

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Reciprocity in Literary Translation: Gift Exchange Theory and Translation Praxis in Brazil and Mexico (1968-2015)

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2wn8v8p6>

Author

Gomez, Isabel Cherise

Publication Date

2016

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Reciprocity in Literary Translation:

Gift Exchange Theory and

Translation Praxis in Brazil and Mexico (1968-2015)

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy
in Hispanic Languages and Literatures

by

Isabel Cherise Gomez

2016

© Copyright by
Isabel Cherise Gomez
2016

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Reciprocity in Literary Translation:
Gift Exchange Theory and
Translation Praxis in Brazil and Mexico (1968-2015)

by

Isabel Cherise Gomez

Doctor of Philosophy in Hispanic Languages and Literatures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2016

Professor Efraín Kristal, Co-Chair

Professor José Luiz Passos, Co-Chair

What becomes visible when we read literary translations as gifts exchanged in a reciprocal symbolic economy? Figuring translations as gifts positions both source and target cultures as givers and recipients and supplements over-used translation metaphors of betrayal, plundering, submission, or fidelity. As Marcel Mauss articulates, the gift itself desires to be returned and reciprocated.

My project maps out the Hemispheric Americas as an independent translation zone and highlights non-European translation norms. Portuguese and Spanish have been sidelined even from European translation studies: only in Mexico and Brazil do we see autochthonous translation theories in Spanish and Portuguese. Focusing on translation strategies that value

taboo-breaking, I identify poet-translators in Mexico and Brazil who develop their own translation manuals. Working through and moving beyond the ideas of Mexican and Brazilian avant-garde theorists, I analyze writers for whom questions of translatability are oriented towards reciprocal two-way exchange, rather than either assimilation or transculturation.

I demonstrate that—while in theory Octavio Paz defines translation as an act of resistance to a poet’s own voice—in his practice as a translator Paz imports his own poetic concerns into the works he translates. His contemporary Rosario Castellanos adopts an opposing theoretical stance while employing a similar practice, where her translated poems become an autobiographical performance of her intersectional vocation. I then trace the development of José Emilio Pacheco’s “approximations,” translations he describes as both cultured and barbaric. Haroldo de Campos and his concept of the “cannibal translator” who “transcreates” from all traditions opened the field for many Brazilian translators. Augusto de Campos, Paulo Henriques Britto, and Clarice Lispector each translate with their own manual, while they benefit from Haroldo’s expansive translation norms. Translation theories from Mexico and Brazil come into contact in translations of Brazilian *modernismo* into Spanish for a Latin American canon published by the Biblioteca Ayacucho. In each chapter, close reading of essays about translation, translation paratexts, and selected translations reveal the function of literary translations as gifts from one writer to another, from one culture to another, or amongst translators.

The dissertation of Isabel Cherise Gomez is approved.

Barbara Fuchs

Suzanne Levine

Efraín Kristal, Co-Chair

José Luiz Passos, Co-Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments		vii
Vita		x
Introduction		1
Chapter 1	Octavio Paz and Rosario Castellanos Give and Receive as Literary Translators: <i>Versiones</i> as Diversion, <i>Versiones</i> as <i>Oficio</i>	36
	Analogous Versions in Theory and in Practice	40
	The Generous Translationship Between Paz and Bishop	50
	<i>Versiones</i> of Nerval: French Alexandrines Through Two Spanish Filters	62
	Paz Takes Back “Literary Interest” Given to Nerval	75
	<i>Versiones</i> of Castellanos: Literary Translation and Self-Fashioning	82
	Versions and Options: The <i>Oficio</i> of a Woman Who Writes	89
	The Dialectic of Dominion and Liberation in Spanish	97
	Poetic Avatars and Cautionary Tales: Castellanos on Dickinson	102
	Translating Dickinson: Unapologetic Autobiographical Translation	107
	Chapter 1 Conclusions: Mexican History and the “Objective” Translator	121
Chapter 2	José Emilio Pacheco and Literary Translation as Writing Without Authorship: Gifting Between Different Americas	123
	Heteronyms and Pseudotranslations: Approximating Other Americas	131
	T.S. Eliot in Spanish: <i>La Tierra Baldía</i> , <i>El páramo</i> , and <i>Cuatro cuartetos</i>	138
	Re-Translations and Shifting Conditions: Prose to Poetry to Criticism	143
	The Mexican Past of the American Midwest in Pacheco’s “Eliotic” Notes	147
	Transplanted Landscapes and Grafted Histories in “East Coker”	157
	Approximating Indigenous Poetries of North America	167
	Reframing Bierhorst’s Frame: From “Ritual Orations” to Poems	171
	Pseudo-Translation: Original Work Presented as an “Apache Song”	178
	Approximations of Brazil: Fame and Anonymity, Memory and Amnesia	184
	Azevedo Oliveira, Mouthpiece for the Coloniality of Racism	191
	Chapter 2 Conclusions: Ayotzinapa and the Politics of Translation	196
Chapter 3	Reciprocal Translation Praxis in Brazil After Haroldo de Campos: From Cannibal Translation to Transcreation and (Un)Translation	200
	The Brothers de Campos: From Concrete Poetry to Cannibal Translation	203
	Haroldo on Oswald: <i>Antropofagia</i> as Writing and Translating Strategy	206
	Literary Translation Theory in Brazil: Where Does the Cannibal Belong?	210
	From Self-Translation to Social Justice Translation in <i>cartonera</i>	214
	The <i>Anticrítico</i> and <i>(In)Tradução</i> : Translation Theories by Augusto	223
	Augusto in Spanish America: Huidobro and Parra over Neruda	231
	Intralingual (Un)Translations and <i>Os sertões dos Campos</i>	239
	The Professional Cannibal Translator: Paulo Henriques Britto	246
	Translation as a Gift of Formal Experiment: Symmetrical Sonnets	250

	Clarice Lispector as a Translator and Adapter: Gifts and Product	258
	Poe in Brazil: Lispector's Translation Manual	264
	Chapter 3 Conclusions: Literary Gifts and Political Alliances	280
Chapter 4	Brazilian <i>Modernismo</i> Journeys from São Paulo to Caracas: Gift Exchanges Between Translation Theorists	283
	Reading Ayacucho's Archives: A Publisher's "Translation Manual"	286
	Framing Brazilian <i>modernismo</i> for Spanish-American Readers	292
	<i>Macunaíma</i> as World Literature: Transcreation and Thick Translation	306
	Héctor Olea's Spanish-American <i>Macunaíma</i> : Tactics of Transcreation	313
	The Value of Incompatibility: Untranslatables as Inflection Points	317
	Conflicting Translation Manuals as Cognitive Highlighter: Reading for Geographic Dislocation and Interpolated Traditions	320
	Chapter 4 Conclusions: World Literature as Mobile Untranslatables	331
Conclusions	Reciprocity and Literary Translation in the Digital Age	332
Bibliography		337

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Scholarly writing, like literary translation, can never be a solo act. So many mentors, friends, and family have given to me generously of their time and support as I have pursued my degree and developed this project. I am incredibly grateful and I extend my sincere thanks:

To my advisers, the co-chairs of my dissertation committee: Professor Efraín Kristal and Professor José Luiz Passos; and to my other committee members: Professor Barbara Fuchs and Professor Suzanne Jill Levine; my work has grown more than I knew possible with the benefit of their insights and valuable feedback throughout the process, their mentorship and conversation over the years, and I am honored to have worked with such phenomenal scholars;

To my other faculty mentors at UCLA and elsewhere: to Anna More for all her support and for bringing me into the realm of sorjuanista scholarship which has given me new research and translation directions; to Sandra Bermann, Michelle Clayton, Jorge Marturano, Benjamin Moser, Christopher Mott, and Maarten van Delden for helping me find opportunities to present my research and for reading early drafts of my work; and to the late, great Michael Heim, who taught me what translation could mean within a scholarly life;

To those who have helped me with the research, editing, and publication of my work: to the editors Hélio de Seixas Guimarães at *Machado de Assis em Linha* and Kristin Dykstra who found a place for my transcreation at *Jacket2*; to the editors of my forthcoming article about English translations of Sor Juana, Emilie Bergmann and Stacey Schlauf; to the editors at the *Journal of World Literature*, Susan Bassnett, David Damrosch, and Esmaeil Haddadian Moghaddam: Chapter Four is a version of my article “Brazilian Transcreation and World Literature: *Macunaíma* Journeys from São Paulo to Caracas.” *Journal of World Literature* 1.3 (2016): 316-314., and I reprint it here with permission from the publisher; to Jessica Gordon-

Burroughs who introduced me to the archival materials at the Biblioteca Ayacucho publishing house; and to those who welcomed me there during my visit: Executive Director Luis Edgar Páez and Editors Elizabeth Coronado, Shirley Fernández, and Daniel Pérez Astros; citations from letters held in the archive at the Biblioteca Ayacucho are included with permission;

To the Revolutionary Women, my writing group comprised of women of color pursuing doctorates in the humanities: Juliann Anesi, Carolina Beltrán, Renee Hudson, Andretta Lyle, Kimberly Mack, Marilu Medrado, Yvette Martínez-Vu, Erica Onugha, Sandra Ruiz, Ester Trujillo, Brandy Underwood, and Joyce Pualani Warren; and in remembrance of Mariana Grajales, we miss you, querida;

To the Interdisciplinary Humanities Graduate Student Writing Retreat Group: my fellow founding members Jenny Marie Forsythe and Roni Hirsch; Shir Alon, Nasia Anam, Gelare Khoshgozaran, and Lilith Mahmud: we did so much writing in community and in beautiful natural settings thanks to our hosts, the UC Natural Reserves at the La Kretz Field Station in Malibu, the Sedgwick Reserve in Santa Ynez, the Sweeney Granite Mountains Research Center in the Mohave Desert, the Landels-Hill Big Creek Reserve in Big Sur, and the James San Jacinto Mountains Reserve in Idyllwild;

To all my other friends, study partners, and collaborators on projects large and small: the UCLA Latin American Institute Research Group on Travel, Translation, and Circulation in Latin America: Kristal Bivona, Audrey Harris, Kevin McDonald, and Amber Bryant Williams; the organizing team for the HEMI-GSI Convergence at UCLA and USC in 2013 “Experimental Collectivities:” Rebecca Garrison, Ana Paulina Lee, Jennifer Reynolds-Kaye, Olivia Sanchez, and Gwynn Shanks; the Translation Studies Working Group: Alejandra Campoy and Renata Stauder; and to everyone not already mentioned with whom I have shared study spaces, works in

progress, poetry readings, and pep talks: Elisa Harkness, Bizzy Hemphill, Molly Hirschfeld, Becky Kosick, Dana Linda, Rebecca Lippmann, Nicole Louie, Rose McCarron, Erin Mizrahi, Nicole Robinson, Jennie Scholick, Gabriela Venegas, Ricardo Wilson, and Stephanie Wolahan;

To my family: my mother Diana, my father Greg, and my sister Angelina; to my grandparents Cherise and Martin Wyneken, Hank Gomez, and in loving memory of my grandma Phyllis Gomez; to the extended Gomez and Wyneken families; and to my partner, Jake Mensch.

Thank you, everyone.

I know that our exchanges of ideas are just beginning.

VITA

- 2004 B.A. in Comparative Literature, Phi Beta Kappa
University of Chicago, Chicago
- 2009-10 Eugene Cota-Robles Fellowship
University of California, Los Angeles
- 2010 Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship (FLAS)
- 2012 Graduate Summer Research Mentorship
University of California, Los Angeles
- 2012-13 Graduate Research Mentorship
University of California, Los Angeles
- 2014-15 Collegium of University Teaching Fellow (CUTF)
University of California, Los Angeles
- 2015-16 Editor-in-Chief *Mester: Journal of the Department of Spanish & Portuguese*
University of California, Los Angeles

PUBLICATIONS

- forthcoming “Translations of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz into English: Ideology and Interpretation.” *Ashgate Research Companion to Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*. Eds. Emilie Bergmann and Stacey Schlau. Burlington: Ashgate.
- 2016 “Brazilian Transcreation and World Literature: *Macunaíma* Journeys from São Paulo to Caracas.” *Journal of World Literature*. Eds. David Damrosch and Susan Bassnett. 1.3 (2016): 316-41.
- 2016 Translations of Additional Works including sel. from the “*Villancicos* for Saint Peter Nolasco,” sel from *Allegorical Neptune*, and “Ballad 51: When, Numina most divine.” By Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. *Norton Critical Edition: The Collected Works of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*. Ed. Anna More. New York: Norton, 2016. 129-59.
- 2015 “Transcreation / Transcrição. Cannibal Translation.” Introduction and Transcreation of “a mulher vai” by Angélica Freitas. *Jacket2: Commentaries*. Ed. Kristin Dykstra. Philadelphia: Kelly Writers House. 28 Oct 2015.
- 2014 “To Be 130 Years Old! Updating the Language of University Culture and Race in Machado’s Short Stories. A Review of a New English Translation by John Chasteen.” *Machado de Assis em Linha* 7.13 (2014): 119-28.

2013 Co-authored with Rafael Ramírez Mendoza, and Sandra Ruiz. “Toward *un estado plurinacional*: An Interview with John Beverley on Postsubaltern Studies.” *Mester* 42 (2013): 117-130.

2013 Translation for supertitles of *The Other Side* by Jorgelina Cerritos. Bilingual Performance at UCLA, October 11, 2013.

PRESENTATIONS

2016 “Bringing Classics to Reluctant Publics: Performative Readings of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz.” *Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA)*. University of Vienna, Austria. July 21-27.

2016 “Untranslation and Brazilian Visual Poetics: Augusto de Campos in Spanish America.” *LASA 2016: LASA at 50*. New York City, May 27-30.

2016 “Sor Juana and Reluctant Twenty-first-Century Publics: Monolingual, Anti-Intellectual, and Performative Readings.” *MLA 2016: Literature and its Publics: Past, Present, and Future*. Austin, TX, January 7-10.

2015 “Reciprocity in Latin American Translation Practice: José Emilio Pacheco’s Approximations” *LASA 2015*: San Juan, Puerto Rico, May 27-30.

2015 “José Emilio Pacheco’s Barbaric Translations: Approximating Other Americas.” *American Comparative Literature Association 2014 Annual Meeting*. University of Washington, Seattle. March 26-29.

2015 “*Macunaíma* as a Traveling Literary Practice: Tactics of the Untranslatable Between São Paulo and Caracas.” *Modern Languages Association 2015 Annual Meeting: Negotiating Sites of Memory*. Vancouver, Canada. January.

2014 “*Antropofagia* in Caracas: Translating Brazilian *modernismo* for a Decolonial Latin American Canon.” *American Comparative Literature Association 2014 Annual Meeting: Capitals*. New York University, New York. March 20-23.

2013 “Consensual Translation and Audience Domination: Dolores Dorantes and Jen Hofer Perform *Estilo* at Machine Project.” *The Front: A Collaborative of Art, Culture, Design & Urbanism*. San Ysidro, CA. November 7.

2013 “The Afterlife of Emily Dickinson’s Poetry in Spanish: Between Indeterminacy and Faithless Love.” *American Comparative Literature Association 2013 Annual Meeting: Global Positioning Systems*. University of Toronto, Toronto. April 4-7.

2011 “Murilo Mendes Rewrites the *Historia do Brasil* of Oswald de Andrade: *Postvanguardia* in Brazil.” *Graduate Colloquium on Brazilian Modernism*. UCLA Center for Brazilian Studies, Los Angeles. February 10.

Introduction

If we consider literary translation as a form of exchange, between individual writers, between languages or cultures, between publishers and publics, what is the nature of that exchange? A literary translation makes for a peculiar product or gift. Even while it is sold or given away in a new space—the target culture—it also remains with the giver, with the source culture. Some translations may operate primarily within an economy of market-driven exchange values in which forms of monetary and cultural capital are extracted, accumulated, and exchanged, and translation acts are assumed to be one-directional. Other translations might function primarily within a gift economy of reciprocal exchanges, in which there is an assumption of mutuality, circulation, and temporary possession of a cultural form. Many translations feature characteristics of both forms of exchange. I am interested in what becomes visible when we choose to focus on the ways in which a literary translation participates in an actual or imagined system of reciprocal gift exchange conceived of as both voluntary and compulsory.

As argued by Peter Sloterdijk, the work of Marcel Mauss on the concept of gift exchange has been needlessly isolated within the discipline of ethnography and applied only to pre-modern societies. I follow his interest in modern and contemporary structures of gift exchange and in applying the insights of Mauss to the social and political present. My project considers literary translation as an expression of the enduring human need to be allowed to participate in reciprocal gift exchange. I am not working from the idealization of an unconditional gift posited by Jacques Derrida (13). Rather, I assert that literary translations share some qualities of the conditional gift as theorized by Mauss, a gift that holds within itself an implicit expectation of reciprocation. I draw on theories of

the gift in order to give pride of place to the elements within literary translation that reflect the human privilege and expression of freedom inherent in gifting behavior and that perform or posit reciprocity as a part of their value. Choosing my translation cases from the latter half of the twentieth century in Mexico and Brazil, I identify a set of alternative and contestatory translation values that break taboos of the market-driven literary world in order to perform reciprocity in translation. I select works by authors and leading public intellectuals who both translated and wrote critically about their translation practice. Within this diverse corpus, I categorize these reciprocal translations in four major ways. Some function primarily as gifts translators give to authors, sometimes even to authors who have also served them as translators of their own work. A second type of gift-giving translation presents itself as a gift to a new reading public. Thirdly, some translations figure as gifts the translators themselves are receiving through the process of composition, either a pedagogical gift, or at times an escapist one. Lastly, some of my translation cases became for their translators and editors a form of potlatch in themselves: fields on which the exchanges of cultural gifts can be performed where these gifts include new vocabularies, popular cultural forms, or literary insights.

Several of my case studies also highlight connections between literary spheres in Spanish America and Brazil in the last half-century. I combine Latin American literary studies with contemporary concerns in translation studies, including the concept of the untranslatable and debates about World Literature, making the vectors and agents of mutual influence among Latin American intellectuals writing in Spanish and Portuguese relevant to these other conversations taking place primarily in English and French. I interpret the Hemispheric Americas as an independent translation zone in order to

highlight non-European translation norms. Even in the European tradition, Portuguese and Spanish have been sidelined from translation studies. The richness of translation practice in Mexico and Brazil in Spanish and Portuguese produces autochthonous translation theories. While such a broad historical view is beyond the scope of my project, an explanation for this would be the invention of Latin America representing a reinvention of Spanish and Portuguese to fit new realities, a legacy that is still evident where “contests over language and cultural identity that still rage in contemporary writing derive from these early nation-building struggles” (Balderston 3). If Latin American literature comes from the forging of difference while recognizing a continuity with the literatures of the Iberian Peninsula and Europe, then as Balderston argues, “translation is central to the process of self-identification in the throes of cultural and linguistic differences, in Latin America’s ‘constant production of differential sites of enunciation’” (Mignolo qtd in Balderston, 3). While much attention has been paid to the translation of Latin American literatures into English, I am interested in focusing on translations into Spanish and Portuguese as acts of generosity but also as performative acts producing new sites of enunciation.

I focus on translation strategies by authors who signal that they are doing something more, or something other than “straight translation,” as evidenced by their use of alternative or invented terms to describe their work: *versión*, *aproximación*, *transcrição*, *intradução*. This constellation of poet-translators in Mexico and Brazil developed their own metaphors and theories of translation: in Mexico, Octavio Paz, Rosario Castellanos, José Emilio Pacheco, and Héctor Olea, and in Brazil the brothers Haroldo and Augusto de Campos, Clarice Lispector, and Paulo Henriques Britto. Rather

than assuming translation will involve either assimilation or transculturation, in some cases, drawn to what Emily Apter has called “untranslatables,” these translators find ways of interpolating their own culture into a source text to increase readability while also leaving elements untranslated. In so doing, they break taboos developed in market-driven literary translation (authorship, copyright, completeness, fidelity) to position literary translation as a process of gifting and exchanging cultural forms that will never be equivalent. If the market for literary translation tends to privilege “domestication,” the translations I focus on privilege not just “foreignization” but a performative rejection of “domestication” in the sense of making the illusion of equivalence between source text and translated text impossible.¹

The literary translations I select all describe or perform the act of translation in ways that I group under the umbrella term of the “potlatch,” which operates under the assumption of reciprocity. Mauss defined the term “potlatch” in his *Essai sur le Don* written in 1925, revised and published in 1950 in French, and translated to English in 1954. In his work examining indigenous cultures of the Pacific Northwest, including the Kwakiutl, the Haïda, and the Tsimshian, the “potlatch” is “a system for the exchange of gifts ... a festival where goods and services of all kinds are exchanged. Gifts are made and reciprocated with interest” (vi). Furthermore, “[t]he obligation to reciprocate constitutes the essence of the potlatch” (41). Gifts that cannot be reciprocated become debts, even to the degree of enslaving the recipient to the giver (42). A further condition of the potlatch is the understood non-equivalence of gifts and counter-gifts: gifts must be

¹ While Venuti does emphasize that his categories were never meant to be mutually exclusive, I am not precisely saying that a translation considered as gift is also one that favors foreignization. Instead I am interested in translation techniques that make full domestication clearly impossible, even where “smoothness” may be achieved in other moments.

reciprocated with interest (42). In some cases, I interpret the translator's added material as literary "interest" positioned as a worthy return made for a gift the translator received from the author of the source text, as though the translation serves as a counter-gift in reciprocation. For Paz as a translator, this addition of his own voice represents a failure of the functional separation he aims for in theory, namely the division between his original creations and his literary translations. Yet for Pacheco and for the Campos brothers, the addition of literary interest represents one of their favored translation strategies.

The paradoxical logic of a voluntary compulsory gift and the element of sacred behavior involved in this exchange make gift theory a fertile heuristic for understanding literary translation. Mauss begins his work with the following questions: "*What rule of legality and self-interest, in societies of a backward or archaic type, compels the gift that has been received to be obligatorily reciprocated? What power resides in the object given that causes its recipient to pay it back?*" (3; emphasis in original). While he gathers his observations from what he problematically calls "societies of a backwards or archaic type" (3), he is ultimately interested in the conventions that continue to govern the moral or social imperative to reciprocate gifts. For Mauss, gift exchanges represent a total social structure that persists in the modern age. In his conclusion, he posits that "this concrete study can lead not only to a science of customs, to a partial social science but even to moral conclusions, or rather, to adopt once more the old word, 'civility', or 'civics', as it is called nowadays" (83). The paradoxical nature of the gift, which is both compulsory and voluntary, and which creates enduring and extended obligations in both giver and receiver, can be used to understand aspects of contemporary life, and can be seen to endure even within a society that has created a market of exchange in which obligations

end in the initial exchange of a good or service for capital. Several of my translators have revised, republished, and repackaged their literary translations in different forms, extending or expanding their intervention into another's work.

It may be possible to understand these extended and repeated return engagements with their translations as driven by opportunities created by the literary market and their increased distinction as authors providing the chance to re-edit and republish. That said, I am interested in considering the human and personal element of this repeated return to the literary voice of another. While none of my authors translate with religious purpose, several do exhibit a spirituality connected with their translation work, a sense of communion or connection. In his observations of Maori culture, Mauss emphasizes the gift as an object invested with the soul of the giver and the sacred nature of gift exchange:

[T]he thing itself possesses a soul, is of the soul. Hence it follows that to make a gift of something to someone is to make a present of some part of oneself. ... In this system of ideas one clearly and logically realizes that one must give back to another person what is really part and parcel of his nature and substance, because to accept something from somebody is to accept some part of his spiritual essence, of his soul. To retain that thing would be dangerous and mortal ... those rituals or those acts of communion—all exert a magical or religious hold over you. Finally, the thing given is not inactive. Invested with life, often possessing individuality, it seeks to return to what Hertz called its “place of origin” or to produce, on behalf of the clan and the native soil from which it sprang, an equivalent to replace it (12-13).

In this passage, we see many of the same metaphors my authors use to describe literary translation: a text takes “magical or religious hold” over the translator, a possession that must be dealt with. It either seeks to return to “native soil” or to produce “an equivalent to replace it” much like the metaphor of transplantation or grafting José Emilio Pacheco uses to describe a literary translation taking root and bearing fruits in the target language. The concept that the gift itself takes on the properties of the exchange relationship and will complete the cyclical movement of gifting and counter-gifting with or without the participation of the human actors involved can also be seen in foundational texts of translation theory such as Walter Benjamin’s “Task of the Translator.” Much like Mauss and his vision of the gift, Benjamin centers the literary texts themselves as agents operating on their own behalf: “the translatability of linguistic creations ought to be considered even if men should prove unable to translate them” (16). While the translators I study may not share the messianic belief in translation that Benjamin explores in this essay, they express some similar convictions about the agency of texts themselves in their pursuit of reciprocity.

I use the vocabulary of gift theory to argue for the ethical investment of some cases of literary translation which appear to avoid “staying still” in the target culture—the idea that a translated text is not inert, but rather still living and desiring of movement or return to its source culture, in a transformed form. Mauss began his study in search of an explanation for this obligation of reciprocity. He understood the giving and receiving of gifts as logical consequences of the principles of self-interest and preservation. Yet he could not explain reciprocation until he understood the belief that the gift itself, the object or service, is not inactive but rather an active and living part of the soul of the giver, and

is believed to contain a desire for return. The literary translation presents itself as an ambivalent gift—who is the giver and who the recipient? I examine specific cases to construct a panorama of literary translation as potlatch: in some cases, the translator figures primarily as gift-giver, in some as gift receiver, in others as a combination, and in further examples the translated text itself becomes a potlatch in which the reciprocal exchange of literary elements is performed. Yet this exchange can never be completed, accounts can never be balanced, because the counter-gift will set up another debt, and the portions of soul exchanged can never be fully returned. The translations I study, when viewed through this theory of the gift, can be understood as performances of recognition in that each exchange is also a return of the self from the other.

In drawing from Mauss and gift theory, I diverge from the current trends in translation studies that borrow from sociology and examine translation as a field of cultural production in the sense defined by Pierre Bourdieu, such as the work of Pascale Casanova, Gisele Sapiro, and Yvonne Lindqvist. To apply the tools of sociology to the field(s) of literary translation, these studies take into consideration the agents of translation (translators, editors, publishers, literary agents, but also less formal agents), translation marketing, and the data available about the publication, distribution, and sales of translated literature. Taking an approach encouraged by the “distant reading” model of Franco Moretti, these studies figure the act of translation as a product operating within the conditions of capital, including monetary assets and cultural capital.

Many useful conclusions can and have been drawn from this method. For example, Sapiro analyzes publications of works translated from French in the US literary market, testing the hypothesis that French literature is on the decline in the World

Literary market. Her data shows that the “idea of the death of ‘French literature,’” reflects not a decline in translation from French but rather an increase in the “the heterogeneity of the works translated from French” (11). If anything is dying, therefore, it is only the centrality of literature “identified with Parisian white, male authors, as opposed to what was defined at the same period [1990-2003] as ‘world literature in French’, referring to writers coming from the Francophone periphery” (Sapiro 11). Without examining closely any translations in her study, Sapiro nevertheless demonstrates the way contemporary translation markets are “challenging the inertia of central Parisian literature” (11).

Lindqvist works with similar methods to understand why “two very small and peripheral languages on a global scale, namely Danish and Swedish, rank among the ten most important source languages in the global translation field today” (174). Her research draws from previous data-driven studies and from the UNESCO *Index Translationum*, an online database of bibliographic information for published translated works dating from 1979. Focusing on the process of “double consecration” in which works must achieve acclaim in a dominant field as well as within their own culture, she concludes that Swedish, although a peripheral language globally, nevertheless plays a central role as a consecrating language within the Scandinavian translation field.

Methodologies such as the data-driven approach used by Sapiro and Lindqvist will inevitably favor translations produced within and tied to the assumptions of a market economy, in which a print publication matters but an online publication of a translated fragment is invisible, when the terms of conditionality are driven by legal and market structures such as copyright, brand status, demand, and where achievements are measured in forms of cultural capital such as prizes and in monetary values such as sales and

distribution. This methodology is best equipped to evaluate translations with the widest distribution, which often pursue aesthetics of completeness, legibility, domestication, authority, and objectivity.

I argue that a different methodology is needed to understand the elements of a literary translation that figure and signify within a gift economy: a methodology of close-reading, an appreciation for the fragmentary rather than the complete, and an interest in the process in addition to the final product. My project contributes specifically to placing Latin American translation praxis within the larger conversation about translation studies as related to world literature as well as to what editors Stefan Helgesson and Pieter Vermeulen call “*critical world literature studies*” (2; emphasis in original). My project departs from the assumption that you cannot understand a translation as a gift without closely reading it to understand the “translation manual” with which it was produced. Language philosopher Willard Quine posits a principle of the “indeterminacy of translation” in which there can be an infinite number of “translation manuals” that produce equally consistent and logical translations, which nevertheless are entirely disparate from one another.² Working from Quine’s insight, Efraín Kristal understands these “translation manuals” as the set of written or unwritten guidelines a publisher, grant institution, or translator may impose on the process (37-9). I select translations that I argue are produced with manuals rooted in gift-economy ideals. Built within these translations are assumptions that they are conditional and multidirectional, that they will be part of a reciprocated cultural exchange rather than representing a unidirectional

² “[R]ival systems of analytical hypotheses can conform to all speech dispositions within each of the languages concerned and yet dictate, in countless cases, utterly disparate translations; not mere mutual paraphrases, but translations each of which would be excluded by the other system” (Quine 73-4).

accumulation of cultural capital. They pursue qualities of incompleteness, opacity, foreignization, arbitrariness, chance, and opinion.

Pascale Casanova argues, as I do, for the need to differentiate the world of literature from the world of the market, and claims that the best use of the world picture is to understand the details involved: the big picture is not the end point. Identifying Latin American literatures as the clearest contemporary example of the non-correspondence between economic and literary centrality, Casanova emphasizes “the relative autonomy of the literary sphere, with no direct link, no cause-and-effect relation between political-economic strength and literary power or legitimacy at an international level” (85). She uses Henry James’ metaphor in “The Figure in the Carpet” to describe close examination as an interpretive model that will result in meaninglessness without first viewing from afar. She aims “to restore the coherence of the global structure within which texts appear, and which can only be seen by taking the route furthest from them ... only in order to return to the texts themselves, and to provide a new tool for reading them” (Casanova 73). In using what she calls the “World Republic of Letters” to inform texts, Casanova is interested in “the exact opposite of what is ordinarily understood by ‘literary globalization’—better defined as a short-term boost to publishers’ profits in the most market-oriented and powerful centres through the marketing of products intended for rapid, ‘de-nationalized’ circulation” (74). She goes on to posit that scholarly attention to this genre of “airport literature” has “fostered belief in an ongoing literary pacification process” (74). I position my project as a counterweight to this belief and the frequent corollary that most if not all translations—especially most if not all translations into global languages with colonial legacies—inevitably function as accessories to this crime.

However, where Casanova concludes her own definition of “literary globalization” as a “series of struggles, rivalries and contests” (74), I also wish to expand upon this formulation. In addition to the qualities of competition, I observe the dynamics of gifts given and received by literary translators.

In my reframing of attention toward generosity and away from competition, I draw from the arguments philosopher Peter Sloterdijk makes to encourage a return to Mauss in order to supplement what he views as the limitations of the dominant interpretation of the human psyche popularized by traditional Freudian psychoanalysis. In applying these insights to literary works, I also respond to Harold Bloom when I argue that translation can be an experience with literary influence operating as an expression of thymotic spirit rather than just as agon or resentment. Sloterdijk writes:

In my opinion, modern ethics is too erotic and not thymotic enough. . . . Unfortunately, we have transformed the human being into a *zoon eroticon*. This is the way we define it. We’ve learned from Plato that Eros is a demigod who only helps people who lack something, who are hunting for an object of lack. A thymotic ethics, on the other hand, would take a different question as its point of departure: what does a human being have that he can give away? The erotic economy is not just driven by money but by lack. It works through lack and fictions thereof. If there is no lack, it invents it in order to go on. The thymotic economy describes human beings as creatures who want to give instead of take. Thymotic economies understand the human as someone with a deep propensity to give; this is

something one can observe in children, who are just as happy giving presents as they are receiving them (Sloterdijk *Giving and Taking* 17).

I would add to this observation that the thymotic impulse is present for many literary translators, even when—or even especially when—they are also being paid for their work. Translation may be a space in adulthood where the human desire to give and to give as freely as possible is expressed and legitimized.

Sloterdijk calls Mauss “a tragic case,” positing that he has been misread as speaking exclusively to the field of ethnography rather than ethics (*Giving and Taking* 10). Additionally, he understands gift theory as relevant to the economy of the modern state, asserting that taxes ought to be understood as gifts, not debts (10). This would bring about a different relationship between the individual and society, in which there would be a focus on generosity rather than lack, even when this is paradoxical in the sense that the state requires the generosity of its citizens. “Mauss is the first and only thinker to date who understood that in the gift, the principle of voluntariness does not cancel out the principle of necessity or obligation. In other words, the gift, like Christ, has a double nature, i.e., it includes both an element of voluntariness and an element of coercion” (Sloterdijk 10). In his reevaluation of Mauss, Sloterdijk is ultimately interested in pointing a way out of what he views as the political dead end of the contemporary left, currently occupied with “ressentiment” and easy affiliation with guilt or bad faith. Sloterdijk describes Mauss as “a socialist who in his own way tried to think a society of generosity, which is to say a socialism without resentment” but opines that “the idea of giving the left an ethical injection that would liberate it from a politics of resentment and move it to a politics of generosity remains a dream” (Sloterdijk 11). In applying

Sloterdijk's reevaluation of Mauss to literary translation, I am also addressing the perspective that all translation is imperialistic at root. Looking at the generosity of translation acts and the reciprocal exchanges possible in certain cases brings out the aspects of translation that are not always already appropriating or aligned with power.

Maurice Godelier and Annette Weiner also revisit Mauss in order to question the reception of his conclusions about the nature of the gift. They examine the existence of sacred gifts, items which must not be given but rather kept, or objects which are paradoxically both given and kept. For Weiner, examining the participation of women in gift economies reveals the existence and the importance of these symbolic gifts kept out of circulation, which underpin the whole system of reciprocally exchanged gifts (x-xi). Sloterdijk returns to Mauss in order to view gift culture in contemporary state societies and in order to revisit the "thymotic" or generous, stout-hearted soul rather than just the "erotic" or lacking, desiring soul. I combine these two reevaluations of gift theory to posit literary translation as potentially (1) one example of a site of potlatch in the modern world in which the spirit of generosity is central and not isolated to the family unit and (2) paradoxical gifts which both are given and kept, namely, those translations which contain many untranslatables or which become a field of exchange rather than a completed gift transaction. The "thymos" or "stout-heartedness" involves demonstrating the ability of the translation and the target culture to "match" or "give worthily to" not only to "best" or "destroy" the author or the source culture. In this sense, I am using Sloterdijk on the gift to move beyond Harold Bloom and the "anxiety of influence."

I am interested in what becomes visible in literary translation when we choose to focus on the aspects of literary influence governed by what Sloterdijk calls a thymotic

economy, in which desire is based on strength of the individual within the strength of a group and a concomitant desire for recognition. My argument also supplements Harold Bloom's understanding of literary influence through an erotic economy in which desire is based in lack and governed by agon, or the spirit of competition. Bloom begins *Anxiety of Influence* quoting Oscar Wilde and associating the term "influence" with giving away something which should not be given away: the self, the personality. Influence, at least in the case of a "weaker" poet (as Bloom classifies Wilde), dooms a poet to produce merely derivative work because he "lacked strength to overcome his anxiety of influence" (6). Bloom writes: "Wilde bitterly remarks in *The Portrait of Mr. W. H.* that: 'Influence is simply a transference of personality, a mode of giving away what is most precious to one's self, and its exercise produces a sense, and, it may be, a reality of loss. Every disciple takes away something from his master'" (Bloom 6). Instead of leaving this bitterness as the main reaction to influence, either overcome in the case of a strong poet, or surrendered to in the case of the weak one, as in Bloom's argument, bitterness in the face of an impressive or powerful predecessor could be seen one of the two sides of thymos. While the "stout-hearted" or "prideful" side of thymos is activated through acts of generosity, there is also the "rage" side when thymos, or the desire for recognition, is denied. Sloterdijk describes the raging thymotic individual in *Rage and Time* as the receiver of pain who has not been able to "give" anything of his suffering back. In "The Aggressor as Giver," Sloterdijk describes "the giving dimension of rage" as what becomes visible "if one regards the object of rage under the aspect of its similarity with the subject" (56). He positions the enraged revenge-seeker as operating not out of a lack or desire to take from another who has more, but instead as operating from a need to give

suffering to that person. “There cannot be any doubt that there is a link between rage and pride, thanks to which rage provides itself with a moral certainty of its own legitimacy. The higher the factor of pride in rage, the more effectively will the ‘you may’ be transformed into a ‘you should’” (Sloterdijk *Rage and Time*, 56). Rage may be expressed through translation, and I explore a few examples in the second chapter on Pacheco as productive counterexamples to my focus on generosity as expressed through translation in which reciprocity has not been damaged to the point of rage.

This relationship Sloterdijk sets up between nonreciprocal generosity, pride, and rage was already theorized within the Brazilian social milieu by Roberto Schwarz. In his term, the giving of an unreturnable “favor” turns what could appear to be generosity between individuals into what Sloterdijk describes as rage or revenge that will arise within someone who has been denied the chance to give anyone anything reciprocally, not even suffering. Schwarz writes about the sometimes perverse and manipulative nature of “favor” specifically to understand Brazilian social life as a heritage of the uneasy adoption of ideologies of liberal political equality in the nineteenth century while slavery was still actively supporting the national economy. Describing a society peopled by landowners, “free men,” and slaves, Schwarz articulates the relationship between the first two types as governed by the bestowal of unreturnable favors, an inescapable and unmentionable social pact, “our quasi-universal social meditation” (37). In this system, acts of favor from landowners to “free men” serve them both as an “ever-renewed complicity ... [that] assured both parties, especially the weaker one, that neither was a slave” (40). The instability of the social lie that Brazil was a modern and liberal society “was an unstable combination which could easily degenerate into the most bitter and

hostile criticism. In order to maintain itself, it needed a permanent complicity, a complicity which the practice of favor tended to guarantee” (40). In fact, Sloterdijk describes a similar moment, where the life project of revenge is formulated in response to the unmet desire to be able to reciprocate, the rage born of inequality between those who are living in the same household or in the same society, as Schwarz describes with Brazil. “The completely motivated vengeful action would be one that takes itself to be the execution of an indispensable, noble necessity. The corresponding empirical models would be revenge murders at the family level and wars of religion and independence on the ethnic and national levels” (Sloterdijk *Rage and Time*, 56). In analyzing literary translation through gift theory, I do not mean to ignore structural inequalities as supported by capitalist markets or their impact on the different positions of power from which gifts are given or received.

