uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

FACULTÉ DES ÉTUDES SUPÉRIEURES ET POSTOCTORALES

uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSDOCTORAL STUDIES

Patricia Van Bolderen
AUTEUR DE LA THÈSE / AUTHOR OF THESIS

M.A. (Translation)
GRADE / DEGREE

School of Translation and Interpretation
FACULTÉ, ÉCOLE, DÉPARTEMENT / FACULTY, SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT

Twice Heard, Hardly Seen:
The Self-Translator's (In)Visibility

TITRE DE LA THÈSE / TITLE OF THESIS

Rainier Grutman
DIRECTEUR (DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS SUPERVISOR

CO-DIRECTEUR (CO-DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS CO-SUPERVISOR

Carla Foz

Ryan Fraser

Gary W. Slater
Le Doyen de la Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales / Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

Twice Heard, Hardly Seen:
The Self-Translator's (In)Visibility

Trish Van Bolderen

School of Translation and Interpretation
University of Ottawa

Under the supervision of
Rainier Grutman, PhD
School of Translation and Interpretation
University of Ottawa

Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of MA (Translation Studies)

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-73848-1
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-73848-1

Abstract[1]

According to the most common definition, self-translation refers to a phenomenon in which author and translator are the same individual. Self-translation has been practiced for centuries, and research on the practice has increased noticeably over the past 15 years. Yet, two main observations can be made with respect to academic interest pertaining to this phenomenon: first of all, to date, there exists no critical review of research conducted specifically on this topic; secondly, although certain scholars have noted that self-translation seems to be overlooked within translation studies texts in which translation is discussed as a general concept, little data has been provided to substantiate the extent to which this might be so.

Therefore, in this thesis, I seek to identify which aspects of self-translation have been studied by self-translation scholars as well as what evidence there might be of self-translation in publications on translation as a broader topic. This investigation also reveals that which has *not* been studied, allowing the reasons for and implications of these gaps to be addressed. Ultimately, this project sheds light on the *under*-representation—or "invisibility"—of the self-translator and of self-translation within Translation Studies.

In the first chapter, I conduct an état des lieux of research on self-translation specifically, noting which aspects of self-translation have tended to be discussed and which have tended to be neglected. The second chapter involves analyzing the tables of contents and indices of encyclopedic publications as well as the argumentation of theoretical texts in order to ascertain whether there is evidence to substantiate that self-translation is under-represented. In the conclusion, I propose various reasons for which self-translation constitutes an important area of investigation within Translation Studies.

[1] An aided, simultaneous self-translation from the French version, with assistance from Joanne Desroches.

Résumé[2]

Selon la définition la plus courante, l'auto-traduction désigne un phénomène où auteure et traductrice sont une seule et même personne. L'auto-traduction se pratique depuis des siècles, et depuis une quinzaine d'années, elle suscite un intérêt théorique croissant. Pourtant, devant la recherche qui lui est consacrée, on ne peut faire que les constats suivants : d'une part, aucune revue critique des recherches qui ont spécifiquement traité de l'auto-traduction n'a été faite à ce jour; d'autre part, bien qu'un certain nombre de théoriciennes aient remarqué que les textes traductologiques traitant du concept de la traduction semblent négliger l'auto-traduction, peu de données ont été fournies pour en faire la preuve.

La présente thèse a donc pour but d'identifier d'abord quels aspects de l'auto-traduction ont été étudiés par les spécialistes de ce domaine puis quelles indices attestent éventuellement de la présence de l'auto-traduction dans les textes qui abordent la traduction de manière plus générale. Cette recherche permet par conséquent de reconnaître aussi ce qui n'a pas été étudié et de cerner la raison d'être et les implications de ces omissions. Finalement, cette enquête met en relief la *sous*-représentation—autrement dit, l'« invisibilité »—de l'auto-traductrice et de l'auto-traduction en traductologie.

Dans le premier chapitre, je présente un état des lieux de l'auto-traduction, tout en notant les aspects autour desquels se sont orientées les recherches jusqu'à maintenant, et ceux qui n'ont pas été examinés. Le deuxième chapitre propose d'analyser le contenu des tables des matières et des index d'un corpus de publications encyclopédiques ainsi que l'argumentaire d'une série de textes théoriques en vue de vérifier si les résultats peuvent soutenir l'hypothèse d'une sous-représentation de l'auto-traduction. Dans la conclusion, je suggère des pistes pour mieux comprendre les différentes raisons qui font de l'auto-traduction un sujet incontournable en traductologie.

[2] Une auto-traduction simultanée (de la version anglaise) et assistée par Joanne Desroches.

Acknowledgements

My sincere appreciation goes to a great many people, including each member of the supportive fifth-floor family of the Arts building. However, I am particularly grateful to:

Rainier, who made it impossible for me not to rave about his mentoring skills on a regular basis;

Jena, who validated everything;

Luis, who calmly and happily offered solutions to each crisis;

Christel, who enthusiastically listened to, read and gave feedback about my writing and ideas;

Joanne, whose door was always metaphorically open;

Dad, Sharyn, Deb, Greg and Cara, who consistently supported me in an endeavour they barely understood;

Graham and Red Wheelbarrows the world over; and

Chocolate, who both rescued and inspired me on an almost daily basis.

This work is whole-heartedly dedicated to my Mum, Kerry (Greer) Van Bolderen, who, in various ways, set all of this up. And who would have been proud.

Table of Contents

Appendices

Table of Tables

"Direct discussion or even mention of self-translation is virtually non-existent in writings on theory of translation."

(Brian T. Fitch, *Beckett and Babel: An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work* (1988), p. 21)

"[T]he achievements of modern bilingual writers are rarely considered 'whole'. We usually know only the books in one of a writer's two languages. [...] Bilingual and polyglot writers must be seen in their linguistic complexity. Not merely the sum of two (or more) monolinguals, bilingual writers are in many ways intrinsically different from their monolingual fellows."

(Elizabeth Klosty Beaujour, *Alien Tongues: Bilingual Russian Writers of the 'First' Emigration* (1989), p.1)

"Le terme auto-traduction mérite [...] autant que l'on s'y attarde, et que l'on ne lui substitue pas trop hâtivement tantôt le terme d''œuvre bilingue' (ou un équivalent), tantôt le terme de traduction comme s'il s'agissait simplement d'un rapport du tout (l'œuvre bilingue ou la traduction) à la partie (l'auto-traduction). Recourir à cette synecdoque par commodité présente en effet l'inconvénient majeur d'estomper la *spécificité* des textes auto-traduits, qui constituent un paradoxe au regard de la typologie communément admise."

(Michaël Oustinoff, *Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction* (2001), p. 21)

"[S]elf-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."

(Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson, *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation* (2007), p.1)

0 Introduction

It is not an exaggeration to state that the investigation into self-translation—also known as "auto-translation", and most commonly understood as "the act of translating one's own writings into another language and the result of such an undertaking" (Grutman 2009b: 257)[3]—has exploded over the course of the past 10 to 15 years. Consider, for instance, the publication dates of the 126 texts identified through a keyword search of "self-translation" in the MLA online bibliography[4]: according to this search, 29.4% (or 37) of these texts were published during the 1990s, and 62.7% (or 79) were published in the 2000s; meanwhile 83.3% (or 105) of the texts were published in or after 1995 (see Appendix A). Further evidence of this boom includes the most recent issue of the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona journal *Quaderns: revista de traducció*, which features a section entitled "Autotraducció" [auto-translation], consisting of six articles on self-translation.[5]

Moreover, numerous papers are being delivered on the subject. For example, self-translation was the topic of three sessions, and nine papers, at the 3rd International Association for Translation and Intercultural Studies (IATIS) Conference (Melbourne, Australia, July 8-10, 2009). Also, at the Author-Translator Conference (Swansea, June 28-July 1, 2010), three sessions were devoted to self-translation ("2A Theories of Self-Translation I," "3A Theories of Self-Translation II," "4A Practice of Self-Translation I: Collaboration and Authorial Control"), and the topic was discussed explicitly in 14 papers[6]. Scholars are also beginning to organize conferences that focus exclusively on self-translation: *Autotraduzione: teoria ed esempi fra Italia e Spagna (e oltre)* [Auto-

---

[3] However, as will be discussed in Chapter 1, the definition of "self-translation" warrants further exploration.

[4] This search was conducted on May 11, 2010. It generated 129 results; however, three of the texts have been discarded for the following reasons: one represents a duplicate; I could not recognize the language of a second text and therefore could not identify the subject matter; the third text does not refer to self-translation.

[5] http://www.raco.cat/index.php/QuadernsTraduccio/issue/view/11291/showToc; Issue 16, published in 2009.

[6] These numbers are based on the programme available on the online website (http://www.author-translator.net/index.html), consulted on May 12, 2010.

translation: theory and examples from Italy and Spain (and beyond)] is scheduled for November 10-12, 2010, in Pescara, Italy[7]; *Autotraduzione: Testi e contesti* [Auto-translation: Test and contest] is scheduled for May 18-19, 2011, in Bologna, Italy[8]; *Auto-traduction : frontières de la langue et de la culture* is set for November 2011, in Perpignan, France. The entry on "self-translation" in the most recent edition (2009) of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* also attests to this boom: updating the previous version, Grutman observes that self-translation "has of late received considerable attention in the more culturally inclined provinces of translation studies" (2009b: 257).

Given this notable increase in academic interest, it seems that now is an opportune time to review and assess the state of research pertaining to self-translation. Of the scholars who have investigated the topic, Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson seem to have done so the most comprehensively insofar as, in their book *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation* (2007), they examine the topic diachronically and in otherwise relatively broad terms. Other academics tend to focus on either a small number of self-translators—such as in *Beckett and Babel: An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work*, in which Brian T. Fitch analyzes the self-translation practices of Samuel Beckett exclusively—or a particular dimension of the phenomenon—such as in the article "Autotraducciones: Una perspectiva histórica" [Auto-translations: An historical perspective], in which Julio César Santoyo identifies self-translators, past and present, with a view to demonstrating that self-translation is far from uncommon. Nonetheless, neither Hokenson and Munson nor the authors of other texts on self-translation that I have come across analyze, in any significant depth, which aspects of self-translation have and have not been studied. Conducting such an evaluation would serve to identify imbalances in this research and therefore fill a current gap in critical reflection on self-translation and within Translation Studies, more generally.

---

[7] http://www.autotraduzione.com/info/, consulted August 25, 2010.
[8] http://www.lingue.unibo.it/DLLSM/Ricerca/convautotrad.htm, consulted August 25, 2010.

This survey would also distil some of the particularities of self-translation. As Michaël Oustinoff points out, self-translation is unique relative to "original"[9] writing as well as to "standard translation"—a term referring both to the practice in which an individual translates someone else's writings as well as to the product that ensues:[10]

> Le terme auto-traduction mérite pour autant que l'on s'y attarde, et que l'on ne lui substitue pas trop hâtivement tantôt le terme d''œuvre bilingue' (ou un équivalent), tantôt le terme de traduction comme s'il s'agissait simplement d'un rapport du tout (l'œuvre bilingue ou la traduction) à la partie (l'auto-traduction). Recourir à cette synecdoque par commodité présente en effet l'inconvénient majeur d'estomper la *spécificité* des textes auto-traduits, qui constituent un paradoxe au regard de la typologie communément admise. (21)

Oustinoff thus also signals that the nuances of self-translation need to be recognized in the theoretical writing about translation as a general topic—that is, writing in which "translation" would presumably include standard translation as well as self-translation.

Yet, as several scholars indicate, self-translation has been ignored within the field of Translation Studies, not to mention those of literary studies and linguistics. Fitch observes, for example, that, with respect to Beckett's self-translations, literary critics "will often not even feel the need to point out that a given text was preceded by a first text in the other language and still less to take into account this difference of status in the way he tackles the text" (12). Moreover, Elena Bandín claims that "[t]here exists no empirical or descriptive research in the field of DTS concerned with self-translation. It is not even mentioned in the academic discourse of Translation Studies" (35). Hokenson and Munson underscore this under-representation most compellingly, given that, again, contrary to the authors of other books on self-translation,[11] they discuss the neglect in general terms; moreover, they focus their investigation on it. At the outset of the text, the authors explain:

---

[9] I place the word "original" between quotation marks to signal the dubious meaning of this concept, which scholars such as Salah Basalamah identify as "mythe" (5).

[10] Although I did not borrow the term "standard translation" from them, it is worth noting that Hokenson and Munson also use it, in their *The Bilingual Text* (10). In this usage, the word "standard" should be understood to mean "used or accepted as normal, average" and not "a level of quality or attainment"/ "a required or agreed level of quality or attainment," since, in this context, the word is not being used to judge quality; rather, it serves to point to the translation practice that seems to be more commonly carried out (Oxford).

[11] In this instance, I refer specifically to the five books identified in Chapter 1 of this thesis.

> In linguistics and translation studies, the phenomenon is mentioned in passing, if at all. Monolingual literary critics extol the writer's 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. (2)

In their research, Hokenson and Munson acknowledge that self-translation is overlooked, discuss various reasons why this might be so, and point to certain gaps in theoretical claims. However, in their effort to survey socio-linguistic conditions and theoretical perspectives across a significant time period (1100-2000), they cannot dwell on individual theoretical writings in terms of their applicability to self-translation, which leaves certain theories only partially explored, and various others altogether untouched.[12] Moreover, little to no *quantitative* data is provided to substantiate the extent to which self-translation is overlooked. That few other self-translation researchers[13] provide evidence of the under-representation of self-translation within Translation Studies further emphasizes another important need: that of establishing such neglect more conclusively.

This master's project is therefore guided by two main hypotheses: on the one hand, that the decidedly increasing research devoted to self-translation is unbalanced, over-representing certain aspects and thereby under-representing others, leaving the latter relatively if not utterly invisible; on the other hand, that self-translation remains largely invisible within theoretical writings about translation as a general topic. Together, these two hypotheses point to what I mean by the (in)visibility of self-translation. It is important to clarify the meaning of "invisibility". The term was popularized within Translation Studies when Lawrence Venuti's book *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* was published in 1995. For Venuti, "invisibility" refers to the

---

[12] Consider, for example, their discussion of Schleiermacher's "On Different Methods of Translating", which seems to be the most developed analysis of the theoretical neglect of self-translation but consists of only two pages that are interspersed with more general appreciation of German Romantic philosophy (See 142-144). With many other theories, Hokenson and Munson only *describe* theories, without addressing their relevance to self-translation (see, for example, discussions of Jakobson, Spivak, Venuti; 151-154).

[13] One exception includes *Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction* (2001), in which Oustinoff challenges ideas about translation that have been proposed by various translation scholars, such as Meschonnic and Berman. (See, for example, discussions of Berman and Borges on pages 19 and 20 of his book.) However, unlike scholars of certain other books on self-translation (Fitch, Hokenson/Munson), Oustinoff does not focus his investigation specifically on the neglect of self-translation.

status of the translator who writes in a way that encourages the reader to believe she (i.e. the reader) is accessing the "original" text and its author, versus a new text written according to choices made by the translator (Venuti 2008: 1). By contrast, I use the term to refer to the varying degrees of under-representation of self-translation. According to Venuti's definition, invisibility poses ethical problems; according to the definition used in this thesis, invisibility poses problems pertaining to misrepresentation.

0.1 Scope and limitations

It is necessary for the definition of translation to vary somewhat in scope throughout this research. While the definitions of "self-translation" and "standard translation" have already been noted, it is worth clarifying the meaning of the term "translation" when it appears on its own. In most other contexts, this term is used as a synonym for what is labelled here as "standard translation". However, in this thesis, "translation" is an umbrella term referring to all instances of standard translation and self-translation. An important objective of Chapter 1 is to understand how self-translation is defined; establishing a fixed definition in advance would therefore be counter-productive. Hence, I have identified above the *most common* understanding of the term as a starting point for approaching this research. In Chapter 2, meanwhile, the scope narrows such that I focus exclusively on literary translation. This shift is necessary because the second chapter consists of identifying where self-translation is invisible within Translation Studies in general versus specifically within writing devoted to self-translation research. Since Translation Studies privileges literary translation, most theoretical works speak to this type of translation. Therefore, from a methodological point of view, and particularly where speculating about the invisibility of self-translation and analyzing seminal texts are concerned, it is necessary to compare same items—in other words, to look specifically at literary translation.

Also, while I acknowledge the fact that, as Tymoczko argues, "translation studies must de-Westernize its perspectives on the nature of translation processes and products, reconceptualizing many of the fundamental (though often unspoken) assumptions of the discipline," this thesis is largely limited to translation in the West (4). Initially, I did not deliberately exclude non-Western texts about translation from the corpora used for this

research; rather, searches conducted in the languages that are available to me did not lead to such texts. Perhaps the only exception is the article by Gayatri Chavorty Spivak, which is analyzed at the end of Chapter 2, and in which she discusses the politics of translating non-Western feminist writings into Western language-cultures. For the purposes of speculating about the invisibility of self-translation in the second chapter, it was also important to identify attitudes towards authorship and translation; again, since the vast majority of the identified texts reflects Western practices and perspectives, it is appropriate to discuss the ideologies that pertain to them.

It would be equally valuable to conduct similar research with respect to non-literary and/or non-Western self-translation. How, for example, is self-translation represented and studied in non-Western societies? What are non-Western perceptions of self-translation and the self-translator? Similarly, in what ways is non-literary self-translation (under-)represented? And how might the findings generated from such questions compare with the findings of this thesis? However, these questions move beyond the scope of this master's project.

0.2 Anticipated contributions

This project is expected to contribute to the field of Translation Studies by increasing awareness of self-translation and the research conducted on it. More specifically, surveying self-translation research could, as mentioned already, fill a gap in critical reflection about translation by identifying existing imbalances. Accordingly, this project could also encourage or facilitate subsequent research that might offset some of these imbalances. Furthermore, by creating awareness of the differences between self-translation and standard translation, the investigation into the invisibility of the self-translator in theoretical texts could encourage a rethinking of certain theoretical assumptions about translation and, ideally, a sensitivity to writing about translation in a way that acknowledges, versus invisibilizes, self-translation.

0.3 Methodology

This project is largely based on primary research; that is, it generally does not follow or build upon a particular, pre-established theory or model.[14] I survey existing writings—about self-translation and about translation, more generally—in order to observe patterns with respect to how self-translation is represented and in order to examine these tendencies. Accordingly, I have built three corpora from which to gather and analyze data: the first corpus consists of books on self-translation; the second comprises encyclopedic texts on translation; and the third brings together a selection of theoretical texts on translation. This involves examining the claims put forth in a corpus of seminal theoretical texts. The specifics of the corpus building, data collection and data analysis are explained in significant detail within each of the chapters.

0.4 Summary

The thesis is organized into two chapters: "Visibility" and "Invisibility". In the first, I survey the research that has been carried out specifically on self-translation by focusing on books pertaining to the subject—that is, books that, at least initially, signal the visibility of self-translation. In this overview, I investigate the type of texts that have been studied, how self-translation has been defined, which self-translators have been researched, and the reasons for which people self-translate. Each of these units includes subsections entitled "Visibility" and "Invisibility", in which those aspects of self-translation that have and have not been written about are respectively identified and discussed. Subsequently, I speculate about the imbalances that are revealed. Then, as a conclusion to or consolidation of the first chapter, I propose four postulates that arise regarding the status and nature of self-translation: that self-translation is indeed a form of translation, that it is unique, that it is neither rare nor new, and, ultimately, that it warrants further investigation.

In the second chapter, entitled "Invisibility", I draw attention to the under-representation of self-translation in general translation studies literature. First, I evaluate this representation quantitatively, by surveying encyclopedic publications on translation

[14] The exception is in Chapter 2, when I apply Michel Foucault's notion of the "author function" to self-translation, in order to consider how the self-translator is perceived.

and identifying the frequency with which such texts either list "self-translation" in their index or devote entries or articles to this topic. Secondly, I explore the ways in which author, translator and self-translator are perceived—noting the hierarchies that consequently develop between them—in order to theorize both the status of the self-translator and her work as well as the invisibility of the latter. Finally, and in light of the conclusions generated from both the latter exploration as well as the investigations of the first chapter, I evaluate the representation of self-translation *qualitatively*. More specifically, this assessment entails, on the one hand, identifying the potential ways in which self-translation is not taken into account in theoretical writings about translation, and, on the other hand, suggesting the impact associated with this disregard, by pointing to the ways in which self-translation challenges theoretical arguments.

With respect to a given text, the self-translator is heard twice: once in each of the language-cultures in which she writes.[15] Furthermore, she is heard arguably twice as often as the author who does not self-translate and certainly twice as often as the standard translator. Yet, in the research relevant to the self-translator's practice, as the following reveals, she is not seen even half as frequently.

[15] Provided that she is working between only two languages, which is most frequently the case.

1 Visibility: Critical état des lieux of research on self-translation

This chapter of the thesis will consist of a critical état des lieux of the existing research on self-translation, thereby providing an overview of what has and has not been studied on the topic. While much has been written and presented on the matter in recent years, only a limited number of *books* deal with it. In fact, there seem to be only five (5) monographs in which self-translation is discussed in depth:

1. *Beckett and Babel: An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Text* (1988), by Brian T. Fitch;
2. *Alien Tongues: Bilingual Russian Writers of the "First" Emigration* (1989), by Elizabeth Klosty Beaujour;
3. *Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction: Julien Green, Samuel Beckett, Vladimir Nabokov* (2001), by Michaël Oustinoff;
4. *English-German Self-Translation of Academic Texts and its Relevance for Translation Theory and Practice* (2002), by Verena Jung;
5. *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation* (2007), by Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson.

Ideally, a survey of self-translation research would take into account all texts on the subject in question. However, given the scope of this master's thesis, and since books represent the text type that, relative to others (e.g. journals, articles, conference papers), ostensibly involves the most in-depth study of a given topic, I will concentrate predominantly on the contents of the five books listed above in order to identify which aspects of self-translation have been studied.

Investigation of this corpus material is organized according to the following four questions, which, while not exhaustive, point to what the contents of the books suggest are key matters pertaining to self-translation:

1. Which types of self-translated texts have been researched?
2. How has self-translation been defined?
3. Which self-translators have been studied?

4. Why, according to the research, have people self-translated?

1.1 Which types of self-translated texts have been researched?

1.1.1 Visibility: Literary self-translation

Four of the five corpus books deal exclusively with self-translation related to *literary* texts. In this context, "literary" is understood as Venuti has defined it: "in the broadest sense (including not only conventional literary genres such as poetry and fiction, but also biography, history, philosophy, and psychology, among other genres and disciplines in the human sciences)," and in opposition to "technical"—i.e., "commercial, diplomatic, legal, scientific"—texts (Venuti 2008: 34). The subtitle of *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation* most conspicuously signals this literary focus, and Hokenson and Munson also identify within the text the breadth of the term "literary", indeed defining it very similarly to the way Venuti does:

> 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 ["Facing Language: Romantic, Modern, and Contemporary Conditions (1800-2000)"] the term refers solely to poetry, fiction, and drama. (14)

The literary scope of self-translation in *Beckett and Babel*, *Alien Tongues* and *Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction* is also apparent. The first of the four units of *Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction* is entitled "Problématique de l'auto-traduction *littéraire*" (emphasis added). Moreover, each of the self-translators studied in these three books is best known as a writer of "conventional" (according to Venuti's definition above) literature—i.e., a poet, playwright, novelist or some combination of these. Not surprisingly then, investigation of these writers' self-translations is essentially limited to conventional literature.

There are, of course, some exceptions to this tendency. For instance, Beaujour discusses certain passages found in Triolet's notebooks, wherein the excerpt represents either a self-translation of a portion of one of Triolet's novels—e.g., "a text of several pages in length that is a self-translation of a chapter of *Zemlianichka*"—or the first version of what would later become a self-translation, despite being presented as an "original"—e.g., "The [yellow] notebook contains a series of personal reminiscences,

written in Russian, some of which were later translated into French by Triolet to become parts of *Bonsoir, Thérèse*" (67, 68). Furthermore, Beaujour explains that Triolet also self-translated some of her diary entries from Russian into French. However, once again, this self-translation is discussed in terms of its inclusion in the preface of a publication that includes some of her and Louis Aragon's conventional literary works (Beaujour 62). As these examples illustrate, self-translations that result from or lead to *non*-conventional literary texts are often considered only because they are ultimately linked to literature that is conventional. However, when self-translation is discussed in terms of non-conventional literary texts, the latter texts are nonetheless literary, such as in *Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction*, where Oustinoff discusses the self-translations of Green's and Nabokov's autobiographies (63, 66). One of the only exceptions to the literary focus is found in the brief section Beaujour devotes to Poplavskii: she observes self-translation in Poplavskii's diaries—"where identical entries are made first in Russian, then in French"—and notes how "unusual" and redundant this process seems to be since, "[i]f the self can speak to itself in one language or the other, then why use both?" (141). No publications ensued from these self-translations; however, even here, Beaujour surmises that they may have been written "with an eye to eventual publication for one (or both) of his potential linguistic audiences" (141). Thus, she supposes the literary intention of the self-translations.

1.1.2 Invisibility: Non-literary self-translation

English-German Self-Translation is the only book that deals with *non*-literary self-translation: as indicated in the title of her book, Jung specifically investigates self-translation of "academic texts", which she defines as "non-literary texts, expository writing" (35). In justifying her decision, she writes:

> One could [...] claim that "Auto-translation is often discussed in literary studies, but ignored in scholarly publications." To my knowledge, self-translation in academic publishing has not yet been written about, therefore, most statements about self-translation [...] aimed at literary self-translation may in fact not be applicable to a different genre. (34)

Jung made this statement in 2002, and it seems as accurate today. Thus, Jung identifies a trend that is apparent in the corpus consulted for this chapter of the thesis: research on self-translation is noticeably unbalanced insofar as scholars have privileged literary texts,

leaving self-translation of other text types virtually invisible. Further evidence of this relative invisibility can be found outside of this five-book corpus. For example, based on the MLA search referenced in the introduction of this thesis, more than 80 of the more than 90 texts referencing self-translators[16] point to conventional literary writers (see Appendix A). Furthermore, some texts that purport to represent non-literary self-translation devote relatively little attention to it. Consider Santoyo's ten-page article "Autotraducciones: Una perspectiva histórica", which features the following excerpt:

> Por lo que respecta a autotraducciones no literarias, valga poner tres brevísimos ejemplos, de entre decenas de ellos que aquí podrían aducirse: los *Elementa Medicinae*, traducidos del latín al inglés por el médico escocés John Brown en el siglo XVIII; *La clef de la science* (1858), de Ebenezer Cobham Brewer, traducida del inglés al francés por su autor ("traduit par l'auteur"); *La sociologie criminelle*, de Enrico Ferri, "traduction de l'auteur sur la troisième édition italienne". (Santoyo 863)
>
> [As for non-literary self-translations, it is worth mentioning three very brief examples, among dozens that could be given here: *Elementa Medicinae*, translated from Latin into English by Scottish medical doctor John Brown in the 18th century; *La clef de la science* (1858), by Ebenezer Cobham Brewer, translated from English into French by the author ("traduit par l'auteur"); *La sociologie criminelle*, by Enrico Ferri, "traduction de l'auteur sur la troisième édition italienne".]

Santoyo expressly intends with this article to provide a long list of instances of self-translation; yet, despite acknowledging that there are scores ("decenas") of examples of non-literary self-translation, he spends only one short paragraph on it and provides only three examples.

Jung's reasons for focusing on academic texts point to the problematic implications of the disproportion of textual representation in self-translation research—namely, that this disproportion erroneously suggests that observations made about literary self-translation necessarily apply to all other kinds of textual self-translation. Meanwhile, the fact that only one book in the corpus represents non-literary self-translation means that numerous other types of self-translated texts—such as legal, governmental, journalistic, commercial—are neglected altogether. Notably also, Jung's corpus, which consists of "non-fictional" texts that "deal with social sciences rather than with natural

---

[16] More than 80 of the 126 texts feature in their title the name of a self-translator; another 10 of the 126 refer to self-translators by mentioning the titles of their works (e.g. journal article entitled "Autour des Limbes," referring to Nancy Huston's same-named book).

sciences," can of course merely scratch the surface of research on self-translation of academic texts (35). Put otherwise: in terms of the phenomenon of self-translation, these other, non-literary text types remain invisible. Yet, if only through anecdotal reports, it is clear that self-translation of these kinds exists. Furthermore, it may even be fair to presume that, relative to literary self-translation, self-translation of those other text types occurs more frequently.

To what extent does the invisibility of non-literary texts in self-translation research reflect a similar phenomenon in general Translation Studies? In her entry on "Commercial translation" in the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2009) (subsection "Studies of commercial translation"), Maeve Olohan writes:

> Given the difficulty of classifying this translation activity [commercial translation] and the wide range of text types it encompasses, it is hardly surprising that translation studies as an academic discipline has paid commercial translation relatively little attention. However, it can be argued that it is neglected due to the high esteem in which literary texts are held, compared with genres considered culturally less prestigious and therefore perceived as less worthy of study. (41)

As in standard translation, the imbalance in self-translation research vis-à-vis text type may also be partly due to the prestige that literature is granted. Therefore, perhaps this imbalance is also indicative of the type of information that is documented and available to be consulted for further research.

1.2 How has self-translation been defined?

Throughout the corpus, self-translation seems to be defined according to three predominant themes: bilingualism, textuality and language. All three will be elaborated in the following pages, with the last two considered in tandem.

1.2.1 Visibility: Bilingualism

The concept of bilingualism is featured prominently in the corpus; consequently, self-translation is significantly defined as a bilingual phenomenon. This prominence is most obvious in that the concept appears in the title of each text: four of them feature the word "bilingual" or "bilingualisme", and a fifth (Jung's) nonetheless points to bilingualism by highlighting two languages (English and German). Similar observations can be made about the divisions within the books: e.g., Fitch's book includes chapters such as "The

Birth of the *Bilingual* Work," "The *Bilingual* Text" and "The *Bilingual* Work"; the introduction to Beaujour's text is labelled "*Bilingual* Trajectories," and the first two chapters are respectively titled "The Neurolinguistic Substrate of *Bilingual* Writers" and "The Mental Geology of *Bilingual* Writing"; Jung's texts includes the subsection "*Bilingualism*" (emphasis added in all cases).

Moreover, the argumentation of the books' content reinforces this focus. Where *Beckett and Babel* and *Alien Tongues* are concerned, the main argument of the book is rooted in bilingualism, which signals the extent to which self-translation is defined by it. At the outset of *Beckett and Babel*, Fitch states that "[t]he truly significant feature that characterizes the evolution of his [Beckett's] work and that has failed to be recognized as such is the systematic elaboration, from 1951 onwards, of a *bilingual* corpus" (3-4; emphasis added). Moreover, he "maintain[s] that whatever the critical approach and procedures that are adopted for the analysis of a particular *unilingual* work, these cannot in themselves prove adequate for the analysis of Beckett's work" (12; emphasis added). Thus, in an attempt to carve out a more appropriate (according to Fitch) space for Beckett's work, Fitch uses bilingualism as the critical framework against which to oppose frameworks conceived for monolingual writing and within which to discuss and define self-translation. Not unlike Fitch, Beaujour argues that "the achievements of modern bilingual writers are rarely considered 'whole'," and that "[b]ilingual and polyglot writers must be seen in their linguistic complexity" (1). Therefore, when Beaujour discusses self-translation, she does so with the intention of defining it in relation to the particularities of bilingual writing.

Oustinoff also seems to conceive of bilingual writing as central to the definition of self-translation. This perception is evidenced by the fact that he includes a chapter on bilingual writing ("Bilinguisme d'écriture et interférence") in the introductory part of the book ("Problématique de l'auto-traduction littéraire")—that is, the section in which he establishes the foundational concepts of self-translation.[17] He frames the chapter on bilingual writing as follows: "Les analogies entre écriture et traduction sont, on le devine,

[17] This section of the book also includes two other chapters, focused specifically on self-translation: "Typologie du texte auto-traduit" and "L'auto-traduction comme espace propre".

multiples. Il faut donc au préalable examiner sans prévention en quels termes, *chez les écrivains bilingues*, se pose la question de leurs rapports" (36; emphasis added).

Meanwhile, the fundamental question guiding Hokenson and Munson's research in *The Bilingual Text* is: "Why [...] has this striking phenomenon of writers translating their work between *two languages* been so neglected?" (1; emphasis added). Claiming that "[t]he field [of translation studies] needs first of all an historically full account of *literary bilinguality* upon which theorists in linguistics and poetics may build," they propose "that current concepts of *bilingualism* and translation are still largely the legacies of German Romantic philosophy of language" (3; emphasis added). Evidently, bilingualism occupies a critical position within this investigation of self-translation; thus, the latter is defined by it.

1.2.2 Invisibility: Multilingualism, biculturalism, multiculturalism, self-translation

> True biculturality [...], and most notably the bilingual writer who personally unites in himself or herself all of 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. (Hokenson/Munson 155)

As alluded to in this excerpt, the consistent emphasis on bilingualism—in which language is privileged over culture and two is privileged over multiple—overshadows multilingualism, biculturalism and multiculturalism. Furthermore, it overshadows the ways in which these concepts pertain to and define self-translation. It is important to note, however, that these first three concepts are not altogether ignored in the books. For example, quoting Nabokov in a 1964 interview with *Playboy* magazine, Beaujour recognizes the relevance of Nabokov's cultural background and the multiplicity that characterizes his linguistic experiences: "I am an American writer, born in Russia and educated in English where I studied French literature, before spending 15 years in Germany. I came to America in 1940 and decided to become an American citizen and to make America my home" (qtd in Beaujour 82). Examples can also be found in *The Bilingual Text*, in which Hokenson and Munson identify the medieval and Renaissance periods as "peaks of both literary bilingualism and bi*culturalism*" and as a time when "bi-

or *multi-lingualism* was not the cultural exception but rather the norm" (19; emphasis added). The authors also write that

> [i]n 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 a commonplace *trilingualism* if we tally scholastic Latin and classical Latin along with an author's vernacular. (33; emphasis added)

However, the concepts are seemingly forgotten: although Beaujour acknowledges "polyglot writers" (see above), she goes on to subsume them under the heading of bilinguals: "bilingual writers may have more in common with bilingual writers in other languages than they do with monoglots writing in any one of the languages they use" (1). This example is representative of those in the other corpus texts, as suggested by excerpts already cited.

Relative to the other scholars in the corpus, Jung seems less preoccupied with bilingualism. She seems to recognize the role of culture more in the practice of self-translation insofar as she addresses it the most directly, in her discussion of preconditions required for self-translation. Under the subsection entitled "Biculturality/bi-intertextuality", she writes:

> While bilingualism is the most obvious necessary precondition, it is *not the only one*. As self-translators are not only speakers of two languages, but authors in two languages, this also means that they *must have a cultural status* in both language communities. (18; emphasis added)

Accordingly, where self-translation within the academic world is concerned, Jung qualifies the importance of bilingualism: "bilingualism must be accompanied by an academic background in both cultures in order for an author to be understood in both circles" (18).

Finally, bilingualism overshadows self-translation itself. In each of the book titles, with the exception of Jung's, bilingualism is in a prominent position relative to self-translation. Despite the central role self-translation plays in *Beckett and Babel* (especially) and *Alien Tongues*, the concept appears nowhere in the titles. Meanwhile, the titles of Oustinoff's and Hokenson and Munson's books—that is, two books devoted specifically to self-translation—feature bilingualism ahead of self-translation. In *The Bilingual Text*, self-translation is even relegated to subtitle status.

