state publishing houses. Writers in such languages as Yiddish, Czech, Polish, or Serbo-Croatian, when they could not emigrate, often published in their languages clandestinely and smuggled manuscripts past political frontiers.

Those who did emigrate comprise, when taken as a group, one of the most striking phenomena of literary modernity. Only a static list can convey the breadth of literary bilinguality among the first modernist generation. In light of the work they produced in the adopted language, it is clear that in exile or expatriation, these writers developed a focus on language that they might not otherwise have found. Running down the list, differences leap to the eye. But so does a certain consanguinity that seems to lie deeper than merely the history of ideas in their time, particularly in relation to medieval and early modern bilinguals. As Miller says about some of these writers, differences among them are obvious, but "For all of them, however, there has been a newly discovered territory which demands redefinitions of language and culture" (1982:129).

There are no neat categories, political or psychological, for sorting writers who adopted new languages in this period. National language policies were often determinate, but it should be remembered that they were always oppressive when not absurd. In Germany in 1933 German Jews were ordered to write in Hebrew, and their German writings were considered "translations" (Klemperer 1995:15). It was apparently for reasons of patriotism that Thomas Mann in exile in the United States remained faithful to the German language, to "that authentic and inalienable country which I had carried with me into exile and from which no potentate could banish me" (quoted by Gaston Gallimard in Assouline 1984:304). Czech writer Jan Kolar has a fictional character explaining, in his French novel *Paradis parallèles*, "C'est donc à cause du

rapport 'sujet-langue' que j'ai choisi le français, Ce n'est pas ma langue maternelle . . . Car j'ai confiance en lui: le français est tantôt le plus stimulant conducteur de ma pensée, tantôt le plus formidable véhicule de phrases creuses"/ So it's because of the 'subject-language' relation that I chose French . . . For I have confidence in it: French is sometimes the most stimulating conductor of my thought, sometimes the most marvelous vehicle for slack sentences (quoted in Voisine-Jechova 1995:44). The Czech Catholic poet Jakub Deml, when pressed to explain in 1934 whether his decision to abandon Czech and write in German was heresy or piety, replied, "Weder Frömmigkeit, noch Haeresie, sondern Poesie!"/Neither piety nor heresy, but poetry! (quoted in Galmiche 1995:60). The Italian writer Antonio Tabucchi, by contrast, decided not to change languages: "and finally, and who knows whether this is not the main reason, I have always been afraid, I have never been brave enough to walk along both my linguistic and affective shorelines at the same time – to use psychoanalytic terms. I have gone to the other shore, but I could never come back in the same boat" (quoted in Tanquiero 2000:58). Ota Filip, another Czech who was placed on the Soviet index of unpublishable writers, could not survive on paltry Samizdat or clandestine revenues, so she switched to German; she tried to keep a sense of the foreign in her German, a note of the writer as 'exotic being,' but therefore when she later tried translating her German text into Czech, she so disliked the results that she ended up hiring translators. Like many eastern Europeans of the past fifty years, she never returned to her native country or literary language.

Among bilingual writers born before 1945, many had published some work in one language before adopting a second literary language for their published work. Some continued to write alternately in both languages. Many used only the second language for their literary medium. These differing bilingual writers include Joseph Conrad, Isaak Dinesen (Karen Blixen), Filippo Marinetti, Oscar Wilde, Jean Arp, Fernando Pessoa, Stefan George, Gabriele D'Annunzio, Rainer Maria Rilke, Léopold Senghor, Emil Cioran, Khalil Gibran, Nathalie Sarraute, Elias Canetti, Vladimir Nabokov, Elsa Triolet, Giuseppe Ungaretti, Isaac Beshevis Singer, Rabindranath Tagore, Julian Green, Samuel Beckett, Jorge Semprun, Joseph Brodsky, Ngùgì Wa Thiong'o, André Brink, Lydia Cabrera, Hector Biancotti, Victoria Ocampo, Konstanty Jelenski, Kateb Yacine, Ariel Dorfman, Esmeralda Santiago, Milan Kundera, Rosario Ferré, Assia Djebar, Anita Desai, Shirley Geok-lin Lim, and many more. Many modernists were originally displaced into the second language by political events. Still other exiles and expatriates continued to write in their native language while abroad, such as Paul Celan in his native German, Witold Gombrowicz and Czeslaw Milosz in Polish, James Joyce and Graham Greene in English. Most of these writers did not grow up bilingual, that is, acquiring two languages from birth simultaneously. Typically, these bilinguals studied the second, "foreign" language at school or university, later becoming idiomatic during residence abroad.

Writers who not only wrote in two languages, but also translated their literary texts between those languages, occupy a unique portion of this spectrum. They include at a minimum Stefan George, Giuseppe Ungaretti, Radindranath Tagore, Ariel Dorfman, Vladimir Nabokov, Julian Green, Samuel Beckett, Esmeralda Santiago, Rosario Ferré. A closer look at modernist literary self-translation should begin with their texts.

It is difficult to find a theoretical or even critical model of translation that might serve to elucidate their enterprise as writer-translators. To survey the theoretical models is to be haunted by Schleiermacher's dictum that the bilingual writer goes about doubled like a ghost, hanging in the unpleasant middle space of languages and literatures. But, as Anthony Pym asks, is not the "middle" ground the very region where translators actually work? And where bilingual *Doppeltgehen* writers actually write? Pym would move all translation theory since Schleiermacher away from the polar extremes and oppositions toward the middle ground, not as a distinct zone "between" but as a locus of intersection, the overlaps of cultures, "where people combine something of two or more cultures at once" (Pym 1998:177). This is where translators live, as people, and it is probably what Kafka and Nabokov meant by "literature" as passport or nationality. It also recalls the metaphorics of the Tudor translators in England – notably two centuries before the Romantics – when Giovanni Florio's translation of Montaigne was praised as almost a separate space of transnational intercourse, "not . . . invassal'd to one monarchy,/ But dwell[ing in] the'intertraffic of the mind" (see Amos 87). Translation theory continues to conceive of writers as belonging to one culture only, usually the target-language culture, for which they interpret the foreign. Yet these writers are people who often lived and worked far from their native land, often acquiring many languages, and very often translating in and out of languages other than their first or even second tongue. They often chose to live in a foreign culture while remaining actively engaged with another, sometimes more than one. This was obvious in medieval and Renaissance eras of wandering scholars and clerics, but it is still common today. Just as no one would think of calling the leading twentieth-century translators "monocultural" (William Weaver, Ralph Mannheim, Richard Howard, David Magarshack, Donald Keene, Gayatri Spivak are at the least sociolinguistic intercultures), so bilingual writers cannot be reduced to a single cultural identity but thrive in the middle region of overlaps. Writing from the midzone, the bilingual self-translator does not just bridge the gaps between cultures but combines them as a single subject living bilingually, and writes both languages with one hand. Split in two by post-Romantic traditions of reading national cultures and language-specific texts, the self-translators can be better approached through such non-binary concepts as interculture and through the attendant correspondences that span their work.

There might seem to be many ways to theorize the modernists' bilingual texts, but they typically defeat standard modes of description. Linguistically, one must approach the two texts as separate pieces of discourse, each bound within a unique verbal system, leaving the middle conjectural. Culturally, one must locate the points of resistance where cross-cultural reference fails, consequently studying modes of compensation as loss, again leaving the middle empty. Psychoanalysis, deconstruction, and other modes of analysis similarly bifurcate the middle ground of commonality for lack of tools to address it directly.

Restrictive notions of text and subjectivity, largely still tacitly monolingual, complicate the theoretical problem of the bilingual text, just as the applied linguists' subordination of author to text, indeed the dismissal of author as a viable category, ultimately foundered on the need to account for singular oddities in literary fictive

discourse, where the conventional codes of linguistic and cultural material are recoded as literary constituents enacting the thematics of the text. For self-translators the recoding of standard language as literary discourse is a redoubled enterprise eventuating from a single subject position in two languages. Reading stereoscopically, one is confronted with a dual mode of literary signification. To Henry Schogt it is obvious that once one enters the domain of specific literary texts, one leaves behind "the general level on which linguistics operates" (1992:202), insofar as semantic theory looks for what is generally valid and systematic whereas "literary translation requires the analysis of the idiolect of the source text" (1992:202), all the singular indices beyond just semantic field. This critical posture was anathema in the structuralist decades, when reader-response critics deplored the scientific pretensions of formal stylistics, which was long construed as discourse analysis in linguistic terms, but semioticians in the 1980s began trying to recoup the literary uses of idiolect for textual analysis. Thus Peter Szondi, analysing differential "modes of signification" in text and translation, argued that one must look beneath rhetorical figures to identify the "change in basic presuppositions" (1992:172), which are found in the performative aspects of a unique text: in Celan's translation of a Shakespeare poem about constancy, repetition of words performs that subject, becoming a constituent element of the text that it thereby enacts. In such ways in the 1980s and 1990s, the writer's unique literary idiolect, under erasure in recent decades, began returning to the foreground. Semioticians and even socio-linguists have begun recurring to the antique modes of rhetoric and stylistics to elucidate literary language, including once again the properties unique to an individual writer's (monolingual) discourse.

We too find stylistics an appropriate avenue into modern self-translations, especially for exploring the middle ground between a writer's separate yet interdependent linguistic versions. Style, in the common understanding inherited from the Romantics, is the hallmark of individuality. A highly original, consistent style is the stamp of genius. Quick to concur with notions of genius, Nabokov would agree. "The best part of a writer's biography", he wrote, "is not the record of his adventures but the story of his style" (*Mary*, 1971:xiii). Obvious in general but difficult to define, it is through their style that we differentiate a Leonardo from a Pollaiuolo, a Mozart from a Salieri, or, as peers across languages and similar borrowings, a Boccaccio from a Chaucer. Style is what allows curators to detect forgeries or humorists to write pastiches. In literature, style is what is most often "lost" in translation, to judge by centuries of critical disputes. To focus on style is not to fall back into a Paterian aestheticism, but rather to construct a bridge across the sterile binaries of form and substance, faithful and free translation, foreignizing and domesticating translative modes. Just as the style of Michelangelo or Picasso emerges clearest through comparison of their work in both painting and sculpture, so Nabokov is both Russian and American, Beckett both French and Irish, as their highly original and consistent style – rather than the language of the moment – affirms. Modern bilingual writers, utterly free to transpose a text as they wish, seem to hew to only one common translative standard, and that standard is stylistic. However variously applied in each case, it entails transposition of the writer's unique idiolect.

In language, stylistic questions seem inherently different from painterly or plastic

ones, primarily because the cultural history is so cohesive with the medium. In translation studies, typically cross-cultural communication theories address the gaps between originals and translations (a literal translation reduces, a re-creative translation alters), in various modes of diminution. Granting that languages and cultures differ, how can an individual style become translingual? And how do we measure the changes made when, in the case of self-translators, they are often lexically indefensible but culturally astute, effectively transposing the reading experience from one medium into another? To approach such questions in modernity, standard notions of foreign-domestic culture and textual diminution must be set aside, in order the better to examine the two texts for functional and stylistic correspondence.

The effort to differentiate a writer's style, and translative stylistic correspondence, from the specific language(s) of its textual embodiment might seem to run contrary to recent trends in critical theory. Although style is a rather discredited rubric in anglophone criticism through the continuing effects of structuralist and post-structuralist thought, critics in the European languages have been charting since the 1990s a "retour de la stylistique" or return to stylistics. Gérard Genette, Gilles Deleuze, Jean Molino, Jean-Pierre Adam, among others, return to their elders Charles Bally, Leo Spitzer, Émile Benveniste, Roman Jakobson, to recontextualize what they said about the receiver of a text into the larger field of literary creative uses of language, which had disappeared in semiotic models and linguistic atomization of the text. Drawing upon lessons from applied linguistics while spanning the chasm opened by structural linguistics between grammar and style, they thus sidestep an outworn dichotomy between generic senders and receivers, to focus on the individual writer's "singular" uses of language in a text as a unity of linguistic and stylistic patterning. In such studies as Sowinski's *Stilistik* (1991), Genette's *Fiction et diction* (1991), Adam's *Le Style dans la langue: Une reconceptualisation de la stylistique* (1997), there is broad agreement that a new textual pragmatics of "le stylistique linguistique-littéraire" can close the chasm opened up by structural linguistics between form/content and norm/variant through renewed attention to replications of both linguistic and literary patterning as constituting "le style individuel" (for a survey of approaches, see Molinié and Cahné).

Style, then, is no longer conceived as a quantifiable deviation from standard language, in discontinuous increments. It is a sustained mode of using standard language, while shaping and unsettling it through individual choices in singular or unique ways. As part of this renaissance, Deleuze quotes Proust from *Contre Sainte-Beuve*: "Les beaux livres sont écrits dans une sorte de langue étrangère"/fine books are written in a sort of foreign language. Deleuze adds that it is not the formal and superficial syntax that regulates the equilibriums of the language, but this "foreign" language within, as a grammar of disequilibrium, where, he stresses, each element tends toward its end in the overall stylistic unity of the text (141). For example, Genette says, style is the exemplicative function as opposed to the denotative: the adjective "brief" denotes, and at the same time exemplifies, brevity (as a monosyllable). Style to Adam is thus the palpable, perceptible, material dimension of the text, on the order of Nabokov's remark about his style quoted above. Its stylistic features (the innumerable forms of such exemplifications) permit the writer to exemplify mere signifiers through this

phonic and lexical co-text; its consistence and unity (patternings) constitute a writer's singular disequilibrium relative to both standard language and classical or received stylistic tradition (Adam 2000:24). To Molino, this requires reinserting the lessons of linguistics into stylistics since, for example, it is now recognized that every denotation carries a connotation in context, and no linguistic function in literature is pure but derives from individual choice.

Thus stylistic analysis can help sketch the lineaments of the bilingual text, as produced by the same singular creative writer using his or her unique literary idiolect across different linguistic systems. These stylistic categories, especially the internal "foreign" disequilibrium and the exemplicative co-text, are particularly useful for watching how self-translators interrelate the two texts.

As in the case studies of medieval through early modern self-translators, the reader will see the effects of period constraints in certain fin-de-siècle bilinguals, for whom the concept of genre still retains a certain stylistic definition. But increasingly in the modern period, such canonical strictures fall away, in the emergence of the ever more singular voice. Once again, however, in sequential treatment the self-translations show how each writer finds his or her own modes of functional correspondence, that is, of redirecting the text for reception by the second reading (or performance) culture.

D. Self-Translators

Two brief sketches of the self-translators Rabindranath Tagore and Stefan George demonstrate the paradigmatic role of stylistics in considering the bilingual text. They will help clarify the kinds of constants or parameters of literary self-translation that come to the fore of this translative practice in modernity, and the sorts of challenge it poses to translation theory. Then a closer look at the bilingual texts of Ungaretti, Green, Nabokov, Beckett, and Ferré will help profile self-translation as a bilingual literary field, with its own technical properties and dialogic relations to differential audiences. Our closing sections on Beckett and Ferré in particular will allow us to consider how postmodern and contemporary self-translators relate to current translation theory.

(1) Modeling Modernity: Rabindranath Tagore, Stefan George, Giuseppe Ungaretti

Bengali poet, novelist, and dramatist, Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941) was the first non-European to receive the Nobel Prize for literature, in 1913, for his collection of poems entitled *Gitanjali: Song Offering*. During 1912 to 1921, he translated five additional anthologies of his poetry. The following, from *Gitanjali*, is his self-translation of Poem 5, followed by the critic Mahasweta Sengupta's literal translation from Tagore's original Bengali:

> I ask for a moment's indulgence to sit by thy side.
> [. . .]
> To-day the summer has come at my window with its sighs and murmurs;

> and the bees are playing with their minstrelsy at the court of the flowering grove.
>
> (Tagore 1912:4-5)
>
> Let me sit near you only for a little while.
> [. . .]
> Spring with its ecstatic breath has come to my window.
> The lazy bee comes humming
> And dwells in the garden.
>
> (Sengupta 1990:56-7)

In British India and in the Bengali language, Tagore was an avant-garde writer, and he remains an influential figure. He worked in more modes than just devotional or spiritual poetry. As Sengupta notes, even in the *Jeevansmritri* from which this poem is taken, he drew subtly upon the syntax and imagery of the Vaisnava poets, including the convention of presenting the votary as a lover or friend (rather than merely as suppliant to a master). He was well read in the classics of Sanskrit and English literature, from Shakespeare to contemporaries. Yet he chose to translate into English only his devotional poems and, as this typical excerpt shows, he put them into staid, even stale Edwardian verse.

He changed the diction, tone, register, imagery, and form, to resemble stylistic models in contemporary English. Today the poems read like plodding love lyrics, more awash in Victorian rose-water than in visionary seas. The immediacy of the implicit wish ("Let me sit near you") crumbles into Victorian formula and English archaism ("I ask for a moment's indulgence to sit by thy side"), just as an image of the poet as wandering the seas becomes one of "endless toil" in a sea of toil, in the labors of poesie. More significantly, the metaphoric axis of inactivity ("lazy bee") disintegrates in excess (bees playing in minstrelsy), just as the incisive personification of "Spring with its ecstatic breath" resolves into a banal figure, in a text recalling Walter de la Mare more than Tagore the Bengali.

But if Tagore's aim was to popularize his work for a European audience, his stylistic move was skillful. The poems were an immense success, reprinted in the thousands, effusively prefaced by distinguished writers, such as W. B. Yeats, and admiringly translated by others, such as André Gide for the French and Juan Ramón Jiménez for the Spanish. Sengupta suggests that, in *Gitanjali*, Tagore had to fit himself into the colonial stereotype of the wise voice from the East, a voice that "spoke of the peace and tranquillity of a distant world" to the materialist West on the eve of war (1990:58). The Swedish Academy crowned this text as "aesthetic theism", and, ironically, noted that Christian mission-preaching in far places was clearly enabling "a revival and regeneration of the vernacular language, i.e., its liberation from the bondage of an artificial tradition". (See Sengupta's discussion of this text, 1990:61-2). In fact, the sheer artifice of Tagore's Edwardian style in English actually effaced the richer vernacular poetry of his Bengali text. In what can only be called Tagore's English pseudo-style, the flatness of the poetry derives from the text's superficial equilibriums, patently constructed to imitate an extant model, stilling even the radically foreign echoes of his Hindu imagery. Howard Young calls Tagore's English "a severe case of

self-bowlderization" (1995:43), which became immensely popular throughout Latin America only because of Jiménez's much improved translation that drew upon his own poetic "style bank" (1995:47). In English circles meanwhile, with the outbreak of war, *Gitanjali* soon disappeared from the literary press.

In a later essay on Tagore, Sengupta theorized her initial defense of these translations in Lacanian terms, deeming this translative process "compulsory" for all rendering of Asian texts in the colonizer's symbolic (Sengupta 1995:172). But we should note that other translators of Asian texts into several Western languages did not experience any such stylistic compulsion; on the contrary, many effected radical change in the poetic forms and modes of the Western language, such as Judith Gautier's translations of Japanese *tanka* into French in 1885 or Paul-Louis Couchoud's translation of *haiku* in 1906 (see Hokenson 2004:113-118, 249-253). And as Sengupta notes, Tagore himself regretted this practice late in life, in 1935, writing to a friend that by giving his poems "certain assumed gestures familiar to you", "I have done thereby injustice to myself" and to the muse's own "climate and culture" (quoted in Sengupta 1995:171).

Tagore marks the rare case of a writer who did not, and perhaps chose not to, fully inhabit the other language *as* a writer, as a self-translator seeking functional and stylistic correspondences in the potentialities of the second language. Instead, in reworking his texts, he produced an affective Edwardian monolith with scant relation to his original and of little stylistic significance in the second literature.

His contemporary Stefan George (1868-1933) was born in Hesse into a family that spoke German at home as well as French. "French is my second native language", he said (quoted in Norton 2002:8). As a young man he meticulously studied the classic texts in his native German and French, and in all the languages he knew (Greek, Latin, English early, later Spanish, Italian, Dutch, Polish, and Norwegian). Translating writers from all these languages, mostly into German, he also wrote original poetry in several, including Latin, English, and French, even inventing two languages of his own. During residence in London, he associated with the Pre-Raphaelites. In Paris in 1889, participating in Mallarmé's circle, he seriously pondered becoming a French poet, mostly from disaffection with contemporary German poetics; but friends persuaded him to return to his native country, where he might renew the German lyric (see Forster 1970:58-9; Norton 2002:55-63).

In Germany he was at first unable to write ("weil ich einfach nicht weiss in welcher sprache ich schreiben soll"/ because I simply do not know in which language to write). Decades later, he concluded that literary creation in a foreign language medium ("sprachstoff") seems like play to a layman, but it has its own necessity: "In der fremden sprache in der er fühlt sich bewegt und denkt fügen sich dem Dichter die klänge ähnlich wie in der muttersprache"/In the foreign language in which he feels, moves, and thinks, the sounds join together for the poet in the same way as in the maternal language (quoted in Forster 1970:57-8, translation modified). He soon founded his own literary school around the review *Blätter für die Kunst* (1892-1919), aiming to reinvigorate German as a literary language, with a new classicism of metrical regularity and phonic harmony, using the model of French Symbolism to displace what he considered debased contemporary German naturalist modes. His first

books, three small volumes of poetry in German, were published in Berlin, Vienna, and Paris in the early 1890s. Later repudiating foreign influences (and concealing his own early work in foreign languages), he became a prominent German poet and aesthetic authority. A fervent nationalist, courted by Nazi officials, he died in 1933 while on vacation in Switzerland. Increasingly writing only in German and publishing only his German texts (now in eighteen volumes), George's self-translations between French or English and German were published infrequently, and collected posthumously in the *Schlussband* of 1934 and 1936. The best known are two English poems, *Those Who Lived in Dreams* and *You Boldly Ceased to Love the God of Yore*, and three French poems, *Proverbes*, *Frauenlob*, and *D'Une Veillée*, which he self-translated into German (on the English see Farrell 1937:218-19; on the French see Jäger 1936:567, 580-87).