Nor do I wish to imagine an idealized literary interaction by using gift theories to understand translation—to the contrary, the gift does not imply a lack of conflict mediation, but rather indicates the very need for mediation itself. Along with Godelier, Weiner, and Sloterdijk, the historians collected in *Negotiating the Gift* examine gift exchanges not as a demonstration of the “archaic” nor even of the “functional” or the “ideal” within European societies. Instead, gifts are figured as fruitful sites to understand the negotiations involved in various forms of social interaction. “Instead of presuming to decree in advance what such transactions ‘really’ were by excluding those which do not conform to an ideal image of the gift or subsuming them under some fixed general scheme of ‘The Gift,’ it is the process of the *management of meaning* involved in such processes that we have sought to explore” (Algazi 12; emphasis in original). In other

words, instead of defining the “gift” as always reciprocal, obligatory, or related to a certain relationship, ritual, object, or exchange goals, the authors use the diversity in the forms of the gifts that exist in order to understand the elements of social negotiation in which they participate. Furthermore, Algazi cautions against assuming that gifts always contain a trustworthy or easily executed promise of counter-gift. “As Pierre Bourdieu has insisted, it is only in retrospect that gifts seem to follow regularly their prescribed paths, to have uniform and foreseeable effects and to conform to rules laid out by indigenous informers or scholarly observers. . . . But for givers and receivers, gifting involved uncertainties and risks. The concept of negotiating is intended to draw attention to the task of reconstructing the logic of their actions” (Algazi 17). Some of the cases I examine, such as the translations by Clarice Lispector or by the translators working for Biblioteca Ayacucho, touch on the unpredictable nature of a writerly life and translation as a related professional enterprise that may or may not provide additional material stability. Negotiations over the qualities and details of a translation, in these cases, are also entangled with material negotiations of payment, timeline, and presentation of the translated text.

In my project, I also observe some literary translations exhibiting the raging, negative side of thymos: it appears at first in the figure of the cannibal described by Oswald de Andrade, and later in the attitude of Paulo Henriques Britto toward the theories of the Campos brothers (or even translation theory in general). José Emilio Pacheco emerges as a translator who expresses both the rage side of thymos and the generous, reciprocal side of thymos. In his different reactions to the several Anglo-American translators of his own poetry, he performs both sides of this split. In several

examples, he translates poems by his translators, demonstrating a generous spirit participating in a gift exchange of equals. But in one example, he expresses himself through a poem that rejects the implication of another translator's invitation to give an interview that it represents a forced performance in relation to the USA literary market. While these examples serve to show the utility of thymos in its multiple guises for analyzing translation, I am more interested in focusing on the dynamics of thymos which has not been thwarted, in which there is not yet the condensation of a rage project, but instead the possibility or the reality of reciprocity is held open and invited.

Sloterdijk defines the modern experience of thymos as having moved from rage expressed by a hero against the enemies of his tribe to the stout-heartedness of an individual expressing his prideful belonging to a group of equals within which he may be recognized and which are also worthy of his recognition. He writes:

The domestication of rage creates the ancient form of a new masculinity. Indeed, the remaining affects that are useful for the polis are incorporated into the bourgeois *thymos*. *Thymos* survives as 'manly courage' ... it helps citizens to step in for the Good and the Right (or, to put it in a modern idiom, our interests). Without stout-heartedness (*Beherztheit*)—this is how one should better translate the term *thymos* nowadays—bourgeois metropolitan life is unthinkable. ... Moreover, the possibility of friendship between adult males in a city still depends on thymotic premises. After all, one can only play one's role as a friend among friends, an equal among equals, if one appreciates in one's fellow citizens the clear presence of universally acknowledged virtues. One does not want only to be proud of

oneself but also of the alter ego, the friend, who distinguishes himself in front of the eyes of the community. To be in good reputation among competing men creates the thymotic fluidity of a self-confident community. Individual *thymos* appears now as a part of a force-field that provides form to the common will (Sloterdijk *Rage and Time* 12-3).

While convincing, the definition of thymos Sloterdijk proposes here is limited by its focus on the male experience and exclusive use of masculine pronouns. Conceptually, the idea of “thymotic fluidity of a self-confident community” (13) can easily be applied in a less gendered way to many kinds of human communities. For example, the thymotic spirit can be immediately translated into 2016 internet-age language as “squad goals” in the terminology of contemporary female-centered social networking. Sometimes expressed as “#squadgoals” in order to be searchable and hyperlinked with other images or texts labeled with the same aspirational content, the label “squad goals” expresses admiration for another group displaying certain qualities while also putting forward one’s own group as able to worthily measure up to other groups, or at least make that a goal of one’s squad. Taking pride in being a part of a particular group and wanting to show that publicly in the context of other groups is at the core of thymos, and its experience is limited by gender expression, although the groups involved and their performance of pride or stout-heartedness may be gendered.

I have selected a corpus of literary translations for the way they perform reciprocity: translations that are difficult to place or appear to resist the norms of the broader translation market, namely those norms including completeness, avoidance of anachronism or idiomatic interpolation, domestication, readability, consistency, and

believability. To understand this series of unusual cases, I use gift theory as a heuristic to understand these literary translations that stretch or break these norms as gifts given, gifts received, and as fields on which the exchange of gifts is performed. The publishing market for translation may expect or require certain norms; each publisher may have its own “translation manual” with which translators are encouraged or required to operate. Following translators who also or primarily identify as writers allows me to observe ways in which they can deploy a different set of expectations, ones that can be explained by an ethics of reciprocity between authors and translators. I am not arguing that there is mutual exclusion between the interests of the literary market and the interests of a reciprocal exchange between authors or translators; in some cases, they may be aligned. For example, the leading online translation journal *Words Without Borders* recently traded on the cachet of mutuality and reciprocity to advertise a special feature and a live event. Titled “(In)verse: Poets Translate Each Other,” the editors grouped four poets together who translated one another’s work between Portuguese and English and between Catalán and English. With this title, the editors invite readers to see *Words Without Borders* as a publication that promotes equality, leveling the playing field between English and what US-based language pedagogy has termed “Less Commonly Taught Languages” of Portuguese or Catalan.³ To see this as reciprocal translation, however, a closer reading is required; besides the marketability of the gesture, what is the nature of the relationship constructed between these pairs of authors—do they translate with more or less freedom,

³ According to the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages, this term applies to every language except English and the four languages that 91% of students of language study in the US, which are French, German, Italian, and Spanish.

do they import their own voices or vocabularies, do they choose to leave words untranslated, and if so, is this a gesture that even a monolingual reader could perceive?

In each chapter, the poet-translators I study signal their disassociation from the most widely used terms “traducción” or “tradução” by choosing alternative labels for their work. While these labels may not consistently indicate the same “translation manual,” even within the work of the same translator, they do tend to indicate genre-building, translation as an independent literary genre, or a series of genres, that may or may not match the genres of their sources. Paz and Castellanos both choose “*versión*,” which has a longer tradition from Spanish-American *modernismo*. Pacheco tends to use his own term, “*aproximación*,” while he also continues to apply the label “*versión*” at times. Haroldo and Augusto de Campos invent umbrella terms for their translation work: “*transcrição*” and “(in)*tradução*” respectively. Haroldo and his student Héctor Olea both use “*transcrição*” or “*transcreation*” to label certain translation projects but not others, signaling a particular level of creative intervention. Additionally, Haroldo even crafts new labels for particular works: “Mephistofaustian Transluciferation” is the invented descriptor he gives to his translation of Goethe’s *Faust*. With his term “(in)*tradução*,” Augusto signals his minimalist aesthetic with this term which visually and audibly recalls “*introdução*” or “introduction” as well as “(in)translation” since the Portuguese word for “in” is the similar-sounding “em.” Since the prefix “in” for words in Portuguese also functions as negation, Augusto’s invented term also signals a rejection of translation, an “(un)translation.” While I do not construct a classificatory system within their invented terms, I am interested in their descriptors for their literary translations, which speak to a different set of goals or a different set of freedoms than a translation labeled as such.

Paz and Castellanos are not the only poets to use the term “*versión*” to describe translations of poetry they incorporate into their own poetic works or collections. Drawing primarily from the Anglophone literary tradition, Lawrence Venuti (2011) describes the genre of the “poet’s version” as an umbrella term broadly implying the text will be something more than a translation but something less than an imitation in the sense popularized during the Early Modern period, a poem written on the topoi laid forth in other texts. A “poet’s version” foregrounds the poet-translator and relates to other versions, not just to the original source text. To distinguish the “poet’s version” from its predecessor, the “imitation,” Venuti recalls Dryden’s definition of imitation from the Early Modern period, in which an “imitation” will be connected to the source while elaborating upon it in a recognizable way: “[n]ot only must the imitator be capable of comprehending the musical theme or source text, but the imitation aims to establish a certain kind of equivalence to it” (231). Readers of imitations expect that the translator has strong knowledge of the source language and that the resulting imitation displays a clear connection to the source text in meaning and style. According to Venuti, the Early Modern imitation went through a qualitative and ethical shift to become the twentieth-century genre of the “poet’s version.” He names Ezra Pound the champion if not originator of this genre of translation, which “routinely involved departures from the source text that were motivated by the imposition of a different poetics or by mere ignorance of the source language” (231). In other words, the “poet’s version” no longer merely extends the variations of a musical theme but rather grafts that theme onto a new musical branch. Unlike a translation or an imitation, therefore, a “poet’s version” might

be critiqued for not intervening *enough* in a source text.⁴ Venuti relies on the the distinction Pound makes between a “translation,” which should serve primarily to accompany and guide the reader through the source text and the “version” which should be in the category of original. A “version” stands alone as a poem, and should not be published alongside any source-texts, because it should not be judged in relation to that source. Instead, it should reflect in some way the voice and concerns of the poet who is acting as translator, and if it *only* reflects those of the source poet, it may not have gone far enough away from a “translation” to merit the label of a “version.” Furthermore, the poet’s version can itself serve as a source text.

In my first chapter analyzing *versiones* by Paz and Castellanos as an exchange of gifts with the authors they translate, I distinguish between the genre within Mexican poetic circles and the Anglo-American poetic spheres that Venuti describes. I am following the suggestion of Robert Young in avoiding the choice to call these Spanish “*versiones*” simply “versions.” Young argues that the growing fields of translation studies and translation theory must contend with the unstated and under-examined assumption that the concept of translation is translatable. He asks: why would we put all the words for translation from different languages, times, traditions and fields on the same plane?⁵ For this reason, although Paz may take some of his cues directly from

⁴ For example, Venuti discusses the 1999 publication *The Eyes: A Version of Antonio Machado* by poet Don Paterson, who admits to making use, and even lifting lines directly from the facing page translations by Hispanist Alan Trueblood. Venuti critiques Paterson for not going as far as he intends to, for not having the courage of his convictions that the “version” should be resistant to the “translation,” pointing out that “Paterson’s versions lack the lexical and syntactical peculiarities that recur in his own poetry, notably the use of slang and Scottish dialect. Thus he has effectively discarded Pound’s concept of the translation as original composition” (233-4).

⁵ “If it was the Romans who inaugurated the practice of translation in Europe, their concept of translation cannot be identified with ours by the very token of the fact that they did not have a single word for such an activity. Nevertheless, discussions of translation proceed as if the concept were as universally transparent as earlier philosophical discussions of truth” (Young 52).

Pound and his translation practice in English, I do not equate his term “versión” as used in Spanish with the English. I do not assume that the transition between imitation and poet’s version described by Venuti represents the same shift in values and assumptions between “imitatio” and “versión.” In fact, *versiones* in Spanish may signal more continuity with tradition than the English term.

In her book *Versiones, interpretaciones y creaciones: Instancias de la traducción literaria en Hispanoamérica en el siglo veinte*, Frances R. Aparicio identifies the popularization of the “versión” with the *modernista* movement of the late nineteenth century. She analyzes literary translation in Spanish-America as responding to authors including Manuel Gutiérrez Nájera, who admonished Spanish-American poets to imitate less from Spanish poets, just as original creation swerved in the same period.⁶ Nájera encouraged poets to adapt styles from other languages, and thus to arrive at a poetry that “se vigorice por el cruzamiento” (34). In her argument, this change in poetic creation in Spanish also led to different values of translation, and the Spanish-American *versión modernista* predates the USA modernist version (35-6). Unlike Venuti and Pound, Aparicio identifies the *versión modernista* as a return to the mode of Early Modern *imitatio* and a break with Neoclassical and Romantic conservatism in poetry and

⁶ In her book, Aparicio makes it clear that she is not claiming that one style of translation replaces another, but rather that she documents a shift in tendencies and stated values. However, neither her use nor mine of this periodization for genres of translation need imply that there are not cases that pre and postdate any of the notable examples we highlight. For one important example, while his work may be outside the scope of the current project, Andrés Bello, a noted thinker on the topic of Spanish-American language, termed his translations of five poems by Victor Hugo “imitaciones” and these works from the 1850s reflect ambivalence over the term at that time. In his analysis, William Bohning writes: “we are impressed with the variety of specific meanings ambiguously concealed under the general term *imitación*. The precise types of imitation range through practical independence in the case of *Los Duendes*, faithful paraphrasing in *Las Fantasma*s, varied procedure in *A Olimpio* and *La oración por todos*, and virtual translation in *Moisés salvado de las aguas*. Even in *A Olimpio* and *La oración por todos*, where the techniques are similar, we discover important differences in the proportions of literal translation, close rendering, and complete independence” (66).

translation, which would come to be known as *imitación desdichada* (32-3). Furthermore, she does not associate the term *versión* with the expectations of the reader, nor does she differentiate a *versión* from a *traducción* based on a lesser degree of knowledge of the language of the source text, as in the distinction Venuti draws. Instead, she draws on the verb form *versionar* in Spanish as a verb to emphasize the concern with process, exchange, and poetic community formation implied in the *versión*. For this reason, the application of gift theory proves particularly useful in understanding the *versiones* I have selected for this chapter: gifting in a reciprocal economy relies on movement rather than stasis, in which poets are not trying to create a definitive version, but rather participate in moving texts forward. Additionally, Aparicio identifies Paz as the culmination of this literary genre for his combination of the *modernista* openness to other traditions with surrealist aesthetics, including automatic writing. Thinking translation through gift theory involves thinking about the community of writers as giving their time and creativity to texts; the texts themselves are recipients, at times, of these gifts.

Reciprocity in literary translation operates in four concrete ways in a series of examples drawn from late twentieth-century Latin American letters: (1) reciprocity in which translators act as gift-giver to authors from whom they have received something, (2) translations in which the translators give gifts to texts or to source or target languages or cultures that reciprocate previous gifts, (3) translators as the recipients of gifts through the act of translation, a gift which may be reciprocated through their own original works, and (4) the translation itself as space of reciprocal gifting, which holds the history of its own exchange between different languages and cultures, the translation itself as a field on which reciprocal exchanges are performed, and receives the gift of that mobility,

revision, re-visitation in a new era, language, and culture. Each of these types of gifting may of course be operating simultaneously.

The first two types of reciprocity in literary translation in which the translator acts as the giver of a gift often overlap: when the translator positions him or herself primarily as a giver of a gift, the recipients can be multiple. The first form of gift giving occurs when a real-world biographical relationship exists between poets, in which the translator is giving the gift of a translation to the author as though to a friend. Some poets who have received the gift are motivated to reciprocate and give back the gift of a translation of a work by that same poet in a direct mutual exchange. In these cases, the translator perceives their work as giving a gift to the author, a gift which may be reciprocated directly, as in the case of the translations Octavio Paz and Elizabeth Bishop did of one another's poems, or of the translations José Emilio Pacheco did of poems by his early translators, including Kenneth Rexroth and Alastair Reid, two prolific translators of Latin American poets, including Pacheco. Paz was also the first Spanish-language translator to work on Bishop; he positions his gift not just to her as a poet but also to the Spanish reader who may not have discovered her work yet or who may not read English. In this second case of literary reciprocity, the author is giving to the target culture.

The third form of reciprocity I observe is located in the choice of work by a translator, not within the context of a personal relationship, but instead based on a perceived, desired, or even feared relationship between the source text and the translator's own writing. In these cases, the translator figures him or herself as the recipient of a gift, and there may be paratexts or translation choices that express an explicit or implicit matching of a source text with the translator's own writing style,

claiming a piece as one's own by translating it, or even in the negative sense when the translator has selected a work because it is so aesthetically opposed to the translator's own work. In these cases, the translator receives a gift when translating: either the gift of recreating an admired voice or the gift of escape from writer's block. This is the case of Octavio Paz translating Gérard de Nerval, of Rosario Castellanos in the negative sense with Emily Dickinson, of José Emilio Pacheco translating Vinicius de Moraes, Augusto de Campos translating Vicente Huidobro, or Paulo Henriques Britto translating Elizabeth Bishop. In these cases, the act of translation is received as a gift to the translator, the work of translation gives something to the translator—a confirmation of their own poetic concerns, a literary echo or a sense of common cause, in the positive sense, they relate to the author of the source text. Or it may be in a negative sense: the translator may receive the gift of an opportunity to experiment with writing styles that he or she would never write. In this way, the translator receives a gift when translating. In this sense, my vision of a translator-writer as a participant in a gift-exchange process supplements Harold Bloom's concept of the "Anxiety of Influence" in which writers must actively destroy elements in their work which resemble too closely their literary models or predecessors who they view as idols or imaginary idealized fathers. Jorge Luis Borges explores a related dynamic in his essay "Kafka and His Precursors" where he posits that every author invents a literary lineage for their own work. In the case of translator-writers, that "invention" must also take place as a writerly act, rather than a readerly one that may get incorporated into their own works: they must use their own language to invent a home for the author from another language tradition they admire and/or resist.

The fourth form of reciprocity I examine occurs when the translation itself becomes a field on which the act of giving and receiving the gifts of cultural forms gets played out. The reciprocal exchange may be on the procedural or even theoretical levels, in the cases of translations that deploy tactics that reference multi-directionality and mutuality, as goals or values. In some cases, the gifts exchanged may be what Emily Apter calls “untranslatables” within source and target cultures.⁷ In other cases, the gifts exchanged may be translation methods; in the case of Héctor Olea’s transcreation of *Macunaima*, both types of gifts are exchanged within the translation. Or in the case of José Emilio Pacheco’s later translation of T.S. Eliot, the gifts exchanged reciprocally are their shared source text in the Spanish mystical tradition. In these cases, the translation is the potlatch, the site of reciprocal gift exchanges. These kinds of translations make the translator visible in ways that make an argument about the pre-existing gift exchange or aesthetic relationship between the source text and the target culture. In short, a translation informed by a theoretical reciprocity would translate in a way that drew attention to *both* the translation as a gift to the source, but also the source text as already containing a previous gift from the target culture. This is also the case in José Emilio Pacheco’s translations of John Bierhorst’s translations of indigenous poetries of North America, as in Augusto de Campos’s so-called “untranslations” of Euclides da Cunha. While there may be more ways to connect concepts of reciprocity and gift theory with the practice of

⁷ Emily Apter draws from the “construct of the Untranslatable” in Barbara Cassin’s *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies: Dictionnaire des intraduisibles* (Apter *Against* 31). Untranslatables include “[w]ords that assign new meanings to old terms, neologisms, names for ideas that are continually re-translated or mistranslated, translations that are obviously incommensurate (as in the use of *esprit* for ‘mind’ or *Geist*), these are amongst the most salient symptoms of the genuine Untranslatable” (35).

literary translation, these are the four I identify in my project and use to understand these select cases within a Latin American zone of literary translation.

In my first chapter, I compare poet-translators Octavio Paz and Rosario Castellanos to tease out the difference between the first two forms of translational reciprocity I identified above. I begin with Paz and the relationship between his translations (or “*versiones*” as he calls them) and his own theories of translation. In theory he defines translation as functionally different from poetic creation, an activity that, when taken on by a poet, may require a deliberate act of resistance to that poet’s own voice. Yet as a translator Paz imports his own poetic concerns into the works he translates. Additionally, as a poet he even accepted the gift of revisions to his own poem “Objetos y apariciones” based on his view that the translation by Elizabeth Bishop improved his original, or rather, achieved in specific ways what the original had not yet, until he revised it based on her translation. His contemporary Rosario Castellanos makes the opposite claim in essay form, and her versions also draw from qualities of her own poetic voice, in one case even taking on autobiographical qualities. As an essayist, she posits that her use of Spanish is intersectional: influenced by her location as a female writer in Mexico writing in a language used as a tool in a long and ongoing process of forced assimilation of indigenous populations. The two authors both label their translations “versions,” indicating their leveling attitude, that one version may not be definitive, or that the translated version need not be considered inferior or derivative, but simply another version. Yet Paz appears to treat deceased authors with an aura of respect (his translations are gifts to them), whereas with contemporary poets, he can allow for the gifting to go in both directions—he receives Bishop’s translation as a gift to his poem,

and he gives her back translations that do indeed alter significantly some of the register of her work. Paz edits his versions in order to more fully submit his own poetic voice to the one he imagines in the source—standing by his theory that the poet and translator are executing parallel but different operations, that the translator must not simply build a poem of his own off of his source. His multiple *versiones* of the sonnet “Délfica” by Gérard de Nerval—and his deliberate, emphasized editing—suggest his wish to take back the part of his gift that encoded a part of his own soul, the part of his translation that betrayed his own poetic voice rather than an analogous version of Nerval’s. Unlike Paz, when Castellanos takes on a deceased author to translate, she appears to be the recipient of a gift. When she frames her Emily Dickinson translations within an essay about the author, Castellanos imagines the self-driven authority that must have been necessary to become the author the Amherst poet became. Castellanos translates her poems as a part of her chapbook *Materia memorable* (1962), introducing into Dickinson’s poem “My life closed twice before its close” a mood of finality and mourning. Reading the changes she makes to this poem and in other translations, along with her essays about writing in Spanish with a female voice, I argue, reveals her receiving the gift of Dickinson’s—even still fraught—self-authorized voice.

In my second chapter, I analyze selections from the extensive translation work of Mexican poet José Emilio Pacheco that exemplify all four forms of reciprocity. Spanning the 1980s to his death in 2014, I trace the development of his practice of “approximation,” a translation act that he describes as exemplary of “la barbarie y la falta de respeto que coexisten en este libro con sus rasgos más culturales [the barbarity and lack of respect that coexist in this book with its more cultured traits]” (*Aproximaciones*

171).⁸ In the case of translations given as a gift to the author of the source text, Pacheco translates selected poems by some of the translators who brought his work into English. In this case, it is a counter-gift, because Edward Dorn, Alastair Reid, and Kenneth Rexroth all translated his work. These reciprocal gestures stand out in the context of Pacheco's powerful negation of the offering of one particular translator. Instead of translating poems by George B. Moore, Pacheco writes a scathing poem about literary celebrity rejecting Moore's invitation to give an interview, titled "Letter to George B. Moore In Defense of Anonymity." In his translations from Portuguese, he performs himself as the recipient of poetic gifts, choosing works that mirror poems of his own composition. In the case of using translation as a field on which reciprocal exchanges can be made, he appears willing to intervene with equal freedom into anonymous indigenous poetries and the modernist master T.S. Eliot. He imports Mexican cultural themes into the *Four Quartets* and into indigenous poetries of North America, translating from English translations. Pacheco returns the gift of reading T.S. Eliot by translating him—and he repeats this gift later in his life, with interest added through the expansive annotations with which he supplements his new translation of two of the *Four Quartets*. His re-translation and annotations function as a field on which the reciprocal exchange between T.S. Eliot and poetry in Spanish is performed. For example, Pacheco highlights the phrases and concepts Eliot borrowed from Saint John of the Cross, citing the translation by Alison Peers to place himself and Eliot in a larger circle of reciprocal exchange. While he cites Paz as his model as a poet-translator, the diversity of translation activities Pacheco engages in reflect Brazilian translation norms to a greater extent.

⁸ This translation is my own, as are all subsequent translations from Portuguese or Spanish originals, unless indicated otherwise.

My third chapter begins with the 1960s canonization by Haroldo de Campos of the portion of the Brazilian avant-garde movement known as *modernismo* centered around *antropofagia*, or cannibalism. Campos draws a panorama of Brazilian literary history based on the metaphor of the cannibal as a mode of cultural production. Along with his brother Augusto de Campos, Haroldo soon applies these concepts to literary translation, positioning his translation activity as a fundamental project, integrated with his own poetry and theoretical writings. I argue that the cannibal should be seen in the light of a threatened thymotic soul, one who has been denied the possibility of reciprocity. Understanding this dimension of the Campos brothers and their translation practice, we can see in some of their translations more of the reciprocal demonstration of using the translation as a gift given or received, and less of the playful destruction associated with the historical avant-garde moment of “classic” *antropofagia*. Allowing the concept of the cannibal translation to be supplemented by the concept of reciprocity, we can also see them in reciprocal relation theoretically with translators who have explicitly critiqued the Campos brothers’ translation theories. By avoiding the strong or self-aggrandizing choices that they make in translation, Paulo Henriques Britto develops a non-theory theory of translation. Understanding reciprocity as coexisting with the literary market will allow for Lispector’s translations to bear the traits of her own writerly voice. Even though they have been dismissed as mere trade, they partake of the same craft she invested in her own writing, and she even imports some of her own themes, receiving and giving to Poe’s stories her casual yet meta-narrative narrators, her vision of the artificiality of art, and her ideas about fascist societies. The broad conception of translation as an art, an art form that can be practiced in a specifically

Brazilian way, as championed by the Campos brothers, allows for the distinction between translation trade and craft to become blurred.

This elision of trade and craft, where both are figured as gifts, allows me to highlight a moment when translation theories from Mexico and Brazil come into contact and conflict in translations of Brazilian *modernismo* into Spanish by Mexican poet Héctor Olea, the subject of my fourth chapter. Edited by Ángel Rama at the Biblioteca Ayacucho in Caracas, these translations were commissioned as part of a new, independent Latin American cultural canon. Providing a counter-narrative to the market-driven “boom” of Latin American literature, this project made no assumption of translatability. Instead, multiple versions of “untranslatables” in avant-garde texts proliferate in these volumes. While they could be read as failures under the still-prevalent translation value of smoothness, I interpret them as reflections of unresolved debates over the proper way to treat a historical avant-garde period when it is translated and canonized. With this final chapter, my methodology expands to include archival resources, pointing towards the value of translators’ papers in determining the elements of gifting behavior at play within a particular translation project. In the case of the letters between Olea and Rama at the archive at the Biblioteca Ayacucho, the conversations and relationships between agents of translation shed light on the text of the translation as a staging ground for the performance of reciprocal translation exchanges, in which Macunaíma was never entirely Brazilian nor does he become fully Venezuelan in translation, but instead remains a shape-shifting trickster, able to change his language to fit new contexts or circumstances.

My dissertation asks: what becomes visible in literary translations when we understand them as gifts, or objects exchanged in a reciprocal gift economy? The first

thing we see is a valuable alternative to the over-used metaphor of betrayal or plundering on one hand or of submission and fidelity on the other. If a translation is figured as a gift, both source and target cultures can be on both the giving and receiving ends.

Additionally, to consider a translation as a gift turns the translator, author, publisher, source and target cultures, into participants in a reciprocal gift exchange rather than a hierarchy in which power only moves in one direction. The theory of gift exchange and potlatch as articulated Mauss relies on the idea that the gift itself desires to be returned. In the examples I have selected, close reading of the paratexts and the translations themselves reveal literary translations positioned as return gifts previously given from one writer to another, from one culture to another, or amongst translators.

Chapter 1

Octavio Paz and Rosario Castellanos Give and Receive as Translators:

Versiones as Diversion, Versiones as Oficio

Both Octavio Paz (1914-1998) and Rosario Castellanos (1925-1974) understand literary translation as a function a creative writer may adopt, one that will be separate from although related to their own original writing. Like many contemporaries and predecessors, both call their literary translations “*versiones*,” and they describe translation as related to a writer’s own voice. However, what is a problem for Paz—the challenge of altering his function from that of a poet to that of a translator, of shedding his own instincts to serve another poet’s poem—for Castellanos represents a relief and an opportunity. Paz figures himself primarily as a giver of gifts when acting as a literary translator: gifting new “poetic islands” to cultures that had not yet “discovered” them, gifting the Spanish-language reader with a poem, or gifting an author with his translation and the access and prestige being translated by Octavio Paz provides. Accompanying this gift—at least theoretically for Paz—is self-discipline, the denial of his instincts and impulses. Conversely, when writing about literary translation, Castellanos primarily describes herself as the recipient of gifts: receiving models of feminine authorship, receiving the freedom or the scandal of another voice within which to write, receiving the gift of a clear task when original writing is blocked by anxiety or ennui.

I analyze selected *versiones* by Paz and Castellanos that perform translation as acts of giving and receiving between writers. I evaluate their translations in dialogue with their essays about translation, authorship, and Mexican Spanish as an ambivalent tool of creation, domination, and liberation. Both are prolific authors and public intellectuals, but

they differ in the degree to which they are willing to import their own poetic voices into their new *versiones*. Although each translates works from a range of poetic interests and life experiences,⁹ I focus on translations in which they apply their own poetic obsessions as translation strategies, reluctantly for Paz, and gratefully for Castellanos.

In the case of Paz, I begin with his translations of a poet whom he knew personally and who also translated his work: Elizabeth Bishop.¹⁰ In addition to this example of a personal and direct relationship of literary reciprocity, I analyze Paz's multiple versions of sonnets by French Romantic Gérard de Nerval. Unlike his translations of living or contemporary poets, these translations do not introduce Nerval to Spanish readers. Nerval, a key reference for Rubén Darío, was already known in Latin America. In this case, Paz's translation figures as a gift not only to the Spanish-speaking public or to the author, but additionally to other translators or translation theorists. I argue that his double versions of Nerval demonstrate in practice his theoretical description of translation: a translation both departs from and returns to a source text, and a good translator will complete a double movement. Furthermore, in the later editions, Paz

⁹ In *Versiones y diversiones* (1974, 1978, 2000) Paz publishes translations of French Baroque poet Théophile de Viau; British metaphysical poets John Donne and Andrew Marvell; French romantic Gérard de Nerval; French poets from symbolism to surrealism including Stéphane Mallarmé, Guillaume Apollinaire, Pierre Reverdy, André Breton and Paul Eluard; US American modernists Ezra Pound, e.e. cummings, William Carlos Williams, and Hart Crane; other Anglophone poets including Elizabeth Bishop, Charles Tomlinson, and Lysander Kemp; Portuguese vanguardista Fernando Pessoa and three of his heteronyms, Alberto Caiero, Ricardo Reis and Álvaro de Campos; four Swiss poets Harry Martinson, Artur Lundkvist, Gunnar Ekelöf, and Erik Lindegren; selections of Kavya or Sanskrit poems from the 7th century; poets from China; poets from Japan in the forms "tanka" and "haiku." In *Materia memorable* (1969) Castellanos translates three poets: American poet Emily Dickinson, French poet Paul Claudel, and Nobel Prize winner for 1960 Saint-John Perse, a Guadeloupe born French diplomat who exiled himself to the USA during World War II and the Vichy regime.

¹⁰ Three other poets Paz translates fit this description: William Carlos Williams, Lysander Kemp, and Charles Tomlinson all translated Paz and he reciprocated their attentions with translations of his own. In the case of Williams, who only translated "Hymn Among the Ruins," Paz translates a collection of twenty poems. Kemp and Tomlinson were extensively involved in the reception of Paz in the Anglo-American literary sphere. Paz translated only one selection by Kemp, "La Conquista," a work which already reflected Kemp's engagement with Mexican letters.

corrects one of his Nerval translations. I use this instance of revision to expand my application of gift theory to represent Paz as calling attention to his withdrawal as retraction of the “interest” he had added to his translation gifts.¹¹

In the case of versions by Castellanos, I posit that her *versiones* of poems by Emily Dickinson can be productively understood as meditations on her journey to self-authorize as a writer and her own complex relationship to the act of writing in Spanish as a Mexican woman with *indigenista* political and aesthetic leanings. I begin with an analysis of the term “oficio,” a favorite keyword Castellanos uses to describe the ambivalent relationship between the writer and society. This term takes on an additional layer of choice and importance when applied to the role of the translator in Mexican society. In her essays discussing literary translation and language politics in Mexico, Castellanos describes two forms of literary reciprocity in translation. In the first, the translator figures as socially-conscious gift-giver—a role Castellanos never claims for herself. She describes translators of indigenous languages as vitally needed for Mexican literature to expand its canon and to be responsible to its actual public and body politic rather than merely a closed elite. In the second, the translator figures as the recipient of a number of gifts including a clear path to work towards in moments of writer’s block and an analogous voice through which to explore her own.

For Paz and Castellanos, the *versión* serves as a flexible genre that may critique the politics of representation while also allowing an author to try on new voices or give

¹¹ While I will not pursue this observation further in the dissertation, in the case of Paz, the examples I choose to focus on are poets who are *not* a part of the Ezra Pound canon of literary translations. Much like Haroldo and Augusto de Campos, Paz did translate a number of the same poets that interested Pound, such as the Italian medieval poets, the French troubadours, or the Japanese haiku or Basho—but he also used his translation practice to explore interests in his contemporaries, especially in the USA and in the case of the Campos brothers, also in Spanish America.

back to other authors who have given them something valuable. Writing in the late 1960s and the 1970s meant contending with a politically divided and disillusioned atmosphere: during the Cold War, after the Tlatelolco massacre of 1968 and the subsequent state repression of student movements, and when the Latin American left was growing increasingly disillusioned with the Cuban revolution. Paz specifically writes in opposition to the idea that poetry is “untranslatable,” and he elevates this position to the level of an ethical concern.¹² He describes the idea of untranslatability as repugnant, offensive: “[c]onfieso que esta idea me repugna” (*Literatura y literalidad* 11). Castellanos also begins her theoretical statement on translation with a resounding rejection of a commonplace: that translation in process is not betrayal. In this chapter, I analyze their translations that perform the giving and receiving of gifts in order to better understand the ethics of translation with which they want to replace these commonplaces.

Reading these translations together and through theories of gift economy allows for new perspectives on these authors’ claims authority and their development of public personas from which to speak. While both Paz and Castellanos share certain access to a public platform—writing for different kinds of publications, circulating as ambassadors of Mexico—they appear to make different claims about their rights and responsibilities as translators. Even before winning the Nobel Prize in 1990, Paz can be described as wearing his public persona with an air of universal relevance.¹³ Castellanos takes an

¹² In his essay, Paz does not cite a specific thinker who articulates this assertion that poetry is untranslatable. He might have been thinking of the poet Robert Frost who is frequently misquoted as defining poetry as that which gets lost in translation. Closer to home he may have been involved in editing an essay by Tomás Segovia for *Plural* titled “Sobre poesía: un lenguaje intraducible” (32 May 1972). Although this may not have been possible, because the essay by Paz is dated even earlier than the publication, July 15 1970.

¹³ As José Frias puts it, Paz is “famous for living his public life as an Author with a capital A,” especially when compared to “writers like José Emilio Pacheco [who] have gone to great length to defer credit for their work and to try to fade into the real and textual background” (Frias 178).

opposing stance: she both embraces and satirizes the conflation of her biographical self with her works,¹⁴ both accepting and critically examining the effect of her gender on her reception as a public intellectual. We can see them experimenting as translators with the extent to which a translation is a gift to another author and also a gift the translator receives, and what kinds of translations function as gifts in these ways.

Analogous Versions in Theory and in Practice

For Octavio Paz, translation is a literary art, all poetry is translatable, and the act of translating a poem is analogous to the process of writing one, but always different and separate from the act of original creation—at least in theory. In his essay “Literatura y literalidad” (1971) Paz describes translation as: (1) always possible and always in operation (2) analogous to criticism and writing original poetry, but importantly resistant to these activities (3) an investigation of deep and shared sources and a collective enterprise with participants aware and unaware, living and deceased;¹⁵ and (4) when practiced by a poet, a challenge to have the self-knowledge to function as a good translator rather than making an original poem from the starting point of another’s work. Yet when he turns to the practice of translation, collecting his translated works in *Versiones y diversiones* (1974), he appears to swerve away from this final prohibition as expressed in theory. In the preliminary notes to his translation anthologies, he describes translation as (1) both random and selective; (2) functional and constructed, rebuilding something in the sense of craft; and (3) not pedagogical, or not related primarily to the

¹⁴ Her autobiographical essays that adopt a self-critical or even self-caricaturing tone are numerous, but they include “Hombre del destino,” “Soy yo, soy Borges,” and “Si ‘poesía no eres tú’, entonces ¿qué?”

¹⁵ As I will argue in my second chapter, Paz does not fully explore this vision of the “collective” in translation, especially when compared with what Pacheco will do with his own translation practice.

source texts or intended to teach a reader something about that source text and (4) aiming to produce a poem in his language. Read in combination, his theoretical essays and his practical introductions raise questions about the extent to which Paz as translator can separate himself from Paz as poet. While Paz may merely be deliberately inconsistent, I contend that making use of gift theory to understand his theoretical and practical attitudes toward translation can create a dialogical relationship rather than a tension between these two statements. The poet *should* be the best translator but is often the worst—not because of anything untranslatable in poetry, but rather because of the challenging make-up of a poetic persona or of the writerly habits of a poet, the reactivity and desire to take more than give. He wants to use his translations to give other authors the gift exposure, or to gift the Spanish reading public with new works; but appears less willing than Castellanos will be to receive anything through translation.

In the title essay of his collection *Traducción: Literatura y literalidad* (1971), Paz meditates on translation in the abstract, and in the four essays that follow he analyzes the poetry of John Donne, Stéphane Mallarmé, Guillaume Apollinaire, and e.e. cummings in relation to concrete examples of his translations of specific poems by these authors. Read together, these essays do not pretend to converge into a proscriptive guide for composing or evaluating translations.¹⁶ Instead, he proposes implicitly that each author, if not each poem, must be translated in a unique way. In the first theoretical essay, Paz makes claims about who should practice translation that appear contradictory. First he writes that “[i]n

¹⁶ Paz also recollects the title essay “Literatura y literalidad” and the Mallarmé essay “El soneto en ix” in *El signo y el garabato* (1974) along with three new essays about his translation practice: “Sobre y de Pierre Reverdy,” “Ezra: galimatías y esplendor” and “La flor saxifraga” about William Carlos Williams. These five essays appear grouped together under a new section title: “Teoría y práctica de la traducción.” This collection was published the same year as the first edition of *Versiones y diversiones*.

theory only poets should translate poetry; in practice, poets seldom make good translators” because “they almost always use the foreign poem as a point of departure to write their own poem” (Paz *Traducción* 14, my translation). He goes on to give two examples of writers who can produce good translations: Arthur Waley (a translator who is also a poet) and Gérard de Nerval (a poet who is also a good translator, able to create both translations and more free imitations). While this may also seem contradictory, I understand Paz to be reasoning from the final results of many poets who translate—including himself—that the vast majority of poets cannot put themselves aside enough to become good translators. Only those poets who can wholly separate themselves as poets from their work as translators merit the title of “buen traductor” in the essay by Paz.

Paz presents two main reasons poets may struggle when adopting the role of translator: although egotism may be part of the challenge, the root of the problem is functional. Paz distinguishes between the poet who is not a good translator and the “good translator” based on their reasons for choosing to make departures from the original poem. Poets depart from the source text to pursue a creative opportunity that will allow them to create their own poems. The “good translators,” on the other hand, will instead grasp the effects of the source poem, acting first as critics, and then they may choose to depart from the source to recreate an analog of those effects. He writes:

En teoría, sólo los poetas deberían traducir poesía; en la realidad, pocas veces los poetas son buenos traductores. No lo son porque casi siempre **usan el poema ajeno como un punto de partida para escribir su poema**. El buen traductor se mueve en una dirección contraria: su punto de llegada es **un poema análogo**, ya que no idéntico, al poema original.