1.2.3 Visibility: Textuality and language

As implied in the previous sub-sections, self-translation is defined in this corpus as an interlingual[18], intertextual phenomenon. Accordingly, the definitions in each book generally correspond to Grutman's definition in the most recent version of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, which was identified in the introduction of this thesis but is worth reiterating: "The term 'self-translation' can refer both to the act of translating one's own writings into another language and the result of such an undertaking" (2009b: 257). While no formal definitions of self-translation appear in our corpus, the term is nonetheless defined clearly in most[19] of the books.

1.2.3.1 Beckett and Babel

By focusing on Beckett, whose works have almost all been self-translated,[20] Fitch inevitably identifies self-translation as a defining (versus subsidiary) trait of a self-translator's œuvre. Thus, just as "it is surely its bilingual character that, first and foremost, distinguishes [Beckett's] work from that of so many other writers," *self-translation* also does so, if not simultaneously (Fitch 11).

An important aspect of the way Fitch's definition pertains to status: he argues that "the status of the text [self-translation] gives rise to enjoys its own particular properties" (78). He claims that this special status is linked to the "covert"[21] nature of self-

---

[18] According to Jakobson's terminology (139).

[19] See discussion of how self-translation is defined in *The Bilingual Text* (1.2.3.5).

[20] Beckett's "practice of always following up the publication of his original works with second versions in the other language was subsequently to be maintained right up to the present" (Fitch 5-6). Fitch notes that, at the time his book was published (when Beckett (d. December 22, 1988) was still alive), "none of the works published in the thirties, with the sole exception of *Murphy*, nor the important text of the *Three Dialogues* (1949), ha[d] been translated into French" (Fitch 17).

[21] According to Juliane House, "A covert translation is a translation which enjoys or enjoyed the status of an original ST [source text] in the target culture. The translation is covert because it is *not* marked pragmatically as a TT [target text] or an ST but may, conceivably, have been created in its own right. A covert translation is thus a translation whose ST is not specifically addressed to a target culture audience, i.e., not particularly tied to the source language community or culture. An ST and its covert TT are pragmatically of equal concern for source and target language addressees. Both are, as it were, equally directly addressed. An ST and its covert TT have equivalent purposes: they are based on contemporary, equivalent needs of a comparable audience in the source and target language communities. In the case of covert TTs, it is thus both possible and desirable to keep the function of ST equivalent in TT" (House 194-5).

translation—"a translation that would not be recognized as such (by its readers, that is)"—, by which the self-translation is assumed to be an "original" (31).[22] However, he refers to the latter perception as a "misconception" that stems only from "the fact that the second versions of [Beckett's] works also come from the pen of the author of the first versions" (12). Thus, Fitch argues that a self-translation is *not* an "original"; rather, it is a metatext (19).[23]

Fitch also defines self-translation as decidedly different than standard translation. It "is a very particular phenomenon," he states (78). In examining several of Beckett's text pairs, Fitch notes that one of the self-translation processes Beckett undertook—namely, for writing *Ping* (English self-translation of *Bing*)—involved consulting not only the apparent "source text" but also various manuscript versions, to which a standard translator would not have had access.[24] Accordingly, Fitch comments on the abnormal nature of self-translation: "Once it becomes clear that the source-text was not the definitive text of the original, then it is equally clear that we are not dealing with a translation in the normal sense of the term" (94). This distinction is further emphasized when Fitch defines self-translation as a new entity and as a creative process. Where the latter is concerned, he notes the freedom the self-translator exercises: "however relative it may be, [it] is real enough" (77). Moreover, he addresses the different levels of creativity allowed the standard translator and the self-translator:

> The creativity [Beckett] revealed in producing the original text continues quite naturally to be attributed to him, even if to a lesser degree, in his second incarnation as the author of the text in the second language ('second' in the chronological sense, that is)—just as naturally as the same creativity will be *denied* the translator. (19)

Thus, Fitch identifies self-translation as a practice in which, as compared to standard translation, the writing subject is privileged because she is more readily or "naturally" entitled to creative expression. Moreover, even if few changes in vocabulary exist in the target text, "this does not mean that the English [target] text is not a new text" (Fitch 76).

---

[22] "The francophone critics have tended, almost in their entirety, to treat all [Beckett's] texts as original French-language works, and most of their anglophone counterparts to treat all his texts as original works in English, making no allowance whatsoever for the foreign-language ancestry of certain of their number in each case" (Fitch 124).

[23] Fitch draws on H. Van Gorp's reference to and understanding of the term (Fitch 14).

[24] See his discussion of *Bing/Ping* in Chapter 5 of *Beckett and Babel.*

The way in which this newness is manifested depends on the text in question: Fitch seems to define the self-translation as a "recasting" and/or a further evolution of the "original" text and, in either case, as a completion of the latter (77). He arrives at this first category of transformation by analyzing how *Ping* was created:

> It is not a question of *redoing* (in the sense of repeating) but of *recasting*, the recasting or **reordering of pre-existing textual matter to form a new text** which happens to be in another language. Or, if one prefers, this process of recasting of textual matter is accompanied by the parallel passage between languages constituting the translation process proper but **without the former's being in any wise reducible to the latter**. (77; boldface added)

(In this context, "pre-existing textual matter" refers to the *Bing* manuscripts.) Fitch clearly identifies the self-translation as a new text, insofar as he attributes to each of the two pieces of writing a certain level of autonomy. Through his investigation of *Immobile* (French self-translation of *Still*), Fitch identifies the second definitional category of transformation—that of a further evolution:

> The creation of this new text is [...] a question [...], above all, of following the trajectory marked out by the original creative process and *carrying it further*, and, where there is recourse to an earlier draft of the original, of going back to an alternative development of the latter which had been discarded and pursuing it in the second language. (93; emphasis added)

Evidently, Fitch defines self-translation as a next step in Beckett's creative process. Moreover, he claims that, since the published "original" text "serve[s] as the point of departure" for the eventual self-translation, the latter simultaneously affects the "original" in two ways: it renders the latter "retroactively incomplete", and it completes it (67, 131). Notably, these categories of transformation corroborate Fitch's claim that a self-translation is not an "original"; rather, it seems to be a *completion* of another text.

He concludes that, in self-translation, there is in fact no real "original" text—that the would-be original and the would-be translation are actually versions of a third entity, and that self-translation in particular is defined as one of two texts that are "variants of something that enjoys no tangible textual existence but whose existence is none the less implicit in their[25] very co-existence" (135). Based on this premise, Fitch argues two further points: 1) both versions of the self-translation process have, as mentioned above,

---

[25] Where "they" refers to the would-be original and the would-be translation.

equal status; 2) "self-translation consists of two texts belonging to a single work" (133, 138).

A final component in his definition of self-translation is the notably unpleasant experience of the process. Fitch remarks, referring to self-translation, that "there is no doubt about Beckett's lack of enthusiasm for the job in hand" (9), which is perhaps best summed up by the following excerpt:

> As he [Beckett] said in a letter of 30 July[26] 1957 to Thomas McGreevy [*sic*][27]:
>
> "Sick and tired I am of translation and what a *losing battle* it is always. Wish I had the courage to wash my hands of it all."
>
> And in April 1957 he wrote to Alan Schneider concerning *Endgame*:
>
> "I have not even begun the translation. I have until August to finish it and keep putting off the *dreaded* day...I have nothing but *wastes and wilds of self-translation* before me for many miserable months to come." (9; emphasis added)

1.2.3.2 Alien Tongues

Beaujour's conception of self-translation in *Alien Tongues* seems to comprise four key facets. The excerpt below highlights the first of these, while introducing a second and alluding to a third:

> Self-translation is the *true test* of whether a bilingual writer[28] can ever *totally coincide with himself.* It is a crucial moment, a *rite of passage endured* by almost all writers who ultimately work in a language other than the one in which they have first defined themselves as writers. Self-translation is the *pivotal point* in a trajectory shared by most bilingual writers. (51; emphasis added)

Thus, Beaujour sees self-translation predominantly as a critical component in the evolution of bilingual writing. Secondly, she points to what is ultimately the paradoxical nature of self-translation insofar as it can either alienate the self-translator from herself—for Elsa Triolet, for example, self-translation "jeopardized the intimate conversation with herself that she prized above all in her writing" (69)—or act as a means of reconciling both linguistic sides of the bilingual writer's identity:

---

[26] According to James Knowlson, this letter was dated January (703, note 104).
[27] Should be *Mac*Greevy, referring to the modernist Irish poet (Knowlson).
[28] In the context of *Alien Tongues* as well as this thesis, "bilingual writer" refers not to a bilingual individual who writes (potentially only in one language) but rather to someone who *writes* bilingually—that is, in more than one language: "What characterizes them [bilingual writers] is that they have committed themselves to working extensively, though not necessarily exclusively, in a language other than the one in which they first defined themselves as artists" (Beaujour 5).

> In the twilight of their careers, most bilingual writers are no longer content to have functioned separately in two different languages. They are in search of **unity**, and in their efforts to fully realize their *bi-destin*, or "double destiny," they **want their collected works to exist in both languages**. (111; boldface added)

The third facet of Beaujour's definition of self-translation, which is only suggested in the summary above (cf. "endured"), and which has been identified in the previous subsection on Fitch's book, is the negative light in which self-translators perceive self-translation, although Beaujour does acknowledge that "later in their careers bilingual writers frequently return to self-translation and may even become addicted to it" (51). By providing several accounts of the self-translation experiences of various bilingual writers, particularly Triolet and Vladimir Nabokov, Beaujour points to the gruelling nature of the practice:

> For Nabokov, as for most potentially bilingual writers, the early experience of self-translation is *so painful and distasteful* that writing directly in one's current second language [...] or even in an ambient third language [...], is clearly preferable to the continued prospect of such *self-inflicted torture*. (89-90; emphasis added)

Accordingly, and as is stressed numerous times throughout Beaujour's book,[29] self-translation is a deeply upsetting and difficult experience: "Nabokov complained that putting his novel into English was 'a terrible thing, sorting through one's own innards, and then trying them on for size like a pair of gloves'"; Beckett had "declared that he hates self-translation"; and Triolet wrote, "Pour les bilingues, *se* traduire devrait être facile? Non pas! On se regarde comme dans une glace, on s'y cherche, ne reconnaît pas son reflet" (90, 174, 62). The challenge seems to stem largely from the fact that self-translation "constitut[es] a rejection of the writer's earlier certainty that something could or should be written in only one language or the other" (Beaujour 54).

The fourth key facet of Beaujour's definition echoes one of Fitch's points regarding the role of the self-translated text within the self-translator's œuvre. She defines self-translation as something that "makes a text retrospectively incomplete," where, furthermore, "both versions become avatars of a hypothetical total text" (112).

---

[29] Consider also the following excerpt: "Only when (and if) they have negotiated *the hell of self-translation* can bilingual writers proceed through the *purgatory* of the first years of writing in a second language and fully realize their bilingual potential" (37; emphasis added).

1.2.3.3 Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction

At the outset of his book, Oustinoff identifies self-translation as "difficilement définissable" (7). Therefore, it is little surprise that he defines it as intrinsically paradoxical, though in a very different way than Beaujour:

> [N]on seulement elle [l'auto-traduction] réunit les deux termes actuellement jugés antinomiques que sont les pôles de l'écriture et de la traduction mais elle est encore paradoxale au sens étymologique du terme, en ce sens qu'elle est susceptible de transgresser la *doxa*[30] traductive existante. (23)

While Beaujour observes a paradox relative to the identity of the self-translator, Oustinoff perceives one relative to the genres of translation versus "original" writing. Accordingly, and similarly to Fitch, Oustinoff claims that self-translation cannot simply be boiled down to a work of "original" writing: "il ne faudrait pas la réduire à l'écriture seule (en la rangeant dans le champ de la recréation) comme on a tendance à le faire trop souvent" (57). Rather, "[e]lle est éminemment *à la fois* traduction et écriture" (57). Hence Oustinoff's habitual use of the term "traduction auctoriale"[31] as a synonym for self-translation—one that represents the translative and authorial elements of the concept equally.

As suggested by the stated "transgressive" nature of self-translation, Oustinoff also defines self-translation as unique relative to both "original" writing and standard translation: the self-translated text is "un espace particulier" and is "soumise à des contraintes particulières" (77, 86). For him, this "particular"-ness stems largely from the self-translator's privileged status, which is accessed through that of the author who writes both the "original" text and the (self-)translation. Thus, self-translation "est un domaine obéissant à un logique propre qui tient à son auctorialité et qui est aussi [un] lieu privilégié" (Oustinoff 57). Thanks to this status, Oustinoff argues, self-translation wipes out the hierarchy that has been established between the "original" text and the translation:

---

[30] Like scholars before him (Barthes, Bourdieu), Oustinoff uses the term "doxa" to refer to the dominant norms imposed upon any discourse: "Il n'y a pas d'adjectif, semble-t-il, qui renvoie à cet ensemble de prescriptions : on parlera dorénavant de traduction *doxale* afin de caractériser toute traduction qui se conforme à une visée traductive donnée, sans *préjuger* de la valeur de celle-ci, le terme étant à prendre dans une acception descriptive, et non normative" (23).

[31] Term borrowed from Gérard Genette in *L'œuvre de l'art. Immanence et trancendance* (qtd in Oustinoff 26)

> [D]ans le cas de l'auto-traduction une telle distinction [entre la « défectivité » et la « secondarité » de la traduction] est nulle et non avenue : traduire l'original comme l'auteur l'aurait exprimé s'il avait écrit directement dans la langue traduisante, ce n'est plus, par définition, une asymptote. C'est une *donnée initiale*. (19)

Later, he specifies that a self-translated œuvre does not simply feature different versions, which is equally true of "traductions allographes"[32]; rather it is "une œuvre à versions *auctoriales*. L'une ne pouvant avoir de préséance sur l'autre" (94). In light of the self-translator's status, Oustinoff also argues that self-translation is inherently defined by "décentrement", a concept he borrows from Henri Meschonnic and amends as follows[33]: "est décentrée toute (auto-)traduction qui s'écarte des normes d'une doxa traduisante donnée indépendamment de tout jugement de valeur" (Oustinoff 32). For Oustinoff, self-translation is defined by this concept, without necessarily reflecting it at all times:

> *Le décentrement est inscrit au cœur de la traduction auctoriale par nature*. Non qu'elle le soit nécessairement au regard d'une doxa traduisante [...]. Le texte auto-traduit prend souvent un aspect semblable en tous points à une traduction allographe—à l'auctorialité près. Le point essentiel est cependant ailleurs dans le fait *qu'à tout moment l'écrivain peut s'écarter de ce que l'on est en mesure d'attendre d'une traduction allographe particulière*. (77; emphasis added)

He specifies that *décentrement* is defined in relation not only to language but also to the other works within the self-translator's œuvre. According to this definition, self-translation is "plural" and "transdoxal" in nature: "L'auteur ayant tous les droits, l'auto-traduction est par nature plurielle—elle est libre de se conformer à telle ou telle doxa, voire à plusieurs—en ce sens elle est fondamentalement *transdoxale*" (Oustinoff 23). In other words, the self-translator is bound by no translative norms except those she imposes upon herself and her work.

The latter point also signals the freedom that characterizes the self-translation process: "Un auteur peut naturellement prendre toutes les libertés en se traduisant lui-même, quitte à introduire des modifications majeures au texte original" (Oustinoff 33). However, Oustinoff is careful to qualify this freedom. For one, he argues that it is not infinite:

---

[32] Referring to standard translation, the term "traduction allographe" is also borrowed from Genette (qtd in Oustinoff 26).

[33] See 1.3.2. "L'auto-traduction décentrée" (Oustinoff 31-33).

> *Liberté ne veut cependant pas dire, ici non plus, licence. La traduction autoriale est soumise à des contraintes particulières*, éventuellement plus fortes que dans le cas où le traducteur n'est pas l'auteur. Ce sont en effet en dernière analyse des contraintes opérales, l'auto-traduction ne faisant pas seulement texte, mais également œuvre. *Une traduction auctoriale surimpose pour ainsi dire à l'acte traductif la propriété coextensive à l'auctorialité qu'est l'achèvement de l'œuvre.* (86; emphasis added)

Indeed, the "major modifications" referenced above can lead to making the self-translated text "une véritable recréation," a revision of the "original" (Oustinoff 24). Oustinoff defines such self-translations in a way that is reminiscent of Fitch's "continuation" (see 1.2.3.1)—that is, as an extension of the œuvre, a reactivation of its potential[34]:

> [L]'œuvre se modifie de telle sorte qu'on ne [*sic*] plus dire qu'elle réside entièrement dans l'original. *Elle se prolonge alors dans le texte auto-traduit*, à moins qu'elle ne s'abrège lorsque l'auteur juge utile d'introduire des coupures par rapport à l'œuvre originelle. En partant de ces prémisses, *on ne peut que conclure que l'œuvre définitive se trouve à la fois dans l'original et dans la traduction.* (244; emphasis added)

Oustinoff also qualifies the freedom of self-translation by insisting that the freedom apparent in self-translations representing revisions does not detract from the translative nature of self-translation: "Que l'on considère l'auto-traduction à l'aune de la révision ne revient pas nécessairement à sortir du domaine de la traduction" (201). At the same time, and like Fitch, Oustinoff defines self-translation as distinct from standard translation and draws attention to the problematic fact that self-translation is largely evaluated according to standard translation criteria and terms:

> Force est de constater que **la « critique externe » des textes auto-traduits s'appuie dans l'immense majorité des cas sur une conception doxale récurrente qui trouve son expression dans ce que l'on pourrait appeler la problématique naturalisante des « gains et des pertes »** telle qu'elle a été formulée par J.P. Vinay et J. Darbelnet. [...] Outre que la notion de « perte » ou de « gains » n'est pas une question qui va de soi, **on peut douter de la pertinence de son application telle quelle à l'étude des textes auto-traduits**, car elle *présuppose* établie la recherche de l'équivalence entre original et traduction comme seule norme. (128-129; boldface added)

---

[34] Oustinoff stresses his argument regarding how self-translation "prolongs" the œuvre, when he discusses Beckett's first self-translation (*Murphy*, which was self-translated from English into French in 1939, though not published until 1947), which was motivated by the fact that he could not find a publisher for his English writings, including *Murphy*: "On voit donc toute l'importance que revêt cette première tentative d'auto-traduction : sans elle, l'œuvre originale risque de rester au fond d'un tiroir. La traduction ne se contente pas de prolonger l'œuvre, *elle en est la condition d'existence*" (Oustinoff 71; emphasis added).

1.2.3.4 English-German Self-Translation

In the introductory pages of her book, Jung discusses the "phenomenon of self-translation" and frequently refers to and concurs with observations made by Grutman in the *Encyclopedia* entry, demonstrating that she defines self-translation along very similar lines, although focusing her attention on academic texts, as discussed above.[35] Otherwise, Jung defines self-translation most predominantly as distinct from standard translation. She claims that, while self-translation is commonly associated with the notion of "freedom", the latter remains ambiguous. Thus, with a view to shedding light on this matter, she studies translations made by two groups of translators—namely, self-translators and standard translators—wherein the "original" text is the same. Accordingly, the two-part question guiding her investigation is: "What did the author want to preserve, which level of language or content is seen as important in the self-translation?" (13). Ultimately, after comparing the choices made by each group of translators, Jung defines self-translation as a "necessarily different approach" than standard translation, most notably observing that "[t]he self-translators clearly favour explicitness over vagueness or ambiguity of reference" (278, 277).

Jung points out that self-translation and standard translation are similar insofar as both writing subjects are readers of the text-to-be-translated: "the self-translator has to read his own text again just as any [standard] translator would" (28). However, she then notes the key difference characterizing those reading (and therefore also translation) processes:

> self-translators have access to some intertext material that ordinary translators cannot access, either written sources, texts they had read and which have influenced their thought, or language use and memories of the writing process or of the inner process before the writing process. (28)

---

[35] Given that Jung's book (2002) was published before the second edition of the *Encyclopedia* (2009), Jung's references to Grutman's observations are necessarily taken from the first-edition entry (1998). Although the two entries differ in certain ways, the definitions themselves are virtually identical. The first-edition definition reads: "The terms auto-translation and self-translation refer to the act of translating one's writings or the result of such an undertaking" (1998: 17). (Compare with definition on page 17 of this document.)

By contrast, the standard translator "cannot access the original, or even the memory of the original intention, let alone have access to the pre-verbal message" (Jung 268). This echoes Fitch's observations about Beckett's privileged access to his manuscripts.

At the same time, Jung recognizes that the self-translator is not all-knowing: "[T]hose self-translators who have self-translated their works after several years, [...], do have to read it again and may not even completely understand their own motivation for choosing certain passages, certain examples or a certain style" (29). Moreover, she is careful to qualify this statement, with regards to how one might access intention, which seems potentially elusive, particularly after some time has passed: "I would at least postulate that [self-translators] can access the memory of an intention [...]. The process of accessing the intention must rather be seen as the interpretation of the first intention" (30).

Jung further defines self-translation by identifying four sets of self-translation "types" (22). The first of these pertains to the direction of translation. Adducing various self-translators, she points out that, like the prescribed trend in standard translation, "[m]ost self-translators prefer writing in their second language and then translating their own work back into their mother tongue" (23). However, she then explains that this is not always the case: certain self-translators who have "near-native" appreciation of their second language will, typically for practical reasons, self-translate into the latter (23). Meanwhile, as Jung explains, identifying which language constitutes the self-translator's "mother tongue" is in itself dubious, since "some authors are unclear in their bilingual status as to which language is their first and which their second language" (24). Furthermore, the "firstness" of a language can vary depending on the criteria used to determine it: for example, "if someone has read and studied linguistics exclusively in English, although German may be the mother tongue, the first language for this academic field is English" (24). Nabokov, for one, felt that, during his youth, despite growing up in Russia, he spoke English better than Russian (Jung 24, citing Beaujour).

Similar to Oustinoff, Jung also recognizes that self-translations may be either "aided" (or "co-authored") or "unaided" (or "single-authored") (24). She insists that aided (i.e. collaborative) self-translations "qualify" as self-translations, since "a text

edited by someone else still retains the style and tone of the original author," and this text "may be closer to the self-translator's intention than an unaided version" (24, 25).

Thirdly, Jung defines self-translation with respect to a continuum that spans between "homoskopic" and "heteroskopic" approaches to translating.[36] Though the definitions of these terms are not specified in the text, the former ostensibly refers to a situation in which the "original" and self-translation have the same or a very similar intention, whereas, in the case of the latter, the intentions would differ. Jung prefers these terms because, contrary to "faithful" and "free", they reflect the respective skopos of the "original" and translated texts (25, 26). Thus, she defines self-translation—and academic self-translation, specifically—as a decidedly "reception-oriented" practice (26). In doing so, she distinguishes her definition of self-translation from that of other scholars in our corpus: she seems to agree that self-translation tends to involve significant would-be freedom given her observation that "[m]ost of the academic self-translations studied here are heteroskopic as to the readership addressed"; however, as per the discussion above, she defines would-be faithfulness (i.e. homoskopic) and would-be freedom (i.e. heteroskopic) according to different—i.e., skopic—terms (26). Compared to the standard translations she studied, Jung notes, "all self-translators necessarily emphasise the production side of translation, whereas most other translation approaches focus either on the original or on the reader" (272).

The fourth set of self-translation types pertains to temporality: namely, self-translations may be "simultaneous" or "delayed" (26-29). "Delayed", or "consecutive", self-translations are "prepared only after completion or even publication of the original" (Grutman 2009b: 259).[37] She claims that "simultaneous self-translation"—another term borrowed from Grutman, which refers to situations in which the translation is "produced even while the first version is still in progress" (2009b: 259)—is a very infrequent

---

[36] Though the notions of "faithful" and "free" are common to Translation Studies, Jung specifically borrows them from Beaujour. Meanwhile, she developed the terms "homoskopic" and "heteroskopic" from Reiss and Vermeer's discussion of skopos (Jung 25, 26).

[37] Though she does not indicate as much, Jung borrows the term "delayed self-translation" from Grutman's encyclopedia entry. In the second edition of the entry (published several years after the appearance of Jung's book), Grutman reformulates the term referring to this concept: "consecutive self-translation" (2009b: 257). Except for in the context of Jung's research, I will refer to this concept using the latter term.

occurrence in the academic arena, explaining that academic self-translators may prefer to create distance between their writing in each language and, otherwise, generally self-translate only when there is demand for a translated text, versus doing so "for its own sake" (26). However, in citing Stefan Heym, who claims that "English syntax and English wording are 'at the back of his mind' whenever he writes as a journalist directly in German," Jung makes room for the possibility that such an "interior" self-translation may represent "simultaneous origins" of self-translations otherwise deemed to be "delayed", or "consecutive" (27).

Finally, Jung insists that, "although self-translation has often been unquestioningly viewed as a second original, it cannot merely be seen as such, since a very close reading of the text originally composed clearly precedes the composition of the new text" (30). Evidently, as do Fitch and Oustinoff, Jung defines self-translation as an offspring of another text.

1.2.3.5 The Bilingual Text

As demonstrated in the investigations of the four previous books, the reader need not rely on formal definitions of self-translation to understand the term, since she can grasp the meaning by gathering definitional components found in each book. However, in the case of *The Bilingual Text*, the absence of a formal definition is particularly shocking given that there is an index listing for "Self-translation, *definition of*, 12-14" (234; emphasis added). Although, on these pages, Hokenson and Munson formally define a series of other key terms pertaining to their investigation (e.g., "self-translator", "maternal language", "bilingual writers", "literary"), there is no definition, here or elsewhere in the book, for self-translation.

Given the way in which the authors define "self-translator"—"the bilingual writer who authors texts in one language and then translates them into the other"—, one would be inclined to understand self-translation according to Grutman's definition: as the self-translator's process and the result of her activity (12). However, discussion of the concept throughout the book suggests that a distinction needs to be made with regards to the meaning of "result". Namely, for Grutman and the authors of the other corpus books,

"result" refers to the "second"[38] text of the self-translation process—for example, Carlo Goldoni's *Il Burbero di buon cuore* is considered the self-translation of *Le Bourru bienfaisant*; yet, as will be discussed, Hokenson and Munson seemingly understand "result" as incorporating both *Le Bourru* and *Il Burbero*, for example. However, even once this distinction is made, the definition used in—yet absent from—*The Bilingual Text* proves contradictory and therefore problematic. In order to understand this complication, let us consider the following three sets of references to self-translation, which have been pulled from the book's introduction:

> [A] 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.[...] 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? (1; emphasis added)

> [B] 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. (2; emphasis added)

In both cases, self-translation seems to be defined as a process, and consequently, Hokenson and Munson's "descriptive and analytical study" of self-translation is categorized as process-oriented descriptive translation studies, according to Holmes's classification system (Hokenson/Munson 3; Holmes 185). Meanwhile, other references, such as those in the following excerpts, suggest that self-translation is a product, however concrete or abstract:

> [C] But any two poems on his [Etienne Dolet's] son, not necessarily self-translations, could achieve that effect, that is, merely give us more information to compare. (11)

> [D] 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... (15)

---

[38] Quotation marks are used to account for the uncertain chronology of text creation in *simultaneous* self-translation.

Still, in others, the term seems to refer to a phenomenon:

> [E] Conversely, many scholars in postcolonial studies today are bringing bilinguality into focus as a cultural issue [...] 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. (2; emphasis added)
>
> [F] 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. (5)

Excerpt B, in particular, points to the basic premises of how Hokenson and Munson define self-translation: namely, its intertextual and interlingual nature and the fact that one individual writes both texts. Furthermore, the three referents of self-translation—that is, process, product and phenomenon—that are illustrated by the six excerpts above and represented throughout the book, are perfectly compatible with one another, just as they are in other definitions we have considered (e.g. the co-existence of "act" and "product" in Grutman's definition).

The complication relative to how self-translation is defined lies in the way in which Hokenson and Munson describe the other foundational term of the book, namely "bilingual text".[39] The latter is identified first as "a self-translation, authored by a writer who can compose in different languages and who translates his or her texts from one

---

[39] Although they acknowledge that Fitch "made one of the few attempts to invent a theoretical model" for the bilingual text, and make various comments regarding how their attitudes about the concept of the term differ from his, Hokenson and Munson do not credit Fitch as a pioneer, if not the originator, of this term with respect to self-translation (10). This is particularly surprising given that, first of all, the term is the focus of Chapter 11 of his *Beckett and Babel*, and that the definitions used in each book fundamentally correspond. Compare Hokenson and Munson's definition (discussed in this subsection of the thesis) with Fitch's. Fitch defines the bilingual text as the concrete and/or abstract result "of bringing the two versions (that is, both texts) of a given work together. [...] Whether or not any real merging or fusion of the two versions is feasible so that the two texts somehow become one [...] is, to say the least of it, a moot point [...] what is at stake here is nothing less than the very possibility of the existence of a *bilingual text*, with equal weight being given to both terms: in other words, the question to be asked is [...] whether the resulting bilingual 'texture' can function as a *text* in the full sense of the term" (194). Hokenson and Munson ultimately argue that, while Fitch assumes that the bilingual text and the self-translator are inevitably haunted by undesired dissimilarities between the languages of the two texts, they believe the opposite is true: that these dissimilarities are not unwanted but rather "open up" the space between the two texts, which thrives on such difference (11).

language into another" (1). Subsequently, in the section devoted to defining terminology, "**the bilingual text** refers to the self-translated text, existing in two languages and usually in two physical versions, with overlapping content" (14). Notably, these definitions rely on the notion of self-translation—the very concept for which no formal definition is articulated in the book. The importance of defining self-translation therefore proves all the more critical.

Setting aside for the moment the references to "self-translation" and "self-translated text" in the two definitions above, the reader can appreciate that the bilingual text refers to a product (or result, as it were), since it is "composed" by someone and exists in "two physical versions". However, when the reader then takes into account the reference to self-translation, the other possible interpretations of this term—that is, those of process and phenomenon—creep in, leaving her to wonder: What is the "bilingual text"? Indeed, it seems to denote the entity consisting of both the "original" and the "translation"—"the dual text"; hence the need identified earlier to distinguish between differing understandings of "result", given the synonymous (or quasi synonymous) relationship established between "self-translation" and "bilingual text" (1). However, confusion with respect to the definition of self-translation remains since, if "bilingual text" incorporates both texts, then why continue to use "self-translation"—meaning product/result, as in excerpts C and D—to refer to the same idea?

Despite this confusion, we can understand other aspects of how the concept is defined in this book. For one, excerpt A points to the frequency of the practice of self-translation (however it is defined), the length of its history, and the scarcity with which it is studied. Also, Hokenson and Munson explain that, when producing the "second" text, self-translators can make significant departures from the "original". For example, when discussing Rémy Belleau's Latin poem "AD APES," as compared to the French version from which it was self-translated, they claim that the Renaissance self-translator "works a more complicated relationship between bees and poet, and poet and woman, where definitions of art and knowledge play an overt role" (75). Similarly, they note that modernist self-translators "Ungaretti, Green, Nabokov [and Beckett] have repeatedly made such radical and startling changes in translation that they defeat any effort to explain them linguistically" (198). Thus, in terms of the choices the writing subject

makes when translating a text, self-translation constitutes a process that allows her much potential freedom. With respect to the modern self-translator, Hokenson and Munson also define self-translation as a practice guided and characterized by the writer's "unique style or literary idiolect" such that a given self-translator's writings can be distinguished from another's, regardless of the language in which that self-translator has written (198).

As suggested in excerpt B ("escapes the categories of text theory"), these scholars also define self-translation as variously distinct from standard translation.[40] On the one hand, they observe that self-translators usually approach the translation process differently depending on whether they are self-translating or translating other writers' works: "Like Nabokov, Green took stances: For others' work, he favored the literal translation [...]. But for his own texts, Green as self-translator clearly found that the literal would not do" (185). Furthermore, they identify self-translation as a space in which notions common to standard translation theory are challenged or simply moot. For instance, "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" (173). Also, Hokenson and Munson argue that, while Charles d'Orléans (1396-1465) has been accused of not creating equivalence between his "originals" and self-translations, "he is not interested in establishing equivalent versions, but rather in engaging in new types of word play and sound matching" (58). The notions of equivalence, originality and translation therefore shift relative to the way they are conceived with respect to standard translation.

In contrast to the other scholars in our corpus, Hokenson and Munson suggest that the "second" text of the self-translation process may constitute an "original". They remark that, "in these [Ungaretti's] self-translations, each is clearly an original creation by the same writer working within what [Marilyn Gaddis] Rose terms 'the affective, semantic space between' languages and texts" (173-4). They back this claim by also considering the self-translator's perception of herself: "The tradition of the bilingual text

---

[40] It is important to note that Hokenson and Munson also acknowledge opposing views, namely Helena Tanqueiro's belief that "self-translation is not a unique translative function but just an extreme case" (199). However, their central argument favours differences between standard translation and self-translation.

since antiquity suggests [...] that many bilingual authors do indeed see themselves as recreators producing a new original on the model of the old" (199).

1.2.4 Invisibility: Physical or psychological self-translation

Notably, in none of the books is the linguistic and textual nature of self-translation directly addressed, a fact that suggests not only the extent to which this definition has been internalized among self-translation scholars but also that to which other understandings of self-translation—which indeed exist—have been marginalized. Such alternative conceptions of the term largely define the latter relative to a physical, psychological or philosophical process.

Consider, for instance, "The Easter Cantata and the Idea of Mediation in Goethe's Faust" (1977), in which Robert Ellis Dye investigates Faust's views of Christ. While analyzing the evolution of these views, Dye writes:

> Upon recovering from his humiliation in the encounter with the Earth Spirit, Faust is about to attempt self-translation 'to new spheres of pure activity' (1. 705) when the intrusion of an Easter cantata upon his consciousness reminds him of the New Covenant. (963; 967)

Evidently, Dye is not referring to Faust's attempts to translate his own writing between two languages; rather, self-translation here denotes a more philosophical experience—a religious and existential transformation, as indicated later in the text: "In truth, of course, it is not a question of decorum but of existential possibility: Can there be such a thing as self-translation, as self-sufficiency?" (967) In another example—namely, that of Allistair Stead's "Self-Translation and the Arts of Transposition in Allan Hollinghurst's *The Folding Star*"—self-translation refers to the physical movement of the main character in Hollinghurst's book. Stead writes: "The concept may be understood at first as a material transporting of the self to elsewhere, a literalizing of Michael Wood's 'translation does involve travel and difference'" (367). A similar representation of self-translation as physical movement into non-"native" spaces and the related identity shift or transfer is found in Joan Ramon Resina's "The Double Coding of Desire: Language Conflict, Nation Building, and Identity Crashing in Juan Marsé's 'El amante bilingüe'". He writes:

As Paul Coates observes, self translation[41] can never be complete:

> The individual enticed away from his native sphere may find the sought-after real unattainable, or attainable only in part. A foot in each camp, heritage at odds with aspiration, he will lead a double life. His split nature will preclude real opposition to the system whose dividedness is replicated in him. (Coates, p. 32)

> Marsé's self translation is doomed to fail for the simple reason that he cannot step outside the inner division nor can he fully ignore the weaker part of the self, which he holds responsible for his failure to compensate for the lack in his own being.

In this reference, self-translation is clearly unrelated to text and language, or, at least, it is not rooted predominantly in these. Amending Grutman's definition in such a way as to accommodate such alternate definitions as those highlighted above might lead to the following formulation:

> "The term 'self-translation' can refer to either the act or result of translating one's own writings into another language and/or the act or result of translating any other aspect of one's own psychological and/or physical self into another version of the latter and/or into another concrete and/or abstract space (e.g. geography, religion, culture, language, text)."