As his comments above suggest, to young George the writerly passage into the foreign language entails more than an outward change of clothing, and is different in kind from transposing oneself into an established style. George's French poetry, for instance, cannot be reduced to Parnassian or even Mallarméan imitation. In George's conception, the poet literally moves within the foreign language, feels in it, and thinks in it. The subject position of the bilingual poet is not transcendent or stereoscopic, but is rather a serial function of the language in use. Schooling himself in their linguistic properties and literary traditions, George was interested in the differences between languages, especially the contrastive modes of syntax and phonic sub-systems, which he enjoyed re-creating in German to revitalize that language. He tried to introduce a Pre-Raphaelite poetics from English and a Symbolist poetics from French into his native German, into a new amalgam, but most critics doubt that he succeeded. In French as in English, his subject is often the melancholy and solitary artist-poet gazing on the world, which reflects back to him (in Symbolist reflexivity) his pained state as elegiast of the ideal. The closing stanza of the first section of *D'Une Veillée/Nachtwachen* reads

> Ne joue pas avec! il est fragile.
> Même quand tu souris (enfin tu t'es endormie)
> Ce sourire est mélancolie
> Et tu penches un peu ta tête endolorie.
>
> (*Werke*, 1958:2:599)
>
> Wenn du lächelst (endlich flog über dir der schlummer her)
> Dein lächeln gleicht dem weinen sehr
> Und du neigst ein wenig dein haupt von kummer schwer.
>
> (George's lower-case nouns; *Werke*, 1958:1:144)

(Literally, the French reads: Don't play with it! it is fragile./ Even when you smile (you've finally fallen asleep)/this smile is melancholy/ and you incline a bit your aching head. The German reads: When you smile (finally slumber has come to you)/ your smile very much resembles crying/ and you nod your head heavy with worry)

The texts in both languages exhibit George's highly characteristic simplicity and clarity, his familiar and almost conversational diction, his mode of the fabulant retailing a quotidian scene or incident. In the two languages, the poet seems to use comparable means to these effects, in meter and syntax, but the tone, the rhythm, and especially the phonic patternings are rendered quite reductively in translation. The colloquialism of the French "Ne joue pas avec!" with its abrupt exclamation is not repeated in German, where George smooths out the rhythm and drops the imperative tense. Semantically, with lexical changes in register, the pain is intensified in the German (*combats* becomes *leiden* or suffering, *mélancolie* becomes *weinen* or cry). The rich phonic cohesions of the French entail patterns of assonance and alliteration (elsewhere in French he rhymes: *content le drame/Des âmes que Dieu condamne*), which are flattened out in the more prosaic German lines. Unlike George's most esteemed poetic work in German, in his translation the structure of rhyme is made even more rigid than the French, and the meter is almost more irregular. Many such features seem to run counter to George's agenda for a new German poetics, which he later achieved in original German texts. His translations do not replicate the primary stylistic originalities (relative to normative German poetics in 1890) of his own foreign-language texts. It may be that his translative apprentice work in French and English was so closely wedded to poetic models (Rossetti, Verlaine) that their absence in his German voice left it rather monotone and banal. The closing line of *Nachtwachen* seems to trail off in marked confusion of rhythm, imagery, and tone.

Unlike the work of most self-translators, these bilingual texts by Tagore and George are stylistically disjunctive. The differences do not cohere into any kind of functional or stylistic correspondence common to the two versions. Monolingually, each reading experience is so different in kind that the effects cannot be said to arise from any common aesthetic or literary properties. Stereoscopically, the interliminal space between texts is more foreclosed than opened up, insofar as the constituent literary elements of the translation efface the very singularities of the first text, in a steady thinning and banalization in the second medium.

The stylistic disparities, then, in Tagore's and George's self-translations disclose the conventional kinds of "gaps" between original and translation that are the mainstay of translation theory. That the diminution or falling off occurs in the native language in George's case demonstrates that self-translators can, and do, fail as miserably as other translators, when they do not seek to create stylistic and especially functional correspondences between their texts. Tagore's Edwardian English, like George's Pre-Raphaelite English and Symbolist French, reveals the challenges and the stakes of literary bilinguality as a primarily stylistic endeavor, beyond the elementary level of semantic transposition. The stylistic and functional characteristics of the modern bilingual text as a dual discourse are more clear in the self-translations of Ungaretti, Nabokov, Green, Beckett, and Ferré.

Thus the case of Giuseppe Ungaretti (1888-1970) presents a different set of translative issues. One of Italy's leading modernist poets, Ungaretti was born into a Tuscan family that had settled in Alexandria, Egypt. He spoke Italian at home, while being educated in French at school. Rather like a medieval poet, then, he was fully conversant with two international languages whose "cultures" he did

not know first-hand, until he emigrated at the age of twenty-four; he never acquired Arabic (which he spoke poorly), the language of his country of birth. He did not even see Italy until he left Egypt in 1912, en route to university studies in Paris. During residence in Paris (1912-1914, 1918-1922), interrupted by war, he was a friend of Apollinaire, Picasso, the Italian Futurists, among other avant-gardists, and he wrote so interchangeably in both Italian and French during this period that it is sometimes still difficult to determine which was the original language of certain early poems. Amid the disruptions of war, publishing poems erratically, he served in the Italian army and he wrote and self-translated literally in the trenches.

His first collection of poems in Italian, *Il Porto Sepolto/* The Submerged Port (1916), was followed by two books in French, *La Guerre*/The War in 1919, and *P.-L.-M.*/Paris-Lyon-Mediterranean [Train] in 1920. These included both translations from the Italian ("mise en français") and new work in French, and those texts in turn led to a second edition of *Il Porto Sepolto* (1923), incorporating some texts translated from the French volumes. (Picon provides a chronology of publications, and Vegliante estimates dates of composition.) Carlo Ossola calls the poet's work during this period "a constant linguistic to-and-fro" (1975:27). Several texts authored in French were self translated only later, such as certain poems in *L'Allegria* (1931) and the collection *Les derniers jours* (1919), which appeared in Italian in Milan in 1947. After leaving France definitively for Italy in 1922, Ungaretti decided upon Italian for his literary language, and seems to have written only in Italian thereafter, although he continued doing many of his own translations into French, chiefly essays, through 1936. His early subjects circled around what he called "the metaphysical tragedy" of rootlessness in his time (quoted in Cary 1969:143), which later in Italy became the still more solitary anguish of the Catholic believer haunted by the lost certainties of faith. Like George all his life into German, and Nabokov for about thirty years into Russian, French, and English, Ungaretti regularly translated for the rest of his life an astonishing array of other writers into Italian, from Shakespeare and Góngora to Blake and Brazilian poets.

So the Ungaretti text is a convenient space for discarding chronological notions of "original" and "translation", source and target texts, since the poet himself scrambled the chronology and seems to have considered each version timeless. The young writer strips both texts of punctuation, standard rhyme, and conventional formal structures, preferring stark simplicity without ornament and isolated words in disjunctive clauses, in striving for a poverty of form that might open new spaces for his themes of innocence and memory, in what he called "evocazioni pure" ("Memoria d'Ofelia d'Alba", *Vita*, 160). Much more than lexical transfer is at issue in the bilingual texts, and neither version is dependent on any external stylistic model (to the degree that a creative amalgam of Apollinaire and Leopardi transcends both legacies). Each version is unique for reasons specific to its language and its form, yet they effect commensurate dialogic relations with their two audiences or readers. The result is two texts that, as doubles replicating the semantic field through stylistic cohesion, invite the kind of stereoscopic reading of all texts and their translations that Rose suggests uncovers "the interliminal richness" generated by the harmonies and disjunctions between the versions (1997:54). Moreover in these self-translations, each is clearly an original

creation by the same writer working within what Rose terms "the affective, semantic space between" languages and texts (1997:55). "Militaires/Soldati" was written at the front in 1918:

SOLDATI
Si sta come
d'autunno
sugli alberi
le foglie (*Vita*, 87)

MILITAIRES
Nous sommes telle en automne sur
l'arbre la feuille

(*Guerre*, 22)

(The Italian reads: Soldiers // They are [or stay] like/of autumn/on the trees/ the leaves. The French reads: Military Servicemen // We are/such as in autumn/on/the tree/the leaf.)

The Italian is a straight column, typographically, and the French an explosion of form. In the third-person, the "soldati" stay (in the sense of both remain and are, "Si sta"), whereas in the first-person, the "militaires" merely are ("Nous sommes"), and they speak the poem, across blanks and pauses. Neither text uses the simple 'like'as pivot of the simile, but the more unusual prepositional form "come/ d'autunno" and pronominal form "telle en automne", only to split it by interposing a phrase, 'on the tree(s),' which ambiguates the referent and redoubles the weight on the final word closing the simile. Italian plurals become French singulars, in 'tree' and 'leaf.' The syntax is identical. Yet on a first reading the poems seem quite different.

Ungaretti could easily have used singular nouns in "Soldati", and indeed a stock translator from the French would have straightforwardly used "Siamo" (we are) and welcomed the easy rhyme with "albero". But instead Ungaretti constructs a different textural world in each language. The Italian plurals thicken, like the redoubling alliterations (in "Soldate, Si sta . . . sugli") and the twice plural "-gli", adding phonic density to this compact column. Both texts induce pathos, in the helpless condition of awaiting an impersonal death, but the French does so by lessening, by enhanced fragmentation and attenuation, in a collective singularity of existence. That is why the titles are poor dictionary translations of one another but fine stylistic cohesions (adopting Fawcett's distinction between coherence as the conceptual connectedness of a text and cohesion as the lexico-grammatical connectedness of a text, 90-99). In Ungaretti's acute etymologies "sol-dati" rings ironically on autumnal 'sun-given' (*sole*) just as "mili-taires" suggests a thousand 'silenced' soldiers (*taire*).

Why these differences? The bilingual text is never merely twinned, in a mirror version, because style is irreducibly both linguistic and literary. Each version of Ungaretti's texts enacts its own themes and motifs as myriad stylistic functions of the language he is using. The more essential question is whether these very differences

generate, or constitute, a singular style unique to Ungaretti as a bilingual writer. One of the best known poems of the post-war period was his "Girovago/Voyage", which became a literary emblem of displaced persons in new, or rather old countries and languages:

GIROVAGO
In nessuna
parte
di terra
mi posso
accasare

A ogni
nuovo
clima
che incontro
mi trovo
languente
che
una volta
già gli ero stato
assuefatto

E me ne stacco sempre
straniero

Nascendo
tornato da epoche troppo
vissute

Godere un solo
minuto di vita
iniziale

Cerco un paese
innocente

(*Vita,* 85)

VOYAGE
je ne peux m'établir

à chaque nouveau climat je me
retrouve une âme d'antan

en étranger je m'en détache

revenu en naissant d'époques

trop vécues

jouir une seule minute de vie
initiale

je cherche un pays innocent

(*Guerre*, 19)

(Literally, the Italian reads: I Wander // In no / part of the earth / can I/ establish [a home for] myself] // In each / new / climate / that I encounter / I end up /in lassitude / which [I had]/ at one time / already been / accustomed to // And I detach myself ever / a stranger // Being born / returning from eras too [much] / lived // To enjoy one single / minute of life / initial // I seek a country / innocent. The French reads: Voyage// I cannot / establish myself / in each / new climate / I / rediscover / a soul of old // a stranger / I detach myself // returned / in being born / of eras / too lived // To enjoy / a single minute / of life / initial // I seek / a country / innocent.)

The same divergence in form runs throughout Ungaretti's bilingual work, splaying what is in fact a close, almost identical syntax in the two languages. Ungaretti's bold habitual practice is to radically isolate very brief phrases or even a single word, as he does vertically in Italian and horizontally in French. Either way, the spacing seems to create semantic breaks but those are often deceptive, as the next segment reveals, in a fluid sequence of conceptually interlacing and lyrically suggestive, rarely complete denotations. The same semantic reversal occurs within segments: thus the lines "Nascendo/tornato da epoche troppo", "revenu en naissant d'époques", seems to designate a birth from the past into a new present, but is immediately countered by the segment's concluding word(s), "vissute" and "trop vécues", which instantly turn the figure of birth into antithesis, actually a circle rounding back into an ancient past of human misery and the poet's consciousness of reenactment. As characteristic of Ungaretti, in both languages, the vocabulary is elementary, simple and familiar. The syntax is ordinary, comprising five sentences that precede and follow the axial clause (quoted above). Each text uses the same types of phonic patterns for the same figure, although each pattern is language-specific: "stacco sempre/straniero" as "en étranger . . . en détache", "nouveau/retrouve/une âme d'antan" as "mi trovo languente/ero stato/assuefatto". The two crucial, mutually revisive terms, in Italian "accasare-assuefatto" and in French "établir-détache", retain the same web of phonic echoes in conceptual contrast, as do other pairs, such as "Nascendo tornato" and "revenu en naissant". Thus it is also a mark of Ungaretti's translingual style or literary idiolect that the only isolate is "innocent/e", a word having no rhyme in either text, and echoing only the opening, "je ne peux" and "In nessuna", in modernist round.

The impersonal opening phrase in Italian, and the immediately personal French, would seem like blatant opposites in a standard translation. But Ungaretti has already equilibrated them through the titles. The noun "Voyage" frames the French text as generic, universalizing the first-person, just as the verb "Girovago" (I wander) personalizes the Italian. Celebrated for introducing a new intensity and purity into

Italian poetry, Ungaretti created a lyric hermeneutic art of the *punto* (what Leone Piccioni called his *punti di sutura*), the fine point of hinge between disparate fragments and discontinuous phrases which, through the consistent stylistic texture of his work, builds from simple denotation to metaphysical songs of memory and anguished desire. The bilingual corpus reveals that indeed his differential approach to his two languages, producing texts that at first glance might seem quite different, actually served the same singular aesthetic that he was in the process of developing in France and at the front in 1912-22. The literary lineage is obvious (Mallarmé, Apollinaire, Leopardi). But it is antecedent to the singular lexical cohesion and stylistic coherence of his bilingual text, where he evolved a style that is independent of either specific linguistic medium. The shifts in form, between vertical and horizontal, are consistent across different time periods and manifest the texts' dialogic engagement with two different audiences, that is, with the state of the lyric in French (after Mallarmé's formal dislocations) and Italian.

Ungaretti thought that World War I disintegrated language, along with other assumptions about meaning. The writer had to assume his freedom from moribund traditions in an act of decisive aesthetic liberty ("una libertà estetica decisiva", *Vita,* lxxvii), when left with only silence and a few bare, common words. In his reflections on style, on what he terms the "problemi dell'espressione poetica e dello stile" ("Ragioni d'una poesia", *Vita,* lxvi-ci), he stressed innocence, of form and voice, as purified of old debris of all sorts, and as evocative concision in conveying spontaneous immediacy. The integrity of his spare bilingual text, through *La Guerre*, *P.-L.-M.*, *Les derniers jours* and their Italian versions, arises from the firm belief that paucity of means was a European condition, for humanity at large no less than for poets juggling even many old languages. To double himself literally as a bilingual poet was perhaps another method of freeing himself from the rubble of specific languages in evolving an interlingual poetics. We will return to the theoretical issues raised by such texts after considering three additional self-translators.

(2) Euro-American Inventio: Vladimir Nabokov

According to exiled novelist and poet Nina Berberova, apropos of the crisis experienced by Russian émigré writers in the 1920s, "Our misfortune was the absence of style, the impossibility of finding one's style. We could not attain it. Only Nabokov succeeded in renewing style" (quoted in Bérard-Zarzycka 1989:358). Growing up trilingual in Saint Petersburg, with Russian parents and French and English governesses, Vladimir Nabokov (1899-1977) seems to have learned to read English poetry before he could read Russian, his native language, though he soon spoke all three languages. A keen student of the three national literatures, well before the revolution and exile abroad, Nabokov played expertly with languages and enjoyed the degree to which both poetry and prose had extended the resources of literary language beyond what had been available in Pushkin's day: the increasing richness and subtlety of mental associations, the greater acuteness and diversity of the senses and the emotions, the readiness to seek other architectures than logic, proportion, classical meter (Boyd 1993:2.93). In the aristocratic milieu of tsarist Russia, the Nabokov family's

language games, like multilingual punning, garbling quotations, parodying styles, translating thorny texts, were a pleasurable pastime, no less challenging than detecting and constructing patterns in chess (Boyd 1993:1.256-7). At age eleven, Nabokov translated Mayne Reid's *The Headless Horseman* from English to French. As a writer, he wrote almost exclusively in Russian until 1938.

In exile as a student at Cambridge (1919-1922), then a prominent Russian émigré writer in Berlin (1922-1937) and Paris (1937-1941), he published poetry, stories, and nine novels in Russian. He refused to learn German well, for fear of diluting his Russian. "My fear of losing or corrupting, through alien influence, the only thing I had salvaged from Russia – her language – became positively morbid and considerably more harassing than the fear I was to experience decades later of my never being able to bring my English prose anywhere close to the level of my Russian" (*Speak*, 1999:265). But with no audience left for his work in Soviet Russia, and only impoverished émigré readers in Europe, in the 1930s Nabokov hesitated between languages. Not unlike Beckett in Paris in the 1930s, he sold translation work to local publications, including in his case the *NRF* and the Russian émigré press, working between Russian, French, and English (also producing, like Beckett in English, a version of Rimbaud's *Bateau ivre* in Russian; for titles and dates of these translations, see Grayson 1977:10-22). In Paris he wrote one autobiographical text in French, plus two critical essays, and he translated one of his own Russian tales into French. Nevertheless, hoping to emigrate to the United States, while in Paris he also translated two of his novels into English, *Kamera Obskura*/*Laughter in the Dark* and *Otchayanie*/*Despair* (the initial English translation was first hired out by the London publisher John Long to Winifred Roy, and published as *Camera Obscura* in 1936, but Nabokov was so displeased with the result that he did his own translation, which Long published as *Laughter in the Dark* the following year). In Paris in 1938, he adopted English as his literary language, and wrote *The Real Life of Sebastian Knight*. In the United States from 1940-1961, he wrote an autobiography and five novels in English, then in his last decades in Switzerland another three novels in English. Unlike Ungaretti's return to his 'first' native language, then, Nabokov dropped his Russian for English during a long period (until the international success of *Lolita* in 1955). Then he began the twenty-year process of self-translating early Russian texts into English and his recent English texts into Russian.

As the irrascible Professor of Russian Literature at Cornell, Nabokov translated classical texts for his students: Pushkin had said that translations are the post-horses of civilization but Nabokov found most English translations to be "the wild asses of ignorance" (Boyd 1993:2.32). As Beaujour points out, through all his American years he was deeply engaged in the Russian language through translating Pushkin and Lermontov and, as his biographer shows, regularly reading classical and modern Russian literature. For these pedagogical exercises, he developed a quasi-theory of translation. The method is basically a defense of literalism, the scholarly interlinear version (see his essay "The Art of Translation"). The most interesting thing about his theory, and his productions from Pushkin and Lermontov, is how radically he overturned these methodological principles when he translated his own literary work.

Nabokov's vaunted "literalism" was really an interlude, like a professorial parenthesis, in his long career as writer and translator. While at Cambridge, he had rendered *Alice in Wonderland* in Russian by transposing the entire setting to Russia, and putting Carroll's verse parodies into pastiches of Pushkin and Lermontov. With no notes or commentary, he invented his own Russian puns and wordplay, and substituted whole images and symbolic figures, so that William the Conqueror eventuates as Vladimir Monomakh in Kiev (see Weaver). His first self-translations in the 1930s are among the most throughly reworked of his English versions although, as Grayson notes, the next most heavily revised renderings (of *Soglyadatai* [1938*]/The Eye* and *Korol', dama, valet* [1928]*/King, Queen, Knave*) were made in 1965 and 1968. The sheer extent or degree of translative revision, then, is not a function of time-lag between first and second texts, but rather seems to reflect relatively greater difficulty in putting his earliest émigré work, the most self-consciously Russian texts, into English. His experiments with imaginary languages were not American developments, in *Bend Sinister* and *Pale Fire*, but date back to 1940 in the Russian *Solus Rex*. As Forster said of Stefan George, "a man who goes to these lengths to exercise himself in an untried medium may be expected to do the same in existing languages too" (Forster 1970:57).

The linguistic violence of Nabokov's switch to English was "like learning anew to handle things after losing seven or eight fingers in an explosion" (*Strong Opinions*, 1973:54). His first American novel, *Bend Sinister* (1947), contains trilingual cultural references, as Beaujour observes, but the "mixing of languages, code-switching, and hybridization of tongues are negatively marked, and paranomasia, cross-linguistic puns, neologisms, and spoonerisms are linguistic practices associated with a vile totalitarian country whose language Nabokov describes as 'a mongrel blend of Slavic and Germanic'" (1995:40). Although motifs of trilingualism and various thematic modes of translation run through all Nabokov's English novels like a subtext, it was only after *Lolita*, growing fame and financial security, plus several years of sustained self-translation into Russian, that his English texts themselves exploded into multivocalities and mixed-language prose. Intricate trilingual textures began reflecting his dazzling signature shifts among plot levels and discursive registers, and characters became trilingual (French, Russian, German), as in *Ada* (1969). He increasingly merged and seamed his languages in the English text, while ever conscious of the prospective Russian version – and possibly French, since he did the French translation of *Lolita* himself and oversaw all French translations for Paris publishers.

To read Nabokov's canon chronologically in two languages is to watch the texts develop a steadily intensifying concern with artifice and pattern. To consider just one trajectory, the elements of the fantastic in the earliest work tend to become interiorized as characters' perceptual delusions uncannily mirroring a movie poster or a reading, and the stable narrative optic gradually splinters into multiple contradictory perspectives, variously interlocking, threaded with more and more codes, enclosing the reader in serial febrile imaginations or pathological minds. Thus ultimately the text became a linguistic and literary conundrum, as in *Ada*, and reading a Nabokov text in English became a process of decoding. (He once pointed out that in the opening paragraphs of *Ada* he planted "three blunders, meant to ridicule mistranslations of

Russian classics", *Strong Opinions*, 1973:285). Although his self-translations reflect to some degree their particular stage in this development, Nabokov's overall practice from the beginning was to impose pattern from the Russian text in English, and to transpose such patterns when translating from English into Russian, making internal adjustments and amplifications within the major designs.

In *Nabokov Translated*, Jane Grayson studies his self-translations from Russian to English. She finds that in translating his first four Russian texts, Nabokov consistently enhances the sexual into the erotic or ribald, adds more humor (often caustic or grotesque) and wordplay, accumulates color symbolism and thematic indicators, often makes the major characters' conversations more clever or more critical and the secondary victims more aware, adds imagery and detail to further stylize characters, sharpens authorial irony, and in *Laughter in the Dark* especially, lengthens the narrative distance from the characters, who then seem to move less like actors than "like caged mice through a carefully constructed maze" (Grayson 1977:47). Grayson rightly concludes that one cumulative effect is to intensify the pathetic or despicable aspects of characters, comparatively stylizing or typifying them, while thereby distancing the narrator as artificer.