No se aparta del poema sino para seguirlo más de cerca ... La razón de la incapacidad de muchos poetas para traducir poesía no es de orden puramente psicológico, **aunque la egolatría tenga su parte, sino funcional**: la traducción poética, según me propongo mostrar en seguida, es **una operación análoga** a la creación poética, sólo que se despliega en sentido inverso (14; emphasis added).

The distinction Paz draws between psychological limitations and functional ones recalls Harold Bloom and the anxiety of influence. Bloom divides “weak writers” who cannot fully make use of the genius of a literary forbear from “strong writers” who can. Paz transfers this distinction onto the idea of a poet who makes a bad translator and a “good translator” who is sufficiently able to perform the different function of a translator rather than needing to “make their own poem” from the source.

Paz displays certainty about what makes a translation “good,” yet his instructions on how to achieve this status, or who is able to do so, appear more uncertain. He states that a good translation will be “less a copy than a transmutation” (160); a good translation is tied to a source text with the purpose of exploring its aesthetic genius in a new language, or, citing Valéry, an “ideal translation ... consists of producing analogous effects with different implements” (160). Paz relates poetic translation to creation, but he never equates them, unlike Haroldo de Campos. Instead, he insists that a translator of poetry must execute two movements: one that is the same as that of the reader and critic, and a second that parallels the poetic work of the poet. The label of a good translation as “analogous” to the source text returns later in the same essay when Paz gets more specific about the differences between a translator’s procedure and materials and those of a poet.

[La] operación [del traductor] es inversa a la del poeta ... la actividad del traductor es parecida a la del lector y a la del crítico: cada lectura es una traducción, y cada crítica es, o comienza por ser, una interpretación. Pero la lectura es una traducción dentro del mismo idioma y la crítica es una versión libre del poema o, mas exactamente, una trasposición. **Para el crítico el poema es un punto de partida hacia otro texto, el suyo,** mientras que el traductor, en otro lenguaje y con signos diferentes, debe componer un poema análogo al original. Así, en su segundo momento, la actividad del traductor es paralela a la del poeta, con esta diferencia capital: al escribir, el poeta no sabe cómo será su poema; al traducir, el traductor sabe que su poema deberá reproducir al poema que tiene bajo los ojos. En sus dos momentos la traducción es una operación paralela, aunque en su sentido inverso, a la creación poética (15-16).

This theoretical assertion, that a translation must be analogous to the source text is not borne out in the introduction Paz writes for his own translations. In the three different “Notas” he writes to introduce his collected translations *Versiones y diversiones* (1974, 1978, 2000), he contradicts his own essay while echoing some of its particulars.

Instead of focusing on the serious critical and creative practice that he describes in his theoretical essay, his introductions frame his translations as responses to his personal experiences, chance coincidence, as well as his subjective tastes and passions.¹⁷ His

¹⁷ “¿Este volumen representa mis ideas y mis gustos? Sí y no. *Versiones y diversiones*, como su nombre lo dice, no es un libro sistemático ni se propone mostrar o enseñar nada. Es el resultado de la pasión y de la casualidad. Por pasión traduje a Pessoa y a Michaux; por casualidad a algunos poetas suecos: Pedro Zekeli me pidió que colaborase con él y yo acepté por amistad y curiosidad. No me arrepiento: fue la revelación de cuatro islas poéticas. (Ahora, años después, los ingleses las descubren y Auden traduce a Ekelöf)” (Paz, *Versiones* 7).

motivation to translate as described here is different from the idea of intentional devotion to a particular text because of what it can offer the target language than what he champions in his translation theory. Instead of putting the emphasis on the texts, he allows (to a certain degree) the focus to be on his own tastes, his reactions, the chance experiences and relationships in his life. In this value of randomness, chance, Paz appears to value a more surrealistic approach to literary translation than the planned project Haroldo de Campos envisions for his translations. Much like Goethe using literary translation to renovate the German literary tradition, for Haroldo, translations form a key part of his larger literary project of creating a systematized and exportable Brazilian reaction and contribution to world literature. Conversely, we see in the prologues Paz writes to his translation collections a definition of translation as a personal non-project in the sense that it is random and should not be evaluated as a work of criticism. He emphasizes the personal, desire and chance-driven, work he does as a translator:

Pasión y casualidad pero también trabajo de carpintería, albañilería, relojería, jardinería, electricidad, plomería — en una palabra: industria verbal. **La traducción poética exige el empleo de recursos análogos a los de la creación, sólo que en dirección distinta.** Por eso pido que este libro no sea leído ni juzgado como un trabajo de investigación o de información literaria. También por eso no he incluido los textos originales: **a partir de poemas en otras lenguas quise hacer poemas en la mía.**

(Versiones y diversiones 9; emphasis added)

In these closing lines of his introduction, Paz echoes his translation essay, but he also offers a different view on his previous statement. At first, he appears to merely repeat his assertion that translation is “analogous” to creation but “in the opposite direction.” Then he swerves from his theoretical statement, where he had asserted that poets make bad translators because they “casi siempre usan el poema ajeno como un punto de partida para escribir su poema” (*Traducción* 14). Instead of admonishing poets for translating in a way that disconnects a version from the source, in this case he is admonishing readers not to attempt to reconnect his versions with the original texts. In this practical introduction, he frames his translations as works to be considered as poems in “his language” rather than writing “the Spanish language.” While this may not go as far as to describe these versions as “his poems,” he does call them “poems in his language,” and he does not wish readers to compare them to their source texts. As a translator, Paz expands his *parole*, his personal use of the Spanish language, the expression of his individual lexicon, not just the abstract *langue* of Spanish.

In the final publication, Paz writes a third introduction, a “Nota final” in which he connects the theoretical essay with his practice. He also opens up the question of translation and its relation to time, adding another paradox to his vision of his versions:

Repito lo que dije en el primer prologuillo: estas versiones son el resultado de la pasión y de la casualidad. Fueron, casi siempre, una diversión o, más exactamente, **una recreación. El punto de partida fueron poemas escritos en otras lenguas; el de la llegada, la tentativa de escribir, con ellos, poemas en la mía.** Muchos de esos poemas fueron compuestos en otros siglos; en mis versiones quise que tuviesen la antigüedad de todas las

obras de arte: la de hoy mismo (Paz writing in Mexico, February 25, 1995, page 16 in the 2014 edition of *Versiones y diversiones*).

In this last introduction, Paz moves even further away from his theoretical prohibition from using the poem as a “punto de partida.” He also uses the word “recreación” in this late evaluation of his translations. Paired with “diversión,” the first meaning would be amusement, recreation. Yet the verb “recrear” also means to reproduce, recreate based on a model. In short, Paz uses the same vocabulary in his practical introduction, but contradicts his own theoretical statement.

Within his poetics, the possibility of translating poetry—the manner in which ideas, images, forms, and poems themselves travel—reveals the universal in all poetic language. Paz does not directly cite Walter Benjamin, although at times his work expresses similar concerns. They share the ideal of a universal poetry, or a pure language, and an image of the translation and the creation of poetry as participating in the same system, although for Paz they are separate functions. Benjamin describes this participatory relationship between translation and creation using the image of a vessel created out of broken shards which were never a part of the same ceramic object but nevertheless fit together perfectly.¹⁸ In the essay by Paz, he uses the image of an orchestra with no conductor in which musicians across languages and locals together harmonize and produce the collective work of literature using improvisation, translation, invention, and imitation.¹⁹ Paz ends his essay about translation with a description of

¹⁸ In “The Task of the Translator” Benjamin writes: “Fragments of a vessel which are to be glued together must match one another in the smallest details, although they need not be like one another. In the same way a translation, instead of resembling the meaning of the original, must lovingly and in detail incorporate the original’s mode of signification, thus making both the original and the translation recognizable as fragments of a greater language, just as fragments are part of a vessel” (21).

¹⁹ “En cada período los poetas europeos—ahora también los del continente americano, en sus dos mitades—escriben el mismo poema en lenguas diferentes. Cada una de esas versiones es, asimismo, un

poetic creation as a set of creative responses to readings that correspond to and mirror one another, by authors near and far, known and unknown to one another. He describes the work of Uruguayan-born French educated symbolist Jules Laforgue (1860-1886) as the bridge between T.S. Eliot's "Prufrock" (1917) and the Mexican poet Ramón López Velarde in his experimental work *Zozobra* (1919). Although López Velarde and Eliot did not know one another's work, both were responding to the same poetry written in French by Laforgue, although they also responded to the different followers and imitators he attracted in their different language traditions. Writing in Spanish, López Velarde read Laforgue through the importance he attained for Latin American *modernistas*, and Paz names specifically the imitations of the Franco-Uruguayan by Lugones in *Lunario sentimental* (1909) more than the translations of his work by Lugones in *Los crepúsculos del jardín* (1905). "[Velarde's] work ended where Eliot's began . . . Boston and Zacatecas: the coupling of those two names brings a smile as if it were one of those incongruent associations Laforgue so greatly enjoyed. Two poets writing in different languages, neither even suspecting the existence of the other, almost simultaneously produced different but **equally original versions** of the poetry written some years earlier by a third poet in yet another language." (162, ellipsis in the original; emphasis added). In this passage ending his theoretical essay, Paz calls the two poems by Eliot and López Velarde "*versiones*" of works by Laforgue. The whole conclusion posits this case as "un ejemplo de la interdependencia entre creación e imitación, traducción y obra original" (18). Notably, the label he gives to his own original translations also applies to the idea

poema original y distinto. Ciertamente, la sincronía no es perfecta, pero basta alejarse un poco para advertir que oímos un concierto en el que los músicos, con diferentes instrumentos, sin obedecer a ningún director de orquesta ni seguir partitura alguna, componen una obra colectiva en la que la improvisación es inseparable de la traducción y la invención de la imitación" (Paz, *Literatura y literalidad* 17).

that “En cada periodo los poetas europeos —ahora también los del continente americano, en sus dos mitades— escriben el mismo poema en lenguas diferentes. Cada una de **esas versiones** es, asimismo, un poema original y distinto” (17). Paz uses the same label, “versión,” here and elsewhere, to describe his own literary translations and also to describe original poems that share corresponding source texts.

Paz concludes his theoretical essay with this vision of poetic creation itself as an intellectual potlatch, a field on which gifts are exchanged *even when the poets are not aware of who they are working with, whom they are gifting*. Translation, at least between contemporaries, may be a space in which you *do* know who you are exchanging gifts with, unlike poetic creation where there is a more oblique exchange. In my understanding of Paz, gift theory is useful because it distinguishes his vision of creation from translation. In his description of the creation of new versions of old poems, the gifting is more oblique. But in literary translation the gifting is more direct, more measured, more in control. It is important for Paz, in translation, that there are limits. That limit is defined by the effects created by the source poem and the idea that the version which creates the same effects is a translation and the version which creates the same effects and then some additional effects is actually an original version, in the sense that both poems by López Velarde and Eliot are original versions of Laforgue. As I will show using his translations of Elizabeth Bishop and Gerard de Nerval, Paz does not resolve the contradictions between his theoretical statements and his practice as a translator. In my argument, it would be more valuable to view some of the additions he makes as gifts given with interest rather than as the proof that he is the kind of “poet translator” he accuses, the

translator who fails on the level of psychology and of technique to be a “good translator” by sublimating his own voice.

The Generous Translationship Between Paz and Bishop

In a 1975 interview, Edwin Honig asks Octavio Paz what contributes to his decisions to translate. Paz responds with an insistence on a lack of planning that might seem contrary to the intentional choice central to the idea of translation as gift-making. However, he soon connects the “accident” of reading a new poet in another language with a desire to participate, a desire to give others who may not yet read English the opportunity to have that same chance encounter. He claims he never decided to translate from English:

I didn't decide really. It was—well, as always—an accident. But also, as always when we talk about accidents, we also talk about desire. When I came to the United States the first time, I said, Well I must learn English better, because I want to read American and English poets. So I learned English mainly to read poetry. Then, reading English and French poems, I **felt that they should be known in Spanish.** You see: it was desire, love—and with love, the **desire for participation** (Honig 1073; emphasis added).

Paz describes choosing his translation projects through the “accident” or “chance” of encountering a new poet that produces a “feeling that they should be known in Spanish” matched with the “desire for participation.” I hear in his wording a thymotic desire rather than only an erotic desire in this phrase: he clarifies that when he says “desire” or “love”

he does not merely mean a desire for a beloved author, or desire to fill a lack in himself as a writer. When he expands the thought to “desire for participation,” he signals that this translatorial desire is also the desire to give greater strength to poets and readers as a group. Paz wishes to participate in making the work of poets he admires known in Spanish; his desire is not just for his own recognition but also for their recognition, and for the greater mutual recognition of poets in Spanish and in English. Paz also chooses projects based on what translations have not yet been completed, what works would most benefit the Spanish-speaking readership. When he started reading the Anglo-American modernists, there were Spanish translations of T.S. Eliot, but he found no adequate translations of Ezra Pound, so Paz chose to work on Pound (Honig 1073).

A happy accident of coinciding academic appointments at Harvard led to Paz and Elizabeth Bishop (1911-1979) meeting in 1971, after which their personal relationship and mutual exchanges of translations grew into what Magdalena Edwards calls a “translationship” (229).²⁰ Their poetic relationship can be traced through a series of poems and mutual translations which I identify as gifts, first to one another, and then to their readers. First, Paz translates three poems by Bishop: “The Monument,” “A Summer’s Dream,” and “Visits to St. Elizabeth’s” for publication in *Plural* in 1973.²¹ In a letter to Bishop dated March 26, 1973, Paz indicates that all three will be published in *Plural* (Edwards 229). Only “Visitas a St. Elizabeth” appears in *Plural* Number 19, April 1973, page 19. Paz adds a note: “St. Elizabeth es el nombre del manicomio en donde

²⁰ Edwards posits “[t]heir translationship, as documented in the translations they left behind, also highlights their shared concern with memory, time, and the limitations of language as a form of memory-making” (217) and furthermore describes “the kind of translationship [Bishop] and Paz enjoyed [as one] where both poets got their hands dirty with the other’s work as poet-translators, not simply as translators” (229).

²¹ He asks Bishop for corrections, writing “Pero, por favor, dime si hay errors o mistranslations” (qtd. in Edwards 230, Elizabeth Bishop Papers, Archives and Special Collections, Vassar College Libraries).

estuvo recluido Ezra Pound” (19), an observation that may indicate the particular value he saw in this poem for connecting Anglo-American modernism to the contemporary poet Bishop and his own work. Then, he writes his own poem connecting the plastic arts to the writer’s craft, “Objetos y apariciones,” in which some of Bishop’s insights in “The Monument” are repeated, sharing a draft with Bishop in 1974. She translates his work as “Objects and Apparitions,” making changes that Paz praises in a letter dated March 16, 1974. Not only “would he give anything” to have written one of her lines, he even takes one of her alterations as a “correction,” altering his poem thanks to her translation:

Tu traducción es perfecta. No hay que cambiar nada, absolutamente nada. No solo es fiel sino que a veces es mejor que el original. Por ejemplo, yo escribo—traduciendo literalmente, “platement”, del francés—“hacer un cuadro como se hace un crimen” pero tú dices “to commit a painting the way one commits a crime”. ¡Magnífico! Daría no sé qué por haber escrito ese “to commit a painting”. Me encanta como me encanta Thumbelina perdida en sus jardines de luz. Sí, tienes muchísima razón—¿cómo no me dí cuenta?—la estrofa 10 debe ser la 13, la penúltima. Ya hice el cambio y le escribiré a Dore Ashton para que haga la corrección. Gracias, gracias, gracias (Paz letter to Bishop, Elizabeth Bishop Papers, Archives and Special Collections, Vassar College Libraries, qtd. in Edwards, fn 227).

Paz thanks Bishop enthusiastically for this “correction,” and all published versions of the poem contain the version indebted to Bishop’s translation, beginning with the first in *Vuelta* (1976). Far from expecting her to play a different role as a translator, Paz expresses extreme gratitude for the gift of her poetic insight. He thinks he should have

already had the idea of ordering the poem in the way Bishop suggested; for this reason, he calls it a “correction” rather than framing it as an imposition of her own voice.

Paz and Bishop exchanged a number of conceptual and literary gifts through their translations, and I focus on three of their poems that exemplify their shared interest in the depiction of objects as measures of the passage of time. Specifically I work with the poems “Objetos y apariciones” by Paz and translated by Bishop and “The Monument” and “Visits to St Elizabeth’s” by Bishop and translated by Paz. Paz dedicates “Objetos y apariciones” to American artist Joseph Cornell who followed Cubist artists including Picasso and Braque to work in assemblage, a mixed-media art form. In an interview with Roberto Gonzalez Echevarría, Paz locates the aesthetics of both assemblage and Anglo-American poetry as inheritors of Surrealism, although in different ways: the writers already had their own Surrealism.²² Elizabeth Bishop’s translation of his poem “Objetos y apariciones” seems to fall so naturally into her poetic voice because Paz already borrowed from her lexicon and her surrealist, painterly eye when writing the original poem. As he comments to interviewers, he translated out of desire, admiration, and Elizabeth Bishop was one of the American poets who most caught his attention as having

²² “The influence of Surrealism on North American painting was decisive. Without Surrealism there would have been neither Expressionism nor Pop-Art. In addition (especially) Joseph Cornell. A fascinating artist. Each one of his boxes encloses a marvelous monster. The myth of the jack-in-the-box is finally realized: combs, marbles, glass flasks, matches, snapshots, and so many other things—the everyday object transfigured by the slow erosion of fantasy and humor. Why didn’t Surrealism influence literature? Perhaps because the English have always had their own and special version of Surrealism. There is a fantastic and humorous vein, either pre- or para-Surrealist, that appears continually in the great authors from Shakespeare to Dickens—not to mention Lewis Carroll or Edward Lear. A surrealism *avant la lettre* which can be reduced to this formula: the maximum of precision to produce the greatest bedlam. It is the quality of the bizarre that Baudelaire was so fond of. It is an element that is also present in North American literature. At least in the best. For example, in Wallace Stevens. Or in Elizabeth Bishop. The poems of Elizabeth Bishop are very rigorous constructions and traditional in appearance, but the effects are very disquieting. A strange visual imagination, which is called ‘fantastic realism’ in painting. It is not accidental that I think of painting when speaking of Elizabeth Bishop; her eyes are the eyes of a painter, but of a fantastic painter” (Paz interviewed by Echevarría et. al. 37).

arrived at painterly surrealism through a different route than the Spanish poets inspired by Surrealist painting. I see in his original “Objetos y apariciones” an echo of Bishop’s poem “The Monument” published in her first collection of 1946 titled *North & South*. Octavio Paz chose to translate this particular poem, which incorporates a sense of artifice, construction, measurement and creation, shared by all creative acts, and ends:

The monument’s an object, yet those decorations,
carelessly nailed, looking like nothing at all,
give it away as having life, and wishing;
wanting to be a monument, to cherish something.

The crudest scroll-work says “commemorate,”
while once each day the light goes around it
like a prowling animal,
Or the rain falls on it, or the wind blows into it.
It may be solid, may be hollow.

The bones of the artist-prince may be inside
or far away on even drier soil.

But roughly but adequately it can shelter
what is within (which after all
cannot have been intended to be seen).

It is the beginning of a painting,
a piece of sculpture, or poem, or monument,
and all of wood. Watch it closely.

(Bishop 19-20)

El monumento es un objeto, esos ornamentos
Clavados al desgaire, como si nada,
Revelan que allí hay vida, hay deseo;
Voluntad de ser monumento, un querer ser algo.
La voluta más tosca nos dice: *conmemorad*,
mientras que cada día, como animal que merodea,
la luz lo cerca
o cae la lluvia y lo empapa
o sopla el viento y entra.
Tal vez está lleno, tal vez está vacío.
Quizás adentro están los huesos del príncipe-artista
o quizá están allá lejos en un suelo aun más seco.
Pero en general —pero cabalmente— ampara
lo que está adentro (y que después de todo
no está destinado a ser visto).
Es el comienzo de una pintura,
una escultura, un poema, un monumento
—y todo de madera. Contempladlo despacio.
(Paz *Versiones y diversiones* 92)

The choices that stand out here amplify the non-literal perception of this monument rather than the literal observations emphasized in Bishop's source text. Instead of her thrice repeated "may" Bishop uses to qualify possible "readings" of the visually impenetrable monument, Paz layers together twice repeating "tal vez" and "quizá"

providing more moments of uncertainty. He chooses “vacío” for “hollow,” a broader term bespeaking emptiness on all levels, rather than the possible sounds produced by a hollowness that echoes. Although knowing nothing about the “what is within” her poem still finds value in taking people to see the monument, in witnessing its relationship to nature and to the challenge of meaning something, to watch it closely. Yet Paz ends his version of the poem with “Contempladlo despacio” for “Watch it closely” in a strong choice to translate Bishop’s “closely” as “despacio” which could be both “slowly” or “in great detail.” Paz ends his translation of Bishop’s poem with a term that invites the experience of time into the apprehension of a visual object.

Paz then amplifies this insight when writing his own poem “Objetos y apariciones.” The first stanza begins describing Joseph Cornell’s assemblage boxes as “Monumentos a cada momento,” referring back to Bishop’s earlier poem. The art of Cornell allows one to watch a moment slowly, just as she encourages the apprehension of a monument that allows a culture to watch itself closely. Bishop first published her translation of Paz’s poem “Objects & Apparitions (For Joseph Cornell)” in the *New Yorker* for June 24, 1974. She also included it in her last poetry collection published before her death, *Geography III* (1976), placed as the penultimate poem. It is easy to mistake this translation for a Bishop original; she places Paz’s name only at the end of the poem, not in the table of contents or at the start of the poem. It was the only translation she ever included in a book of her own poetry, although she completed many.²³

²³ Bishop did print many of her translations of Brazilian poets in the important *Anthology of Twentieth-Century Brazilian Poetry* she edited and published in 1972 at the Wesleyan University Press. Her other translations of Octavio Paz’s poems (four more) were included in her *Complete Poems* published in 1983, after her death in 1979, though they were previously published in *Harvard Advocate* in 1972 (Bishop 927).

The poem speaks in apostrophe to the assemblage artworks by Joseph Cornell: “But you constructed / boxes where things hurry away from their names.” The particular placement of objects, in the source poem by Paz, gets questioned, the names of objects get put into motion, made strange through new placement or through new configurations, as they do in the artwork of Joseph Cornell and other assemblage artists. In the translation by Bishop, this insight also applies to the act of translation from one language to another, where the names for objects are unlikely to always mean the same thing, where, as Benjamin points out, the words for “bread” in different languages signify the same object but will never mean the same thing.²⁴ The first and last two stanzas, in both versions, read as follows, and extend this idea of an object running away from its name to figure the assemblage box as a space in which the momentary name for an object becomes visible:

Hexaedros de madera y de vidrio
apenas más grandes que una caja de zapatos.
En ellos caben la noche y sus lámparas.

Monumentos a cada momento
hechos con los desechos de cada momento:
jaulas de infinito.

.....

Las apariciones son patentes
Sus cuerpos pesan menos que la luz

²⁴ The words *Brot* and *pain* ‘intend’ the same object, but the modes of this intention are not the same. It is owing to these modes that the word *Brot* means something different to a German than the word *pain* to a Frenchman, that these words are not interchangeable for them, that, in fact, they strive to exclude each other” (Benjamin 18).

Duran lo que dura esta frase

Joseph Cornell: en el interior de tus caja
mis palabras se volvieron visibles un
instante.

(Paz, *Obras completas. Vol. 12, 59-60*)

Hexahedrons of wood and glass,
scarcely bigger than a shoebox,
with room in them for night and all its lights

Monuments to every moment,
refuse of every moment, used:
cages for infinity.

.....

The apparitions are manifest,
their bodies weigh less than light,
lasting as long as this phrase lasts.

Joseph Cornell: inside your boxes
my words became visible for a moment.

(Bishop 169-70)

Bishop chooses not to prolong the wordplay beyond the main relationship between
“monument” and “moment” in this stanza. Whereas the Spanish creates the internal

rhyme between “hechos” and “desechos,” her translation nullifies and separates the relationship between these two related terms. This allows her to maintain the tension between “refuse” and “used” but not in a way that adds to the musical repetitions of the Spanish line. Instead, this allows the translation to emphasize instead the connection between “monument” and “moment.” Again, this means that the poem’s lexicon sticks more closely to Bishop’s own poetic voice—she reads herself into Paz’s poem.

In his translations of “The Monument” and of “Visits to St. Elizabeths,” Paz appears to depart from Bishop’s poems to follow the broader aesthetic trend she participates in more closely, especially to provide the same relationship between objects frozen in time that Bishop and Paz both put in their poems and admire in the aesthetic of assemblage art. In his essay “Elizabeth Bishop: The Power of Reticence,” he describes her poetry as unusual for their moment because of her minimalism, her use of silence and gaps as tools of expression. He writes that her poems are:

Objects made of words that speak but, above all, objects that know how to keep silent. From political discourse to ideological sermon, from surrealistic “ceaseless murmur” to public confession, twentieth-century poetry has become garrulous. We are drowning not in a sea but in a swamp of words. We have forgotten that poetry is not in what words say but in what is said between them (Paz, “Power of Reticence” 213).

When Paz translates Bishop, he gifts his Spanish reading public with a different poetic voice, one that might allow them to write a poetry unlike his own, a more unadorned poetry, pared down. In his translation of “Visits to St. Elizabeths” he simplifies some

elements of her language, which in some cases has the result of elevating a surrealistic and visually striking picture of the insane asylum depicted in her work.

The poem “Visits to St. Elizabeths” represents one of Bishop’s few moments of semi-autobiographical poetry, where she paints a picture of an insane asylum, its residents and their cherished objects, behaviors, and affects. Her mother was committed when she was five years old, and the poem includes that child-like point of view given that it is built on the same pattern of the repetitive nursery rhyme “This is the house that Jack built.” Her poem begins with the one-line stanza “This is the house of Bedlam” which grows to a two-line stanza “This is the man / that lies in the house of Bedlam” (Bishop 129), and each stanza adds more detail while ending in that same place of stasis.

Paz’s translation also departs from the semantic meaning of the poem to follow its lyrical characteristics more closely. The line “past the staring sailor” (Bishop 129) becomes “más allá del marinero de los ojos en blanco” (Paz *Versiones y diversiones* 95). His choice to end the line with “blanco” creates an assonant rhyme with “piso, plano, periódico, dormitorio, blanco” which end the last lines of the tenth stanza. In Bishop’s sixth stanza the word “sailor” connects with “ward, board” in an off-rhyme. But in the following stanzas, when the end-words “war, door, floor” are added, the “sailor” rings with a stronger rhyme with “ward” and “board” than it did before (Bishop 128-9). Paz creates rhymes in different parts of the poem, but he does follow Bishop’s cue to increase the proportion of end-rhymes as the poem moves forward.

One of the major choices Paz makes in his translation of Bishop’s repetitive poem is the line repeated at the end of every stanza: “that lies in the house of Bedlam.” In the version by Paz, this line becomes “que está en la casa de los locos” which makes for a

more neutral image but also a more active role for the residents of Bedlam. He could have chosen a more literal translation by choosing the verb “yacer” that appears on gravestones in the same context as “Here lies... .” Instead, he chooses the more unmarked verb “estar,” which can be applied to any object in many contexts. This choice takes away the rather eerie tone to the human element in Bishop’s poem, where both people and objects are just things. Every subject of each stanza, “the man, the time, a wristwatch, a sailor, a newspaper hat, the soldier home from the war” is just another thing “that lies in the house of Bedlam”—inert, possibly dead, certainly dead-in-life. In the Paz version, they “are located in the house of the crazy people” and there is less deathly connotation. Additionally, the phrase “casa de los locos” gives a possessive subjectivity to the “locos” living there, a more active term for psychiatric incarceration than “house of Bedlam” as in Bishop. In the repeated refrain by Paz, the translation creates a greater sense of subjectivity for the people represented in this repetitive, almost psychotic poem. After so many repetitions with slight changes to the placement of certain objects, the reader should be left with a sense of the disorientation that comes with madness, confinement, incarceration. Paz’s poem cannot directly translate “Bedlam” and so his solution “casa de los locos” gives greater voice and sense of place to the residents, inviting the reader to imagine that they are there with them, rather than indicating where they “lie” as though dead and buried. The translation manages to produce the effects of the original while departing from its language.

While I limit myself to discussing his “translationship” with Bishop, Paz also translated three other poets who translated his work: Lysander Kemp, Charles Tomlinson, and William Carlos Williams. In each of these cases, we can observe that Paz selects a

poem that will match well with his own use of Spanish, even finding ways to associate these translated poems with his own keywords or main tropes within Mexican culture. For example, the long poem “The Conquest” by Lysander Kemp tell the story of the conquest of Mexico by Cortés. Kemp composed his poem in a register of English he crafted to sound like Spanish Golden Age verse. When Paz translates selections into a Spanish that sound like Garcilaso de la Vega, he is in a sense writing an original version of the poem that Kemp’s poem imagined itself to translate. In a similar act of borrowing between poets, his translations of Bishop respond to his own ideas of what creates a “monument” within a “moment;” he also appears to gratefully receive the gift of her insightful translation, such that he changes his own poem significantly in response.

Versions of Nerval: French Alexandrines Through Two Spanish Filters

Unlike Elizabeth Bishop, Gérard de Nerval had already received the attentions of Spanish-language translators, both in Spain and in Mexico, especially from writers associated with surrealism.²⁵ In his own literary magazine *Plural*, Paz publishes the five sonnet cycle “Le Christ aux Oliviers,” a group of five sonnets in *Les Chimères* translated by Gerardo Deniz. He is not “discovering new poetic islands,” as he describes his translations of four Swedish poets. In the case of this widely read French romantic poet, Paz is not only giving a gift to the author or to readers of Spanish, although these publics

²⁵ For example, in Spain, Ramón Gómez de la Serna published a monograph on Nerval in 1942; Spanish author Juan Chabás y Martí published his translations of the novels *Sylvia*, *La mano encantada*, *Noches de octubre*, *Paseos y recuerdos* in Madrid in 1923 and in Argentina in 1949. Closer to Paz might have been the volume including *El sueño y la vida*, *Aurelia* translated by Mexican surrealist artist and writer Agustín Lazo with a prologue by Xavier Villarrutia, published in Mexico by Editorial Cultura in 1942.

do still signify. I understand his translations of Nerval to be gifts to other translators, performances of Paz's virtuosity as a translator.

Nerval is the only poet in the first two editions of *Versiones y diversiones* who receives two "versions" for each of the three sonnets he translates. One exception arrives later in the *Obras completas*: Paz includes two versions of a short poem by Guillaume Apollinaire titled "*Carpa*." The versions differ greatly, and not just because the first is four lines and the second is only three: Paz imagines in an endnote that the author would have been "amused" by this treatment of his poem.²⁶ Yet this one other example of Paz creating double versions only highlights the more serious and systematic qualities of the two versions of three of his Nerval sonnets, in which there is a clear pattern, a functional difference in the two manners of translation applied to the same source. In all three cases, the first version is in blank verse and maintains much of the word order of the French original, often choosing cognates in Spanish. Also in all three cases, for the second version, Paz has crafted a formally perfect alexandrine sonnet with the same metric and rhyme scheme as the source. To do so, he has rearranged concepts and lines, replaced or added in words, but achieved the same formal qualities as the the Nerval source texts.

In his essay about translating Mallarmé, Paz expresses a wish to give "Soneto en ix" the same treatment, but I have not found evidence that he did so. Paz describes the first version as "verso blanco" and the second, imagined version would be "tal vez más libre pero con rimas de dificultad y sonoridad análogas" (*El signo y el garabato* 82-3). He goes on to clarify what he *does* accomplish in his version:

²⁶ "Carpas. Segunda versión. (Página 33.) Me atreví a transformar este pequeño poema de cuatro versos en una suerte de haikú aunque sin respetar la métrica del poema japonés. Creo que le habría divertido a Apollinaire esta travesura" (*Versiones* 2014 edition, 383).

[P]rocuré seguir el ritmo del alejandrino de Mallarmé y moderé hasta donde pude la tendencia a lo rotundo y lo escultórico de nuestro verso de catorce sílabas. Aunque el modelo más inmediato y afín de una traducción de esta índole sea la versificación modernista—encabalgamiento, apoyo rítmico en sílabas con acento débil, erosión de los límites entre hemistiquio y hemistiquio—casi de una manera instintiva, por lo que toca a la sintaxis, me acogí al ejemplo de nuestros poetas barrocos (83).

While Paz does acknowledge here that the Spanish-American modernists reacted to Mallarmé's poem (and also those of Nerval) by writing with their own style of *alejandrinos*, he chooses for himself a different, older model for his translation. He describes this choice as “almost instinctive,” and he appears to make a similar instinctive selection in his Nerval sonnets, where he emphasizes rather than blurs the divisions between hemistitches.

Favored by the later Symbolists and Surrealists, Nerval remains a touchstone for Paz and a reference he incorporates into numerous works. In addition to the translations, Paz uses the first quatrain of the Nerval sonnet “Artémis” as an epigraph to his long poem “Piedra del sol” (1957), connecting his own excavation of the Pre-Columbian past with the French Romantic poet's use of the tropes of classical antiquity. Paz connects Nerval's oblique image of a clock in which the thirteenth is also the first with his own circular poem using the Mayan calendar as a structural base. The Nerval sonnet of fourteen lines references the twelve hours of the day; the Paz poem consists of 584 hendecasyllabic lines, plus one *pie quebrado* that repeats a line in the beginning of the poem, to match the span of a year in the Mayan calendar which based on the “synodical revolution of the

planet Venus [♀], which is 584 days” (*Piedra de sol*, 57). He does not translate the French epigraph when it appears at the start of his own poem, first published in 1957. But when he did publish his translation of the whole sonnet, he makes choices that emphasize the concept of the return of the first hour, either in a celebration of the mystery, or in an anxious insistence on this interpretation of the thirteenth hour also as the first. This strong translation choice adding emphasis could also be read as a statement Paz is making about the Nerval poem, which does not make the same gesture his own “*Piedra de sol*” makes—the failure to make the thirteenth line a repetition of the first, or the fourteenth line a repetition of the second, to Paz, could represent a failure of the poem to live up to its possibilities, which he corrects in his own version.

La Treizième revient . . . C’est encor la première;
Et c’est toujours la seule,—ou c’est le seul moment:
Car es-tu reine, ô toi ! la première ou dernière ?
Est-tu roi, toi le seul ou le dernier amant ? . . .

(Nerval 24)

Artemisa Primera versión

Vuelve otra vez la Trece – ¡y es aún la Primera!
Y es la única siempre – ¿o es el solo momento?
¿Dime, Reina, tú eres la primera o la última?
¿Tú eres, Rey, el último?, ¿eres el solo amante?

Artemisa Segunda versión

Vuelve otra vez la Trece – ¡y es aún la Primera!
Y es la única siempre – ¿o es el único instante?

¿Dime, Reina, tú eres la primera o la última?

¿Tú eres, Rey, el último?, ¿eres el solo amante?

(Paz *Versiones*)

This use of Nerval in his own poem also begs one question about an alteration *both* of his versions make: whereas the source text appears doubtful, hesitant, using ellipses, semicolons, dashes to connect ideas and then ending with question marks, the double exclamation points framing the second hemistiquio ¡! in the versions by Paz can be understood as celebratory, elated. Conversely, they could indicate an anxiety about comprehension, an uncertainty that without emphasis the reader will not understand the connection between the first and second halves of the line. In the same vein, they could be expressions of an emphasis on Paz's metric choice to maintain the separation between the two halves of this alexandrine line, rather than blur the gap as did Darío in his alexandrines. This stanza differs only in one line, where Paz moves away from the cognate of "moment" "momento" to choose "instante" which will rhyme with "amante." Judith Bernard sees a different parallel in the use of this epigraph, claiming "for both Paz and Nerval, the woman represented in these poems is the prototype of womanhood, built on the images of several women, rather than one specific person. In this erotic syncretism and in the annihilation of time in the poem by the combination of associations drawn from different ages and from different civilizations, Paz is spiritually at one with the French poet" (Bernard 10). His translation does more than connect him to Nerval—he places the poet speaker in a space of intimacy with the beloved addressed in the poem, with the use of the familiar "Dime, Reina" in the informal, "Tell me, Queen" strikes a more intimate tone than "Car es-tu reine, ô toi." The speaker is present in the translation

in a way that he is not present in the source, and he is present in an erotic competition with the other male figure in the poem, the King. As a translator of Nerval, Paz recirculates this image once again, and in multiple versions.

In addition to using his poem as an epigraph, Paz consistently includes Nerval in his list of precursors, to his own poetry and to the Spanish-American poetry that was the most important to him, especially Mexican *modernista* Ramón López Velarde (“The Road of Passion” in *The Siren and the Seashell*, 87) and Rubén Darío. Paz connects Darío to Nerval specifically through his sublime poem “Yo persigo una forma...” with which he ends *Prosas profanas* (1896). Paz writes: “It is scarcely necessary to point out that these superb alexandrines recall those of ‘Delfica: Reconnaiss-tu le TEMPLE ou péristile immense. . .’ The same faith in the stars and the same atmosphere of orphic mystery. Darío’s lines evoke that ‘state of supernatural delirium’ in which Gérard de Nerval was said to have composed his sonnets” (from “The Siren and the Seashell” 39-40). Paz also connects Nerval to the Spanish language tradition that preceded him. In an essay from 1942, “Poetry of Solitude and Poetry of Communion,” read for a lecture series for the 400-year celebration of the birth of Saint John of the Cross, Nerval appears in the list of Romantics who respond to this tradition: “What is asked of the poet is not abandon but greater discipline. We want a superior form of sincerity: authenticity. In the past century a group of poets who represent the hermetic branch of Romanticism—Novalis, Nerval, Baudelaire, Lautréamont—showed us the way. . . . The seduction that these masters—our only possible masters—exercise upon us is due to the veracity with which they embody the proposition that attempts to unite the two parallel tendencies of the human spirit: consciousness and innocence, experience and expression, the act and the

word that reveals it” (in *The Siren and the Seashell* 172). Paz also consistently characterizes Nerval as the best French Romanticism has to offer and the model he and other Spanish-American poets should draw from over other French Romantic models (Paz, title essay in *The Siren and the Seashell* 20). In all these ways, Paz shows himself as a poet who has received important insights and gifts from Nerval, which explains the double gifting gesture of his writing two versions of each of the sonnets in the first edition of his collection *Versiones y diversiones*. While Paz shows his debt to Nerval in essay form and with the homage of his epigraph, as a translator he treats Nerval differently than other sources. Namely, he publishes two versions of three of Nerval’s sonnets. This double gifting also traces the two different moments of translation he describes. He illustrates his theoretical position on translation with Nerval, giving to the reader and also to the translator at the same time.

Reading just the Paz versions, you can see traces of his translation process as a double movement, away from the poem and back towards the source. In his “Primera versión” of “El desdichado” the rhyme scheme is not regularized while metrically it tends toward *alejandrinos*, or fourteen syllable lines. In the “Segunda versión” the most apparent difference is the strictness of the rhyme scheme, using full consonant rhyme and maintaining the same consonant end-rhyme pattern. In pursuing stricter rhyme, Paz needed to move more words around in the second version—altering the order of some lines, displacing some adjectives from other lines. Even without consulting the original poem by Nerval, readers with knowledge of Paz as a translator might be able to identify the first version as a first step, a translation that places objects in the same order as the

source text. In the second version, Paz takes his poem another step further away from the source text in order to return to its adherence to the formal qualities of the sonnet.