Evidently, in terms of representation within the corpus of books consulted for this thesis, self-translation as evolution or transportation of the self is invisible, while textual self-translation is comparatively very visible. The *Encyclopedia* entry serves as further evidence of how self-translation-as-intertextual-and-interlingual-transfer has been and continues to be privileged in self-translation research. While the definition proposed above recognizes intertextual and interlingual self-translation, it also accounts for self-translation that is manifested in other physical, psychological and philosophical ways.

Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction and *English-German Self-Translation* seem to be the only books in the corpus in which another kind of self-translation—"mental" or "interior" self-translation—is addressed:

> On peut dès lors également se poser la question de savoir si cette étude ne conduit pas également à mieux comprendre une forme de traduction particulière, que Jorge de Sena, s'adressant à un public lusophone dans son introduction aux poèmes anglais de F. Pessoa, qualifie de *traduction 'mentale'*. (Oustinoff 46; emphasis added)

According to Oustinoff, Jorge de Sena specifically describes Pessoa's English poems as featuring "de nombreux traits syntaxiques et stylistiques de sa langue mentale, *effectuée*

---

[41] Notably, "self translation" is not hyphenated in this instance, which suggests that a distinction between "self-translation" and "self translation" may be required.

lui-même, de constructions courantes, ou moins courantes, que la langue anglaise possède et permet" (Oustinoff 47; emphasis added). Similarly, as discussed earlier (see 1.2.3.4), Jung refers to Heym's "interior type of self-translation" (27)[42]. That said, this understanding of self-translation is entertained only briefly (a few pages in *Bilinguisme*; a few lines in *English-German*) and as related to—that is, *not* as *un*related to—the same concept of self-translation that has been defined above (i.e. interlingual, intertextual).

1.3 Which self-translators have been studied?

Not surprisingly, one of the primary means of collecting data on self-translation and drawing conclusions about the practice is to study self-translators. The present survey of self-translation research therefore must account for those self-translators. The list below summarizes the names of those featured in each corpus book:[43]

- *Beckett and Babel*: Samuel Beckett;
- *Alien Tongues*: Elsa Triolet, Vladimir Nabokov, Marina Tsvetaeva, Boris Poplavskii, Vasily Yanovsky/Vasilii Semënovich Ianovskii, Beckett[44];
- *Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction*: Julien Green, Beckett and Nabokov, William Beckford[45], Oscar Wilde[46];

---

[42] Here, Jung references Gössmann's notion of "inner language": "Gössmann describes the writing process as a transfer of thoughts from the less structured 'inner language' of one's mind to the necessarily structured language of the written output" (27).

[43] Notably, certain other self-translators are also referenced in the corpus, examples including: Joseph Brodsky (Beaujour 158); James Joyce (Oustinoff 105); Nancy Huston (Jung 16, 17); and Robert Grosseteste (c.1168-1253), Ariel Dorfman, and Esmeralda Santiago (Hokenson/Munson 42). However, these are not discussed in significant depth—discussions typically ranging in length from the mere mention of the self-translator's name to a few sentences on the writer—and therefore are not included in this list.

[44] *Alien Tongues* features additional bilingual writers (i.e. Zinaïda Shakhovskaia/Schakovskoy, Il'ia Zdanevich/Iliazd, Vladimir Pozner, Hélène Iswolsky/Elena Alecksandrovna Izvol'skaia), but Beaujour does not identify them as self-translators.

[45] Beckford wrote the first version of the novel *Vathek* in French and, along with Samuel Henley, worked on translating the text into English. Given Beckford's participation in this collaborative translation, Oustinoff deems him a kind of partial self-translator: "Cette traduction n'est pas entièrement de la main de Henley, elle est en effet révisée par l'auteur et *à ce titre en partie auctoriale*" (Oustinoff 92; emphasis added) (See Oustinoff 90-94). According to Jung, this would qualify as aided self-translation.

[46] Wilde wrote his play *Salomé* in French and then collaborated with Lord Alfred Douglas on the translation into English (Oustinoff 105). Oustinoff refers to the latter translation as an "auto-traduction" (107).

- *German-English Self-Translation*: Rudolf Arnheim, Hannah Arendt, Stefan Heym, Peter Hutchinson, Klaus Mann, Wolfram Wilss, Monika Schmid and Magdalena Zoeppritz;
- *The Bilingual Text*: Nicolas[47] Oresme, Charles d'Orléans, Rémy Belleau, John Donne, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, Carlo Goldoni, Rabindranath Tagore, Stefan George, Giuseppe Ungaretti, Nabokov, Green, Beckett and Rosario Ferré.

My analysis will be guided by five questions, deemed to be among the most relevant and revealing:

1. With what frequency is a given self-translator researched?
2. To what time periods do these self-translators belong?
3. Into and out of which languages do these self-translators work?
4. With which nations/geographical locations are these self-translators associated?
5. How is gender represented among the self-translators researched?

Of course, this survey must also account for those self-translators who are *not* represented above; I will address this matter after considering the latter questions.

1.3.1 Visibility: Beckett & Co.

As detailed below, the answers to these five questions indicate that the self-translators represented in the research on self-translation are both literally as well as symbolically Beckettian: not only is Samuel Beckett preeminently featured in the research but various of his traits are attributable to the vast majority of the other self-translators in the corpus.

1.3.1.1 With what frequency is a given self-translator researched?

Of the 27 self-translators' names listed above, three are recurring—namely, those of Beckett, Nabokov and Green. While the remaining self-translators are discussed only once, Beckett is discussed in four of the five books, Nabokov in three, and Green in two. Moreover, the nature of the attention these individuals are paid is noteworthy. First, they are featured in, respectively, three, two and one of the book titles. Secondly, and

[47] Referred to in *The Bilingual Text* as "Nicole" (Hokenson/Munson 39-50).

particularly where Beckett and Nabokov are concerned,[48] they are discussed in substantial proportions, relative to the space granted other self-translators. Beckett is the sole focus of Fitch's book. Beaujour devotes a 15-page appendix in *Alien Tongues* to discussing Beckett's self-translation process. Although Beaujour's reasons for including him—namely, to use him as a "control"[49]—may be valid, it is nonetheless surprising that so many pages are dedicated to him in a book that is explicitly focused on *Russian* writers. As for Nabokov, although Beaujour's text deals with 10 Russian bilingual writers (6 of whom are identified as self-translators), Nabokov is discussed in 37 pages, with approximately 8 of those pages devoted specifically to the topic of self-translation. This attention is far more than that paid to most of the others listed for this book, Triolet being the only exception.[50]

1.3.1.2 To what time periods do these self-translators belong?

For the most part, the corpus features self-translators from the 20th century. This is certainly the case for Fitch's, Beaujour's, Oustinoff's and Jung's books. The only books that refer to self-translators who are *not* from the 20th century are *The Bilingual Text* and *Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction.* Beckford (1760-1844) and Wilde (1854-1900) constitute the only non-20th-century self-translators included in the latter, and Oustinoff devotes relatively few pages—approximately 18[51]—to studying them. As highlighted earlier, Hokenson and Munson point out at the outset of their book that self-translators are greater in number and, as a group, have been practicing self-translation for longer than what is commonly believed: "A roll-call of self-translators would summon up the stellar figures of many literatures and languages"; Hokenson and Munson explain, however, that "[i]n selecting specific bilingual figures for close study, [they] have aimed for representational rather than exhaustive coverage" (1, 15).

---

[48] While the title of Oustinoff's book suggests that equal attention might be paid to all three of the self-translators identified, Green certainly receives less attention than do Beckett and Nabokov.

[49] "Because it is important to see whether the patterns that emerge among these writers are exclusive to them, or whether they are independent of the purely Russian aspects of their linguistic situation, it is useful to have a 'control'. For this purpose, I provide an appendix that considers the bilingual aspects of the writings of Samuel Beckett" (Beaujour 6).

[50] There are 21 pages devoted to Triolet.

[51] See Oustinoff 90-94 (re: Beckford), 104-117 (re: Wilde).

Their book is organized chronologically into three main parts, according to three time periods: Medieval and Renaissance (1100-1600); Early Modern (1600-1800); Romantic, Modern, and Contemporary (1800-2000). At the end of each of the first two sections, Hokenson and Munson focus on three self-translators belonging to those eras: in the first, Nicolas Oresme (1320?-1382), Charles d'Orléans (1396-1465) and Rémy Belleau (1528-1577); in the second, John Donne (1572-1631), Sor Juana de la Cruz (1648?-1695) and Carlo Goldoni (1707-1793). For the third section, they discuss six self-translators: Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941), Stefan George (1868-1933), Giuseppe Ungaretti (1888-1970), Vladimir Nabokov (1899-1977), Julian Green (1900-1998), Samuel Beckett (1906-1989) and Rosario Ferré (1938). Therefore, with respect to the number of self-translators they study, Oustinoff as well as Hokenson and Munson echo the trend noted in the other four texts, insofar as they privilege self-translators of the 20th century. Moreover, since Hokenson and Munson explicitly aim for "representational coverage", these proportions suggest that self-translation is more common in the 20th century. However, whether this suggestion is accurate is questionable, given the time periods associated with the list of self-translators Santoyo identifies.

1.3.1.3 Into and out of which languages do these self-translators work?

The table below outlines the languages between which each self-translator featured in the corpus has self-translated[52].

Table 1 Self-translators: languages

	Self-translator	Languages
1	Samuel Beckett	French English[53]
2	Elsa Triolet	Russian French
3	Vladimir Nabokov	Russian English French[54]

[52] The self-translators are listed in order of their appearance in the previous list (see 1.3). Despite repetition between books of certain self-translators' names, each name is listed here only once.

[53] Knowlson explains that Beckett also self-translated into German,: "[Klaudia Ascher] suggested improvements to one of his poems, 'Cascando,' which he had translated into German before leaving Dublin" (219). However, our corpus does not highlight this language.

4	Marina Tsvetaeva	Russian French German[55]
5	Boris Poplavskii	Russian French
6	Vasily Yanovsky/ Vasilii Semënovich Ianovskii	Russian English[56]
7	Julien/Julian Green	French English
8	William Beckford	French English
9	Oscar Wilde	French English
10	Rudolf Arnheim	German English
11	Hannah Arendt	German English
12	Stefan Heym	German English
13	Peter Hutchinson	German English
14	Klaus Mann	German English
15	Wolfram Wilss	German English
16	Monika Schmid	German English
17	Magdalena Zoeppritz	German English

[54] According to Hokenson and Munson, "Nabokov self-translated the French ["Mademoiselle O"] directly into English" (Hokenson/Munson 182). However, according to Beaujour, the "directness" of the act is less clear, even though she shows that an English version of this part of his autobiography *did* constitute an important part of his eventual self-translations: "Probably the most significant of Nabokov's self-translations was his linguistically chameleonic autobiography. It developed slowly over almost three decades, beginning with 'Mademoiselle O', which was written in French, published in 1936, and first Englished by Hilda Ward. The other chapters that would constitute *Conclusive Evidence* were written in English between 1946 and 1950 and published separately in various magazines. Rearranged and somewhat revised, they were then grouped together as *Conclusive Evidence* in 1951" and, later, Nabokov self-translated the latter into Russian as *Drugie berega* (Beaujour 112-113). Hokenson and Munson also state that Nabokov "translated one of his own Russian tales into French" (178).

[55] "[S]he wrote one last letter in German, the language of their [Tsvetaeva and Rainer Maria Rilke's] correspondence, and then developed the letter into a Russian poem" (Beaujour 137).

[56] "Levitin and Yanovsky himself collaborated on the translation of *Of Light and Sounding Brass*" from Yanovsky's Russian text (Beaujour 151).

18	Nicolas Oresme	Latin French
19	Charles d'Orléans[57]	French English
20	Rémy Belleau	Latin French
21	John Donne	English Latin
22	Sor Juana de la Cruz	Spanish Latin
23	Carlo Goldoni	Italian French
24	Rabindranath Tagore	Bengali English
25	Stefan George	German French English
26	Giuseppe Ungaretti	Italian French
27	Rosario Ferré	Spanish English

According to this table, significant attention has been paid to self-translators who work into and/or out of English and French (19 and 14 people, respectively); moderate attention is given to German (10) and Russian (6); and some is paid to Latin (4), Italian and Spanish (2 each), and Bengali (1). This distribution need not be surprising, perhaps particularly given that the two languages most represented are also those in which the corpus books themselves are written. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to qualify these numbers further. First of all, although it is true that Nabokov, born and raised in Russia, is discussed in four of the corpus books, only *one* book—namely, *Alien Tongues*—otherwise represents self-translators who write in Russian. Likewise, with the exception of Tsvetaeva (in *Alien Tongues*) and George (in *The Bilingual Text*), only one book—namely, *English-German Self-Translation*—discusses self-translators working into and/or out of German. In other words, relative to English and French, Russian and German are discussed less evenly throughout the corpus.

[57] Hokenson and Munson point out that "Latin formed a third translative medium of Charles's work," but that those writing were "not in his own hand" (58).

Hokenson and Munson, whose book offers the most diverse linguistic representation, address the emphasis on French in their book: "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" (15). In any case, most attention is paid to official languages of Europe and the United States—that is, to those languages that officially dominate in the Western world.

1.3.1.4 With which nations/geographical locations are these self-translators associated?

The following table maps out the geographical regions associated with each self-translator, based on the places in which the latter resides or resided.

Table 2 Self-translators: nations/geographical locations

	Self-translators	Location
1	Samuel Beckett	Ireland France
2	Elsa Triolet	Russia France
3	Vladimir Nabokov	Russia England Germany United States Switzerland
4	Marina Tsvetaeva	Russia France Germany[58]
5	Boris Poplavskii	Russia France
6	Vasily Yanovsky/ Vasilii Semënovich Ianovskii	Russia United States[59]
7	Julien/Julian Green	France United States

[58] It is unclear in Beaujour's text whether Tsvetaeva ever lived in or visited Germany; however, the importance of Germany to Tsvetaeva is evident: "The pro-German poems that she had written and read publicly during the First World War, and her article 'On Germany' also attested to her long-standing attachement to Germany" (Beaujour 135).

[59] Yanovsky had also lived in France, starting in the mid to late 1920s until 1942 when he moved to the U.S.; however, he did not self-translate at that time (Beaujour 147, 148).

8	William Beckford	England
9	Oscar Wilde	Ireland
10	Rudolf Arnheim	Germany United States
11	Hannah Arendt	Germany United States
12	Stefan Heym	Germany United States
13	Peter Hutchinson[60]	n/a
14	Klaus Mann	Germany United States
15	Wolfram Wilss	n/a
16	Monika Schmid	n/a
17	Magdalena Zoeppritz	n/a
18	Nicole Oresme	France
19	Charles d'Orléans	France England
20	Rémy Belleau	France
21	John Donne	England
22	Sor Juana de la Cruz	Mexico (New Spain)
23	Carlo Goldoni	Italy France
24	Rabindranath Tagore	British India
25	Stefan George	Germany France England
26	Giuseppe Ungaretti	France Italy Egypt
27	Rosario Ferré	Puerto Rico United States

This table shows that 11 self-translators are associated with France, and at least 8 with the United States. Also, more than 5 and 7, respectively, are linked to Russia and Germany. However, as indicated above with regards to the Russian and German languages, the representation of Russia and Germany is less evenly distributed across the corpus. The overall conclusion that can be drawn is that each of the books deals with self-translators who belong to the Western world, with a particularly high concentration on France, Germany and the United States. Classifying Nabokov, the other Russian writers named in Beaujour's book, or Tagore as "Western" may not seem accurate since they are originally

[60] Jung's book does not indicate where these self-translators lived.

from either Russia or India. However, Nabokov spent a great deal of his life in Western Europe and in the United States (moving to U.S. in 1940[61]), just as the other Russian emigrants Beaujour studies left for similar destinations. With regards to Tagore (1861-1941), although he is from the region now known as India, the latter did not exist as a state independent from British rule until 1947. As a subject of the British empire, Tagore translated into the central language of the latter.

1.3.1.5 How is gender represented among the self-translators researched?

This corpus shows, unsurprisingly, that female self-translators are under-represented in research on self-translation: of the list of 27 self-translators, merely 7 are women. Moreover, it suggests that research on female self-translators is more likely to be conducted by female scholars. In *Alien Tongues*, for instance, Beaujour not only includes two female self-translators but also devotes one of the 2 more in-depth studies[62] to one of them—namely, Triolet. In *English-German Self-Translation*, Jung studies 8 self-translators, and 3 of them are women: Arendt, Schmid and Zoeppritz. And finally, like Beaujour, Hokenson and Munson include 2 female self-translators in their study: Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz and Rosario Ferré. By contrast, neither Fitch nor Oustinoff discusses self-translation practices among women.

1.3.2 Invisibility: Beyond Beckett

As discussion inspired by the first question (With what frequency is a given self-translator researched?) has indicated, significant attention has been paid to certain self-translators, most notably Beckett (though Nabokov is certainly not far behind): his prominence in the corpus reflects how predominantly he is studied throughout research on self-translation. For example, 21 of the texts identified through the MLA keyword search explicitly reference him in the title, either via his name or via the name of one or more of his works. Representing roughly one sixth of the total number of texts found, this number does not take into account those publications, such as *Alien Tongues* and *The*

[61] Date taken from *The Routledge Translation Studies Reader*, 112.
[62] Not including the Appendix, which features Beckett.

Bilingual Text, whose titles do not directly refer to Beckett, but in which he is nonetheless significantly featured.

Beckett and Nabokov are "arguably the two most famous examples of sustained self-translation," having self-translated numerous works (Grutman 2009b: 257). Given Beckett's renown and the abundance of self-translated texts that he has produced, he represents an important object of study for understanding self-translation. However, if Beckett continues to be studied in such disproportionate ways relative to other self-translators, we will increasingly perceive his particular approaches to, attitudes towards and experiences of self-translation as emblematic of self-translation and of most or all other self-translators—a perception that would be flawed. Evidence of this perception is apparent in the rhetoric of the corpus books. Oustinoff, for example, writes that "...ce qui vaut pour Beckett le [*sic*] vaut aussi en un certain sens pour l'auto-traduction en général" (58). True as this may be, the "en un certain sens" qualifier must be heeded, and the following question therefore considered: In what way exactly and to what extent can this generalization be fairly made? Oustinoff later writes: "Au regard du bilinguisme d'écriture, le cas de Beckett est *unique* dans la mesure où l'auto-traduction dans les deux sens s'applique à pratiquement l'ensemble de l'œuvre" (76; emphasis added)[63], and later still that "Samuel Beckett, tant sur le plan de l'écriture que de la traduction est, cela est souvent affirmé, un « cas limite »" (141). That Beckett is "unique" and a "cas limite" signals the problem caused by over-emphasizing him and his work. Moreover, Beaujour writes that "it is so difficult to make any generalizations about cultivated bilingualism" (157). Given the links established between bilingualism and self-translation in this book as well as in the others in the corpus, it seems fair to presume that Beaujour's remark might also apply to self-translation. Grutman addresses the problematic implications of this imbalance in his recent article "La autotraducción en la galaxia de las lenguas":

> [M]e temo que la proliferación de estudios sobre Beckett haya creado cierta confusión, en la medida en que se le ha considerado a menudo como un *hapax* (o

[63] Oustinoff goes on to write: "Cela ne veut pas dire pour autant qu'il faille isoler des autres écrivains bilingues tels que Vladimir Nabokov, bien au contraire : c'est d'une même problématique qu'il s'agit" (Oustinoff 76-77). However, this statement should be called into question, particularly given that the example of Nabokov is hardly representative of most non-Beckettian self-translators: as already mentioned, he is comparable to Beckett in terms of the volume of his self-translated work.

> [*sic*] ocurrencia única), como un ejemplo *sui generis* cuyo estatus de excepción genial sirve, a pesar de todo, para confirmar la ley implícita del monolingüismo en el reino de las letras. Más aún, por intricada que sea la trayectoria lingüística del escritor irlandés, no creo que nos haya enseñado tanto como quizás hubiéramos querido sobre la autotraducción en general. Para decirlo con una tautología: al estudiar a Beckett se conoce cada vez mejor a Beckett, el más famoso de una serie de autotraductores estudiados en espléndido aislamiento. (2009a: 125)
>
> [I am afraid that the proliferation of studies about Beckett has created some confusion, insofar as he has often been considered as a *hapax* (or unique occurrence), as a *sui generis* example whose exceptional status serves, in spite of everything, to confirm the implicit law of monolingualism within the realm of literature. Furthermore, no matter how intricate the Irish writer's linguistic trajectory may be, I do not believe that it has taught us as much as we might have wanted to know about self-translation in general. To say it with a tautology: the study of Beckett allows us to always better understand Beckett, the most famous of a series of self-translators studied in splendid isolation.][64]

Interestingly, Beckett embodies nearly all of the "visible" aspects identified through the answers to the previous questions pertaining to research on self-translators: he is a European man who self-translated between French and English during the 20th century,[65] and he thereby symbolically and actually represents what seems to be something of a fetish within self-translation research. Relative to the self-translators studied, the aspects of self-translation that remain to varying degrees under-represented, or *in*visible, are those aspects that go *beyond* Beckett: female self-translators; self-translators living and working outside of Western Europe (and the United States); those who translated their own texts before the 20th century; as well as those who self-translate between languages other than English and French. Since, in the corpus, only Hokenson and Munson consider pre-twentieth-century self-translators, their *Bilingual Text* represents an important contribution to self-translation research because it helps to develop a more diachronic awareness of self-translation. Meanwhile, Asian and African languages, various Aboriginal languages, Middle Eastern and Eastern European languages, and Soviet languages remain almost completely invisible, as do the regions of Africa, Asia, Oceania, Central and South America, Mexico, Canada and the Middle East.

---

[64] Aided self-translation (with Van Bolderen).

[65] We might also add that he is white, though this has not been addressed directly.

1.4 Why do people self-translate?

It is equally important to consider which texts have *not* been selected for such transfers. Few writers are "polyglot *as writers*," and thus, of course, not all of those who have the potential to self-translate do so (Beaujour 3). Furthermore, those who do take advantage of this potential, do not self-translate *all* of their works. In his definition of self-translation, Grutman addresses the non-arbitrary decision to self-translate:

> Self-translators do not just master, but choose to create in more than one language. Their conscious awareness of this option cannot be overstated: while 'bilinguals frequently shift languages without making a conscious decision to do so, polyglot and bilingual *writers* must deliberately decide which language to use in a given instance'. (2009b 257, qtg Beaujour)

Grutman goes on to write that "self-translation involves an equally important decision" (2009b: 257). The question therefore becomes: *Why do people self-translate?* And the corollary question: *Why do certain people* not *self-translate?* Jung points out that "sufficient preconditions to predict reliably that an author will become a self-translator do not exist" (18). Nonetheless, the corpus indicates that various factors—some particular to a given self-translator, others recurring from one individual to another—can prompt the decision to self-translate.

1.4.1 Visibility: Practical, artistic, ideological and personal motivations

The corpus reveals that self-translation is frequently motivated by practical factors. For Beckett, self-translation was initially a means of personal and professional survival. According to Deirdre Bair (cited by Oustinoff), Beckett's decision to write directly in French was made based on both "l'impossibilité de trouver un éditeur anglais pour *Watt*" as well as the many "difficultés qu'il a dû affronter au début de sa carrière"—"[d]ifficultés matérielles notamment" (Oustinoff 68, 71). However, since Beckett did not at that time feel sufficiently comfortable with the French language to write longer texts directly in French, he began self-translating some of his English works into that language (e.g. *Murphy*: English, 1938; French, 1947).[66]

---

[66] There seems to be some confusion with respect to precisely which texts were linked to Beckett's motivation to self-translate: Oustinoff refers to both *Murphy* (E) and *Watt* (E) as pivotal in this process; yet much time separates their writing and publication. As indicated in an earlier footnote (see page 24), Beckett's first self-translation was *Murphy* (English into French, 1939).

Jung identifies in the following paragraph another practical reason writers have opted to self-translate:

> Peter Hutchinson wrote his self-translation from English into German in England, as the article on Peter Huchel he had written was to be used for a Suhrkamp publication and therefore had to be in German. Wolfram Wilss translated his already famous and important publication into English for a similar reason, so it would be available to the English-speaking market. Magdalena Zoeppritz and Monika Schmid both translated their own text, one German to English, the other English into German; each self-translated into the language that was needed for a specific publication. (16; emphasis added)

Evidently, Hutchinson, Wilss, Zoeppritz and Schmid's works were translated because of the scholars' desire to access additional markets. Perhaps this reason seems to apply only to why the texts were *translated*, rather than specifically to why they were translated by the *author*. However, the answer to the latter question is nonetheless implied when Jung identifies these scholars as "internationally publishing academics" (16): by translating themselves, these scholars were able not only to position themselves within a larger number of academic arenas but also, presumably, to do so more effectively or credibly than had they accessed the new forums via an intermediary, standard translator. In other words, self-translation serves here as a tool for potentially improving the professional profile of each of the self-translators.

Jung also points to the financial benefits of self-translation, when discussing self-translations produced by Stefan Heym[67] and Klaus Mann[68]: not only had there been a lack of readership in the language in which the original text was written but there had been a lack of means to fund having a text translated by someone else (17).

Beaujour observes that "[e]xile and bilingual writing are inextricably related in obvious ways in the lives and careers not only of Russian and East European émigrés, but also of most of the other bilingual writers currently or recently practicing" (43). Given the association Beaujour makes between bilingual writing and self-translation, it is

---

This was written several years before the writing of *Watt* (English, 1942-44); moreover, *Murphy* (F, 1947) was published before the publication of both *Watt* (E; 1953) and *Watt* (F; 1968).

[67] Jung specifically looks at Heym's "The tender little buds of East Germany" in: *The New York Times*, Thursday, May 24, 1973 and his (1985) "Zwei Alternativen" in: Wege und Umwege, München: Goldmann.

[68] Jung specifically looks at Mann's (1943) *André Gide—The Crisis of Modern Thought*, New York: Creative Age Press and his ([1947] 1966) *André Gide und die Krise des modernen Denkens*, München: Nymphenburger.

reasonable to extend her remark about exile to self-translation. The corpus corroborates this claim, since many of the self-translators identified began self-translating after leaving their home country. Beckett, for instance, did so after moving from Ireland to France. Each of the writers in *Alien Tongues* who self-translated did so after leaving Russia. French self-translator Charles d'Orléans was "[h]eld captive by the English for twenty-five years" and, presumably, began self-translating after being captured[69] (Hokenson/Munson 51). Playwright Carlo Goldoni was a native of Venice but wrote his *Le Bourru bienfaisant* and self-translated into *Il Burbero di buon cuore* after moving to Paris (Hokenson/Munson 115). Furthermore, Hokenson and Munson identify exile—royal exile, in particular—as a reason why self-translators in the early modern period self-translated:

> 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. (93)

While acknowledging exile as a possible reason why people self-translate, Jung claims that "similar conditions do not necessarily prompt a similar reaction" (15):

> Only after he had returned to Germany did Klaus Mann work on his self-translations, Arnheim and Hanna Arendt both did theirs in the United States, but had contact with the German-speaking world.
>
> The most recent self-translations studied here [texts by Hutchinson, Wilss, Zoeppritz, Schmid] all stem from internationally publishing academics, they were produced for academic purposes and their creation is not linked to exile or transposition into a different culture. (16)

Indeed, there are various other examples within the corpus which demonstrate that exile is unrelated to the decision to self-translate.[70]

---

[69] This correlation is presumed based on Hokenson and Munson's reference: "His [d'Orléans's] famed French-English bilingualism followed directly from historical circumstance" (51).

[70] *The Bilingual Text* offers a few similar examples, largely because it deals with self-translation situations from the Medieval, Renaissance and Early Modern periods. As Beaujour remarks: "we know and easily accept the fact that in previous centuries, before the myth of Romantic 'self-expression,' people wrote in Latin as well as in their vernacular languages" (3). Self-translation that occurred through this bilingual writing did not necessarily result from displacement of the self-translator.

Like the English-German self-translators identified above, Rémy Belleau was interested in increasing his audience base. However, Hokenson and Munson indicate that his decision to self-translate was more particularly motivated by the fact that, if his French poems were available in Latin, they would benefit from greater longevity: "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" (66-67). The example of Belleau alludes to the potentially *artistic* rationale behind self-translation. In certain cases, self-translators feel strongly that they must protect their work, not trusting another writer with the translation. Nabokov, for example, "undertook to translate this most American of his works [*Lolita*] into Russian himself, thus protecting her [his American muse] from the clumsy attentions of future, well-intentioned incompetents" (Beaujour 114). Similarly, Oustinoff cites Mann, who had originally written his autobiography in English, as claiming: "Je ne pourrais laisser à personne le soin de raconter *en allemand* ma vie. Je dois le faire moi-même" (42).[71] The protectionist attitude motivating self-translation can stem not only from an *a priori* reticence to entrusting another with translating the writing but also from dissatisfaction with others' previous translations: Oustinoff writes that "Nabokov a estimé avoir été mal traduit, ce qui l'amènera très vite à procéder lui-même à la traduction de ses propres œuvres" and, according to Hokenson and Munson, Ferré self-translated her 1991 short-story collection *Papeles de Pandora* because she had been "disappointed by an initial second-hand translation" of it (Oustinoff 127; Hokenson/Munson 200).

As already discussed, Beaujour characterizes self-translation as a key stage in an author's evolution to becoming a bilingual writer (see 1.2.3.2). In doing so, she identifies the latter goal as a *why* of self-translation. Accordingly, self-translation can represent a means through which a writer can practice her written skills in the language(s) in which she feels less comfortable writing: in one of her notebooks, for example, Triolet self-translates one chapter of her Russian novel *Zemlianichka* into French (Beaujour 67).[72]

---

[71] Oustinoff does not indicate one way or the other whether Mann actually self-translated his autobiography.

[72] The text was eventually translated into French, as *Camouflage*, by Léon Robel (Beaujour 67).

Self-translation can also enable the self-translator to establish a bilingual œuvre. Beaujour speculates that sections of Poplavskii's diaries in which he writes the same text in two languages may have been created "with an eye to eventual publication for one (or both) of his potential linguistic audiences" (141). She makes similar speculations about Beckett: "[T]he fact that Beckett should have spent so much pain and energy[73] on self-translation may be a key to his work, for his bilingualism seems to determine the nature of his work as a whole" (175).

Perhaps the most distinct example of the artistic rationale behind self-translation is Nabokov's re-Englishing of his autobiography,[74] which seems, at least in part, to have been done because this reworking represented an artistic challenge. He explains that "the 're-Englishing [...] proved to be such a diabolical task, but consolation was given me by the thought that such multiple metamorphosis, familiar to butterflies, had not been tried by any human before'" (Beaujour 114). Actually, as Hokenson and Munson's text shows, someone *had* performed such a task before: Belleau had "translate[d] his original French text back into Latin, and through this process, says Bizer, [found] 'sa propre esthétique et poétique'" (67). In this case, however, the doubled self-translation is not motivated by (a perceived) artistic novelty, as it is with Nabokov. Rather, "[i]n 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" (Hokenson/Munson 67).

There is also evidence that self-translation is motivated by a more personal, versus practical, intention—namely, the self-translator's need to express herself. Julian/Julien Green expresses this when he writes about a text he originally wrote in English:

> Simplement pour me *tenir*, je me suis contraint de continuer la traduction de *Memories of Happy Days* en français. A tout coup, je suis arrêté par des difficultés sans *nombre*. Elles se réduisent pourtant à ceci : ma vraie personnalité ne peut guère s'exprimer qu'en français ; l'autre est une personnalité d'emprunt et comme imposée par la langue anglaise (et pourtant sincère, c'est là le bizarre de la chose). Cette personnalité, je ne puis la faire passer en français que fort malaisément : elle ne *semble* pas tout à fait vraie. (Oustinoff 62, qtg Green's journal)

---

[73] Beckett is described as having an "obsessive commitment to self-translation" (Beaujour 174).
[74] Expanding on—self-adapting?—his French autobiographical text "Mademoiselle O," Nabokov wrote his memoirs (*Conclusive Evidence*), self-translated them from English into Russian (*Dugie berega*) and then self-translated them back into English (*Speak, Memory*). (Beaujour 114)

Also, Hokenson and Munson point out that, in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, when multilingualism was the norm[75], one of the reasons self-translation was practiced was that it represented "a powerful tool through which individuals could create and assert multiple cultural identities in highly variable and complex ways" (25).

According to the corpus, writers may decide to self-translate for ideological reasons as well. Hokenson and Munson indicate that Nicolas Oresme was motivated to self-translate his Latin treatises on economics, *De Moneta* and *Tractatus contra astrologos iudicarios*, into French (*Traictié des monnoies* and *Le Livre de divinacions*, respectively) in order to access new audiences. Oresme writes of *Traictié*: "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" (qtd in Hokenson/Munson 41). However, his decision to "democratize" his work must be understood in terms of the historical context of the production as well as Oresme's influential position within the Charles V administration (Hokenson/Munson 39):

> 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 in to the vernacular. (Hokenson/Munson 42-43)

Thus, we can appreciate that Oresme's interest in other audiences was politically and ideologically motivated: "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" (Hokenson/Munson 41).

Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz and John Donne also self-translated for ideological reasons. While Oresme used self-translation to advocate certain economic values, de la Cruz and Donne, both writers of theological texts (among others), sought to promote certain values pertaining to religion. John Donne's 1611 Latin-English self-translation of *Conclaue Ignati/Ignatius His Conclave*[76] was "one of the most spirited and public literary attacks against the Jesuits," and self-translation allowed Donne to further this attack by

---

[75] Hokenson and Munson identify the medieval and Renaissance periods as "peaks of both literary bilingualism and biculturalism" and as a time when "bi- or multi-lingualism was not the cultural exception but rather the norm" (19).

[76] Full title of each texts: *Conclaue Ignati: Situe eivus In Nvperis Inferni Comitiis Inthronisatio*; *Ignatius His Conclave: or His Inthronisation in a late Election in Hell* (Hokenson/Munson 101).

presenting it to a greater number of people (Hokenson/Munson 101): "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" (Hokenson/Munson 102).[77] Meanwhile, de la Cruz had a feminist agenda:

> 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. (Hokenson/Munson 113)

1.4.2 Invisibility: Reasons to resist, to stop and to not self-translate

To a much lesser degree, the corpus points to certain reasons why individuals who could self-translate resist doing so altogether, stop self-translating or do not self-translate certain works (while having self-translated others). Most of these observations, made in Beaujour's and Oustinoff's books, pertain to self-translators Triolet and Beckett. One of the reasons self-translators resist translating their own works is that they perceive a particular language as inherently suitable to the work they have written and therefore perceive other languages as *un*suitable. Triolet's self-translation of *Na Taiti* had not been premeditated, and Beaujour suggests that the reason Triolet took so long ("forty-five years after its initial appearance" (61)) was that rewriting it in another language threatened the decision she had made to write it originally in Russian:

> Triolet's reluctance to translate herself is therefore less a reflection of the objective linguistic difficulty of the task than of her need as a bilingual writer to assure herself that she had originally made the right choice of language for her works. (62)

Triolet also resisted self-translation because of the identity conflict it engendered:

> She [was] afraid of the high emotional cost of self-translation, which [...] threatens the bilingual writer with a far more serious split than does writing directly in two different languages. For Triolet, self-translation raises the terrifying spectre of noncoincidence with herself. (Beaujour 62)

Another important question to consider is: Once a writer decides to self-translate, why does she not translate all of her works? Oustinoff points to at least two reasons for which Beckett decided not to self-translate his collection of prose, *More Pricks than Kicks*. One

---

[77] As noted by Hokenson and Munson, "[a]s 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" (102).

is that Beckett perceived this work as inferior in terms of its quality: "*More Pricks than Kicks* a bien été publié du vivant en 1934, mais l'absence d'une auto-traduction signifie que l'auteur tient l'œuvre pour trop mineure pour mériter d'être traduite" (71). The other reason reflects the level of difficulty involved in executing the transfer: "*Dream of Fair to middling* [sic] *Women* et *More Pricks than Kicks* contiennent effectivement un mélange de langues dans l'écriture qui n'est pas sans rappeler *Finnegans Wake*, ce qui rend particulièrement ardue toute traduction" (72). Otherwise, Oustinoff mentions only in passing, via footnote, the fact that Green refused to self-translate his *The Apprentice Psychiatrist*: "Julien Green s'est refusé à traduire lui-même en français cette première œuvre" (59). He does not, however, address the *reason* for the refusal.