The short story *Rasskaz* (1934)*/The Circle* (1972) illustrates how Nabokov's lexical changes distance the characters while reorienting the narrative optic. A "sedoi lakei" (gray-haired servant) becomes "a senile flunkey", and a nondescript gardener and girl "a deaf little hunchback" and "an ethereal but ugly damsel whose shyness expressed itself in onion sweat" (Grayson 1977:135). The stylistic functions of this basic feature of Nabokov's translative practice, which might be called lexical and syntactic amplification with semantic demeaning in stylization, are clearest in the longer texts, such as *King, Queen, Knave* (1928/1968). The novel is an adulterous triangle tale where the murder of the husband goes awry and the wife dies suddenly, leaving the duped husband despondent and the manipulated lover finally free of the tyrannical woman. When in Russian the lover sees the lining of her coat, it is unexceptional, but in English it becomes "crimson, as crimson as lips and flayed animals, and smelled of heaven" (1968:95). Nabokov inserts the following sentence, intensifying the lover's cowardice but notably doing so through the narrator's superior monologic position: "A high-strung and abject coward in matters of feeling (and such cowards are doubly wretched since they lucidly perceive their cowardice and fear it), he could not help cringing when, with a banging of doors in a dramatic draft, [husband and wife] entered" (1968:105). The "dramatic draft" is also typical of these translations, where Nabokov heightens references to illusion (theatre, cinema, magic) even as he enriches the alliterative texture, the rhyme and extended wordplay (such as the high-strung figure cringing), the comic and the grotesque. This self-translator favors the rhetorical forms of noble cadence, particularly doubled nouns in balanced clauses, which themselves cohere as a kind of stylistic pun insofar as they are deployed for such banal matter.

Overt narrative artifice, suggesting the puppeteer behind the story, was not new in his English (a Russian critic in 1930 praised the "noble artificiality" of his fiction). Amplified in English, however, it is the distinguishing trait of his translative practice. He never changed a setting, only occasionally renamed characters in the second

language (Mary for Mashenka), often tightened structure without changing it. When translating, it was clearly at the level of textual style that Nabokov worked hardest and experienced the most pains and rewards. Devising and refining an English style was especially difficult because he believed that each language comports its literary heritage which the writer must both transcend and manipulate in his own way: "My private tragedy, which cannot, and indeed should not, be anybody's concern, is that I had to abandon my natural idiom, my untrammeled, rich, and infinitely docile Russian tongue for a second-rate brand of English, devoid of any of those apparatuses – the baffling mirror, the black velvet backdrop, the implied associations and traditions – which the native illusionist, frac-tails flying, can magically use to transcend the heritage in his own way" (Afterword to *Lolita*, 1955:307). Rejecting a proposal for certain translators of his work in 1942, he replied, "they lack my main desiderata: style and a rich vocabulary. Without a good deal of linguistic and poetical imagination it is useless tackling my stuff" (quoted in Boyd 1993:2.45).

Precisely what Nabokov understood his literary style to be becomes clear when tracing the stages through which he moved from first text through revisions to second text. For the major period of self-translation, after 1960, he developed a method of using "subtranslators" (often his wife or son) who submitted a literal translation from which he prepared the final text for publishers. These elaborate novels are often quite long, but a few selections illustrate the kind of textual enrichment characteristic of Nabokov's procedure. In Russian, he had always used striking, surprising imagery (often synesthetic, combining orders of animal-vegetable, sense-mind) with consistent aesthetic purpose. "Nabokov's images leap a gap of surprise, they are meant to look artificial, unnatural, and yet awaken the possibility of a universe somehow coruscating with consciousness in ways we cannot see" (Boyd 1993:1.296). In English, the conflictual semantic and phonic effect of his imagery is therefore a prime focus of attention, a lexical base on which he builds rhythmically, often adding to the narrator's discourse technical or rare words. Nabokov typically amplifies the subtranslators' literal version either through minute lexical changes (as in "curved" becoming "helical" or "exclamations" becoming "ejaculations"), or through larger arabesques changing image and rhythm, often reflexively, as in "those gloomy gentlemen" becoming "those lugubrious scribes", "the battering and harping sound of the words" becoming "the drubbing-in, rubbing-in tone of each word", or "It is like diving into icy water or parachuting into the void" becoming "It is like diving into icy water or jumping from a burning balcony into what looks like the heart of an artichoke" (from Grayson 1977:176-180, 73).

Such subordination, or sacrifice, of the literal to phonic patterns and expansion is complemented by Nabokov's practice of adding new images and figures. In the following, the underlined words are Nabokov's translation of a Russian phrase, to which Nabokov as self-translator in English adds the rest: "<u>slightly protruding eyes</u>, the mild blue eyes which bulged a little when he was thinking hard (and as he had a slowish mind this occurred more often than it should" (Grayson 1977:43); "<u>With a condescending grin, he offered his hand, hardly bothering to sit up.</u> I grasped it only because it provided me with the curious sensation of Narcissus fooling Nemesis by helping his image out of the brook" (Grayson 1977:69). When later revising his

own translation of a text, Nabokov steadily amplifies the tropes and figures, with jarring artifice that intensifies the narrator's overt orchestration of language and his multi-directional reference. From first- to second-stage self-translation, "the mighty motorbus of my tale" becomes "the bus, the motorbus, the mighty montibus of my tale", just as the simple "looking through it" becomes "looking through that terrible prism" (Grayson 1977:69, 76).

From the beginning in 1937, Nabokov amplified and embellished in English, enriching the linguistic texture and thereby the modes and tones of characterizations, actions, and settings. *Despair*, for instance, like earlier self-translations, becomes in English a work of overt linguistic skill, calling attention to its stylistic virtuosity. In often elaborate new images, tunnels and prisms and corridors of the mind mirror the hallways and other physical spaces the characters traverse, in multiple lexical and metaphoric interlacings that in turn reflect back through the embroidered language. As Grayson conjectures about the translative vocabulary, "it would almost seem that Nabokov, in order to establish an individual style and stamp it with difference and distinction, was . . . quite deliberately choosing the extraordinary" (1977:193). It is certain that his early translations into English (pre-1955) heavily embellished the Russian text; and although embellishment became exaggerated in his post-1955 practice, the early work probably served as an apprentice's laboratory for developing the stylistic arabesques that he then went on to use directly in English, in *Lolita* then in the full pryotechnics of *Pnin* (1957), *Pale Fire* (1962), and *Ada* (1969).

One persistent question about the bilingual writer is what role a specific language plays in shaping the text. That is, when Ungaretti or Nabokov skip the dictionary and the calque to create a differential passage in the second language, do the properties inherent in the second language lead them to do so? Or to what extent? The case of Nabokov is illuminating in this respect. It is obvious that the phonic co-text of rhyme, alliteration, assonance, and so forth, is language-specific; similarly, where cultural, especially literary and philosophical allusions do not readily transfer across cultures, the self-translator changes them, as in Nabokov's switching a pun on *Eugene Onegin* to *Macbeth* (or Beckett alluding to Hamlet instead of Pascal). The kinds of incremental changes we have been considering in Ungaretti and Nabokov effect some basic formal or lexical changes in the way in which the text is presented to the second-language reader. In Nabokov syntax, tone, even narrative optic in fiction and intertextuality in all genres, evolve in new directions. Translingual stylistic analysis, rather than examining the texts from within each language and its linguistic or cultural requirements, can conjoin them as functions of one stylistic idiolect, or literary stylistic works by one hand, effecting commensurate dialogic relations to their audiences. Nabokov, being idiomatically trilingual, offers the rare opportunity to use his French text as a kind of Archimedes's lever, lifting the analysis out of the standard binary mode of analysing his bilingual Russian/English writing.

The fifth chapter of his autobiography, "Mademoiselle O", concerning his French governess, was originally written in French, and published in 1936 in Jean Paulhan's new review *Mesures* (where Ungaretti also published poetry). Nabokov self-translated the French directly into English, so there is no intervening Russian text to be considered. Independent of any shaping properties that might be construed as inherent

in the Russian language, the French-English text nevertheless exhibits the same translative practice in sustaining his translingual style: "L'aile moirée d'un oiseau exotique au chapeau de Mademoiselle"/ "the ruffled exotic bird with one bloodshot eye on Mademoiselle's hat" (Grayson 1977:148). The glittering detail of the watered silk or *moiré* bird-wing is already characteristic of Nabokov in the 1930s, in Russian as in French. The phonic pairs "oiseau-chapeau" and "exotic-eye/bird-bloodshot" are linguistic effects typical of all his work between languages. To add the "bloodshot eye" is equally characteristic of Nabokov's translative exemplification, into any language. When he later puts this passage into Russian, he keeps the bloodshot eye and further develops this image of the governess (then further yet in the final English version).

In French, as in the early Russian novels, Nabokov places the narrative optic relatively close to the characters. In the French "Mademoiselle O", he invests it in the first-person as child. In translation he withdraws it to the adult as judge and writer: "Il faut bien noter que, malgré l'emphase de son langage et la naïveté de ses idées, le français de Mademoiselle était divin"/ "And, really, her French was so lovely! Ought one to have minded the shallowness of her culture, the bitterness of her temper, the banality of her mind, when that pearly language of hers purled and scintillated, as innocent of sense as the alliterative sins of Racine's pious verse?" (Grayson 1977:151).

Even from his French, then, exulting in alliterative "sins", the self-translator seems always to craft a more dense linguistic and literary texture, a more detached and ironic perspective, in the second text. The material surface of the text is clearly a function of language as linguistic medium, as for any writer. But the bilingual text exhibits the distinct distillation of style in the translative process, independent of any specific language, least of all Russian. The interchanges between Nabokov's Russian, English, and French, in whatever stages of revision and between whichever languages, tend to show the same process of amplifying pattern and design, distance and artifice, in translation. Specific languages are dramatically subordinated to the ironic arabesques and *inventio* that are the hallmarks of Nabokov's style, across three linguistic media.

Though it was recognized that Nabokov shared comic grotesquery and thematic daring with Dostoevsky, Gogol and others, and used Russian with the finesse of Pushkin, some émigré critics considered his prose "foreign" and "un-Russian", just as some American critics later found his English contrived. In a fictive interview, "Nabokov" invoked the Russian term *ostranenie* (making strange), adding, "What doesn't make strange, estrange, strangify in a book if the author is a genuine artist?" (Grayson 1977:216n). The bilingual writer *is* strange, both a foreigner and a local, an interculture, using two languages rather bizarrely to say the same thing differently. (For his students' examinations at Cornell, a favorite question about selected European novels was, "What do you consider to be their international and everlasting features?" quoted in Boyd 1993:2.265.) Among leading bilingual writers, the unique nature of the "foreign" as singular idiolect in both Proust's and Nabokov's sense varies in each case, of course, yet it is consistent across the writer's languages. George Steiner, remarking on Nabokov's self-translations in his book *Extraterritorial*, concludes that "Nabokov is a writer who works very near the intricate threshold of syntax; he experiences linguistic forms in a state of manifold potentiality and, moving

across vernaculars, is able to keep words and phrases in a charged, unstable mode of vitality" (1992:10). It is this mode of ever greater lexical and stylistic vitality that marks Nabokov's translative practice, and constitutes the midzone that we are calling translingual style.

In an essay on the "grand style", Marc Fumaroli suggests that the Romantics dismissed the high style of rhetorical tradition in favor of an individuating discourse as vehicle of the imagination, ultimately elaborating figures for the sublime. Later writers, he argues, must choose between either a neo-Romanticism, on the order of symbolists and surrealists, or "an art in the second degree": during the century from Flaubert to Proust, Céline, and Beckett, this modern writing subverts the Romantic sublime and seeks, by very diverse and disconcerting routes, to place ironically and ostensibly in evidence its discursive figures, in order to veil the very inaccessibility of the thing that can render discourse or style "grand" (Fumaroli 1994:114). This stylistic practice would seem to be a fair description of the options followed by bilingual writers in particular, as in Ungaretti's dramatic poverty of language and Nabokov's caustic ironies. Part of the intellectual fabric of our times, as Williams noted, and of the literary history of modernity, this "art in the second degree" seems acutely self-conscious among self-translators, for whom the "sprachstoff" of the linguistic media is no longer tethered to the maternal language and the single national tradition.

(3) Trans-Atlantic Tonalities: Julian Green

It might be objected that the bilingual canon of Julian Green (1900-1998) suggests otherwise. Green's maternal language was English, which was the only language he spoke at home in Paris with his American parents. But his first nurses and all his schooling in Paris so thoroughly imbued him with French that, to his mother's dismay, he spoke English with a French accent. "Born in English", to adapt Ferré's phrase, he grew up in two languages simultaneously. He once remarked that the Rue de Pompe was his Atlantic Ocean. During World War I, he served at the front in a French uniform and then, upon being sent back because of his young age, he re-enlisted with the Americans (Lucera 1987:10). In the United States for university studies during roughly 1919-1922, he wrote and published his first story in English ("The Apprentice Psychiatrist"). Returned to Paris, he published a French novella then his first novel in French (*Mont-Cinère*, 1926), followed by five more French novels in the 1930s, plus the first volumes of his famous journal, *Journal (1928-39)*, which he continued keeping in French all his life. Fleeing occupied Paris for the United States, he again became an American writer (e.g., *Memories of Happy Days*, 1942), translated Charles Péguy into English, and translated his own journal as *Personal Record*, all the while translating selected English texts of his own into French, in most cases for later publication. Again back in Paris after the war, he resumed writing in French, producing several novels and serial volumes of his *Journal*. In 1971 he was the first American and the first foreigner to be elected to the Académie Française, where his inaugural address concerned bilingualism, entitled "Qui sommes-nous?"/Who are we? He seems to have been the first prominent bilingual writer of this generation to issue two texts in bilingual format, with the English and French on facing pages, *Le Langage et son double* (1987) and *L'Homme et son ombre* (1991).

In voluntary exile in the United States in 1941, Green decided to repay his debt to France by writing a book about that country. He naturally began writing it in French, which he considered his native language. But after about ten pages, he realized that no one would read it, or even publish it in French in America. So he switched languages, "intending to translate my own sentences into English": "At this point something quite unexpected happened. With a very definite idea as to what I wanted to say I began my book, wrote about a page and a half and, on rereading what I had written, realized that I was writing another book, a book so different in tone from the French that a whole aspect of the subject must of necessity be altered. It was as if, writing in English, I had become another person. . . This puzzled me considerably, and still does" (Green 1987:174).

By Green's account, this expressive doubling of the writer seems at first antithetical to the stylistic continuities of other bilingual modernists across their languages. Green was acutely aware of the subjective dislocations experienced by exiled writers in New York in the 1940s, and he felt great sympathy with their struggles, rarely successful, in an adopted language. To this Catholic bicultural, the conflictual impulses he felt in different languages was an ongoing artistic concern and a metaphysical problem: "Si nous parlions plusieurs langues avec une égale facilité, dans quelle langue se fera l'unité de notre être intellectuel?"/ If we speak several languages with an equal facility, in which language will the unity of our intellectual being be created? ("La musique des langues", Green 1987:386n). Artistically, like all bilingual writers, Green appreciated and exploited the expressive wealth of his languages. But intellectually, he kept recurring to this question of unity in plurality. In literary critical terms, for Green this was the question of style, specifically of writing texts "so different in tone".

As several readers in both languages have noted, the most striking and consistent trait of Green's writing, in French and in English, is that he writes without a trace of intercontamination, or regional accent, or even personal tic. Noting that "Le résultat d'une telle épuration est une écriture fluide, immédiatement accessible" (1997:238), Jean-Pierre Frayssinhes observes that Green's stripped, neutral, and classical clarity *is* the norm in French, as traditionally conceived, "la marque propre du français", like the looser diction of his American English, which is equally normative in the United States. Frayssinhes concludes that in so expertly using his two verbal systems, Green is literature's "merle blanc", or white crow. In self-translation, Green as writer may seem to split himself into black and white, in these two linguistic and literary systems as separate discourses, but as his critics recognize in adducing the *rara avis* figure for such work (like Sor Juana de la Cruz' critics as well), his supreme achievement is that the bilingual text is nevertheless one work splayed across the pages of a single book.

Concerning translation, like Nabokov, Green took two stances. For others' work, he favored the literal translation, as in his versions of Péguy, Catholic poet and essayist, or the King James translators of the Bible (surprisingly "modern" because they understood that for the Bible "only a literal translation will do", Green 1987:198). But for his own texts, Green as self-translator clearly found that the literal would not do. His methods never vary. He does not make radical changes, only brief additions or excisions, and he rarely modifies the lineaments of structure, setting, imagistic or

symbolic patterns. What he does change is the tone, and, through various sustained micro-textual adjustments, the rhythm of the text as a whole, that is, the entire register, diction and cadence in which the text unfolds.

Le Langage et son double consists of sixteen loosely autobiographical sections. Each was originally written and published in one or the other language, then translated (usually immediately for publication, though in some cases printed only in this volume), and now brought together *en face*. Following an opening section on Blake as divinatory poet, the text traces the narrator's odyssey through countries, languages, and literatures from childhood to about age fifty, ending back in time on his first day as a foreigner and a befuddled freshman at the University of Virginia. It should be borne in mind that, although Green published the text itself in 1987, most of these sections were composed before 1950, at a time when American written English was considerably less formal than standard written French.

In "An Experiment in English/Une expérience en anglais", the English is conversational, even familiar ("with the unexpressed assumption that we didn't") whereas the French is rather more punctilious ("sous-entendu que nous ne le pouvions pas", 154-5). English tenses and locutions are usually in standard spoken form ("At this point something quite unexpected happened"), where the French hews to the literary *passé simple* and standard written syntax ("Là, l'inattendu arriva", 174-75). The conversational tone vanishes in French, but the French is in no way pedantic or staid. On the contrary, Green writes a lively, spritely French infused with his temperament as a reflective thinker and an amusing, self-deprecating narrator. The point is rather that he translates himself into a different register, one that fulfills the same stylistic function in the hierarchical registry of the second language but, comparatively, sounds quite different. Green thus introduces into this discussion the question of biculturality as expressive constraint.

Like Ungaretti, Nabokov felt no resistance when writing in French, a language he had known all his life. But Nabokov had to struggle to write in English, shed Russianisms and Gallicisms, control the syntax, and in particular he labored meticulously to acquire the more jaunty diction of an American voice (as in changing his Continental "crazy about the cinema" to "mad about the movies"). Green, on the other hand, moved ambidextrously between French and American English, switching voices effortlessly, in a kind of flawless ventriloquism perfectly pitched to each cultural group. But he experienced the very ease of the move itself as a kind of resistance, as though the expressive skill were somehow subverting identity. It is in this sense that the consistency of Green's style, in two distinct voices as well as languages, seems to be an extreme case (until Beckett) of bilingual "art in the second degree". This sense of bifurcation, as bilingual writer between verbal systems, is undoubtedly what led him to the unusual point of displaying the written characters of his two languages side by side, or, to adapt Fumaroli's terms, placing ironically and ostensibly in evidence the discursive figures in a single dual volume. Green's tacit question, in this text so fissured with reflections on bilingualism and translation, is where he as author is situated, on the left page or the right. The jacket enclosing them reads "Julian Green traduit par Julien Green", although to be accurate it should also read the reverse.

There the autobiographical fictions are markedly less divergent than the more

essayistic chapters. Reprinted in this volume is the novella *Christine*, written in French in 1924, self-translated in 1925 (originally published in the French collection *Le Voyageur sur la terre* in 1926, and in the English collections *Pilgrim on the Earth* and *Christine and Other Stories* in 1931). In the French genre of the *récit*, the first-person retrospective account of a past experience, it is the strangely moving tale of a young boy's sudden access of passion for his visiting cousin, who is hidden away in a far room of the New Hampshire house during a summer visit because, the boy learns in the end, she is aphasic and mentally unstable. The two texts are remarkably close, sentence for sentence. Yet the French is classical and condensed, in balanced clauses and intense verbs, and the English looser ("Je montai dans ma chambre en toute hâte et fouillai dans mes tiroirs"/"As hastily as I could, I went upstairs to my room and hunted about in the drawers of my bureau", 68-9). Green is quite capable of the kinds of imagistic and phonetic transposition characteristic of bilingual writers ("Un ciel terne pèse sur ce triste paysage"/"A dull sky hangs heavy over the cheerless landscape", 54-5). But such changes are minimal, for in neither language can his prose be called imaged or ornate. His translative practice is rather to open and lengthen the taut French line, not explicitating the content so much as extending the line through adverbs and short subordinate clauses, all the while varying the rhythm and lightening the tone. The reader of "En exergue autour d'un oeil-de-boeuf se lisaient ces mots", is in the hands of a classicist adept in architectural terms, whereas the reader of "Below the little round window in the gable, these words could be read", is receiving an American text in easy informality. (In French Green adds a footnote to explain the term "Pilgrim" as pertaining to the Puritan ancestors of the house.) Both novellas move fluidly, through identical periods of the boy's confused desires and fears to the horrific discovery of the girl's madness. The climactic sentence, focused on the gold ring he had given her, which reappears months later on his aunt's hand (signalling the girl's death), is almost identical: "A sa main dégantée brillait le petit saphir"/"On her ungloved hand shone the little saphire". The zone of overlap between these texts, even in tonality, is thus far greater than the divergences.

In general, as a writer of fiction, Green begins on a realistic base then builds, through characters' inner emotional and sexual conflicts, toward puzzling intersections of dreams and irrational events, leaving the characters spiritually anguished. Green's religion plays an overt role only after 1940, his homosexuality even later. Georges Poulet noted that Green's oneiric power, far from veiling perception of the real, gives it on the contrary an extraordinary relief (1977:366), and this kind of numinous detail is translated exactly. Green was always interested in what he called "l'irruption de l'éternité dans le temps" (Raclot 1997:71), and this too, as a function of narrative rendering of characters' perceptions, translates almost exactly. Michèle Raclot finds that the threshold or *seuil* is Green's primary narrative field, where all thematics converge in the split between visible and invisible, flesh and spirit, and similar avatars of being and death. There is also an obvious threshold of languages that similarly fascinated and troubled Green, as a brink where language gives onto the inexpressible: "ce quelque chose d'inexprimable. Les mots ne peuvent le décrire. Il se cache sous le seuil du langage, et sur cette terre il reste muet"/this inexpressible something. Words cannot describe it. It hides under the threshold of language, and on

this earth it remains mute (*Partir avant le jour,* 1977:674; our translation).