Paz also appears to expand upon Nerval's use of concepts and references in his second version. In some cases, he expands on an existing image with a typical baroque conceit; in other cases he adds in a conceit not present in the source poem. For example, in the third stanza or first tercet of "El desdichado," the first version maintains the word "red" that appears in the French, but the second version changes this to the "aurora" or "dawn," a common trope in Spanish baroque sonnets.

Primera versión:

Roja mi frente está del beso de la reina;
Soñé en la gruta donde nadaba la sirena,

Segunda versión:

El beso de la Reina tornó aurora mi frente;
En tu gruta, sirena, manó el sueño veneros;

(Paz, *Versiones*)

These changes are significant; not only does he introduce an additional conceit into the second version, he also changes the mermaid into an object of direct address, present in the poem rather than just a reference or a figure in the dream of the speaker.

In the last pair of sonnet versions, "Artemisa" I see Paz inserting his own poetic terminology more obviously into the second version. Once again, the first is looser and the second is more perfectly rhymed. In this case, he inserts one of his own keywords—also that of Góngora and "Las soledades"—into the sonnet:

Primera versión:

Santa napolitana de manos encendidas,
Flor de Santa Gudula de corazón morado,
¿Encontraste tu cruz en el cielo desierto?

Rosas blancas, ¡caed! –insultáis nuestros dioses,
Caed, blancos fantasmas, de vuestro cielo en lumbre,
¡Es más santa a mis ojos la santa del abismo!

Segunda versión:

Santa napolitana de manos como flamas,
Flor de entrañas violáceas, rosa de soledades,
¿Encontraste tu cruz en el cielo desierto?

¡Caed, blancos fantasmas, de vuestro cielo en llamas!

Rosas blancas, ¡caed! –insultáis mis deidades.

Más santa es la que surge del abismo entreabierto.

(Paz, *Versiones*)

Paz switched the first two lines of the last stanza, making possible the rhyme between “soledades” and “deidades.” Additionally, he does not even attempt to include “Santa Gudula” in the second version; his changes in the second version not only move Nerval’s vocabulary closer to his own but also eliminate certain moments of Catholic reference that he would never include in his own works. Although he does claim to make a change

to these translations in the second edition to fix the fact that he made Nerval's poems less religious, this is one of many examples of a change he did not correct.

In her analysis of these multiple versions Fabienne Bradu writes that Paz allows the reader to make the choice between which "sacrifice" they prefer: form sacrificed to preserve content or content sacrificed to preserve form.²⁷ In the context of gift theory and of Paz's writing about translation and about Nerval, I would add that he also invites the reader to consider that neither choice is a sacrifice, but instead a creative way of performing his insistence that poetry is translatable. Not only can he translate this incredibly challenging poet, he can do so twice. Paz demonstrates the two steps of a translator as described in his essay while also gifting to Nerval in a redoubled way. He adds interest to his counter-gift of all he has learned from his own readings and considerations of Nerval—and those of other modernist and surrealist poets.

I consider the implications of Paz's double versions of Nerval in several ways. First, he appears to show the two movements involved in translating—departing and returning to the text. In his essay about the translation, these two movements are described as first the movement of the reader/critic and second that of the poet/translator to re-make the poem. In the Nerval versions, he stays close to word order in the first versions, and then he departs further from semantic meaning in the second, but only in order to return to the formal qualities of the source texts.

²⁷ "Las proezas de la versión rimada y medida no despiertan la misma clase de admiración que los atisbos, aparentemente más llanos y literales, de la primera versión. ¿La segunda estaría más cerca del poema de Nerval porque conserva la forma estricta del soneto? En los dos tipos de sacrificio a los que obligan una versión y otra, ¿qué sacrificio sacrifica menos? Sé bien que muchos se inclinarán hacia la segunda versión: obra maestra de impecable técnica, pero, sobre la fría y a veces iluminada relojería, me seduce más la inspiración que recorre libremente la primera versión. Dilema insoluble que seguramente animó a Paz a publicar las dos versiones conjuntamente, como si le dejara al lector la imposible decisión que él no pudo tomar" (Bradú 30).

Second, these double versions indicate the making of translation as a never-ending task. As I have discussed, Paz does not simply provide the first and then the second version, the one which displays more changes, more shaping—and in some cases, more hyperbaton, more references to the Spanish conceptista and culteranista tradition. He continues the process in a later edition, to expose the process as one that may need to be revisited and repeated.

Third, they honor the “chimerical” composition of the source texts. The Nerval poems were put together over a long period of time, and the poet re-ordered and put the pieces, lines, and stanzas together in different ways (Jay 9). Knowing how protracted the process of composition was for the source author, Paz is also showing some time passing, some duration in the production of first one version and then another.

Fourth, these different versions honor the translation practice of the author of the source text. Nerval translated in multiple ways, as Paz discusses in his own essay cited above. He was best known for his translations of Goethe, in which he does take the poem of the German romantic as a launching pad for a poem of his own, but he also translated other poets with fewer liberties. “El buen traductor de poesía es un traductor que, además, es un poeta—como Arthur Waley: o un poeta que, además, es un buen traductor—como Nerval cuando tradujo el Primer Fausto. En otros casos Nerval hizo *imitaciones*, admirables y realmente *originales*, de Goethe, Jean-Paul y otros poetas alemanes. La ‘imitación’ es la hermana gemela de la traducción: se parecen pero no hay que confundirlas.” (Paz *Traducción* 14). The two different *versiones* Paz writes of Nerval’s sonnets may not differ as greatly as these original imitations differ from Nerval’s

translations. Yet Paz demonstrates control over the options available to him as a translator who is nevertheless going to produce an “analogous” poem to the original.²⁸

Fifth and finally, these poems can be understood as layered homage, not just to Nerval but also to Nerval’s homage to Virgil. Paz adds an epigraph from Virgil to the sonnet “Délfica.” He also elects to translate the four poems in the sonnet cycle of twelve poems which are the most closely associated with Virgil and the landscape around Naples where his tomb lies.²⁹ Paz makes use of Nerval in order to touch an even older poetic predecessor. If Nerval created new versions of the classical tropes in French, Paz responds with versions of his own. In composing two versions of three of Nerval’s sonnets, Paz honors the patchwork composition process, the multiple translation styles, and the homage to Greek poetry of his source author.

In one exception to his double-version response to Nerval, Paz adds a single sonnet to the group of six versions made from three source poems starting with the 1978 second edition of *Versiones y diversiones*. I contend that this exception proves the pattern I discern in the other poems. Furthermore, he simultaneously *retracts* certain kinds of

²⁸ One English translator, Peter Jay describes a similar choice when rendering Nerval in English. He writes: “Although the translation faces the French text here, it is not intended to provide the sort of word-for-word, or phrase-by-phrase, correspondence to which a literal prose translation might aspire. (I know, for example, that *mille* “means” thousand, not million.) While I hope to have avoided misconstruing his beautifully lucid and syntactically simple French, my aim has been, like Nerval’s in his versions from German poetry, to turn *Les Chimères* into *The Chimeras*—a chimerical task if there ever was one!—and to return the reader through them to the better understanding of *le bon Gérard*’s poetic genius” (11).

²⁹ “But the landscapes of the *Chimères* belong to the countryside round Naples, which Gérard visited twice, in 1834 and 1843. ... There are biographical reasons for this, but also an important literary one. For Nerval, this was Vergil’s country. Virgil’s tomb stands beneath a laurel tree on the hillside of Posilipo overlooking the sea (in “El Desdichado”, “Myrtho”, “Delfica” and “Artémis”). The prophetic Sibyl—*la sibylle au visage latin*—guided Vergil’s Aeneas through the underworld, a journey of intense significance to Nerval, who described his own madness as ‘that which, for the ancients, was represented by the idea of a descent into the infernal regions’ (*Aurélia*). He also thought of Virgil, typically, in the medieval occult way, as a kind of poet-magician—a Mage whose poetry had divinatory powers—and who provided a path, or a charm maybe, through the subterranean regions of the mind” (47 in the final essay by Richard Holmes).

alterations he made to another sonnet, “Délfica,” while also *introducing* another sonnet version with similar and significant interventions. In his single version of the sonnet “Mirto,” Paz achieves the perfect rhyme and metric scheme of the source text while also still adhering to the vocabularies and word order: in other words, he does not need to write two versions of “Mirto” because they are both possible in one version. However, there are two major exceptions: Paz tones down the religious connotations of a particular line, instead preferring a more bacchanalian image, and he adds in a reference to the dawn personified as Aurora, as in “El desdichado.” “Myrtho” and “Mirto” read:

C’est dans ta coupe aussi que j’avais bu l’ivresse
Et dans l’éclair furtif de ton œil souriant,
Quand aux pieds d’Iacchus on **me voyait priant**,
Car la Muse m’a fait l’un des fils de la Grèce.

(Nerval 16)

En tu copa bebí la ebriedad de la hora
Y en el fugaz relámpago de tu ojo sonriente,
Cuando a los pies de Iaco **me inclinaba ferviente**:
Soy hijo, por la Musa, de Grecia y **de la Aurora**.

(Paz *Versiones* 1978, 21; emphasis added)

The French source text places the poet speaker if not praying at the very least kneeling before Iacchus, or one of many epithets for Bacchus or Dionysus, the Greek god of wine. “Priant” is the present participle of the verb “prier” or “to pray.” Instead of creating this clearly worshipful image, Paz intervenes into the text in two ways, both of which alter the image from a religious, worshipful pose between deity and supplicant into a more

erotically charged image between beloved and lover. First, he chooses the verb “inclinarse” or to “incline towards, lean towards, bend towards, favor, be persuaded by” with much more secular connotations than the source text about praying. Second, he adds the adjective “ferviente” or “fervent, burning, ardent.” If combined with “rezar” or “praying,” this adjective could have elevated the religious supplication of the speaker, as in the source poem. Instead, Paz crafts an image of the poetic speaker “bending fervently” at the feet of Bacchus, a pose of erotic abjection rather than prayerful intensity. Additionally, when he expands the mythic parentage of the speaker Paz takes Nerval a step further: not only is the speaker another spiritual son to Greece by the muses, he is also son of the Dawn figured as a Greek goddess. As I will discuss in the following section, Paz calls attention to these types of secularizing interventions when he makes changes to his translation in the first edition in order to backtrack that very same choice.

Paz Takes Back “Literary Interest” Given to Nerval

The changes Paz makes to the religiosity and the scope of mythic reference in “Mirto”—a sonnet introduced in the second edition—stand out all the more given that he simultaneously retracts similar changes to another poem by Nerval. Thematically related to “Mirto,” the sonnet “Délfica” treats the topic of poetic witness to the return of ancient gods through the voices of poets, as the Greek sibyl once channeled the prophecies of the same gods, but through an unchangeable, impervious face, chiseled in monument and ritual. In his “Nota a la segunda edición” (1978) he points out “Délfica” as one of the two translations with significant edits, and he explains the changes eliminate an echo of his

own literary tradition that he could not help but import into his translation. I focus on his edits to the Nerval poem because these changes reflect his vision of literary translation.³⁰

In these edits, Paz performs an attempt to adhere to his own definition of being a “good translator” rather than the poet translator who merely uses the source as a point of departure. However, his corrections represent the exceptions that prove that Paz cannot help but be the “poet translator” who is compelled to respond to his own ideas and poetic tradition. In this preliminary note, he makes a performance of attempting to obey his theories of translation as a necessary and intentional separate function from creation and making this “correction” even while it pains him to eliminate a favorite line. First, he corrects a “traición” to the religious philosophy of Nerval. Second, he backs away from his previous version and his translation choices “not because it was inexact but because it made something explicit which was only implicit in the original” (8, translation mine). Paz expresses melancholy about needing to make these changes:

A su vez, cambié el tercer verso no porque la versión sea inexacta sino porque vuelve explícito lo que en el original sólo está insinuado. La misión de las sibilas es hablar — y hablar en la forma más alta del habla: la profecía. Pero las sibilas hablan sólo cuando están poseídas por el furor divino. Petrificada, dormida bajo el poder del cristianismo (el arco de Constantino), la sibila de *Délfica* volverá a hablar cuando despierte de su sueño e estatua: cuando se haya operado esa *revolución*, es el sentido literal de la palabra, que anuncia Nerval y que consistirá en una revuelta,

³⁰ Paz also explains and analyzes his alterations to a four-line poem by Wang Wei “En la ermita del Parque de los Venados.” However, unlike in the case of his changes to the Nerval poems, these edits are not a reflection of his translation theories. Instead, Paz describes these changes as informed by his growing understanding of Chinese poetry through conversations with Chinese poet Wai-Yin Lip and further reading.

una vuelta de los tiempos paganos. O sea: cuando los dioses regresen, la despierten y la inspiren. No sin pesar — me gusta mucho el hemistiquio: “piedra el furor divino” pues en sus siete sílabas me parece oír como ecos enlazados de Góngora y Darío — me he decidido por una versión que, si es menos briosa e hispánica, se ajusta más al original y tiene la ventaja de reintroducir el *visage latin* de la sibila (8, 1978; emphasis in original).

In this passage, Paz uses the words “revolución” and “revuelta” to describe the return to past ways of life and past beliefs, and he describes these ancient times as “tiempos paganos” rather than other possibilities more directly related to the topics of the poem: he could have chosen “clásicos” or even “antiguos” to describe these times long past. Instead, he selects words which are inextricably associated with his interest in the continued unfinished business of the Mexican Revolution and his continuous centering of the cultural heritage of pre-Columbian society within contemporary Mexican culture. In this passage, he claims to use “revolución” and “revuelta” their most literal senses, a physical turning or returning. Yet when Paz pairs these terms together, and places them in same passage as “tiempos paganos,” he cannot be referring only to a passive, teleological, predestined return. Instead, he signals a more active and even explosive revolution, the unfulfilled promises of the Mexican revolution to return to an older and fairer way of life in Mexico that would bring back a shared heritage of pre-Columbian sharing of land and resources, the “solar” of his idea of Mexican culture.

In this poem, the speaker invites the listener to behold visual monuments and lyric songs that represent the mystic survival of a lost past, a past encoded in multiple ways including classical Greek, imperial Roman, even legendary with the reference to a slain

dragon. The attitude towards the passage of history in Nerval could be read as a statement that faith lasts. In Paz's hands, I read it as a statement that art lasts even where faith or ritual are destroyed. Paz includes the epigraph Nerval eliminated from the final publications of "Délfica" in another choice that determines his prerogative as translator to produce a new version from which ever version of the source text he chooses.³¹ It reads: "*Ultima Cumaei venit jam carminis aetas*" (Paz). This is an unreferenced citation of the fourth eclogue of Virgil, the fifth line, and means roughly "*Now comes the song of the final era.*" This statement of times ending has traveled through many final eras, and in the versions by Paz almost takes on a hopeful characteristic, in which the final era has not yet arrived, that the "now" of Virgil's line is still echoing through multiple centuries.

The final tercet of the "Primera versión" of "Délfica" remains the same in both editions and reads:

Cependant la sibylle au visage latin
Est endormie encor sous l'arc de Constantin :
e—Et rien n'a dérangé le sévère portique.

(Nerval 22)

Mas todavía, bajo **el arco de Constantino**,

La sibila de rostro latino está dormida.

Y nada turba aún al pórtico severo.

(20, 1974; 1978)

³¹ See Rinsler 73-83 for a detailed composition and publication history as well as commentary. Nerval included this epigraph in the first publication of the sonnet in 1845, followed by another version in 1853 with a different epigraph from the same eclogue, and finally in 1854 the epigraph is eliminated (74).

The final tercet of the second version—the version which transcreates the metric and rhyme scheme of the sonnet more precisely—in the 1974 and 1978 editions read:

Mas nada turba aún al pórtico impasible.

Dormida bajo **el arco solar** de Constantino

Se calla la sibila —piedra el furor divino.

(21, 1974 bolding mine).

Mas nada ha perturbado al pórtico impasible.

Dormida bajo **el arco imperial** de Constantino

Calla aún la sibila de semblante latino.

(21, 1978)

It bears mentioning that, by pointing out this change, Paz makes it possible to include both versions of the tercet, even while he performs his suppression of his own tastes by editing the translation. In other words, he acknowledges that he added something in his earlier version, something particular to the Spanish poetic tradition and not the source text. To use the heuristic of gift economy terms, Paz signals that his gift was made with interest, literary interest in the form of additional material from his own tradition. He goes further, expressing the difficulty of eliminating this addition, and acknowledging why he made it in the first place: that it sounded “briosa e hispánica” and gave him an echo of Góngora and Darío. In his second edition, Paz demonstrates the tension between the two movements he describes in his translation essay. He repeats the first movement—that of the reader and critic—in order to make a correction to what happened with the second movement—that of the poet, but in the opposite direction. He corrects what he considers his “error” in creating a poem that reflected his own interests, his tastes, his

way of combining the traditions coming from the baroque Góngora and the modernist Darío. In the 1978 version, he corrects this “error,” while acknowledging that it was difficult for him.

Paz may claim that his choice to revise “el arco solar” to “el arco imperial” brings his version closer to the source text. However, adding any adjective at all is still a choice that alters the reading and emphasis of the poem. The source text—and the first version by Paz—only state “el arco de Constantino” in a limited reference to a historical figure and monument. The term “solar” can mean “house” in the sense of a noble lineage, cultural roots, heritage; or it can refer to the parcel of land in which this “house” is located or is destined to be. These noun forms relate physical spaces with familial and cultural inheritance, the link between land, history, and culture—a theme that Paz returns to in his work on Mexican culture. Additionally, in its adjective form, “solar” of course refers to the sun and solar energy, another trope Paz connects with Mexican pre-Colombian ideas about the sun, as in his work “Piedra del sol.”

Even in the first edition, the two versions display an effort to write Nerval away from another Spanish-American poet: Paz eliminates the word “peristilo” from his second version. As noted above, the word “peristilo” featured prominently in the *modernista* experiments with the alexandrine line by Rubén Darío in his sonnet “Yo persigo una forma” where the line by Darío reads “Adornan verdes palmas el blanco peristilo” (177). Following the logic of Paz in his essay about Mallarmé, we can understand this choice by Paz as a deliberate move away from Darío and the *modernista* alexandrine.

Original by Nerval:

Reconnais-tu le Temple, au péristyle immense,
Et les citrons amers où s’imprimaient tes dents?
Et la grotte, fatale aux hôtes imprudents,
Où du dragon vaincu dort l’antique semence.

Primera versión:

¿Reconoces el Templo de inmenso peristilo,
Los amargos limones marcados por tus dientes,
Y la gruta, fatal a imprudentes intrusos,
Que esconde la simiente del vencido dragón?

Segunda versión

¿Reconoces el Templo, la piedra en luz ungida,
La marca de tus dientes en el limón de oro
Y la gruta, al intruso funesta, y su tesoro:
El semen del dragón en su entraña dormida?

Reading the two versions together, we see Paz first revealing the source of Darío’s line in Nerval—a movement akin to that of the reader or critic alert to these connections between French romanticism and symbolism and Latin American Modernism. In the second version, we see Paz moving towards a Baroque use of the alexandrine. Instead of the united line favored by the *modernistas*, he instead separates the two hemistiches more firmly, delineates between them with a comma. Furthermore, he crafts a Góngoresque hyperbaton in the second hemistich “la piedra en luz ungida” to make space for the rhyme with “dormida.” Paz associates both qualities with the Spanish Baroque tradition. Yet the surprising association between the commonness of the

inanimate object “piedra” and the verb “ungir,” usually associated with materials, holy oils or ointments, also strikes me as surrealistic Paz addition. The word “sicomoro” or “sycamore” in the first stanza determines the rhyme scheme in the second version, which requires many additional changes to the second stanza. Paz adds in the words “oro” and “tesoro;” the presence of the dragon does imply the associated objects “gold” and “treasure,” but they are not included in the source poem or in the first version by Paz. By making changes that move his second version away from aesthetic tendencies of Darío, Paz displays Bloomian “anxiety of influence.” Yet when he makes those changes visible in the two different versions of the same sonnet, and when he makes the second version a deliberate move toward the older model of the *conceptista* and *culteranista* baroque lyricists, he is displaying what I am calling a reciprocal gift-giving through translation, where he gifts the text with a snapshot of a larger and ongoing process of influence and borrowing. While Paz may take back one element of the gifts from the Spanish tradition he added to Nerval through translation, he leaves behind many others.

***Versiones* by Rosario Castellanos: Literary Translation and Self-Fashioning**

Where Paz separates the function of a poet from that of a translator, at least in theory, Castellanos makes no such pretense of objectivity as either reality or aim. She uses the term “oficio” to describe and combine the range of writerly tasks she and her literary models fulfill, including that of translator. This difference between Paz and Castellanos in their placement of literary translation should not surprise, considering how greatly their poetic works, essays, and personas as public intellectuals differ. For Castellanos, the “oficio” of a writer represents a messy and uncomfortable combination

of passionate vocation and professional responsibility; privileged position of broad vision and the terrifying responsibility that comes with it; the opportunity to be in an ethical relationship to educate or even create a new public and the compromised reality of self-promotion and self-serving that comes with any participation in lettered culture—especially with forms of recognition or success (Castellanos “El escritor y su público” in *Juicios sumarios* 401-11). The ambivalence of this “office” redoubles if that writer is a Mexican woman, as she explores in her poem “Última crónica” (*Materia memorable* 48-52). In this free-verse lyric with narrative qualities—as suggested by the title—the poetic speaker is privileged to witness the ritual mutilation of a female body in an imagined space dedicated to upholding cultural tradition. Unlike the charmed confidence of the poetic speaker of Paz’s version of Nerval’s “Délfica” that all lost traditions will be returned and witnessed once more, the speaker in Castellanos arrives at a far darker conclusion about this role. Playing the role of scribe to the oracle, the poetic voice at first wears this “oficio” with pride. Soon, however, the cruel reality she witnesses reduces her to a babbling automaton, mindlessly repeating platitudes which she knows to be lies.

Castellanos, like other female writers bearing witness to her time, uses the poetic register to make some of her strongest statements that reflect an unmet demand for intellectual recognition. Castellanos used her platform as one of the first female public intellectuals in Mexico and her position writing for the newspaper the *Excélsior* along with other literary magazines and supplements to introduce the Spanish-speaking public to a wide range of female authors in Spanish and other languages. In her comparative work on Castellanos, Cecilia Meireles, and Gabriela Mistral, Karen Peña claims that all three use lyric poetry to “reinscribe themselves as intellectuals and voice their strong

opinions ...[because] poetry offered glimpses of other mythic worlds and new associations of meaning” naming Castellanos as one who connects language itself with “patriarchal institutions [that] forbid women to convey their realities” (1). Peña also cites her poem “Última crónica,” and I would describe this piece as one of many works by Castellanos in which the poetic speaker is identified as a female thinker or writer struggling to bear witness through language:

He descargado el látigo para hacerme saber
que no tengo atributos de juez y que **mi oficio**
es solo de amanuense.

Y me dicta mentiras: vocablos desgastados
por el rumiar constante de la plebe.

Y continúo aquí, abyecta, la tarea
de repetir *grandeza, libertad, justicia, paz, sabiduría*
y... y... no entiendo ya
este demente y torpe balbuceo.

(Castellanos *Materia memorable* 52)

Despite initial expressions of pride, on her return to society, the poetic speaker finds herself repeating the words of one in power, repeating his words to describe the violence she has witnessed as “*grandeza, libertad, justicia, paz, amor, sabiduría*” (52). The moment when the speaker cannot go on, stammering, refers to and rewrites the line from “Cántico espiritual” by San Juan de la Cruz, in which the speaker is overwhelmed by the

grace of God and the beauty of Nature. In his direct address to these powerful figures, who he calls respectively “Amado” and “Esposa,” San Juan’s writes:

Y todos cuantos vagan
de ti me van mil gracias refiriendo,
y todos más me llagan
y déjame muriendo
un no sé qué que quedan balbuciendo

(San Juan de la Cruz v. 31-5)

Just like the speaker in San Juan de la Cruz, the speaker in Castellanos’s poem is left undone, speechless. Yet in the work by the mystic poet, the speaker experiences speechlessness as the sublime intensity of meaning and God’s greatness read through the grandness of nature. He cannot go on, babbling, but the poem does go on to further enumerate these “mil gracias” that initially set back the speaker. In a dramatic reversal of his phrase, the speaker in Castellanos instead experiences not a loss of speech but a loss of meaning, a horrific reaction to a new truth that turns the most meaningful words in society into babbling. Her poem ends there, with the speaker realizing that her treasured, honored “oficio” as a witness to a cultural ritual of meaning-making has actually turned her into an “abject” accomplice, force to repeat something that is now nothing more than “demented and hopeless babbling.” The ambivalence with which Castellanos describes her “oficio” as a writer, here in this poem and elsewhere in essay form, carries into her translation work.

The term “oficio” can be traced through different works by Castellanos as keyword that “defined the relationship of the writer to her reading public in ethical terms

[...] a term she uses to combine the ideas of vocation and service” (O’Connell 211). I would add to this observation that this term additionally figures at times as a burden or a threat. Primarily, Castellanos appears to use it to denote a position of ethical relationship to a public, a vocation, a spiritual office or service, but also a series of professional or interpersonal expectations, or even the oldest profession in the world of prostitution. She gives the term pride of place in the title of her second novel *Oficio de tinieblas* (translated by Ester Allen as *Book of Lamentations*).³² In essays and other poems in addition to “Última crónica,” she uses the malleability of “oficio” to relate her sense of pride and responsibility in her role as a writer to her other concerns about the limitations of that role as constructed around an idealized set of qualities, conditions, and expectations about the gender, race, or class positions that align or fail to align with that role. In her essay about translating Claudel, she notes that in order to write his caustic, daring dramatic works, he needed to put aside his “oficio” as a diplomat for a moment. She herself may have needed to learn how to do the same in her own writing.

Castellanos does not translate as extensively as Paz or Pacheco, and compared to other poets who translated in her circle, Castellanos’s poetic reputation is not generally associated with her work as a translator.³³ Yet I contend that analyzing her translation

³² Although the translation is excellent, this title over-emphasizes one of the many sides of “oficio” in Castellanos’s thought. The original title does evoke the lamentable state of grasping in darkness, but also work to be done, work that can accomplish something, even find a way out of darkness. In her translator’s note, Allen writes that “*Oficio de tinieblas* “is the name of the Roman Catholic service known in English as Tenebrae (Latin for darkness). During the Tenebrae service, which is observed in the final part of holy Week, all candles in the church are progressively extinguished until only one remains lit, in commemorations of Christ’s sufferings and death. The lesson or Bible reading that accompanies the Tenebrae service is taken from Lamentations, the Old Testament book attributed to the prophet Jeremiah; thence the books’ English title” (xiii). While it is clear that the title is connected to these religious markers, within Castellanos’s thought, the term “oficio” tends to be more than religious vocation or ritual, it also invokes the glad privilege of meaningful work and the attendant challenges and rewards.

³³ For example, in the obituary in *Revista Iberoamericana* about the deaths in 1974 of Jaime Torr s Bodet, Salvador Novo, and Rosario Castellanos, both of the other authors receive comment about their translations, where for Castellanos this is not mentioned.

work and essays referencing literary translation illuminate her vision of the “office” of the writer. Furthermore, they provide a valuable counterpoint to the translation theory and practice of Paz for several reasons. First, his journal *Plural* apparently published a harsh critique of her translations.³⁴ Second, while she calls her translations “versions,” she takes the idea further than Paz in her essay “Traduciendo a Claudel,” implying that each source text is only a “version” itself.

To my knowledge, her only published translations are the *versiones* ending her 1969 chapbook *Materia memorable* and recollected in *Poesía no eres tú: Obra poética: 1948-1971*, her collected poems published in 1972: nine short lyric poems by Emily Dickinson (Amherst, Massachusetts, USA; 1830-1886), the “Oda segunda: El espíritu y el agua” from *Cinq odes* by Paul Claudel (France; 1868-1955), and the prose poem “Marcas” by St-John Perse (Guadeloupe 1887-France 1975). Unlike Paz, her translation choices are not based on the personal coincidence of travel and diplomacy, but rather a different affinity. While she writes many essays about language politics and the situation of the female writer in Mexico, she only has one essay dealing directly with literary translation, “Traduciendo a Claudel.” In this essay, she does not refer directly to Paz or to any of his translation models such as Alfonso Reyes or Ezra Pound. Instead of claiming

³⁴ In an interview with Cynthia Steele, Elena Poniatowska responds to questions about her participation in the literary sphere of Mexico D.F. in the 1950s, 60s, and 1970s, specifically asking about the irreverent satire *Melés y Teleo* she wrote as a theatrical *roman à clef*, where characters represent the major Mexican authors of her day. Describing her relationship to the members of that circle, she says: “En general no quieren a las mujeres. Hay que ver cómo hablaron de las traducciones de Rosario Castellanos, quien tradujo, a mi juicio, bastante bien a Emily Dickinson y a St. John Perse y a Paul Claudel y entonces la deshicieron en la revista de Octavio Paz que entonces se llamaba *Plural* y ahora se llama *Vuelta*” (Poniatowska 90). While this statement may only reflect Poniatowska’s impressions of the accessibility of *Plural* to women authors, she suggests ways in which Castellanos specifically as a translator came into conflict with views held by Paz. Unfortunately, I have not yet located the issue or the article in *Plural* to which she refers, where Castellanos is critiqued for her translations. Given Poniatowska’s reference to the journal as *Plural*, she must have meant one or more articles or reviews published when the literary supplement was called *Plural* (1971-1976) before it was renamed *Vuelta*. She may be referring to a review of *Poesía no eres tú* published in 1972; this collection of Castellanos’ poems includes her *versiones*.

these authorities, she describes the act of translation itself as an act of self-authorization, one that she uses alongside her poetry and essays to develop a public sphere for female intellectuals in Mexico. She may have had a religious affinity with Paul Claudel, a dramatist and poet open about his Catholicism. When reflecting on her collected poems in the essay “Si ‘poesía no eres tú,’ entonces ¿qué?” she describes taking the formal qualities of Saint-John Perse’s prose-like poetry for her own poem “Lamentación de Dido” (*Mujer que sabe latín...* 201-2).³⁵ In this chapter, I will focus on her translations of Emily Dickinson and the other essays and poems in which Castellanos incorporates the Amherst poet into her intellectual framework and claims her voice in order to go a different way.

Where Paz theoretically encourages poets who translate to strenuously resist the mapping of their own voice and poetic obsessions, Rosario Castellanos goes in another direction, embracing individuality through feminism, and translating in an autobiographical mode. Castellanos gestures toward translation as: (1) an act of self-knowledge through *both* recognition (of shared sensibilities) and acceptance (of one’s

³⁵ A future project could analyze “Lamentación de Dido” alongside the translation of Perse’s “Marcas” while also asking to what extent Castellanos inserted her own biographical experiences into this translation, as she does with her translations of Dickinson. In the case of her original poem, Castellanos connects it directly to her experiences of frustrated love both before and during her marriage. In the essay mentioned above, Castellanos describes herself as “soltera contra mi voluntad” and describes the simplicity of her writing style as part of her rejection of “los aspectos más obvios de la feminidad” (201). Yet her style changes dramatically with the long, porous prose lines of “Lamentación de Dido,” which she claims coincides with experiences of love and betrayal, given form by poetic tradition through the story by Virgil and the form by Perse. “Pero, como decía san Agustín, el corazón es lo que pesa. ... El sufrimiento es tan grande que desborda el vaso de nuestro cuerpo y va a la búsqueda de recipientes más capaces. Encuentra la figuras paradigmáticas de la tradición. Dido, que eleva la trivialidad de la anécdota (¿hay algo más trivial que una mujer burlada y que un hombre inconstante?) al majestuoso ámbito en que resuena la sabiduría de los siglos. La *Lamentación de Dido* es, además de percance individual, la convergencia de dos lecturas: Virgilio y Saint-John Perse. Uno me proporciona la materia y el otro la forma. Y sobreviene el instante privilegiado del feliz acoplamiento y del nacimiento del poema” (201-2). Calling the poem a “personal setback” or “incident,” she focuses on the coupling of her readings rather than the implied other coupling of her unfaithful husband. In short, Castellanos takes a self-satirizing approach to connecting her personal experiences with the literature she writes; perhaps a similar self-satire is at work in the Perse translation.

own tastes and needs, even if shameful) (2) a gift of plenitude in times of scarcity or writer's block; and (3) an important part of reframing a Mexican literary canon away from a language developed for the needs of Spaniards on the Iberian peninsula.

Versions and Options: The *Oficio* of a Woman Who Writes

As a female public intellectual, Castellanos wrote essays on themes of language, literature, and gender as both strategies of power and possible tactics of resistance. She studies the feminine experience in the Mexican public sphere, often using a newly international feminist discourse to do so, thereby projecting her perspective in a new way both within Mexico and internationally. Castellanos does write about the construction of a canon of female and feminist predecessors, and some of her essays in *El uso de la palabra* approach a language philosophy from her everyday perspective. Even though this often involves going beyond the Mexican and Spanish-language contexts—in essays and translations on Dickinson, Simone de Beauvoir, Virginia Woolf—she often connects her work to her own everyday life as an intellectual woman, a mother, a diplomat, and an indigenista activist. She writes about the Spanish language as an instrument of domination and frames Mexican poetry as beginning with the indigenous poetic works that had only recently been translated into Spanish in her essays “Notas al margen: El lenguaje como instrumento de dominio” (1973) and “Notas para una antología imaginaria” (in *Juicios sumarios*). These works display her hope for the transformative power of her “oficio” as essayist and poet, but also her concern and deep ambivalence that the tool of domination may not be able to liberate.

Castellanos was the first Mexican writer to bring topics and figures traditionally understood as feminine into public discourse while also adopting an unapologetically casual, sometimes brash, and always accessible register to do so, as Joanna O’Connell and Peña demonstrate.³⁶ O’Connell summarizes her work as fitting into three forms of feminist discourse: “those that talk directly about women make Mexican women’s lives visible; those with other themes offer a feminist critique of the clichés, prejudices, norms, and myths that define and constrain Mexican society; finally, the essays as a body are themselves exemplary because with them Castellanos performs publicly, in a mass forum, as a female intellectual and as a legitimate, active participant in Mexican cultural production” (O’Connell 209). She goes on to state that the rhetorical strategies Castellanos uses to achieve this impact and to reframe the image of the female in Mexican letters “include engendering the writing voice as female, placing female experiences at the center of the work, and using an array of strategies of double-voiced discourse” (O’Connell 225). Translation should be considered one of these strategies, as I will demonstrate using her essays about translation and her translations themselves.

Rosario Castellanos creates her own paradoxical definition of literary translation for the practitioner in her essay “Traduciendo a Claudel” included in *Mujer que sabe latín* (1973), a definition in which a writer can both find and lose herself in translating another writer. Paul Claudel (1868-1955) was a French poet and dramatist known for writing plays in verse, and he and Castellanos shared the experience of serving their country as a

³⁶ Peña compares her with Chilean Nobel Prize winner Gabriela Mistral and Brazilian modernist poet Cecilia Meireles, an earlier generation of South American female poets and public intellectuals who maintained more conservative poetic forms. Describing Castellanos as the “most realistic” and the “most relaxed in style” of the three, Peña demonstrates that Castellanos benefits from these earlier models while breaking new ground in Mexico (Peña 6).

diplomat. Much like Paz, she acknowledges different attitudes toward translation, different needs writers may express through the act of translation. But unlike Paz, in the four different perspectives on translation she describes, none entertains or idealizes the concept of an objective translator, as Paz imagines should theoretically be possible, or at least should serve as an orienting goal. She describes the translator as an ambitious usurper taking power from the oppressor; she imagines translation as a way to embody the other which may be a projection of the translator's fantasies or fears of the other; also a way to participate in writing even during writer's block or other "dry spells;" and lastly, she considers translation as a path writers take to write precisely what they are unable to say or write themselves, but that they would like to have written. Unlike Paz and his vision of an ideal translator who is a poet who can put himself aside, Castellanos imagines translation as a way for writers to find or access parts of themselves that might otherwise not be expressed. Where Paz imagines himself as a translator gifting his versions to authors, to his own language tradition, Castellanos figures the translator as the recipient of gifts. In each of these four situations, the gifts may be of power, of perspective on the other, of activity and work, or of a new voice in which to write. Castellanos begins her essay sketching out four different attitudes towards translation, distinct ideological, psychological, practical, or aesthetic reasons to translate. Some are directly in contradiction, as though she is spinning the dial of possible motivations.

Castellanos begins by challenging the idea of translation as betrayal while also accepting the premise of the metaphor. "No traiciona sino el siervo y no se traiciona sino a quien se obedece, a quien se está sometido. Y el traductor es un súbdito ambicioso que aspira, fundamentalmente, a usurpar" (1997). In this first vision of translation, there is an

element of a thymotic urge to demonstrate worthiness: the translator does not betray, in an empty revenge project that simply destroys what the more powerful figure (the author) may have. Instead, the translator usurps, gifts the author with the sense of powerlessness that the translator may have. Sloterdijk's vision of rage as an urge to give excess suffering or powerlessness away applies to the perspective Castellanos expresses about literary translation.

Her second representation of translation describes beautifully the insights a writer might gain from attempting to embody another writer, to dress up in the self of another:

Ser, durante un breve momento, la encarnación de *el otro*, admirado a distancia; intentar **disfrazarse** usando sus **investiduras**, duplicar sus **gestos**, sus **entonaciones** e ir más allá de lo que la imagen pública ofrece y exhibe y penetrar en la intimidad en la que *el otro* no es más que una criatura atormentada por sus fantasmas, perseguida por sus demonios, obsesionada por algunas figuras, por algunas asociaciones de palabras, por algunas urgencias oscuras que claman por su acceso a la claridad (1997; emphasis added).

She uses words associated with stagecraft to consider the performance of translation: the translator dresses up in costume, imitates, and modulates the voice to duplicate the author. Yet this duplicating performance is not merely enacted to recreate analogous effects in a new language. This performance, again, figures as a gift to the translator who can now, by performing like the writer, gain access to something behind the public persona of an admired author, to “penetrate” something true and vulnerable about them. The author is revealed as no more powerful or talented or strong than anyone else,

because to translate is to see clearly that every writer has their obsessions, their favorite words and associations, their fantasies or demons. This supports my idea of an autobiographical element to her translations—even if it is only a performance of an autobiographical reading. Choosing authors with similar “demons” or “obsessions,” in the light of this essay, becomes a way to make peace with her own possession by those same figures. To translate an author, then, allows for clarity on one’s own state as a “tormented creature” driven by certain writerly concerns or favorite concepts returned to again and again in different writing projects.

In her third representation of literary translation, she envisions it as a practice of utility, a way to work through what she calls “etapas de sequedad” or “dry spells” in the life of a writer. This contradicts the first definition—that there is a rebellious usurper inside every translator—because in this case the translator is represented as seeking out a happy and blessed docility to the author as though to a master.