It is also possible for self-translators to stop self-translating altogether. According to Beaujour, Triolet's decided to stop self-translating because the process of becoming a bilingual writer was complete: "*Bonsoir Thérèse*, which marks the moment when Triolet stops translating herself from Russian and accepts the idea that she will write directly in French, is not a book of rupture" (69).

Surely, more reasons must exist. Meanwhile, the question that, as far as I can tell, remains untouched throughout the corpus is that of why those writers who have the potential to self-translate do not engage in this activity. Beaujour takes the beginning steps towards addressing this question insofar as she identifies bilingual writers who do not self-translate—namely, Iliazd, Iswolsky and Pozner (156). Why, when many other bilingual writers decide to self-translate, do certain others choose *not* to?

1.5 Conclusions

In this survey of self-translation research, the corpus consulted has revealed various aspects of self-translation that have and have not been studied. Many other questions about the topic, which could not be dealt with here, remain to be tackled. For example, *How* do self-translators self-translate? Oustinoff, for example, explains that Nabokov for the most part self-translates according to the same criteria he uses when translating other

writers' works.[78] Do other self-translators maintain consistent translation strategies for standard translation and self-translation? Oustinoff also points out that both Beckett and Nabokov participated in "collaborative" or partial self-translation. How common is this practice among these and other self-translators? It would also be valuable to consider the following question: What approaches have been taken for studying self-translation? Hokenson and Munson, for example, are the only scholars from the corpus to consider self-translation from a historical perspective, while Jung's methodology is unique in that as she compares translation choices that a self-translator and a standard translator make when working with the same text. Moreover, she considers the didactic value of self-translation.

In signalling the complex nature of self-translation, this chapter ultimately postulates:

1. that self-translation is a form of translation;
2. that self-translation is a unique kind of translation;
3. that self-translation is neither new nor uncommon; and ultimately
4. that self-translation warrants further study.

1.5.1 Self-translation is a form of translation

In *Constructing Cultures*,[79] Susan Bassnett argues that self-translation is among several other concepts that are *not* forms of translation:

> The problems of defining what is or is not a translation are further complicated when we consider self-translation and texts that claim to be translated from a non-existent source. Becket's [*sic*] self-translation is not, under any stretch of the imagination or following any of the existing definitions of equivalence a translation. (38)

Indeed, as cited earlier (see 1.2.3.1), Fitch conceives of a Beckettian self-translation as one of two texts that are "variants of something that enjoys no tangible textual existence but whose existence is none the less implicit in their very co-existence" (135). However, this conception of self-translation need not be problematic in the way Bassnett suggests. Rather, she seems to restrict her understanding of self-translation to parameters designed

---

[78] Notably, Hokenson and Munson argue that the opposite is true: "The most interesting thing about his [Nabokov's] theory, and his productions from Pushkin and Lermontov, is how radically he overturned these methodological principles when he translated his own literary work" (178).
[79] In the second chapter, entitled "When Is Translation Not A Translation".

for standard translation, which is the exact approach Oustinoff has insisted is inappropriate, since self-translation has various unique characteristics. Meanwhile, just as the scholars of the other corpus texts assert, Oustinoff and Fitch insist that self-translation maintains its identity as a translation: "[e]lle est éminemment à la fois traduction et écriture" (Oustinoff 57); "Que l'on considère l'auto-traduction à l'aune de la révision ne revient pas nécessairement à sortir du domaine de la traduction" (Oustinoff 201).

1.5.2 Self-translation is a unique kind of translation

The opinion that self-translation is decidedly different than standard translation is not unanimous. I have already cited Tanqueiro, who denies the special nature of self-translation, claiming that it is merely an "extreme case" of standard translation (though I would argue that being an "extreme case" nonetheless sets the phenomenon apart from standard translation). Another, more recent example is Shlomit Ehrlich, who studies André Brink's Afrikaans-English self-translation of the novel *Kennis van die aand* (1973)/*Looking on darkness* (1974). Ehrlich observes that,

> Despite the liberty that a self-translator presumably has as the author of the text, and the undisputed authority that comes with authorship, the self-translator in question followed conventional translation procedures rather than carve out a different translation approach—as might, perhaps, have been expected of a translator with privileged access to the text. (243)

However, as our corpus indicates, the predominant position in self-translation research is that self-translation is, in various ways, indeed unique. Jung observes: "One of the unique features of self-translation is that self-translators are perceived as performing a transformation of their original creative act rather than producing a text structure, which is then to be compared to the structure of the first text" (46). As we have seen, scholars claim that the self-translator is allowed more freedom or creativity than the standard translator. Fitch and Jung also point out that, when self-translating, a writer can consult manuscript versions of the published "original" and can access memories of the writing process to which the standard translator typically does not or cannot refer. While all translators are readers of the "original" work, "the self-translator can never be a reader of the original text in any normal, full sense of the term" (Fitch 130). Furthermore, Beaujour argues that self-translation plays a different role than standard translation in a writer's evolution towards writing bilingually. Numerous other examples throughout the corpus

corroborate the distinct nature of self-translation in terms of how it complicates certain familiar notions: e.g., "original", "translation", "source text", "target text", "equivalence".

1.5.3 Self-translation is neither new nor uncommon

Hokenson and Munson's historical account of self-translation indicates very clearly, as discussed, that self-translation is not a recent phenomenon. Nor is it rare: consider Charles d'Orléans, who "produced a large body of bilingual lyric poetry, a total of 141 poems" (Hokenson/Munson 53). Yet, the bilingual character of his writing was not commonly acknowledged because the "texts were sorted by language as two single-author books of lyric poetry" (Hokenson/Munson 53). Santoyo's article especially reinforces the fact that self-translation is neither new nor unusual, by providing an extensive list of self-translators—who, as a collective, work between various languages, in various places and across centuries—and then rhetorically asking: "Visto lo visto, uno no puede menos de preguntarse: '¿saben estos (y otros muchos) críticos de qué están hablando?'" [In light of what has been seen, one cannot help but ask herself: 'Do these (and many other) critics know what they are talking about?] (866) He concludes: "Lejos de ser un 'caso marginal' [...], la traducción de autor cuenta con una larga historia" (866). [Far from being a "marginal case" [...], author's translations have a long history.]

1.5.4 Self-translation warrants academic attention

Each of the three previous postulates point to the ultimate contention that self-translation represents fertile ground for further research. Hokenson and Munson offer various examples of why self-translation is important: e.g., "By the fourteenth century [...], the bilingual text plays an ever more crucial role in a widening range of increasingly secularized intellectual domains previously dominated by Latin" (41). Jung advocates both the practice and study of self-translation, for didactic purposes. Meanwhile, Fitch insists that such research would contribute to the field of Translation Studies:

> It goes without saying that the results of [seeking to grasp the exact nature of the relationship between the two versions of a self-translation] ought to enable us to understand better the activity of the self-translator and the processes involved therein. They would therefore constitute a valuable contribution to translation and text theory. (15)

And Santoyo declares that now is the time to study self-translation since the phenomenon is

> uno de los fenómenos culturales, lingüisticos y literarios más frecuentes e importantes en nuestra aldea global, y desde luego merecedora de mucha más atención de la que hasta ahora se le ha prestado. (866)
>
> [one of the cultural, linguistic and literary phenomena that is the most frequent and important in our global village, and of course most deserving of much more attention than it has received until now.]

Given the value of studying self-translation, it is surprising to note that, although it is gaining attention in research devoted to the specific topic of self-translation, it seems to be overlooked in literature discussing translation as a general concept. The following chapter will address this invisibility.

2 Invisibility: Observing self-translation in Translation Studies

In *Beckett and Babel* (1988), Fitch observes that "direct discussion or even mention of self-translation is virtually non-existent in writings on theory of translation" (13, 21). Nearly 20 years afterwards, Hokenson and Munson (2007) make a similar observation: "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" (1). In the first chapter of this project, I considered some of the key ways in which self-translation is discussed in theoretical writing on that topic. The second chapter, by contrast, serves to provide an overview of the extent to which self-translation has been represented in translation studies literature that discusses translation as a general topic. The hypothesis underlying this investigation is that self-translation remains noticeably under-represented. This relative invisibility is partly informed by the fact that, as noted, the theoretical texts on self-translation—wherein the phenomenon is identified as unique and deserving of further attention—are predominantly written by comparative literature scholars (Fitch, Beaujour, Hokenson/Munson). Therefore, these texts also predominantly come from outside of Translation Studies, which suggests that scholars within the latter discipline—that is, a discipline to which self-translation surely belongs—are passing alongside it.

This invisibility will be evaluated in two ways: first, quantitatively: I estimate and analyze the frequency with which self-translation is acknowledged in encyclopedic materials that deal with translation in broad terms; second, qualitatively: I examine seminal theoretical texts on translation in the interest of identifying how self-translation is overlooked rhetorically.

2.1 Quantitative evaluation of self-translation within general translation research

2.1.1 Corpus building

2.1.1.1 Criteria for corpus building

The ultimate goal is to identify texts that represent translation as comprehensively as possible so that, subsequently, I can evaluate as fairly as possible the presence or absence of self-translation in translation research in general. Therefore, publications focusing exclusively on a particular type of translation (e.g. biblical), a given perspective on translation (e.g. colonial) or a specific aspect of translation (e.g. terminology, self-translation) are deemed too narrow for this particular research.[80] By contrast, encyclopedias and encyclopedic texts—that is, reference materials that are similar to encyclopedias in terms of their breadth of scope—that focus on translation are ideal.

Since, as noted in the previous chapter, research on self-translation has been noticeably increasing over the last 15 years, this corpus has been restricted to texts published on or after 1995. Moreover, in the interest of developing a corpus that is manageable in size, this collection of texts is restricted to books—versus journals, conference papers, etc.—supposing that encyclopedic texts are more frequently published in book form than in any other.

2.1.1.2 Methodology for corpus building

I have compiled the corpus by consulting three sources: the Translation Studies Bibliography (TSB), the Modern Languages Association (MLA) International Bibliography and the University of Ottawa library catalogue. Each of these represents a large number of potentially relevant texts insofar as the university has an extensive collection of translation studies resources, the MLA bibliography has an international reach, the TSB focuses specifically on Translation Studies, and all three include texts written in many languages.

---

[80] Since, as specified in the Introduction, the scope of this thesis is limited to translation/self-translation practices and theories that are rooted in Western thought, the corpus identified here tends to reflect this perspective.

Three separate searches were performed in order to compile the corpus. The first search served to identify encyclopedias, strictly speaking, and the second and third served to flesh out the results of the first search by possibly identifying additional encyclopedias and otherwise locating other key encyclopedic texts.

2.1.1.2.1 Search 1 parameters: "encyclopedia" + "translation"

The first search involved consulting all three databases. Advanced searches were performed using the *AND* search function in order to identify texts that include both "encyclopedia" and "translation" in the title of the work. This search was performed in the following sample of languages, which represent some of the principal languages in which Western scholarly research in translation studies is published: English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, German and Dutch.[81]

2.1.1.2.2 Search 1 results: 4 relevant texts

The Spanish, Portuguese, Italian and Dutch searches in the University of Ottawa catalogue generated no results. Meanwhile, the German search provided only one, invalid result.[82] The English search in this catalogue proved more fruitful, the results of which consisted of the first and second editions of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, the first two volumes of *Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung /Translation: an international encyclopedia of translation studies /Traduction: Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*,[83] and both volumes of the *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*. The French search in the University of Ottawa catalogue generated one valid result, and one already identified in the English search. Searches in the MLA bibliography generated no results for those searches performed in Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, German and Dutch and no valid results for searches in French or English. No results were found in the Translation Studies

---

[81] Equivalents identified for "encyclopedia": encyclopédie (French), enciclopedia (Spanish), enciclopédia (Portuguese), enciclopedia (Italian), Enzyklopädie (German), encyclopedie (Dutch). Equivalents identified for "translation": traduction (French), traducción (Spanish), traducción (Portuguese), traduzione (Italian), Übersetzung (German), vertaling (Dutch).

[82] The only result: Röllig, Monika. 1963. Atatürk : [eine vollständige Übersetzung des zehnten Heftes der Islamischen Enzyklopädie (Islâm Ansiklopedisi)].

[83] Ubersetzung comprises three volumes, but the third volume is not available in the University of Ottawa library, as it seems to have not yet been published.

Bibliography searches in French, Italian, German or Dutch, and no valid results were found for the Spanish and Portuguese searches. The only valid results from the English search in the TSB were the Routledge encyclopedias and the *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, mentioned previously. To summarize, this first series of searches pointed to the following four reference guides:

- *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 1st edition (Baker 1998)
- *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd edition (Baker 2008)
- *Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur ubersetzungsforschung /Translation: an international encyclopedia of translation studies /Traduction: Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*, Volumes 1-2 (Kittel 2004)
- *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, Volumes 1-2 (Classe 2000)

2.1.1.2.3 Search 2 parameters: "translation studies"

While generating little in the way of noise, the first group of searches presumably produced a certain amount of silence. An encyclopedia on translation would not necessarily have been identified through a search of "encyclopedia" and "translation". As the word "Handbuch" (in *Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur ubersetzungsforschung*), literally meaning "manual", indicates, other terms such as this one or "survey" or "guide", could have been used instead of "encyclopedia". Similarly, focus on translation might have been signalled by the word "translator". This is especially true for texts that, while not encyclopedias, are considered encyclopedic. Therefore, a second set of searches was necessary in order to highlight a greater number of texts discussing translation. Not surprisingly, performing searches in each of the three databases using only the string "translation" (or equivalent) in the title generated results that were too numerous and too noisy.[84] Identifying books that contain "translation studies" in the title, however, was valuable.

The original intention was to search each of the databases, using equivalents for "translation studies" in all of the languages identified for the last search. However, the search in English proved already too vast, with 540 hits in the TSB English search alone. The University of Ottawa library database, meanwhile, generated a more manageable

[84] Each such search identified several hundreds of potentially relevant results: University of Ottawa library catalogue: 620; MLA: 12,316 total results, 808 results listed under "Books"; TSB: 8,397, with likely a very small percentage of the results would be pertinent to the corpus.

number of results: 168. Consequently, the second search was limited to the latter source, and, thus, could include searches in all of the identified languages.[85] Moreover, the online catalogue search was followed by an in-person scan of the library shelves where arguably most translation studies texts are located (i.e. section P 306). The online scan allowed all documents available at the library to be identified, including those texts borrowed by other users, and the manual scan allowed the content of the located reference texts to be verified, given that the substance and scope of each text is not immediately apparent from the catalogue entry. Furthermore, given that the term "translation studies" is scarcely used outside of the discipline it names, this search tended to focus attention on texts belonging to the field in question.

2.1.1.2.4 Search 2 results: 5 additional relevant texts

Of all three eventual searches, this search identified the largest number of valid texts. The Portuguese, Italian and Dutch searches generated no results. The German and French searches generated 3 and 63 results, respectively, but none of these were valid. The English search, meanwhile, generated the following four valid results:

- *Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*, Volumes 1-4 (Baker 2009)
- *The Translation Studies Reader*, 2nd edition (Venuti 2004 [2000])
- *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications* (Munday 2008)
- *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (Munday 2009)

Consisting of four volumes, 74 articles and over 1500 pages, *Critical Concepts* is deemed an encyclopedic text for its considerable reach. As editor Mona Baker states in the introduction, "[t]he current reader reflects [the development of translation studies] and provides the most extended and ambitious collection of writings on translation and interpreting to date" (1). Furthermore, as Baker goes on to say, it emphasizes "contemporary critical material," draws on a "range of disciplines" and "deal[s] with translation and/or interpreting in non-Western and minority cultures" (1). Thus, the scope is appropriately broad. Similarly, the *Translation Studies Reader*, consisting of 527 pages and 32 articles, provides a global view of "main approaches to understanding translation

[85] Equivalents used for "translation studies": traductologie (French), traductología (Spanish, Portuguese), traductologia (Italian), Übersetzungwissenschaft (German), vertaalwetenschap (Dutch).

in the West" and, while it presents the information diachronically, it especially focuses on the last 30 years (1). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications* comprises 236 pages and 64 articles, spread over 12 chapters. The 287-page *Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* includes nine articles/chapters. While these do cover considerable ground,[86] their scant number suggests that this text might not constitute a comprehensive enough appreciation of translation studies for this corpus. However, the text is primarily deemed relevant because it includes a 75-page section entitled "Key concepts", where one might find a reference to self-translation.

Finally, the Spanish search identified five texts, of which the following text was valid:

- *Traducción y traductología: Introducción a la traductología* (Hurtado Albir 2001)

This 695-page book is extensive, organized according to the following three key headings: "La traducción" [Translation], "La traductología" [Translation Studies], "Un analysis integrador de la traducción" [An integrating analysis of translation, i.e., an analysis of how translation fits into or relates to other disciplines[87]]. Notably, the book also includes a 13-page glossary. In the introduction, Amparo Hurtado Albir acknowledges the "carácter general y panorámico" [the general and far-reaching nature] of the text (19). Though "encyclopedia" does not appear in the title, the text effectively presents itself as this type of book: according to the table of contents, there are 236 entries in the book—indicating the breadth of the content—and each entry is quite brief,[88] indicating Hurtado Albir's interest in providing an overview of the subject matter versus in-depth coverage of specific concepts.

2.1.1.2.5 Search 3 parameters: "translation" + "English" + "literature"

---

[86] The chapters of the *Companion* are entitled "Issues in translation studies," "The linguistic and communicative stages in translation studies," "Translating text in context," "Translation as a cognitive activity," "Translation as intercultural communication," "Translation, ethics, politics," "Technology and translation," "Issues in interpreting studies" and "Issues in audiovisual translation".

[87] Translation and paraphrasing by Christel Kopp.

[88] Less than 14% of the entries are six of more pages in length; 94, or nearly 40% of the entries, were one page or less.

The goal of the third search was to identify texts that have been published outside of the discipline of Translation Studies but that are nonetheless relevant to the field and therefore to this research and corpus. Therefore, this final search consisted of locating, in all three databases, texts whose titles include the words "translation," "English" and "literature" (or equivalents in the languages mentioned earlier[89]). The rationale behind this search is that, as discussed in the previous chapter of this thesis, translation studies research tends to privilege literary translation. Consequently, literary-focused texts represent a significant proportion of texts dealing with translation. Furthermore, this search was beneficial because it allowed texts not located in the P306 area of the university library to be found.

2.1.1.2.6 Search 3 results: 1 additional relevant text

In the University of Ottawa library catalogue, MLA bibliography and TSB, only one of the 51, 21 and 24 (respectively) results for the English search was valid:

- *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* (France 2000)

The other results consisted mainly of texts discussing specific literary translations into or out of English.[90] In the searches using the other languages, no relevant results were identified; noise similar to that of the English searches was produced.[91]

2.1.1.3 Corpus results

In summary, the corpus identified for the quantitative evaluation consists of the following ten encyclopedic texts, listed in bibliographic order, consisting of one Spanish-language text, eight English-language texts and one trilingual—German, English and French—text:

---

[89] Equivalents: "traduction," "français," "littérature." (French); "traducción," "español," "literatura" (Spanish); "traducción," "português," "literatura" (Portuguese); "traduzione," "italiano," "letteratura" (Italian); "Übersetzung," "Deutsch," "Literatur" (German); "vertaling," "Nederlands," "literatuur" (Dutch).

[90] The following represent a few examples: University of Ottawa: Writing about literature: essay and translation skills for university students of English and foreign literature (Judith Woolf); MLA: Literature of the German Democratic Republic in English Translation: A Bibliography (Margy Gerber, Judith Pouget); TSB: "Angles on the English-speaking world: literary translation, world literature or 'worlding' literature" (review by John Jamieson).

[91] University of Ottawa (German): e.g., no results; MLA (Italian): no results; TSB: e.g., "El español coloquial en la literatura hispanoamericana: problemas de traducción" (Claude de Frayssinet).

- *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 1st edition (Baker 1998)
- *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd edition (Baker 2008)
- *Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*, Volumes 1-4 (Baker 2009)
- *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, Volumes 1-2 (Classe 2000)
- *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* (France 2000)
- *Traducción y traductología: Introducción a la traductología* (Hurtado Albir 2001)
- *Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur ubersetzungsforschung /Translation: an international encyclopedia of translation studies /Traduction: Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*, Volumes 1-2 (Kittel 2004)
- *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications* (Munday 2008)
- *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (Munday 2009)
- *The Translation Studies Reader* (Venuti 2004 [2000])

2.1.2 Quantitative data

2.1.2.1 Quantitative data collection criteria and methodology

In collecting quantitative data from the corpus, I consulted first the table of contents of each text and then the index, examining both in light of the following questions:

1. How many of the corpus texts include entries for "self-translation" (or variant[92] or equivalent[93])?
2. How many of the texts list "self-translation" (or variant or equivalent) in the index?
3. With what frequency does "self-translation" (or variant or equivalent) appear in each text?
4. How do these three questions apply to a selection of Western self-translators?
    a. How many of the corpus texts include entries for these names?
    b. How many of the texts list these names in the index?
    c. With what frequency do these names appear in each text?

With the fourth question, I attempt to compensate for instances in which the table of contents or index might reference the self-translator in addition to or without also referring explicitly to the concept of self-translation. Therefore, related searches serve to increase the chances of observing evidence of how self-translation has been recognized or, put another way, to reduce the likelihood of missing key references to the concept or practice. The self-translators identified for this part of the data collection are:

---

[92] Variants include inflectional variations of self-translation (auto-translation, self-translations), self-translator (auto-translator, self-translators), self-translate (auto-translate, self-translating, self-translated, ...).

[93] Equivalents identified for "self-translation": auto-traduction (French); autotraducción (Spanish, Portuguese); autotraduzione (Italian); Selbstübersetzung (German); zelfvertaling (Dutch).

- Samuel Beckett
- Julien/Julian Green
- Nancy Huston
- Vladimir Nabokov
- Rabindranath Tagore

These five individuals were selected because they are among the best known self-translators in Western society and therefore, depending on the individual, they are likely to be documented as frequently as or more frequently than certain others. Beckett, Nabokov and Green, who have received considerable attention in the books devoted to self-translation, seem to be logical choices for the current investigation. Tagore, meanwhile, won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1913, precisely for his self-translation from Bengali into English (*Jeevansmritri/Gitanjali: Song Offering*) (Hokenson/Munson 168-9). And Nancy Huston, who "rédige ses textes en français, et ensuite les traduit, ou les réécrit en anglais (prenant parfois le chemin inverse)" has a "renommée internationale [...] de nature exceptionnelle, car l'auteure touche directement des lectorats tant francophone qu'anglophone" (Dvorák x, ix). Indeed, she may represent the most famous, living self-translator.

2.1.2.2 Quantitative data results and analysis

All of the quantitative data that has been gathered are presented in Appendices B through F. In this portion of this chapter, I will distil the data from the appendices in order to provide first a general overview and analysis of the data collected and then, a more in-depth interpretation of it. As Table 3 indicates, the corpus consists of a significant number of entries and pages, even while representing only 10 books.

Table 3 Totals[94]

Total number of books	Total number of entries or articles	Total number of pages
10	1723	8789[95]

[94] See Appendix B for more details regarding this data.
[95] This figure does not take into account volume 3 of *Übersetzung*, which has yet to appear in print.

These large numbers legitimize the claim that there is substantial opportunity for a large number of topics—including that of self-translation—to be addressed in the corpus. Quantitative data regarding the extent to which self-translation is represented is summarized in the four tables below (Table 5 through Table 8). These indicate in how many texts, in which texts and on how many pages "self-translation"[96] or the names of the identified self-translators are referenced in the table of contents or index. Each text corresponds to one of ten letters that are listed variously under the number in the centre column of each table and serve to identify in which texts self-translation is represented (see Table 4).

Table 4 Corpus text key

A	*Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 1st edition (Baker 1998) Henceforth referred to as: *Routledge Encyclopedia (1st)*
B	*Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd edition (Baker 2008) Henceforth referred to as: *Routledge Encyclopedia (2nd)*
C	*Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*, Volumes 1-4 (Baker 2009) Henceforth referred to as: *Critical Concepts*
D	*Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, Volumes 1-2 (Classe 2000) Henceforth referred to as: *Literary Translation*
E	*The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* (France 2000) Henceforth referred to as: *Oxford Guide*
F	*Traducción y traductología: Introducción a la traductología* (Hurtado Albir 2001) Henceforth referred to as: *Traducción*
G	*Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur ubersetzungsforschung /Translation: an international encyclopedia of translation studies /Traduction: Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*, Volumes 1-2 (Kittel 2004) Henceforth referred to as: *Übersetzung*
H	*Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications* (Munday 2008) Henceforth referred to as: *Introducing*
I	*The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (Munday 2009) Henceforth referred to as: *Companion*
J	*The Translation Studies Reader* (Venuti 2004 [2000]) Henceforth referred to as: *Reader*

I will analyze the data by first addressing the results from the searches within the tables of contents and subsequently considering those obtained through the index searches. In

[96] Or variant or equivalent.

both cases, the results from the searches for "self-translation" (versus the self-translators' names) will be examined first.

As Table 5 (below) shows, three of the corpus texts include a listing for self-translation in the table of contents: both editions of the *Routledge Encyclopedia* have an entry for the concept—"auto-translation" in the first edition; "self-translation" in the second—while *Literary Translation* includes an entry for "self-translators." The table also indicates that, according to these table-of-contents references, self-translation is discussed on a dubious 11 pages (this "dubious"-ness is discussed in more detail below). Though these initial figures ultimately must and will be considered in light of the results of the other searches, it is reasonable to deem them low.

Table 5 Table of contents: "self-translation"[97]

Searched string	Number of corpus texts representing string in the table of contents	Number of pages representing string
"self-translation"[98]	3 [A, B, D]	11→ 7→4

At first glance, this low 30% text representation may seem at once logical and surprising. Since "encyclopedia" typically denotes a text that lists and discusses in isolation concepts belonging to a given subject, it may not be unexpected that those texts whose titles do not feature the word "encyclopedia" do not include an entry specifically on "self-translation" either. This logic implies that *Übersetzung*—whose title *does* include "encyclopedia"—would (or should?) have such an entry; however, this is not the case: self-translation goes utterly unacknowledged in the 312[99] article titles of the table of contents. On the other hand, given the organization of this text—i.e., a series of articles (versus entries) on various topics related to translation, grouped thematically—*Übersetzung* more closely resembles those encyclopedic texts that are not encyclopedias *per se*. Whether the seven texts not represented in Table 5 (*Critical Concepts*, *Oxford Guide*, *Traducción*,

[97] Or variant or equivalent; see Appendix C for more details regarding this data.
[98] Or variant or equivalent.
[99] This number has been estimated by adding together the number of articles found the first volume (106), the number found in the second volume (77)—versus the number according to the table of contents in the first volume—and the number of articles for the third volume that are listed in the table of contents of the second volume (129).

Übersetzung, *Introducing*, *Companion*, *Reader*) are considered encyclopedias proper—that is, whether or not they are expected to include entries devoted exclusively to self-translation (or any other topic)—is a moot point. The reason the under-representation in the latter texts is surprising, then, is that "self-translation" appears in none of the 898[100] titles. While similar arguments can be made about other texts in the corpus, let us consider *Critical Concepts*, which features 72 articles organized into 16 themes. Many of these themes would be appropriate for writing focused on self-translation; however, the under-representation of self-translation within this publication is perhaps most notable insofar as the topic is not addressed under those headings that seem most obviously linked to self-translation such as "Part 4 – Translation at the interface of cultures: contact zones, third spaces and border crossings", "Part 12 – Voice, positionality, subjectivity," and "Part 13 – Minority: cultural identity and survival". Results of this search suggest that, in terms of the number of entries, self-translation is reflected in 0.17% of them. This evaluation does not involve the use of a control group; nonetheless, it seems fair to understand this percentage as quite low.

The second statistic to consider in this table-of-contents search is the number of pages on which self-translation is discussed. The *Routledge Encyclopedia (1st)* begins on page 17 and ends on page 20; the *Routledge Encyclopedia (2nd)* begins on page 257 and ends on page 260; and the *Literary Translation* entry begins on page 1250 and ends on page 1252. Therefore, since the entries seem to amount to 4 pages of text in each of the *Routledge Encyclopedias* and 3 pages in *Literary Translation*, it would appear that there are 11 pages on which self-translation is discussed. This statistic is already low, at just over 0.125% of the total number of pages in the corpus. However, notably, two other numbers in Table 5 are listed alongside this one, and it reflects, perhaps more accurately, the number of pages covered. The entries in the *Routledge Encyclopedias* actually occupy only three pages each. Meanwhile, the *Literary Translation* entry occupies only 1 page of text, since page 1251 features merely 10 lines of text related to the entry in question, and page 1252 includes only paratext (brief bibliographic information). Consequently, the number of pages on which "self-translation" appears in the corpus, according to the pages referenced through the table of contents, would be 7 (or 0.08%). Furthermore, although

[100] See previous footnote.

certainly not identical, the *Routledge Encyclopedia* entries represent certain redundancy in content, the second being an updated version of the first. Therefore, it may be more accurate to conclude that the table-of-contents search pointed to a total of only 4 (or 0.05%) pages on self-translation.

Table 6 (below) summarizes the frequency with which the self-translators' names are referenced in the table of contents.

Table 6 Table of contents: self-translators[101]

Searched string	Number of corpus texts representing string in the table of contents	Number of pages representing string and on which self-translator is discussed *in terms of self-translation*[102]
[last name of self-translators][103]	2 [D, E]	14 → 6 B, 3 N, 3 T, 2G

The tables of contents in two[104] of the texts—namely, *Literary Translation* and the *Oxford Guide*—refer to one or more of the self-translators. As indicated above, there are 14 pages (0.16%) on which these self-translators are discussed in terms of self-translation. *Literary Translation* references all of the self-translators but Huston. Meanwhile, Beckett is the only self-translator referenced in the *Oxford Guide*. The latter is not surprising, as it echoes the imbalance discussed already regarding which self-translators are more or less studied. Neither should it be surprising that Huston is altogether unrepresented in these publications: both *Literary Translation* and the *Oxford Guide* were published in 2000, meaning that they would have initiated research for the texts prior to Huston's rise to public notoriety in the mid to late 1990s.

---

[101] See Appendix D for more details regarding this data.

[102] Occurrences in which the self-translator is "discussed in terms of self-translation" include any reference to the fact that the author and translator are the same person: while the word "self-translation" (or variant) might be used, it is also possible that the author-translator coincidence be referenced via paraphrase (e.g. "...he was the chief translator of his works" [in reference to Beckett, Oxford Guide, 294]).

[103] "Beckett," "Green," "Huston," "Nabokov," "Tagore".

[104] Notably, the *Reader* also refers to Nabokov. However, this reference is due only to the fact that Nabokov wrote one of the articles in the anthology; within the text itself, neither his name nor self-translation is mentioned.

Although the results of this search for self-translators' names do not indicate that there is a wealth of discussion on self-translation, they are not particularly startling or problematic either, since discussion of self-translation need not refer to a given self-translator in the title. The invisibility of self-translation, in this case, is more apparent in some of the paratextual data of the entries themselves, most notably in *Literary Translation*. In this text, the name of the self-translator serves as the title for the entry in question, and, underneath the title, as a kind of subheading, there is a list of professional titles associated with the individual. The four heading-subheading pairings read as follows:

- Beckett: "Irish dramatist, novelist, short-story writer, *translator* and *self-translator*" (122) (emphasis added)
- Green: "French novelist, short-story writer, dramatist and diarist" (579)
- Nabokov: "Russian/American novelist, short-story writer, dramatist, poet and *translator*" (987) (emphasis added)
- Tagore: "Indian poet, dramatist, novelist and philosopher" (1368)

Note that, although these writers all translated some of their own literary work, only Beckett is listed as a self-translator. (Also notable is that only Beckett and Nabokov are listed as translators.) Accordingly, via these subheadings, self-translation is to a certain extent invisibilized in this publication, which seems to contradict certain visibility that the text otherwise seems to accord self-translation: as discovered through the table-of-content search for "self-translation," the table features an entry on "Self-translators," and the concept is discussed within the entries on these writers.

Further evidence of this invisibility can be found by comparing the list of works included in each entry, which are classified according to telling categories. In the list accompanying Beckett's entry, such categories include "Translations" and "Self-translations". However, the other three inventories do not feature the grouping of "Self-translations". This proves odd because the fact that Green, Nabokov and Tagore self-translated is acknowledged, in a more implicit way, in the text. Under "Translations" (sub-section "Autobiography") in the entry on Green, the writer is listed as the translator of his *Souvenirs (Quand nous habitions tous ensemble)* (580). Meanwhile, Marilyn Gaddis Rose (author of the entry) highlights Green's self-translator status in the prose

text that follows the list of works: "For example, Memories of Happy Days (1942) and 'Souvenirs (Quand nous habitions tous ensemble, 1943)' (the latter translated by Julian GREEN, 1976, as Memories of Evil Days) began as the 'same' reminiscence" (581). Similarly, he is listed as the translator of *Sud* (under sub-section "Play") and of *Le langage et son double* (under sub-section "Other Writing"), which is followed by: "*The Language and Its Shadow* (*self-translated* parallel texts on language)" (581; emphasis added). Comparable observations can be made about Nabokov and Tagore.[105] Why is it, then—when the writers and editors of the publication acknowledge the existence of self-translation—that three of these four self-translators are not identified as such in the subtitle of the entry on them?

Table 7 (below) presents statistics gathered from the index search for "self-translation".[106] In this case, the indices in four (40%) of the texts refer to the concept: "Auto-translation" in *Routledge Encyclopedia (1st)*, "Self-translation" in the *Routledge Encyclopedia (2nd)*, "Self-translation" and "Auto-translation" in *Critical Concepts*, and "Self-translators" in *English Translation*. In this last case, "Self-translators" is followed by a list of names of those self-translators who are discussed in the two volumes, with page references listed alongside the names.

Table 7 Index: "self-translation"[107]

Searched string	Number of corpus texts representing string in the index	Number of pages representing string
"self-translation"[108]	4 [A, B, C, D[109]]	46→ 18

[105] Nabokov is listed as the translator of his *Camera Obscura*, *Otchaianie*, *A Russian Beauty and Other Stories* (in collaboration with Dmitri Nabokov and Simon Karlinsky); *Tyrants Destroyed and Other Stories* and *Details of a Sunset and Other Stories* and *Izobretenie Val'sa* (in collaboration with Dmitri Nabokov); *Nabokov's Dozen: A Collection of Thirteen Stories* (in collaboration with Peter Pertzov); *Conclusive Evidence: A Memoir*, *Speak, Memory: An Autobiography Revisited* (988). Tagore's name is listed as the translator of his *Collected Poems and Plays of Rabindranath Tagore* and *The English Writings of Rabindranath Tagore* (1369).

[106] Or variant or equivalent.