The startling simplicty and clarity of Green's style, then, the "limpidité classique", is a carefully controlled purity, like an architect's *épure*, designed to suggest, since it cannot state, the invisible and inexpressible. As Raclot points out, this is a literary art of suggestion. It suppresses the linear logic of plot and structure to foreground impressions and associations so that the reader feels before understanding. The texture must be simple and clear, a lucent sequence in which a single word like "hand" (see below) can arrest the flow and quicken thought. In translation, it is because Green works essentially at this level of phrasal conjunction and liaison, rather than Nabokov's cohesive permutations and polyvalent images, that he manages to translate his texts so fluidly back and forth. He can translate the sentences easily, then he must calibrate their interactions to be equally suggestive in this way in the second language. That is perhaps partly why he so radically shifts tonalities. He does not seek to be a with-it American, but an American writing the most familiar, accessible kind of prose in that language; it is through the conjunction of familiar forms that he can most subtly generate a sense of the unfamiliar, perhaps the invisible. In *Christine*, following a faintly sardonic paragraph on the history of the house ("Firmly set in the natural rock" since 1640, "at the time when the Pilgrims, at the points of their muskets, were establishing the Kingdom of God in these barbarous regions"), the third paragraph of the text begins: "Il n'est pas un aspect de la vieille maison puritaine dont mon esprit n'ait gardé une image distincte, pas un meuble dont ma main ne retrouverait tout de suite les secrets et les défauts"/ "There is not an aspect of the old Puritan house of which my mind has not kept a distinct image, not a piece of furniture the secrets and defects of which my hand could not find without hesitation" (52-3). In context, through sequencing, Green effects an uncanny sense of the narrator's hand plunging back through time to touch 1640, the era's secrets and defects, which are indeed part of the boy's character and thematic components of the story. This primary stylistic feature of Green's work enacts, from beginning to end of his canon, his themes of the invisible in religion and the unsayable in sexuality. His translative practice entails modulating tonalities and rhythms in order to elaborate these points of suggestiveness within the two languages as commensurate stylistic constructions. It becomes an "art of the second degree", in Fumaroli's sense, when Green confronts his two constructions, as languages, equilibrated together on the page. Then the two languages themselves operate like his two sentences suggesting the common threshold beyond their reach.

Many translation theorists, when examining differences between any two versions as purely lexical and semantic changes, find such changes as Green's indefensible. Arguing that Beckett's changes, for instance, give rise to an entirely different experience of the fictive world, Fitch and Clément, for example, conclude that the self-translation is not transposition but creation of entirely new work (see below on Beckett). Reading Green stereoscopically, however, and shifting the lens from the linguistic to the literary level of analysis, enables one to watch stylistic and thematic continuities build into an inherently dual construction (palpably dual on facing pages). The reader is almost required to read across that threshold or seam bridging the pages, in a dual reading that the writer's bilingual format certainly invites. There in the interliminal space of reading bilingually, the stylistic continuities linking versions come to seem

more significant than the micro-modulations characterizing the rendering of the same story in two languages, even for a writer changing tonalities so markedly as Green – particularly because the oneiric idiolect so consistently recurs across the pages, whether from right to left or from left to right. The threshold *is* the space of reading. Green's format materializes in space what most self-translators leave to time, by publishing their second versions separately. Their readers may or may not, as they choose, conjoin the two books as a dual construction or overtly bilingual text. Green, however, tacitly insists that we do so. His tonal changes demonstrate that, on the one hand, he is writing for two different audiences, in interculturally dual discourse, yet on the other hand he is suggesting through his publication format that the bilingual, and thus to Green bi-cultural, reader can best appreciate the cultural and therefore stylistic nature of the duality.

(4) Transposing Cultures: Samuel Beckett

Another modern self-translator engaged with similar linguistic and epistemological questions was the Irishman Samuel Beckett (1906-1989), who eventually translated almost every text that he wrote, in French or in English, between the two languages. French was an acquired language for Beckett, who studied modern languages at Trinity College Dublin, with honors courses in French and Italian. During a first residence in Paris in 1928-1930, he wrote essays and stories in English, as he continued to do when shuttling back and forth between Dublin and Paris in the 1930s, amid other travels in Italy and Germany. Having definitively settled in Paris by 1937, he was writing some poems in French, and had begun translating *Murphy* into French before that novel was finally published in London in 1938 (the translation would not be completed until 1942; Cohn 2002:108). He became a friend of Joyce among other writers and painters in Paris, and sold extensive reviewing and translation work from English, Spanish, French, and German poets, as he continued to do for financial reasons until 1950. He wrote another English novel (*Watt*) in 1941-1945, while in hiding during the Nazi occupation of France, as a resistant in the guise of a French labourer. His long period of writing only in French (1946 to 1954 or 1955) produced many stories, novels, and a new turn to the theatre: most notably the prose trilogy *Molloy* (1951), *Malone meurt* (1951), and *L'Innommable* (1953), plus the play *En attendant Godot* (1952), ultimately translated as *Molloy* (1955), *Malone Dies* (1956), *The Unnamable* (1958), and *Waiting for Godot* (1954). In 1954-1955 in his notebook, in the midst of writing the story *D'Un ouvrage abandonné* Beckett drew a line across the page and began rewriting the last passage in English, later publishing the text as *From an Abandoned Work* (1957); his notation reads "This text . . . was the first text written directly in English since *Watt* (1945)" (quoted in Cohn 2002:214). So although it was long assumed that Beckett switched languages during the war, one cannot date the moment when he adopted French as a literary language. His earliest French texts go back to 1937, while he was writing predominantly in English, and after 1955 he was alternately writing both fiction and drama in either language and translating between them. As for most bilingual writers, Beckett's one experience with another translator (Patrick Bowles "in collaboration with the author" for *Molloy*) was not repeated. Beckett resumed

self-translation of his texts, as initiated almost twenty years earlier.

Concerning his temporary switch of literary languages, Beckett once said that he adopted French "Because in French it is easier to write without style" (quoted in Cockerham 1975:156), noting on another occasion, French has the right "weakening" effect. Style, types of official style, the concept of style, were keen preoccupations through the 1930s. Writing about some commissioned translations in a letter in German to his friend Axel Kaun in 1937, the young writer said, "It is indeed becoming more and more difficult, even senseless, for me to write an official English. And more and more my own language appears to me like a veil that must be torn apart in order to get at the things (or the Nothingness [*oder das dahinterliegende Nichts*]) behind it. Grammar and Style. To me they have become as irrelevant as a Victorian bathing suit or the imperturbability of a true gentleman. A mask" (*Disjecta*, 1983:171). Language must be shredded, normative styles dismantled, the verbal medium ripped like so much linguistic fabric: He hopes that, like painters with their medium, writers will "bore one hole after another in it [language], until what lurks behind it – be it something or nothing – begins to seep through; I cannot imagine a higher goal for a writer today" (*Disjecta*, 1983:172). In what he only half mockingly calls his "program" for literature, he hopes that the modern writer will dissolve "that terrible materiality of the word surface" (1983:172). But, concludes the young man, "At first it can only be a matter of somehow finding a method" (1983:172). He is still "On the way to this literature of the unword, which is so desirable to me", so for the moment he contents himself with "the consolation, as now, of sinning willy-nilly against a foreign language, as I should love to do with full knowledge and intent against my own – and as I shall do – Deo juvante" (*Disjecta*, 1983:173).

The result, now legendary, was a revolutionary poetics so distinctive that it has been imitated in drama and fiction for two generations. As Cohn points out, Beckett later dismissed this text as "German bilge" (*Disjecta*, 1983:170n). He might rightly consign the Romantic tearing of the veil to juvenilia, but he never again stated his own stylistic relation to normative literary language, and his agenda as contemporary writer in any language, so clearly. It is in the context of this assault on "official English" that later remarks on style by Beckett, who became ever more laconic through the years, should resonate. The linguistic surface of a text is not meant to cohere in any familiar way, not in familiar lexicon, semantics, or syntax. "My work is a matter of fundamental sounds (no joke intended) made as fully as possible", he said about *Endgame* in 1957 (*Disjecta*, 1983:109). A text is "rather difficult and elliptic" (1983:107). A text should "claw". Concerning an allusion to Augustine in *Godot*, it is not the semantics, nor even the Augustine intertextuality in a sentence that counts, rather "It is the shape that matters" (quoted in Worton 1994:75).

In particular, in the letter to Kaun, writing in a third language about his first, Beckett proposes "sinning against" language, notably his foreign languages, while seeming to reserve his native tongue as the primary target. In that language as literary medium in the 1930s, the immense weight of Joyce was inescapable. Beckett helped Joyce with the redaction of *Finnegans Wake*, produced a monograph on the work of Proust, and apparently felt hemmed in by both Joycean English and dominant modernist luxuriance in general. He overtly contrasted his work with Joyce's, and spoke

in 1947 of "my dream of an art unresentful of its insuperable indigence" (*Disjecta*, 1983:141). He once told Ludovic Janvier, "[Je] me remis à écrire – en français – avec le désir de m'appauvrir encore davantage. C'était là le vrai mobile"/I took up writing again – in French – with the desire to impoverish myself still further. That was the true purpose (quoted in Cohn 1973:59). Where Nabokov inflated, in the modernist vein of Joyce and Proust, Ungaretti and Green stripped their language of ornament, working toward a quintessence of lexicon and skeletal form, and Beckett carried their sort of minimalist endeavor to its furthest extreme. Indigence of every literary sort becomes the expressive problem, and often the subject, of Beckett's texts in French and eventually in English as well.

To oversimplify a complex canon, briefly Beckett's methods of dissolving the textual surface in narrative fiction entailed evacuating the first person. The 1950s trilogy moves from a series of narrators to an "unnamable" being, who reveals previous voices to have been his "vice-existers" and himself "not I", distinct from the pronouns that seek to enclose him as if in assault; he fights back with failed fictions about himself, but is still trapped in words, then tries anguished rhythms, but is still trapped in sounds and verbal cadences, and he ends still at "the threshold of my story", seeking exit from language. The later prose texts became increasingly spare and elliptic, with images like ink washes dissolving and reforming only to dissipate again into formal patterns of sounds and scraps of allusion. In drama, Beckett similarly evacuates the realist illusion, most famously dissolving elementary conventions of plot and action into mere waiting, character into shards of memory, and speech into a churn of scarcely continuous fragments. The late plays further leach the few elements left, including body in *Not I/ Pas moi* (1973/1975), where only an upstage mouth speaks scarcely intelligible words while a silent auditor gestures. The characters are never writers or actors, though they all muse on language and memory, telling and hearing, being and playing. It is an art of "lessness", to use one of Beckett's titles, where stylistic depletion and fragmentation enact the tragi-comic loss of meaning itself. Beckett insisted that producers adhere strictly to his stage directions, just as he worked closely with his German and Italian translators. Each element of the textual surface, like each point of punctuation or lighting, plays a signifying role in conveying the irrational experience of meaninglessness.

Before devising these methods in his own texts, in 1934 Beckett had decisive ideas about translation. Reviewing a volume of Rilke in English, he deplored its amplification (as in a German phrase that "blossoms forth" or is "promoted to" another register). The young reviewer's one criterion for standard translation was as strict as Nabokov's: "The translation gets least in the way when it follows its text most closely . . . The numerous deviations are unwarrantable, that is to say, ineffective" (*Disjecta*, 1983:67). When he came to translate his own work, however, Beckett made radical amplification and diminution an integral part of his translative practice, and he clearly sought to transpose the "effects" in one language into another.

Few self-translations have received the close critical scrutiny of Beckett's. Bilingual readers agree that his translative practice is extraordinarily adaptive, though the deviations are startling in each language, and many scholars have examined discrepancies There is no need to repeat their work here, although it is helpful to review

the types of texts considered and the general trends in analyses. Following Cohn and Cockerham in the 1960s, who both included drama, the focus of most bilingual critics has been the novels and the late short fictions, chiefly *Bing/Ping* (1966/1967), *Sans/Lessness* (1969/1970)*, Le Dépeupleur/The Lost Ones* (1970/1972), *Company/ Compagnie* (1980/1980), *Mal vu mal dit/Ill Seen Ill Said (*1981/1981). That most translation critics and theorists neglect the dramatic texts is not surprising, given the added complexities of performance, Beckett's directorial notebooks supplementing the published text, and his mid-rehearsal changes. Examining only the fictions, however, has somewhat skewed the fifty-year production of bilingual texts, spanning two genres, that is, seeking similar effects in prose and performance.

Many critics have surveyed Beckett's changes in translation. Cohn, Federman, Fitch, Chamberlain, Oustinoff, Clément, Collinge, all agree on certain consistent patterns of translative practice, although each frames them in different conceptual ways. For our purposes, what matters most is that the patterns uncovered by comparatists are consistent. In Cohn's original study of "Samuel Beckett Self-Translator", studying the two *Murphy*'s, *En Attendant Godot/Waiting for Godot*, the trilogy of novels, and *Fin de partie/Endgame*, she found almost precisely the same types of changes between these French and English texts as later critics have found in the later work. Moving from English to French in *Murphy*, Beckett changes the "mockingly elegant tone" of the English for a heightened comic tone in French, with less word-play and more vulgar and colloquial phrasing. In French the detachment of the comic mode is further accented by narrative commentary, including two inserted allusions to his own translation from "anglo-irlandaise" (615). But moving from French to English in *Godot*, Beckett deletes more than he adds, cutting almost four pages of text, while he enhances the characters' despair and the pathos of their condition. The second play, *Fin de partie/Endgame* shows the same tendency to delete French amplification in English while (to use Fitch's term) enhancing emotions and attitudes: "froid" or 'cold' in French becomes "bitter", "comédie" becomes "farce", the nondescript "vieux linge" or 'old cloth' becomes "old stancher" (617).

In the trilogy, English *Molloy* too contains more additions (none more than a sentence) than deletions, on the order of "En me sentant soudain envahi d'une grande fatigue, malgré l'heure qui était celle de ma vitalité maxima", amplified to "And suddenly overcome by a great weariness, in spite of the dying day when I always felt most alive". Mock-pious notes are introduced with "God"s and "Christ"s, and the three narrators insert parenthetical comments. Metaphors are concretized, Cohn finds, so that "Les pleurs et les ris, je ne m'y connais guère" becomes "Tears and laughter, they were so much Gaelic to me". In a more "elegant" English, "quelle gallerie de crevés" is rendered as the "gallery of moribunds", just as the mordant colloquial register of "que la connerie prenne son vrai visage, un nonsens cul et sans issue" becomes in Beckett's more emotive and nuanced English, "and the whole ghastly business looks like what it is, senseless, speechless, issueless misery". The following two novels exhibit the same patterns of addition and amplification in English, intensification of emotive modifiers (notably on Malone's bitterness and the pathos of the Unnamable's situation). Only in English does the final paroxysmic five-page sentence include the appalling segment "the words fail", and only in English does Beckett insert "I can't

go on" just before the concluding "I'll go on". Like most subsequent critics (except Fitcheans), Cohn emphasizes that in comparative literary terms the translation fully recreates the text in all its intricate word-play and in the overall close rendering of dramatic characters and narrative worlds. She shows that the *types* of divergence between French and English clearly operate in both directions (whether translating from French to English or from English to French) and that they anchor Beckett's self-translative methods from the first.

It is important to recognize, as Cohn pointed out long ago, that the relatively higher register of the English, greater comic detachment in the French, more emotive texture in English, less mock piety in French, are all deviations from the common translingual style: *both* texts are pitched at a register well below middle-class speech, both revel in comic detachment from human ideals, both mock mercilessly at platitudes of divinity, both create characters world-famous for their disconcerting humor and courage in absolute misery. Textual discrepancies are variations on this common core or translingual zone of commonality.

In 1988 in *Beckett and Babel: An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work*, Fitch examined the opening paragraphs of two novels before focusing on the late short fictions. Like Cohn he found that whether originally written in English (*Company*) or in French (*Le Dépeupleur*), whether translated into English (*The Lost Ones*) or into French (*Compagnie*), the same relations obtain: the French is more reduced and the English more amplified, the English has added color and detail of objects and situations where the French is more colorless and spare, the English narrator is more differentiated as a distinct presence where the French narrator seems a neutral cipher. The divergences are consistent across the bilingual *Le Dépeupleur/The Lost Ones*, Fitch shows, "whether this be in the form of characters' abode, attributes, or actions or in the manner of their evocation and the reader's subsequent relationship to them" (1988:120). From his predominantly linguistic perspective, such divergence is incompatible "contradiction". Fitch does not seem to allow any literary or stylistic value to intercede in his analysis, and he is not interested in the fact that, through the consistent patterns of dissimilarities, Beckett so consistently produced the same English-French differential in one bilingual text after another.

A brief look at some of Fitch's examples from *Le Dépeupleur/The Lost Ones*, contrasting phrases and sentences, will illustrate the specific kinds of dissimilarities that, for the theorist, preclude commonality. Thus the oxymoronic "jeune chenue" becomes "The white-haired woman", the laboring "corps grimpeurs" lighten into mere "searchers", the simple adverb "lentement" becomes "with measured tread", the narrator's neutral "Ceux qui se mêlent encore de copuler" becomes "Those with stomach still to copulate". As Fitch says, the English narrator's more emotive language draws attention to his presence, as in the change from "ils sont sujets toujours à de brusques retours de fièvre oculaire" to "The spent eyes may have fits of the old craving". The French narrator remarks on the cylinder's "petite lumière inutile", amplified in English to "its fatuous little light". The French narrator judges the characters starkly as "malheureux qui s'avisent de monter à leur tour", but the English, in its more habitual sardonic tone, sneers instead at one "wretch with no better sense than to climb before his time". (Fitch 1988:116-118). In short, cataloguing some hundred such

modifications, Fitch finds that the contrasts are so pervasive as to create two different texts. Most notably, the more sympathetic, amplified narrative voice and the closer narrative optic of the English contrasts sharply with the French, "whose characters scurry hither and thither, viewed like so many ants through the cosmic microscope of an indifferent if not positively malevolent deity" (Fitch 1988:123).

Grayson observed a similar effect in the amplifications by Nabokov, who similarly imposes artifice and greater narrative distance in translating. He removes the characters from potentially sympathetic associations, rendering them "mice in a cage", as Grayson said, in a more malevolent world than they inhabit in the first language. In Beckett as in Nabokov, this differential does not change, and it is not a function of the specific language of the first or second version.

Noting that neither linguistics nor translation theory had addressed self-translation, in the course of his analyses of Beckett's versions Fitch proposed what has become a highly influential theory of the self-translated text. His thesis is that Beckett's English texts are so divergent that they cannot possibly give rise to the same reading as the French versions (1988:60). Paradoxically, the deviations are so great that the second text escapes all theoretical modes of standard translation, yet the similarities are so great that neither can it be called an autonomous creation (1988:78). As two "independent" texts in "interdependence", the second text does not interpret the first so much as it "completes" or finshes it (1988:133). To Fitch, then, the texts are "variants of something that has no tangible textual existence" (1988:135). Tailoring Benjamin's notion of pure language to the Piercean "megatype", Fitch literally interweaves lines from both versions to construct the missing synthesis, with sometimes fruitful results, as in showing how *L'Innommable/The Unnamable* might be about bilingualism itself, the struggle to write in "their" language (1988:141-54). Underlying this theory is the premise that any two languages are unique verbal systems, as reflected in "the essential dissimilarity of the French and English languages, which means that, given that no two words taken from two different languages will cover an identical semantic area and possess exactly the same range of connotations, the *dissimilarities* between any translation and its original will always be greater than their *similarities*" (1988:226).

Fitch proposes that once a writer produces a second linguistic version of a text, the first is incomplete without it. Then, comparing versions, encountering so many dissimilarities, the bilingual reader has a completely different experience of the fictive universe: "the imagination of the reader of the English text is stretched in different directions from that of the reader of its French predecessor" (1988:123). Thus Beckett did not produce translations, but rather additional texts. Bilingual reading bifurcates in contradictions. The only thing linking the two texts is the reader's "awareness of the common identity of authorship" (1988:226), an extra-linguistic entity.

Like Benjamin's notion of pure language, where text and translation are shards of an unstated whole, Fitch's thesis on the bilingual text has had a long posterity. Messchonnic on literary translation, Beaujour on Nabokov, and Clément on Beckett, for example, all invoke Benjamin and Fitch to describe the bilingual texts as "incompatible", says Clément: they are only drafts, and each one is an "incarnation imparfaite d'une oeuvre idéale que tout entreprise de matérialiser corromprait nécessairement"/

an imperfect incarnation of an ideal work that any attempt to materialize would necessarily corrupt (1994:245).

One of the few critics to study the bilingual texts of more than one writer, Michaël Oustinoff in *Bilinguisme d'écriture* (2001), is impatient with this entire Fitchean trend in translation theories and studies of bilingual writing. Noting that it all depends on which theoretical frame one adopts to read bilingually, he is particularly cogent on the "problème de la localisation" (2001:243) or what Fitch had called the "quandary" of where to locate the megatext of the essence of self-translation, for lack of an "analytical tool" (Fitch 1988:226-27). Oustinoff points out that distancing was a prime feature of Beckett's first texts in French, including distance from *all* language: "le français n'était que l'instrument de la genèse de cette écriture distanciée"/French was only the instrument of the genesis of this distanced writing (2001:253). Once Beckett found this voice, he could use it in all languages, writing or translating (2001:253). Oustinoff prefers to shift the frame from Benjamin and Fitch to Jakobson on poeticity, or the literary functions of linguistic structures. He finds that in literary terms Nabokov's translations are recreative variations on the same themes, in a more ludic mode, disclosing potentialities in the first text, and that Beckett's texts are poetic transpositions, such that *Malone Dies* merely anglicizes *Malone meurt*. Thus the texts are consubstantial (2001:253). Still, to Oustinoff, the differences are so great in texts by Nabokov and Beckett that there seem to be almost "two authors", but he quickly backs away from that critical conceit and decides that "the preservation of the operant identity [*l'identité opérale*]" is evident through the similarities in the two versions (2001:275). Ultimately, Oustinoff too ends on a sense of quandary, concluding that the bilingual text is "un problème typologique majeur" (2001:277), primarily because it is both writing and translating, two enterprises both on the order of *écriture*, which is probably best solved, he counsels, by printing all the texts in bilingual format.

But is not the "operant identity" of the author just as elusive between any two novels by a monolingual writer, such as Dostoevsky or Woolf? We speak easily of their consistent style, thematic constructs, narrative frames and procedures, as we should for self-translators as well. In the course of his discussion, Oustinoff introduces an important concept from Gérard Genette's *Palimpsestes* which he does not develop, but which can be quite helpful in characterizing the modern self-translated text. Discussing the many variants and versions of any author's text in one language, Genette invents the term "transtextualité" to characterize this consistency, and he refers to the "transtylization" that occurs as the writer elaborates this piece of literary discourse in different stages and versions (*Palimpsestes*, 1991:257-261). Typically, Genette is not concerned with ontological or Benjaminian notions of immanence in aesthetics, but focuses rather on functional aspects of texts, on what aims they serve and how they work. It is clear to Genette that "toute transtylisation . . . procède inévitablement par *substitution*, c'est-à-dire . . . *suppression+addition*" (1991:261). His premise is that the writer's style is transposed from version to version, even within one language, with augmentation and reduction, achieving different linguistic embodiments while remaining distinctive; on translation, he posits the original as hypotext, the translation as hypertext, in a comparable relation. We find that transtylization

can quite effectively characterize the types of self-translation that we have been considering by Ungaretti, Green, Nabokov, and Beckett. While opening up the midzone of similarity and continuity, it does not foreclose significant, even radical differences (*écarts*) between versions.