Traducir es, también, dar a las “etapas de sequedad” de las que se lamentan los místicos una apariencia laboriosa y fecunda. La mano cesa de entretenerse en trazar dibujos caprichosos y sin sentido en redactar textos cuya unanimidad alcanza una total evidencia desde el momento en que surgen. **La mano es dócil** al dictado de una forma no sólo viable sino viva y se ejercita en seguir los lineamientos seguros y conclusos del autor hasta llegar, **con él**, a la feliz culminación y al cumplimiento total (1997; emphasis added).

I find it interesting how frequently in Castellanos’s work she gives the author a masculine gender—while it is the neutral in Spanish, it is a part of the gendered construction of

author as male and translator as female that Castellanos plays into in this essay. In this case, Castellanos's vision of the translator taking advantage of the "unity" of the work echoes the part of Paz's essay, where she distinguishes the work of creation from that of translation by precisely that reality: a translator knows what the completed work should look like. Yet for Paz, this is a challenge to a writer. For Castellanos, this can be a comfort, a mystical, or even erotic, freedom in submission. In this case, the translator receives a gift of choice, to be able to choose the clarity of following in the footsteps of another author's previous activity rather than the uncertainty of doodling something new.

The fourth suggestion Castellanos makes is that we translate precisely what we are unable to say or write ourselves but that we would like to have written. Yet this desire to have written the work of another is expressed as both admiration and shame:

Entre las inagotables probabilidades de traducir se elige aquello que, de cierta manera, dice lo que nosotros, de ninguna manera, somos capaces de decir. Aquello que hubiéramos querido haber descubierto, formulado, inventado. Aquello que corresponde, con bastante exactitud, a las exigencias de nuestro temperamento, a las orientaciones de nuestro trabajo, a las necesidades—vergonzantes o explícitas—de nuestra expresión (997).

This last line connects the "needs" or the "demands" of writers to the choices they may make as translators. In clarification, she appears to say the act of choosing may be the same regardless of whether these temperamental demands are either "shameful or explicit." Recalling Sloterdijk and his corrective interest in thymos as opposed to eros, I would highlight that both of these forms can be seen as desire for recognition rather than

a desire for satisfaction of a lack. Her strange formulation appears to create equivalence between contradictory positions: the desire to have been the one to write something and the potential shame for wanting to express oneself that way. The phrase “vergonzantes o explicitas” pairs the needs or tastes made “explicit” in a writer’s own works with those other demands or tastes that remain less expressed. Tastes or interests that are expressed or unexpressed in a writer’s work can find correspondence in their choices of texts to translate. I connect this to thymos and the concept of a spectrum of affect that ranges between generosity and rage depending on the strength of an individual and the health of their recognition within their society. Speaking specifically about women, the rage or the shame angle may be more thoroughly inhabited, given what Castellanos describes elsewhere as the many generations in which women were not welcome as writers, thinkers, or even fully human subjects.

Although Castellanos does imply that she draws from her own experience translating one of Claudel's *Five Odes*, the only work she mentions in the essay is a different work entirely, his play *L'échange*. The early section of the essay covers the four general and theoretical points related to translation outlined above. Yet the logical inconsistency of the essay as a whole—discussing a work that she did *not* translate—begs the question of who is “Translating Claudel,” really. In my reading, the oblique argument of the essay is that Claudel translated himself. He made a “second version” of his play nearly fifty years later, where he draws out the Catholic elements of the play, which were more implicit in the first version. As she posits, translating allows translators to write in a way they needed to write, but cannot or have not written yet—or even are ashamed to try. The act of translation, therefore, gives the translator a gift of this needed writing

experience. The text that forms the basis of this gift could be penned by another, or it could be penned by that other person one was, fifty years earlier. In an unresolved paradoxical move, Castellanos defines translation as a mirror that can show writers both what they would have liked to achieve and what they might be ashamed or embarrassed to have written themselves, but nevertheless are drawn to translate. Translations can fill the needs of a writer that are explicit in their own work or that are shameful, and they reflect the time and place of the translator more than the source.

Her “versiones” make up a significant portion of her collected volume of poetry *Materia memorable* (1969), around two-thirds of the poetry in this volume. Because of this imbalance between her original work and her translations, I read Castellanos’s title as one of her self-deprecating, self-critical, paradoxical satires on the narcissism of the lyric poet. She performs an outsize humility, classifying very little of her own work as “memorable.” In her article on the essays and journalism of Castellanos titled “The Ambivalence of Power,” Martha LaFollette Miller takes a psychoanalytic approach to understanding the ambivalent discourse the highly successful author constructs around her own persona and platform. Citing Bloom on the dynamic of competition available to male authors (174), she demonstrates that, in her columns, when Castellanos performs the power and freedom she has achieved as a writer, she immediately undercuts herself with a display of feminine weakness, ambivalence about her worthiness, or a direct negation of her abilities (Miller 168-71). I concur with Miller that Castellanos is strikingly consistent in pairing her achievements with her humanity, humility, and vulnerabilities expressed in gendered terms. Yet I would add to her psychoanalytical reading of this state of affairs a thymotic reading. In these self-deprecating moments, Castellanos does more

than “appease” (174). She also expresses a desire for recognition of the female person she actually is, and while doing so, she is claiming space for other female writers. The title also refers to the work by French philosopher Henri Bergson *Matière et mémoire: Essai sur la relation du corps à l’esprit* (1896). Although the two titles may sound similar, Bergson creates a sharp distinction between matter and memory, the body and the spirit. In her poems and translations, Castellanos counters this conceptual division, often positing a female body as a remembering body or a body that is both memorable and holding societal memory and history within it.

The Dialectic of Dominion and Liberation in Spanish

I analyze Castellanos’s translations in the contexts of her essays about the “oficio” of the female Mexican writer. In “Divagación sobre el idioma” Castellanos frames her meditation on Spanish as a response to a question from an Austrian correspondent who asked: “si el idioma representa un problema para mí en tanto que escritora” (161). In responding, she realizes that it is not just as a female writer but as a “mexicana” she is troubled by language. To avoid “feeling like a hopeless or unique case,” Castellanos develops a theory: “la teoría de que el castellano es un idioma creado por un pueblo profundamente diferente al nuestro, con otros antecedentes históricos, otro temperamento, otras circunstancias, otros proyectos, otras necesidades expresivas” (161). While this essay takes a comic approach to diagnosing this problem and exemplifying its display in contemporary discourse, other essays take a more constructive and prescriptive approach. In *Mujer que sabe latín...* (1973), Castellanos pairs two essays in a dialectical argument about the status of the Spanish language in Mexico: “Notas al margen: El

lenguaje como instrumento de dominio” and “El lenguaje, posibilidad de liberación.” The first essay describes a dark vision of languages as an ultimately brutal and normalizing force on the side of power. Castellanos identifies the performance of correct or eloquent Spanish as one factor in structures of racialized power divisions in Mexico.³⁷ She even goes so far as to reference the butterflies and the “princesa está triste” of Rubén Darío as examples of the over-handled words that come from the colonial and post-colonial situation of Spanish as a performance of *criollo* elitism. Encouraging her fellow writers to avoid this mistake, she charges them with making words “evident” in themselves, not “gratuitous” (980).³⁸ Her hope is that writers will value “exactitude” and will ensure that “[l]a palabra es la flecha que da en ‘su’ blanco” (980). Castellanos depicts here the difficult position of the writer—and by extension the translator—in Mexico, where there may be a social imperative fueling a desire for eloquence, a status-driven need to value precision, clarity, hitting the target.

In the companion essay “El lenguaje, posibilidad de liberación,” she expresses hope that language may also provide a mechanism, if not to undo the colonial history of Spanish, at least to add onto it a new interest the relational value of the language. She ends describing the case in which language liberates: not when used between equally free parties, but between those who *desire* one another to be equal and free.

³⁷ “Lo importante entonces era ostentar signos de distinción que evidenciaran, a primera vista y a los ojos de cualquier extraño, el rango que se ocupaba en la sociedad. El color de la piel decía mucho pero no todo; había que añadir la pureza y la antigüedad de la fe y algo más: la propiedad de los medios orales de expresión” (“El uso del lenguaje como instrumento de dominio” in *Obras*, 978).

³⁸ “Pueden ser complejas, pueden regirse por un orden que produzca placer en el contemplador. Lo que ya no les está permitido volver a ser nunca es gratuitas. Las palabras han sido dotadas de sentido y el que las maneja profesionalmente han sido dotadas de sentido y el que las maneja profesionalmente no está facultado para despojarlas de ese sentido sino al contrario, comprometido a evidenciarlo, a hacerlo patente en cada instante, en cada instancia” (980).

El sentido de la palabra es su destinatario: el otro que escucha, que entiende y que, cuando responde, convierte a su interlocutor en el que escucha y el que entiende, estableciendo así la relación del diálogo que sólo es posible entre **quienes se consideran y se tratan como iguales** y que sólo es fructífero entre **quienes se quieren libres** (Castellanos, “El lenguaje, posibilidad de liberación” in *Obras II*, 980).

Castellanos frames equality and freedom among all interlocutors as deferred desires, not necessarily preconditions for language to liberate. Her discussion of literary translation in Mexico also fits within this hope to use the office of writer and public intellectual to position her own use of language to expand equality for women and indigenous people. In my reading, this formulation may echo some of the qualities of the gift theory of Mauss: the giver and receiver do not need to both be equal, but they need to want one another to be free, they need to want to give to someone capable of giving back. The desire to give to someone who cannot give back is the desire to turn someone into your slave or servant—this is not a gift. This paired set of essays responds to a key element in any reciprocal ethics of translation. Castellanos writes through her recognition that the domination of a multi-lingual and multi-ethnic indigenous population became one of the primary functions of the Spanish language in Mexico while she also expresses her commitment to the hope that language can also liberate.

Liberation requires self-definition and knowledge, and Castellanos dwells on questions of canon formation in her essay “Notas para una antología imaginaria:” who determines a literary canon, who authors that canon, and how canon formation can change. While she does celebrate the translations from indigenous languages by Ángel

María Garibay and Miguel León-Portilla as important correctives to the formation of the Mexican literary tradition, this essay assumes that the conditions through which a canon should be formed do not yet exist. Castellanos defines poetry as a human spiritual activity related to science, religion, philosophy, and morality. She defines a “tradición” as the qualities of a poetry that contains a confluence of different styles, where the concerns remain even as styles change with time. In Mexico, the poetic tradition begins with what she calls “prehispanic civilization” because it includes the testimonies, monuments, and responses to their art forms, especially in the visual arts. She expresses frustration that only recently has translation demonstrated that this tradition includes valuable lyric poetry and other literary genres in addition to the plastic arts.³⁹ Referring to a lack of attention to the documents and literary qualities of indigenous cultures, she praises the work of translators who have brought materials into Spanish that will allow for a more thorough vision of the Mexican literary tradition, freed from the “prejudice” that the pre-Columbian world lacked skill with language:

Al padre Angel María Garibay y al doctor Miguel León Portilla debemos el haber rectificado opinión tan errónea. Ahora que se han exhumado papeles y traducido textos sabemos con certeza que las civilizaciones prehispanicas no sólo practicaron, con dominio y soltura, todos los géneros literarios, sino que en la poesía lírica alcanzaron grados de excelencia que nada tienen que pedir a los de las naciones más privilegiadas. (*Juicios sumarios* 139)

³⁹ “La falta de investigaciones, la ignorancia de los documentos, había sustentado el prejuicio de que los indios, admirables creadores de monumentos arquitectónicos, maestros en las artes plásticas, carecieron del ‘don de la palabra’” (*Juicios sumarios* 139).

In this essay, her praise of translators of the indigenous Mexican tradition serves as another example of Castellanos's interest in connecting the "oficio del escritor" to an ethos of collectivity, social relevance, and utility. She also specifically connects the translators of this tradition with the cultures they translate, implying that their "oficio" as translators shares a social function with the indigenous poets themselves.

El poeta indígena, a diferencia del europeo, no hacía **uso de su oficio** para cantar emociones o meditaciones individuales sino que servía, al través del poema y en el anonimato de un trabajo colectivo, a los intereses de la tribu. Unas veces consignando sus hazañas, otras encerrando en fórmulas de fácil recordación sus creencias o dando un desahogo a sus sentimientos. El poema debía ser acicate para el guerrero, consejo para el gobernante, oración para el sacerdote, guía para el cronista (139).

This list of functions for the poem or the office of the poet recalls Castellanos's own description of her task as a female writer, which includes the recording of deeds, advising, praying, guiding. For her, the Mexican poetic tradition will always be more than the Spanish language: it is Hispanic culture as reconstituted by and grafted onto the pre-Hispanic indigenous cultural base. There is a social function and a valuable labor that the poet is needed to fulfill—a function that Castellanos connects to both the act of translating indigenous poetry and the act of writing poetry from a female perspective.

Poetic Avatars and Cautionary Tales: Castellanos on Dickinson

In the following, I demonstrate the way Castellanos receives gifts from Dickinson as one of her avatars for thinking through the challenges of building a female writerly

life. I will then discuss the gifts she gives to Dickinson in her translations. Despite her wariness about the biographical interpretations of Dickinson's poems, I discern an autobiographical quality in Castellanos's translations of the Amherst poet. Her Dickinson translations are rooted in feminism and a search for models for her own voice.⁴⁰ In the poem "Meditación en el umbral," Emily Dickinson appears as one of a series of insufficient "solutions" available to women to solve the question of how to "be human and free." This challenge of self-definition and access to humanity appears to particularly affect women with a literary sensibility in this poem; the problem is not just how to access the freedom to make literature but how to make a free life. I quote the poem in full as an illustration of her placement with other women of intellect, fictional and historical:

No, no es la solución
tirarse bajo un tren como la Ana de Tolstoi
ni apurar el arsénico de Madame Bovary
ni aguardar en los páramos de Ávila la visita
del ángel con venablo
antes de liarse el manto a la cabeza
y comenzar a actuar.

No concluir las leyes geométricas, contando
las vigas de la celda de castigo
como lo hizo Sor Juana. No es la solución

⁴⁰ In another project, I analyze translations of Emily Dickinson into Spanish through Quine's principle of indeterminacy in translation, considering the range of different, valid, but incompatible translations of her work by poets including Juan Ramón Jiménez, Rosario Castellanos, Silvina Ocampo, and Nuria Amat.

escribir, mientras llegan las visitas,
en la sala de estar de la familia Austen
ni encerrarse en el ático
de alguna residencia de la Nueva Inglaterra
y soñar, con la Biblia de los Dickinson
debajo de una almohada de soltera.

Debe haber otro modo que no se llame Safo
ni Mesalina ni María Egípcíaca
ni Magdalena ni Clemencia Isaura.

Otro modo de ser humano y libre.

Otro modo de ser.

(Castellanos, *Poesía no eres tú* 316)

She begins with two fictional feminine suicides, title characters and protagonists who took control of their narratives with fatal solutions that are not recommended (Anna Karenina and Madame Bovary). Castellanos soon moves to historical figures in her own tradition, Santa Teresa de Ávila and Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. While Santa Teresa appears in the poem as free to roam in the outdoors in the “páramos de Ávila” or the “meadows of Ávila,” she is also depicted as intellectually cloistered, needing, waiting passively for the “angel with the dart” before she “tightened her veil / to begin to act” (my rough translations). The vocabulary of Dickinson anticipates her arrival in the poem,

the “páramos de Ávila” could be described in many ways, but using the word “páramo” connects this original work with the translation by Castellanos “Jamás he visto un páramo,” her version of the Dickinson poem “I never saw a meadow.”

The poem groups the first three figures together, and while two are fictional and one a historical author, all are women who had range of movement and even access to a bucolic country life, but who nevertheless came up against the walls of limitations on their intellectual horizons imposed by gender norms. The second stanza groups together three women experiencing forms of confinement: Sor Juana and the cloister of her habit and the convent; Jane Austen and the cloister of her status as an unmarried woman who did not take her place as a spinster head of her father’s household; and Emily Dickinson who chose her seclusion, but nevertheless chose experience most of her adventures intellectually or through correspondence and family relationships rather than venturing from her family home.

From there, the third stanza jumps even further back in history and hagiography to mention the Greek poet and favorite historical lesbian Sappho, the ascetic Saint Mary of Egypt famed for living alone in the desert, Valeria Messallina, wife and rumored promiscuous betrayer of Roman Emperor Claudius, Mary Magdalene the disciple whom the church later conflated with prostitutes who also kept company with Jesus, and Clemencia Isaura, the Provençal sponsor of floral and poetic competitions. These women become shorthand for the way history, the Catholic faith, and the world of literature has sidelined them and reduced them to a one-dimensional stereotype or cautionary tale. The poem ends by positing but not confirming that there must be another way: the limits of her models imply a hint of the “brink” on which Castellanos’ speaker imagines herself to

be. She must plunge into an unknown where these social codes can be rejected, but what replaces them may not yet be visible.

Castellanos makes a similar argument in essay form in “Otra vez Sor Juana,” her critique of the recent psychoanalytic reading of the Decima Musa and her work by German scholar Ludwig Pflandel. Through her analysis of Sor Juana, she also argues against the tendency to read women’s lives in certain ways, which creates a trap for female intellectuals that their work is always read in reference to a very limited set of female biographical tropes (whore, mother, Madonna, monster, madwoman). Castellanos asserts that, within her poetry, Sor Juana figures her femininity as a “hypothesis” rather than a conclusion or explanation (*Juicios sumarios* 27). Castellanos cites Romance 48: “Yo no entiendo de esas cosas; / sólo sé que aquí me vine / porque, si es que soy mujer, / ninguno lo verifique” (27). Castellanos is pointing at the irony that the renewed interest in Sor Juana’s work has also meant a revival of an image of who she was—which can mean a refusal to assimilate parts of her ideas, an insistence on certain gendered readings. I consider Castellanos’s critique of the authorial position of the woman, or even of the indigenous person, within a written language that always constructed them as objects of speech but not as speakers. Translating a female author like Emily Dickinson puts her in the position to both entertain and negate autobiographical interpretations of her work.

Unlike these other avatars of feminine self-determination, some tragic, some admirable but out of reach, Castellanos pays Emily Dickinson further homage by translating her work. In the first instance of publishing these translations, she includes them within her weekly column along with a contextualizing essay titled “Una mujer

singular: Emily Dickinson” and published January 18, 1964 in the *Excelsior*.⁴¹ The essay included four translated poems; along with an additional five, these *versiones* feature in *Materia memorable*. Castellanos appropriated Dickinson’s work and voice as a precursor to the kind of female public intellectual Castellanos was working to become: one who included the private sphere in her public persona. She also invites her readers to do the same, to take on the same “oficio” or “vocation as she calls it in this context.

In this essay, Castellanos speaks to her reader with the assumption of a shared vocation. Implying that her readership will be other women writers, she observes that although literature has not always been accessible to women, “[l]as que nacimos en este siglo encontramos mucho terreno desbrozado, mucho camino abierto. Pero quienes nos precedieron tuvieron que alcanzar cierto grado de heroísmo para que su vocación se realizara en circunstancias adversas.” (Castellanos, “Una Mujer Singular” 258) Speaking with such a powerful “we” when discussing the life and poetry of Emily Dickinson implies the same degree of intimacy with her own readers that Dickinson enjoyed with hers, who were friends, family, recipients of her letters. In addition to envisioning this reading public as a potential writing community, Castellanos opts to phrase her analysis primarily as questions. Yet in translation, Castellanos finds a way to mesh her own personal biography with that of Dickinson, both leaving as an open question whether her poems can be sufficiently explained by her life, and vice versa, and inviting other female writers to use Dickinson as a way to think through ways of being.

Castellanos Translating Dickinson: Unapologetic Autobiographical Translation

⁴¹ To my knowledge, this essay was not reprinted until 2004 when Andrea Reyes edited the impressive three-volume collection *Mujer de palabras: Artículos rescatados de Rosario Castellanos*.

The short lyric “I never saw a meadow” takes on a different character in Spanish when Castellanos translates the first line as “Jamás he visto un páramo.” For a reader of Mexican literature, this phrase might echo the the vocabulary, if not also the themes, of the most influential novel of the mid-century Mexican environment, *Pedro Páramo* (1959) by Juan Rulfo. In a book where the title character is searched for but never seen, this Dickinson poem appears to fit well:

Jamás he visto un páramo
y no conozco el mar
pero sé cómo debe ser la ola
y cuál es la apariencia del brezal.

Con Dios no he hablado nunca
ni el cielo he visitado
pero estoy tan segura del lugar
como si en algún mapa lo hubieran señalado.

(Castellanos, *Materia* 71)

Giving this lyric pride of place at the end of her Dickinson versions, Castellanos transforms the English metric-syllabic verse into a lyric that approaches and then breaks with the *silva* form: two heptasyllabic lines, two hendecasyllables in the first stanza, followed by two heptasyllables, one hendecasyllable, and a final line of fourteen syllables, an alexandrine divided into two hemistiquios. In creating a final line that disrupts the previously established rhythm, she creates several new effects that swerve away from the source text by amplifying elements that are understated in the source

poem. Dickinson's original poem reads:

I never saw a Moor –
I never saw the Sea –
Yet know I how the Heather looks
And what a Billow be.

I never spoke with God,
Nor visited in heaven –
Yet certain am I of the spot
As if the Checks were given –

(Dickinson 480, #1052 in Johnson)

The Dickinson poem maintains the same metric foot count, (three, three, four, three) in both stanzas, matching the certainty of the unseen natural world with the same certainty in the unlocated spiritual realm. Dickinson alternates the images in the first stanza, with the first and third lines representing moor and heather and the second and fourth lines representing sea and wave. By contrast, Castellanos could be seen as even improving upon the poem by weaving the waves of heather on the moor more closely together. She also translates with a certain freedom to preserve the rhyme and relationships between words rather than their order in the source text. She preserves rhyme scheme by putting the “páramo” and the “brezal” on first and fourth lines, interspersed with “mar” and “ola.” Yet her choices to lengthen the final line adds to a mood of uncertainty, expands on the subjunctive verbal tense in the source. When Dickinson writes “As if the Checks were given” there is less uncertainty associated with “Checks,” which gains the authority

of the capitalized letter. These checks are not “given” but their existence is not called into question. Castellanos’s translation, “como si en algún mapa lo hubieran señalado” casts doubt on the very existence of the map, calling it merely “some map” undercuts the knowledge professed earlier in the poem.

When analyzing Dickinson’s poem “My life closed twice before its close –” in her essay “Una mujer singular,” Castellanos gives her reader the typical biographical interpretation of this work as referring to Dickinson’s two episodes of frustrated love, questions them, and then simply gives her translation of the poem as though it should be the only answer to its own interpretation.

Los biógrafos de Emily Dickinson se han desesperado buscando las causas de esta decisión [to sequester herself in her room.] La hipótesis más fácil ha sido, naturalmente, la de amores contrariados. El primero fue Leonard Humprey [sic], arrebatado por la muerte en años prematuros. El segundo fue George Gould, cuyas relaciones amorosas con Emily no fueron aprobadas por su padre. ¿Es a estos episodios a los que se refiere en uno de sus poemas más renombrados? (Castellanos, “Una mujer singular” 260)

Castellanos’s translation takes great liberty of meter, rhyme, vocabulary, and emotionality, yet it works well as a poem in Spanish in 1964, when confining the poet to the tetrameter followed by a trimeter formal scheme would have seemed old fashioned and unsuited for such an emotionally bleak poem:

Dos veces antes se cerró mi vida
y yo permanecí para mirar
si la Inmortalidad, sin velos, me guardaba

algún evento más;

concebido tan grande, ay, tan sin esperanza

como la doble llave de mi encierro.

La despedida es lo único que sabemos del cielo.

Y no necesitamos nada más del infierno.

(Materia memorable 67)

My life closed twice before its close –

It yet remains to see

If Immortality unveil

A third event to me

So huge, so hopeless to conceive

As these that twice befell.

Parting is all we know of heaven,

And all we need of hell.

(Dickinson 702-3; #1732 in Johnson)

Castellanos adds in the captivating image of the “doble llave” which makes her translation seem even more imprisoned than the original. Doors with old lock mechanisms sometimes can be locked twice for a deadbolt lock; the sound they make will echo with more finality and more entrapment than a regular, single lock. She also reuses the word “cerró” in a different form as “encierro” to give the same sense of repeated death and closing off that the poem speaks of. Whereas the original has this repetition in

the first line, Castellanos delays the second appearance of enclosure, again to increase the sense of claustrophobic, depressive, entrapment. She also activates the alternative meaning of “velo” or “wake” when she renders the “unveiling” as “sin velos” rather than “develar” or “revelar,” the choices Silvina Ocampo will make in another version of the same poem. The most poignant moment in this poem is also an invention by Castellanos. In the first line of the second stanza, she inserts an exclamation “ay” in the middle of a poem that tempered its emotionality although it is “so huge, so hopeless.” The pain contained in Castellanos’s line “concebido tan grande, ay, tan sin esperanza” reflects the deathly conclusion of Dickinson’s original. It could also convey the pain of her own “doble llave” or her two miscarriages before giving birth to her son.⁴² She also reorders the phrase to place more emphasis on “concebido” which in Spanish as in English shares the meaning of an abstract and a biological conception. Reading autobiographical information from the translator into their work may seem counterintuitive. However, in her essay “Translating Claudel,” Castellanos did acknowledge the reality that writers are drawn to translate works they relate to. Her essay questions critics’ interpretations of Dickinson’s poetry through the scant biographic information available about her life, a suspicion of biographical interpretation which she shares with many. Yet as a translator, she may at the same time use Dickinson’s original to express the pain of two major losses that made her doubt the possibility of a third event to measure up to that pain. Castellanos referred to these two experiences with miscarriage as motherhood; in one of her *Excelsior* columns, she summarizes her romantic history in the following way:

⁴² “Two miscarriages prior to the birth of her son, Gabriel Guerra Castellanos, in 1961, caused a sense of profound loss. Eventually she obtained a divorce. The poems in *Lívida luz* (1960) and *Materia memorable* (1962) [sic] reflect those experiences of grief, solitude, and rejection” (Ahern 4).

I remained single until the age of thirty-three, during which time I reached an extreme degree of isolation, confined in a tuberculosis asylum, and [then] working in an institute for Indians. I then entered a marriage that was strictly monogamous on my part and totally polygamous on my husband's. I had three children, of whom two died [through miscarriage]. I received my divorce papers when I was in Tel Aviv. (Castellanos, cited in Guillermprieto, viii).

As this column in the *Excelsior* demonstrates, Castellanos felt free to write about her experience with death, miscarriage, and motherhood under her own name. However, as the essay she writes about translation demonstrates, this may not have been enough. In her translation of Dickinson, Castellanos receives the gift of a space to write another poem about her own experiences. Unlike the other poems of her own composition in *Materia memorable* that express the speaker's proximity to death, this poem instead focuses on the feelings of confinement, waiting, uncertainty that come between brushes with death. She can write from the place after the two miscarriages that put her in touch with death twice, but before conceiving for the third time and bearing her son. Castellanos gifts Dickinson with the brash, emotional "ay!" exclaimed in the middle of the poem; Castellanos receives from Dickinson a subtle place from which to write about the confinement and isolation of life after great loss.

In addition to this translation, in which Castellanos receives the gift of a space in which to explore lyrically and with more distance, she also receives certain phrases from Dickinson, which I see appearing in some of the poems in the original works in *Materia memorable*. For example, in one of the two short lyric poems titled "Canción," she begins

with a line that could come from Dickinson: “I met a dove” (my translation). A two stanza *romance*, with regular octosyllabic lines, the poem begins in Dickinson’s voice, and then grows more brash, violent, ending with two lines that express the same limbo between life and death that she translated through in the poem above.

Yo conocí una paloma
con las dos alas cortadas;
andaba torpe, sin cielo,
en la tierra, desterrada.

La tenía en mi regazo
y no supe darle nada.
Ni amor, ni piedad, ni el nudo
que pudiera estrangularla.

(Castellanos, *Materia memorable* 32)

The identification of the humble bird and its plight with the speaker has echoes of Dickinson, who frequently uses images of communion or identification with birds, flowers, and bees in her poetry. The play on words in the line “en la tierra, desterrada” – the bird is out of place on land, so exiled from the sky, but the Spanish word “desterrada” instead of other options rings with a simple insight, a quality both poets share.

The two poets share a recurring treatment of the theme of feeling out of place on earth, of imagining death as a remedy for life rather than its end. In two poems, Castellanos echoes “’Tis not that Dying hurts us so,” which she translates as “Morir no hiere tanto.” The source poem reads:

'Tis not that Dying hurts us so –
'Tis Living – hurts us more –
But Dying – is a different way –
A Kind behind the Door –

The Southern Custom – of the Bird –
That ere the Frosts are due –
Accepts a better Latitude –
We – are the Birds – that stay.

The Shiverers round Farmers' doors –
For whose reluctant Crumb –
We stipulate – till pitying Snows
Persuade our Feathers Home.

(Dickinson 158-9; #335 in Johnson)

This poem frames the human condition as similar to the life of an unnatural, foolish bird unable or unwilling to obey instincts or migratory patterns. The “we” of the poetic speaker appears unable to choose to depart to warmer climes, and so must remain trembling, beholden to the Farmer’s crumb until the benevolent hand of a natural death comes as a release. The “hurt” and the “shiver” with which Dickinson describes this state of being appear amplified in the version by Castellanos. Her choices increase the violence of this physicalized experience of psychic pain, when she chooses words for “wound” rather than “hurt” and “trembling” rather than “shivering.” Her full translation reads:

Morir no hiere tanto.
Nos hiere más vivir.
Un modo diferente, una forma escondida
tras la puerta es morir.

Los pájaros del sur tienen costumbre
—cuando la escarcha está a punto de caer—
de emigrar hasta climas más benévolos.
Nosotros no sabemos sino permanecer.

Temblorosos rondamos en torno de las granjas
buscando la migaja que alguno ha de arrojar.
Tal es el pacto. La piadosa nieve
persuade a nuestras plumas de volver a su hogar.

(Castellanos, *Materia memorable* 66)

In addition to her choices to amplify “hurt” to “wound,” Castellanos also removes the benevolent hand of the “Farmer,” who, although “reluctant” in the source poem, at least appears and can be relied upon for a “Crumb.” Instead, the birds in Castellanos poem appear without any figure to look to for that compassion; they “rondamos en torno de las granjas / buscando la migaja que alguno ha de arrojar” (66). This “someone” may not arrive, these birds are “looking” as well as “surrounding,” as though their activity is required, they cannot just wait passively.

Castellanos also chooses to translate with more clarity and emphasis on the verb “stipulate” in the Dickinson source, in a move to associate the existential uncertainty of weak living things with the bureaucratic uncertainty of people living in an unfeeling system. She translates it as a full sentence: “Tal es el pacto” (66). As Maureen Ahern observes, Castellanos writes numerous poems and essays that draw from language of non-literary writing: newspapers, bureaucratic forms, questionnaires, reports, solicitations (25).⁴³ Ahern connects this use of state-sponsored formal language to the professional roles Castellanos took on and to her tendency toward irony, also noting that the same strategy can be observed in many Latin American literary works. In addition to these observations, reading Castellanos through Dickinson allows for the insight that her bureaucratic language is often paired with the vocabulary of religion. If the “pacto” in the Castellanos version is a spiritual covenant, it is also brought down to the level of a contract.

In her poem “Nota roja,” Castellanos explores a similar insight as in “Morir no hiera tanto,” but in a more violent register. Instead of the charming migrating birds of the Amherst poet, Castellanos borrows her visual images from sensationalist newspaper reports of urban violence and murder. For the dead body depicted, death came easily and quickly: “[e]s tan fácil morir, basta tan poco” (24) in a direct echo of the first line of her Dickinson *versión* “Morir no hiera tanto.” The title “Nota roja” refers to a term widely used in Mexico to describe a genre of news story consisting of sensational reports of local

⁴³“The years that Castellanos worked within the Mexican government sharpened her talent for re-creating bureaucratic formats and the officialese of its administrative documents and press releases... [The] irony so characteristic of her poetry stems from the contrasts between these mediums and their messages, resulting, as I have pointed out elsewhere, in subversion. It also produces a kind of discursive parody that is a common strategy in contemporary Latin American testimonial literature where the formats of oppressive governments or sacred ritual are rearranged or reinserted to express protest” (Ahern 25).

crime or street violence, often including an image depicting a victim of violent murder. The image of the dead body infects those readers who remain to walk the streets of the same city; as in the Dickinson poem, those who remain with the living are the ones who are subject to trembling in fear of death. The full text of “Nota roja” reads:

En página primera
viene, como a embestir, este retrato
y luego, a ocho columnas, la noticia:
asesinado misteriosamente.

Es tan fácil morir, basta tan poco.
Un golpe a medianoche, por la espalda,
y aquí está ya el cadáver
puesto entre las mandíbulas de un público antropófago.

Mastica lentamente el nombre, las señales,
los secretos guardados con años de silencio,
la lepra oculta, el vicio nunca hartos.

Del asesino nadie sabe nada:
cara con antifaz, mano con guantes.

Pero este cuerpo abierto en canal, esta entraña derramada en el suelo
hacen subir la fiebre

de cada Abel que mira su alrededor, temblando.

(Castellanos, *Materia memorable* 24)

The poem begins with a descriptive account of the encounter with the narrative of the crime, almost an assault by the violent image on the first page of a cheap, sensational newspaper. The second stanza begins with the more elevated pronouncement that echoes Dickinson: “[e]s tan fácil morir, basta tan poco” (24) before returning to the banal chewing of the public. The readership is represented as a disembodied set of “cannibalistic mandibles” that “masticate” the stories of violent crimes afflicting other people as though it will never be satiated of the desire to bear witness to the pain of others. The poem ends in the spirit of the living, the “shiverers” who “mira su alrededor, temblando.” Castellanos selects “temblorosos” to translate “The Shiverers;” this word also appears in her poem “Nota roja,” in a second point of contact between the two poems. In Dickinson’s poem they tremble from cold, loneliness, feeling out-of-place or left behind; whereas in Castellanos’s they tremble from fear, paranoia, a sense that danger is always around the corner. In both poems the simplicity and finality of death makes the problem of how, where, and why to live seem all the more daunting, hurtful, shiver-inducing. Naming the living “Abel” in reference to the biblical tale of fratricide, Castellanos again connects the lack of protections by the state to a lack of divine mercy. The failure to fulfill a social contract promising security or safety to the public reading the newspaper, in the final stanza of the poem, maps onto the even larger betrayal potentially experienced by the faithful.

The last line of the second stanza in the Dickinson translation, “Nosotros no sabemos sino permanecer,” appears echoed in another a poem in *Materia memorable*

titled “Recordatorio.” The conceit is that the speaker is writing a “Reminder” to unnamed authorities, asking their attention to the oversight: the speaker has been ignored or left behind. In another example of Castellanos using formal bureaucratic language as a starting point, she begins the poem “Obedecí, señores, las consignas” addressing unnamed “sirs.” Her complaint concerns unfulfilled promises, unpaid debts, unmet needs. The speaker “obeyed the instructions” and yet finds herself without the promised return, the recognition of her worth as a woman that she was promised for her behavior within the gender codes assigned to her at birth.

He pagado el tributo de mi especie
pues di a la tierra, al mundo, esa criatura
en que se glorifica y se sustenta.

Es tiempo de acercarse a las orillas,
de volver a los patios interiores,
de apagar las antorchas
porque ya la tarea ha sido terminada.

Sin embargo, yo aún permanezco en mi sitio.

Señores ¿no olvidasteis
dictar la orden de quien me retire?

(Castellanos *Materia* 56)

In the Dickinson poem, the line “We – are the Birds – that stay” represents a greater indictment of human-kind than of their situation. She creates an image of people as foolish birds who linger on past their season, who are stolidly clinging to the prison of the same, the familiar. In the original poem by Castellanos, there is a reversal of the blame and an increased personalization of the experience. The speaker is “yo” instead of Dickinson’s “we.” Dickinson’s poem ends by looking forward to the moment when nature will take its course: “till pitying Snows / Persuade our Feathers Home.” Yet Castellanos ends her poem with the speaker asking why she has been left where she is, politely calling attention to her state as an oversight, bureaucratic error: “Señores ¿no olvidasteis / dictar la orden de quien me retire?” (56). Where Dickinson always stopped short of direct critique of God or the divine presence in her poems, Castellanos turns this religious omnipresence into a bureaucratic one, bringing the divine down to the point of a set of rules, orders, norms, and offices that are confining when they function but which often also fail to function as promised. In tracing these moments where Dickinson’s concerns and vocabulary enter into the original poetry included in the same collection, I demonstrate the extent to which Castellanos willingly accepts the gifts of translation. Not only does she find affinity with themes that are explicit in Dickinson, she also draws out a latent similarity between them, namely Dickinson’s latent matching of a spiritual condition with a bureaucratic case.

Chapter 1 Conclusions: Mexican History and the “Objective” Translator

Paz and Castellanos each perform paradoxical ideas about authorship in their translations and in their essays about what translation can do within Latin American or

Mexican literatures. Paz posits in essay form that a good translator will return to the source text with analogous tools, but will refrain from gifting a poet he admires with the literary “interest” of his own poetic voice. Yet he describes his own translation practice not as a careful selection but instead as the product of “passion” and “coincidence,” and only in rare exceptions does he avoid making significant changes to a poem for the sake of exploiting his own aesthetic tools from the poetic lexicon of Spanish. Additionally, even when he attempts to remove himself from his translations, he cannot fully extricate his use of Spanish from his ideas about the enduring home of a pre-Columbian cultural root, and the Mexican Revolution as a truncated attempt to return to that idealized past. He shares the autobiographical element of “passion” and the additional quality of “shame” that Castellanos uses to describe the affective experience of wanting to translate a piece of writing that is precisely the opposite of what you would be able to write yourself. Castellanos views translation, as with writing, as a vital, sometimes sustaining but sometimes impossible job, or “oficio.” She places the Spanish language in Mexico within consideration of its use as a colonizing instrument, and as a form of social discipline where communication is not always as important as style. As a translator, she works against this history in overt ways, translating in a way that refuses any pretense to objectivity and accepting the gift of a different side of the writer’s *oficio*.

José Emilio Pacheco will begin his conceptualization of literary translation where Paz and Castellanos end. Pacheco begins his prologue to his own translation collection *Aproximaciones* (1984) with a citation from Paz introducing *Versiones y diversiones*. On the level of execution, the approximations by Pacheco go further than Castellanos framing translation and literary creation as a collective expression of responsibility to a

community. Yet for him this gift appears in a more playful guise than the “oficio” of her perspective. They also take Paz a step further the sense of practice being more valuable than a final version, every approximation is just one of many possible, just like a version, but there is more motion in Pacheco’s term. Unlike the gifts given by Paz or the gifts received by Castellanos, Pacheco will present his translation work as a gift to a larger rhizomatic, unpredictable, and ultimately creative enterprise of translation that does *not* rely on access to a definitive version of any original but rather puts whatever materials available into new circulation.