[107] Or variant or equivalent; see Appendix E for more details regarding this data.

[108] Or variant or equivalent.

[109] *Literary Translation* features three indices, entitled as follows: "Titles", "Translators" and "General Index". Only the "General Index" provides page numbers; therefore, this is the only index used.

This data needs to be considered in light of particular information regarding three of the texts. First, the index in the *Oxford Guide* is restricted to names of authors; since there is no subject index, it is impossible to identify a reference to self-translation. Second, *Traducción* does not have an index at all. Third, although *Übersetzung* has an index, the latter appears in the third volume of the encyclopedia, which, as mentioned earlier (2.1.1.2.2 Search 1 results), has not yet been published. Consequently, it might be more accurate and less misleading, to assess the relative number of texts that have index listings for self-translation at 4 out of 7, or 57%.

This index search suggests that there are 46 pages devoted to self-translation. However, there is a significant amount of redundancy between the pages referenced in the table of contents and those referenced through the index. Once these are taken into account, it becomes clear that only 18 *new* pages are identified through this last search—which explains the second figure listed in the last column of Table 6.

The fact that self-translation is not listed in the index of the *Companion* is particularly noteworthy because, unlike most of the other books (*Traducción* being the exception), this book includes a glossary of terms. The *Companion* includes a 75-page section entitled "Key concepts", a glossary consisting of 204 terms ranging from terms that might be labelled as translation studies staples—e.g., "sign," "calque," "parallel text" and "polysystem theory"—to those that are perhaps less so, or at least less obviously so—e.g., "opera translation," "pseudo-translation," and "RID" (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf). Given the length of the glossary and the range of its terms, as suggested by this brief sampling, one might have expected to find "self-translation" among the other terms of this glossary. Similar comments can be made about the 13-page, 143-entry *glosaría* in *Traducción*, which also includes "staple" terms—e.g., "adecuación" [adequacy], "falsos amigos" [faux amis/false friends], "subtítulo" [subtitle]—and not-so-staple terms—e.g., "método filológico" [philological method], "traducción multimedia" [multimedia translation]. Thus, these texts reflect more, obvious evidence of the invisibility of self-translation.

Further invisibility of self-translation was revealed through the index search in *Critical Concepts*. The index listing for "self-translation" refers to two pages (98 and 99)

in Volume II of the collection and one page (17) for "auto-translation" in Volume IV. However, when consulting the pages in the second volume, I discovered that self-translation is discussed, and at length, on pages 96 and 97 as well.[110] What does the non-reference in the index suggest about the invisibility of self-translation in Translation Studies? How many other references within this and other corpus texts are similarly hidden? How can discussion of this concept be located when they are not listed in the table of contents or index? Why are these references unaccounted for in the index?

Table 8 (above) summarizes the frequency with which, according to the index, the self-translators are present in the corpus.

Table 8 Index: self-translators[111]

Searched string	**Number of texts representing string in the index**	**Number of pages representing string and on which self-translator is discussed *in terms of self-translation***
[last name of self-translators]	5 [A, B, C, D, E]	26→ 11 [5 B, 6 T]

As with the "self-translation" data gathered from the index, this data on the self-translators must be understood in terms of the fact that data could not be collected from three of the corpus texts—that is, those listed above that either do not have an index, do not have a relevant index or have an index that has proved inaccessible. Therefore, the five texts whose indices have listings for at least one of the self-translators should be understood to represent 71% (5 out of 7) versus 50% (5 out of 10) of the corpus. Also similar to the previous index search, this data needs to be considered in terms of redundancy relative to the number of pages listed in the table of contents: though it would

[110] It is twice mentioned by name on page 96. (1) "The self-translation before the First World War of the Indian poet Rabindranath Tagore from Bengali into English earned him the Nobel prize"; (2) "The self-translation of Milan Kundera from Czech into French in the 1970s made him one of the most internationally consecrated writers in recent years." And it is referenced once on page 97 "If translation can be described as an operation through which a text from a deprived literary area succeeds in imposing itself as literary with regard to the legitimate authorities, then the whole series of strategies which aim to facilitate traversing the literary border can be included in the category of 'translation': self-translation, transcription, dominating language, double symmetrical translation, etc."

[111] See Appendix F for more details regarding this data.

seem initially that the self-translators are discussed on 26 pages, only 11 of these had not already been referenced through the table-of-contents searches for "self-translation" or the self-translators.

These totals do *not* include references to Tagore, since no listing for "Tagore" is found in the index. However, as indicated in the footnote accompanying details about the self-translation index search results, Tagore was named on page 96 of *Critical Concepts*, Volume II. Although all other persons appearing in the index were listed by *last* name, knowledge of Tagore's presence in the book prompted me to conduct a second search for him, this time under his *first* name, "Rabindranath". This name is indeed listed in the index. In fact, it is listed twice: first with a lower-case "r", which refers the reader to page 57 of the first volume, where there is only brief mention of Tagore's self-translation practice[112]; then with an upper-case "r", which refers to a series of pages (vol. 2, 96; 253-5; 257-60), all of which include significant discussion of his experience with self-translation. This mix-up suggests another way in which self-translation is invisibilized.

As summarized in Table 9, the results from this quantitative survey reflect an under-representation of self-translation in general translation studies material. Five texts in the corpus seem to make no reference at all to self-translation, and meanwhile, the concept is discussed on only 54 (or 50 or 46) (0.6%) of the 8789 pages in the corpus.

Table 9 Totals: visibility

Search	**Number of texts representing string**	**Number of pages representing string and on which self-translation/self-translator is discussed *in terms of self-translation***
Table of contents: "self-translation"	3 [A, B, D]	7
Table of contents: self-translators	2 [D, E]	14
Index: "self-translation"	4 [A, B, C, D]	18

[112] "From the evidence of [Tagore's] practice and from the few statements he made about translation, he would certainly be in the company of those who regard translation as new writing. In English, *besides what he did to his own writing*, his most extreme demonstration of this practice can be seen in *One Hundred Poems of Kabir* (1917), done in collaboration with Evelyn Underhill" (57; emphasis added).

Index: self-translators	5 [A, B, C, D, E]	11
Totals:	**5**	**50**

Interestingly, among the five texts that do not seem to reflect self-translation are some of the more recently published works as well as the two texts including glossaries. With the results of each search having been discussed individually, several general observations can be made, namely with respect to the dates of publication of each text, the explicit goals of certain texts, and the types of books that do and do not tend to discuss self-translation.

The oldest of the texts in the corpus—the *Routledge Encyclopedia (1st)*—published in 1998, is among those that include an entry on self-translation and therefore also refers to the term in its index. In other words, twelve years ago, it signalled self-translation as a note-worthy concept in Translation Studies. While, of course, this book does not represent the first time self-translation has been referenced in an academic publication,[113] the *Routledge Encyclopedia (1st)* is nonetheless the first *encyclopedia* devoted to Translation Studies: it is "a pioneering work of reference which sets out to chart a territory that has hitherto not been charted" (Baker 1998, 31). Consequently, it is a text that also has great significance within Translation Studies and for the scholars of this and related fields. Therefore, it is surprising that so many subsequent encyclopedic texts, particularly those that define themselves as encyclopedias or that feature glossaries, do not also acknowledge self-translation. The fact that this concept appears again in the subsequent edition of the book seems logical enough; the absence of the term and/or concept in five other publications on general information about Translation Studies, on the other hand, seems peculiar.

Take, for example, the *Reader*. According to its introduction, it has been designed with a view to providing a "historical survey" of writing about translation, to being pedagogically valuable—"the primary audience imagined for this reader is academic"—, and to "challeng[ing] any disciplinary complacency, to produce a consolidation that

[113] For instance, the MLA search referenced in the previous chapter of this thesis includes a journal article ("Stefan Georges französische Gedichte und deutsche Übertragungen" [Stefan George's French poetry and German self-translations]) that was published in 1936.

interrogates the ways in which translation is currently researched and taught by revealing—even if implicitly—the limitations of scholarly knowledge and pedagogical practices" (Venuti 2004: 7, 2). Yet, according to the table of contents and the index in this anthology, there are no references to self-translation. As seen in the previous chapter of this thesis, self-translation has a long history and has received increased attention over the past 15 years. The missing mention of self-translation is therefore even more surprising because the editor consciously devotes more space for research conducted during the past thirty years (Venuti 2004: 1). Finally, it is interesting to note that there may be a tendency to highlight self-translation in texts that do not necessarily "belong" to the field of Translation Studies. Much of the work on self-translation is found in the field of Comparative Literature, as noted in Chapter 1, wherein three of the five corpus texts were written by scholars from this field. Has the latter accepted self-translation more readily than Translation Studies to which the term seems more appropriately to belong?

2.2 Speculating about the invisibility of self-translation

That the quantitative evaluation indicates a marked under-representation of self-translation prompts the questions: Why? Why is self-translation so invisible? What might account for its under-representation in general literature on Translation Studies? There are no doubt various possible responses to the main question of why.[114] The present intention is to discuss what is arguably one of the fundamental reasons—if not *the* key issue—underlying this question, by proposing that this relative invisibility is a result of the ways in which the self-translator is perceived in the Western world. At the root of this discussion, meanwhile, is another that focuses on the ways in which the writing subjects of the author and the standard translator are perceived. I will begin by identifying fundamental differences between the standard translator and the self-translator in order to differentiate between how they are perceived. I will then examine how the author and the

[114] Several reasons are provided in the texts used for the corpus in Chapter 1 of this thesis. For example, Hokenson and Munson speculate that "one reason for critics' neglect of the bilingual text in these years [Renaissance] 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" (37).

standard translator are perceived, briefly considering the important matter of copyright, which arguably epitomizes how these perceptions are manifested. Finally, I will look at how the self-translator is perceived, arguing that this perception leads to her relative invisibility and consequently to that of self-translation within translation research.

For the purposes of this section, I am specifically interested in self-translation that is defined textually and interlingually, since, as discussed, this is the predominant definition in self-translation research and is therefore more likely to resurface. Furthermore, given the emphasis on literature, in both Translation Studies generally as well as self-translation research specifically, I will be limiting my discussion to literary self-translation.

2.2.1 Distinguishing standard translation from self-translation

The fundamental difference between standard translation and self-translation is that, while both phenomena involve two texts and two language-cultures, the former implies two writing subjects whereas the latter implies only one. Though this distinction may seem obvious and therefore simple, its implications are in fact rather complicated, because each type of translator has a different number of personas, and these personas allow—or perhaps cause—the translator and self-translator to be perceived very differently. Arguably, the standard translator comprises only one persona: that of the translator, who is responsible for presenting a foreign text to a new language-culture. I propose that, in contrast to the standard translator, the self-translator has three personas, and that these can be labelled and defined as follows:

- the author persona: that facet of the self-translator that is the creator of a given text;
- the translator persona: that facet of the self-translator that transfers a given text into another text in another language-culture; and
- the self-translator persona: that facet of the self-translator that translates one of her *own* texts into another text in another language-culture.

A particular power dynamic exists between the self-translator's three personas. In order to understand this dynamic, we must reflect on how the writing subject represented by each persona is perceived. This discussion will consist of a sketch of Western perceptions

of the author, the standard translator and the self-translator. Ultimately, investigation of how these perceptions interact will reveal how the potency of authorship promotes the invisibility of self-translation.

2.2.2 Perceptions of the author

Authorship is a vast topic of discussion and can, as many publications show, easily be the subject of lengthy and in-depth exploration.[115] This discussion of the author will therefore be restricted to those features of contemporary perceptions of the author that are key to considering the invisibility of self-translation.

"Literary theory," writes Andrew Bennett, "is largely a question of author theory" (4-5). This statement, which situates the writing subject at the centre of an arguably text-based discipline, underscores the perceived importance of the author. By surveying the historical evolution of how the author is seen, Bennett points out that the term "author" is not uncomplicated. While acknowledging certain exceptions, he explains that, until the Romantic era, the name of the author bore no particular importance. Oral traditions and collaborative writing practices, for example, attributed very little, if any, credit or responsibility to a single individual. Meanwhile, the medieval *auctor*, whose job it was to transcribe writings, modifying the text in varying degrees depending on his rank, "is still thought of as a person who writes the words of others as well as of his own," and "no particular privilege" was given to the *auctor* who was entrusted to contribute more of his own ideas (39, referencing J.A. Burrows; 39, referencing 13th-century Franciscan monk St Bonaventure). The author's name and, therefore, acknowledgement of the author's involvement in the writing process, became required information only after the fact. Moreover, when there is a temporal discrepancy between the author—whomever she or they may be—and the modern[116] individual or society asking the question *Who wrote text X?*, there may also be a discrepancy between how the modern asker and the society of the

---

[115] See, for example, *The Author* (2005), by Andrew Bennett, *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida* (2008), by Seán Burke, and *L'auteur: Textes choisis & présentés* (2001), by Alain Brunn.

[116] In this context, "modern" refers approximately to the period from the Romantics (late 18th century) until now.

author understand the concept of authorship. Consequently, the "answers" to the modern asker's question prove dubious.[117]

Notably, regardless of the changes marking the evolution of authorship, certain invariables characterize the way in which the author is perceived. The author—the poet, more particularly—has long been associated with a certain divinity, as a medium of spiritual interception, and has thus been viewed as a source of originality, meaning and truth: "The *auctor* ultimately takes his authority from God" (Bennett 39). Even though he argues that the poet is mentally unstable, Socrates also claims that "the true poet works through inspiration": "The poets themselves are 'not the ones who speak those verses', [...] rather 'the god himself is the one who speaks, and he gives voice through them to us' (p. 42)" (Bennett: 37). The perception and assertion of the author as an expressive and transcendental subject boomed in the Romantic period, "as part of a more general development of the idea of the self" (Bennett 57). It is since this time that, according to Venuti, the author has been seen "as the ultimate signified" of the written work (Venuti 1986: 188): the

> author freely expresses his thoughts and feelings in writing, which is thus viewed as an original and transparent self-representation, unmediated by transindividual determinants (linguistic, cultural, social) that might complicate authorial originality. (Venuti 2008 6)

Friedrich Schleiermacher envisioned the author in this way when he discussed, in 1813, the importance of the individual who expresses an idea:

> One understands an utterance as an action of the speaker only if, at the same time, one can feel where and how he was seized by the force of the language, where along its path the lightning flashes of thought snaked their way, where and how in its forms errant imagination was held fast. (Venuti 2004: 46-47)

"Lightning flashes" evoke channelling a higher power that "seizes" the author/ "speaker". This perception of authorship was the impetus for Roland Barthes's 1967[118] article "La mort de l'auteur" ["The Death of the Author"] and Michel Foucault's 1969 article

---

[117] Consider, for example, Homer. "While not denying that Homer may in fact have been an individual who brought the poems now known as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* to a level of perfection that transcends every other oral epic poem that has come down to us, [Albert B.] Lord argued that Homer inherited not only his stories but also his compositional techniques, his themes and his very linguistic 'formulas' from a tradition stretching back many centuries" (Bennett 32).

[118] According to Bennett, this article was presented at a U.S. conference in 1967, despite being subsequently published in 1968. (9-10, footnotes)

"Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?" ["What is an Author?"], which represent foundational criticism on authorship (Bennett 11). Both dealt with the author figure from a poststructuralist point of view. Barthes wanted language—that is, the text—to be acknowledged for housing ideas, and he sought to replace the authority and power of the author with that of the reader. Foucault, meanwhile, called into question the importance of *who* is speaking—who is the originator of a thought—and, after asserting (however reluctantly) that it does in fact matter, he sought to analyze the space carved out by the author, a space he viewed as ultimately that from which the author has in fact disappeared. What is interesting for this thesis is that, despite the fact that, according to their rhetoric, Barthes and Foucault want the author to "die", both recognize the staying power of this figure. In other words, even those who resist the notion ultimately seem unable to conquer or ignore it.

Foucault's treatment of this subject is, as Bennett states, "more carefully argued and more historically decisive" (20). It is therefore relevant to examine Foucault's paper more closely, specifically regarding the notion of the *fonction auteur*, or *author function*, that it introduces. This term refers to the discursive effect the author has on her work and is based on Foucault's claim that the author's name is not merely a proper noun: while a proper noun draws an arrow from itself to the real person it designates, he argues, the author's name suggests an idea of an individual, who resides more in the imagination of the reader than in reality, and the author's name performs the important function in certain discursive situations of classifying works (Foucault 796). Thus, the author function reflects the widely held perception that the author occupies a privileged position.

The perception of the author is not only very clearly established but also repeatedly validated and even blindly accepted—that is, it is generally difficult for people to conceive of the author in a way that does not see her in a privileged position in terms of creative and expressive originality. For self-translation, this suggests that the same is true for the author persona of the self-translator. Before drawing further conclusions, however, it is important to consider the perception of the standard translator. For example, is there such a thing as a "(standard) translator function"?

2.2.3 Perceptions of the standard translator

As with the notion of authorship, the question of how the standard translator is perceived can be discussed at length. I will therefore speak only to the points that are most relevant to understanding the invisibility of the self-translator and of self-translation. Ultimately, despite efforts by those advocating the contrary, the standard translator seems to be largely perceived as a subordinate technician, as per "la hiérarchie communément admise qui *subordonne* la traduction à l'original" (Oustinoff 84).

As highlighted in the call for papers for the "Swansea Author-Translator in the European Tradition" conference, there has recently been a movement in translation studies research to promote the translator's creative abilities:[119]

> The recent 'creative turn' in translation studies has challenged notions of translation as a derivative and uncreative activity which is inferior to 'original' writing. Commentators have drawn attention to the creative processes involved in the translation of texts, and suggested a rethinking of translation as a form of creative writing. Hence there is growing critical and theoretical interest in translations undertaken by literary authors.[120]

This turn inevitably evolved in part from the ideological shift that preceded it—the "translator turn", wherein a number of translation studies scholars called for a space to be carved out for the translator and sought "to put an end to" the "low status of both translation theory and translation practice" (Robinson 1990: xiii). Douglas Robinson contends that,

> instead of pretending that the translator constructs a stable one-to-one pattern of correspondence or equivalence between the SL and the TL text (which proves to be ultimately impossible), we should recognize and, contextually, encourage the translator's poetic creativity. (xv)

---

[119] See, for example, Bassnett and Bush as well as Loffredo and Perteghella. In the introduction of the first text, the authors remark that the contributors to the book are all "more or less concerned to show the level of creativity, scholarship and linguistic expertise necessary to fulfill the responsibilities of a translator" (2). In the introduction to the second, the authors write that certain "contemporary explorations and experimental practices, *often still at the margins of the common perception of translation*, reveal how translation is being rethought and redefined in the light of 'creativity' and *as a form of 'writing'*. Creative writing, as a new critical setting, has increasingly become the next contender field promising an insight into the process of translation and, ultimately, and innovative and stimulating 'project of translation'" (2, emphasis added).

[120] Swansea University Faculty of Arts and Humanities, http://www.swan.ac.uk/german/SeminarsLecturesandConferences/Conferences/Author-TranslatorConference/; consulted 2010-02-27.

The creative authority that Translation Studies has sought, over the past 20 years or so, to grant the translator echoes what is, as discussed in the previous section, generally associated with the author. Consequently, in attempting to seek some kind of relative parity of status between the standard translator and the author, many translation studies scholars seem to suggest that, in addition to a translator persona, the standard translator has something of an author persona. However, much of the discourse both within and outside of Translation Studies indicates that perceptions of the standard translator do not tend to coincide with those championed by the above-mentioned conference and like-minded publications (cf. "often still at the margins of the common perception of translation" in footnote 119). Rather, as will be explained, it seems that the standard translator is largely expected to be both invisible and silent, out of deference to the foreign author.[121]

According to Venuti (2008: 6), a notion of authorship for the translator has not yet been articulated. Consequently, in the theory and practice of standard translation, while the foreign author is perceived as having privileged status, the standard translator is relatively subordinate, commonly seen as a "copyist" or a "play actor" (Venuti 2008: 7). Venuti provides many examples of the standard translator's sympathetic attitude towards the foreign author. Among them is that of twentieth-century translator Willard Trask who asserts that there is a "clear distinction between authoring and translating" (Venuti 2008: 6). With this claim, he subscribes to the established conception of authorship and denies the standard translator's access to it. This denial is clear in Trask's further contention that "'when you translate you're not expressing yourself'" (qtd in Venuti 2008: 7). The performance analogy Trask then uses to define the role of the (standard) translator suggests, however, that he ultimately believes that the translator should simulate the

[121] It is important to note that the rather negatively connoted perceptions of the standard translator presented here reflect Western perspectives. Certain non-Western cultures conceive of the standard translator differently. Tymoczko discusses the word for translation in Chinese ("fanyi") as well as in certain other non-Western language-cultures, in order to point out that the implications of the words relative to how translation (and therefore the translator) are perceived in Chinese culture(s) is different than the way they are perceived in the West. She discusses this perception in terms of not only the role translators have played historically but also the role they have played in the conscious mind of Chinese people: "The importance of translators as culture heroes in China is signalled by the popular tale about bringing the Buddhist scriptures to China to be translated, known in its most famous redaction as Journey to the West" (72).

behaviour of the foreign author: he "realized that the translator and the actor had to have the same kind of talent" (qtd in Venuti 2008: 7).

In the process of attempting to copy or imitate the foreign author, argues Venuti, the standard translator engages in a process that constitutes "a weird self-annihilation," (2008: 7) in which she creates the illusion of exiling herself not onto the periphery of the translation but rather *beyond* it; into the void, thereby making herself seem invisible. More concrete manifestations of this invisibility suggest that the latter is systematically approved (by translators, by society). As Robinson points out, "[t]ens of thousands of translated books and articles have been published without mentioning the translators' names" (2002: xviii). Moreover, he notes, "[a]uthors who achieved fame exclusively through their translations, like Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt in the mid-seventeenth century, often do not appear in encyclopedias at all, even in their own countries" (2002: xviii-xix). This is further underscored in the example of a translation produced by translator and translation studies scholar, Luise von Flotow. In 2008, Seven Stories Press (New York) published *Everybody Talks About the Weather. We Don't.*, von Flotow's English translation of a collection of German articles written by Ulrike Meinhof[122]; however, von Flotow's name failed to appear on the cover of the book or anywhere else within the work (von Flotow, 2010).[123] Citing Lori Chamberlain, Robinson also highlights that the standard translator is perceived as someone who is expected to remain silent:

> As Lori Chamberlain points out in 'Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation', in patriarchal hierarchies the translator stands to the original author as woman does to man (nurse to doctor, teacher to administrator, etc.), and this prescribed secondary and parasitic status has all too often consigned translation theory as well to oblivion. Like women, like children, translators in the West have been expected to be seen but not heard. The translator is the silent servant of the original author, 'his' wife. The translator who raises his or (worse) her voice to draw attention to the work he or she has done provokes uneasiness, even open hostility (2002: xviii- xviii).

What seems clear is that, according to the previously cited definition of the author, the standard translator cannot be an author in the same way as the foreign author can, since

---

[122] There is no one title in German; the book consists of a number of selected articles that Meinhof published between 1959 and 1969 in *Konkret* and other journals.

[123] The only exception is that editor Karin Bauer mentions von Flotow in the thank-you. Seven Stories eventually amended the omission by providing the correct information on all Internet sites and by submitting von Flotow's involvement as translator to the Library of Congress.

the standard translator's "thoughts and feelings" are generally not perceived as being "expressed freely" (Trask) in a translation. It is for this reason that, earlier, the standard translator was assigned only a translator persona and not also an author persona.

The hierarchical relationship between author and translator is perhaps further emphasized because it seems that it is impossible to conceive of the translator or translation without also thinking of the author or "original" authorship. Fitch discusses (standard) translations as "metatexts"—texts that "'point to' another text" and, thus, "lack autonomy" (19). Despite how pivotally translation may contribute to the status of the text in question,[124] the author is perceived as existing independently of the translator. The translator, by contrast, is perceived as entirely dependent upon an author, and therefore subordinate, marginal.

2.2.4 Copyright

Copyright laws embody, in significant ways, the dynamic that characterizes the relationship between standard translator and author—or, more precisely, the relationship between the ways in which each of these figures is perceived. The laws were created in the 17th and 18th centuries as a means of enabling authors[125] to earn a living through writing: the advent of printing allowed writers to mass-produce their work, and copyright laws offered a means of protecting the latter (Bennett 49, 50; Basalamah 23). Meanwhile, the laws also signalled—and still signal today—the modern understanding of authorship.

In his *Le droit de traduire: Une politique culturelle pour la mondialisation*, Salah Basalamah surveys legal and ideological questions surrounding copyright laws in the UK and ultimately focuses on those pertaining to the *droit d'auteur* in France.[126] In doing so, he reconceptualizes the laws in terms of their implications for translation, calling into

---

[124] Itamar Even-Zohar, for one, points to this importance when he refers to the "broad recognition among historians of culture of the major role translation has played in the crystallization of national cultures" (Venuti 2004: 199).

[125] Copyright laws also served to protect booksellers, but it is the author who sold the copy to the latter, which ultimately gave power to the author: "the law instituted the author as legal entity" (Bennett 51).

[126] Although the terms "copyright" and "droit d'auteur" are similar, there is a distinction between them: while the first term refers to the ownership of a given text, or copy ("l'œuvre littéraire comme une propriété"), the second refers to the protection of author, and her moral and intellectual rights relative to the text (Basalamah 12; Brunn 68).

question the "originality" of the author "pour renoncer au mythe de l'origine" (5). Basalamah explains that, for example, Samuel Johnson—witnessing the era of the Copyright Act of 1710, the first legal document of its kind—had a "volonté d'indépendance [qui] lui a fait considérer que le droit de propriété de l'auteur dans son œuvre est plus fort que celui d'occupation de la terre" (12). Johnson's point of view speaks to the primacy of the author's perceived metaphysical position, and echoes the imperative that the author's work be protected (Basalamah 23). By contrast, a translation is not seen as something belonging to the translator, or as something that needs to be protected *by* the translator (Basalamah 26). Instead, it is conceived of legally, as an extension of the author's creation, a thing requiring protection for reasons that pertain to the author's interests. This paradigm insists that the translator be subordinated to the author, and as Basalamah argues, the translator, or more specifically "la liberté d'expression du traducteur [...] est doublement dépendant : et du bon vouloir de l'auteur et du système du droit d'auteur" (26). Is the same true in self-translation? How do dynamics of dependence affect the self-translator?

2.2.5 Perceptions of the self-translator

Fitch argues that "[t]he situation changes radically once the reader knows that it is the author of the original who is responsible for the second version" (19). How *does* the reader perceive the self-translator? One way to approach this question is to consider three related excerpts, all of which are taken from the *Routledge Encyclopedia (2nd)* entry on self-translation.

1. "The public's reception of an author's own translation is often based not so much on an extensive study of the textual product's intrinsic qualities [...] as on an appreciation of the process that gave birth to it" (259).

Implied here is that standard translators, when recognized for their work, are judged predominantly according to the text they have written and how successfully or "accurately" it coincides with the original, foreign work. By contrast, Grutman states that the "process that gave birth to" the self-translation was one in which the translator and author were the same person. Therefore, the way in which the self-translator is perceived

results from an "appreciation" of the fact that, in addition to being the translator, she is the creator of the original.

2. "Since the writer himself is the translator, he can allow himself bold shifts from the source text which, had it been done by another translator, probably would not have passed as an adequate translation" (Grutman 2009b: 259, qtg Perry 1981: 181).

In other words, precisely because she is seen as the author, the self-translator is allowed a great deal of authority when translating, whereas the "good" standard translator is, as discussed earlier, typically seen as deferential to the original text and author.

3. "[T]he writer-translator is no doubt felt to have been in a better position to recapture the intentions of the author of the original than any ordinary translator" (Grutman 2009b: 259, qtg Fitch 1988: 125).

In this instance, Fitch uses "writer-translator" as synonymous for self-translator. The self-translator's higher status, relative to the standard translator, is implied by the reference to the "better position" she holds. These three passages signal the dynamic at play between the roles of the author and the translator—that is, those roles established through dominant perceptions. Barring exceptional circumstances, when a self-translated text is published, no other name but that of the self-translator accompanies the title of the text; accordingly, the self-translator is perceived as author. In other words, this individual is seen—where the standard translator frequently, if not commonly, is not—and, when she is seen, she is recognized as the originator of the text. Since the self-translator has both an author persona, accompanied by the potency of authorship, and a translator persona, carrying a dramatically weaker authority or presence, she seems to have a different kind of status—a *higher* status—than the standard translator.

Why, then, is self-translation under-represented in encyclopedic work on translation studies? Given the author-translator dynamic inherent to the self-translator, this type of translator embodies the struggle that is familiar to the translator (versus the author) and translation (versus authorship). Within the self-translator, the author persona seems to trump the translator persona and consequently also the self-translator persona. Therefore, the self-translator is likely to be seen as an author—with all the status,

authority and primacy associated with the latter—and the translator persona is eroded. Fitch articulates this trumping effect, writing that

> to the extent that [the self-translator] chooses [to seek to create for his reader an impression of cultural and linguistic familiarity], the resulting text's metatext status stands a strong chance of being obscured in favour of its status as text. This has often been the fate of the second versions of Samuel Beckett. (25)

The self-translator persona, for its part is, if acknowledged at all, often mentioned merely as a secondary or peripheral point of interest about the author (cf. Green's and Nabokov's self-translation status in *English Translation*). Because of the widely accepted hierarchy between the author and the translator, there may also be a conscious or unconscious reluctance or refusal to accept that an author can be a translator and vice versa. Therefore, if the self-translating subject is *perceived* as an author, then little will be written about *self-translation*; self-translation is predisposed to invisibility.

2.3 Qualitative evaluation of self-translation within general translation research

In contrast to the first segment of this chapter, wherein the presence of self-translation was evaluated in terms of the frequency with which the concept was referenced, this final section involves investigating how self-translation is *not* reflected in the specific arguments of certain texts on translation. This section represents a qualitative evaluation of general translation studies texts, in which I consider the following two questions: In what ways does self-translation complicate the claims of the text, thereby revealing that it has been overlooked? In what instances has self-translation not been discussed when, according to the theorist's argument, it *could* have been? It would also be valuable to analyze how such texts account for self-translation. However, such an investigation moves beyond the scope of time and space associated with this project. Furthermore, and more significantly, the assumption that the texts account for self-translation seems automatic, whereas the neglect is less evident. Therefore, identifying ways in which self-translation has been disregarded seems more beneficial.

2.3.1 Corpus building

2.3.1.1 Criteria for corpus building

Similarly to the corpus identified for the quantitative evaluation, this corpus will focus on texts that deal with translation as a general concept. However, the corpus used for the qualitative evaluation differs in several ways. While the quantitative corpus was open to texts in which translation and its various sub-topics are defined or explored only briefly (e.g. a glossary entry), the qualitative corpus must include texts that offer a certain depth of argumentation (e.g. a book, an article, an essay). While the former corpus required that, as a collection, the publications comprise a large number of sub-texts, the latter corpus must be limited to relatively few texts, since in this case, as opposed to conducting a general survey, I will examine the substantial (i.e. pertaining to substance) and rhetorical content of each text. Furthermore, the texts included in the qualitative corpus should cover a large period of time and should comprise what are deemed "seminal" texts. The former criterion is essential to demonstrating how self-translation is overlooked in texts written some time ago as well as in those published more recently. Seminal texts define the discipline to which they belong; thus, if these do not reflect a particular concept, then, it can be argued, the discipline overlooks that concept.

2.3.1.2 Methodology for corpus building

Most of the texts identified for this corpus were pulled from the corpus used for the quantitative evaluation. This decision was motivated by two important factors. First, the focus of the publications in latter corpus—i.e., writings about translation in general—corresponds to that of the qualitative corpus. Second, the methodology followed for building the first corpus was appropriate to a methodology that might have been used here. Moreover, while not all of the publications are appropriate for qualitative investigation, it offers a variety of potentially relevant texts from which to choose. *Critical Concepts*, *Übersetzung* and the *Reader* feature articles that are substantial in length and decidedly argumentative in nature, whereas the entries of the other corpus texts tend to be short and are predominantly descriptive. Of these three, the *Reader* ultimately represents the most suitable publication for this qualitative study since the collection of essays spans a much longer period of time than do the other two

publications.[127] Moreover, the *Reader* intentionally features seminal texts, and the perceived importance of these seems particularly high given that the book is in its second edition. The other two books are focused on more recent writings.

It would be too large a task for this thesis to undertake evaluating self-translation in each of the essays in the *Reader*. Therefore, one article has been selected from each of the time periods identified in the table of contents. Accordingly, six of the thirty-two articles in the anthology were identified. They are as follows:

- *Foundation Statements*: "On the Different Methods of Translating," Friedrich Schleiermacher (1812), translated by Susan Bernofsky (2004)
- *1900s-1930s*: "The Task of the Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Beaudelaire's *Tableaux parisiens,*" Benjamin, Walter (1923); translated by Harry Zohn
- *1940s-1950s*: "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation," Jakobson, Roman (1959)
- *1960s*-1970s: "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem," Even-Zohar, Itamar (1978/revised 1990)
- *1980s*: "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign," Berman, Antoine (1985); translated by Lawrence Venuti
- *1990s* and beyond: "The Politics of Translation," Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1992)

In addition to the six articles, the corpus for the qualitative evaluation includes Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. This book has been identified for several reasons. For one, the evaluation would be better served if the corpus included an entire book, since, by virtue of its length, this kind of text offers opportunity for more in-depth evaluation than do articles, which are necessarily shorter. Furthermore, while this book is commonly remembered for the first part of its title (*The Translator's Invisibility*), the second part (*A History of Translation*) is equally important; though Venuti's book is polemical, it is not merely that: in it, Venuti also purports to survey Western translation diachronically.

---

[127] Essays in the *Reader* were initially published as early as 395 and as recently as 2000 (revised in 2004). In *Critical Concepts*, by contrast, the oldest essay was published in 1962, and most were written in or after the 1980s.

2.3.1.3 Corpus results

The following is a summary of all of the texts identified for this corpus for qualitative:

- "On the Different Methods of Translating," Schleiermacher (1812), translated by Bernofsky (2004)
- "The Task of the Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Beaudelaire's *Tableaux parisiens,*" Benjamin (1923), translated by Zohn
- "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation," Jakobson (1959)
- "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem," Even-Zohar (1978/revised 1990)
- "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign," Berman (1985); translated by Venuti
- "The Politics of Translation," Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1992)
- *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (2008), Venuti

2.3.2 Qualitative data

2.3.2.1 Methodology for corpus evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is not to criticize the value of the contributions of the written works. Rather, it is to identify gaps in the argumentation with respect to how self-translation is being represented. Since nothing in the texts explicitly indicates otherwise,[128] and in order to give each article the benefit of the doubt, I analyze each text assuming that "translation" is used as the umbrella term defined in the introduction of this thesis—that is, one that accounts for both standard translation and self-translation.

Through an investigation of the *Reader* and *Invisibility*, I will show that various problems arise when the principles and arguments presented in the texts are applied to self-translation. The difficulty lies largely in the fact that, in self-translation, the lines separating many of the perceived binarisms, such as author/translator, original/translation, source/target, or home/foreign, are blurred. The format of interrogating certain claims and assumptions made in each of the corpus writings will generally take the shape of analyses. However, it will also involve asking questions

[128] None of the authors explain that, when they refer to "translation", they are *not* referring to self-translation in addition to standard translation.

without necessarily providing answers but with an interest, rather, in signalling possible areas where there seems to be room for further discussion regarding the particularities of self-translation. Ultimately, by bringing to the fore the fact that claims and assumptions made about standard translation cannot necessarily be applied to self-translation, this evaluation will serve to underscore the results of the quantitative evaluation: that self-translation is overlooked within broad-based literature on Translation Studies.