Transtylization operates outside the circuits of mimesis, insofar as whatever type or degree of mimetic relation to the world the text establishes, has been established in the first version. The new circuit is internal and stylistic, in the relation of first to second text as a rewrite, within circuits of substitution. This is not a referential but a literary domain, comprising two pieces of discourse. When it comes to two languages as the two literary discourses, then the transtylization does include a new set of readers or spectators, and extends the second version into new dialogic relations with audience. There is no reason, however, to assume that the stylistic substitutions create a different kind of mimesis; the mimetic function is apriori and constant, as sustained by the translingual style obtaining in both discourses as partner versions.

Thus is it not rather *because* Beckett's translative practice always entails the same patterns of differences, as all critics and theorists find, that it is possible to speak of the writer's bilingual style or literary idiolect sustained across languages, periods, and narrative and dramatic genres? Federman rightly describes "two radically different tones" in Beckett's bilingual texts, remarkably similar yet also dual; he adds that a comprehensive analysis of Beckett as translator would have to encompass also "how certain cultural, philosophical, and literary allusions, and even quotations, are not simply transposed but transposed into a French or an English context to produce a totally different set of cultural, philosophical, or literary connotations" (1987:13). For his part Fitch does not comment on this kind of cultural transposition, yet it is a primary feature of all self-translators' work, as we have seen. Micro-analysis at the sentence level cannot disclose how the micro-changes also effect a cumulative shift into another cultural register with the same overall functional effects: the changes in social, literary, and philosophical allusions create an exemplicative co-text to transpose the core style for monolingual readers or spectators in their native language, in ways that no other kind of translation can achieve.

The play *Happy Days/Oh les beaux jours* (1961/1963), written first in English, poses precisely this challenge of cultural transposition to any theory of the bilingual text. Beckett's prattling protagonist Winnie speaks almost unwittingly in scraps of literary quotation, the nearly meaningless debris of a moribund civilization (see our Introduction above). Unless Beckett could construct a comparable echoic system in French, his clawing ironies and serio-comic puns would be lost altogether, yet such transposition would paradoxically (in theoretical terms) just enhance the difference between language versions. He had always transformed some literary and philosophical allusions while keeping others (Voltaire becomes Berkeley in *Malone Dies*, a line from Baudelaire becomes a line from Shakespeare in *Endgame*). But *Oh les beaux jours* required radical cultural transposition to effect a French Winnie, in functional and stylistic correspondence with the English Winnie. A straight dictionary transposition would not only fall flat, it would be unintelligible.

As Knowlson details in the notes and afterword to his bilingual edition of the text, Beckett changes English surnames and place names to French ones, cuts certain scraps

of quotation (from Shakespeare and Charles Wolf) and adds new ones (from Racine and Hugo), and generally equilibrates the two allusive textures of Winnie's speech through suppression and addition. Thus her line "that is in the wilderness" becomes "c'est-à-dire dans le désert", in the biblical phrase familiar in each language. English Winnie's remark, "Ensign crimson" followed by "Pale flag" (from *Romeo and Juliet*) becomes French Winnie's "bouchette blémie" (from Ronsard's "Quand au temple nous serons") (24-25; 134n38). Lexically, the translation is indefensible. Most language-based studies, such as Collinge's micro-analyses of hundreds of sentences in Beckett's *Malone*'s, and indeed Fitch's close contrasts, tend to founder on the binary theoretical model being used for the analysis. Yet the bilingual text is always more than its sentences and phrases. Invoking the concept of compensation, Knowlson points out about this text that "although in picking up a particular theme, the correspondences can never be exact and the balance within sections of the text may be altered, looked at in terms of an entire act or even the whole play, the balance of humour or pathos, for example, will be more or less evenly restored" (Knowlson 1978:120).

Knowlson is led to such conclusions because, on the order of Genette's critical theory, he recognizes that Winnie's classics "are used functionally rather than referentially" (1978:109). They come in scraps, fragmented and only half-remembered, and they are being deployed by a dramatist seeking the same effects in two languages. Through substitution, as Genette suggests, the cultural transposition is complete. Even though at the lexical level they can be construed as two different works, incompatible because so contradictory, at the literary and dramatic level of stylistic cohesions and overall functional effect on the audiences, they are bilingual renderings of Winnie's experience. As Knowlson says, she is a character unique in both languages, trying to impose pattern and order on her existence, and failing, necessarily failing in different literary fields in French and in English. Like the English and French narrators of *Le Dépeupleur/The Lost Ones*, Beckett nuances the discursive register and narrative optic to create comparable effects in the second language. As Chamberlain said in 1987, we should not be looking at differences, within our critical categories of representation (especially "original" and "translation") but at the kinds of repetitions that produce both similarities and differences; she suggests that it is the *lack* of "exact resemblance" between Beckett's use of words and standard usage, as between any two linguistic versions, that most characterizes Beckett's translative practice and that requires explaining (1987:21-23).

In that vein, citing Chamberlain, Corinne Scheiner suggested in 2002 that theorists who have great difficulty accepting the nature of the bilingual text as a dual discourse, and who seek a "key" to contradictions in an ideal megatype, are still wedded to a mimetic standard that has no valency in self-translation. She argues that most theorists who consider self-translation rely (consciously or not) on Benjamin's concept of "pure language". Why? By invoking an extra-linguistic domain outside the two texts, it avoids the obvious problems of "equivalence" conceived in linguistic terms. It also seeks to construct a dialectic relation between the two texts, in order to avoid standard translation theorists' unidirectional relation from source to target language. But to Scheiner these are poor solutions deriving from the pure language model, as in Fitch on Beckett or Beaujour on Nabokov. She notes that such theories ignore the

fact that writers focus *out*, toward the reader. Since the two texts exist only by virtue of their differences (beginning with the language being used), critics too must look beyond the two texts indeed, but to the reader, and to the two cultures as the readers' contexts. Scheiner describes this relationship of text to culture by referring to Deleuze, on repetition with variation, and especially to Bakhtin, who showed that discourse is inevitably directed toward an other; the monolingual reader-text interaction is "a shared cultural space". Thus in self-translation, the first text engages a dialogue with the reader, and both versions participate in dialogue with other texts – both their partner texts and those of the literary fields of their readers' languages. The self-translated text is therefore best described as literary bi-discursivity. Textual differences are primarily cultural because they are audience-oriented.

Scheiner's concept of difference between cultural discourses helps illuminate the common core of the self-translated text, which cannot be located by applying a mimetic standard that seeks sameness (equivalence) across some sort of continuum, and that regrets discrepancies. Stepping outside the theory of representation, that is, the site of equivalence, the theorist should be looking at *why* the partner texts produce differences, and at the patterns or the structure of differences effected during the translative process of redirecting a text toward another culture. Indeed, as we have seen in this section, all four leading self-translators considered here (Ungaretti, Green, Nabokov, Beckett) have repeatedly made such radical and startling changes in translation that they defeat any effort to explain them linguistically. We hope it is evident by now that there remains a common core of what we are calling the modern writer's unique style or literary idiolect which allows one to distinguish a "Nabokov text" in either language from one by Joyce or Pasternak, a "Beckett text" from one by Pynchon or Pinget. Their self-translations render the idiolect in two pieces of discourse directed toward two different cultural and literary fields.

Concerning mimesis, to George Steiner the *Encyclopédie* was the last monument of mimetic confidence, "the assumption of a representative interrelation between language and the facts of the world" (1971:158). Modernity, however, "puts the whole of language to question; it racks and splinters the worn common forms to discover whether there are antique, hidden springs of inventive visions below the frozen crust" (1971:164). Traditionally, the long-established logic of syntax meant in part that words could mirror the world and history, but modernists fractured that mimetic relation between world and language. The idea is familiar but it is worth recalling in the context of self-translators: why should translation theory continue to hold bilingual writers to a mimetic standard, and measure their translations by how well the two texts mirror each other, in the word-thing correlation, when their literary project is so often to disrupt that very premise?

As we have seen, *inventio* was a significant part of the translative process in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, as a rubric indissociable from authorship of any kind. Although it began losing currency over time, *inventio* was still at issue in the translating cultures of early modern Europe, in the disputes between Pléiade poets and their hostile critics, for example. As standards of fidelity, in respect for alterity, superseded the translator's "Gallic" licence among Romantics, Victorians, and assuredly moderns, in publishing houses as in translation commentaries and theories, translative *inventio*

became a relic of the past. As a group, however, modern self-translators shared no such disdain for medieval types of translative liberties and creative exuberance in rewriting a text for new audiences.

Perhaps for lack of awareness of such historical continuity, modernist concepts of language, translation, and subjectivity continue to bedevil theoretical studies of self-translators, particularly Beckett, in several ways. Linda Collinge in *Beckett traduit Beckett* (2001) argues that each languages has its "génie" (2001:18) yet each one is also only an arbitrary system of conventions or signs; only the unconscious is not arbitrary, being structured instead around a certain relation of the real and the affective symbols laid deeply in the mind during preverbal infancy. Thus Beckett in moving from French *Malone meurt* to English *Malone Dies*, returning to the maternal matrix of his native language, becomes more derisive and mocking because English is the locus of old wounds and parental authority (Collinge 2001:70-76). She briefly broaches "l'équivalence stylistique" (2001:32) but only to show that the translator's free association directs artistic choice, as the unconscious intervenes to render the subject more fragile in English and the translation more ludic and eccentric (re-becoming the odd boy his mother believed him to be). Thus without invoking Benjamin, Collinge nevertheless positions the modern writer's unconscious as the mega-text of the two versions, or in this case perhaps an infra-text that undergirds them as a Benjaminian *tertium comparationis*. Sometimes the opposite occurs, as in Christopher Whyte's assertion that "the person least qualified to translate any poem is the person who wrote it" (2002:68); because there is no such thing as the real meaning of a text, the author has no special authority. No author, no self-translator, so no mega-text needed. Helena Tanquiero adopts a compromise position, arguing that self-translation is not a unique translative function but just an extreme case: once the writer completes the first version, it is as completely finished as it is when remanded to a second-hand translator. Although "in terms of subjectivity there is no gap between the author and the translator" (2000:59), this only amounts to fewer dissimilarities than usual, and the self-translating writers "see themselves more as translators than as authors when they translate" (2000:59).

The tradition of the bilingual text since antiquity suggests, however, that many bilingual authors do indeed see themselves as recreators producing a new original on the model of the old. Nor is it so easy to assume that the chronology is sequential, when such writers as Ungaretti or Nabokov sometimes work on the same text in two language versions simultaneously, or later return to one or the other to make changes, even to both, as in Ungaretti's *La Guerre/La Guerra*. Steiner strikes us as closer to the mark when he observes that "Much of European vulgate literature has behind it the active presence of more than one language": From Petrarch to Hölderlin, a great deal of poetry "represents a long act of *imitatio*, an inner translation into the relevant vernacular of Greek and Latin modes of statement and feeling" (1971:4). Languages and cultures certainly do have their modes of statement and feeling to this day, and it seems only reasonable to assume that bilingual writers are still consciously aware of this, and switch such modes in switching languages. At a late point in that tradition, Steiner finds, Beckett's "parallel texts have an uncanny brilliance . . . he seems to find in the other language the unique, the natural analogue", as he shifts cultural contexts

(Steiner, 5). Attention to culture and audience leads Steiner to see that "Beckett's idiom – the laconic, arch, delicately paced inflections of his style – is a *pas de deux* of French and English, with a strong dose of Irish tomfoolery and arcane sadness added" (18). In short, Beckett's translative practice entails "finding in his alternate language an exact counterpart to the undertones, idiomatic associations, or social context of the original" (18). This art of the audience counterpart, what we are calling cultural transposition, is evident in cameo in *Godot*, one of the earliest translations. Beckett's cultural license comically and almost wholly transforms the famous tirade. The French "Andouille! Tordu! Crétin! Curé! Dégueulasse! Micheton! Ordure! Archi . . . tecte!" becomes the equally outraged, but quite effectively British tirade "Moron! Vermin! Abortion! Morpion! Sewerrat! Curate! Cretin! Crritic!"

On this matter of writers' socio-location of analogues, Tanquiero points out that the self-translator is unique in not being bound to "the linguistic universe" of either the source or target language (2000:63), and can adapt those worlds to singular ends. She rightly concludes that self-translation should therefore become "an alternative line of study" in translation theory (2000:62). To Neubert, similarly, it is obvious that all translators must be bicultural in order to replicate the many complimentary domains interpellated in the text as background, in order to effect "the enculturation of translations" (2000:19). This is his standard for contemporary translators in general, and it should also, we believe, be an important critical rubric for analysing modern self-translations in particular. For centuries now, transposing one's style for different audiences has been an indelible part of transposing texts between languages and reading cultures. Our last example of a self-translating writer dramatizes such issues in striking ways.

(5) Caribbean Crossways: Rosario Ferré

Few literary canons seem as remote from Beckett's minimalism as the baroque texts of Rosario Ferré (b. 1938). Raised in bilingual Puerto Rico to a politically prominent family among the educated élite, she was "born into Spanish", she says, but quite soon spoke both Spanish and English idiomatically. Traditionally, aristocratic children had been sent to Europe for their education, but after Puerto Rico became a U.S. territory in 1898 most schooling on the island was conducted in English, and sons and daughters of the political class were sent to American universities. In 1917 Puerto Ricans were granted U.S. citizenship, as members of the island Commonwealth, and English remains the second official language. For her part, Ferré studied literature for a few years at both an American college and at the University of Puerto Rico, where she published short stories in Spanish. Completing a doctorate in Hispanic literature at the University of Maryland (1987), she spent nine years in "voluntary exile" in Washington. D.C. (1983-1992) before returning to Puerto Rico. Disappointed by an initial second-hand translation, Ferré translated her first book of short stories, *Papeles de Pandora* (1976), into English as *The Youngest Doll* (1991), plus her second novel *Maldito amor* (1986) as *Sweet Diamond Dust* (1989). She has published two novels first in English and then translated them into Spanish, *The House on the Lagoon* (1995)

as *La casa de la laguna* (1996) and *Eccentric Neighborhoods* (1998) as *Vecindarios excéntricos* (1998). She has said that in writing a novel, she works from an outline conceived in Spanish, which she then translates and amplifies in English before also writing and amplifying it in Spanish ("Siempre hubo un mapa o plano de base que fue concebido en español"/I always had a basic map or plan that was conceived in Spanish; quoted in Rinks et al 1997:63). One of her most recent publications is a volume of poetry in bilingual format, *Language Duel/Duelo del languaje* (2002). Among the last of the generation of bilingual writers born before 1945, Ferré describes her life today as a constant shuttling between the island and the mainland, in the linguistic to-and-fro of "coming and going from south to north, from Spanish to English", and finding herself "traveling constantly between two very different cultures" (1995:47, 49).

It is no exaggeration to say that Ferré is the conscious inheritor of almost all the leading bilingual writers, and certainly all the translation theory, that we have been tracing since the Middle Ages. As a "postcolonial" herself, and a close student of literary history since Sor Juana, Chaucer, and Étienne Dolet, she assumes, like a fact of life or culture, much of what modernist writers had to argue or actively promote as an anomalous position. Nabokov's status as an international freak or Kafka's claim for literature as its own palimpsestic *natio*, become in Ferré the given substrate for a specific historical task: "Only a writer who has experienced the historical fabric, the inventory of felt moral and cultural existence embedded in a given language, can be said to be a bilingual writer. . . Translation is not only a literary but also a historical task; it includes an interpretation of internal history, of the changing proceedings of consciousness in a civilization" (1995:41).

To Ferré, her own identity is unitary, as an amalgam of Latin American and North American existences (1995:41). Notwithstanding this capacity to unite the two cultures within herself, she insists that languages, however, have their own "cultural identity": Latin American society is still rooted in Thomistic, Aristotelian beliefs, without a Hobbes or a Locke, or indeed a scientific or an industrial revolution, so "Translating a literary work (even one's own) from one language to another curiously implies the same type of historical interpretation that is necessary in translating a poem of the seventeenth century, for example, as contemporary cultures often enclaved in different epochs of time coexist with each other" (1995:42). Thus the bilingual writer navigates "very different views of the world" (1995:42). "Translating has taught me that it is ultimately impossible to translate one cultural identity into another" (1995:42): The baroque aesthetics of Spanish literary tradition, the synthesis of Spanish and Indian theocracies, preclude fluid transfer into North American English. Moreover, "such diverging cultural matrices determine to a certain extent the themes that preoccupy literature" (1995:44).

Yet she finds self-translation to be essential, "a necessary reality for me as a writer" (1995:47). Having undergone long exile, she seeks to write both for her island compatriots and for the thousands of Puerto Ricans estranged in the barrios of New York or Los Angeles: "It is for these people that translation becomes of fundamental importance" (1995:47). "Memory, which so often erases the ache of penury and destitution suffered on the island, after years of battling for survival in the drug-seared ghettos of Harlem and the Bronx, can, through translation, perhaps be reinstated to its

true abode" (1995:48). On the face of it, this seems like a large agenda, but of course in the historical tradition of literary bilinguality it is not anomalous, and recalls the transatlantic tasks of Sor Juana or Julien Green. One last point that should be stressed in Ferré's conception of her literary work is that she writes as a woman, subtly rendering gender differences as a function of Latin American women's "stifling social repression" (1995:48), and thus navigating also between the cultural worlds of Latin American and North American men and women. As a young writer, Ferré felt that she could be more sexually frank in English, although even her tamer Spanish texts were received with shock and indignation in many sectors of the Latin American literary press. Throughout her life, she has often repeated that she writes in English both for Puerto Ricans abroad and for the wide readership that English as an international language entails. Translating from Spanish to English requires, for Ferré, sacrificing "poetic intensity, in order to establish a dialogue with a wider audience" (1997a:4). Clearly Ferré writes outward, wired "for two types of electricity: English 120 volts, and Spanish 220 volts. Fortunately, Puerto Rican writers can do this. Language, I tell myself, must be the electric current that leads us outwards, rather than the fence that keeps us in" (1997a:7).

In the translative process, therefore, "as I translated I was forced to substitute, cancel, and rewrite constantly, now pruning, now widening the original text" (1995:46). Gaps have been the worst problem, "the lacunae which arise from the missing cultural connotation" (1995:47). Thus even her titles frequently undergo the sort of cultural transposition that she considers requisite for self-translation. The phrase "maldito amor", for example, is an idiomatic expression suggesting doomed or accursed love, with a sense of treachery, and it also the title of a nineteenth-century Puerto Rican popular song conjuring landowners' happiness; Ferré's analogue in English translation is "sweet diamond dust", a phrase referring both to the bourgeois family's sugar-plantation at the heart of the story, and to the equally treacherous "angel dust" or the cocaine traffic imperiling the culture of the island. To adapt Neubert's term, both phrases similarly but also quite differently "enculturate" a split image of the sugar plantation, and thereby Puerto Rico, as happy-doomed and sweet-poisonous.

In that text, as in others, Ferré's translative practice has been much criticized for adulterating the English with new material aimed overtly at *Yanquí* readers. The problem, for many postcolonial theorists in particular, is not just that she creates neologisms to convey a sense of alterity (the black prostitute Gloria speaks a mangled Spanish-English laced with "wordweed" in *Maldito*/*Sweet*, and the cupboards of a peasant household include "garlics"). In English Ferré inserts whole passages explaining the history of Puerto Rico, changes the names of places and buildings, and inserts phrasing that both positions the narrator as a channel between cultures and circumscribes the reader as a foreigner. She changes the name of the main sugar mill from the paternalistic "Central Ejemplo"/Model Mill to the equally paternalistic "Snow White", stressing the child-like image of the workers while thickening the politico-economic association of sugar-cane with cocaine or white snow. In Spanish the land-owners make a toast with cognac (typically aping French upper classes), which Ferré changes in English to rum, to animate the North American stereotype for these vapid upper-class idlers. She inserts long passages adding background on

the indigenous Taíno people and their stone deities, for example (*Sweet*, 1988:4). To a description of the island's natural prosperity she adds:

> And presiding over all of this the fragrant suckling pig, slowly turning on its perfumed branch over the smoking embers; a golden deity sacrificed to an even greater glory of the senses, a crackling, sizzling, barbarous delight of which the ears, the snout, the curlicued tail, the labyrinthine blood sausages spiced with Hottentot peppercorns were the horror of our foreign visitors and the most exquisite morsel of our holy day feasts. (*Sweet Diamond Dust*, 1988:6)

The narrator in both languages speaks in the first person plural, introducing "our valley" as the ancestral home of many races, and the text soon breaks up into five narrative voices variously recounting the story of one family's generations. But only in English does this note of "foreign visitors" enter, to be positioned in sharp contrast with "our" customs and history as a singular, if not alien domain that requires effort to be known or understood. Similarly, various narrators pause in English to provide background on horsmanship or daily mass, as Ferré amplifies the text for English-language readers unfamiliar with daily life in Puerto Rico, with the domains of men's macho competitions and women's routine religious observances. The text is sewn with small lexical modifications, several as startling as "Hottentot", until one realizes that the African term may be entirely appropriate to the racial interlacings of Puerto Rico, which the translation is subtly enhancing through addition (rarely excision) and substitution.

To Ferré it is clear that in such translations, "the main thread of the story remains the same" in both languages. Echoing Steiner, the changes in versions have to do with "changes of mind perhaps, also with changes in feeling", as shaped by the languages themselves. Thus Ferré's prime point, often repeated in interviews, is that "you're writing for a different audience" (quoted in Perry 1993:101). This distinction of audience is precisely the charge leveled against her in the 1980s and early 1990s during the heyday of cultural studies and postcolonial theory, when such a riven cultural allegiance (particularly to the United States) was construed as betrayal of one's "native" culture. In a collection of essays entitled *A la sombra de tu nombre* (2001), Ferré recalls how controversial her decision to translate into English was, prompting accusations that she did it for mercenary reasons, to sell books to the larger U.S. market, and thereby betraying "los valores patrios" as founded by and contained in the Spanish language (177). To critics who insisted that "a bilingual writer should *only* write in his native language", Ferré replied that Puerto Rican identity is itself dual, "at the same time American *and* Puerto Rican" (1997a:5).