Chapter 2

José Emilio Pacheco and Literary Translation as Writing Without Authorship:

Giftng Between Different Americas

*No importa que la flecha no alcance el blanco
Mejor así
No capturar ninguna presa
No hacerle daño a nadie
pues lo importante
es el vuelo la trayectoria el impulso
el tramo de aire recorrido en su ascenso
la oscuridad que desaloja al clavarse
vibrante
en la extensión de la nada*
José Emilio Pacheco, *Islas a la deriva* (1976)

In “La flecha,” José Emilio Pacheco (Mexico DF: 1939-2014) draws attention to the space created by the release of an arrow into flight, regardless of whether or not it hits any target. This poem can be read as a figure for his approach to translation, where “lo importante / es el vuelo.” For Pacheco, what matters most in translation is not the source text or the target text, but rather the longer process of flight and distance between one moment of expression and another, and the capacity of the Spanish language and his own idiom to carry that flight. A generation after both Paz and Castellanos, Pacheco shares some of their translation ideals. Much like Paz, he gifts some of his translators with translations of their own poems into Spanish. Much like Castellanos, he takes on translation projects that relate to his own poetic materials. Yet unlike both, his primary vision of translation is not as either a diversion, a passion, or a serious if ambivalent vocation or office with an implied audience as its endpoint. Rather, his act of gifting is to the process, to the sustained and repeated effort of other translators. In this chapter, I focus on a selection of his broad translation corpus to argue that he takes his ideas about

translation furthest when translating from texts already closest to his own poetic materials. In his translations from other geographies in a pan-American translation zone, he imagines this arrow of translation as one with the potential to be less violent than the use of translation in the colonial project, but which still carries the memory of that trajectory that the practice of translation into Spanish has travelled.

Pacheco calls his translations approximations;⁴⁴ he explains his use of this term as a way to distinguish his practice from that of an academic or a professional translator.⁴⁵ He posits an alternative vision of translation practice as “drawing near” by doing “approximations” rather than “translations,” with their attendant history of “translation studii” as something that accompanied the “translatio imperii” or “transfer of rule.” An approximation can be defined as a genre of writing where the relative positioning of multiple authors, readers, and texts is always in a state of flux and dialogue. Pacheco’s approximations play with and empower his readers, refusing to settle on one model of translation or authorship or to allow any one version to take precedence or to remain static. His translation manual uses strategies including geographic dislocation, re-punctuation, re-lineation, pastiche, and imitation. With all these techniques, he imports his own poetic voice into the works he translates in ways that readers familiar with his style can identify as his, leaving the source texts and his own work altered by that contact, and creating a space for texts without authors. Additionally, he mixes together

⁴⁴ I use the term approximation in English to indicate the name Pacheco gives to the genre of translation he works in. This is unlike my choice in the previous chapter because to my knowledge, the Anglophone literary sphere does not have an established tradition of the approximation, and so there is not the same need to distinguish between them. In both English and Spanish, “approximate” comes from Latin “approximare” or “to draw near” (OED and RAE). Additionally, when referring to Pacheco’s volume titled *Aproximaciones*, I use the Spanish term in italics.

⁴⁵ Introduction to *Tarde o temprano* (1980).

translations of existing poems with pseudotranslations and works by heteronyms, further complicating his ambivalence.

While Pacheco claims to have learned how to translate from reading Paz, his paratexts—and even more so, his approximations themselves—contradict his predecessor’s values. Pacheco begins the introductory note to his collected translations *Aproximaciones* (1984) by citing the last phrase of Paz’s collection *Versiones y diversiones* (1974). He writes: “‘A partir de poemas en otras lenguas quise hacer poemas en la mía.’ En mi adolescencia Octavio Paz y Jaime García Terrés me enseñaron este arte. Nunca terminaré de aprenderlo pero desde entonces se ha hecho inseparable de mi propio trabajo en verso” (5). While Pacheco cites Paz as a model, and dedicates the collection to both Paz and Terrés, he also states that his translations are “inseparable from my own poetry,” directly opposing the theoretical distinction Paz drew between the two. Pacheco favors his own label “approximations” and uses it consistently across publications; but at times he also uses the term favored by Paz. For example, when listing the newspapers and literary supplements that published his translation works, he calls them both “aproximaciones” and “versions.”⁴⁶ Pacheco’s approximations are similar in their aesthetic goals, but I argue that, when his approximations are also retranslations, he traces the trajectory of a work through prior Spanish-language translations and through a concomitant history of poetic exchange across languages and cultures.

⁴⁶ “Entre 1978 y 1982 Enrique Loubet Jr. Publicó la mayor parte de **estas ‘aproximaciones’** en la sección ‘Poesía para todos’ de su revista *Comunidad Conacyt* (Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología). Sin la exigencia mensual de Loubet acaso no se hubieran escrito. Julio Scherer García, Vicente Leñero y Armando Ponce me han permitido incluir varias otras en el ‘Inventario’ de *Proceso*. Gracias a ellos en el debate político y cultural mexicano hay también un sitio para la poesía. Fernando Benítez, Huberto Batis y Cristina Pacheco, a su vez, **han difundido unas cuantas de estas versiones** en *Sábado*, suplemento de *Unomásuno*” (Pacheco, *Aproximaciones* 5; emphasis added).

Pacheco's translations of the late work *Four Quartets* by T.S. Eliot demonstrate a shift over several decades, an expansion of what an approximation can be. He publishes approximations of Eliot's *Quartets*, in part or in full, in 1980, 1989, 2011, and 2014. Parallel analysis of these retranslations shows increasing liberty to re-punctuate Eliot's free verse and to add references, not only to one of Eliot's source texts in Spanish, the mystic poet San Juan de la Cruz, but also to Mexico and other Latin American geographies and realities. In this reciprocal exchange between cultures, Pacheco seeks to reposition the East-West movement of the Anglo-American poet's creative scope in order to also include a gaze from the South, from Mexico. His approximations of English translations by John Bierhorst of indigenous poetry of North America demonstrate that relineation, editing, and pseudotranslation can be used to insert a political ideology into translation while also making a commentary on the reason that interpolation is problematic. He gifts these anonymous songs with a poetic structure and style, while also questioning whether this act is as ethically grounded as it should be. I conclude with his approximations of Brazilian twentieth century poets, one Brazilian modernist poet, two from the Geração de 45, and an invented heteronym, Azevedo Oliveira, a bilingual Brazilian-Uruguayan poet whose voice allows Pacheco to consider Mexican and USA American interests in indigenous cultural forms from an outside perspective. Each of these works approximates another America. Additionally, in each of these three categories of his translation works, he supplements his approximations with works written by heteronyms: invented authors with fantastic biographies who represent transnational or deterritorialized poetic practices.

Pacheco's approximations of these other Americas create instability in the relative positions of authority between sources, authors, texts, and readers. His habits of continual revision are performed through his translation practice just as much as in his poetry. Pacheco performs translation as a creative practice, which he himself describes as both "barbaric" and "cultured," acknowledging the multidirectional palimpsest of his translations.⁴⁷ His term "approximation" foregrounds the tensions in the act of translation, using a verb that signifies both drawing near and always holding apart. "To approximate" will never mean either "to duplicate" or "to bring over:" an approximation never quite gets there, the arrow of Pacheco's translation never quite arrives at its target. This term also relates to his concept of poetry as the result of the collective practice of poetic work. When introducing his anthology *Aproximaciones* (1989) he writes: "[S]i por mí fuera preferiría mil veces que estas páginas colectivas se publicaran anónimas" (*Aproximaciones* 7).⁴⁸ In this anthology, he places works together that do not have the same rights to exist—not to equate them, but to question assumptions about authorship by mixing pseudotranslations and works written by heteronyms together with translations that have originals. A pseudotranslation is an original work presented as a translation: for example, Pacheco includes an original poem along with his other translations of North American indigenous poems, claiming that it is a song from the Apache.⁴⁹ A heteronym

⁴⁷ "En 1934 había escrito los *Two English Poems* que nunca ha querido traducir al español. En la cuenta de la barbarie y la falta de respeto que coexisten en este libro con sus rasgos más culturales, hay que poner la afrenta y osadía de traducir al castellano a un clásico de nuestra lengua. Valga como atenuante el hecho de que la tentativa se ha extendido a lo largo de casi veinticinco años." (*Aproximaciones* 171)

⁴⁸ "Were it up to me, I'd prefer a thousand times that these collective pages be published anonymously."

⁴⁹ The canon of Hispanic and Latin American texts that draw from the device of pseudotranslation includes a work as important as *Don Quixote*; considering the relationship between translation and pseudotranslation is a valuable intervention Pacheco invites. Susan Bassnett cites Gideon Toury who defining the term "pseudotranslations" as texts presented as translations with no corresponding source texts in any language (Bassnett *Constructing Cultures* 28).

is an invented personality who writes poetry. Portuguese poet Fernando Pessoa (1888-1935) championed this practice and crafted numerous heteronyms over his lifetime, each with their own biography, voice, and relationship to various poetic traditions. Pacheco created two heteronyms who, like him, write in Spanish: Julián Hernández and Fernando Tejada. He also invents three others who he claims to translate from English, Italian, and Portuguese: Gordon Woolf, Piero Quercia, and Azevedo Oliveira. All included in *Aproximaciones*, these works are both authored by heteronyms and pseudotranslations. Just as his heteronyms require an informed reader to identify and understand, his translations need to be considered as masks and displaced performances of his ideas about authorship.

Friis, Mary Docter, and Hugo Verani identify the central importance of intertextuality to the works Pacheco attributes to himself, particularly after his third book of poetry *No me preguntes cómo pasa el tiempo* (1969). Yet his translations are not always incorporated into this analysis, and when they are, they may not be fully evaluated as creative work.⁵⁰ Published along with his books of his own poetry from the first published volume *Elementos de la noche* (1963), his approximations follow the same arc as his poetry. They shift from the first two lyrical and abstract volumes, *Elementos* and *El reposo del fuego* (1966) to a poetic voice that is at once more politically motivated, collective, and also self-reflexive in his third published volume, *No me preguntes* (1969).⁵¹ He cared enough about his approximations to revise some of them extensively

⁵⁰ While Friis mentions the value of Pacheco's translations, he stops short of analyzing them (Friis 59-60; 105). Docter and Verani both evaluate the epigraph to *Tarde o temprano* attributed to his heteronym Julián Hernández: "La poesía no es de nadie: se hace entre todos" (*Tarde o temprano* 1980, 246)). This aphorism is actually a translation from the French-Uruguayan poet Lautremont.

⁵¹ His first selected works, *Tarde o temprano* (1980), would be made up by these first three books, along with the subsequent three: *Irás y no volverás* (1973), *Islas a la deriva* (1976), and *Desde entonces* (1980). He collects all the translations in the back, organized under the heading "Aproximaciones (1958-1978)."

when reprinted, as he notoriously did with his own poetry. Pacheco read select approximations at one of his last public readings at the 2009 Feria Internacional del Libro (FIL) in Guadalajara, demonstrating the importance of his approximations for his entire poetic career.⁵² Unfortunately, his translations have been sidelined from his collected works. Where the first two editions of his selected works *Tarde o temprano* (1980, 1986) end with a section of his *Aproximaciones (1958-1978)* that he had incorporated in five of his first six poetry books, the third and fourth editions (2000, 2009) exclude the translations. Although the 2000 edition promised another volume just of translations, this collection has not yet come to fruition. I hope continued interest in Pacheco's work will also turn attention to his translations as objects of study alongside works he authored or as creative work in themselves.⁵³

Critical readings of his poetry have taken into account some aspects of Pacheco as an intertextual writer without fully exploring the complexity of Pacheco as a translational thinker. Ronald Friis looks at Pacheco's poetry through the lens of the concept of anxiety

These are complete but he also adds to his translations, reorders them, and translates the titles from the original English, French, and Italian into Spanish. The book *El reposo del fuego* was his only chapbook that did not include translations as it functions as one whole with many parts divided into three sections—much like Eliot's *Waste Land*, which is a major source text.

⁵² Pacheco read from his unpublished approximations at the 2009 FIL, an important public appearance a month after he received the Premio Cervantes, a prestigious literary prize from Spain. According to an account by Norma Gutiérrez, he read: “un poema polaco ‘La Primera Foto de Hitler’ siguieron los poemas ‘Pigmeo’, ‘El Vampiro’, ‘Las Flores del Mal’, ‘Besos’, ‘La paseante’. Con el tiempo encima, finalizó su lectura con el poema ‘Vivimos sólo para amarnos’ y ‘La flor del Cerezo’” (web). The first is his version of a poem by Wislawa Szymborska, the next five are translations from Charles Baudelaire, only three of which are in his collections, and he ends with what I believe are also approximations, the first from Catullus and the second from his large corpus of haiku. I think “La flor del Cerezo” refers to the 2001 publication in *Letras Libres* of “Reloj de arena: El viento entre los pinos: 24 aproximaciones al haiku” which includes: “No apremia / su condena / a la flor del cerezo. –*Kin'u*” (32).

⁵³ I do not yet know what motivated the separation of Pacheco's approximations from the rest of his of poetry in later publications: author request, editorial choices, publisher's mandates, copyright issues, or any combination. The exclusion of his translations from his collected works impacts scholarly attention: a recent collection *Pasión por la palabra: Homenaje a José Emilio Pacheco* (2013) does not include any essays that refer to his translations, and the participating critics all use the third or fourth editions of *Tarde o temprano* (2000, 2009), which do not include his approximations.

of influence by Harold Bloom. Describing the prolific work of Mexican poets in his lifetime, Friis specifically names Julio Cortázar and Jorge Luis Borges outside of Mexico and Alfonso Reyes, Octavio Paz, and Rosario Castellanos within Mexico as poets who “have cast long shadows across the work” of Pacheco (30). Using that model, he argues that Pacheco incorporates his influences in a way that both evades and re-inscribes the author function when he creates his heteronym, Julián Hernández. To understand his heteronyms as such, a reader would need to know his work.⁵⁴ Because of this, Friis argues that Pacheco both undermines authorial authority and requires that readers respect his. I build on this analysis, but unlike Ronald Friis, I do not think that any of his translations should be bracketed off from his creative work, or described as “straight” (Friis 105), because of his incorporation of pseudotranslation and because of his specific refusal to claim responsibility for the source text.⁵⁵ Mary Docter describes Pacheco’s technique as distinct from intertextuality, as a poetics of reciprocity. In opposition to Bloom’s model of anxiety, she sees Pacheco as negotiating a relationship between the source and recreated text that can be mutually nutritive. Where Docter applies these ideas to Pacheco’s citations within poetry signed with his own name, I apply them to his approximations, his texts signed with other names. Pacheco uses translation to push the problematizing of the author function beyond the use of heteronyms or his references to poetic influences within his signed works. I argue that his approximations elevate the

⁵⁴ Friis questions the assumption that the key poem attributed to Hernández “Legítima defensa” can be read as an “ars poética” for Pacheco, or the oft-cited epigraph “La poesía no es de nadie: se hace entre todos” (*Tarde o temprano* 1980, 246) should be understood as a directive Pacheco takes for his own work. There is a more complex game of referentiality at work, since the epigraph is a translation of French-Uruguayan and favorite of the *modernistas* Lautremont.

⁵⁵ While outside the scope of this chapter, I am intrigued by the heteronormative ideologies underpinning the characterization of a translation as “straight” in the terms Friis uses. This raises the question: is there something “queer” about Pacheco’s other translations? Is literary translation in general a “queer” textual practice, or only when certain conditions are met?

responsibility of the reader to understand the ideological implications of certain choices of how to read a translated text—or any text, given that any text should always be understood as in flux. I focus on his poetic representations of time as a flux of destruction and creation, as applied specifically to the landscape and the history of Mexico, a theme he reads into the work he publishes as approximations of other Americas.

Heteronyms and Pseudotranslations: Approximating Other Americas

Pacheco displaces himself from his writing by inventing heteronyms with biographies and poems that are often kitschy or playful. Given that all of Pacheco's heteronyms are bi- or multicultural and well-traveled polyglots, they function as a space for him to think through the implications of literary bilingualism or multilingual poetry. He incorporates works written in the voice of his heteronyms into his translation collection to perform the idea that the act of translation can be similar to the invention of a heteronym, or, the invention of a different personality from which to write poetry. Translating, or approximating for Pacheco, is the act of inventing another voice from which to speak. The works Pacheco publishes as translations by poets who do not exist touch on all three aspects of his translation practice I will cover in this chapter. First, he attributes his first translation of a fragment by T. S. Eliot to his heteronym Julián Hernández. Second, he relates his translations of North American indigenous songs to a work titled “Western” by his heteronym Azevedo Oliveira, in addition to adding in a pseudotranslation. Finally, he translates from Brazilian poets of the Geração de 45, but also invents Oliveira, a poet who would be responding to their legacy. In addition to considering these heteronyms seriously as commentaries on transnational poetry, I am

also interested in the gesture Pacheco makes by publishing them along with translations which do have source texts in other languages. Pacheco writes from alternative modernisms and avant-gardes through these invented lives and voices, but he also gifts them with a new perspective, one that is centered in Latin America and contests other Anglo- or Francophone centered narratives of modernist literary history. Verani describes the heteronym Julián Hernández as a space where Pacheco rehearses rough drafts.⁵⁶ Docter incorporates these voices into an argument about how Pacheco is beyond anxiety of influence and instead performs the reciprocity of poetic voice. He invents at least four transnational heteronyms: Julián Hernández, Gordon Woolf, Piero Quercia, and Azevedo Oliveira, and connects them to his translation work by ascribing a translation of Eliot to Hernández or by publishing the works of his heteronyms as pseudotranslations. The poems written by heteronyms represent an alternative historical perspective or emphasis; by working through similar themes through the different placements of these invented poets, he takes the position of the translator as trickster, displacing the self across time and language.

One of the best examples of these kitschy games Pacheco plays with his heteronyms is the final line of the biography of Azevedo Oliveira that mentions his book *Contra Barthes* (1976). An invented author writing a fake book against the author of “The Death of the Author” recalls the kind of cerebral literary games that destabilize the author similar to those played by Borges. Friis cites Matei Calinescu on kitsch as one of the *Five Faces of Modernism* to describe Pacheco’s use of humor to undercut some of the

⁵⁶ Identifying Julián Hernández as the most developed and prolific of Pacheco’s heteronyms, Verani implies that it is through Hernández that Pacheco rehearses new poetic ideas because “sus epigramas parecen un borrador de los que firma Pacheco, un irónico dictamen de su propia poesía, convirtiéndose en cierta medida en una parodia de si mismo” (Verani 284).

serious implications of the loss of authorial status.⁵⁷ When Pacheco translates the “Two English Poems” by Borges into Spanish, he uses translation to destabilize both the authority of the author and the idea of authorship as centered on a mother tongue.⁵⁸ By insisting that Borges’s English poems would be interesting to a Spanish reading audience—and that he has the right to translate them, even though the author never wanted to do so—he insists on the “extraterritorialidad” (*Aproximaciones* 171), as he calls it, of literature. Pacheco’s biographical note about Borges places him among Beckett and Nabokov as the great writers capable of literary genius in multiple languages. He proposes that the ideas of Yeats and Pound, that a writer could only write in the mother tongue, have been overturned by the era in which he lived, which produced three bilingual writers, who nevertheless are exemplary of their native cultures: Beckett, Nabokov, and Borges.⁵⁹ Beckett and Nabokov were also celebrated for their self-translations from French and Russian into English. In contrast, Borges worked as a collaborative translator, translating fantastic fiction into Spanish with Adolfo Bioy Casares and Silvina Ocampo or, as Pacheco describes him, working with Norman

⁵⁷ Friis cites Calinescu on kitsch to connect translation with this one of his *Five Faces of Modernism*. “As Roland Barthes has written, the writer is no longer seen as the romantic figure of the poet-prophet (Author), or the avant-garde’s *pequeño dios* (little god) but rather as a compiler of inter texts. Pacheco’s defense mechanism against his affinity to these radical ideas is to situate his observations within the context of humor and *cursilería*. Matei Calinescu writes that ‘the whole concept of kitsch clearly centers around such questions as imitation, forgery, counterfeit, and what we may call the aesthetics of deception and self-deception’ (222). There also exists a relationship, built on repetition, between kitsch, translation, and humor. Kitsch lives off mass-produced art, and translation is another manner of reproduction, one that privileges the swerve” (98).

⁵⁸ “En los años sesenta Borges, con la ayuda de Norman Thomas di Giovanni, reescribió en inglés su obra narrativa y se convirtió en el maestro de la nueva ficción norteamericana y europea. En 1934 había escrito los *Two English Poems* que nunca ha querido traducir al español. En la cuenta de la barbarie y la falta de respeto que coexisten en este libro con sus rasgos más culturales, hay que poner la afrenta y osadía de traducir al castellano a un clásico de nuestra lengua. Valga como atenuante el hecho de que la tentativa se ha extendido a lo largo de casi veinticinco años” (*Aproximaciones* 171).

⁵⁹ “Con todo, nuestra época ha visto nacer a tres grandes escritores bilingües: Samuel Beckett, Jorge Luis Borges y Vladimir Nabokov. Otro crítico polígloto, George Steiner, habla a propósito de ellos de ‘extraterritorialidad’. Sin embargo, será difícil encontrar alguien más irlandés que Beckett, más argentino que Borges, más ruso (blanco) que Nabokov” (*Aproximaciones* 171).

Thomas di Giovanni on English translations of his work. While Borges is a deterritorialized writer who does not self-translate, Pacheco describes some of his heteronyms as “virtual self-translators,” which I read as an oblique reference to their status as inventions. It also bears mention that one of these “virtual self-translators,” Azevedo Oliveira, recalls the character Horacio Oliveira, an Argentine expat in Paris and protagonist of Cortázar’s *Rayuela* (1963). With these heteronyms, Pacheco participates in several games at once: deterritorializing literature and displacing the self.

While Docter, Oviedo, and Verani have commented on the heteronyms Julián Hernández and included in the “Cancionero Apócrifo” section of *No me preguntes*, the heteronyms in *Aproximaciones* have received little attention. According to Verani, Hernández and Tejada are announced as heteronyms when Pacheco includes epigraphs from Antonio Machado and Fernando de Pessoa, Spanish and Portuguese poets associated with creating new personalities from which to write.⁶⁰ He does not use allusion to signal the status of some of translation works as heteronyms: in fact, he mixes their names with real poets before ultimately grouping them together as the least well known authors he translates. In the course of thanking friends for their help with his translation process, after asserting once more that poetry is made collectively, Pacheco creates equivalence between two heteronyms Woolf and Oliveira and several real poets including Ramón Xirau, the well-known Spanish poet exiled in Mexico after the Spanish Civil War, and Fernando Ferreira de Loanda, the Angolan-Brazilian poet and journalist with

⁶⁰ “El título, tomado de Machado, y los epígrafes que escoge, uno del poeta español y otro de Pessoa, quienes se refugian, como es sabido, en voces complementarias, indican claramente la intención de identificarse con una tradición estética de largo recorrido” (Verani 285).

ties to the Mexican literary sphere.⁶¹ Then, by defining them as both self-translators and lesser-known poets, relying on a long-standing assumption that to self-translate is a mark of poetic genius, he arouses suspicion. By pairing Woolf and Oliveira with authors who exist, Pacheco hides that two of the three bilingual poets are heteronyms. He finally gives away his hand⁶² when groups all three of the heteronyms together and insist that his whole collection “wants to be read only as it is: a book of collective poetry in which the big names (Goethe, Apollinaire, Montale) appear in the same title as poets with no recognition (Woolf, Quercia, Azevedo Oliveira), indigenous shamans and geishas. A book, in short, in which the texts matter more than the authors” (8, translation mine).⁶³ By inventing transnational and multilingual heteronyms, Pacheco expands the cultural spaces from which he can write with the voice of someone at home in that language. And yet his heteronyms often have a troubled sense of home, culture, or language.⁶⁴

If a heteronym is the creation of a fictional personality behind a literary work, writing a translation might be similar, in that the translator must imagine the way an author would write in their language. The translator must write from a reconstruction of

⁶¹ “Aunque soy el único responsable de la forma final en que se publican los textos, varias personas colaboraron en los primeros manuscritos con su saber, su amistad, su estímulo y su crítica. Las cito por el orden más o menos cronológico en que figuran los poetas traducidos: Ramón Xirau (los trovadores y Petrarca), [he goes on to cite other friends who helped him translate]. . . Gordon Woolf, Fernando Ferreira de Loanda y el desaparecido Aurelio Acevedo [sic] Oliveira, poetas bilingües, son más que yo los autores de sus propias versiones” (*Aprox.* 6).

⁶² It would not be any fun if I could entirely rule out the possibility that these three poets did live and write and are simply unknown to the library databases or publications now available to me. However, Pacheco’s hints, and the concurrence of Verani who calls these three authors “nuevas máscaras textuales” (286), make me confident that these three poets are indeed heteronyms for Pacheco hiding in his collection of approximations.

⁶³ “*Aproximaciones* quiere ser leído sólo como lo que es: un libro de poesía colectiva en que los grandes nombres (Goethe, Apollinaire, Montale) aparecen al mismo título que los poetas sin reconocimiento alguno (Woolf, Quercia, Azevedo Oliveira), los chamanes indígenas y las geishas. Un libro, pues, en que importan más los textos que los autores.” (*Aprox.* 8)

⁶⁴ The Derrida insight from “The Monolingualism of the Other” which I paraphrase as “I only ever speak one language; that language is not mine” (2) applies in this context.

the personality of a known author with the addition of at least one key fiction: that author writes in the target language. Both forms of composition allow for a disassociation from the results and represent experiments in writing without making full claims to authorship. Pacheco uses heteronyms to distance himself from the reactions his poems provoke in readers, in himself, in critics.⁶⁵ They also represent the negative fears and fantasies of poets: the lure and threat of anonymity could be a seductive fear for someone like Pacheco in the mid 1980s. The biographies and personalities he constructs for his avatar poets often include realities of a literary life that are less harmonious than the ideals of collective creation that Pacheco champions in his practice as an approximating translator. All of the jealousies, criticisms, in-group dynamics, all the psychologically non-optimal tendencies of poets are represented in the biographies of his heteronyms. Julián Hernández is a dipsomaniac; Piero Quercia is a suicide at age twenty-four; Gordon Woolf is a pathological liar. Azevedo Oliveira has the most complimentary biography, which outlines his decision to leave a lucrative medical practice to work in favelas and later works between Mexico and Brazil to promote environmental preservation efforts. Yet he too dies of bad and ironic luck during a mugging in Rio: “Por una cruel paradoja Azevedo Oliveira, que había dedicado su existencia a los pobres, murió en Río de Janeiro al resistirse a un asalto callejero” (*Aproximaciones* 187). Pacheco here implies that Azevedo suffered from the most dangerous disease of all those that tend to effect poets:

⁶⁵ One of the epigrams signed by Hernández is a brief lyric about courting failure to escape from self and self-critique:

(Monólogo del poeta I)
 Quisiera ser un pésimo poeta
 para sentirme satisfecho con lo que escribo
 y vivir lejos
 de tu dedito admonitorio,
 autocrítica. [1949] (Pacheco *Tarde o temprano*, 105)

idealism. Julián Hernández (born in Mexico to a North American mother and Spanish father) had a literary career marked by a combative and unproductive relationship with his contemporaries.⁶⁶ Gordon Woolf (b.1922) a mythomaniacal poet who insists that he was born in Tampico, Tamaulpias in México, not to be confused with Tampico, Illinois where Ronald Reagan was born (180). He blends a sense of U.S. American aggressive masculinity and independence with the Oscar Wilde type whom he relates to as another author who invested his genius in his personality and merely his talent into his poetry (180). The Woolf biography is tongue in cheek—yet by citing the unlikely and fantastical Oscar Wilde, who did indeed exist, the unbelievable narrative becomes credible. Woolf shares both a name with the modernist master Virginia Woolf (greatly admired in Latin America since she was translated by Borges) as well birthdate with the literary masterpieces “The Waste Land” and *Ulysses*. The cranky, self-important personality of this heteronym may represent a discharging of anxiety of influence on the part of Pacheco, freeing the poet to handle the work of Eliot with less agon and more thymos.

The heteronyms allow Pacheco a vantage point to comment on literary gossip and current events without taking full responsibility for his comments. Woolf especially, the imaginary transnational American poet who claims to be more Mexican than American and who hates Ronald Reagan, must have filled a need when Pacheco wrote and published this work in the middle of the Reagan presidency (1981-1989) when he enjoyed extreme popularity. Among the myths this Woolf character tells about himself:

⁶⁶ “Su mal carácter lo enemistó con todos los grupos y generaciones literarias. De su arbitrariedad y resentimiento queda testimonio en los artículos aparecidos de 1932 a 1954 en *El Universal* ... [Sus epigramas] intentan y a veces logran expresar poéticamente la visión de un *outcast*, la amargura sarcástica de un perpetuo excluido que contempla la vida literaria, y la existencia en general, con quebrantada y a la postre estéril ironía” (*Tarde o temprano*, 101-2).

he was the love child of Katherine Anne Porter and Hart Crane, or B. Traven and Dolores del Río, or Tina Modotti and José Vasconcelos. But the myth that Pacheco claims is true is almost as unbelievable: that he returned a Purple Heart received after Iwo Jima for his hatred of Reagan.⁶⁷ As a US citizen of Mexican heritage, one of his poems is dedicated to the occasion of his return to Mexico City after a fifteen-year absence. When Pacheco draws out the Mexican and Spanish themes within the poetry of T.S. Eliot, his literary gesture is similar to the invention Woolf—speculation into alternative pasts.

T.S. Eliot in Spanish: *La Tierra Baldía*, *El páramo*, and *Cuatro cuartetos*

When Pacheco began working on T.S. Eliot, his poetry had already impacted poets writing in Spain and Latin America, many of whom translated his works.⁶⁸ Pacheco responds not only to Eliot as a source text but also to the broader trajectory translations of Eliot into Spanish. Tom Boll makes this argument in the case of Octavio Paz, and I draw from his research to demonstrate that Pacheco’s repeated approximations of Eliot touch on different stages in his reception history in Spanish. Boll traces the complex relationship Paz had to his readings of Eliot throughout his life, from his initial shocked but admiring contact with a prose Spanish translation of “The Waste Land” at age nineteen to his later readings of Eliot in the original English—including of *Four*

⁶⁷ “Lo cierto es que Woolf efectivamente combatió en la segunda guerra mundial, pero no en Europa sino en el Pacífico. Por su valor heroico en Midway e Iwo Jima recibió las máximas condecoraciones norteamericanas. Devolvió sus medallas a la Casa Blanca cuando Reagan subió a la presidencia” (180).

⁶⁸ In Chapter 3, I will discuss translations by Paulo Henriques Britto. In his article “Para uma tipologia do verso livre em português e inglês,” he analyzes the use of Eliot to develop a free-verse mode in Portuguese, an argument about Brazilian translators that provides an interesting contrast to the approximations of Pacheco. As Pacheco is a poet benefitting from the free verse experimentation that came before him, he takes Eliot back into metered verse.

Quartets.⁶⁹ Boll argues that the influence of Eliot on Paz needs to be understood in the complex context of his broader influence on the poets and translators who worked on him, in Spanish and especially in Mexico.⁷⁰ Paz describes his teenage reading of a prose translation of “The Waste Land” by Enrique Manguía Jr. in the literary magazine *Contemporáneos* (“El páramo” 1930) as a mixture of admiration and surprise. Manguía’s version allowed for an encounter with a poetic master that underscored the challenges of translation by translating the English free verse into Spanish prose.⁷¹ Yet it eliminated some of the editorial elements of the source text by reducing Eliot’s notes to a minimum.⁷² In a similar research project into Eliot reception across the Atlantic, Emilio Barón Palma traces three stages of interpretations and translations in Spain, which involved many major Spanish and Catalan poets.⁷³ Neither comprehensive work

⁶⁹ Paz describes this initial encounter when accepting the 1988 T. S. Eliot Prize from the Ingersoll Foundation in Chicago. In an article about Manguía published in *Vuelta*, “Paz confesses that ‘Eliot contradecía todo lo que yo pensaba que era *moderno* y todo lo que yo creía era *poético*’ [Eliot contradicted everything that I thought was *modern* and everything that I thought was *poetic*]” (Boll 1).

⁷⁰ Boll identifies the multiple voiced influence of Eliot through his Spanish translators as a set of “Chinese whispers” rather than the firm paternal voice “single identity” of influence in a “Bloomian idealization of his imaginative vision” (Boll 7). “Eliot’s influence is translated in its broadest sense, transferred and then mediated through the context of Mexico in the 1930s. Yet the Eliot that Paz first reads is also translated in the more restricted sense of linguistic transfer: he is the author of two separate *Waste Lands*—Enrique Manguía’s ‘El páramo’ (1930) and Ángel Flores’s *Tierra baldía* (1930)—of Rodolfo Usigli’s ‘El canto de amor de J. Alfred Prufrock’ (1938) and of Bernardo Ortiz de Montellano’s ‘Miércoles de ceniza’ (1938). Eliot is not simply one presence among many but a multiple, textual presence. Frequently, these translations are produced by writers with considerable reputations of their own, which further subjects Eliot’s identity to complex forms of transposition and dispersal” (Boll 7).

⁷¹ The first two translations of “The Waste Land” which have been influential to Spanish speaking poets and readers were both published in 1930: the prose translation by Enrique Manguía in the literary magazine *Contemporáneos* and “Tierra Baldía” by the Puerto Rican poet Angel Flores first published by the Editorial Cervantes in Barcelona.

⁷² “Paz also encountered a different text from the English reviewers. Manguía selects from Eliot’s notes, and places them at the bottom of the page rather than at the end of the poem. He consistently excises the kind of authorial presence that provoked Powell and Monro. The notes are less numerous, less conspicuous, and they no longer suggest an author-approved reading of the poem. ... The notes that Manguía does provide read as an extension of this substantial introduction—they provide the help of another reader, rather than a reminder from the author of whose poem this is” (Boll 24).

⁷³ Barón Palma divides work on Eliot into three major historical phases: starting with the translation *La Tierra Baldía* by Ángel Flores in 1930, he looks at the Spanish Civil War era work by Federico García Lorca, Pedro Salinas, Jorge Guillén – and after by Juan Ramón Jiménez, Damaso Alonso, and Luis Cernuda. In the period between 1951-1978 and the new Spanish Constitution, he discusses the translations,

considers Pacheco's approximations of Eliot, nor do they fully articulate a theorization of retranslation in the context of Eliot's reception in Spanish.

When Pacheco published his translation *Cuatro cuartetos* in 1989,⁷⁴ Octavio Paz praised it as “the best translation of the *Four Quartets* that has appeared in any language” (“The Dry Salvages” 20, my translation).⁷⁵ Pacheco was not the first to translate *Four Quartets* into Spanish. However, his translation was the first to craft a Spanish version that matched the formal qualities of the source by moving from free verse into sections written in ballad or *romance* form. Full translations were already available, done by Vicente Gaos (Madrid, 1951); J.R. Wilcock (Buenos Aires, 1956); Valverde, 1978; and Esteban Pujals Gesalí 1988.⁷⁶ The first two translations did not pursue a metric structure that paralleled that of Eliot. In *T.S. Eliot en España*, Emilio Barón Palma traces the translations of Eliot in Spain and the influence of his writings on Spanish writers. He includes an evaluation of the version by Esteban Pujals Gesalí, published in 1988, which also pays closer attention to the metric changes and moods in the work.⁷⁷

the “Grupo de los Cincuenta” and the echoes of Eliot in the poetry of Jaime Gil de Biedma. The final period is from 1978-1995 and includes the translations of *Four Quartets* contemporary to Pacheco's.

⁷⁴ This first publication is subtitled “(Traducción de José Emilio Pacheco)” but by the 2012 publication in *Letras libres* Pacheco uses “aproximación.”

⁷⁵ “José Emilio Pacheco emprendió en 1985 una versión de los *Four Quartets* de T. S. Eliot. El FCE publicó en 1989 una primera tentativa. Octavio Paz la consideró ‘la mejor traducción de los *Cuatro cuartetos* que ha aparecido en ningún idioma’. A pesar de este gran reconocimiento, Pacheco prosiguió su trabajo. Un cuarto de siglo después, al fin la ha terminado. La versión anotada que hoy publicamos de “The Dry Salvages,” el tercero de los *Cuatro cuartetos*, nunca se había impreso hasta hoy” (editorial note, Pacheco “The Dry Salvages” 20).

⁷⁶ In addition to these four complete translations, many of the important literary magazines of Latin America also published fragments or individual quartets from *Four Quartets*, including an article by Rodolfo Usigli in *El Hijo Pródigo* (1943), “East Coker” in *Origenes* translated by José Rodríguez Feo (1946), “Little Gidding” in *Sur* translated by E.L. Revol (1947), and “The Dry Salvages” anthologized by Augustí Bartra (1952). For an extensive bibliography in the translations of Eliot into Spanish focused in Mexico and Argentina, see Boll, 212-4. For an annotated bibliography focused on translations published in Spain, see Barón Palma, 121-9.

⁷⁷ Citing from the translation by Esteban Pujals Gesalí. *Cuatro cuartetos: Edición bilingüe de EPG*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1988. “En la Nota, el autor pasa revista a las anteriores traducciones de los CC (Gaos, 1951; Wilcock, 1977; y Valverde, 1978): ‘ni Gaos ni Valverde emplean un criterio métrico estricto, y de hecho la decisión de traducir cada verso inglés mediante un verso español, a lo que les conduce es a una

Pacheco's translations move through stages that put into practice one of Eliot's major themes: art as an opportunity humankind returns to repeatedly as a new opportunity to humanize itself in the face of destruction and disaster. The successive approximations Pacheco publishes in 1980, 1989, 2011, and 2014 also mirror the history of translations of Eliot's poems into Spanish and demonstrate an increasing freedom to "draw closer" to Eliot by imitating his devices found in other works. His first published translation of Eliot is in prose, attributed to his heteronym Julián Hernández, and included in the first edition of *Tarde o temprano* (1980). He follows this first encounter with a complete verse translation under his own name (1989). Finally, he returns to the work later in life, and some of his last published works include the annotated critical translations of two of the four quartets published by *Letras Libres* in 2011 and 2014. Pacheco appears increasingly willing to significantly alter the lineation of Eliot's poem. Pacheco's annotations also reveal his interest in centering his translation around the debt Eliot owes to the Spanish tradition of Catholic mysticism through the poetry of San Juan de la Cruz in the translation by E. Allison Peers, and other more oblique relationships between English and Spanish and their histories as imperial languages.

It might be tempting to consider Pacheco's approximations of Eliot as "straight" because of the broad international readership of the well-known Anglophone poet. A readership that expects respect, accuracy, and reliability may impact the translator. Yet the opposite can as easily be the case: Pacheco is after all working with a source text of

traducción en prosa. Wilcock, por otra parte, utiliza versos españoles genuinos en combinaciones de heptasílabos, endecasílabos y alejandrinos, intentando ajustar las promociones de unos y otros al efecto general que debe presidir cada sección'. Y añade: 'En mi versión he intentado encontrar equivalencias aproximadas en español, no de la forma prosódica inglesa utilizada por Eliot en cada caso, sino del efecto que tal forma produce para el oído cultural británico. A menudo esto es posible utilizando combinaciones de medidas. A las utilizadas por Wilcock he añadido las cualidades un tanto indeterminadas y, por lo tanto, más flexibles por menos connotadas del eneasílabo'" (Barón Palma 128).

this celebrated innovator which had already been translated into Spanish four times. So I contend that Pacheco's Eliot approximations should still be read within his reciprocal poetics for their dialogues with the legacy of Eliot in Spanish and for the liberties he takes. Not only is his first translation attempt attributed to Hernández and written in prose: he also back-dates his engagement with Eliot to 1945, labeling his epigraph to *Tarde o temprano* "Traducción literal en prosa por Julián Hernández, *Letras de México*, 1945." This would be before the translation by Gaos (1950)—a gesture that speaks of the desire to get there first, to be a discoverer of great work while also acknowledging that much translation (and much writing) is retranslation and rewriting. It could also demonstrate a thymotic desire to give something to Eliot as a contemporary, to have been a part of the first reactions and encounters with this piece, rather than being only eight years old at the time of their first publication. The prose epigraph refers to the importance of Munguia's prose translation within the history of translating Eliot into Spanish. It also represents Pacheco ventriloquizing an older mode of translation practice common to the 1930s-1950s, when prose translations or glosses of well-known works were often published, sometimes with the source texts in the *vanguardista* little magazines of the Spanish American cultural hubs of Buenos Aires and Mexico DF such as *Sur* or *Contemporáneos* or *Vuelta*. By the time of his composition in 1980, a prose translation of Eliot could have seemed either old-fashioned or unaccomplished, given the availability of other Spanish translations in free verse. By using a known heteronym to execute this dated translation style, Pacheco shows that he will not hesitate to play any literary game, even the literary games of past eras, and even mixing them together.