2.3.2.2 Qualitative analysis

2.3.2.2.1 The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation (Venuti)

Neither "self-translation" nor any of its variants or synonyms is listed in the comprehensive, 12-page index at the end of the book. Furthermore, neither these words nor the concepts to which they refer appear within the text itself. Venuti argues that, since the 17th century, English-language translations have been created and evaluated according to the standard of "fluency"—a term he uses to refer to "the translator's effort to insure easy readability by adhering to current usage, maintaining continuous syntax, fixing a precise meaning." (2008: 1). He also argues that there are two dominant problems with this criterion: the first is that the translator becomes invisible[129] by writing in a way that encourages the reader to believe she is gaining direct access to the original text and author; the second and resulting problem is that the foreignness of the original text is eroded. The qualitative evaluation of this book will therefore involve consideration of how self-translation proves to complicate these two problems.

2.3.2.2.1.1 Invisibility

Venuti (2008: 1) stresses that the invisibility of the translator is merely an illusion: the translated text is necessarily a product of the translator's choices, and these choices are not benign components of the translating practice. Rather, they reflect the translator's interpretations of the foreign text as well as her motives for importing this writing into the translating language-culture. In short, the translation acts as a form of appropriation. Thus, Venuti insists that, where this first instance of invisibility is concerned, the

[129] As discussed in the introduction of this thesis, Venuti's concept of "invisibility" is not the same as the one to which I refer in this thesis.

translator is less a victim than a willing and active participant in imposing invisibility upon herself. Through the illusion of the translator's invisibility, the author of the foreign text is, in turn, made visible—although, of course, this visibility, Venuti argues, must also be understood as an illusion.

Is the self-translator equally susceptible to the kind of self-effacement referenced in this instance of invisibility? Is she capable of it? According to Venuti, the majority of translators—that is, those who translate in a domesticating way, in a way that appropriates the text for the translating culture, minimizing traces of foreignness from the original text—seek to "identify with the author" and therefore "psychologiz[e] a relationship with the foreign text" (2008: 6). Some of these translators seem or claim to embrace a sympathetic attitude towards the foreign author, while others seem or claim to resist such a rapport. Ultimately, however, both attitudes are associated with the invisibility of the translating subject. The same cannot be said of the self-translator: while she may at times echo behaviours or attitudes demonstrated by the standard translator, the consequences for her level of visibility differ.

In his *On Translating Homer* (1861), for example, Matthew Arnold calls for "the union of the translator with his original" (qtd in Venuti 2008: 108). Arnold uses the word "original", but, according to the established conception of authorship and Arnold's own interest in the Romantic idea of the transcendental subject, the meaning of the text (the "original" to which Arnold refers) is the author herself (Venuti 2008: 107). Thus, this "union" can also be understood to refer to one between the translator and the foreign author. For Arnold, this union "alone can produce a good translation" (qtd in Venuti 2008: 108), which for him means a translation that leaves him invisible. It is difficult to argue that this kind of union is lacking within the self-translator: it is through this union that the translator persona can be (mis)taken for the author persona and thus for an author. The self-translator is visible, as an individual; however, this visibility is made possible because, as discussed previously, the author function of the self-translator's author persona trumps the translator function (if such a thing exists) of her translator persona.

In 1791, Alexander Tytler published his "Essay on the Principles of Translation," in which, according to Venuti, he advocates "masking the second-order status of the

translation" and obliterating "the distinction between translator and author" (2008: 60, 62). He claims that, to do so, the translator must essentially attempt to *become* the foreign author: "the translator must adopt the very soul of his author, which must speak through his own organs" (Tytler qtd in Venuti 2008: 62). Venuti argues that, by striving to inhabit the foreign author, Tytler aims to conceal his own voice, intentions and choices. In the case of the self-translator, erasing the distinction between the author and translator is far less complicated, practically speaking. Moreover, while the self-translator's author and translator personas can be isolated conceptually, it is indeed the convoluted nature of their relationship that is partly responsible for the visibility of the self-translator, as an individual.

When these attitudes regarding the ideal relationship between the standard translator and the foreign author are applied to self-translation, they illustrate that, through the author function of her author persona, the self-translator remains visible. There may, however, be an important connection to make between the self-translator's translator persona and the standard translator: namely, given the way in which it is so often trumped by the author persona, the self-translator's translator persona seems subjected to an invisibility similar to that of the standard translator. In that case, is the invisibility of the translator persona—like that of the standard translator—also an illusion?

While the previous standard translators claim to seek to narrow the gap between them and the foreign authors whose works they translate, others reject adopting a sympathetic attitude towards their author. These include, for example, Sir John Denham and his predecessors. Denham obliterates not the difference between the author and the translator but rather the idea of authorship altogether. Thus, he seemingly claims and displays no overt sympathy towards the foreign author. In 1656, Denham published *The Destruction of Troy: An Essay upon the Second Book of Virgils AEneis. Written in the year, 1636* (Venuti 2008: 35). Notably, he did not sign his name to this translation. This decision, according to Venuti, shows that Denham was "not asserting any individualistic concept of authorship" (Venuti 2008: 36). Thus, Denham's decision to remain anonymous indicates that he was not at all seeking to sympathize with the foreign author, Virgil. Venuti speculates that Denham's manifested lack of interest in connecting with

this author may result from "an effort to *conceal* his identity, a precaution taken by royalist writers who intended their work to be critical of the Commonwealth" (2008: 36), which seems to have been Denham's intention: by appearing to the reader to be invisible, Denham enables his own critical voice.

Are such indirect means of criticism available to the self-translator? It is possible for her to be anonymous? While the translator persona of the self-translator is often made invisible, the self-translator-as-individual—the person who subsumes the three personas—is necessarily marked by her name which, whether perceived as representing her as a translator, an author or a self-translator, nonetheless negates the opportunity for her to conceal her identity in the way Denham did. In light of these questions, the author function of the self-translator's author persona and the visibility it imposes seem to adopt a more haunting quality than it may have seemed to do previously.

Denham's contemporaries, such as "W. L. Gent." and Sir Thomas Wroth, chose another means of separating themselves from the foreign author: that of appearing to subordinate themselves out of a kind of deference to the foreign author by way of "apologies" and "requests" (Venuti 2008: 38). In notes accompanying their translations, "Gent." and Wroth articulate their so-called intentions in order to gain "freedom"—freedom that, they claim, serves to make the voice of the foreign author heard, enabling them to communicate the foreign author's "true" intention and meaning. In the apology of his 1628 Virgil translation, for example, "Gent." calls upon "the freedome of a Translator" with a view to "preserv[ing] the Kernell safe and whole" (Venuti 2008: 38). Similarly, in "A reqvest to the Reader," accompanying his 1620 translation entitled *The Destruction of Troy*, Wroth invokes the same "freedome" so that he "stray not from the scope and intent of the Author" (Venuti 2008: 38). Both of these cases illustrate the standard translator's supposed attempts to source out the so-called true meaning of the foreign text, in deference to the foreign author. Thus, the rhetorical strategy of the so-called "apology" and "request" serve ultimately to assert the illusional invisibility of the standard translator, giving her the "freedom" to say more than she might otherwise have been able to say.

Does the self-translator have access to such rhetorical devices? A similar "apology" or "request" may seem, and indeed *be*, either illogical or inappropriate. On the

other hand, does she even require such access? In short, how free is the self-translator? Through the visibility of her author persona, the self-translator may automatically access this independence of expression. If the self-translator persona is visible—that is, if the reader recognizes the text as a self-translation—is the reader more forgiving of the self-translator with regards to what might otherwise be considered "inaccuracies"? Given the primacy of the individualistic conception of authorship, the reader may perceive the self-translator's author persona as having transferred to its translator counterpart the "ultimate" intention and meaning of the original text. In what ways does this visibility of the author persona lend too much authority to the self-translator? While the standard translator subscribes to the illusion of invisibility as a strategy for justifying the "accuracy" of her translations, the self-translator, who may appear to have inherent access to the meaning of the original text, may in turn be making automatic use of this strategy and asserting her visibility (via the author persona and its function) in order to prove it.

Evidently, according to Venuti's argumentation, the invisibility of the standard translator persists, whether she distinguishes herself from the foreign author or develops a bond with her. Meanwhile, the visibility of the self-translator proves equally consistent. The author function of her author persona dominates the way in which the self-translator is perceived. Consequently, while she seemingly automatically gains access to this visibility, she also has limited, if any, means of escaping it. The visibility of her translator and self-translator personas is less easily defined, however. In certain self-translation situations, the translator and self-translator personas are clearly seen: e.g., consecutive self-translation in which the author indicates both her role as the original author and her role as the (self-)translator on and/or within the published text.[130] In other situations,

---

[130] For example, in Julien/Julian Green's book *Le langage et son double*, a collection of consecutive and simultaneous self-translations.

- Each self-translation is introduced with a paragraph identifying the nature of the production (either consecutive or simultaneous), and, in the case of consecutive self-translations, the languages translated into and out of as well as the publication dates of each version are also identified.
- The book is formatted as a bilingual publication: the source language text appears on odd-numbered pages; the translating language text appears on even-numbered pages.
- On the front and back cover of the book as well as on the inside page, the author is indicated as "Julian Green" and, subsequently, the text reads "traduit par Julien Green."

however, the self-translation status of the text is not made apparent, and thus the translator and self-translator personas remain invisible: e.g., self-translations, either consecutive or simultaneous, where the self-translator indicates her name once only, signalling authorship exclusively. As this example shows, the invisibility of the self-translator's translator persona is an illusion; however, this illusion may or may not be desired. Moreover, while the author persona can, and often does, transfer its function and status to the translator and self-translator personas, the opposite does not hold true: the transfer back is prevented because of the power dynamic between the author persona and the other two personas, which privileges the former.

2.3.2.2.1.2 Foreignization

The value in Venuti's overall argumentation of discussing the translator's invisibility is twofold. First, it emphasizes the prevalence of domesticating translation practices—i.e., those that promote the fluency enabling this invisibility. Secondly, it breaks down the seemingly innocent or deferential nature of that invisibility, thereby revealing its subversive effects. Venuti refers to the sum of these effects as "the violence of translation" (2008: 13), which characterizes all translation situations because the foreign text can never be transferred completely intact into a new language-culture. In other words, all translating involves some domesticating; otherwise, "translation" would simply consist of transplanting the foreign text, as is, into the new language-culture, wherein the latter would have no access at all to the text. Venuti points out, however, that "domestication need not mean assimilation" (2008: 177). He advocates a foreignizing translation practice as a means of countering the assimilating potential of translation, claiming that "foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations" (Venuti 2008: 16).

Throughout his book, Venuti argues that, in translation, there are two principle ways of foreignizing a text: through the specific manipulation of the text itself—henceforth referred to as *in-text* foreignization—and through the very choice of the text to translate. Venuti also emphasizes the role of the translator's agenda in shaping her

decision to foreignize. Every translation, regardless of its practice, has an agenda. Certain agendas motivating domesticating translations have already been alluded to. However, the question of agendas will be addressed specifically with regards to foreignizing practices.

Venuti provides several examples of standard translators who produce foreignizing works: these translators include, but are not limited to, Doctor John Nott, Francis Newman, Iginio Ugo Tarchetti and Paul Blackburn. I will first describe the strategies of each of these translators and subsequently consider them in light of self-translation.

In 1795, Nott produced a foreignizing English-language translation of Catullus (Venuti 2008: 68). Most notably characterized by sexuality and linguistic vulgarity, the Latin text was widely viewed as offensive and, when translated, tended to be censored; Venuti also states that translations of the Catullus text were "routinely assimilated to transparent discourse" in the English literary culture (2008: 69, 71). However, Nott was not looking to assimilate the text; he was more interested in representing its foreignness, in terms of both culture and history. He therefore chose to translate in a way that adopted a mimetic strategy—which was perceived as outdated—in order to "render the Latin quite closely" (Venuti 2008: 71, 73). He also used false rhyme and inverted, elliptical and convoluted syntax (Venuti 2008: 73). These strategic choices enabled him to produce a translation whose reading was "jarring" and otherwise "un-English" insofar as it could not be read fluently (Venuti 2008: 75, 73). In short, Nott's translation created, according to Venuti, "an uncomfortably alien reading experience" (2008: 76). The effect of his choices was foreignizing because these choices challenged the dominant literary and moral values and trends of the target language-culture.

Venuti also highlights the foreignizing practice of Francis Newman, who translated *The Iliad of Homer* in 1856. Explicitly seeking to "retain every peculiarity of the original" (Venuti 2008: 101), Newman produced a translation that was, like Nott's, considered "un-English," and it was thus perceived as "perverted" and "hard to read" (Venuti 2008: 106; 105). The foreignness of Newman's translation stemmed most notably from his use of archaisms, which he used to signal the historical remoteness of the classical text relative to his culture, further emphasized by his use of the ballad meter,

which was perceived as antiquated and chosen for that very reason (Venuti 2008: 102, 106). Moreover, he advocated linguistic creativity in order to destabilize the reading of the translation and used artificially constructed language, even including a glossary to give meaning to the new words (Venuti 2008: 102; 103). Ultimately, Newman's translations were foreignizing by virtue of their "literary discourse, the strangeness of the archaism," which "deviated from current usage and cut across various literary discourses, poetry and the novel, elite and popular, English and Scottish" (Venuti 2008: 103).

In 1865, Iginio Ugo Tarchetti produced a translation of a Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley text, to which he gave the title "Il mortale immortale (dall'inglese)", or "The Immortal Mortal (From the English)" (Venuti 2008: 134). The foreignizing effects of Tarchetti's translation are most obviously due to three in-text choices. First, he maintains the fantastic (Gothic) genre—one that, Venuti argues, subverts "the formal conventions of realism and the individualistic concept of subjectivity" (2008: 126-7). Second, Tarchetti writes in the Tuscan dialect—that is, the major Italian dialect—thereby subverting the latter by virtue of its role in facilitating a Gothic text, one that belonged to a minor culture (Venuti 2008: 134). Third, Tarchetti uses a "strategy of amplification" to exaggerate certain patriarchal images, thereby increasing both the presence of the feminist ideology as well as the "mimetic and marvelous" narrative register (Venuti 2008: 143, 151).

Finally, modernist Paul Blackburn was something of a self-imposed disciple of Ezra Pound, learning directly from him and ultimately adopting and even refining Pound's philosophy on and approach to translation and, particularly, foreignizing translation. Among the many translations Blackburn produced are those of Argentine Julio Cortázar, most notably the short text entitled "Continuidad des los parques" [translated as "Continuity of Parks"], which belonged to the genre of magical realism (Venuti 2008: 229). The key in-text foreignizing strategy of this translation was, ironically enough, fluency. By writing in a fluent way, he was able to create verisimilitude and mimic realism. Venuti observes that, through the manipulation of pronouns, shifts in narrative points of view, bidirectional inversions of the explicit and implicit, added detail, and exaggerated melodrama, Blackburn draws in the reader and then displaces her in a jarring way, thereby creating a foreign reading experience

reflective of the foreign genre (Venuti 2008: 230-1). Contrary to many foreignizing translation projects, Blackburn's Cortázar translations actually contributed to changing English-language literary canons, which eventually adopted the genre of magical realism (Venuti 2008: 227).

In each of the four examples above, the foreignization strategies used by the translators deal with marginal target values inspired by foreign language-cultures. Thus, before engaging in the in-text foreignization of his translating process, these translators had to establish, or already be aware of, what the dominant values of their contemporary language-culture were: e.g., fluency, current usage of lexicon and syntactical structures, realism, patriarchal discourse, the individualistic ideology of subjectivity. In order to determine a strategy for their foreignizing practice, they must also have had to identify that which their potential or targeted readership would consider foreign: e.g., vulgarity, archaism, artificiality, feminism, fantastic, uncertainty, magical realism. It is also important to note that, in each of the discussed cases, the translators are presumably translating into their mother tongue. The self-translator may or may not have access to the same ideas regarding dominant values and foreignizing strategies. Furthermore, it is unlikely that she is always translating into a language she considers to be her mother tongue. Therefore, can the self-translator identify what is foreign? And, in turn, can she identify which translating culture values are dominant? The answers to the questions above will vary according to the answers to the questions below, among others:

- How well does the self-translator know the language-cultures within which she is working?
- Does she know one language-culture better than the other?
- Is the self-translator an immigrant learning a language native to her new home?
- Does she have *current* knowledge of the language-culture (including dialectal variances) into which she is translating?

In certain cases, the potentially complicated identity of the self-translator, in terms of her relationship to the two language-cultures out of and into which she self-translates, may suggest that in-text foreignizing strategies require adaptations for self-translation.

In the following discussion, we will revisit the four standard translators introduced earlier, with a view to observing how the choice of which text to translate

proves critical to their foreignizing translation strategy, since before deciding *how* to translate, each translator first decided *what* to translate. I will then look at how this key strategy complicates foreignization for self-translation. Nott's decision to translate the Catullus text was foreignizing for at least two reasons. First and foremost, the text was characterized as taboo: it was commonly censored, on account of its sexual references and coarse language (Venuti 2008: 69). Secondly, it opposed literary canons of that time: it was lyric, when epic was favoured (Venuti 2008: 69). Similarly, Newman's foreign text choice, the *Iliad*, was also foreignizing for two main reasons. On the one hand, it was a classical text at a time when, according to Newman, classical texts were being ignored by the educated elite (Venuti 2008: 100). On the other hand, the *Iliad* was predisposed to enabling the archaic in-text translation Newman sought in order to evoke classical literature. By choosing to translate Shelley's text, Tarchetti brought the fantastic genre to a literary culture that, according to Venuti (2008:126), was dominated by realism. Consequently, it also created uncertainty about the individualistic concept of subjectivity. Moreover, by choosing this text, Tarchetti chose to translate a feminist ideology, which was particularly foreignizing because it is presented through male authorship, thereby challenging certain dominant patriarchal values. In Blackburn's case, the decision to translate Cortázar's text was critical to the foreignizing effects of his translation because, not unlike Tarchetti, Blackburn used this translation to introduce into the translating culture not merely different thoughts from a foreign author but also an entirely new genre (i.e. magical realism).

Venuti repeatedly reminds his reader that the choice of which text to translate is just as important as, if not more important than, textual strategies used for foreignization. The previous examples strongly validate his claim. However, when the argument is applied to self-translation, it points to the limitations of self-translation with respect to foreignizing practices. Whereas the standard translator can choose to translate more or less any of the accessible texts from the foreign language-cultures out of which she translates, the self-translator is restricted to a comparatively very small number of texts, since they must have been written by her. Furthermore, should she seek to increase the number of original texts to which she has access, she is nonetheless limited by time, forced to create both the original versions and the potential self-translations within her

lifetime. Meanwhile, the nature of the few texts from which she has to choose is also limited. It is not guaranteed that any, let alone all, of her originals will be appropriate to a foreignizing self-translation. Therefore, in addition to asking herself: "*How many* foreignizing self-translations can I produce?" the self-translator interested in foreignizing strategies must also, and first of all, ask: "*Which* text is appropriate for a foreignizing self-translation?"

Throughout his book, Venuti reveals that each (standard) translator has an agenda when producing a target text. This is true of domesticating standard translations, as Venuti points out on numerous occasions in order to highlight the illusion of the translator's invisibility. This is also true of foreignizing standard translations. In the following, I will outline the agenda of the same four standard translators discussed earlier and speculate on some of the possible foreignizing agendas that a self-translator may have.

Nott had two goals in mind when translating the Catullus: "to ward against an ethnocentric response to the Latin text" and to signal the time-space difference of the foreign work (Venuti 2008: 71). However, the underlying agenda was to "resist the pressure of bourgeois moral values on his translation" (Venuti 2008: 71). These agendas help to account for the foreignizing strategies that characterize Nott's translation: a version of the classic Catullus, featuring vulgarities in both language and content, which threatens the bourgeois code. Newman's foreignizing translation of the *Iliad*, meanwhile, reflects an agenda to educate its audience about classical literature and promote "the recognition of cultural differences" (Venuti 2008: 101). Newman was particularly upset by the "scholarly disdain for translation" and academe's neglect at that time of classical literary culture (Venuti 2008: 100). Meanwhile, Newman was aware of Schleiermacher's 1813 lecture on the theory and value of the foreignizing approach to translation and was frustrated by English academia's desire to "forget that [translation] is a translation at all" (Venuti 2008: 99, 101). Ultimately, Newman sought to target the elite and thereby challenge its "concept of national English culture" (Venuti 2008: 106). Hence, his translation of a classical text which uses artificial language and archaisms, and does not lend itself to a fluent reading.

Given that Tarchetti was part of the *scapigliatura* movement, it is not surprising that his primary agenda in the translation of Shelley's text was to subvert bourgeois ideologies and contribute to mobilizing social change (Venuti 2008: 126, 128). Thus, by choosing a feminist fantastic text to translate, he critiques patriarchy, namely "male physical superiority" and also questions ideas upon which realism is based (Venuti 2008: 138). Furthermore, Venuti shows that, in addition to stressing certain ideologies that already characterize Shelley's text, Tarchetti deviates from them in order to reflect other ideological agendas related to race and social class (Venuti 2008: 143, 146). For example, he emphasizes the hierarchy between aristocracy and the working class and, albeit perhaps unintentionally, removes racism from Shelley's text (Venuti 2008: 146). In any case, his choices support his rejection of "bourgeois respectability" (Venuti 2008: 145). Blackburn, for his part, subscribed to the modernist cultural agenda and held "a leftwing internationalism that viewed translation as a foreignizing intervention into American culture" (Venuti 2008: 227). Thus, Blackburn was promoting his agenda by translating Cortázar's story, thereby bringing a marginal foreign text and genre to U.S. mainstream culture, and representing the "strangeness" of the foreign writing through discursive heterogeneity (Venuti 2008: 228).

Venuti views domestication and foreignization as terms that "indicate fundamentally ethical attitudes towards a foreign text and culture" (Venuti 2008: 19). In the case of the foreignizing standard translations of Nott, Newman, Tarchetti and Blackburn, the agendas indeed seem to be characterized by an ethical thrust, typically with regards to reflecting and honouring the differences of the foreign language-culture and promoting their value within the translating language-culture. Are foreignizing self-translations also rooted in ethics? As noted in the conclusion to Chapter 1 of this thesis, I have not investigated the ways in which individuals self-translate. Thus, I do not seek here to identify or discuss agendas or foreignizing practices of specific self-translators. Instead, I aim to consider more generally what ethical reasons might motivate a self-translator to produce a foreignizing self-translation. She may be inclined to foreignize if she is translating out of a minor language-culture and into a dominant one: in this situation, the foreignizing practice would serve to assert the voice of the minor language-

culture, acting as a form of resistance against the hegemony of the dominant language-culture.

Venuti ends his "Margin" chapter by stating that "[t]he very practice of translation, if driven by the pursuit of the foreign, demands a constant rethinking of experimentalism so that foreign poetic traditions without a strong modernist tendency do not fall victim to a new exclusion" (Venuti 2008: 236). Thus, regardless of the text chosen for translation, and regardless of the chosen method of in-text foreignization or the agenda motivating the foreignizing practice, the here-and-now value of the translation is void once the foreign is recognized as familiar. In other words, new translations, which "rethink experimentalism," are required. These can be either translations of foreign texts that have not yet been translated or retranslations of texts that have been experimented on before. The implications of Venuti's statement for self-translation once again reveal the discrepancy between the standard translator and the self-translator, in that the opportunity for self-translation—or, in this case re-self-translation—is limited by the number of years in the self-translator's life. What does this say about the shelf life of a given self-translator's work? Oustinoff contends that self-translation prevents translations—therefore implicitly including *re*translations—by other people: "Se traduire soi-même, c'est naturellement empêcher qu'une autre traduction soit faite par un autre, mais c'est également du même coup rendre caduque toute traduction passée et forclore toute traduction à venir du fait de l'auctorialité dont la traduction de la main de l'auteur est dès lors investie" (278). He does not seem to explain or justify his claim; however, this logic, according to Venuti's argument, suggests that the shelf life of the self-translator's work would be further limited.

2.3.2.2.2 Translation Studies Reader

As discussed at the end of the previous chapter of this thesis, one of the basic postulates of this thesis is that self-translation is indeed a kind of translation. The fact that a discussion of translation does not include an explicit reference to self-translation does not necessarily suggest that self-translation is being overlooked. However, when certain arguments, applied to self-translation, are no longer coherent or require nuances, then the disregard for self-translation becomes apparent. Accordingly, in the process of

identifying instances where self-translation has been overlooked, I will point to at least some of the implications of the invisibility of self-translation, namely, by revealing certain ways in which self-translation complicates translation theory.

2.3.2.2.2.1 On the Different Methods of Translating (Schleiermacher)

In this talk, Schleiermacher addresses what he considers to be incorrect methods of translation (i.e. imitation and paraphrase) and then proposes the only two approaches he deems acceptable: the translator may strive to move either the foreign author towards the local reader or the local reader towards the foreign author. Ultimately, while also acknowledging its many challenges, Schleiermacher advocates the latter of the two approaches, calling for translations that expose the foreign nature of the original text. Various scholars (Berman, Pym) have analyzed Schleiermacher's paper, addressing how, for example, it reflects the Romantic notion of authorship, the hierarchy between language and the individual, and a nationalist agenda. However, the ways in which self-translation has been overlooked in the paper have been less studied and are therefore less obvious and less understood.

The only specific reference to self-translation that Schleiermacher seems to make is found at the outset of the paper: "Indeed, we must sometimes translate our own utterances after a certain time has passed, would we make them truly our own again" (43). Removed from the context of the rest of the writing, this statement could be added to the section in the previous chapter of this thesis in which the reasons to self-translate are discussed: Schleiermacher seems to propose that self-translation serves the writer who seeks to or needs to renew ownership of her ideas. However, this excerpt must be appreciated contextually, and it is clear, based on several key points made in his paper, that Schleiermacher does not take self-translation into account.

This disregard becomes evident when, pointing to what he sees as the power language wields over the individual, he insists that "the goal of translating just as the author would have written originally in the language of the translation is not only unattainable, but also in itself null and void" (56). Where translation performed by the author of the text is concerned, the validity of this statement is particularly unclear and arguably nil because the concept of "original writing" is blurry. As cited in Chapter 1,

Oustinoff points out that the opposite statement is true in self-translation: "[T]raduire l'original comme l'auteur l'aurait exprimé s'il avait écrit directement dans la langue traduisante, ce n'est plus, par définition, une asymptote. C'est une *donnée initiale*" (19). Let us consider, for example, the self-translation process of Puerto Rican writer Rosario Ferré: some have involved an outline in Spanish that evolves first into a "translation and amplification" in English and then into another translation and amplification in Spanish (Hokenson/Munson 201). We might also consider cases such as Beckett's *Bing/Ping*[131]—that is, instances of "simultaneous self-translation". According to these examples, in which languages have Ferré and Beckett "written originally"? Is it fair to say that they have not written originally in the language of the translation? Even if they do not *always* do so, is this option not one of those available to them, and other self-translators, and therefore (potentially) characteristic of the self-translation practice? Schleiermacher does not nuance his argument or discussion to account for the particularities of this type of translation.

That he overlooks self-translation is also apparent when, continuing with the previous argument, he contends that "each person produces originally only in his mother tongue" (57). As discussed earlier, the question of which language is the self-translator's "mother tongue" is far from being easily answered. Ferré, who understood Spanish and English "idiomatically" early in life, both exemplifies and addressed this ambiguity: "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)" (Hokenson/Munson 200, 203). However, even if and when the so-called mother tongue is identified, Schleiermacher's claim must, as Fitch points out, be nuanced for self-translation, since "in contrast with other forms of translation, where the translator almost always translates into his mother tongue, he who translates his own

---

[131] Having consulting various drafts of *Ping* and *Bing*, Fitch observes that "in the course of drafting the English version, Beckett began by composing a version 'identical' [...] to the final French text [...], or at least went through such a draft stage (since we cannot be certain that *all* the manuscript drafts of the English texts have been found), before effecting the modifications that we have just examined. In other words, these modifications did not come about during the original transition between the two languages but at a later stage during the course of Beckett's revising and reworking an already extant manuscript draft, if not the very first draft in English" (70).

work necessarily writes in a language that is not his own" (22). Moreover, not only do self-translators necessarily write in a language that is (however dubiously labelled) "not their own" but, as discussed earlier, they often do so *directly*—or "originally", to keep with Schleiermacher's terms. For example, Irish-born Beckett wrote most of his "originals" in French and then self-translated them into his mother tongue, English[132]; Goldoni wrote the play *Le Bourru bienfaisant* before self-translating it into his native Italian (*Il Burbero di buon cuore*) (Hokenson/Munson 115); and Ferré, who claims to have been "born into Spanish", wrote two of her novels in English and subsequently self-translated them into Spanish[133] (qtd in Hokenson/Munson 200).

It is important to note that, although Schleiermacher later acknowledges spoken and written multilingualism, he ultimately classifies such occurrences "not within the domain of the translator, but rather [...] that of the interpreter" (58).[134] By relegating multilingualism to a domain other than translation, not to mention one he deems relatively inferior, Schleiermacher implicitly dismisses self-translation from his discussion, regardless of the fact that it belongs to his conception of art and science. Fitch as well as Hokenson and Munson acknowledge this problem. Fitch rightly points out that "Schleiermacher would not consider even those texts first written [by Beckett] in French to be original works" (23). Similarly, Hokenson and Munson argue that Schleiermacher banishes the self-translator to a "no-man's land" by ideologically fusing a single nation with a single language: accordingly, rather than being arguably doubly creative, she is "empty of all originality of mind and expression, that is, subjectivity itself" (143). Yet, the banishment of the self-translator and of self-translation is never explicitly acknowledged by Schleiermacher.

2.3.2.2.2.2 The Task of the Translator (Benjamin)

---

[132] Hugh Kenner writes that Beckett's "English fictions, subsequent to *Watt* [composed 1942-44; published 1953], are arrived at by translation from a French original" (qtd in Oustinoff 69).

[133] *The House on the Lagoon* (1995)/*La casa de la laguna* (1996) and *Eccentric Neighborhoods* (1998)/ *Vecindarios excéntricos* (1998).

[134] Note that Schleiermacher defines "translation" in a particular way, in opposition to his notion of "interpretation": "[t]he interpreter plies his trade in the area of business, while the translator proper works above all in the areas of science and art" (44). Furthermore, Schleiermacher privileges the translator, who "ascends higher and higher above the interpreter" (45).

In contrast to Schleiermacher, who addresses the *method* of translating while stressing the importance of the mother tongue, or "*national* language", Benjamin focuses on the *role* of the translator while evoking "*pure* language" (78). The translator's objective, he argues, is to "find the intended effect" of the original text—one that "no single language can attain by itself but which is realized only by the totality of their intentions supplementing each other: pure language" (77, 78). Also in contrast to Schleiermacher—as well as the other authors in our corpus of seminal texts—, Benjamin discusses translation in a way that does not ignore self-translation; rather, it proves very applicable.

The applicability of this writing is signalled by several self-translation scholars. Fitch discusses Benjamin in relative detail, going so far as to refer to Benjamin as "the only writer [...] whose account of translation could possibly throw some light on the situation we are examining" (181). In this case, "the situation" to which Fitch refers is the challenge of harmonizing the two texts that belong to Beckett's self-translation process, and Benjamin's concept of pure language does indeed provide a means of reconciling the seeming incompatibilities between the languages of Beckett's works, not to mention those of self-translators in general. Similarly, Beaujour views Benjamin's theory as a means through which the different versions of self-translation can be understood particularly well:

> Because self-translation and the (frequently) attendant reworking makes a text retrospectively incomplete, both versions become avatars of a hypothetical total text in which the versions in both languages would rejoin one another and be reconciled (as in the "pure" language evoked by Benjamin). (112)

Hokenson and Munson corroborate this idea, though articulating it slightly differently: according to them, Benjamin's model "conflates original and translation as two incomplete versions of the same thing, the same essence escaping form" (152).

That Benjamin's theory of translation applies so well to self-translation is perhaps surprising given the context in which the text was written. As its title in the *Reader* indicates, the text constitutes the introduction to Benjamin's translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux parisiens*. Since the *The Task of the Translator* ostensibly stems from musings on a process of *standard* translation, it would be perfectly logical for Benjamin's philosophy to refer exclusively to this kind of translation, regardless of how deliberately. Indeed, certain aspects of the article indicate that Benjamin had not taken self-translation

into account when formulating his theory. For example, Benjamin refers to a self-translator—namely, Stefan George—without recognizing that he translated his own work. Benjamin was "acquainted with the Stefan George circle," and accordingly, may very well have been aware of George's self-translation practices (Spencer). However, Hokenson and Munson explain that "George's self-translations between French or English and German were published infrequently and collected posthumously" (171). Thus, since George died in 1933—10 years after Benjamin's article appeared—, Benjamin may not have known about George's self-translations and therefore would not have been able to incorporate such knowledge into his writing.

Other examples that point to the disregard of self-translation include Benjamin's claims that "a translation comes later than the original" and that "the task of the translator [...] may be regarded as distinct and clearly differentiated from the task of the poet" (76, 79). In self-translation, as we have seen, both the chronology of "original" and self-translation as well as the distinction between poet/author and translator are much more ambiguous than Benjamin acknowledges. However, the implications of such microtextual disregard for self-translation are ultimately insignificant. As Fitch observes, no difficulties arise when applying Benjamin's theory to self-translation: "at no time does the German writer refer to the particular activity of self-translation. However, the fact that Beckett is himself the translator of his own work would not appear to affect the fundamental situation as far as Benjamin in concerned" (182).

2.3.2.2.2.3 On Linguistic Aspects of Translation (Jakobson)

As the title indicates, Roman Jakobson discusses translation through a linguistic approach. He identifies the ways in which language, as a system, allows for translatability, arguing that, with the exception of poetry, all writing is translatable. Though this essay does not mention self-translation explicitly, most of its postulates can be argued with as much relevance to self-translation as to standard translation. For example:

- His three classifications of translation—intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic—are certainly applicable whether the individual is translating her own work or that of someone else.

- The matter he labels as "equivalence in difference" can also be applied to both types of translation (139).
- Nothing in his discussion about the importance of bilingual dictionaries and grammars or in his denial of "untranslatability" signals that he is overlooking self-translation (140).
- Similarly, the solutions he suggests to support translatability—i.e., borrowings, neologisms, "semantic shifts", circumlocutions—are not unique to standard translation (140).

Initially, Jakobson's paper may indeed seem entirely applicable to self-translation. However, this proves not to be the case, as evidenced in the second half of the paper when Jakobson addresses the challenges presented by grammatical differences between languages, namely with his well-known claim that "[l]anguages differ essentially in what they *must* convey and not what they may convey" (141). Certain aspects of the translating process that pose problems or challenges for the standard translator need not do so for the self-translator: most notably, according to Jakobson, grammar dictates that a choice needs to be made. He claims, for example, that "[i]f some grammatical category is absent in a given language, its meaning may be translated into this language by lexical means." He gives the example of dual forms, as opposed to plural:

> When translating the English sentence 'She has brothers' into a language which discriminates dual and plural [such as Ancient Greek or Russian], we are compelled either to make a choice between two statements 'She has two brothers' – 'She has more than two' or to leave the decision to the listener and say: "She has either two or more than two brothers.' (141)

The self-translator does not necessarily need to make such a choice. Depending on the circumstances of the translation situation, and unless the self-translator is *seeking* to create ambiguity about the number of brothers "She" has, the self-translator may very well know whether she had intended there to be two brothers or more (cf. Jung). The same would apply to self-translation into English from Old Russian.