But Ferré has come to believe that the concepts of both "nacionalidad" and "la idendidad cultural" have changed over the past fifty years, in all languages. Global migrations and the electronic incursion of English into all cultures across the planet, mean that bilingualism is becoming pervasive, even in the United States with its growing Hispanic population. The cultural hybridity of Latin America, Puerto Rico par excellence, enfigures a common human future. World capital cities, so recently monolingual in tone, now resound with many different languages. Thus today "la nacionalidad no depende únicamente del lenguaje" (*A la sombra*, 174). Moreover,

mere hybridity, the kinds of religious and racial syncretism that have shaped many peoples in Latin America, has long been redoubled in Puerto Rico by the island's bilingual condition as a Spanish-English/South-North crosspoint. Thus just as the people have long enjoyed "la doble visión que nos permite el bilingüismo" (177), so the self-translator works like a "telescópio", extending this internally dual vision of Puerto Ricans to larger spaces in the English of North America ("a larga distancia", *A la sombra*, 151). Far from respecting the barriers raised by nationalistic prejudice and political perspectives, she deliberately breeches them by self-translating, in the service of displaced bilingual readers (in both languages), cultural memory, and her sense of Puerto Ricans as occupying multiple "espacios existenciales", to adopt one of her section titles in *A la sombra de tu nombre* (13). Ultimately, it is in the bilingual writer's mind that the cultural spaces overlap, and, echoing that figure, Ferré insists that "Soy una ciudana del Nuevo Mundo – de América del Norte *y* de América del Sur – y seguiré escribiendo en español y en inglés aunque sobre mi cabeza se crucen las espadas"/I am a citizen of the New World – of North America *and* South America – and I will continue to write in Spanish and in English, even if swords are crossing over my head (179).

Many of Ferré's bilingual contemporaries across Latin America, not to mention the younger generation of postcolonial writers, echo this sense of bilinguality as supra-nationality. The self-translator Ariel Dorfman (b. 1942) is intently aware of the various linguistic diasporas that Latin American history entails. We should note that the map of Latin America, like that of Africa and much of Asia, consists in lines drawn by colonial powers for their own convenience, rather than as demarcations of indigenous communities of interest and allegiance; the colonial languages pervading such "national" cultures, Spanish and English, both originally European languages, have become transnational Latin American media of cross-cultural communication, literary not least. Spanish is the only "official" language held in common by many nation-states ranging from Mexico out across the Caribbean and down to Chile. Writers in some of these states grow up with two colonial languages, such as Spanish/Italian in Uruguay, Spanish/German in Argentina, Spanish/English in Puerto Rico, not to mention local indigenous languages and such heritage languages as Yiddish or Russian. Dorfman describes this process: born to Jewish Russian émigrés in Argentina, he spoke Spanish as an infant but his parents, facing political persecution, transported him to New York. He "repressed" his Spanish, he says, as "a child who wanted to remake himself, free himself from who he had been", to become an all-the-live-long-day Zip-A-Dee-Doo-Dah American (*Heading South*, 1998:49). To Dorfman the boy, "the question of language had become ensnared in the question of nationality, and therefore of identity" (47). Only much later did he learn that "another language can keep us company as if it were a twin" (6). The McCarthy hearings, to this son of communist parents, drove a wedge of fear into his love of America, leading to a family sojourn in Chile and later in California culminating in a decision in 1968 to return to Chile and to Spanish: "I willed myself to become monolingual again" (101). After serving in the Allende government until its bloody end, Dorfman was forced into exile; returning to the United States, he has taught at Duke University since 1985 and, since the restoration of democracy in Chile in 1990, he divides his time between

Santiago and the States. He now sees his life as like "the history of Latin America as it searched for a language with which to express its hybridity" (191), and as an intricate interlacing of identities, languages, and politics. "I *am* American. Latin American. *Soy chileno*" (267). In the dedication to his bilingual text *Heading South, Looking North: A Bilingual Journey/ Rumbo al sur, deseando el norte: un romance en dos lenguas* (1998), he describes his life as "the story of my many exiles and my three countries and the two languages that raged for my throat during years and that now share me, the English and the Spanish that I have finally come to love".

Celebrated author of the play *Death and the Maiden*, concerning the victims of torture in Latin American dictatorships, Dorfman has published a volume of poetry in bilingual format and regularly translates his fiction and drama between his languages, perhaps most notably his novel *Konfidenz* (Spanish, 1994)/ *Konfidenz* (English, 1995). More overtly than Ferré, he positions himself in his writings as the bilingual voice of political protest against repressive regimes, including United States' imperialist endeavors of all sorts, particularly the drive to linguistic no less than cultural hegemony. He shares with Ferré an acute consciousness of bilinguality as cultural perspectivism, the lens that like a prism opens up to view the deeper layers of cultures where languages both clash as socio-political systems and, at the same time, construct selves in palimpsest. Space does not allow us to examine Dorfman's bilingual texts in detail. But Ferré's work can stand, emblematically, as a quite comparable crossway, conjoining Latin American and North American linguistic, literary, and cultural issues in the bilingual text.

Epilogue

There is a great deal more to be said about self-translation in the West, about each historical period and indeed each writer. If this book has met its goals, it will have inspired at least a few readers along the way to pursue these matters in new directions. In the end, we hope that this survey of literary self-translators leaves readers, as it leaves us, rather humbled by the venerable history, the complex cultural transactions, and the extraordinary utility of the dual text through the centuries. When viewed along an historical continuum, bilingual writers clearly share more with one another than they do with theorists of the gaps and the losses between languages. We hope it has become evident that their artistry thrives not between but across languages and cultural spaces.

Today, nearly two centuries after the Romantics proclaimed their new philosophy of language, many studies of self-translators are still premised on the structure of a "split" into languages, cultures, identities, even warring selves, as we saw apropos of Charles d'Orléans, Goldoni, and Green, for example. We have discovered that it is rather a structure of continuities, on the order of repetition with variation, that best characterizes the self-translators' enterprise over the centuries. Moreover it has become clear to us that a great deal of fine comparative work can be done on bilingual texts by using standard literary-critical analysis, of the sort that examines the interrelations of monolingual texts by a given writer, like Petrarch's sonnets as a group or Tolstoy's novels, or the poems or successive autobiographies of any monolingual writer: once one overleaps the monolingual horizon and can read stereoscopically, the similarities signify as instantiations of a singular poetics in dual discourse. We have found that this is so primarily because bilingual writers across the centuries seem to share certain notions about language.

Like all writers, they seem to labor for years to achieve a voice and a style, whether that means manipulating a new vernacular, a new genre, or old languages and forms, in distinctive ways. When they translate their singular texts into other languages, they make changes that seem almost always to arise from the need, the desire, or the delightful occasion to re-address the text to a new audience. The dimensions of this task are infinite, given the cultural complexities of the new literary field, and each writer selects his or her different means to this end.

In the Introduction, we sketched one notion in particular that pervades this history and these critical readings of self-translations: functional correspondence in translation, that is, bilingual writers' modes of redirecting the text for reception by the second reading (or performance) culture. In century after century, case by case, these self-translators have shown a remarkable consistency in fitting their first-language version into the second-language culture. In watching how various writers undertake this process in different historical moments and milieus, it also became clear to us that one of the stumbling blocks for translation theorists has been the concept of time in translation. Like it or not, those of us in translation work or theory, or manuscript studies, have been conditioned to think in terms of first and second texts, versions, languages. It is almost as though we continue to conceive translation along the vertical axis of *translatio studii* whereby a second text descends from the summit or

arch-value of the "original", in diminution and loss. This seems like merely an innocuous metaphor until one finds one bilingual writer after another critically constrained to models of native-language "originality," or secondary vernacular "imitatio," or subsequent variants of "megatext," and so on. If one flattens this temporal axis to the horizontal, however, and construes the bilingual text as bi-discursivity focusing outward to cultural spaces, then self-translation emerges into view as a cultural and historical practice bridging audiences in unique ways. Thus, rather like genre in earlier periods, and like style in modernity, the model of audience spaces helps elucidate the continuities and dissimilarities of the bilingual text as functions of deploying literary idiolects in different reading cultures.

Harsha Ram has argued that modernist theories stressed the temporality of translation, a "tardiness" relative to the original, that led theorists to privilege syntax over sense or meaning. Benjamin's "afterlife," Fenellosa's Chinese ideograms compressing time, and their derivatives, coincided with a metaphysics of time that produced modernist translation theory's paradigm of syntactic equivalence. What "remained untheorized . . . was the intransigence, the refractory nature of transcultural space" (1995:206). Ram holds instead that translation elicits "the situatedness of both languages at play," and that this requires greater vigilance toward what he calls "the formal markers of space that situated the original poem from within," but which the temporalizing rhetoric of the modern era has obscured (206). Thus "translation as spatialization" restores the metaphoricity of *trans-latio* as a text borne across cultural spaces of home and nation (207).

Working on Russian poetry, Ram has come to believe that translators must recognize how all texts, whether original or translation, situate the writer's language with relation to cultural space, and subtly dislocate that normative relation in their unique ways: "the translator must grasp poetic history as a series of evolving locative modes: the place names, the shifters, and broad lexical registers that situate the poem and the poet" (209). In short, "the translator's task is to expose the gap existing *within the original itself* between language as a national patrimony" and its current sociopolitical contexts (220), as evident in the writer's subtle yet challenging "dislocations of culture" that the writer insinuates into language and its voices (199). He might be describing self-translation when he adds, "a translation relocates political and poetic force as an encounter *between* entities: nations, languages, structures, and their agents" (200). This is just the sort of transculturation that Beckett's tirade in *Godot* achieves, in relocating the onus of "Archi . . . tecte!" to "Crritic!" or that Belleau achieves in switching our focus from *cella* to *palais dorez*.

Ram's model of transcultural spatialization is particularly useful for its stress on the historicity of both text and translation as literary fields for writers' dislocations of culture from within the national language as patrimony, subtly challenged. Reading the text as the writer's idiolect at work in inherited linguistic *and* cultural space, enables watching more precisely how he or she translates it into the comparable situatedness of another language. As we noted apropos of Julian Green, his bilingual format materializes in space what even most self-translators leave to time, by publishing their other version separately. Yet in one sense, by looking outward to different audiences, the bilingual text escapes temporal sequencing, as a product of one hand addressing

two cultural spaces existing simultaneously, like Sor Juana's Spanish courtiers and Latin theologians, or Ungaretti's French and Italian soldiers fighting the same war.

In a recent critique of the contemporary state of comparative studies, Christopher Prendergast inveighs against critical arguments "engineered by the a priori category of the nation." That category still underlies the preponderance of critical work on "hybridized" texts and "dual subjectivities" in postcolonial literatures, he finds, and it is actually a tacit premise as unexamined as the term literature itself (2004; 21). Our study of the bilingual text since medieval times has echoed, at several points, that sort of impatience with some of the basic critical rubrics routinely applied to self-translators' work over the centuries. Literary histories and even translation theory, as typically focused on second-hand translation, are still suffused with tacit assumptions of nation as the indubitable substrate of language.

That situation is at last changing, however, in two ways. On the one hand, postcolonial scholars' attention to bilinguality in the 1990s, as both a linguistic and a political issue in various social contexts, has spilled over into other domains in the twenty-first century. For instance, it has created what Isabelle de Courtivron calls the new genre of "language memoirs". These are autobiographical accounts of bilingual peoples' experiences in moving from one language and culture to another. These frequently anthologized writers are not necessarily literary figures, but also bilingual journalists, academics, professional translators, and publishers. Courtivron assembles a selection of such accounts, and brief excerpts from others, in her anthology entitled *Lives in Translation: Bilingual Writers on Identity and Creativity* (2003), based on papers read by bilinguals invited to speak at the Center for Bilingual/Bicultural Studies, established in 1998, that she directs at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Both Wendy Lesser in *The Genius of Language: Fifteen Writers Reflect on Their Mother Tongues* (2004) and Stephen Kellman in *Translingual Writers Reflect on Their Craft* (2003) similarly bring together an assortment of first-person accounts of this experience. These are usually living bilingual writers, and their editors do not identify those who self-translate (those most typically included are Rosario Ferré and Ariel Dorfman). But self-translators are often present in such collections of language memoirs, like a faint watermark running through contemporary discussions of bilinguality. In literary critical studies as well, beginning in the 1990s, scholars have been focusing on intercultural experience in bilingual writers' handling of such matters as a single genre or a single geo-cultural region (see for example Hokenson, 1995, on autobiography, or Pérez-Firmat, 2003, on Cuba).

Most editors of the new genre of language memoirs, however, introduce it as a personal record of identity crisis, because they still subscribe to the tacit premise that bilinguality threatens "identity and creativity," in Courtivron's phrase. This is to impose on the genre, a priori, not only the familiar modernist split or irreducible gap between languages, but also the post-Enlightenment, Romantic concept of bilinguality as a challenge to creativity, furthering Schleiermacher's stubbornly persistent model of creativity as monolingual. In literary critical work on past centuries, this unstated premise, when it addresses self-translation at all, also tends to impose a structure of "split" into languages, identities, selves, as we have seen. In collections of language memoirs today, "between" is the banner preposition of many prefaces, and authors

are invited to describe their struggles as creative writers who have suffered loss of the mother tongue.

As Lesser's title suggests, plus in French Isabelle Felici's *Bilinguisme: Enrichissements et conflits* (2000) and Aleksandra Kroh's *l'Aventure du bilinguisme* (2000), there is a parallel and perhaps growing sense of more positive aspects of enrichment and adventure in the experience of bilinguality. Some of these language memoirs are themselves overturning several postcolonial postulates about the loss of identity and creativity in bilingual conditions. Many writers have certainly recounted such experiences although, in retrospect, a number of anthologies now seem to have been tailored to that premise, and the literary press in several countries is beginning to run articles by writers stressing gain rather than loss. As Kroh put it in 2000, editors are recognizing that, whether in ancient societies or in modern nations, situations of language contact are a "réalité universelle," and that bilingual writers are not the Schopenhauerian freaks of recent centuries but indeed "les virtuoses, les artistocrates du bilinguisme," writing all or part of their work in a language which is not their native tongue (Kroh, 9). Kroh cites the linguist W. E. Lambert suggesting that persons must be "psychologiquement libre" to become bilinguals, and she easily adapts the monolingual model of subjectivity to a bilingual model of a single subject position in two languages (see Kroh for interviews with nine living writers who have recently adopted French as a second literary language). Kroh points out that studies of bilingualism in the mid-twentieth century, focusing on immigrant children, naturally found bilinguality a handicap (they had two semi-languages), then the late century found them to be privileged with cognitive flexibility, as developed by switching between symbolic systems (144), and eventually superior intellectual achievement, attaining more complex mental structures than a monolingual. The concept of threshold became essential: the greater the development of the first language upon contact with the second, the greater the enrichment and the harmony of the interacting languages in the individual. She adds that theorists are finding as well that harmonious bilinguality also depends upon how the two languages are perceived by the surrounding communities.

On the other hand, beginning in the late 1980s several of the leading authorities in structuralist and poststructuralist thought turned from the impersonal study of language to the more personal articulation of their own complex relations to the concept of the native language. Julia Kristeva in *Étrangers à nous-mêmes* (1988)*/Strangers to Ourselves* (1991), and Jacques Derrida in *Le Monolinguisme de l'autre* (1996), for example, take a kind of Occam's razor to the perennial issues of linguistic and cultural differences. They level them all to one external standard against which to contrast the *internal* experience of psychic disequilibriums in all individuals, as constructed by patrimony as language. This is to argue that all persons are actually "bilingual", that is, struggling to come to know "the foreigner" within. This proposition participated in ongoing twentieth-century efforts to define the self with relation to language, and the first person in one's own prose. Some of the most acute observations on the maternal language have come from Derrida. As a monolingual European of Jewish parentage, raised in French Algeria, he grew up, he says, without a culture (*inculturel*): with neither Yiddish or Hebrew, nor Arabic, he acquired the maternal language of

the distant metropole and thereby its "culture": one grows up into a language (the form or identity of the self never precedes the forms of "I" of a maternal language) and that language imposes its idiom and its philosophical tradition (or its reserve of concepts that one uses), with which one describes both transcendent universality and phenomenal experience (*empiricité*, 115). Aware of that process, one tries to go back and invent a pre-language, for discovering a memory or an event that perhaps never happened (*Monolinguisme*, 118). One ends – we all do – in translation, in his case an internal French-French translation trying to locate the self that does not fit into any language (123). We always end up, he says, speaking in a language about a metalanguage, which does not exist (129). In himself as an individual, all his work is a lifelong effort to translate himself out of the structures of "la culture gréco-latino-christiano-gallique" that enclose him, and the effort is futile (132).

Echoing Beckett, Derrida concludes that all he knows is his language, yet he senses that he is also an "other" whose language he does not know: he can only conclude that one reason for his estrangedness from his language is that his Judeo-French-Arab genealogy is not present in the cultural structures of his language, the colonial French that has cast its veils over him (133-35). Kristeva too speaks of "the foreign" within each individual psyche, and she notes that the supersession of "nation" over the welter of languages has produced the public figure of the foreigner as alien, outside the native culture and language, in a political structure that actually reflects this deeper psychic structure, which she charts in Freudian terms quite like Derrida in culturo-linguistic terms. For Kristeva the child fits herself into the forms of language, just as the foreigner fits himself into the new language and culture, in modes that can be deeply enriching as well as psychically mutilating (*Strangers to Ourselves*, 39). Ferré too speaks of *el otro*, the foreigner within. As a contemporary Latin American, however, she is referring to whole continents, "*el otro*, 'the other' that lurks inside us: our neighbor to the North if we come from Latin America, our neighbor to the South if we come from North America" ("Reflections", 2). In short, thinkers in many modes, and bilingual writers in many languages today, are re-envisioning the relations between language and culture like a mathematical proportion: one's pre-verbal essence or genealogy relates to one's first maternal language in exactly the way that the maternal language relates to second, third, and fourth acquired languages, as incremental expansions over the enduring mystery of how language functions dually in the creation of selves and societies. It is in this contemporary context of writers "unhoused" by a single language, and societies becoming more multilingual, that Steiner has proposed that the bilingual text is like a cat's cradle (*Extraterritorial*, 19). He is discussing Beckett's *Textes pour rien* (1955)/*Texts For Nothing* (1967), but this is an eloquent figure for the bilingual text as literary construction: two sets of fingers, like two languages, are held apart yet intertwined by the same string in a construction over empty space, the space of literature and culture, of all that languages denote both separately and together. We construe the string as the literary style, the unique idiolect that links the languages in one dual literary production.

Kroh concludes that the definition of bilinguality will have to become more malleable in the twenty-first century. "Unilingual" countries are rare, she says, and from the global viewpoint of contemporary conditions, monolingual people are a distinct

minority today. As communication channels widen and literatures become ever more melded, scholars and social scientists will have to recognize that bilinguality is an election. To Kroh, a bilingual is anyone who elects a second language in a particular way: "Neither the wealth of vocabulary, nor the knowledge of grammar, nor years dedicated to learning a language make a bilingual. A bilingual is anyone who finds, in a second language, the sensation of being at ease, the certainty of mastering the rules of the game and knowing how to transgress them not from ignorance, but to obtain a desired effect. It is in response to this entirely personal criterion that one becomes bilingual, whatever the level of knowledge of the foreign language" (10, our translation).

If one accepts Kroh's contemporary largesse in defining bilinguality, as our study of the self-translated text through history suggests one should, then we seem to be recreating today the ambient multilingual conditions of earlier periods, when writers routinely elected to write in adopted dialects and languages, ever widening the compass of the bilingual text and its audiences.

References

Aarsleff, Hans (1982) *From Locke to Saussure: Essays on the Study of Language and Intellectual History*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Adams, James Noel (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

------, Mark Janse and Simon Swain (eds) (2002) *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aers, David (1992) 'A Whisper in the Ear of Early Modernists; or, Reflections on Literary Critics Writing the "History of the Subject"', in David Aers (ed) *Culture and History, 1350-1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities, and Writing*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 177-203.

Allen, Don Cameron (1949) 'John Donne and the Tower of Babel', *Modern Language Notes* 64(7): 481-83.

Allen, Gay and Roger Asselineau (1987) *Saint John de Crèvecoeur: The Life of an American Farmer*, New York: Viking.

André, Valérie (1995) 'Chamisso, émigré français et écrivain allemand', *Revue de littérature comparée* 69(1): 73-79.

Anselment, Raymond A. (1971) '"Ascensio Mendax, Descendio Crudelis": The Image of Babel in the Anniversaries', *ELH* 38(2): 188-205.

Anzaldúa, Gloria (1987) *Borderlands/La frontera: The New Mestiza*, San Francisco: Spinters/Aunt Lute.

Arena, Richard (1988) 'Réflexions sur la théorie monétaire de Nicole Oresme', in Pierre Souffrin and Alain Philippe Segonds (eds), 195-207.

Arenal, Electa (1991) 'Where Woman is Creator of the Wor(l)d, Or, Sor Juana's Discourses on Method', in Stephanie Merrim (ed) (1991a), 124-41.

Arn, Mary-Jo (ed) (2000) *Charles d'Orléans in England (1415-1440)*, Cambridge: Boydell.

------ (1994) 'Charles d'Orléans: Translator?', in Roger Ellis and Ruth Evans (eds) *The Medieval Translator 4*, Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 125-35.

------ (1993) 'Charles of Orleans and the Poems of BL MS Harley 682', *English Studies* 74: 222-35.

------ (1990) 'Poetic Form as a Mirror of Meaning in the English Poems of Charles of Orleans', *Philological Quarterly* 69(1): 13-29.

------ (1983) '*Fortunes Stabilnes*: The English Poems of Charles of Orleans in Their English Context', *Fifteenth-Century Studies* 7: 1-18.

Assouline, Pierre (1984) *Gaston Gallimard: Un Demi-Siècle d'édition française*, Paris: Ballard.

Audra, Emile (1931) *L'Influence française dans l'oeuvre de Pope*, Paris: Champion.

Bachet de Méziriac, Gaspard (1635/1998) *De la traduction*, Ottawa: Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.

Baddeley, Susan (1993) *L'Orthographe française au temps de la Réforme*, Geneva: Droz.

Baggioni, Daniel (1997) *Langues et nations en Europe*, Paris: Payot & Rivages.

Baker, Mona (1992) *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, London: Routledge.