Re-Translations and Shifting Conditions: Prose to Poetry to Criticism

Pacheco translates and re-translates same key passage from “East Coker” in three different forms over thirty real years and nearly seventy imagined heteronym years. The lines thematically treat the repeated discovery or recovery followed by loss and amnesia of an unnamed but invaluable cultural good, and the necessity to keep trying to recover it, despite insurmountable challenge. From the first fragment published by Julián Hernández in 1980 but posing as 1945, to his poetic versions from 1989 and again in 2014, Pacheco’s re-translations transition from prose to metrically respectful poetic lines to heavily annotated poetic lines. By performing the very theme of these lines, his acts of re-translation appear, in Pacheco’s words, as both “bárbaro y culto,” both invasive and cultured, both presumptuous self-interpolation and homage Eliot. Where the source text humbly places the poetic speaker “in the middle way,” Pacheco consistently brings this line back into the terms of Dante, while also adding in his own changes, placing all three voices on more equal footing. Additionally, he will shift back and forth in one of his translation decisions, where conditions for the speaker’s efforts at times *are* challenging, but at other times merely *seem* challenging. The source text reads:

So here I am, in the middle way
.....
[.....] And what there is to conquer
By strength and submission, has already been discovered
Once or twice, or several times, by men whom one cannot hope
To emulate—but there is no competition—
There is only the fight to recover what has been lost

And found and lost again and again: **and now, under conditions**

That seem unpropitious. But perhaps neither gain nor loss.

For us there is only **the trying**. The rest is not our business.

(Eliot 189, bolding mine)

These lines in question are taken from the fifth and final section of the second quartet, “East Coker,” and they mark a metric and tonal shift. The previous section draws from the legacy of San Juan de la Cruz, the English metaphysical poets and the Spanish *conceptista* poets, written in perfect *décimas* and ending in the line “Y a este Viernes llamamos Viernes Santo” (24). The final section shifts into a more conversational voice favored by the poets of Eliot’s day, who craft longer, freer lines. The opening line “So here I am, in the middle way” (Eliot) becomes “Así pues, aquí estoy, en medio del camino” (Julián Hernández) or “Y bien, estoy aquí, en medio del camino” (Pacheco 1989, 2014). Whereas Pacheco stays close to the casual register of Eliot’s speaker “So here I am” with his “Así pues, aquí estoy,” his translation introduces a strong citation from Dante where Eliot’s is more oblique, or even an avoidance of Dante in preference for a Buddhist concept of balance, neutrality. The translation by Pacheco closer to the Italian poet’s opening line “Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita.” Eliot’s line “in the middle way” has none of the sonority of “cammin,” and so when Pacheco chooses to add in “camino,” he performs in his translation the cyclical nature of art, or the insight that what is “lost / And found and lost again and again” that comes several lines down in Eliot’s “East Coker.” The belatedness of Eliot is redoubled in Pacheco’s approximation.

The section goes on to amplify this sense of coming after, arriving late on the scene and needing to recover something, hoping to measure up to those who had come

before and truly had something to conquer. In Pacheco's translation, this insight appears to have even more to do with territoriality than in Eliot:

Y lo que fuerza y sumisión deben conquistar ya ha sido descubierto varias veces por quienes uno jamás podrá emular —pero no hay competencia. Sólo existe la lucha por recobrar lo perdido y encontrado y vuelto a perderse; **y ahora en condiciones impropicias**. Pero tal vez no hay ganancia ni pérdida. Para nosotros sólo existe **el esfuerzo**. Lo demás no es asunto nuestro.—Traducción literal en prosa por Julián Hernández, *Letras de México*, 1945. (*Tarde o temprano* 13).

The 2014 approximation returns to elements of this prose version that the two intervening translations had eliminated. In this prose version, Pacheco translates Eliot such that his poetic speaker affirms something that the source text only posits. There is a relation to tradition, but an inability to use the same words. It has only grown more difficult to use language to find one's way through emotion—or so it *seems* to the speaker in Eliot's poem. Pacheco (in the voice of Hernández) does not to allow hopefulness into the first proposition “seem unpropitious” before correcting it: the first approximation in prose is “y ahora en condiciones impropicias,” but the 1989 version is “Y ahora en condiciones que parecen adversas” (26). When he expands Eliot's five lines of variant length into seven lines of more regularity, he follows his own poetic instinct. He also ends the with a beautiful couplet including the off-rhyme “intento / nuestro” to replace the visual relationship in the source text between “loss” and “business.”

—Pero no hay competencia:

Sólo existe la lucha por recobrar lo perdido

Y encontrado y perdido una vez y otra vez

Y ahora en condiciones que parecen adversas.

Pero quizá no hay ganancia ni pérdida:

Para nosotros sólo existe **el intento**.

Lo demás no es asunto nuestro.”

(*Cuatro cuartetos* 1989, 25-6)⁷⁸

He returns to the first iteration of this line in 2014: “Y ahora en condiciones impropicias” (24). In Pacheco’s last approximation, the pessimism must be figured as present, not possible or seeming, to fully appreciate the optimism of his vision of “the trying” or “el esfuerzo” or “el intento.” This initial choice was corrected to adhere more closely to the guarded, qualified pessimism of Eliot, only to be re-asserted in the last published version. Conditions do not merely seem unpropitious—they are so. This is what makes the trying so important. The conversational ease and deceptive simplicity of Eliot can prove a challenge for translators (Palma 128), and Pacheco continued to be concerned with the smallest changes that alter relative weight of the ideas contained in these lines.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ In the third and fourth editions of *Tarde o temprano* (2000 and 2009) Pacheco draws from his 1989 translation, now attributed to himself rather than to Hernández, and he shortens the citation from Eliot to the final five lines and the translation is now attributed to J.E.P.

⁷⁹ Barón Palma also highlights a few key lines from “Burnt Norton” and “East Coker” to consider the challenge of even simple phrases: “Time present and time past / Are both perhaps present in time future” (Eliot “Burnt Norton” 1-2) and “Only through time time is conquered” (Eliot “Burnt Norton” 99). He also looks at the key lines of “East Coker” that Pacheco also emphasizes through his epigraph to *Tarde o temprano*: “The rest is not our business” (Eliot). “Traduce los versos 1-2 de ‘Burnt Norton’ como ‘Están presente y pasado presentes / tal vez en el futuro. . .’, lo que resulta mejor que ‘El tiempo presente y el tiempo pasado / están quizá presente los dos en el tiempo futuro’ de Valverde. También su traducción del verso 99: ‘Sólo en el tiempo se conquista el tiempo’, es más acertada que la de éste: ‘Sólo a través del tiempo se vence al tiempo’. Por el contrario, el verso 254 de ‘Little Giding’ [sic], que Pujals traduce como ‘lo restante no es de nuestra incumbencia’, queda más natural en la versión de Valverde: ‘lo demás no es asunto nuestro’.” (Barón Palma 128). This last “more natural” version is the same as Pacheco’s—retranslation is often a process of great change, but also repetition.

The Mexican Past of the American Midwest in Pacheco's "Eliotic" Notes

Pacheco's restless habit as a translator and poet of going back to revise details or make significant changes shows a reluctance to consider any work final and a view of translation as retranslation, just as all writing is rewriting. Published in the last year of his life, the annotated approximations support the argument that his translations should be read on a plane equal to his poetry.⁸⁰ This act of re-translating his own translations places Pacheco at the end of the line of Spanish translators of Eliot; he writes himself indelibly into that tradition. A re-translation of *Cuatro cuartetos* into Spanish would now need to contend with Pacheco's annotations.

Comparing his first complete publication to the annotated approximations published nearly twenty-five years later, Pacheco takes increasing liberties of lineation. He clips even more of Eliot's long, conversational lines down to briefer phrases, reducing them to the length of one breath or thought, or approximating a traditional Spanish hendecasyllabic line. He also adds in a set of extensive footnotes, annotating Eliot in an "Eliotic" way modeled after the author's notes to "The Waste Land." These retranslations of his own translations are reminiscent of Pacheco's own performance as a self-editor, an inscription of his authority as translator over that of Eliot as author, and homage to Eliot in his guise as his own first critic, a participant in making his own mythology. Not only does Pacheco track some of Eliot sources, as Eliot did in an inconsistent way, he also exposes his own sources, concerns, and strategies as translator. In addition, he

⁸⁰ In Helen Vendler's book *Last Looks, Last Books*, she posits a unique invitation to readers made by the last books of major poets, as a rereading of prior ground covered through their poetic career, just as in the Irish folk tradition of the "last look" around your property when death is nigh. Pacheco chooses to return to this part of his translation history or legacy as one of his last published works. The belatedness of these revised translations, read through Vendler, supports my argument about Pacheco's approximations as an important segment of his poetic corpus.

interpolates into the poem the concept of a bridge, a river, or a border between the poetries of the USA and Mexico as a space of communication and shared past. Where Eliot dealt with the American imaginary and ideas of expansive East to West manifest destiny, Pacheco's annotations and word choice place another coordinate on the map: the South. In Pacheco's Eliot, the Mississippi river does not just mark a frontier with the Wild West, it also traces the North-South routes of the slave trade and marks the memory of the territorial expansion of the US into what was Mexico prior to the Louisiana Purchase.

The provenance and value of the explanatory notes he wrote for the first published edition of "The Waste Land" represent an intractable discussion in Eliot scholarship. Some find the notes to reveal the poem; others find they did more to obscure the poem than to clarify it. In his critical edition, Michael North places the beginning of this controversy at Eliot's feet because of his own dismissive description of the annotations in his essay "The Frontiers of Criticism." In this 1957 essay, he regrets his "bogus scholarship" and claims they were only written because "the poem was inconveniently short" while expressing sorrow for "having led critics into temptation" because his notes "stimulated the wrong kind of interest among the seekers of sources" (Eliot, *The Waste Land* 112-13). Yet North points out that this explanation cannot be accurate, as the poet's correspondence shows he was considering the notes long before the publication he claims required them (21fn). Some of the sources are the same: Ecclesiastes comes up in Eliot's notes to "The Waste Land" as well as Pacheco's notes to *Four Quartets*. Others are more oblique, even designed to be red herrings: just as Eliot alludes to the Tarot deck without needing to, Pacheco references "the grimpen" in the *Hound of Baskervilles*. Pacheco includes a similarly extensive series of annotations in his

revised approximations of two of the *Four Quartets* published in *Letras Libres*, “The Dry Salvages” and “East Coker.”⁸¹ These notes imitate Eliot’s notes from “The Waste Land” into his translation of *Four Quartets*; they share with Eliot’s notes the fertile mixture of useful citation that help readers discover the poem through explication of sources and other notes that are obscurantist red herrings providing little interpretive guidance.

In his annotated approximation, Pacheco transforms some of Eliot’s geographical references without altering the place names themselves. His note redefines the Mississippi river of the landscape in the first section of Eliot’s poem as the border between what would be Mexico and the USA, between two places rather than merely the frontier of the USA in a westward expansion into a wasteland. Pacheco makes the boundary between the translation and original more porous, the relevance of Eliot to Mexican literature is more direct, and the importation of Mexicanisms or other references to the Spanish language appears more a matter of excavating fossilized connections rather than importing localisms or “domesticating” Eliot for Mexico.

Eliot’s title was already a troubled translation—and Pacheco’s annotations conflate spaces and times even more vertiginously. The explanatory note affixed to the source text—which he resisted adding⁸²—clarifies the title as the “name of a place”⁸³ and asserts the origin of that name as a homophonic (false) translation from a French name.

⁸¹ These two *Letras Libres* publications do not indicate whether Pacheco completed annotations to the other two quartets, nor is it clear why Pacheco publishes the third quartet first.

⁸² Eliot decided to add it after the reaction of his trusted friend John Hayward who did not understand that “The Dry Salvages” referred to a specific place (Gardner 120-1). Helen Gardner traces the manuscripts, letters, and other documents that contributed to *The Composition of the Four Quartets* (1978), especially the letters between Eliot and his friend John Hayward. Pacheco cites her his annotation to “The Dry Salvages” and this book specifically in his “East Coker.” As an aside, Hayward also wrote an introduction and notes to the French translation, and it would be worth checking that translation to see if Pacheco used it as a source.

⁸³ In his letter to the author commenting a draft, John Hayward writes that “[The Dry Salvages] is not, like East Coker, a place-name so much as a name of a place” (Gardner 121).

Eliot's note reads: "(The Dry Salvages—presumably *les trois sauvages*—is a small group of rocks, with a beacon, off the N.E. coast of Cape Ann, Massachusetts. *Salvages* is pronounced to rhyme with *assuages*)" (191). Presenting information about place objectively but not authoritatively, Eliot's note does not claim to know for certain the origin of the name. His gloss on pronunciation indicates the name is more than a title or name for a specific place: it is also a unit of poetry with sound and metric qualities that he values, and he wants to make sure the reader knows this word sounds different than the English "savages," regardless of the connection he presumes.⁸⁴ Pacheco's annotation moves Eliot's note to the end of the poem and expands on Eliot's explanations in ways that further complicate the picture by referring to the "redskins" or "savages" and the "salvage" that the "savage" rocks become once a lighthouse is added to them.

En el habla marinera de Nueva Inglaterra se llaman *dry* a las rocas que sobresalen aun bajo la marea alta. Por el peligro que representan, los navegantes llamaron "salvajes" a este conjunto porque las piedras evocaban el peligro que para ellos significaban los pieles rojas. George Williamson apunta que, gracias a su faro, 'los tres salvajes' (*sauvages*) se convierten en *salvages*: medios de salvación contra el naufragio. (Pacheco 2011, 27)

This was precisely the explanation that Eliot's note appears to want to eschew: by distancing itself in pronunciation from the French term, there is never a "savage" in Eliot,

⁸⁴ In the first appearance of this note in the fourth manuscript of the poem, Eliot wrote that it rhymes with *rampages*, but then changed that to *assuages* in the proofs (Gardner 120). The word "rampages" relates more to "savages" whereas "assuages" relates more to "salvage"—Eliot appears to take care to create distance between the presumed French original and the English.

but Pacheco's approximation puts several into the poem through his annotations and translation choices.

In two annotations to the first period of the poem itself, Pacheco further transforms the space of "The Dry Salvages" from the Mississippi River as depicted within the American literary canon into a river that marks a space of contact between the USA and Mexico, or as a contested space, always dominated by the river regardless of the language spoken by the people in power at the time. The unnamed river that in the second line becomes the "strong brown god" is still the Mississippi river—just as "The Dry Salvages" remains the same place. But Pacheco transforms the significance of that river when he draws attention to its different meaning for different observers. The Mississippi river represents a "frontier" from the American perspective and a "border" from a perspective rooted in the people who made their homes on the other side: Mexicans and indigenous people. While "frontera" can mean both in Spanish, Pacheco's annotation makes it clear that in his approximation the river is a "border" whereas in Eliot's source text it is a "frontier" between a place (USA) and an empty wasteland.

I do not know much about gods; but I think that the river
Is a strong brown god—sullen, untamed and intractable,
Patient to some degree, at first recognized as a frontier;
Useful, untrustworthy, as a conveyor of commerce;
Then only a problem confronting the builder of bridges.
The problem once solved, the brown god is almost forgotten
By the dwellers in cities—ever, however, implacable,
Keeping his seasons and rages, destroyer, reminder

Of what men choose to forget.

(Eliot 191)

No sé mucho de dioses, pero creo que el río

Es un dios pardo y fuerte,

Hosco, intratable, indómito,

Paciente hasta cierto punto,

Al principio reconocido como frontera;

Útil, poco de fiar como transportador del comercio.

Después solo un problema para los constructores de puentes.

Ya resuelto el problema

Queda casi olvidado el gran dios pardo

Por quienes viven en ciudades

—Sin embargo, es implacable siempre,

Fiel a sus estaciones y sus cóleras,

Destructor que recuerda

Cuanto prefieren olvidar los humanos. (Pacheco 20)⁸⁵

One beautiful choice Pacheco makes in this reapproximation of Eliot is to place a different weight on the word “comercio” or “commerce” through spacing in order to bring home the disturbing history of the river. By leaving a pause in the line, he delays the revelation of what is transported on this river, inviting the reader to pause to remember that one of the major sources of commerce for the river was the slave trade.

⁸⁵ The word choices of Pacheco’s 1989 approximation are primarily the same with the exception of “supongo” instead of “creo” in the first line. However, in the first approximation he primarily maintains the lineation of the source, only adding one break between “rages, destroyer” that differs from Eliot. This second approximation splits five of the nine first lines into two.

Then, in his annotations, he takes the reader back through the history of the landscape exchanging hands between imperial powers of Europe:

Solo un problema para los constructores de puentes. El Eads Bridge (1867-1874), hecho totalmente de hierro, fue considerado en su inauguración una de las nuevas maravillas del mundo. Cuando Eliot era niño se erigió el Merchants Bridge (1887-1889) [...] San Luis Misuri fue llamado así en honor de Luis XV. Lo ocuparon los franceses y después los españoles. En 1803 Napoleón lo vendió a los Estados Unidos como parte de la compra de la Luisiana que duplicó el territorio inicial del nuevo país. Cuando nació Eliot, San Luis Misuri –**frontera entre el mundo anglosajón y el “salvaje oeste” de los indios y los mexicanos**– ya tenía 450.000 habitantes. (27, emphasis added)

While Pacheco does not cite her here, the reference to Eads Bridge likely comes from Gardner’s book. She uses Eliot’s introduction to *Huckleberry Finn* published in 1950 in order to trace his representation of the Mississippi as a brown god. In that introduction, the river is connected to one historical trauma of that landscape and of the western hemisphere in general, in that it moves bodies of enslaved people down-river as a part of the brutal plantation slavery system. But Pacheco conflates the two spaces that appear at the start of this poem by associating the “savages” of the reference to the *trois sauvages* with the idea of the river as a problem for bridge builders in order to consider the river the boundary between civilization and barbarism or between “el mundo anglosajón y el ‘salvaje oeste’ de los indios y los mexicanos” – when he repeats the word “salvaje”⁸⁶ in

⁸⁶ Sarah Meltzer writes in the French context about the distinction between “barbarian” and “savage.” The former is a being with no language or capacity for language (from the Greek and an onomatopoeic term

his gloss about the river, he ties together these two geographies in a new way. Eliot's poem does draw that connection, but for Pacheco it becomes about the frontier of the USA from the other side, the side that does not consider itself savage. Gardner writes that the drafts demonstrate Eliot's gradual connection between the two spaces of his childhood, St. Louis and New England, through the Mississippi River and the rocks he knew as "The Dry Sauvages" as spaces of two different historical traumas that both speak of the same insight: "two symbols from his childhood came together as symbols of the permanence of past agonies: the Mississippi and the reef of the Dry Salvages off Cape Ann, the ragged rock that 'is what it always was'" (49-50). Pacheco conflates these two spaces and historical traumas even further through the repetition of the word "salvaje" in relation to the Mississippi.

Within the space of the title and the first two periods, Pacheco has found two different ways to reference the "salvaje oeste" or the "savage West" of the USA and define it as a space encompassing both indigenous people and Mexicans. He defines the territory of that Mexican and American borderland as a space of cyclical destruction and renewal, themes that will occupy the rest of Eliot's long poem and which recur throughout Pacheco's work. While the note does little to illuminate Eliot's poem, it conveys an approximation, a drawing near to the geographical territory of the source text in ways that could leave the translator more at liberty to intervene into the text of this Anglo-American modernist with specific Mexican vocabularies, localisms, geographical or ecological markers.

imitating a babbling sound) and the latter is someone or something wild, savage that has the capacity to be tamed. The "wild west" in Eliot's poem is depicted from the perspective of those who anticipated and achieved taming that "empty" or "wild" space—in Pacheco's annotated approximation, there is a representation humanity given to those who are invisible to Eliot's poem.

In addition to drawing closer to Eliot's poetic landscape by interpolating shared histories, in his annotations Pacheco also reveals some of his translation choices that replace the ecology of Eliot's poem with a local set of flora, justifying the choices he makes to approximate the images. For example, he chooses "ciprés" or "cypress" instead of "yew tree" in both the 1989 and 2014 translations. In the annotated approximation, he makes explicit what was implicit in the previous translation and the source poem: this long-lived tree is associated with funerals, cemeteries, and death. The yew-tree makes several appearances in Eliot's "Four Quartets" and always as a representation of a very old, slow-moving and slow-changing living being that nevertheless does change and move over a long period of time. As one of the most long-lived species of trees in Europe, the yew-tree is a perfect conceit for Eliot's perspective on time.⁸⁷ In Pacheco's translation from 1989, the line from "Little Gidding" where the image of the yew-tree is finally resolved in the last section of the fourth quartet, reads: "El momento de la rosa y el momento del ciprés / Son de igual duración" (49). ["The moment of the rose and the moment of the yew-tree / Are of equal duration." (Eliot 208)]. The poetic representation of the perception of time through botanical, geological, or various ecological signifiers is shifted through translation, which in Pacheco's annotations also becomes a meta-commentary on how translation can shift language. If the moment of the cypress is also the moment of the yew tree, the "transplantation" of Eliot's poem into Spanish has been a success—a successful transplantation, a grafting.

⁸⁷ The yew tree is only found in Europe, Northern Africa, and Asia, so Pacheco chose to translate the tree into a similar species that is found in North America, the cypress tree. Much like the yew, the cypress is known for longevity of the tree species and the durability of the wood. It is impossible to know exactly how old a yew is, because the boughs become hollow with time, eliminating the older rings on the inside.

Pacheco's reapproximation of "significant soil" as first "el suelo significante" and decades later into "un suelo en que hay sentido" comments on translation as transplantation or grafting which gives new nutrients to both cultural contexts, creates and renews language as the soil in which repeated plantings and turning over of crops produces more and more layers of meaning. The 2011 approximation has been extensively revised from 1989: "Nosotros, los finalmente satisfechos / Si nuestra reversión temporal nutre / (A no mucha distancia del ciprés) / La existencia de un suelo en que hay sentido.—" (26). This is very different from his first translation of the last line: "La vida del suelo significante" (1989, 38). As translations for Eliot's concluding lines: "We, content at the last / If our temporal reversion nourish / (Not too far from the yew-tree) / The life of significant soil." (Eliot 199). Eliot's conception of "significant soil" can be read in both ways Pacheco chose to translate the line: as "soil that is significant, important, meaningful in the world" which is most closely conveyed by Pacheco's first translation "suelo significante." The alternate meaning of "significant" can be "that which signifies, which produces meaning in itself" and the second translation "un suelo en que hay sentido" gets at this more underlying meaning of Eliot's phrase. Spanish does have a word for yew-tree: "tejo." The choice Pacheco makes is not based on a lack. His note to "The Dry Salvages" mentions these different options.⁸⁸ In one of many examples, Pacheco uses the annotation as a space to include multiple options: ciprés, yew tree, and tejo become signs to one another and to the larger category of "árbol funerario" rather than operating only within either source or target cultures.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ "Eliot escribe por supuesto *yew tree* (tejo). En la cultura anglosajona, el tejo es el árbol de los cementerios. En la cultura hispánica, el ciprés representa el árbol funerario por excelencia" (32).

⁸⁹ Pacheco is not the first to import local flora into Eliot's poems. In an early translation of "The Hollow Men" (1925) published in *Contemporaneos* 33 (1931), translator León Felipe adapts the nursery rhyme in

In Pacheco's own work—especially the poem “Árbol entre dos muros” which is one of his first published⁹⁰—the image of the tree is also used to convey interstitial flux. A tree is somewhere between a rock and a human, it can convey the illusion of stasis while also being in constant motion. In this poem, the central image of a great tree made up of a river of sap connects these concepts of stasis and mobility.⁹¹ Pacheco chooses a translation for this key symbol of Eliot's that will call up the proper reference for his local readers of his own poetry (domestication), and through his annotation (foreignization), he expands the image to the larger category of funereal tree, a concept which flows through different cultures, which he can name in multiple ways without foregrounding one name or another in a poetics of reciprocal exchange.

Transplanted Landscapes and Grafted Histories in “East Coker”

In his annotations, Pacheco interpolates references to Spanish language poetics and the intermingling of Spanish and British histories into the poem Eliot sets in the landscape of his family ancestral home in Somerset, England. In this set of annotated details, Pacheco invites the reader to imagine that the ancestral past Eliot draws on in

“Los hombres huecos” so the line: “Here we go round the prickly pear” in his version is “No damos más que vueltas al nopal / al nopal, al nopal” (cited in Durán, 58).

⁹⁰ First collected in *Los elementos de la noche* (1963), the poem opens the initial section titled “Primera condición (1958-1959)” and remains as the first poem in *Tarde o temprano*.

⁹¹ The image of a tree between two walls is connected to the constant flow of a river — the poem plays between the stability of objects and the constant movement of life, words, emotions. He is concerned with the permanence of everything as corollary to the impermanence of everything.

Atrás, combate el tiempo contra el cielo,
como algo que no acaba al apagarse,
[...]
el gran árbol que fluye
sobre la veta móvil de su gran río de savia,
el muro de tinieblas
donde abandona el mundo nuestro nombre enlazado;
el final de la hoguera
(Pacheco *Elementos de la noche*, 13)

“East Coker” (2014) references not only the England this sixth-generation American returned to, but also an England in relationship with Spain. Where the notes to “The Dry Salvages” (2011) tended to work through geographical reference and connection between the Midwestern USA as formerly French and Mexican territories, in his notes to “East Coker” (2014) I detect a greater concern with the enmeshed history of the colonizing cultures of Early Modern Spain and England.

Pacheco’s annotations participate in the poem’s haunting of the past—but in a way that increases the vertiginous nature of reflecting on past realities. Again, Pacheco sets this tone with his extended gloss on the first line, which includes far more of the history of Mary Queen of Scots than is needed to understand the phrase “En mi principio está mi fin” as an inversion of the line “En ma fin est mon commencement” which appeared on her throne. Pacheco contributes from the translator’s perspective to the poem’s meditation on time and what could have been. He refers to the “conspiracy to free Mary Stuart” by Juan of Austria, a “natural son of Carlos V” of Spain, who died before he could execute the plan to marry her: the alliance which “would have meant the end of the imperial ambitions of the English” (26).⁹² Had England become part of the empire of Carlos V and of Catholic Spain at that point, what would that have meant for the ancestors of T.S. Eliot and their home in East Coker? Would the source text have been written in Spanish if the Spanish empire had encompassed the English? The poem takes its title from the Eliot family ancestral home in the Somerset area of England—a space

⁹² “La más importante conspiración para liberarla [María Estuarda] fue el proyectado desembarco de un ejército español al mando de don Juan de Austria (1547-1578), hijo natural de Carlos V y el héroe que en Lepanto derrotó a la armada otomana (1571). En recompensa, don Juan de Austria iba a casarse con María Estuardo. La alianza habría significado el término de las ambiciones imperiales inglesas. La prematura muerte de don Juan arruinó los planes” (26).

that he only visited once personally. This “casa solar” becomes a mystical touchstone for him in this poem, as in the scene of the first section where he imagines witnessing the fertility dance of peasants from another time. Pacheco makes it so that Eliot’s poem not only haunts the past of his own family origins—in Pacheco’s approximation Eliot even haunts the past to explore outcomes that did not obtain, alternative visions of a different way his Spanish language could have become enmeshed with the English of Eliot.

In addition to this thought experiment about the moment when England could have become Spain, Pacheco also draws out Eliot’s debt to the devotional verse of San Juan de la Cruz (1542-1591), framing this reference through the particular English translation he used. Pacheco asserts a vision of translation as an action that always expands a text. Eliot admits his interest in the Spanish mystic poet, Saint John of the Cross: he wrote a review of a translation of the mystic. In fact, Eliot took the Spanish mystic poet so seriously that he implied that few could understand or take his devotionals as a model, that few were capable of grasping him.⁹³ Moving beyond this understood intertextual reference, Pacheco’s annotations emphasize the movement from San Juan de la Cruz through the translation by E. Alison Peers into the poetic voice of Eliot. Just as Eliot then composed a version in English that bridges his own concerns with those of the sixteenth century Spanish Catholic, so does Pacheco’s translation produce a fourth version of this work. His annotated version invites a four-way comparison between versions—but also conditions the conclusions of that comparison.⁹⁴ He foregrounds three

⁹³ “During the 1930s and 1940s the cult of John promoted the publication of at least six studies and biographies in Britain, not to mention translations. Robert Sencourt, a friend of Eliot, wrote a book on John of the Cross, and also an article which Eliot published in *Criterion*” (Sharp 277).

⁹⁴ Pacheco’s incorporation of these multiple versions within his translation is an interpretive act inviting different modes of understanding from the reader than if he had written a critical essay of literary analysis positing the connections between these four versions. He simply presents three out of four different texts,

out of the four versions—the only version absent from his annotated approximation is the source text. Eliot’s absent text figures somewhere in between Pacheco’s approximation, the source Eliot drew from in *Subida del Monte Carmelo* I, 13, and the English translation by E. Allison Peers. Additionally, Pacheco creates a connection between translation practice the paradox central to mystical thought: that the loss of everything is the way to find salvation. The idea of owning only what is not yours and going through where you are not speaks to a translation practice that always only “approximates” or “approaches” a target—the importance for Pacheco, as for San Juan, is the way.

The particular section Eliot selects and rewrites from San Juan also represents a portion of his work that encodes its own history of repetition and rewriting. The text from this chapter of *Subida* was first composed as a map of the three pathways to heaven, a frontispiece which San Juan composed and sketched while imprisoned in El Calvario, now a celebrated relic of his life. A series of verses without regular meter (from nine to eleven syllables) this portion represents not only poetic achievements of San Juan but also his spiritual achievements in the promotion and circulation of his ideas: the image of the frontispiece, which was later elaborated more artistically for publication and circulation, represents an encapsulation of his spiritual thought. This image was one that San Juan de la Cruz repeated in different genres and contexts; when Eliot writes about repetition, it means one thing; but when Pacheco translates Eliot into Spanish, he also ventriloquizes San Juan’s own repetitions of these insights in multiple ways. A comparison between the lines that introduce these verses calls attention to repetition and the shifts over time and through translation in the content and in the position of the

and makes an argument for their equivalence on some level, even if they differ in the most basic ways that include language, register, and length.

speaker. Eliot's transition shifts into a conversational register that is typical of his poems.

⁹⁵ With each new repetition, a new "I" says these words, reaches this insight:

Dices que repito
Algo que he dicho.
Lo diré nuevamente.
¿Lo diré nuevamente?
Para llegar ahí,
Para llegar adonde estás,
Para salir desde donde no estás,
Debes ir por un camino en el que no hay éxtasis.
(Pacheco "East Coker," 23)

You say I am repeating
Something I have said before. I shall say it again,
Shall I say it again? In order to arrive there,
To arrive where you are, to get from where you are not,
You must go by a way wherein there is no ecstasy.
(Eliot 187)

From a comparison of the last two lines of this section in all four versions, the different lengths and registers are more apparent:

para venir a lo que no posees,

⁹⁵ Lee Oser comments on this passage to diagnoses this work of Eliot as a series of non-linear and significant poetic transitions, using the work of Henry Reed. "[T]o read Eliot well (as Reed does) is to pay attention to transitions that do not progress in a linear fashion. It is to enter into an experience of displacement and revision, not only of symbols and concepts, but of pronouns that include the self. The paradox in this passage from "East Coker" lies in the precise dissonance of the repetition; for the adverb "again" speaks to a different "I" with each turn of the verse" (223).

has de ir por donde no posees;

para venir a lo que no eres,

has de ir por donde no eres.

(San Juan de la Cruz, cited by Pacheco in “East Coker,” 29)

In order to arrive at which thou possessest not,

Thou must go by a way that thou possessest not.

In order to arrive at that which thou art not,

Thou must go through that which thou art not.

(Peers, cited by Pacheco in “East Coker,” 29)

And what you own is what you do not own

And where you are is where you are not.

(Eliot 187)

Y lo único que posees es lo que no posees

Y en donde estás es en donde no estás.

(Pacheco “East Coker,” 23)

After the citation from the Peers English translation of Saint John, Pacheco gives a brief comment that indicates some familiarity with different ideas and theories about translation between Romance languages and Germanic languages — there is an idea that to translate something from a Latinate language like Spanish into English will shrink it down, will cause up to 15-20% reduction in word count. Pacheco does not accept that this is a quality of Spanish language translations but rather insists it is translation itself that swells up a text: “No sólo las traducciones al español: toda traducción es por necesidad más verbosa que el original” (30). Pacheco appears defensive when he denies charges of

verbosity made against Spanish by unnamed speakers.⁹⁶ In his annotated approximation, Pacheco uses Eliot's poem to defend Spanish against the charge that the language will expand, inflate texts in translation.

Comparing these different versions, the heaviness of the Peers translation stands, with the word choice "possesest" conveying an older register but not reflecting the clarity of San Juan. Pacheco's translation of Eliot may fall into some of the same traps: his addition of the word "único" to the line "lo único que posees es lo que no posees" for Eliot's "what you own is what you do not own" eliminates the clean parallelism of the source. However, he exploits the similar sounds of "es" and "estás" in his translation "en donde estás es en donde no estás" where he preserves the mirror of these opposing paradoxical clauses perfectly. In Pacheco's multiplying of source texts through his annotation, he asserts an equivalency between them all that other modes of translation do not achieve. He also connects the act of translating to the text of the poem, the poetic speaker admitting to repetition, volunteering to repeat once more—"I shall say it again, / Shall I say it again?"—the question of how to go about "saying it again" is central to the possibility of translation as well as central to the aims of Eliot's *Four Quartets*. The poem is deeply concerned with crafting a language that can hold human understanding and convey it across time and otherness produced by geography and history; one conclusion the poem posits at the end is that everyone must say it again in his or her own way.

Pacheco volunteers the necessary source texts to demonstrate that Eliot saying this

⁹⁶ By representing these moments of competition and citation between the early modern Spanish and English courts and church hierarchies, Pacheco also invites the question of the relative statuses of these two languages today, in a post-NAFTA environment where the financial benefits of connecting the USA and Mexico tend to flow northwards while what flows south is a series of products that "speak" English. Pacheco's poem "H & C" refers to the Hot and Cold water taps which in Mexico City are installed in the opposite fashion to mean "Caliente" and "Helado" (from *Islas a la deriva*, in *Tarde o temprano* 182).

through the text of another is a way of performing the poetic argument his poem makes in favor of repetition. As with many of his choices as a translator of Eliot (at least in the twenty-first century approximations) he works through the sources of his source text as well as Eliot himself in order to perform this flux of language and ideas as a constant in which both he as translator and Eliot as poet are a part of the same system.

Pacheco uses the same dynamic of expansion in one of his notes in order to reference the history of Biblical translations and the participation of Spaniards in the Protestant Reformation. In the first stanza of the first section, his translation includes the line “Hay un tiempo para la construcción,” which he turns into a line on its own (in both the 1989 and 2014 versions) that emphasizes the biblical reference more than the original which reads: “Houses live and die: there is a time for building / and a time for living and for generation” (182). The note identifies this as a paraphrase of Ecclesiastes 3: 1-8, and then he goes on to cite the whole passage from the Spanish translation by Casiodoro de Reina y Cipriano de Valera (1520-1594), the excommunicated sixteenth century monk from Seville who was connected with the Polyglot Bible, who translated the Bible into Spanish as a Lutheran theologian. While the note does not give this history, Pacheco does choose a specific translation, one that predates but is roughly contemporary to the King James Bible that Eliot would have drawn from.

Yet Pacheco does not only cite the section of Ecclesiastes that Eliot paraphrases – that section is brief, and could be covered by a simple reference to a few verses.

Pacheco’s translation is: “Las casas viven y mueren: / Hay un tiempo para la construcción, / Un tiempo para habitar y engendrar / Y un tiempo para que el viento

arranque el cristal desprendido” (“East Coker” 20).⁹⁷ Instead of referencing just the few verses of the Ecclesiastes passages contained within Eliot’s poem, he includes the entire section, as though to ensure the full frame of reference for those lines.⁹⁸ Why would citing the whole chapter from Ecclesiastes inform the three line paraphrase that Eliot includes in his work? One possible consequence of this annotation is to set off a series of other associations and echoes, not necessarily directly through the Eliot, but in a constellated relationship between the biblical reference and Eliot among many rewriters of that text. Pacheco’s approximation amplifies the polyvocal elements already present in Eliot through these annotations—he places Eliot as one voice in a chorus of other voices before and after him, expressing the same concepts or even words, but with the differences inherent in any repetition.

Pacheco’s translations of Eliot over the course of his long career can be read as an argument about the nature of translation as way to measure the passage of time through languages and cultures. He asks, multiple times, ventriloquizing Eliot’s voice “¿Lo diré nuevamente?” first as a prose translation by his heteronym, then as a translation, and finally as an annotated approximation. In each distinct translation moment, the question—while remaining composed of the same words—figures differently within the work of the translator. Different poetic, religious, and symbolic representations of time

⁹⁷ “Houses live and die: there is a time for building

And a time for living and for generation

And a time for the wind to break the loosened pane” (Eliot).

⁹⁸ “*Hay un tiempo para la construcción*. Paráfrasis de Eclesiastés 3, 1-8: ‘Todo tiene su tiempo y todo lo que se quiere debajo del cielo tiene su hora. / Tiempo de nacer y tiempo de morir; tiempo de plantar y tiempo de arrancar lo plantado; / tiempo de matar y tiempo de curar; tiempo de destruir y tiempo de edificar; / tiempo de llorar y tiempo de reír; tiempo de endechar y tiempo de bailar; / tiempo de esparcir piedras y tiempo de juntar piedras; tiempo de abrazar y tiempo de abstenerse de abrazar; / tiempo de buscar y tiempo de perder; tiempo de guardar y tiempo de desechar; / tiempo de romper y tiempo de coser; tiempo de callar y tiempo de hablar; / tiempo de amar y tiempo de aborrecer; tiempo de guerra y tiempo de paz’ (Versión de Casiodoro de Reina y Cipriano de Valera)” (26).

are shared themes in the poetries of Eliot and Pacheco. Pacheco's short lyric "Siempre Heráclito" from *Irás y no volverás* represents the speaker and humanity as the worn-down rock in the middle of the river.