Jakobson also highlights:

> In order to translate accurately the English sentence 'I hired a worker,' a Russian needs supplementary information, whether this action was completed or not and whether the worker was a man or a woman, because he must make his choice between a verb of completive or noncompletive aspect [...] and between a masculine and feminine noun. (141)

And shortly thereafter: "Because the information required by the English and Russian grammatical pattern is unlike, we face quite different sets of two-choice situations" (141). Again, unless she had intended to create or maintain vagueness, the self-translator has access to these bits of information and is therefore not faced with this series of "two-choice situations".

Jakobson then goes on to say: "therefore a chain of translations of one and the same isolated sentence from English into Russian and vice versa could entirely deprive such a message of its initial content" (141). Is it unlikely that, relative to this question of numbers and time in particular—*How many brothers? Feminine or masculine noun?* etc.—, continual back-translations performed by a self-translator would "deprive" anything of its content? It seems highly probable that each back translation might lead to a repetition of the same two versions of these aspects of the sentence: one in English, one in Russian. On the other hand, if these back-translations incurred changes, the reasons for those changes would likely be different—and arguably less problematic in terms of the question of translatability—than those motivating changes in standard translations. This consistency results from the fact that the writing subject is constant, and therefore, her intention(s) may very well be constant as well. Undoubtedly, various factors could alter this probability, such as if the self-translation is consecutive, and many years separate the original text and the translation. The point here however is that, while Jakobson's arguments seem appropriate for standard translation, they do not necessarily apply to self-translation, and it is even *unlikely* that they would apply to self-translation. So, while the self-translator does indeed have a choice to make when moving between these languages, that "choice" may in fact correspond to something she had already known but, for whatever reason, had not (yet) made explicit.

2.3.2.2.2.4 The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem (Even-Zohar)

Even-Zohar argues that translated works are historical entities that, together, represent an active literary system positioned within the larger literary polysystem, and he speculates about the central, peripheral or somewhere-in-between nature of that position. The invisibility of self-translation in this article lies, quite simply, in the main premise of the

paper—that translation is a systems-based phenomenon. Even-Zohar focuses on the collective rather than on the individual, largely dismissing the translating subject from the argument, insofar as he does not refer to her until the last of the five segments.[135] Yet self-translation is defined most fundamentally by the individual—individual texts and individual persons: it is the sameness of the subject, who writes the corresponding "original" and "translation", that characterizes the phenomenon.

The incongruity between self-translation and the basis of the article is further evident in the two ways in which, according to Even-Zohar, translated works correlate. He claims that one is "in the way their source texts are selected by the target literature" (199). While the target literary system does not play a trivial role in determining whether a text might or might not be self-translated (cf. practical factors motivating self-translation, in section 1.4.1), this selection process depends at least as significantly on the self-translator. It is she who is most aware of her "original" writings and therefore has the greatest opportunity to translate them; furthermore, she has a vested interest in translating them (for various reasons already discussed) and has the authority to do so. It is difficult, for example, to deny that Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz's self-translations—with which she sought to propagate her feminist ideals—were produced in large part because *she* had wanted them written.

The second way that translations correlate, according to Even-Zohar, is "in the way they adopt specific norms, behaviours, and policies" relative to "the position taken by translated literature" (200, 203). Yet, as Oustinoff points out, there are no norms *per se* for the self-translator, except those she imposes upon herself, and from which she can deviate "à tout moment" both within and across self-translation projects (77). Reading Even-Zohar's article with self-translation in mind compels one to ask: What might the system of *self*-translated literature be? At the same time, it leaves the reader wondering whether such a system can even exist. This would require self-translations to be classified according to a larger group of texts; but what would this group consist of? Other translations? Other "original" works? Opting for one versus the other is problematic since

---

[135] The only exception is a brief and incidental reference in the second segment: "...often it is the leading writers (or members of the avant-garde who are about to become leading writers) who produce the most conspicuous or appreciated translations" (200).

the lines between "translation" and "original" as well as between "source" and "target" are blurry: which is the "source" text and which is the "target"? Moreover, it is problematic to compare self-translation, in such a systemic way, to either standard translation or "original" writing: as Oustinoff notes, self-translation is "éminemment *à la fois* traduction et écriture" (57). Thus, perhaps would the group of texts consist of a given self-translator's own self-translations? This cannot be since, by "literary system", Even-Zohar does mean "system of one translator's œuvre": this would only bring us back to the individual, versus the collective, which, as stated initially, runs counter to Even-Zohar's premise.

2.3.2.2.2.5 Translation and the Trial of the Foreign (Berman)

Not unlike Venuti after him, Berman argues that literary translation is an ethical practice that should highlight, versus repress, the foreignness[136] of the foreign text. He then proposes what he calls an "analytic of translation," whereby he identifies and describes 12 ways ("deformations") in which the translation of literary prose is commonly prevented from representing the foreign (278). These deformations, which represent the crux of the article, "operat[e] in every translation" (Berman 278). Despite the apparent inclusiveness of this rhetoric (cf. "every"), self-translation seems to complicate Berman's stance.

Many of Berman's deformations reflect self-translation because they are necessarily imposed by language and its structures. For example, Berman explains that the negative characteristic of "clarification" is that its "explicitation aims to render 'clear' what does not wish to be clear in the original" (281). Given the examples he uses,[137] Berman seems to suggest that it is the translating language itself that dictates this level of clarity. One might argue that, while the standard translator and self-translator may be equally susceptible to deforming the translation in such ways, the author function of the

---

[136] We could begin examining this article by problematizing the notion of foreignness in light of self-translation. However, since this matter has already been addressed in detail in the analysis of Venuti's book and, to a lesser extent, in the discussion of Schleiermacher's talk, discussing it further would prove largely redundant. Nonetheless, it can be considered one of the aspects of the article that self-translation complicates.

[137] "French does not tolerate a literal rendering because..." (281); "To render the suggestions of a Russian sentence, it is often necessary to complete it" (281, qtg Chapiro) (cf. Jakobson above).

latter allows her "wishes" to play an important role in determining how "clear" the text would be—more so than for the standard translator. In other words, she may have greater freedom in deciding *not* to deform the translation.

The invisibility of self-translation can be best understood through investigation of Berman's eighth and ninth deformations. The first of these is labelled "the destruction of underlying networks of signification," where the networks consist of signifiers that are not especially meaningful on their own but acquire meaning when considered in conjunction with certain other signifiers (284).[138] Although Berman does not distinguish between them, these networks ostensibly comprise those that are intentionally created by the writer of the original text as well as those that may have been produced *un*intentionally—or perhaps intentionally but unconsciously so (a relevant note since Berman describes his analytic as partly *psycho*analytic) (284). The translator may read into the text any number of networks from either category. On the other hand, as Berman suggests, a translator may not identify all of them or all of their components; in short, she may "misread" them (285). This claim seems to apply particularly to standard translation. It is unlikely that, when translating her own work, the self-translator would "destroy" or otherwise misinterpret networks she had intentionally designed. The self-translator is, as discussed (cf. Jung), a reader of her own text and might therefore observe new patterns or forget old ones when re-reading it, particularly when a lot of time separates the first and second writings. Nonetheless, having written the original text, she is privy to a wealth of memories that inform her translation process. Moreover, the self-translator has probably read the entire text before she begins to translate it,[139] which is not necessarily the case with standard translation. Consequently, she is predisposed to knowing and understanding these networks, versus misreading them.

As for *un*intentionally created networks, the self-translator may be just as likely or unlikely as the standard translator to recognize them. On the other hand, if her unconscious still connects with those patterns, the self-translator could conceivably be predisposed to recreating these networks as well. Had Berman been considering self-

---

[138] Berman's concept of underlying networks of signification seems to correspond to Algirdas J. Greimas's notion of *isotopie*: "Par isotopie nous entendons un ensemble redondant de catégories sémantiques qui rend possible la lecture uniforme du récit" (30).

[139] The exception being instances when she is conducting a simultaneous self-translation.

translation, he would have qualified his discussion of this deformation by acknowledging apparent distinctions between standard translation and self-translation. He concludes this section with the following two lines: "V. A. Goldsmidt studies the words that Freud did *not use* or *avoided* where they might be expected. Needless to say, translators have often inserted them" (285). Had Freud translated the texts himself, would he have inserted these words?

The ninth deformation, entitled "the destruction of linguistic patternings" and subsuming three other deformations ("rationalization", "clarification", "expansion") refers to changes in "sentence constructions" (285) According to Berman, these changes often result in a text that, relative to the original, is homogenized and therefore less coherent or consistent (285). He accuses the translation process of being inconspicuously "asystematic" and then contends:

> Readers, however, perceive this inconsistency in the translated text, since they rarely bestow their trust on it and do not see it as the or a 'true' text. Barring any prejudices, the readers are right: it is not a 'true' text; it lacks the distinguishing features of a text, starting with its systematic nature. (285)

The first question, regarding the relevance of these assertions to self-translation, is: Is the process of self-translation also asystematic? This claim seems dubious: would a self-translator not be more inclined to make "bold shifts" in order to reflect the heterogeneity of the text than to allow such perceived inconsistency (Grutman 2009b: 259)? In this case, the system of the translation may simply be different than that of the original. Secondly, is it true that readers fail to "bestow their trust on" a self-translation? This seems equally—if not more—doubtful: whether readers see the text as an original or a translation, they understand that its writer is the person who created the original; by virtue of the self-translator's author function, readers consider the translation a "true text". Furthermore, while Berman claims that the text resulting from translation is false, self-translation scholars maintain that, while not an "original",[140] self-translation is indeed a new text and, presumably, therefore a "true text".

It is important to note that Berman's article is the only text of the seven analyzed here in which some caveat is provided regarding the scope of his term "translation",

---

[140] As discussed, Hokenson and Munson provide the only exception to the position that a self-translation is not an "original".

insofar as he states that his analysis is "provisional: it is formulated on the basis of my experience as a translator (primarily of Latin American literature into French)" (278). Given that, to my knowledge, Berman has not translated his own writings, his statement suggests that, in his analysis, he has not accounted for self-translation. Nonetheless, at the end of his article, he asserts that his "analytic [...] focuses on the *universals* of deformation inherent in translating as such" (288; emphasis added). Given the challenge of applying several of them to self-translation, do the deformations in fact constitute "universals"? Are these deformations "inherent" to self-translation? The preceding discussion suggests that these tendencies are perhaps not as innate to self-translation as they may be argued to be in standard translation.

2.3.2.2.2.6 The Politics of Translation (Spivak)

Spivak investigates the political role of language, notably for the feminist translator. Focusing on translations between "Third World"[141] language-cultures and their "First World" counterparts, she argues that the feminist translator must recognize and contend with the rhetoricity of language, rather than blindly deferring to its "logic"[142]: she claims that language is indicative not only of "the workings of gendered agency" but also of cultural differences between women around the world, and that ignoring this rhetorical value of language will lead to a kind of neo-colonialism (369, 371).

The first challenge of applying Spivak's paper to self-translation lies in the way in which she conceives of the relationship between language and identity. She develops the argument of her article from the postulate that language is a process through which meaning, and therefore identity ("self-meaning"), is created and understood (369). Taken on its own, this notion of language suggests that self-translation is a particularly valuable tool for creating and understanding identity: since self-translation constitutes a double (at least) encounter with language—relative to a "same" hypothetical text—and therefore a

---

[141] The terms "Third World" and "First World" (p. 380) denote hierarchical relationships that I neither endorse nor wish to propagate. Therefore, I use these terms strictly with a view to being consistent with Spivak's article, and I place them in quotation marks to signal their problematic nature.

[142] "Logic allows us to jump from word to word by means of clearly indicated connections. Rhetoric must work in the silence between and around words in order to see what works and how much" (371).

double opportunity to create the self, it would also represent a means by which the individual could create her identity to a greater extent than were she writing only an "original" or only a translation of someone else's text. Considering self-translation in such a way could, for example, shed some light on Beaujour's bewilderment over the self-translations found in Poplavskii's diary (as cited earlier[143]) or the dedication with which certain self-translators engage in translating their own works despite the gruelling nature of the process.

However, as Spivak narrows the focus of her argument, she implies that self-translation—in which thoughts are indeed generated independently[144]—is something that is often unsatisfactory to identity creation: "if one feels that the production of identity as self-meaning [...] is as pluralized as a drop of water under a microscope, one is not always satisfied [...] with 'generating' thoughts on one's own" (369). This dismissal is further emphasized as she identifies translation as "one of the ways to get around the confines of one's 'identity,'" namely, by working "at someone else's title" (369). Does self-translation allow the self-translator to "get around the confines of her identity"? According to Spivak's understanding of language and identity creation, the opposite is true: self-translation plunges the self-translator deeper into her self. Moreover, the title that the self-translator "works at" is not someone else's; it is her own. Thus, when applied to this article, self-translation creates certain contradictions.

That self-translation is overlooked is also noticeable in other ways in which Spivak perceives the act of translating. It is, for one, a "miming of the responsibility to the trace of the other in the self," she writes (369). This statement prompts two main questions. First of all, who or what is the "other" in self-translation? Is it her author persona? The "original" text? The language-culture in and for which the self-translator first wrote (in the case of consecutive self-translation)? Each of these significations is possible, yet the answer is unclear. However, it does not seem that she is referring to any of these possibilities, as evidenced when she later urges that "[i]f you want to make the translated text accessible, try doing it for the person who wrote it," or when she writes

---

[143] "If the self can speak to itself in one language or the other, then why use both?" (Beaujour 141)

[144] With the exception of partial self-translations involving the writer of the original and one or more collaborators, as discussed previously.

that "[a]bsolute alterity or otherness is [...] differed-deferred into an other self who resembles us, *however minimally*, and with whom we can communicate" (379; 370-1; emphasis added). Evidently, she does not allow for the fact that the self-translator *is* that person. It seems reasonable to presume that, had Spivak been using "translation" as an umbrella term to include self-translation, she would have either nuanced these statements in light of the latter or discussed the ways in which self-translation seems rather exemplary of her translation mandate, since the self-translator ostensibly *does* translate "for the person who wrote it" (379). The second question: if such an "other" exists (as author persona, "original" text or language-culture, for example), is there merely a "trace" of it in the self? In self-translation, such an "other" would seem rather ubiquitous, since the division between self and other is a conceptual one. It is important to note that, by complicating the notions of "other" and "trace", self-translation inevitably muddles the argument that they underlie—i.e., that "solidarity" among women cannot be presumed and that, instead, otherness and the translator's responsibility to it are imperative.[145]

According to Spivak, translation also involves, as its first step, "surrendering" to the other. Here, "other" is more clearly defined: she claims that the translator must surrender, on the one hand to the foreign author, by cultivating an intimate relationship—a "friendship"—with the latter, and on the other hand, to the foreign text, by reading this text "intimately" (372; 370). She describes the process of pre-translation as a "surrender of identity" in order to become intimate with the original writer—to develop and "earn the right of a friendship" with the original writer (372). Again, the argumentation requires nuance in order for it to be applied to self-translation: has the self-translator not already developed an intimate relationship with the "original writer"—herself? How does the self-translator "surrender" her identity? As suggested above, does she not *deepen* it, rather?

---

[145] "The presupposition that women have a natural or narrative-historical solidarity, that there is something in a woman or an undifferentiated women's story that speaks to another woman without benefit of language-learning, might stand against the translator's task of surrender. [...] To surrender in translation is more erotic than ethical. In that situation the good-willing attitude 'she is just like me' is not very helpful" (372).

Spivak writes that "[t]he politics of translation from a non-European woman's text too often suppresses th[e] possibility [of facilitating the love between the original and its shadow] because the translator cannot engage with, or cares insufficiently for, the rhetoricity of the original" (370). While self-translation does not invalidate this statement—that is, this possibility may indeed be suppressed too often—, it does signal a point of discussion on which Spivak does not follow up. Namely, if the author and translator are the same person, how little is she likely to care about this rhetoricity? Might the politics of translation to which Spivak refers not, to some degree, be attenuated? Could the non-European female, for example, not be empowered by self-translation? Might she not be more ethically inclined, depending on her relationship with the non-European language-culture in which she initially worked?

Such matters of surrender, intimacy and respect are key to Spivak's discussion of the politics of translation—to that which she deems an ethical approach to translating. As referenced above, self-translation seems, at least potentially, exemplary of how such goals might be achieved. In short, what are the "politics of *self*-translation"? Jessica Tsui Yan Li has written an article with exactly that title, in which she addresses the practice of Chinese writer Eileen Chang (1920-1995): "Through self-translation," she writes, "[Chang] both undermines and manipulates Chinese and English literary and cultural conventions" (99). The implications of the ethics of translation seem likely to differ from those asked relative to standard translation; yet, they remain un-addressed in Spivak's article.

2.3.2.3 Conclusions

As discussed throughout the qualitative evaluation, self-translation complicates the corpus texts, by interrogating and, at times, invalidating certain claims. In some cases, such as Jakobson's article, self-translation challenges only a proportionately small—though rhetorically significant—part of the text. In other cases, such as Schleiermacher's talk and Venuti's book, the implications of the neglect of self-translation are more recurrent and dramatic. Of all the texts in the corpus, only Benjamin's reflects self-translation without also creating incoherences; as a number of scholars have noted, Benjamin's concept of pure language helps elucidate the phenomenon of self-translation.

In each other case, however, there is no doubt about the invisibility of self-translation. In *The Translator's Invisibility*, the two fundamentals notions of the argument—invisibility (as per Venuti's definition) and foreignization—have been shown to be destabilized in various ways when self-translation is taken into account. Schleiermacher devalues and dismisses the possibility of writing "originally" in more than one language, which is inherent in self-translation. The privileged status of the self-translator, who has certain access to the writing process, challenges Jakobson's assertions about translation choices that are dictated by grammar. Even-Zohar's systems theory is rooted in the collective, ignoring that self-translation is necessarily concerned with the individual. Berman assumes that the translator will misinterpret the network of signifiers in the "original" text; he does not acknowledge that the self-translator is predisposed to recognizing and maintaining these. Spivak seems to neglect to take into account how the practice of translation might be very different ethically when the translator is also the author of the "original" text. Notably, the interest in discussing standard translation exclusively is nowhere articulated, leaving the reader who is aware of self-translation to presume that the argumentation also applies to this phenomenon.

By virtue of their seminal status within Translation Studies, the texts examined in this qualitative evaluation have been studied countless times. Thus, revisiting the writings may seem redundant, irrelevant and/or uninteresting. However, precisely because they have been read so often and identified as core texts within the discipline, it is critical that they be read again, through various different lenses—this time, through the lens of self-translation. Such a re-reading exposes not only further evidence of how self-translation is overlooked but also the extent to which this is so. These texts are among those that most define the discipline. Thus, if these texts—and the book in which they are found—that represent the theoretical foundation of the field do not reflect self-translation, then self-translation is arguably under-represented in that field.

3 Conclusions

Throughout this project, I have focused on those spaces in Translation Studies through which the self-translator and the concept of self-translation, or certain aspects of it, have slipped. The premise of the first chapter was two-fold. First of all, as indicated by its title ("Visibility"), the chapter served to identify that which *has* been researched by scholars who specifically discuss self-translation. The five-book corpus on the subject, complemented by related articles, signalled various research trends. In self-translation research, as in the broader field of Translation Studies, literary texts—particularly poetry, novels, plays and the like—constitute the dominant focus. There are also patterns with respect to the ways in which the term "self-translation" is defined. Rooted in bilingualism, which challenges the monolingual paradigm pervading the ways in which text creation and the writing subject are understood, self-translation is widely considered a textual transfer between languages, wherein author and translator are the same person.

Within these definitional parameters, the corpus scholars otherwise understand self-translation in ways that, for the most part, complement one another. The text that results from the self-translation process is not deemed to be an "original"; rather, it is a metatext, an offspring or "second" object that has been preceded by another textual manifestation of a "hypothetical", overarching third entity. The process is a creative one in which the self-translator has the potential to depart from the "original" text according to personally established criteria. Thus, the process results in a decidedly new text that may constitute a revision or an extension of the "original". Self-translation is also a paradox: it fuses, without minimizing the presence of, the seemingly contradictory practices and products of author and translator, thereby nullifying the hierarchy that, in standard translation, tends to subordinate the latter writing subject to the former. Furthermore, self-translation is a privileged phenomenon, in terms of both the status of its product and the writer's access to mental and written resources that precede the "original" writing. Finally, self-translation is defined in the corpus as a rite of passage, a necessary step to becoming a bilingual writer, and one that is generally difficult as well as unpleasant for the self-translator.

We have also seen that self-translation research focuses significantly on not only Samuel Beckett himself but also writers who are similar to him: 20th-century European men, who self-translate "conventional" literary works between English and French. Lastly, we identified various reasons why self-translators engage in the process of self-translation, including those pertaining to professional and personal survival and gain, an interest in "protecting" their work from "inadequate" standard translators, and the desire to establish a bilingual œuvre or promote an ideological perspective.

Observations about the visibility of self-translation have led to broader insights about the nature of self-translation: namely, that it is an established and unique form of translation. Underlying the research in each book is the belief that, although self-translation shares certain traits with standard translation, the former is distinct from the latter. Consequently, terms that have unique significance relative to self-translation emerged (e.g. simultaneous/consecutive, aided/unaided, heteroskopic/homoskopic self-translations), and familiar theoretical notions were complicated (e.g. equivalence, original/translation, target/source, native/foreign, adequacy).

The title of the first chapter is, to a certain extent, used ironically, since, by observing visibility, we were also able to identify what is *in*visible. Hence, the second objective of the first chapter: to determine which aspects of self-translation have been investigated very little or not at all. The facets that remain relatively invisible in the research include: self-translation of non-literary texts; definitions of self-translation that reflect bicultural, multicultural and/or multilingual perspectives, and that move beyond text and language to account also for geographical or psychological transfers of the self; female self-translators, pre-20th-century self-translators, self-translators working into or out of non-European (especially French and English) languages, self-translators from Asia, Africa, Oceania, Central America, South America, Mexico or Canada; reasons for which certain bilingual writers do not self-translate and for which self-translators do not self-translate certain texts. Many of these trends may reflect comparable patterns in Translation Studies more generally. However, such similarities should not lessen the value of observations regarding gaps in self-translation research: not only do they serve to corroborate noted research patterns defining Translation Studies but they also point to the need to offset such imbalances within self-translation specifically. Moreover, certain

observations about self-translation research are decidedly unlike those characterizing Translation Studies (e.g. under-representation of Canada). Ultimately, the self-translation research patterns signalled here contribute to identifying self-translation as a relevant area of study and as one calling for further investigation.

In Chapter 2, which consists of a survey of how self-translation is represented in Translation Studies, the invisibility of self-translation was further signalled, this time through an evaluation of general translation studies literature. In the first phase of that evaluation, the presence of self-translation was quantified. Table-of-contents and index searches for both "self-translation" and the names of selected self-translators revealed that self-translation is significantly overlooked in encyclopedic books on translation. This under-representation was apparent in the scant number of pages and listings devoted to self-translation and the self-translators as well as in missing and peculiar listings for self-translation and Rabindranath Tagore. It was also noted in the sub-headings accompanying certain entries on self-translators (*Literary Translation*), where only Beckett is recognized as a "self-translator", and in the two glossaries of the corpus, neither of which include the term "self-translation". Meanwhile, editors' stated goals for their texts (*Routledge Encyclopedia (1st)*; *Reader*) suggest that the neglect of self-translation is unintentional.

In the second part of this chapter, with a view to exploring why self-translation might be ignored, I analyzed the status of the self-translator by identifying her three personas, discussing the ways in which each writing subject associated with those personas is perceived, and theorizing the status of each in light of Foucault's notion of the author function. This investigation indicated that, while the self-translator is visible as an individual, her author persona trumps her translator persona and thus, as a translator or *self*-translator, she remains invisible.

In the final portion of the evaluation, the representation of self-translation was qualified. In six of the seven seminal texts analyzed, it became clear that the respective scholars had not considered self-translation when formulating their particular theory on translation. It seems that Benjamin—author of the seventh text—also overlooked self-translation; however, the minor inconsistencies in his text are ultimately inconsequential. As noted, the overall disregard in this corpus does not arise from an author's articulated

intention of focusing exclusively on standard translation, seeing as none of the authors refer to such a desire when defining the scope of their argument. Rather, there seems to be an internalized reflex to marginalize self-translation in theoretical texts. Consequently, when scholars discuss various aspects of translation, they do so in a misleading way: they purport to address these topics in relation to translation (umbrella term) but in fact intend to discuss standard translation exclusively, thereby completely neglecting the self-translator. Moreover, not accounting for the various ways in which self-translation and standard translation differ clouds our understanding of translation. As discussed in this evaluation, particularly in light of the self-translator's author function, the implications of these differences are sufficient to warrant that standard translation and self-translation be explicitly distinguished from one another—that scholars either address the peculiarities of self-translation when discussing translation or that they acknowledge that self-translation falls outside of the scope of their argument. This latter could be as simple as using a term such as "standard translation" rather than continuing to using the broader and more ambiguous "translation".

Although there has been a distinct increase in academic interest in self-translation, research pertaining to self-translation remains on the periphery of Translation Studies. Anecdotal experience, wherein scholars in the field do not recognize or understand the term "self-translation," supports this claim. The findings of this thesis provide more substantive evidence: the survey in the first chapter demonstrates that relatively few books exist on the subject and that many areas remain to be studied; the evaluations in Chapter 2 point to the marginal status of self-translation within the discipline.

3.1 The value of self-translation research

The benefits of studying self-translation are many. Such study can shed new light on matters of personal identity, language and society. For instance, Hokenson and Munson claim that "it is [the] dual nature of the 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" (67). Similarly, they argue that examining Belleau's self-translations can provide insight into poetry in the Renaissance in terms of "the figure of the poet, the relationship between the individual poet and the

larger cultural collective, the imbalance 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" (71). Studying self-translation can also provide an opportunity to reflect on one's own writing. Jung, for example, argues that examining self-translation is advantageous for didactic purposes, proposing that translation studies students translate their own writings in order to "reflect on this process" (272). Furthermore, she conceives that, through this reflection, "self-translation may also serve to make the prospective author more aware of his or her own writing style and serve to bring about the language sensibility (Beaujour 1995: 37) attributed to all bilingual writers" (274). Moreover, the practice of self-translation may notably increase in the coming years. Jessica Tsui Yan Li, for one, predicts that, while self-translation tends to be viewed as a rare occurrence, it will, "in the globalised world of the future, be more common: writers with bilingual and bicultural backgrounds translating their own works" (99). If this proves true, the study of self-translation will prove all the more valuable.

Self-translation, as Oustinoff insists, involves a combination of equal parts "original" writing and translating. Therefore, greater awareness and consideration of self-translation could contribute to rethinking both standard translation and "original" writing. Since the self-translator subsumes author and translator, she insists that the latter two writing subjects are not as diametrically different as they are commonly perceived to be. Thus, increased awareness of self-translation could encourage recognition and validation of the standard translator's creativity and artistry, for example, not to mention of the difficulty of her task. In turn, such study could contribute to unsubordinating self-translation relative to "original" writing and the self-translator relative to the author. Conversely, since author and translator are joined, the figure of the self-translator also challenges the notion of "originality" associated with the author: while she may be the ultimate "creator", she may also be the ultimate copyist. Consequently, the study of self-translation could contribute to "dethroning", so to speak, the author.

3.2 Subsequent research

This project was limited in terms of the number of texts that I could consult. It would have been valuable, for example, to survey self-translation research published in formats

other than books. Santoyo has recently made available a comprehensive bibliography of all writings he identifies as pertaining to self-translation, consisting of 43 pages and over 500 texts.[146] In this project, I have been able to consider only a fraction of a very small number of these texts. Thus, it remains to be seen how findings from journal articles and conference papers, for example, would corroborate or falsify the imbalances identified in Chapter 1. Similarly, it would be valuable to analyze more theoretical texts, as in the qualitative evaluation of Chapter 2, in order to assess how many more texts disregard self-translation and in what ways. Moreover, as noted in the introduction, research on non-literary and non-Western self-translation remains scarce and therefore represents terrain for further investigation. The same is true with respect to non-Beckettian self-translators and alternative definitions for "self-translation".

Finally, little has been investigated with respect to self-translation practices in Canada. This is surprising given that Canada is recognized internationally as an innovative and progressive leader in Translation Studies. Santoyo identifies Canada as one of the countries of which, in the 20th and 21st centuries, self-translation is "characteristic" (859); however, even he provides little proof: of the 128 self-translators he identifies, only two are Canadian—Honoré Beaugrand and Nancy Huston (863, 865). Indeed, Nancy Huston receives significant academic attention. However, she has not lived in Canada for many years. Furthermore, she represents only one person; it seems that the time has come to add more Canadians to this list and to investigate their process.

3.3 Conclusion

In *The Translator's Invisibility*, Venuti provides the results of "symptomatic readings" he had performed on various foreign and translated texts. According to him, such readings serve to "locat[e] the discontinuities" (or symptoms) "at the level of diction, syntax or discourse that reveal the translation to be a violent rewriting of the foreign text, a strategic intervention into the receiving culture" (2008: 21). It is through such readings that Venuti betrays the would-be invisibility (as per his definition) of the (standard) translator: he overturns her attempts to go unnoticed by pointing to her translation choices, which inevitably constitute her presence in the text.

---

[146] http://www.autotraduzione.com/bibliografia/

This master's thesis also represents something of a symptomatic reading—not only of Venuti's book but also of several other seminal texts on translation, of various encyclopedic texts on translation, of key texts on self-translation, of self-translation research and, ultimately, of Translation Studies as a whole. In this case, however, I have sought to locate discontinuities with respect to the representation of self-translation, and investigation has pointed to the invisibility of the latter—that is, the invisibility of the self-translator and the uniqueness of her position, status and practice.

Indeed, what is fundamentally of interest here is the invisibility of the self-translator—the writing subject who defines self-translation—because it is in the self-translator that the paradox central to this project lies. In the title of his book, Venuti uses "invisibility" paradoxically, since the focal point of his book is to insist that the translator is, in fact, never invisible—this "invisibility" is merely an illusion. With respect to the *self*-translator, invisibility is paradoxical in a different way. As a person, the self-translator can never be invisible because her name accompanies her text regardless of whether that text is "original" or "translation": she is twice heard, doubly represented. However, in terms of the way in which translation studies scholars account for her, as this project has discussed, she proves to be quite invisible, hardly seen.

References

---. "Standard." New Oxford American Dictionary. Apple Version 2.0.3 (51.5). Oxford: Oxford U P, 2007.

Baker, Mona. ed. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London: Routledge, 1998.

---, ed. Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics. 4 vols. London: Routledge, 2009.

Baker, Mona, and Gabriela Saldanha, eds. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2009.

Bandín, Elena. "The Role of Self-Translation in the Decolonisation of African Countries" Estudios Humanísticos. Filología 26 (2004): 35-53.

Barthes, Roland. The neutral: lecture course at the Collège de France (1977-1978). New York: Columbia U P, 2005.

Basalamah, Salah. Le droit de traduire: Une politique culturelle pour la mondialisation. Ottawa: U of O P, 2009.

Bassnett, Susan, and Peter Bush, eds. The translator as writer. London: Continuum, 2006.

Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere. Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998.

Beaujour, Elizabeth Klosty. Alien Tongues: Bilingual Russian Writers of the 'First' Emigration. Ithaca: Cornell U P, 1989.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." Trans. Harry Zohn. Translation Studies Reader. 2nd ed. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2004 (1923). 75-83.

Bennett, Andrew. The Author. London: Routledge, 2005.

Berman, Antoine. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." Trans. Lawrence Venuti. Translation Studies Reader. 2nd ed. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2004 (1985). 276-289.

Bourdieu, Pierre. Outline of a theory of practice. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1977.

Brunn, Alain. L'auteur: Textes choisis & présentés. Paris: Flammarion, 2001.

Bueno García, Antonio. "Le concept d'autotraduction." Traductologie, linguistique et traduction. Eds. Michel Ballard and Ahmed El Kaladi. Arras: Artois Presses Université, 2003. 265-277.

Burke, Seán. The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U P, 2008.

Classe, Olive, ed. The Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English, 2 vols. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 2000.

Dvorák, Marta, and Jane Koustas. Vision/Division: l'œuvre de Nancy Huston. U of Ottawa P, 2004.

Ehrlich, Shlomit. "Are self-translators like other translators?" Perspectives: Studies in Translatology 17 (2009): 243-255.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem." Translation Studies Reader. 2nd ed. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2004 (1978), 199-218.

Federman, Raymond. "The Writer as Self Translator." Beckett Translating/ Translating Beckett. Eds. Charles Rossman, Dina Sherzer and Alan Warren Friedman. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 1987, 7-16.

Filippakopoulou, Maria. "Self-Translation: Reviving the Author?" Other Words 25 (2005): 23-27.

Fitch, Brian T. Beckett and Babel: An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work. Toronto: U of T P, 1988.

Foucault, Michel. "Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?" Dits et écrits 1954-1988. Eds. Daniel Defert and François Ewald. Paris: Gallimard, 1994 (1969), 789-821.

France, Peter, ed. The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2000.

Genette, Gérard. L'œuvre de l'art. Immanence et transcendance. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1997.

Green, Julien/Julian. Le langage et son double. Paris: La Différence, 1985.

Greimas, A.J. "Eléments pour une théorie de l'interprétation du récit mythique." Communications 8 (1966): 28-59.

Grutman, Rainier. "Auto-translation." Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. 1st ed. Ed. Mona Baker. London: Routledge, 1998, 17-20.

---. "La autotraducción en la 'galaxia' de las lenguas." Quaderns: Revista de traducció 16 (2009): 123-134.

---. "L'autotraduction : dilemme social et entre-deux textuel." Atelier de traduction 7 (2007): 193-202.

---. "Self-translation." Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. 2nd ed. Eds. Mona Baker, and Gabriela Saldanha. London: Routledge, 2009, 257-260.

Hokenson, Jan Walsh, and Marcella Munson. The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007.

Holmes, James S. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." Translation Studies Reader. 2nd ed. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2004 (1972), 180-192.

Honig, E. The Poet's Other Voice: Conversations on Literary Translation. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1985.

House, Juliane. A Model for Translation Quality Assessment. Tubingen: TBL Verlag Gunter Narr, 1977.

Hurtado Albir, Amparo. Traducción y traductología: Introducción a la traductología. Madrid: Cátedra, 2001.

Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." Translation Studies Reader. 2nd ed. Ed. Lawrence Venuti, London: Routledge. 2004 (1959), 138-143.

Jung, Verena. English-German Self-translation of Academic Texts and its Relevance for Translation Theory and Practice. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2002.

Kittel, Harald et al, eds. Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. 2 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Knowlson, James. Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

Kuhiwczak, Piotr, and Karin Littau, eds. A Companion to Translation Studies, Buffalo: Multilingual Matters, 2007.

Larochelle, Corinne. Cantique des plaines de Nancy Huston. Ottawa: Leméac, 2001.

Li, Jessica Tsui Yan. "Politics of Self-Translation: Eileen Chang." Perspectives 14 (2006), 99-106.

Loffredo, Eugenia, and Manuela Perteghella, eds. Translation and Creativity: Perspectives on Creative Writing and Translation Studies. New York: Continuum, 2006.

Meinhof, Ulrike. Everybody Talks About the Weather...We Don't. Trans. Luise Von Flotow. Ed. Karin Bauer. New York: Seven Stories Press, 2008.

Munday, Jeremy. Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2008.

---, ed. The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies. London: Routledge, 2009.