------ (ed) (2001) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, 2nd edition.
Ballard, Michel (1992) *De Cicéron à Benjamin: Traducteurs, traductions, réflexions*, Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille.
Barnstone, Willis (1993) *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory, Practice*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
Bassnett, Susan (1980/1991) *Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, 2nd edition.
------ and André Lefevere (eds) (1990) *Translation, History and Culture*, London: Cassell.
Batchelor, John (1993) *The Life of Joseph Conrad: A Critical Biography*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Batteux, Charles (1747-1748) *Principes de littérature*, in Douglas Robinson (ed), 195-99.
Beaujour, Elizabeth (1995) 'Bilingualism', in Vladimir Alexandrov (ed) *The Garland Companion to Vladimir Nabokov*, New York: Garland, 37-43.
Beaumarchais, J-P, Daniel Couty and Alain Rey (eds) (1984) *Dictionnaire des littératures de langue française*, Paris: Bordas, 3 volumes.
Beckett, Samuel (1983) *Disjecta: Miscellaneous Writings and a Dramatic Fragment*, Ruby Cohn (ed), London: Calder.
------ (1978) *Happy Days/Oh les beaux jours: A Bilingual Edition*, James Knowlson (ed), London: Faber and Faber.
Beeby, Allison, Doris Ensinger and Marisa Presas (eds) (2000) *Investigating Translation: Selected Papers from the 4th International Congress on Translation, Barcelona, 1998*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Beer, Jeanette (1995) 'Patronage and the Translator: Raoul de Presles's *La Cité de Dieu* and Calvin's *Institution de la religion chrétienne* and *Institutio religionis Christianae*', in Jeanette Beer and Kenneth Lloyd-Jones (eds), 90-142.
------ and Kenneth Lloyd-Jones (eds) (1995) *Translation and the Transmission of Culture Between 1300 and 1600*, Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University Press.
------ (ed) (1989) *Medieval Translators and Their Craft*, Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University Press.
Befu, Harumi (1993) *Cultural Nationalism in East Asia: Representation and Identity*, Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies/University of California Press.
Belleau, Rémy (1878/1965) *Oeuvres poétiques de Rémy Belleau*, 2 vols., Charles Joseph Marty-Laveaux (ed), Paris: A. Lemerre; Geneva: Slatkine.
Bellenger, Yvonne (ed) (1988) *Le Sonnet à la Renaissance: Des origines au XVIIe siècle*, Paris: Aux Amateurs de Livres, 167-80.
------ (1983) 'Rémy Belleau and the Figure of the Artist', *French Studies* 37(1): 1-16.
Benjamin, Walter (1923) 'Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers', trans. Harry Zohn as 'The task of the translator', in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (eds), 1992, 71-82.
Bensimon, Marc (1958) 'Les Foresteries de Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaie et les productions pastorales de la Pléiade', *Modern Language Notes* 73(1): 25-33.
Benson, Robert L. and Giles Constable (eds) (1991) *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Benveniste, Emile (1966/1971) Problèmes de linguistique générale, trans. M. E. Meek as Problems in General Linguistics, 1971, Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press.
Bérard-Zarzycka, Ewa (1989) 'Les écrivains russes – blancs et rouges – à Paris dans les années 20', in *Le Paris des étrangers*, André Kaspi and Antoine Marès (eds), Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 351-69.

Berdichevsky, Norman (2004) *Nations, Language and Citizenship*, Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland.

Bérier, François (1988) 'La traduction en français', in *La Littérature française aux XIVe et XVe siècles: Tome 1*, Daniel Poirion, Armin Biermann and Dagmar Tillmann-Bartilla (eds), Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 219-65.

Berman, Antoine (1984) *L'Épreuve de l'étranger: Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique*, Paris: Gallimard; trans. S. Heyvaert as *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*, 1992, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Berriot, François (1989) 'Langue, nation et pouvoir: Les traducteurs du XIVe siècle précurseurs des humanistes de la Renaissance', in Marie Thérèse Jones-Davies (ed) *Langues et nations au temps de la Renaissance*, Paris: Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 113-35.

Besserman, Lawrence (ed) (1996) *The Challenge of Periodization: Old Paradigms and New Perspectives,* New York: Garland.

Bhabha, Homi (1994) *The Location of Culture*, New York: Routledge.

Bible, The Reader's, Being the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible (1611/1951) 'The Translators to the Reader', London, Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, and Eyre and Spottiswoode, xi-xxxi.

Binns, J. W. (1990) *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan England: Latin Writings of the Age*, Leeds: Francis Cairns.

Bizer, Marc (1995a) *La Poésie au miroir: imitation et conscience de soi dans la poésie latine de la Pléiade,* Paris: Champion.

------ (1995b) 'Ronsard the Poet, Belleau the Translator: The Difficulties of Writing in the Laureate's Shadow', in Jeanette Beer and Kenneth Lloyd-Jones (eds), 175-226.

Black, R. (2001) *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bondanella, Peter, Julia Bondanella and Jody Shiffman (eds) (1996) *Dictionary of Italian Literature*, Westport, CT: Greenwood, revised edition.

Bosco, Gabriella (1993) 'Goldoni et le dragon', *Revue de littérature comparée* 67(3): 353-60.

Botley, Paul (2004) *Latin Translation in the Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boyd, Brian (1991) *Vladimir Nabokov*: *The American Years*, London: Vintage, vol. 2.

------ (1990*) Vladimir Nabokov*: *The Russian Years*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, vol. 1.

Boyer, Abel (1694) *The Compleat French Master for Ladies and Gentlemen*, London: Sare and Nicholson.

Braybrook, Jean (1988) 'Les sonnets pétrarquistes de Rémy Belleau', in Yvonne Bellenger (ed), 167-80.

Bridrey, Émile (1906) *Nicole Oresme: La théorie de la monnaie au XIVe siècle: Nicole Oresme; étude d'histoire des doctrines et des faits économiques*, Paris: V. Giard et E. Brière.

Brittan, Simon (2003) *Poetry, Symbol, and Allegory: Interpreting Metaphorical Language from Plato to the Present*, Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Budick, Sanford and Wolfgang Iser (eds) (1996) *The Translatability of Cultures: Figurations of the Space Between*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Burckhardt, Jacob (1860) *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore as *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy: An Essay*, 1954, New York: Modern Library.

Burkhart, Louise M. (2000) "The Native Translator as Critic: A Nahua Playwright's Interpretive Practice", in Robert Blair St. George (ed), 73-87.

Bynon, Theodora and Frank Robert Palmer (eds) (1986) *Studies in the History of Western Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carruthers, Mary (1990) *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cary, Joseph (1969) *Three Modern Italian Poets: Saba, Ungaretti, Montale*, New York: New York University Press.

Cave, Terence (1979) *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chamberlain, Lori (1987) '"The Same Old Stories": Beckett's Poetics of Translation', in Alan Friedman et al (eds), 16-24.

Chapelain, Jean (1619-1620) Preface to Le *Gueux, ou la vie de Guzmán de Alfarache*, in Douglas Robinson (ed), 149-52.

Chatfield-Taylor, H. C. (1913) *Goldoni: A Biography*, New York: Duffield.

Chaucer, Geoffrey (1987) *The Book of the Duchess*, in Larry D. Benson (ed) *The Riverside Chaucer*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 329-46, 3rd edition.

Chaytor, Henry John (1945) *From Script to Print: An Introduction to Medieval Vernacular Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chesterman, Andrew (1997) *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cholakian, Rouben (2000) 'Le monde vivant', in Mary-Jo Arn (ed) (2000), 109-22.

------ (1984) *Deflection/Reflection in the Lyric Poetry of Charles d'Orléans: A Psychosemiotic Reading*, Potomac, MD: Scripta Humanistica.

Cigada, Sergio (1960) *L'Opera poetica di Charles d'Orléans*, Milan: Società vita e Pensiero.

Clément, Bruno (1994) *L'Oeuvre sans qualités: Rhétorique de Samuel Beckett*, Paris: Seuil.

Cockerham, Harry (1975) 'Bilingual Playwright', in Katharine Worth (ed) *Beckett the Shape Changer*, London; Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 139-59.

Coffin, Charles Monroe (1937/1958) *John Donne and the New Philosophy*, New York: Columbia University Press; rpt. New York: Humanities Press.

Cohen, Michèle (1996) *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century*, London: Routledge.

Cohn, Ruby (2002) *A Beckett Canon*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

------ (1973) *Back to Beckett*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

------ (1961) 'Samuel Beckett Self-Translator', *PMLA* 66(1): 613-21.

Coldiron, Ann E. B. (2003) 'Translation's Challenge to Critical Categories: Verses from French in the Early English Renaissance', *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 16(2): 315-44.

------ (2000) *Canon, Period, and the Poetry of Charles d'Orléans: Found in Translation*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Collinge, Linda (2001) *Beckett traduit Beckett: De Malone meurt à Malone Dies: L'Imaginaire dans la traduction*, Geneva: Droz.

Colombani-Giaufret, Hélène (1993) 'Goldoni écrivain français dans les *Mémoires*', *Revue de littérature comparée* 67(3): 337-52.

Comte, Auguste (1830-1842) *Cours de philosophie positive*, Paris: Bachelier.

Condillac, Étienne Bonnot de (1788) *Essai sur l'origine des connaissances humaines*, trans. H. Aarsleff as *Essay on the Origins of Human Knowledge*, 2001, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Contamine, Philippe, Marc Bompaire, Stéphane Lebecq and Jean-Luc Sarrazin (2003) *L'Économie médiévale*, Paris: Armand Colin.

Cook, Elizabeth H. (1996) *Epistolary Bodies: Gender and Genre in the Eighteenth-Century Republic of Letters*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Coopland, George W. (ed) (trans) (1952) *Nicole Oresme and the Astrologers: A Study of His "Livre de divinacions"*, Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool.

Cope, Jackson I. (1987) 'Franco Fido's *Studi goldoniani:* A Modern Cicerone Maps the Corpus', *Italica* 64(2): 298-308.

Copeland, Rita (2006) 'Language Frontiers, Literary Form, and the Encyclopedia', in O. Merisalo and P. Pahta (eds) *Frontiers. Proceedings of the Third European Congress of Medieval Studies* (Jyväskykä, 10-14 June 2003), Louvain-la-Neuve: Brepols, 507-24.

------ (1991) *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

------ (1989) 'The Fortunes of "Non Verbum Pro Verbo": Or, Why Jerome Is Not a Ciceronian', in Roger Ellis et al. (eds) *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*, Woodbridge, UK: D.S. Brewer, 15-35.

Courtivron, Isabelle de (ed) (2003) *Lives in Translation: Bilingual Writers on Identity and Creativity*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Crespo Garcia, Begoña (2000) 'Historical Background of Multilingualism and Its Impact on English', in D. A. Trotter (ed) *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*, Cambridge: Brewer, 25-36.

Cruz, Sor Juana Inès de la (1996) *Obras completas*, Francisco Monterde (ed), Mexico City: Editorial Porrúa.

Curtius, Ernst Robert (1948) *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, Bern: A. Francke AG Verlag, trans. Willard R. Trask as *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, 1953, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

D'Ablancourt, Nicolas Perrot (1654) Dedication [of his translation of Lucian], in Douglas Robinson (ed), 156-61.

Damian-Grint, Peter (1999) *The New Historians of the Twelfth Century Renaissance: Inventing Vernacular Authority*, Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.

De Man, Paul (1984) 'Autobiography as De-facement', in *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*, New York: Columbia University Press, 67-81.

De Mauro, Tullio (1963) *Storia linguistica dell'Italia unita*, Bari: Laterza.

Demerson, Guy (1998) 'Rémy Belleau et la naissance du monde', in Jean-Claude Ternaux (ed) *La Naisssance du monde et l'invention du poème: Mélanges de poétique et d'histoire littéraire du XVIe siècle offerts à Yvonne Bellenger,* Paris: Champion, 193-215.

Denham, John (1656) Preface to *The Destruction of Troy*, in Douglas Robinson (ed), 156.
Derrida, Jacques (1996) *Le Monolinguisme de l'autre, ou la prothèse d'origine*, Paris: Galilée.
Di Stefano, Giuseppe (1970) 'L'hellénisme en France à l'orée de la Renaissance', in Anthony Levi (ed) *Humanism in France at the End of the Middle Ages and in the Early Renaissance*, Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 29-42.
Diderot, Denis and Jean le Rond d'Alembert (1969) *L'Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts, et des métiers*, Paris: H. Veyrier.
Dingwaney, Anuradha and Carol Maier (eds) (1995) *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
Dolet, Étienne (1950) *La Maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre*, in Bernard Weinberg (ed) *Critical Prefaces of the French Renaissance*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 77-83.
Donne, John (1969) *Ignatius His Conclave: An Edition of the Latin and English Texts with Introduction and Commentary*, T. S. Healy (ed), Oxford: Clarendon.
Dorfman, Ariel (1998) *Rumbo al sur, deseando el norte: un romance en dos lenguas*, New York: Siete Cuentos Editorial.
------ (1998) *Heading South, Looking North: A Bilingual Journey*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Dryden, John (1697) Dedication [of his *Aeneis*], in Douglas Robinson (ed), 174-75.
Du Bellay, Joachim (2003) *Œuvres complètes*, vol. 1: *La Deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse*, Francis Goyet and Olivier Millet (eds), Paris: Champion.
------ (1993) *Oeuvres poétiques. Premiers recueils, 1549-1553*, Daniel Aris and Françoise Joukovsky (eds), Paris: Bordas.
Elias, Norbert (2000) *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom, and Stephen Mennell (eds), trans. Edmund Jephcott, Oxford: Blackwell, rev. ed.
Fairchild, H. N. (1955) *The Noble Savage: A Study in Romantic Naturalism*, New York: Russell and Russell.
Farrell, Ralph (1937) *Stefan Georges Beziehungen zur englischen Dichtung*, Berlin: Verlag Ebering.
Fawcett, Peter (1997) *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained*, Manchester: St Jerome.
Federman, Raymond (1987) 'The Writer as Self-Translator', in Alan Warner Friedman et al (eds), 7-16.
Fein, David A. (1983) *Charles d'Orléans*, Boston: Twayne.
Felici, Isabelle (ed) (2000) *Bilinguisme: Enrichissements et conflits*, Paris: Champion.
Ferguson, Charles A. (1966) 'National Sociolinguistic Profile Formulas', in William Bright (ed) *Sociolinguistics*, The Hague: Mouton, 309-15.
Ferré, Rosario (1997a) 'Writing Between', Paper read at National Endowment for the Humanities seminar, Florida Atlantic University, 14 March 1997.
------ (1995) 'On Destiny, Language, and Translation; or, Ophelia Adrift in the C. & O. Canal', in Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier (eds) *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 39-49.
------ (1986) *Maldito amor*, Mexico City: Joaquín Mortiz; trans. R. Ferré as *Sweet Diamond*

Dust, 1988, New York: Ballantine.
Fido, Franco (1984) *Da Venezia all'Europa: Prospettivi sull'ultimo Goldoni*, Rome: Bulzoni.
Fitch, Brian T. (1988) *Beckett and Babel: An Investigtation into the Status of the Bilingual Work*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Folena, Gianfranco (1983) 'Il francese di Goldoni', in *L'Italiano in Europa: Esperienze linguistiche al Settecento*, Turin: Einaudi, 359-96.
Formigari, Lia (1990) *L'esperienza e il segno: La filosofia del linguaggio tra Illuminismo e Restaurazione*, Rome: Riuniti; trans. W. Dodd as *Signs, Science and Politics: Philosophies of Language in Europe, 1700-1830*, 1993, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Forster, Leonard (1970) *The Poet's Tongues: Multilingualism in Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fox, John (2000) 'Glanures/Charles d'Orléans: Three Macaronic Rondeaux', in Mary-Jo Arn (ed), 89-108.
------ (1969) *The Lyric Poetry of Charles d'Orléans*, Oxford: Clarendon.
France, Peter (ed) (2000) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Frayssinhes, Jean-Pierre E. (1997) 'Une sorte de merle blanc', in Jean Touzot (ed), 231-40.
Freeman, Henry G. (2003) 'From the First to the Fifth Republic: Antoine Rivarol, Johann Christoph Schwab, and the Latest Lingua Franca', *French Review* 77(2): 312-23.
Friedman, Alan Warner, Charles Rossman and Dina Sherzer (eds) (1987) *Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Friedman, Lawrence M. (1999) *The Horizontal Society*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
Fumaroli, Marc (1994) 'Le grand style', in Georges Molinié and Pierre Cahné (eds), 139-48.
Galderisi, Claudio (2000) 'Charles d'Orléans et l'"autre" langue: Ce français que son "cuer amer doit", in Mary-Jo Arn (ed), 79-87.
Galmiche, Xavier (1995) 'Langue de la faute, langue du salut: Le bilinguisme tchéco-allemand dans l'oeuvre de Jakub Deml', *Revue de la littérature comparée* 69(1): 55-62.
Genette, Gérard (1991) *Fiction et diction*, Paris: Seuil.
------ (1982) *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*, Paris: Seuil.
George, Stefan (1958) *Werke: Ausgaben in zwei Bänden*, Munich: Helmut Küpper vormals Georg Bondi.
Gillard, Lucien (1990) 'Nicole Oresme, sujet théorique, objet historique', in Jeannine Quillet (ed), 195-233.
Goldoni, Carlo (2003) *Le Bourru bienfaisant/Il burbero di buon cuore*, Paola Luciani (ed), Venezia: Marsilio.
------ (1936-1956) *Tutte le opera di Carlo Goldoni*, vol. 10, *Mémoires*, Giuseppe Ortolani (ed), Milan: Mondadori, 1936, 14 volumes.
------ (1926) *Mémoires*, trans. John Black as *Memoirs of Carlo Goldoni, Written by Himself*, New York: Knopf.
Goodrich, Norma (1967) *Charles of Orleans: A Study of His Themes in His French and in His English Poetry*, Geneva: Droz.
Gray, Edward and Norman Fiering (eds) (2000) *The Language Encounter in the Americas, 1492-1800*, New York: Berghahn Books.
------ (1999) *New World Babel: Languages and Nations in Early America*, Princeton:

Princeton University Press.
Grayson, Jane (1977) *Nabokov Translated: A Comparison of Nabokov's Russian and English Prose*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Green, Julian (1985-1990) *Oeuvres complètes*, Jacques Petit (ed), Paris: Gallimard, 8 volumes.
------ (1987) *Le Langage et son double*, bilingual edition, trans. by Julien Green, Paris: Seuil.
------ (1977) *Partir avant le jour*: *Oeuvres complètes*, Jean Petit (ed), Paris: Gallimard, volume 5.
Greenblatt, Stephen (1976) 'Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century', in Fredi Chiappelli, Michael J. B. Allen and Robert Louis Benson (eds) *First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 561-80, 2 volumes.
Guenée, Bernard (1981) 'État et nation en France au Moyen Age', in *Politique et histoire au Moyen-Âge: Recueil d'articles sur l'histoire politique et l'historiographie médiévale*, Paris: Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 17-30.
Habermas, Jürgen (1985) *Der philosophische Diskurs der Moderne: Zwölf Vorlesungen*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp; trans. Frederick Lawrence as *The Philosophical Discourses of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*, 1987, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Hall, Donald E. (2004) *Subjectivity (The New Critical Idiom)*, London: Routledge.
Hampton, Timothy (2001) *Literature and Nation in the Sixteenth Century: Inventing Renaissance France*, Cornell: Cornell University Press.
Haskell, Yasmin Annabel (2003) *Loyola's Bees: Ideology and Industry in Jesuit Latin Didactic Poetry,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Haskins, Charles Homer (1927/1957) *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Hassel, R. Chris (1971) 'Donne's "Ignatius His Conclave" and the New Astronomy', *Modern Philology* 68(4): 329-37.
Healy, T. S. (ed) (1969) *Ignatius His Conclave: An Edition of the Latin and English Texts with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford: Clarendon.
Hokenson, Jan Walsh (2004) *Japan, France, and East-West Aesthetics: French Literature 1867- 2000*, Madison; NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
------ (1995) 'Intercultural Autobiography', *A/B Auto/Biography Studies* 10(1): 92-113.
Hollier, Denis (ed) (1989) *A New History of French Literature*, Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
Holmes, James (1988) *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Huntsman, J. F. (ed) (1978) *Alexander Tytler: Essay on the Principles of Translation*, Amsterdam; John Benjamins.
Hyslop, Beatrice F. (1945) 'The Theater During a Crisis: The Parisian Theater During the Reign of Terror', *Journal of Modern History* 17(4): 332-55.
Jäger, Hans (1936) 'Stefan Georges französische Gedichte und deutsche Übertragungen', *PMLA* 51(2): 563-93.
Jakobson, Roman (1958) 'Linguistics and Poetics', in David Lodge (ed), 31-55.
------ (1956) 'The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles', in David Lodge (ed), 56-60.
Johnson, Samuel (1759) *The Idler 68/69*, in Douglas Robinson (ed), 204-05.

------ (1779-1781) *Lives of the English Poets*, in Douglas Robinson (ed), 205-07.
Jooken, Lieve (2000) 'Descriptions of American Indian Word Forms in Colonial Missionary Grammars', in Edward Gray and Norman Fiering (eds), 293-309.
Joukovsky, Françoise (1991) 'La composition de *la Bergerie* de R. Bellau', in Alain Niderst (ed) *La Pastorale française: de Rémi Belleau à Victor Hugo*, Paris: Published Papers on Seventeenth Century Literature (63), 9-22.
Kachru, Braj (1983) *The Indianization of English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Karttunen, Frances (2000) 'Interpreters Snatched from the Shore: The Successful and Others', in Edward Gray and Norman Fiering (eds), 215-29.
Kay, Sarah, Terence Cave, and Malcolm Bowie (2003) *A Short History of French Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kellman, Stephen G. (ed) (2003) *Translingual Writers Reflect on Their Craft*, Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
Kerrigan, W. and G. Braden (1989) *The Idea of the Renaissance*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
Kittay, Jeffrey and Wlad Godzich (1987) *The Emergence of Prose: An Essay in Prosaics*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Klemperer, Viktor (1995) *Ich will Zeugnis ablegen bis zum Letzten: Tagebücher 1933-45*, Berlin: Aufbau Verlag; trans. Martin Chalmers as *I Will Bear Witness: A Diary of the Nazi Years 1933-41*, 1999, New York: Modern Library.
Knowlson, James (1978) 'Afterword', in Samuel Beckett, *Happy Days/O les beaux jours: A bilingual edition*, James Knowlson (ed), London: Faber and Faber, 84-128.
Kristeva, Julia (1988) *Étrangers à nous-mêmes*, Paris: Fayard, trans. Leon Roudiez as *Strangers to Ourselves*, 1991, New York: Columbia University Press.
------ (1981) *Le langage, cet inconnu*, Paris: Seuil ; trans. Anne M. Menke as *Language the Unknown*, 1989, New York: Columbia University Press.
------ (1974) *La révolution du langage poétique*, Paris: Seuil; trans. Margaret Waller as *Revolution in Poetic Language*, 1984, New York: Columbia University Press.
Kristol, Andres M. (2000) 'L'intellectuel "anglo-normand" face à la pluralité des langues: le témoignage implicite du MS Oxford, Magdalen Lat. 188', in D. A. Trotter (ed) *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*, Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 37-52.
Kroh, Aleksandra (ed) (2000) *L'Aventure du bilinguisme*, Paris: L'Harmattan.
Kuin, Roger (2001) rev. '*Charles d'Orléans in England (1415-1440)*; *Canon, Period, and the Poetry of Charles of Orleans*: Found in Translation', *Renaissance Quarterly* 54(4.2): 1609-12.
Lacan, Jacques (1977) *Écrits*, trans. Alan Sheridan as *Écrits: A Selection*, 1977, New York: Norton.
Law, Vivien (2003) *The History of Linguistics in Europe from Plato to 1600*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
------ (1986) 'Originality in the Medieval Normative Tradition', in Theodora Bynon and Frank Robert Palmer (eds), 43-55.
Lecointe, Jean (1993) *L'Idéal et la différence: la perception de la personnalité littéraire à la Renaissance*, Geneva: Droz.
Lefevere, André (1981) 'Translated Literature: Towards an Integrated Theory', *Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 14(1): 68-78.
------ (1990) 'Translation: Its Genealogy in the West', in Susan Bassnett and André Lefe-

vere (eds), 14-28.
Lefèvre, Sylvie (1990) 'Une "rude manière de parler": L'enjeu rhétorique du prologue du *Livre de divinacions* de Nicole Oresme', in Jeannine Quillet (ed), 177-94.
Lejbowicz, Max (1990) 'Chronologie des écrits anti-astrologiques de Nicole Oresme: Étude sur un cas de scepticisme dans la deuxième moitié du XIVe s.', in Jeannine Quillet (ed), 119-43.
Lerner, Isaías (2000) 'Spanish Colonization and the Indigenous Languages of America', in Edward Gray and Norman Fiering (eds), 281-92.
Lesser, Wendy (ed) (2004) *The Genius of Language: Fifteen Writers Reflect on Their Mother Tongues*, New York: Pantheon.
Levi, Anthony Herbert (ed) (1970) *Humanism in France at the End of the Middle Ages and in the Early Renaissance*, Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
Liu, Lydia H. (1995) *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity, China 1900-1937*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Lloyd-Jones, Kenneth (1989) 'Humanist Debate and the "Translative Dilemma" in Renaissance France', in Jeanette Beer (ed) *Medieval Translators and Their Craft*, Kalamazoo: Western Michigan State University Press, 347-71.
Locke, John (1689) *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1975.
Lodge, David (ed) (2000) *Modern Criticism and Theory*, 2nd ed. revised by Nigel Wood, London: Longman.
Lonsdale, Allison Beebe (2001) 'Direction of Translation (Directionality)', in Mona Baker (ed), 63-67.
Lough, John (1978) *Writer and Public in France*, Oxford: Clarendon.
Lounsbury, Thomas R. (1968) *Shakespeare and Voltaire*, New York: B. Blom.
Lucera, Giovanni (1987) 'Introduction: Un Américain à Paris', in Julien Green, *Le langage et son double*, Paris: Seuil, 7-21.
Luciani, Paola (ed) (2003) *Le Bourru bienfaisant/Il burbero di buon cuore*, Venezia: Marsilio.
Lusignan, Serge (1987) *Parler vulgairement: les intellectuels et la langue française aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles*, Paris: J. Vrin. Marotti, Arthur F. (1991) 'The Transmission of Lyric Poetry and the Institutionalizing of Literature in the English Renaissance', in Marie-Rose Logan and Peter L. Rudnytsky (eds) *Contending Kingdoms: Historical, Psychological, and Feminist Approaches to the Literature of Sixteenth-Century England and France*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 21-41.
Martindale, Joanna (ed) (1985) *English Humanism: Wyatt to Cowley*, London; Croom & Helm.
Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels (1983) *The Marx-Engels Reader*, Robert C. Tucker (ed), New York: Norton.
Mate, Mavis (1969) 'A Mint of Trouble, 1279 to 1307', *Speculum* 44(2): 201-12.
Mayhew, Nicholas J. (1974) 'Numismatic Evidence and Falling Prices in the Fourteenth Century', *TheEconomic History Review* 27(1): 1-15.
McDowell, Nicholas (2004) 'Levelling Language: The Politics of Literacy in the English Radical Tradition, 1640-1830', *Critical Quarterly* 46(2): 39-62.
McFarlane, Ian D. (1980) *Renaissance Latin Poetry*, Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
McGuire, Brian (2004) 'Jean Gerson and Bilingualism in the Late Medieval University',

in Peter Andersen (ed) *Pratiques de traduction au Moyen-Âge/Medieval Translation Practices: Actes du colloque de l'Université de Copenhague 25 et 26 oct. 2002/Papers from the Symposium at the University of Copenhagen 25th and 26th October 2002*, Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen Museum Tusculanum Press, 121-29.

Menut, Albert Douglas (ed) (1970) *Maistre Nicole Oresme: Le Livre de Politiques d'Aristote*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series 60(6), Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.

Merrim, Stephanie (1999) *Early Modern Women's Writing and Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*, Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

------ (ed) (1991a) *Feminist Perspectives on Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*, Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

------ (ed) (1991b) *'Mores geometricae*: The "Womanscript" in the Theater of Sor Juana de la Cruz', in Stephanie Merrim (ed) (1991a), 94-123.

------ (1991c) 'Toward a Feminist Reading of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz: Past, Present, and Future Directions in Sor Juana Criticism', in Stephanie Merrim (ed) (1991a), 5-37.

Meschonnic, Henri (1999) *Pour la poétique*, vol 2, *Épistémologie de l'écriture: Poétique de la traduction*, Paris: Gallimard.

Miller, Jane (1982) 'Writing in a Second Language', *Raritan* 2(1): 115-32.

Minnis, Alastair (1988) *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages,* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2nd edition.

------ (1979) 'Late Medieval Discussions of *Compilatio* and the Role of the *Compilator*', in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 101: 385-421.

Molinié, Georges and Pierre Cahné (eds) (1994) *Qu'est-ce que le style?* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Montesquieu (1995) *Lettres persanes*, Laurent Versini (ed), Paris: Flammarion.

Moss, Ann (2003) *Renaissance Truth and the Latin Language Turn*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mounin, Georges (1955) *Les Belles infidèles*, Paris: Cahiers du Sud.

Myles, Anne (2000) 'Dissent and the Frontier of Translation: Roger Williams's *A Key into the Language of America*', in Robert Blair St. George (ed), 88-108.

Nabokov, Vladimir (1973) *Strong Opinions*, New York: Vintage.

------ (1971) *Mary*, London: Weidenfield and Nicholson.

------ (1966/1999) *Speak Memory, An Autobiography Revisited*, New York: Putnam, rev. edition.

------ (1955) *Lolita*, New York: Vintage.

------(1941) 'The Art of Translation', *The New Republic* (4 August 1941): 160-2.

------ (1936/1999) 'Mademoiselle O', in *Nouvelles*, Paris: Laffont; trans. as 'Mademoiselle O', in Vladimir Nabokov, *The Stories of Vladimir Nabokov*, 1949, New York: Vintage, 480-99.

------ (1928) *Korol', dama, valet*, Berlin: Slovo; trans. Dmitri and Vladimir Nabokov as *King, Queen, Knave*, 1968, New York: Vintage, 552-72.

Nelson, Robert J. (1989) 'The Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns', in Denis Hollier (ed), 364-69.

Neubert, Albrecht (2000) 'Theory and Practice of Translation Studies Revisited: 25 Years of Translator Training in Europe,' in Allison Beeby et al. (eds), 13-26

Neveux, François (1990) 'Nicole Oresme et le clergé normand du XIVe siècle', in Quillet (ed), 9-36.

Nichols, Stephen J. (1983) *Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography*,

New Haven: Yale University Press.
Nida, Eugene (1964) *Toward a Science of Translating*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
Niranjana, Tejaswini (1992) *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Norton, Glyn P. (ed) (1999) *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 3: *The Renaissance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
------ (1984) *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents*, Geneva: Droz.
Norton, Robert E. (2002) *Secret Germany: Stefan George and His Circle*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
O'Brien, John (1994) 'Ronsard, Belleau and Renvoisy', *Early Music History* 13: 199-215.
Ong, Walter J. (1971) *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Oresme, Nicole (1970) *Maistre Nicole Oresme: Le Livre de Politiques d'Aristote*, Albert Douglas Menut (ed), Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series 60(6), Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.
------ (1956) *The "De moneta" of Nicholas Oresme and English Mint Documents, Translated from the Latin with Introduction and Notes*, Charles Johnson (ed and trans), London: Thomas Nelson.
------ (1864) *Traictié de la première invention des monnoies de Nicole Oresme*, Louis Wolowski (ed), Paris: Guillaumin.
Charles d'Orléans (1923/1982) *Poésies*, 2 vols., Pierre Champion (ed), Paris: Champion, reprint.
------ (1941/1946) *The English Poems of Charles of Orleans*, 2 vols., Robert Steele and Mabel Day (eds), London: Oxford University Press.
Oseki-Dépré, Inès (1999) *Théories et pratiques de la traduction littéraire*, Paris: Armand Collin.
Ossola, Carlo (1975) *Giuseppe Ungaretti*, Milan: Mursia.
Oustinoff, Michaël (2001) *Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction: Julien Green, Samuel Beckett, Vladimir Nabokov*, Paris: l'Harmattan.
Ouy, Gilbert (1998) *Gerson bilingue: Les deux rédactions, latine et française, de quelques oeuvres du chancelier parisien*, Paris: Champion.
------ (1984) 'Bilinguisme ou trilinguisme? Latin commun, latin savant et français aux XIVe et XVe siècles', *Actes de la Table Ronde «Genèse de l'Etat moderne; Etat et Eglise», Madrid, nov.-déc. 1984*, Madrid: Bibliotheca de la Casa de Velasquez, 85-101.
------ (1970) 'Gerson et l'Angleterre', in Anthony Levi (ed), 43-81.
Parry, Mair (2002) 'The Challenges to Multilingualism Today', in Anna Laura Lepschy and Arturo Tosi (eds) *Multilingualism in Italy Past and Present*, Oxford: Legenda/Modern Humanities Research Association, 47-59.
Patterson, Lee (2003) *Voyage into Language: Space and the Linguistic Encounter, 1500-1800,* Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
------ (1996) 'The Place of the Modern in the Late Middle Ages', in Lawrence Besserman (ed), 51-66.
------ (1990) 'On the Margin: Postmodernism, Ironic History and Medieval Studies', *Speculum* 65(1): 87-108.
------ (1987) *Negotiating the Past: The Historical Understanding of Medieval Literature,*

Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Paz, Octavio (1982) *Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, o, Las trampas de la fe*, Barcelona: Seix Barral, trans. Margaret Peden as *Sor Juana or The Traps of Faith*, 1988, Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
Percival, W. Keith (1986) 'Renaissance Linguistics: The Old and the New', in Bynon, Theodora and Frank Robert Palmer (eds), 56-68.
Pérez-Firmat, Gustavo (2003) *Tongue Ties: Logo-Eroticism in Anglo-Hispanic Literature*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Perry, Donna (1993) 'Rosario Ferré', in *Backtalk: Women Writers Speak Out*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 83-103.
Pessoa, Fernando [under the pseudonym of Bernardo Soares] (1982) *O livro do desassossego*, Lisbon: Communicação.
Picon, Isabel Violante (1998) '*Une oeuvre originale de poésie': Giuseppe Ungaretti traducteur*, Paris: Université de Paris-Sorbonne.
Planche, Alice (1975) *Charles d'Orléans, ou la recherche d'un langage*, Paris: Champion.
Poirion, Daniel (1981) 'Écriture et ré-écriture au moyen âge', *Littérature* 41: 109-18.
------ (1965/1978) *Le Poète et le prince: l'évolution du lyrisme courtois de Guillaume de Machaut à Charles d'Orléans*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France; reprinted Geneva: Slatkine.
Pollock, Sheldon (2000) 'Cosmopolitan and Vernacular in History', *Public Culture* 12(3): 591-625.
Poulet, Georges (1977) *Études sur le temps humain*, vol. 4: *Mesure de l'instant*, Paris: Editions du Rocher.
Purcell, Sally (ed) (1973) *The Poems of Charles d'Orléans*, Cheadle: Fyfield Books.
Pym, Anthony (1998) *Method in Translation History*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
------ (2000) *Negotiating the Frontier: Translators and Intercultures in Hispanic History*, Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
------ (2001) 'Spanish Tradition', in Mona Baker (ed), 550-63.
Quillet, Jeannine (ed) (1990) *Autour de Nicole Oresme: Actes du Colloque Oresme organisé à l'Université de Paris XII*, Paris: J. Vrin.
------ (1988) 'Nicole Oresme traducteur d'Aristote', in Pierre Souffrin and Alain Philippe Segonds (eds), 81- 91.
Raclot, Michèle (1997) 'Vision panoramique de l'oeuvre romanesque de Julien Green: Étapes, constantes et variations esthétiques', in Jean Touzot (ed), 49-93.
Ram, Harsha (1995) 'Translating Space: Russia's Poetic in the Wake of Empire', in Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier (eds), 199-222.
Reesink, Hendrika (1931) *L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709*, Paris: Champion.
Reiss, Timothy J. and Roger H. Hinderliter (1979) 'Money and Value in the Sixteenth Century: The *Monete Cudende Ratio* of Nicholas Copernicus', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 40(2): 293-313.
Ricken, Ulrich (1984) *Sprache, Anthropologie, Philosophie in der französischen Aufklärung*, trans. Robert Norton as *Linguistics, Anthropology and Philosophy in the French Enlightenment*, 1994, London: Routledge.
Rinks, Gloria Díaz and Elisabeth Sisson-Guerrero (1997) 'Rosario Ferré entre el inglés y el español: "Let Oneself Become the Meeting Place of Both"', *Dactylus* 16: 61-69.

Robinson, Douglas (2001) *Who Translates? Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

------ (ed) (1997) *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, Manchester: St Jerome.

Rolnick, Arthur J., Francois R. Velde and Warren E. Weber (1996) 'The Debasement Puzzle: An Essay on Medieval Monetary History', *The Journal of Economic History* 56(4): 789-808.

Romaine, Susan (1989/1995) *Bilingualism*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2nd edition.

Ronsard, Pierre de (1858/1995) *Oeuvres complètes de Pierre de Ronsard*, Prosper Blanchemain (ed), Paris: P. Jannet; rpt. Geneva: Slatkine, 3 vols.

------ (1878/1965) 'Elegie de Pierre de Ronsard a Ivles Gassot, Secretaire du Roy', in Charles Joseph Marty-Laveaux (ed) *Oeuvres poétiques de Rémy Belleau*, Paris: A. Lemerre, 2 vols.; rpt. Geneva: Slatkine.

Rose, Marilyn Gaddis (1997) *Translation and Literary Criticism: Translation as Analysis*, Manchester: St Jerome.

Roth, Guenther and Claus Wittich (eds) (1968) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, New York: Bedminster.

Ruttenberg, Nancy (1998) *Democratic Personality: Popular Voice and the Trial of American Authorship*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Salmon, Vivian (1996) *Language and Society in Early Modern England*: *Selected Essays 1981-1994*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

------ (1988) *The Study of Language in Seventeenth-Century England*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2nd ed.

St. George, Robert Blair (2000) *Possible Pasts: Becoming Colonial in Early America*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Scheiner, Corinne (2002) 'The Dialogic Task of the Self-Translator', unpublished paper read at the annual meeting of the American Comparative Literature Association, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 13 April 2002.

Schlegel, August Wilhelm (1796) *Homers Werke von Johann Heinrich Voss*, trans. Douglas Robinson as 'Poetic Translation, An Imperfect Approximation', in Douglas Robinson (ed), 214-219.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich (1813) *Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersezens*, trans. Douglas Robinson as 'On the Different Methods of Translating', in Douglas Robinson (ed), 225-38.

Schogt, Henry (1992) 'Semantic Theory and Translation Theory', in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (eds), 193-203.

Scholar, Angela (2000) 'French: Poetry 1450-1620', in Peter France (ed) *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 257-59.

Schons, Dorothy (1927) 'Some Obscure Points in the Life of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz', in Stephanie Merrim (1991), 38-60.

Schopenhauer, Arthur (1851/1997) *Parerga und Paralipomena*, trans. Douglas Robinson as 'Language and Words' in Douglas Robinson (ed), 246-249.

Schreyer, Rüdiger (2000) '"Savage" Languages in Eighteenth-Century Theoretical History of Language', in Edward Gray and Norman Fiering (eds), 310-26.

Schulte, Rainer and John Biguenet (eds) (1992) *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Searle, John (1994) *The Rediscovery of the Mind*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed) (1966) *Portraits of Linguists: A Biographical Source Book for the History of Western Linguistics, 1746-1963*, Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2 vols.
Shelley, Percy Bysshe (1821/1997) 'A Defence of Poetry,' in Douglas Robinson (ed), 244-245.
Sherman, Claire Richter (1995) *Imaging Aristotle: Verbal and Visual Representation in Fourteenth-Century France*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Shoaf, Richard A. (1983) *Dante, Chaucer, and the Currency of the Word: Money, Images, and Reference in Late Medieval Poetry*, Norman, OK: Pilgrim Books.
Smith, Winifred (1964) *The Commedia Dell'Arte*, New York: Benjamin Blom.
Snell-Hornby, Mary (1988) *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Souffrin, Pierre and Alain Philippe Segonds (eds) (1988) *Nicolas Oresme: Tradition et innovation chez un intellectuel du XIVe siècle,* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (2003) *Death of a Discipline*, New York: Columbia University Press.
Steele, Mabel and Robert Day (eds) (1941/1946) *The English Poems of Charles of Orleans*, London: Oxford University Press, 2 vols.
Steiner, George (1975/1992) *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edition.
------ (1968/1971) 'Of Nuance and Scruple', in *Extraterritorial: Papers on Literature and the Language Revolution*, New York: Atheneum, 12-21.
Steiner, Thomas R. (1970) 'Precursors to Dryden: English and French Theories of Translation in the Seventeenth Century', *Comparative Literature Studies* 7: 50-81.
Stierle, Karlheinz (1996) '*Translatio Studii* and Renaissance: From Vertical to Horizontal Translation', in Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser (eds) *The Translatability of Cultures: Figurations of the Space Between*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 55-67.
Szondi, Peter (1992) 'The Poetry of Constancy: Paul Celan's Translation of Shakespeare's Sonnet 105', in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (eds), 163-85.
Tagore, Rabindranath (1961) *Complete Works of Rabindranath Tagore*, vol. 10: *Jeevansmriti*, Calcutta: Government of West Bengal.
------ (1912/1913) *Gitanjali: Song Offering*, London: India Society.
Tanquiero, Helena (2000) 'Self-Translation as an extreme case of the author-translator dialectic', in Allison Beeby et al (eds), 55-63.
Theile, Wolfgang (1993) 'La Fortune littéraire de Goldoni en Allemagne', *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 67.3: 383-402
Tomlinson, Charles (1989) 'The Presence of Translation: A View of English Poetry', in Rosanna Warren (ed) *The Art of Translation: Voices from the Field*, Boston: Northeastern University Press, 258-76.
Touzot, Jean (ed) (1997) *Julien Green*, Paris: Klincksieck.
Tytler, Alexander Fraser (1791) *Essay on the Principles of Translation*, in Douglas Robinson (ed), 209-12.
Vance, Eugene (1979) 'Chaucer's House of Fame and the Poetics of Inflation', *Boundary 2* 7(2): 17-38.

Vega, Ana Lydia (1988) 'Pollito Chicken', in Vega and Carmen Lugo Filippi (eds) *Virgenes y mártires*, Rio Pedras, Puerto Rico: Editorial Antillana, 75-79.
Vegliante, Jean-Charles (1987) *Ungaretti entre les langues*, Paris: Italiques.
Venuti, Lawrence (ed) (2004) *The Translation Studies Reader*, New York: Routledge, 2nd edition.
------ (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, New York: Routledge.
Virgil (1934) *Eclogues*, *Georgics, Aeneid 1-6*, H.R. Fairclough (ed) (tr), Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press.
Voigts, Linda E. (1996) 'What's the Word? Bilingualism in Late-Medieval England', *Speculum* 71(4): 813-26.
Voisine-Jechova, Hana (1995) 'La langue souterraine: Quelques réflexions sur l'oeuvre de Jean Kolar, Václav Jamek et Milan Kundera', *Revue de la littérature comparée* 69(1): 39-54.
Watson, Foster (1908) *The English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their Curriculum and Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Waswo, Richard (1999) 'Theories of Language', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 3: *The Renaissance*, Glyn P. Norton (ed), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 25-35.
Watts, Cedric (1982) *Preface to Conrad*, London: Longman.
Weaver, Warren (1964) *Alice in Many Tongues: The Translations of Alice in Wonderland*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Weber, Henri (1955/1981) *La Création poétique au XVIe siècle en France: de Maurice Scève à Agrippa d'Aubigné*, Paris: A.-G. Nizet.
Weinberg, Bernard (ed) (1950) *Critical Prefaces of the French Renaissance*, Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University Press.
Whyte, Christopher (2002) 'Against Self-Translation', *Translation and Literature* 11(1): 64-71.
Williams, Raymond (1989/1996) *The Politics of Modernism*, London: Verso.
------ (1977) *Marxism and Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wollin, Lars (2001) "Swedish Tradition", in Mona Baker (ed), 563-570.
Wolowski, Louis (ed) (1864) *Traictié de la première invention des monnoies de Nicole Oresme*, Paris: Guillaumin.
Worth-Stylianou, Valerie (1988) *Practising Translation in Renaissance France: The Example of Étienne Dolet*, Oxford: Clarendon.
Worton, Michael (1994) '*Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*: Theatre as Text', in *The Cambridge Companion to Beckett*, John Pilling (ed), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 67-87.
Young, Howard (1995) 'The Invention of an Andalusian Tagore', *Comparative Literature* 47(1): 42-52.
Zilsel, Edgar (2000) 'The Sociological Roots of Science', *Social Studies of Science* 30(6): 935-49.
Žižek, Slavoj (1999) *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Center of Political Ontology*, London: Verso.

Index