Oustinoff, Michaël. Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction. Julien Green, Samuel Beckett, Vladimir Nabokov. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2001.

Perry, Menakhem. "Thematic and Structural Shifts in Autotranslations by Bilingual Hebrew Yiddish Writers. The Case of Mendele Mokher Sforim." Poetics Today 2 (1981): 181-192.

Robinson, Douglas. The Translator's Turn. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1990.

---. Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzche. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2002.

Santoyo, Julio César. "Autotraducciones: una perspectiva histórica." Meta 50 (2005): 858-867.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Different Methods of Translating." Trans. Susan Bernofsky. Translation Studies Reader. 2nd ed. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2004 (1813), 43-63.

Schmeling, Manfred. "La biculturalité comme paradoxe : l'auteur traducteur de lui-même." Écrire en langue étrangère: interférences de langues et de cultures dans le monde francophone. Eds. Robert Dion, Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink et Janos Riesz. Québec-Saarbrücken: Éditions Nota Bene-Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation, 2002.

Spencer, Lloyd. "Walter Benjamin: Biographical Note & Chronology." http://www.wbenjamin.org/biog.html. 25 July 2010.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "The Politics of Translation." Translation Studies Reader. 2nd ed. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2004 (1992), 369-388.

Tanqueiro, Helena. "Self-Translation as an extreme Case of the author-Translator-Dialectic." Investigating Translation. Eds. Allison Beeby, Doris Ensinger and Marisa Presas. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 2000, 55–63.

Tymoczko, Maria. Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2007.

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

---. "The Translator's Invisibility." Criticism 28 (1986): 179-221.

---. The Translator's Invisibility. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2008.

von Flotow, Luise. Email to the author. 28 February 2010.

Appendix A: MLA "self-translation" keyword search

#	Title	Year	Retained	Discarded	Reason for retaining/discarding (if applicable)	Name of self-translator (explicit in or implied by title of their work)	"Literary" self-translator?	"Conventionally" literary self-translator?
1	Textual Migration Self-Translation and Translation of the Self in Leila Abouzeid's Return to Childhood The Memoir of a Modern Moroccan Woman and Rumu' 'Ila Al-Tufulah	2009	√			Abouzeid, Leila	yes	yes
2	Traducere sau rescriere? Opera lui Panait Istrati sau arta modulatiei [Translation or re-writing? The work of Panait Istrati or the art of modulation]	2000	√			Istrati, Panait	yes	yes
3	Creole English West Indian Writing as Translation	1997	√		e g , " in the banal sense of translation of the self, but also in the sense of translation by the original writer" (28).	n/a	n/a	n/a
4	The Vanished Cane and the Revised Trick. A Solution for Nabokov's 'Lips to Lips'	2006	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes
5	Karen Blixen's Bilingual Oeuvre *The Role of Her English Editors*	1997	√			Blixen, Karen	yes	yes
6	Mercier et/and Camier Un voyage de decouverte linguistique est-il traduisible?	2006	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
7	Dédoublements du texte beckettien 'Pour finir encore'/'For to End Yet Again' et 'Still'	2004	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
8	Traduzindo a Tradução Uma Recriação de 'How It Is' de Samuel Beckett [Translating a translation a remake of 'How It Is' by Beckett]	2002	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
9	Self-Translation and Re-Writing Rosario Ferre's 'Maldito Amor' and 'Sweet Diamond Dust'	1999	√			Ferre, Rosario	yes	yes
10	Translation and Self-Translation	1995	√		No access to text, presumed relevant because it is discussed in a book about Nabokov (i e self-translator, textual definition), author is Beaujour, who has previously written about textual self-translation	Nabokov, Vladimir (This chapter appears in book entitled *The Garland Companion to Vladimir Nabokov*)	yes	yes
11	Self-Translation in Vladimir Nabokov's Pnin	2000	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes
12	Rewriting One's Self into English Milosz Translated by Milosz	1995	√			Milosz, Czeslaw	yes	yes
13	Pere céleste, la creature était bilingue' ('Heavenly Father, the Creature Was Bilingual') Beckett de l'anglais au français	2006	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
14	Malone's 'Queer' Neighbors	2000	√		No access to text, relevance is supposed because this text discusses a Beckett work	Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
15	Vladimir Nabokov's 'Task of the Translator' Identity in Need of Editing	2006	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes
16	Is There an Educational Problem with *Reading Hannah Arendt's* 'The Human Condition' in English Only?	2008	√			Arendt, Hannah	yes	no
17	Translation and Self-Translation through the Shakespearean Looking-Glasses in Joyce's Ulysses	1999	√			Joyce, James*	yes	yes

#	Title	Year	Retained	Discarded	Reason for retaining/discarding (if applicable)	Name of self-translator (explicit in or implied by title of their work)	"Literary" self-translator?	"Conventionally" literary self-translator?
18	Bog Poems and Book Poems Doubleness, Self-Translation, and Pun in Seamus Heaney and Paul Muldoon	1992	√		No access to text, relevance is supposed based on evidence that Paul Muldoon has self-translated	Heaney, Seamus, Muldoon, Paul	yes	yes
19	Preface to Testimonies of Exile On Territories, Tied Tongues, and Translations	1997	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
20	Samuel Beckett De l'ecriture comme une autotraduction	2006	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
21	Self-Translation as Minorization Process Nancy Huston's Limbes	2009	√			Huston, Nancy	yes	yes
22	Samuel Beckett Self-Translator	1961	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
23	De Happy Days à Oh! Les Beaux Jours Beckett traducteur d'une métaphore obsédante	2002	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
24	Auto-traduction et auto-censure dans Malone Meurt	1998	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
25	From Sirin to Nabokov The Transition to English	2005	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes
26	Supresion-adaptacion-amplificacion, tres procedimientos de la estrategia traductora de Carme Riera [Suppression-adaptation-amplification, three aspects of Carme Riera's translation strategy]	2006	√			Riera, Carme	yes	yes
27	Charles of Orleans Self-Translation	2003	√			Charles d'Orleans	yes	yes
28	The Space Between Self-Translator Nancy Huston's Limbes/Limbo	2005	√			Huston, Nancy	yes	yes
29	The Space between Self-Translator Nancy Huston's Limbes	2004		√	Duplicate text	n/a	yes	yes
30	Sleeping with the Enemy The Tensions of Literary Translation	2004	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
31	Self-Translation, Untranslatability The Autobiographies of Mpho Nthunya and Agnes Lottering	2008	√			Nthunya, Mpho, Lottering, Agnes	yes, yes	no, no
32	Nabokov as a Russian Writer	2005	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes
33	Lolita in Russian	1995	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes
34	The Easter Cantata and the Idea of Mediation in Goethe's Faust	1977	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
35	Guillaume Oyono-Mbia A Bilingual Playwright	1993	√			Oyono-Mbia, Guillaume	yes	yes
36	L'Etrangete rassurante de la 'bi-langue' chez Abdelkebir Khatibi et Nancy Huston	1997	√			Huston, Nancy, Khatibi, Abdelkébir	yes, yes	yes, yes
37	Die Autorübersetzung Ein Schritt über die Grenze [The authorial translation A step accross the border]	1998	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
38	Cross-Writing and Self-Translating One Canadian/Quebec Experience	2006	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
39	Zwischen den Sprachen und Kulturen Becketts Selbstubersetzungen [Between languages and cultures Beckett's self-translations]	2005	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
40	Felix Pollak als Selbstübersetzer [Felix Pollak as Self-translator]	2000	√			Pollak, Felix	yes	yes
41	I Believe That My Two Tongues Love Each Other cela ne m'étonnerait pas' Self-Translation and the Construction of Sexual Identity	2007	√			n/a	n/a	n/a

#	Title	Year	Retained	Discarded	Reason for retaining/discarding (if applicable)	Name of self-translator (explicit in or implied by title of their work)	"Literary" self-translator?	"Conventionally" literary self-translator?
42	Les Ecarts culturels entre l'original et la traduction La Reecriture d'Eric de Kuyper	2007	√			de Kuyper, Eric	yes	yes
43	Samuel Beckett's Fin de partie/Endgame/Endspiel A Dynamic Evolving Reality	2008	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
44	James Dickey's The Zodiac A Self-Translation	1990	√			Dickey, James	yes	yes
45	The Trilogy Translated	2000	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
46	The Bilingual Text History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation	2007	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
47	Latein und Deutsch bei Ulrich von Hutten [Latin and German in Ulrich von Hutten]	1996	√			von Hutten, Ulrich	yes	yes
48	Selbstübertragung als Test der dichterischen Tragfähigkeit Antonin Brousek [Self-translation as a test of poetic capacity and its limits . Antonin Brousek]	2004	√			Brousek, Antonin	yes	yes
49	Stefan Georges französische Gedichte und deutsche Übertragungen [Stefan George's French poetry and German self-translation]	1936	√			George, Stefan	yes	yes
50	Wen xue chuang zuo yu wen xue fan yi de hu wen guan xi yan jiu-Ji yu Lin Yutang zuo pin de miao shu xing fen xi	2009		√	Cannot determine the language of this text, therefore, cannot identify its subject matter	n/a	n/a	n/a
51	Karen Blixen's Translations of Her Own Work	1998	√			Blixen, Karen	yes	yes
52	Writing Germany in Exile-the Bilingual Author as Cultural Mediator Klaus Mann, Stefan Heym, Rudolf Arnheim and Hannah Arendt	2004	√			Mann, Klaus, Heym, Stefan, Arnheim, Rudolf, Arendt, Hanna	yes, yes, yes, yes	yes; yes, no, no
53	Les Archives de Krapp Enregistrement, traduction, langue	2006	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
54	Les Voix paralleles de Nancy Huston	1996	√			Huston, Nancy	yes	yes
55	Ich werde ein großes Kunstwerk schaffen ' Eine Untersuchung zum literarischen Grenzgangertum der zweisprachigen Dichterin Isak Dinesen/Karen Blixen ['I will create a great work of art. ' An investigation into the literary bordercrossings of bilingual poet Isak Dinesen/Karen Blixen]	2000	√			Blixen, Karen, Dinesen, Isak (Dinesen is Blixen's pseudonym)	yes	yes
56	Voicing the Minority Self-Translation and the Quest for the Voice in Gaelic Poetry	2008	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
57	Joseph Brodsky as Self-Translator Analysis of Lexical Changes in His Self-Translations	2006	√			Brodsky, Joseph	yes	yes
58	Isak Dinesen in English, Danish, and Translation Are We Reading the Same Text?	1993	√			Dinesen, Isak	yes	yes
59	Die literarische Übersetzung als de-zentrale Struktur. Das Paradigma der Selbstübersetzung [Literary translation as decentralizing structure The paradigm of self-translation]	1992	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
60	La autotraducción como reescritura creative [Self-translation as creative re-writing]	2006	√			n/a	n/a	n/a

#	Title	Year	Retained	Discarded	Reason for retaining/discarding (if applicable)	Name of self-translator (explicit in or implied by title of their work)	"Literary" self-translator?	"Conventionally" literary self-translator?
61	Politics of Self-Translation Eileen Chang	2006	√			Chang, Eileen	yes	yes
62	Beckett's Poems and Verse Translations Or, Beckett and the Limits of Poetry	1994	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
63	Extranjeridad Lengua y traduccion en la obra de Manuel Puig [Foreignness Language and translation in the work of Manuel Puig]	2008	√			Puig, Manuel	yes	yes
64	Three Portuguese Poets in Self-Translation	1986	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
65	La autotraducción en la ley vasca [Auto-translation in the Basque law]	2007	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
66	Rerouting the Self Georg Forster's Reise um die Welt	2008	√			Forster, Georg	yes	no
67	When I Was Puerto Rican de Esmeralda Santiago La metáfora de la escritura como traduccion en el contexto de la traduccion postcolonial	2009	√			Santiago, Esmeralda	yes	yes
68	Sarah Kofman Effecting Self Translation	1998	√			Kofman, Sarah	yes	no
69	Autobiographical Re-vision Ruth Kluger's weiter leben and Still Alive	2004	√			Klüger, Ruth	yes	no
70	Beckett, the Translator, and the Metapoem	1990	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
71	Beckett, Chamfort, and the Wastes and Wilds of Self-Translation	1987	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
72	Meri Lao traduttrice di se stessa [Meri Lao translator of her self]	2002	√			Lao, Meri	no	no
73	'The Only Truth Stands Skinned in Sound' Antjie Krog as Translator	2002	√			Krog, Antjie	yes	yes
74	Il corpo neutro Il linguaggio bilingue in Mon corps en neuf parties [The neutral body Bilingual language in Mon corps en neuf parties]	2007	√			Federman, Raymond	yes	yes
75	Noetic Licence in Brodsky's Self-Translation	1995	√			Brodsky, Joseph	yes	yes
76	'An Atropos All in Black' Or Ill Seen Worse Translated Beckett, Self-Translation and the Discourse of Death	2002	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
77	A Roving Cancellation Beckett's (Self-)Translation as Poetics of Self-Divestiture	2000	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
78	Translating History and Self-Translation João Ubaldo Ribeiro's Viva o Povo Brasileiro	1994	√			Ubaldo Ribeiro, João	yes	yes
79	Con licenza di traduzione Dialetti, lingue, culture poesia e operare autotraduttivo [With permission to translate dialect language, culture, poetry and the workings of self-translation]	2002	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
80	Applying the Socratic Elenchus? MacDiarmid's 'Direadh I'	1992		√	There is no reference in this text to the concepts of translation or self-translation	n/a	n/a	n/a
81	Notes on Translating the Self	2006	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
82	Moon, Madness, and Mutilation in Eileen Chang's English Translation of The Golden Cangue	1988	√			Chang, Eileen	yes	yes

#	Title	Year	Retained	Discarded	Reason for retaining/discarding (if applicable)	Name of self-translator (explicit in or implied by title of their work)	"Literary" self-translator?	"Conventionally" literary self-translator?
83	Thematic and Structural Shifts in Autotranslations by Bilingual Hebrew-Yiddish Writers The Case of Mendele Mokher Sforim	1981	√			Mendele Mokher (or Mocher) Sforim (pseudonym = S Y Abramovitsh, as below)	yes	yes
84	Baratynsky's Russian-French Self-Translations On the Problem of Invariant Reconstruction	1992	√			Baratynsky, Evgeny	yes	yes
85	Self-Translation as Self-Confrontation. Beckett's Mercier et	1992	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
86	Vladimir Nabokov Camera Obscura et Laughter in the Dark ou la confusion des textes	1995	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes
87	Translation as Transcreation and Reincarnation	1995	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
88	The Destruction of the Myth of Spanish Homogeneity Marginal Characters in Carme Riera's Palabra de mujer	1997	√			Riera, Carme	yes	yes
89	Feathers and Suns Joseph Brodsky's 'Dedal v Sitsilii' and the 'Fear of Replication'	2007	√			Brodsky, Joseph	yes	yes
90	Nabokov's Autobiography Problems of Translation and Style	1984	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes
91	L'Ecrivain galicien Alvaro Cunqueiro autotraducteur Merlin e familia e outras historias et son hypertexte second Merlin y familia. Avers et envers trames d'un tissu macrotextuel reversible	2006	√			Cunqueiro, Alvaro	yes	yes
92	Preface, postface, ou deux états du commentaire par des traducteurs	2007	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
93	Autotraducciones Una perspectiva historica	2005	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
94	De Nebrija a Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz Apuntes someros para una historia de las traducciones de autor (autotraducciones) en España y Portugal, 1488-1700 [From Nebrija to Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz Brief notes on a history of author translations (auto translations) in Spain and Portugal, 1488-1700]	2003	√			Sister Juana Inés de la Cruz, de Nebrija, Antonio	yes, no	yes, no
95	Excentricite et auto-traduction chez Samuel Beckett	1998	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
96	The Shtetl and the City The Origins of Nostalgia in Ba-yamim ha-hem and Shloyme reb khayims	2006	√			Abramovitsh, S Y (pseudonym of Mendele see above)	yes	yes
97	Textologische untersuchungen einiger werke Autoversionen O Ju Kobyljans'kas unter dem aspekt der mehrsprachigkeit [Textological Research on Some Works Autotranslations by O Iu Kobylians'ka in Light Multilingualism]	1987	√			O Iu Kobylians ka	yes	yes
98	Translation as Manipulation The Power of Images and Images of Power	1995	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
99	Whose Song, Whose Land? Translation and Appropriation in Nancy Huston's Plainsong	2001	√			Huston, Nancy	yes	yes
100	Julien Green traducteur de lui-même	2007	√			Green, Julien	yes	yes
101	Redefining Translation through Self-Translation The Case of Nancy Huston	2009	√			Huston, Nancy	yes	yes

#	Title	Year	Retained	Discarded	Reason for retaining/discarding (if applicable)	Name of self-translator (explicit in or implied by title of their work)	"Literary" self-translator?	"Conventionally" literary self-translator?
102	Yiddish in America, or Styles of Self-Translation	2008	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
103	Translating and Interlingual Creation in the Contact Zone Border Writing in Quebec	1999	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
104	Self-Translation and the Arts of Transposition in Allan Hollinghurst's The Folding Star	1999	√			Hollinghurst, Allan	yes	yes
105	I Write My Self The Female Body as a Site of Transculturation in the Short Stories of Carmen Rodriguez	2007	√			Rodríguez, Carmen	yes	yes
106	Translation as Writing across Languages Samuel Beckett and Fakir Mohan Senapati	1996	√			Beckett Samuel Senapati Fakir Mohan	yes, yes	yes, yes
107	Censorship and the Self-Translator	2008	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
108	Self-Translation as an Extreme Case of the Author-Translator-Dialectic	2000	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
109	Traduire l'effacement Notes sur la traduction de Comment c'est	1993	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
110	The Mother Tongue	2003	√		Cannot access text, however, its relevance is presumed because the text appears in a book called *Bilingual Games Some Literary Investigation*	n/a	n/a	n/a
111	Woolly-Woo-Boo-Are? French in Nabokov's Two Lolitas	2007	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes
112	Visions and Re-Visions Nabokov as Self-Translating Author	2005	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes
113	Antjie Krog's Role as Translator A Case Study of Strategic Positioning in the Current South African Literary Poly-System	2007	√			Krog, Antjie	yes	yes
114	Authorial Translation Samuel Beckett's Stirrings Still/Soubresauts	2006	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
115	Funktsii zaglaviia v avtoperevodakh Iosifa Brodskogo [The Function of the title in Joseph Brodsky's self-translations]	2003	√			Brodsky, Joseph	yes	yes
116	'Inhabiting' the Translator's Habitus Antjie Krog as Translator	2007	√			Krog, Antjie	yes	yes
117	Yiddish	2003	√			n/a	na	n/a
118	Against Self-Translation	2002	√			n/a	na	n/a
119	Autour de Limbes	2006	√			Huston, Nancy	yes	yes
120	Ecrire entre les langues Traduction et genre chez Nancy Huston	2009	√			Huston, Nancy	yes	yes
121	L'arte del camaleonte Traduzione e autotraduzione nella poesia sudafricana moderna [The art of the chameleon Translation and self-translation in modern South-African poetry]	1999	√			n/a	na	n/a
122	Between French and Breton The Politics of Translation	2009	√			n/a	n/a	n/a
123	'Confusion Too Is Company Up to a Point': Irony, Self-Translation and the Text of Samuel Beckett's Company	1999	√			Beckett, Samuel	yes	yes
124	The Writer's Double Translation, Writing, and Autobiography	2009	√			n/a	na	n/a
125	The Three Phases in the Development of Vladimir Nabokov's Theory and Practice of Translation	2008	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes

#	Title	Year	Retained	Discarded	Reason for retaining/discarding (if applicable)	Name of self-translator (explicit in or implied by title of their work)	"Literary" self-translator?	"Conventionally" literary self-translator?
126	Silver Shadow (2004): The Arthurian Poems by Antonio Enrique or the Different Reception of a Translation and a Self-Translation	2008	√			Enrique, Antonio	yes	yes
127	*Found in Translation*: The Two Lives of E. M. Cioran; or How Can One Be a Comparatist?	2007	√			Cioran, E.M.	yes	no
128	Tadeusz Rittners Autoversionen [Versions of oneself]	1981	√			n/a	na	n/a
129	Kamera obskura' i 'Smekh v temnote': Perevod na drugoi iazyk ili dva romana? ['Camera obscura' and 'Laughter in the Dark': translation into another language or two novels?]	2006	√			Nabokov, Vladimir	yes	yes

Total retained texts: 126

Total texts per year:

1936	1
1961	1
1977	1
1981	2
1982	0
1983	0
1984	1
1985	0
1986	1
1987	2
1988	1
1989	0
1990	2
1991	0
1992	4
1993	3
1994	2
1995	7
1996	3
1997	5
1998	5
1999	6
2000	8
2001	1
2002	7
2003	5
2004	5
2005	6
2006	17
2007	13
2008	10
2009	7

Total texts per decade:

1930s	1	
1940s	0	
1950s	0	
1960s	1	
1970s	1	
1980s	7	
1990s	37	*29%*
2000s	79	*63%*
1995-2009	105	*83%*

Appendix B: Total number of pages and articles

	Text name	Year of publication	No. of pages	No. of entries/ articles	Total no. of [pages; articles], in case of multi-volume publications
A	Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (1st ed.)	1998	654	112	n/a
B	Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (2nd ed.)	2008	674	107	n/a
C1	Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics (Vol. 1)	2009	357	19	1533; 74
C2	Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics (Vol. 2)	2009	377	17	1533; 74
C3	Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics (Vol. 3)	2009	394	20	1533; 74
C4	Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics (Vol. 4)	2009	405	17	1533; 74
D1	Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English (Vol. 1) (p.1-876)	2000	876	349	1714; 607
D2	Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English (Vol. 2) (p.877-1714)	2000	838	258	1714; 607
E	Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation	2000	656	170	n/a
F	Traducción y traductología: Introducción a la traductología	2001	695	236	n/a
G1	Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur übersetzungsforschung (Vol. 1)	2004	1061	106	1799+/312
G2	Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur übersetzungsforschung (Vol. 2)	2007	738	77	1799+/312
G3	Übersetzung: ein internationales Handbuch zur übersetzungsforschung (Vol. 3)	n/a	n/a	129	1799+/312
H	Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications	2008	236	64	n/a
I	Routledge Companion to Translation Studies	2009	287	10	n/a
J	Routledge Translation Studies Reader	2004	541	32	n/a

Total number of pages for the Übersetzung volumes is unknown; this number reflects only the first and second volumes

This number is based on the table of contents listing in volume 2 (articles #184-313)

Total number of pages:	8789
Total number of articles/entries:	1723

"Key concepts" section is considered the 10th article

Appendix C: Self-translation - Table of contents

	a	b	c	d	e
	Text name	**Year of publication**	**Listing in table of contents**	**All page numbers referenced in table of contents**	**Number of pages devoted to entry/article**
A	Routledge Encyclopedia (1st)	1998	"Auto-translation"	17; 18; 19; 20	4
B	Routledge Encyclopedia (2nd)	2008	"Self-translation"	257; 258; 259; 260	4
C1	Critical Concepts (Vol. 1)	2009	n/a	n/a	0
C2	Critical Concepts (Vol. 2)	2009	n/a	n/a	0
C3	Critical Concepts (Vol. 3)	2009	n/a	n/a	0
C4	Critical Concepts (Vol. 4)	2009	n/a	n/a	0
D1	Literary Translation (Vol. 1) (p.1-876)	2000	n/a	n/a	n/a
D2	Literary Translation (Vol. 2) (p.877-1714)	2000	"Self-translators"	1250; 1251; 1252	3
E	Oxford Guide	2000	n/a	n/a	0
F	Traducción	2001	n/a	n/a	0
G1	Ubersetzung (Vol. 1)	2004	n/a	n/a	0
G2	Ubersetzung (Vol. 2)	2007	n/a	n/a	0
G3	Ubersetzung (Vol. 3)	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
H	Introducing	2008	n/a	n/a	0
I	Companion	2009	n/a	n/a	0
J	Reader	2004	n/a	n/a	0

Appendix D: Self-translators - Table of contents

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
	Text name	**Year of Publication**	**Self-translator's name**	**Listing in table of contents**	**All page numbers referenced in table of contents**	**Number of pages devoted to the entry / article**	**Pages on which self-translator is discussed in terms of self-translation**	**Number of these pages on which self-translator is discussed in terms of self-translation**
A	**Routledge Encyclopedia (1st)**	**1998**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green, Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
B	**Routledge Encyclopedia (2nd)**	**2008**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green, Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
C1	**Critical Concepts (Vol. 1)**	**2009**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green, Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
C2	**Critical Concepts (Vol. 2)**	**2009**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green, Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
C3	**Critical Concepts (Vol. 3)**	**2009**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green, Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
C4	**Critical Concepts (Vol. 4)**	**2009**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green, Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
D1	**Literary Translation (Vol. 1) (p.1-876)**	**2000**						
			Beckett, Samuel	"Samuel Beckett"	122, 123, 124, 125 126	4	122, 123, 124, 125	4
			Green, Julien/Julian	"Julian Green"	579, 580, 581, 582	4	580, 581	2
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
	Text name	**Year of Publication**	**Self-translator's name**	**Listing in table of contents**	**All page numbers referenced in table of contents**	**Number of pages devoted to the entry / article**	**Pages on which self-translator is discussed in terms of self-translation**	**Number of these pages on which self-translator is discussed in terms of self-translation**
D2	**Literary Translation (Vol. 2) (p.877-1714)**	**2000**						
			Nabokov, Vladimir	"Vladimir Nabokov"	987, 988, 989, 990	4	988, 989, 990	3
			Tagore, Rabindranath	"Rabindranath Tagore"	1368, 1369, 1370, 1371	4	1368 1369, 1370	3
E	**Oxford Guide**	**2000**						
			Beckett, Samuel	"Beckett" (under Part II Translated Literature, "French")	294, 295, 296	3	294, 295	2
			Green, Julien/Julian	n/a	n a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
F	**Traducción**	**2001**						
G1	**Ubersetzung (Vol. 1)**	**2004**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green, Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
G2	**Ubersetzung (Vol. 2)**	**2007**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green, Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n a	0
G3	**Ubersetzung (Vol. 3)**	**2007**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
H	**Introducing**	**2008**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green, Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
I	**Companion**	**2009**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0

Only one third of p 296 is used, and this text consists of only references

This volume has not been consulted directly, taken from volume 2

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
	Text name	**Year of Publication**	**Self-translator's name**	**Listing in table of contents**	**All page numbers referenced in table of contents**	**Number of pages devoted to the entry / article**	**Pages on which self-translator is discussed in terms of self-translation**	**Number of these pages on which self-translator is discussed in terms of self-translation**
			Green Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n a	n/a	0	n/a	0
J	**Reader**	**2004**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n a	n a	0	n a	0
			Green, Julien Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov, Vladimir	Vladimir Nabokov "Problems of Translation *Onegin* in English"	115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121 122, 123, 124 125, 126, 127 128	14	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n a	0

Appendix E: Self-translation – Index

	a	b	c	d	e
	Text name	**Year of publication**	**Listing in index**	**All page numbers referenced in index** (bold face indicates pages that have are not also represented in table of contents listings)	***Number of pages devoted* to listing (excluding pages from entry data about self translat*ion* identified in the table of contents)**
A	Routledge Encyclopedia (1st)	1998	"Auto-translation"	17; 18; 19, 20	0
B	Routledge Encyclopedia (2nd)	2008	"Self-translation"	**175**; 257; 258; 259	1
C1	Critical Concepts (Vol. 1)	2009	n/a	n/a	0
C2	Critical Concepts (Vol. 2)	2009	"Self-translation"	**98; 99**	2
C3	Critical Concepts (Vol. 3)	2009	n/a	n/a	0
C4	Critical Concepts (Vol. 4)	2009	"Auto-translation"	**17**	1
D1	Literary Translation (Vol 1) (p.1-876)	2000	("Self-translators")	n/a	n/a
			by Bettina von Arnim	**509**	1
			by Samuel Beckett	122; 123; 124;125; **476**	1
			by Karin Blixen	**158; 159**	2
			by Guillermo Cabrera Infante	**208**	1
			by C.P. Cavafy	**240**	1
			by Umberto Eco	**395; 396**	2
			by Meier Goldschmidt	**334**	1
			by Julien* Green	581	0
			by Rabindranath Tagore	**706**	1
D2	Literary Translation (Vol. 2) (p.877-1714)	2000	"Self-translators"	1250: 1251; 1252	0
			by Samuel Beckett	1250; 1251	0
			by Karin Blixen	1250; 1251	0
			by Joseph Brodsky	1250	0
			by Raymond Federman	1250; 1251	0
			by Julien* Green	1250; 1251	0
			by Czeslaw Milosz	**951**	1
			by Vladimir Nabokov	**989**, 1250, 1251	1
			by Manuel Puig	**1126**	1
			by Rabindranath Tagore*	1369; 1370	0
			by Peter Weiss	**1491**	1
E	Oxford Guide*	2000	n/a	n/a	0
F	Traducción	2001			
G1	Ubersetzung (Vol. 1)*	2004	n/a	n/a	n/a
G2	Ubersetzung (Vol. 2)*	2007	n/a	n/a	n/a
G3	Ubersetzung (Vol. 3)	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
H	Introducing	2008	n/a	n/a	0
I	Companion	2009	n/a	n/a	0
J	Reader	2004	n/a	n/a	0

There is no index in this encyclopedia

This guide does not have a subject-based index.

Appendix F: Self-translators - Index

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
	Text name	**Year of publication**	**Self *translator s* name**	**Listing in index**	**All page numbers referenced in index** (bold face indicates *pages that are not also* represented in table of contents listings on self translator)	**Number of pages devoted to listing** (excluding pages from data on self translator identified in table of contents i e can only count those pages that are in bold in column e)	**Pages on which self translator is discussed in terms of self translation***	**Number of these pages on which self *translator is* discussed in terms of self translation***
A	**Routledge Encyclopedia (1st)**	**1998**						
			Beckett Samuel	Beckett Samuel	**18* 19* 20* 40**	4	18 19 20 40	4
			Green Julien Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Huston Nancy	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	"Nabokov Vladimir self translat on is specified* just before the last two page numbers are listed	**99 125 171 18* 19***	5	18 19	2
			Tagore Rabindranath	Tagore Rabindranat h	**472 474**	2	472 474	2
B	**Routledge Encyclopedia (2nd)**	**2008**						
			Beckett Samuel	"Beckett Samuel	**31 257* 259* 345 418 507**	6	257 259	2
			Green Julien Julian	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Huston Nancy	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	Nabokov Vladimir	**112 257***	2	257	1
			Tagore Rabindranath	Tagore Rabindranat h	**382 402 457**	3	457	1
C1	**Critical Concepts (Vol 1)**	**2009**						
			Beckett Samuel	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Green Julien Julian	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Huston Nancy	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
C2	**Critical Concepts (Vol 2)**	**2009**						
			Beckett Samuel	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Green Julien Jul an	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Huston Nancy	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	"Nabokov V	**98**	1	98	1
			Tagore Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n a	0
C3	**Critical Concepts (Vol 3)**	**2009**						
			Beckett Samuel	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Green Julien Julian	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Huston Nancy	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n a	0
C4	**Critical Concepts (Vol 4)**	**2009**						
			Beckett Samuel	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Green Jul en Julian	n/a	n a	0	n a	0
			Huston Nancy	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n a	0
D1	**Literary Translation (Vol 1) (p 1 876)**	**2000**						
			Beckett Samuel	"Beckett Samuel	122 123 124 125 126 476	1	476	1

Astensks refer to page numbers that are represented through the *entry on auto translation*

Asterisks refe to page numbers that are represented through the entry on auto translat on

Astensks refer to page numbers that are represented through the entry on self translation*

Aster sks refer to page numbers that are represented through the entry on self translation

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
	Text name	**Year of publication**	**Self-translator s name**	**Listing in index**	**All page numbers referenced in index** (bold face indicates pages that are not also represented in table of contents listings on self translator)	**Number of pages devoted to listing** (excluding pages from data on self translator identified in table of contents--i e can only count those pages that are in bold in column e)	**Pages on which self translator is discussed in terms of self translation***	**Number of these pages on which self-translator is discussed in terms of self translation***
			Green Julien Julian	"Green Julian"	579 580 581 582	0	n/a	0
			Huston Nancy	n a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	n/a	n a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	"Tagore Rabindranat h"	**132 528 706**	3	706	1
DZ	**Literary Translation (Vol 2) (p 877-1714)**	**2000**						
			Beckett, Samuel	Beckett, Samuel	**1250*, 1251***	2	1250, 1251	2
			Green Julien Julian	Green Julian"	**1250*, 1251***	2	1250 1251	2
			Huston Nancy	n a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	"Nabokov Vladimir	898 987 988 989 990, **1250*, 1251*, 1352**	2	1250 1251	2
			Tagore Rabindranath	"Tagore Rabindranat h"	1368 1369 1370 1371 **1373**	0	n/a	0
E	**Oxford Guide**	**2000**						
			Beckett Samuel	Beckett Samuel	**34 79 248, 252, 283 284, 287, 288, 290, 291,** 294 295 296 **433**	11	34 79 288	3
			Green Julien Julian	Green Julien'	**287, 288, 290 291**	4	n/a	0
			Huston Nancy	n/a	n a	0	n a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	'Nabokov Vladimir	**xix, 5, 8, 78, 90, 92 93 95, 421, 583, 584, 585, 586, 588, 589 606**	16	n/a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	'Tagore Rabindranat h'	**79 457 460, 465**	4	79 460	2
F	**Traduccion**	**2001**						
G1	**Ubersetzung (Vol 1)**	**2004**						
			Beckett Samuel	n a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green Julien/Julian	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Huston Nancy	n/a	n a	0	n a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	n a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	n/a	n a	0	n/a	0
G2	**Ubersetzung (Vol 2)**	**2007**						
			Beckett Samuel	n/a	n a	0	n a	0
			Green Julien Julian	n/a	n a	0	n a	0
			Huston Nancy	n a	n a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	n/a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	n a	n a	0	n/a	0
G3	**Ubersetzung (Vol 3)**	**2007**						
			Beckett Samuel	n a	n a	0	n/a	0
			Green Julien/Julian	n a	n a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n a	0	n a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	n a	n a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	n a	n/a	0	n/a	0
H	**Introducing**	**2008**						
			Beckett Samuel	n a	n a	0	n a	0
			Green Julien Julian	n/a	n a	0	n a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	n a	n a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	n a	n a	0	n/a	0
I	**Companion**	**2009**						

Asterisks refer to page numbers that are represented by the table of contents listing for "self translators

Asterisks refer to page numbers that are represented by the table of contents listing for "self translators

This text does not include an index

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
	Text name	**Year of publication**	**Self-translator's name**	**Listing in index**	**All page numbers referenced in index** (bold face indicates pages that are not also represented in table of contents listings on self translator)	**Number of pages devoted to listing** (excluding pages from data on self translator identified in table of contents--i e can only count those pages that are in bold in column e)	**Pages on which self-translator is discussed in terms of self-translation***	**Number of these pages on which self-translator is discussed in terms of self-translation***
			Beckett Samuel	n a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Green Julien/Julian	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston, Nancy	n/a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	n/a	n a	0	n/a	0
			Tagore, Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0
1	**Reader**	**2004**						
			Beckett, Samuel	n/a	n/a	0	n a	0
			Green Julien Julian	n a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Huston Nancy	n a	n/a	0	n/a	0
			Nabokov Vladimir	'Nabokov V"	**8, 112, 113,** 115 116 117 118 119 120, 121 122 123 124 125, 126, 127, **195**	4	n/a	0
			Tagore Rabindranath	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0