El viento pasa y al pasar se desdice
Se lleva el tiempo y desdibuja el mundo

Somos la piedra a la mitad del torrente
Siempre igual y distinta a cada segundo

pulida por las incesantes aguas del cambio.

(Tarde o temprano, 124)

Much like Eliot's lyrics, Pacheco's poems use the concept of flux associated with pre-Socratic philosopher Heraclitus and the fragment about time as the river that you never step in twice. The image of the river is important for Pacheco in his original poetry and in the works he chooses to translate. In the following section, I will highlight a pseudotranslation Pacheco hides within a series of translations of North American Native American poetry from an English-language anthology. Unlike his heteronyms, the paratexts do not give away the true author of this piece: instead, identifying its provenance requires knowledge of Pacheco's favored themes, including that of the Heraclitan concept of time and flux.

Approximating Indigenous Poetries of North America

We have seen that Pacheco approximates Eliot by adding notes that are not strictly necessary for understanding either the original or the translation but which reflect on the status of the Midwest USA as formerly a part of Mexico or of a stereotyped “Wild West.” In the next sections, I analyze his approximations of North American indigenous poetry and the choices he makes in terms of selection, reframing, and even creating new material. The theme of flux will allow careful readers to ask whether Pacheco approximates or invents in these compositions. What would otherwise be a humble two-part song if he credited it to himself, placed at the end of his anthology and attributed it to the Apaches, the poem “Cantos a las corrientes de la tierra” (135) performs the appropriative nature of approximation while also testing his readers and their responsibilities to remain wary of making easy assumptions about the origins of texts.

Pacheco ends his collection *Aproximaciones* (1984) with “Catorce poemas indígenas de Norteamérica,” selected from the English translations by John Bierhorst in his anthology *In the Trail of the Wind* (1971). He gives these approximations pride of place as his conclusion, and frames them as a “humble homage,” or a gift.⁹⁹ His paratextual commentaries invite analysis of these works in comparison to his own poems that think through or read with indigenous poetries of Mexico. Introducing these Spanish translations of English translations of poems and songs, selected from an anthology that works from forty different indigenous languages from North America, Pacheco writes: “it was not enough to defeat them, dispossess them of their land, exterminate them. They were also converted into a spectacle for our entertainment” (*Aproximaciones* 189, translation mine). He refers specifically to the spectacle of “daubed masses” or “masas

⁹⁹ “Quise terminar estas *Aproximaciones* que abrió Omar Khayyam con unos cuantos poemas aborígenes de Estados Unidos y Canadá, a manera de nuevo y humilde homenaje a los indios americanos” (189).

pintarrajeadas” that form a cliché visual trope in the film genre of the Hollywood Western.¹⁰⁰ While he offers his translations as a way of proving value, equivalence, giving to Spanish language readers proof that the indigenous cultures of the territories in the USA had cultural forms of value, there is also a self-critique present. He wants to approximate poems from indigenous cultures, but without forgetting how problematic it can be to translate from a culture with such a fraught history in relation to translation and power, how false it would be to say that he understands the works he translates. In this way, his homage is a gift to the source cultures but also to other translators.

The question of how to translate indigenous cultural forms for a post-Revolutionary Mexico is fraught and goes through cycles of hopefulness and cynicism; I read Pacheco’s approximations as performing both sides of that cycle. Starting in 1968, Pacheco’s own poetry explored the growing interest in Mexican indigenous languages and literary works and to writing a political poetry reflecting on Mexican social reality. Gordon Brotherston describes the wide-spread and lasting influence of the translation by Angel Garibay of *Cantares Mexicanos* and *Poesía Nahuatl* (1965-8) on Mexican letters. He understands their work as a corrective to the ideologically suspect translations of an earlier generation, especially the nineteenth century US historian W. H. Prescott who “had given an ideological twist to the ‘laments’ of the poet-king Nezahualcoyotl (1402-72), seeing in them covert yearning for Cortes and his religion” (343). As Brotherston argues, Pacheco was a part of this profound and widespread moment of reevaluation of Nahuatl texts from the period before and during the conquest—a new approach, both to the texts themselves and to the model of translation applied to these texts. In his own

¹⁰⁰ He makes this connection through a reference to the poem “Western” by Azevedo Oliveira, one of the works by a heteronym that Pacheco presents as an approximation with the rest (189).

work, Pacheco has practiced and also problematized the collapsing of a long historical past with a representation of the present-day. The two-part poem “Manuscrito de Tlatelolco” combines these two historical moments. It begins with the first part “Lectura de los ‘Cantares Mexicanos’” which cites from the indigenous narration of the Spanish conquest of the Aztec empire as recently translated in *Visión de los vencidos* by Ángel Garibay. The second part “Las voces de Tlatelolco” narrates the massacre of 1968 through the citation of eyewitness testimonies and journalistic accounts.¹⁰¹ Together these two works form one “manuscript” that Pacheco’s poetic voice assembled together for a new meditation on Mexican history through his present moment and vice versa.

Whereas Brotherson reads the translation work of Garibay and León-Portilla as correcting the hegemonic ideological position of previous translations and replacing those with a new “enhanced understanding” of elements of life for the Nahuatl-speakers of pre-Colombian and colonial times, Ignacio Sánchez Prado has described how problematic this moment was as well, how it was as equally imbricated as other historical moments in a hegemonic process of constructing the indigenous past in a certain way for the purposes of present day political realities.¹⁰² For him, these translations are utilized by a state project of identity politics, which makes these new translations a “paradoxical form of political empowerment that goes beyond the defense of the cause itself, for the

¹⁰¹ This poem was written for Elena Poniatowska’s work of nonfiction narrative *La noche de Tlatelolco* (1971) but first collected in *No me preguntes cómo pasa el tiempo* (1969).

¹⁰² “The defense of the indigenous people and the recovery of their cultural origins within a national state constructed and sustained by a *criollo/mestizo* ideology after the Mexican Revolution allowed the use of the Pre-Colombian imaginary in the different discourses that has sustained the revolutionary regime’s ideology. From the idealization of the Indian and his culture in works such as Ermilo Abreu Gómez’s *Canek* to the use of supposedly indigenous traits as a form of defining, and sometimes criticizing the ‘Mexican self’ (i.e., Samuel Ramos’s *Perfil del hombre y la cultura en México*) and reaching one of its more paradigmatic points in José Vasconcelos’s work, a large intellectual tradition of recovery of the Pre-Colombian past as icon of the agendas of the revolutionary regime has led to a reading of León-Portilla’s work as one of the bases for the constitution of a national ideology” (Sánchez-Prado 49).

recognition of Pre-Colombian origins allows a prescriptive construction of notions of national identity through its usage by different instances of the political hegemony” (Sánchez-Prado 49). As a translator, Pacheco negotiates between the less critical position of Brotherston and the more dubious perspective of Sánchez-Prado, a delicate balance he works through by translating from an English language collection of indigenous poetics from throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Pacheco’s approximations share some of what Brotherston describes as the “corrective” ideology of the Garibay/León Portilla project—his selection and editing of Bierhorst’s works reflect this ideology. However, when he adds a pseudotranslation, he is critiquing the translation project as inevitably an invention along the lines of contemporary ideological identity politics, in a way that is closer to Sánchez-Prado’s position. Pacheco makes choices as a translator in his selection, editing, and word choice that reveal his investment in seeing the indigenous past as one of honorable resistance rather than passive capitulation: he cuts a poem off before the surrender occurs, or he emphasizes the present-tense of these poems where the source text (the translation by Bierhorst) tends to dwell in the past. He also works to give his translations qualities of song and prayer that the English source texts do not always have, even when the texts are labeled “songs” or “prayers.”

Pacheco writes with more ambivalence about the state-sponsored cultural forms or a normative interest in North American indigenous people sponsored by an intellectual elite because he cannot say the same things about the Mexican instrumentalization of indigenous cultural forms. His “Catorce poemas” measures the distance between the moment of his translations (1984) and the earlier moment that celebrated the Garibay

translations (1965-8) or the translation collection by Bierhorst (1971). The 1960s and 1970s represent a high point in the incorporation of indigenous poetics into the writing of both U.S. American and Mexican poetry.¹⁰³ By 1984, Pacheco cannot have the same celebratory attitude about the translation of indigenous texts. Writing during the Reagan administration and the rise of neoliberalism, he can no longer uncritically applaud or participate in cultural recognition of indigenous people when they were being increasingly exploited through new economic relations with the USA.

Reframing Bierhorst's Frame: "American Indian Poems and Ritual Orations"

Bierhorst frames his work curating indigenous poems in translation by inventing an internal thematic unity among indigenous poems that he does not extend to other world cultures. He also posits that these texts should be considered literary and that they conserve cultural values that are lasting even if not monumental or architectural. Bierhorst does acknowledge that the categories he invents to organize his anthology are purely constructed—but he then insists on their validity. He organizes the poems not by culture but around themes including "The Deer," "Home," "Dreams," and "The Arrival of the Whites," or genres including "Omens and Prophecies," "Words of War," or a series of prayers labeled "Give Us Many Good Roads." He does express, rightfully, some ambivalence about grouping together a vast and diverse set of cultures without differentiating between Crow, Apache, Inca, or Aztec. And he evinces some desire to compare the architectural marvels of some cultures with the nomadic state of others while

¹⁰³ Bierhorst is not the only US American poet to work on translations of indigenous works as a poet and not an anthropologist. Others such as Jerome Rothenberg represent a supplemental and literary approach to the work by American ethnographers such as Dennis Teacock who translated the Popol Vuh into English.

avoiding the privileging of physical monument over intangible ones.¹⁰⁴ However, he ultimately goes forward in a way that Pacheco's translations will critique.

Bierhorst appears to be less uncomfortable than Pacheco with the generalizations that his anthology implies. Even while Bierhorst problematizes his own act of selection in placing together many peoples and languages and divergent cultural histories into one volume, under the same rubric or using the same organizing principles, he immediately defends his categories.

The thematic arrangement of the following selections is an attempt to call attention not only to the differences but to **the similarities that exist between Native American cultures**. It should be borne in mind, however, that hundreds of different languages are spoken by American Indians; and needless to say, the indigenous cultures of British Columbia and Guatemala, for example, are very very different. **Yet certain aspects of Indian thought seem sufficiently widespread to deserve notice** (Bierhorst introduction, n.p.; emphasis added).

The repeated modifier "very very different" protests too much, because Bierhorst quickly goes on to identify shared cultural traits and formal aspects to the poetry he translates from all these "very very different" cultures. These include: the power of words,¹⁰⁵ the significance of dreams, personality given to animals and objects, dualism as an extension

¹⁰⁴ "By A.D. 500 the great cultures of Mexico, Central America, and Peru were already in full flower. (Although these classic civilizations may be taken to represent the pinnacle of Indian achievement, they are by no means superior in every respect. Out of a complex of cultures whose lasting values are not merely technological but especially artistic, even ethical, one may choose to glorify Navajo religion or Kwakiutl painting or Iroquis law as well as, say, Mayan architecture)" (Bierhorst introduction, no page numbers).

¹⁰⁵ While Bierhorst does not put it this way, because this critical vocabulary is used today more than in the 1970s, he means the use of performatives, or speech acts empowered to change reality. We now understand performatives to be particular to different situational speech acts rather than specific to one culture or group of cultures.

of sexuality, “Father Sky and Mother Earth,” “the cult of the four world quarters” which also makes the number four sacred, and anonymity. Bierhorst uses these general concepts to make translation choices: because of the personification of nature, he writes “wind” rather than “the wind,” for example. Unfortunately, it would be possible to attribute most of these general world-views to Greek or Roman classical myth, or Nordic myth, or others, and that obvious parallel is not explored. This implies that there is only parallelism between indigenous cultures of the Western Hemisphere.¹⁰⁶ In short, Bierhorst attributes a series of shared qualities to Native American poetics without making much distinction between different cultures, while implying a large distinction between this conglomerate indigenous culture and other world cultures.

While Pacheco shares one of Bierhorst’s premises—namely that indigenous lyrical or literary works should be recognized as much as architectural monuments already are—he does not share the idea of a broad indigenous thematics. Unlike Bierhorst, he champions the value of indigenous poetry of North America in comparison with all world cultures, not just with other indigenous cultures of the Americas. Yet his pseudotranslation denies the possibility that we can know what cultural values are being transmitted—those of source or target cultures. With slightly more direct vocabulary, Pacheco expresses a similar perspective in reference to the question of value in the poetry he is translating. He also stakes out his intervention into Bierhorst’s problematic grouping together, and flattening into one, all of the civilizations of the Americas under the same

¹⁰⁶ While it is purely speculative to ask why Bierhorst would be avoiding drawing parallels with Greek and Roman cosmologies, he does miss this opportunity to do something closer to the attitude held by José Martí: we need our own ancients more than those of Greek and Rome. In his own way, he is falling into the old distinction between indigenous peoples of the Americas as though they are different from the forefathers of Western civilization.

rubric. “Ni bárbaros ni salvajes, aún aquellos que no edificaron Palenque ni Macchu Picchu ni unas artes plásticas comparables a la escultura Azteca, hicieron una poesía como la europea y la oriental” (Pacheco 189). Using the terms “bárbaros” and “salvajes” even in the negative associates this translation with a long history of the discourse of civilization and barbarism in the Americas. He also insists on equivalence not only with Aztec or Incan civilizations but also with European and Asiatic cultures. Given the vast diversity of world cultures he includes in his anthology of approximations, Pacheco invites comparisons across a broader geography than Bierhorst, who resists those parallels either thematically or in terms of aesthetic judgment.

Pacheco makes no pretense of objectivity and tends instead to translate pieces that best relate to his own work. He alters them significantly in the same way he did with Eliot’s English, but he uses other techniques such as editing out sections that do not match a particular ideology about indigenous resistance and choosing value-laden vocabulary to support that perspective. Reading the patterns in the types of changes Pacheco made to Bierhorst’s work, he uses strategies of (1) selection (2) repunctuation to recast prose into poetic lines and to alter meaning (3) explanation to provide information not in the text and (4) interpolation. It should be noted here that Bierhorst included translations from Spanish versions of Ángel Garibay and from indigenous languages of South and Central America; Pacheco does not, as those works are available in Spanish. He separates the indigenous past of the USA from that of Spanish America where Bierhorst conflated them.

In one example of relineation, Pacheco’s “Canción de amor de los Kwakiuti” (Pacheco 136) is an approximation of Bierhorst’s “Love Song of a Young Man”

(Bierhorst 84) that succeeds as a poem where the English source is stiff and unremarkable. He uses “amada” where the English “mistress” stands out as the wrong word for the context. There is also the repetition of “Whenever” in English, whereas Pacheco uses line-breaks to trace a beautiful, meandering shape on the page:

Si como,
como el dolor de tu amor, amada.
Si duermo,
sueño el dolor de tu amor, amada.
Si yazgo,
yazgo en el dolor de tu amor, amada.
Dondequiera que voy
piso el dolor de tu amor, amada.”

(Aproximaciones 136-7)

Compared to the almost prosaic lines of Bierhorst’s translation, Pacheco’s approximation conveys more emotion and lyricism through presentation on the page and sonorous word choice. The restless meandering of the lovesick is immediately visible and audible, whereas in Bierhorst’s version, the lines do not come to life:

Whenever I eat, I eat the pain of your love, mistress.
Whenever I get sleepy, I dream of my love, my mistress.
Whenever I lie on my back in the house, I lie on the pain of your love,
mistress.
For whenever I walk about, I step on the pain of your love, mistress.
(Bierhorst 84)

Pacheco's poem sounds more like a song and speaks more to the extremity of love experiences than Bierhorst's version. The lines begin with "si" or "if" in Pacheco's version, leaving open the possibility that the speaker will not eat, or sleep, for the pain of this love, whereas Bierhorst's speaker claims to experience the pain of love "whenever I eat." The intensity of love-sickness intensifies for Pacheco's speaker, who will either eat the pain of love or eat nothing and experience the pain of hunger and of love, or the pain of sleeplessness along with that of love. The speaker might even avoid these human needs in effort to escape the pain of love, but that attempt will also be fruitless. Pacheco also ends the poem with a more global expression: "dondequiera que voy" means "wherever I go," not "whenever I walk about" as in Bierhorst's line. The speaker experiences the same pain everywhere and anywhere, rather than only in those moments as detailed in the source text. Additionally, the choice to use "mistress" stands out as odd diction. Even in "To His Coy Mistress," Marvell's speaker never addressed his beloved with that label within the poem. This translation choice also strikes the ear as a mismatch in register to the informality of "get sleepy." From Bierhorst's unformed phrases with unclear tone and unconvincing descriptions of love, Pacheco shapes a poem.

Even when Pacheco translates without making new line breaks or diction, his translations can demonstrate the same ideology Brotherston identifies in the translations by Garibay and León-Portilla, to correct the record of previous translations by removing a tone of lament and desire for the oppressor. In his approximation of "Profecía (*Iroqueses*)" (137) Pacheco cuts the poem off before it places the collective poetic voice of the indigenous people in the irretrievable past. His translation of "Prophecy *Iroquis*"¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷ The ideology of indigenous presence is even served by the grammatical difference in English and Spanish: Bierhorst uses the singular name of the tribe as a label for each poem, to signify that this

is direct, although he divides it into long lines of poetic prose rather than leaving it as a block of narrative prose. But Pacheco completely changes the resulting mood by eliminating the second half of the prophecy. I quote them in full to demonstrate how a translation that eliminates portions of the original text makes a statement about that text.

Many winters ago, our wise ancestors predicted that a great monster, with white eyes, would come from the east and, as he advanced, would consume the land. This monster is the white race, and the prediction is near its fulfillment. They advised their children, when they became weak, to plant a tree with four roots, branching to the north, the south, the east, and the west; and then collecting under its shade, to dwell together in unity and harmony. This tree, I propose, shall be this very spot. Here we will gather, here live, and here die.

(Bierhorst 140)

Hace muchos inviernos nuestros sabios ancestros lo predijeron:
el monstruo de ojos blancos llegará del oriente. Al avanzar consumirá la tierra.

Este monstruo es la raza blanca. La profecía está a punto de cumplirse.

(Pacheco 137)

When Pacheco chooses to end his approximation of the prophesy before the advice, his translation takes the reader back in time, further than the translation into English by

“Prophecy” is from the “Iroquis tribe,” singular because it is in its adjective form. Pacheco consistently uses the plural to label the poem’s origin: Papagos, Iroqueses, Arapajos. This makes them seem more vital, numerous, and present as a group of people or a living community. Instead, the singular adjectival form that Bierhorst uses signifies less as a contemporary culture than as a label of a culture that does not have any members any more: Papago, Iroquis, Arapajo.

Bierhorst, to before the prophesy is fulfilled. Instead of inviting the reader to imagine a community planning the location and manner of its own demise, which implies the assumption that the day of weakness predicted by the ancestors is in the past, Pacheco creates a space in which the prophecy still has not been fulfilled. Through this use of a different grammatical mood, he places the presence of the indigenous culture in the present rather than in a doomed past.

Pseudotranslation: Original Work Presented as an “Apache Song”

The most unusual, daring, or even invasive¹⁰⁸ gesture Pacheco makes is to add in a poem of his own creation to the other thirteen selections that indeed come from Bierhorst’s anthology. He undermines the stability of his entire translation anthology and calls into question the possibility of a translation to be other than an invented ventriloquism. Someone familiar with the poetry Pacheco publishes under his own name could recognize in this work the themes of Pacheco. A suspicious reader may think this poem was somehow “too good to be true” in its correspondence with his own poems. Claiming to be a set of two “Songs to the Currents on Earth” by the Apaches, Pacheco interpolates a reflection on the theme of Heraclitean flux into his collection of approximations. This adds to the instability of his translation voice and shows his willingness to add in his own philosophy to works of the past.

He labels this pseudotranslation with the culture of the Apaches, a North American tribe that does not get more than one entry in Bierhorst’s anthology. In one

¹⁰⁸ I deliberately use the term invasive to connote the violence that is often ascribed to any act of translation. Pacheco performs this invasive gesture, and it both relieves the other translations from the same strong condemnation and also implicates even translations with sources in this invasive act of invention and appropriation.

sense, this could be read as another way in which Pacheco appears to “correct” Bierhorst, providing additional cultural material from a particular indigenous group that has not received sufficient attention from the other translator. On the other hand, and with equal weight, the very act of doing so by inventing a poem and attributing it to the Apaches is equally problematic as creating an impression that some cultures were somehow more poetic and literary than others. An umbrella term that came to English through Spanish, “the Apache” refers to the indigenous peoples making their lives on the Great Plains, the American Southwest, Oklahoma, and other regions between the USA and Mexico both before and after the Louisiana Purchase.¹⁰⁹ In short, cultural labels given to indigenous cultures by settler-colonial cultures tend to be fraught mis-translations—or, as in the case of the Apache, pseudotranslations—of what a people called themselves. There is no way to find the source of any of the indigenous poems Pacheco approximates without consulting the source anthology. Bierhorst cites specific languages, volumes, and the other scholars and translators who have compiled these poetic works. Each one of his translations has an entry that explains the source and even gives a bit of commentary. Pacheco does not give his readers that context; instead, his introductory note presents his ideas about the act of translating indigenous poetry rather than tracing back through literary or scholarly sources for the poetry he is translating. As I discussed previously, he places these poems on an equal plane with world literatures, writing that he ends his

¹⁰⁹ This is the first recorded definition of “Apache” in Spanish: “Apache. Adj. Dicese del individuo de una tribu Americana que ocupa la zona fronteriza entre los Estado Unidos y Méjico. Ú. t. c. s. Pertenciente o relativo a esta tribu. m. Miembro de una asociación de malhechores que hicieron de Paris campo de sus fechorías y que tomaron el nombre de la tribu antes citada. Por extensión, se usa el nombre de apache como sinónimo de malhechor. Estar apache. frs. fam. *Amér.* En Chile, tener dos o más personas grande amistad o confianza” (1917 Diccionario Alemany y Boulfer). The contemporary definition is: “Se dice del indio nómada de las llanuras de Nuevo México, caracterizado por su gran belicosidad.” (Real Academia Española, 2014).

volume which began with Omar Khayyam “a manera de nuevo y humilde homenaje a los indios americanos” (189). While he does not give as much context for these poems as for the Eliot approximations later in his life, he does not give any of the poets in the volume any more annotation or background information: poets from the most renowned to the anonymous to those he invents all receive the same treatment.

Pacheco’s pseudotranslation can be read as a larger commentary on translation: the poem he adds is about flux, and can be read as a commentary on the ever-changing position of writers, texts, and readers. The poem’s title “Cantos a las corrientes de la tierra” (135) encodes the paradox inherent in translation practice. “Corriente” is a word that encapsulates so much about the problem of flow and stability that literary translation deals with. The term in Spanish incorporates multiple opposites: both stylish or up-to-date and common or cheap; both constant movement and a stable pathway or trajectory. It could also be read as a signal to a suspicious reader: the concept of an Apache song to tumultuous, howling torrential rivers could represent an interesting disconnect for the generally arid geographies in which the image of “the Apaches” have typically been depicted. In reading the poem as connected to the concept of flux, the history of the term in Spanish reveals its flow between opposites and across different European powers participating in the exploitation of the world’s “currents” through global navigation. The word “corriente” can be an adjective meaning fluid, but also a noun meaning a current in constant flow: the word itself encloses the fable of Herodotus.¹¹⁰ The title highlights the

¹¹⁰ The definition of “corriente” in the RAE includes elements of fluidity but also stability. Constant movement but stability of direction. The adjective definitions include “(1) Que corre. (2) Dicho de una semana, de un mes, de un año o de un siglo: Actual o que va transcurriendo. (3) Que está en uso en el momento presente o lo estaba en el momento de que se habla. *La moda corriente*. (4) Dicho de un recibo, de un número de publicación periódica, etc: Último aparecido, a diferencia de los atrasados. (5) cierto, sabido, admitido comúnmente. (6) Que no tiene impedimento ni estorbo para su uso y efecto. (6) Que no tiene impedimento ni estorbo para su uso y efecto. (7) Admitido o autorizado por el uso común o por la

oxymoronic tension of the word “Corrientes”—and Pacheco activates a less common meaning for the term. The word calls up the current of a river, but metonymically it also stands for the river itself in this poem. The title could therefore refer to all the rivers of the earth; or to the currents of the world, all waters including rivers and oceans, or to the all the different elements in flux on earth, including wind currents, electrical currents of lightning or other forms of electricity, or the fault-lines of the earth’s crust. The title contains the elegant concept that even things that do not appear to have any motion or “currents” within them actually are in constant flux and motion. A current speaks to the possibility of constant change but also to a permanent localization in one place on the surface of the earth.¹¹¹ The poem reads:

Cantos a las corrientes de la tierra (*Apaches*)

1

El manso arroyo esbelto,
convertido en torrente,

costumbre. (8) Que sucede con frecuencia. (9) Medio, común, regular, no extraordinario. (Dicho de una persona: De trato llano y familiar. (11) Dicho del estilo: fluido (suelto, fácil).” The noun definitions include: “(12) Movimiento de traslación continuado, ya sea permanente, ya accidental, de una masa de materia fluida, como el agua o el aire, en una dirección determinada. (13) Masa de materia fluida que se mueve de este modo. (14) corriente eléctrica (15) Tiro que se establece en una casa o habitación entre las puertas y ventanas. (16). Curso, movimiento o tendencia de los sentimientos o de las ideas. As an adverb, the word also means “(17) para mostrar aquiescencia o conformidad” (Definition from RAE). The historical dictionaries (Nebrija, Autoridades) demonstrate the wide lexical ambiguity of the word from the start of its long history of its use in different languages and contexts. The Autoridades includes a few gems: “Vale tambien por translacion el progreso y continuado curso de alguna cosa, con repetidos y demasiados actos, que llevan tras si y ocasionan perjudiciales consecuencias. ... En la Germanía significa Rio. Juan Hidalgo en su Vocabulario” (1729 Autoridades).

¹¹¹ “Currents” could be a better metaphor for translations than “constellations.” Currents move in relationship to other currents, but retain a centrifugal pull and remain loosely connected to one location. A constellation, on the other hand, is made up of stable elements that move with time but in a cyclical fashion. Constellations can be reinvented, created from new legends, or from the deaths of great figures in myth and history. The constellation is celestial, aspirational whereas the current is terrestrial, common. Constellations and currents both were elements that aided global expansion and travel, but they evoke different imaginary reactions. If translations of world literature form constellations, I might describe the anonymous translations of oral poetics that Pacheco promotes as translation currents instead.

alaba
con su bramar tumultuoso
la generosidad de la Madre Lluvia.
2
No he de volver a verte,
río. Seguirás fluyendo
sin mí, sin mí.
Tan sólo otra mirada
que se añadió a tus aguas.
(*Aproximaciones* 135)¹¹²

Pacheco's pseudotranslation incorporates the destabilization of the poetic speaker by using repetition and negation to create an unstable poetic speaker primarily known through absence, movement, loss and haunting. The repetition of "sin mi, sin mi" evokes the repeated stepping into the river, a different river each time, where every repetition implies a difference. It also speaks through a doubled or tripled poetic voice—what kind of poetic speaker gets constructed through this pseudotranslation? The anthology by Bierhorst encouraged a literal or even non-literary reading of these works, even as he

¹¹² Songs to the Earth's Currents (Apache)

1

The tame and slender stream
transformed into a torrent
praises
with its tumultuous howl
the generosity of Mother Rain.

2

I need not return to see you,
river. You will continue flowing
without me, without me.
Just another look
added to your waters.

presented them as poems—the “us” or the “we” in these poems, in his reading, is a collective voice of the “culture” passing knowledge through generations.¹¹³ However, when Pacheco writes that the Apaches wrote this line “without me, without me,” he creates a multiplication of positions for the poetic speaker of this work, and implicitly for all of his other approximations. If you accept Bierhorst’s reading of indigenous poetry, the line refers to a river that is left without the Apaches who are no longer near the same rivers, either through forced displacement or through extermination. If you accept Bierhorst’s reading but acknowledge that this is Pacheco’s creation, the line refers to a poem left without the actual author, who has left behind his creation, signed with another anonymous name and disguised as a translation. Reading the line as a lyric construction relates the poem to the long history of other elegiac poetic works expressing the nostalgia for a lost home, the *saudade* of the navigator always looking out to sea. The collectivity of this poetic speaker, therefore, would include opposing figures that mutually exclude one another—the native and the traveler, the individual poet and the expression of collective sentiment. Through pseudotranslation, Pacheco achieves one of his goals for his collection of approximations: constructing works where texts matter more than authors, and where the real translator is the Spanish language as processed through a long view of Mexican history. Pacheco ends his introductory note placing himself in a long line of indigenous and bi-cultural translators into Spanish: “Mediante su humilde intérprete mexicano—uno más, otro más en una cadena que empezó cuando Fernando de

¹¹³ “The Indian poet does not consider himself the originator of his material but merely the conveyor. Either he has heard it from an elder or he has received it from a supernatural power. Describing more or less the same processes, the self-conscious European or Euro-American poet speaks of reworking traditional materials or, fancifully of drawing inspiration from a muse. But the Indian, being relatively unself-conscious, does not see it this way. Indian poetry, then, is usually attributed not to an individual but to his culture” (Bierhorst, no page numbers).

Alva Ixtlixóchitl tradujo en liras frayluisinas los poemas de su bisabuelo Nezahualcóyotl, no se ha interrumpido ni cesará—el verdadero autor de estas *Aproximaciones* es el idioma español” (8). Again, if the “true author is the Spanish language,” his translations mean to give something to that language, rather than merely take something away from the source culture in order to convey the source text in Spanish. This stated goal is brought into further relief when Pacheco attributes works of his own creation to anonymous or invented authors.

Approximations of Brazil: Between Fame and Anonymity, Memory and Amnesia

Just as when Pacheco invents a pseudotranslation that fits with his own theme of flux, when he translates from Brazilian literature, he chooses texts that will create a parallel with his own literary sensibility. His awareness of the works by the Portuguese poet Fernando Pessoa is evidenced by his use of heteronyms; but unlike Paz, Pacheco does not translate Pessoa. Not only does he avoid the internationalized Concrete Poetry movement when he translates a *modernista*, he also avoids the early heroic phase of Brazilian *modernistas* championed by the *concretistas* and instead chooses Vinicius de Moraes (1913-1980), the crossover poet who popularized his work in *bossa nova*. Pacheco also works with two poets associated with the Geração de 45: Lêdo Ivo (1924-2012) and the Angolan-Brazilian poet Fernando Ferreira de Loanda (1924-2002) who was a key figure in that movement as both a poet and an anthologist defining that generation in *Antologia da nova poesia brasileira* (1965). In addition to these approximations that have source texts in Portuguese, Pacheco also invents a heteronym named Azevedo Oliveira, a Brazilian poet born ten years after those of the Geração de

45, a poet who would draw from their techniques. He uses this character to ventriloquize critiques about Mexican and U.S. American placements of the indigenous body into their poetic histories and their popular culture. Looking at the small segment of Brazilian poetry presented by Pacheco, we see a vision of the Geração de 45 and its legacy that is not related to the aesthetic experimentalism of the Brazilian concretists. Much like Pacheco himself, these poets instead pursue a poetics of simplicity and legibility, where complexity is constructed through referentiality, games of deferred authorship and authority. As I will examine in Chapter 3 in the case of the field of translation practice in Brazil as influenced by theories of Haroldo de Campos, Pacheco's translation practice shares with Campos an interest in using translation to construct a porous body of work that speaks to a different model of world literature, a personal one, routed through their particular idioms of Mexican Spanish or Brazilian Portuguese. Pacheco is closer to Haroldo de Campos than Paz as a translator, although he claims Paz as his model and ignores concrete poetry.

Pacheco translates a poem by Vinicius de Moraes in which the speaker struggles with the desire for anonymity that may accompany the degree of literary fame that both poets had achieved by 1984. Moraes was a member of the Brazilian *modernista* cohort, but he was also the poet who moved furthest beyond the elite and aestheticized early phases of that movement in the 1920s and 1930s. Later in his life, he was more associated with the *bossa nova* movement, composing bossa-nova lyrics and the play that would become the film *Black Orpheus* (1959). In the poem "Mensagem à poesia" from his 1960 anthology, Moraes is an ideal voice for Pacheco to adopt to articulate his own rejection of elements of his life in poetry, a certain set of expectations about what poetry is or can be,

or what a poet should do. Much like Pacheco, Vinicius de Moraes unites a complex and elite tradition (including that of the Peninsular tradition and its literary forms) with a humble, accessible and readable poetry that speaks to the conditions and lives of the regular people in their respective countries. Pacheco cites Angel Crespo calling Moraes a poet “of the minority and of the multitude.”¹¹⁴

Pacheco translates Moraes as a way of commenting on the desire for anonymity that may accompany literary fame, an argument that fits well within his collection *Aproximaciones*, which he wanted to publish anonymously. In “Mensagem à poesia” the poetic speaker declaims a rejection of contact with others in the poetry community, an avoidance of performing the duties of one who has achieved the celebrity of authorship. Pacheco tends to avoid the spotlight, or at least perform his rejection of attentions to his persona over his poetry, and he has written a similar poem titled “Carta a George B. Moore en defensa del anonimato” in which the poetic speaker rejects the invitation of an American give a reading. Pacheco confirms in an interview that this text does reflect some of his thinking about the difference between the work the author writes and the work the reader reads, and he places “mis versos y mis versiones” on the same plane.¹¹⁵

In the context of this poem by Pacheco, his approximation of Moraes appears at first to also elaborate on his refusal to give interviews or perform all of the expected duties of the celebrated poet or participant in public intellectual life. This first impression may be produced by the relationship between the title: “Mensagem à poesia,” [“Recado a

¹¹⁴ “Angel Crespo ha dicho que Moraes hermana al toreador y el juglar, el poeta de minorías y el poeta de multitudes” (*Aprox.* 177).

¹¹⁵ “Y yo quisiera como el maestro español / que la poesía fuese anónima ya que es colectiva / (a eso tienden mis versos y mis versiones). / Posiblemente usted me dará la razón. / Usted que me ha leído y no me conoce. / No nos veremos nunca pero somos amigos. / Si le gustaron mis versos / qué más da que sean míos / de otros / de nadie. / En realidad los poemas que leí son de usted: / Usted, su autor, que los inventa al leerlos” (*Tarde:* 2009, 304).

la poesía,” “Message to Poetry,”] the successive lines of refusal, impossibility, and the final object of the “encuentro” which can mean “encuentro” or “meeting” or even “conference” or “seminar” when the term is used in the context of literary or academic life, while it could mean “date,” “appointment,” “encounter” or “meet-up” in other contexts.

No puedo, no es posible

Díganle que es totalmente imposible

Ahora no puede ser, es imposible, no puedo.

Díganle que lo siento muchísimo pero esta noche no puedo ir a su encuentro.

(Pacheco *Aproximaciones*, 99)¹¹⁶

Não posso

Não é possível

Digam-lhe que é totalmente impossível

Agora não pode ser

É impossível

Não posso.

Digam-lhe que estou tristíssimo, mas não posso ir esta noite ao seu encontro.

(Moraes)

¹¹⁶ [I just can’t, it’s not possible
Say that it’s completely impossible
It can’t be—now—it’s impossible, I can’t.
Just say that I’m very sorry but tonight I can’t make it to the meeting.
(my translation from Pacheco’s translation)]

The pronouns “le” and the “lhe” of Spanish and Portuguese hide the gender of the person the poetic speaker is avoiding until later in the poem. This allows the object to be ambiguous for a time, and for the surprise that this avoided encounter is a romantic one with a woman: “Explíquenle delicadamente y sin lastimarla que si no voy / no es porque no la quiera y ella lo sabe / Es porque hay héroes en la cárcel” (100). The poetic speaker cannot allow himself either poetry or romantic attachment because of all the people going hungry, because of all the tyrannies of the world. This approximation also demonstrates Pacheco’s tendency to reorganize poetic lines according to his sense of the necessary rhythm for a free verse creation in Spanish rather than reproducing the choices made for another language. Where he shortened Eliot’s long lines in *Four Quartets*, he lengthens the short lines of Moraes by combining them into lines that are closer in length to his own, making the poem fit with his own work stylistically and thematically.¹¹⁷

Pacheco, much like Paz, participated in the form of direct reciprocity in translation by translating the poetry of other translators, including translators who had made versions of his own work and translators who worked on others. Loanda lived in Mexico, worked to promote and translate Brazilian poetry there, and was himself translated into Spanish.¹¹⁸ Loanda was a member of and key part of consolidating the Geração de 45 and Lêdo Ivo was a celebrated member of this poetic group. The poem “Chichén Itzá” by Loanda and translated by Pacheco unites favorite themes of the Mexican poet—endurance of substances and language through multiple transformations; the natural elements such as water, sand, or stone as reflections in a different pace and

¹¹⁷ Pacheco wrote a poem where the speaker describes why he does not write love poetry. Yet his translations of two Brazilian poets Moraes and Loanda include the theme of love. By translating poets who relate to some of his preferred themes, he also gains a bridge to those he has refrained from exploring.

¹¹⁸ Gabino Alejandro Carriedo translated Loanda into Spanish.

vocabulary of the same biological transformation and cycle that human beings go through—with a location in Mexico related to international tourism and travel literature. The site of a Mayan city in the Yucatan was described by many visiting authors including Simone de Beauvoir, D.H. Lawrence, and Malcolm Lowry. The poem also draws from a set of images and vocabulary central to some of the most celebrated poems of Brazilian modernism: the image of the stone as a piece of language, the stone as a word, the speaking stone. These are heavily recycled images from Carlos Drummond de Andrade “No meio do caminho tinha uma pedra” or from the prime member of the Geração de 45 João Cabral de Melo Neto in “O Sertanejo falando,” in which a Northeasterner, a humble rural Brazilian, is represented as speaking through the rocks in his mouth, which are metonymically related to the rocks he works with as a mason.

La piedra habla y es paisaje;
por aquí pasó un hombre, aquí
cayó la lluvia, la secó el sol,
el viento la barrió, lápida.

Este polvo fue piedra—
no llenó la honda de David;
se dispone en columna, no sombrea
la caminata de Trajano.

Piedra sobre piedra
la palabra se hace y se dice.

Dice que la piedra es piedra,
no el sueño ni el deseo.

Bajo presión, fosilizado
y biológicamente transformándose,
el hombre al fosilizarse
con el cincel modela la piedra.

(Transl by Pacheco in *Aproximaciones* p. 110-1)¹¹⁹

Pacheco responds to the idea of a dust so humble it was truly just a simple stone, not a stone that “filled the slingshot of David” nor was it involved in any other important lives or events — this stone is merely stone on stone. The final stanza imagines the human body fossilizing and transforming biologically and “with the chisel molding the stone.” Not only is the human as a living being capable of producing something that gives record of having been there—even as a fossil, the human body is capable of becoming and molding itself into stone. In his translation of “Chichén Itzá” by Loanda, Pacheco translates a text that already has a “native” connection to Mexican geographies—even though it is also already highly rehearsed through different literary greats who made visits there and incorporated this site into travel literature.

Azevedo Oliveira, Mouthpiece for the Coloniality of Racism

Pacheco’s approximations of Eliot question the nature of the Mississippi river as a “border” or a “frontier” and the ideologies of racial superiority and U.S. American

¹¹⁹ The source text by Loanda is in *Poemas de Fernando Ferreira de Loanda* (Luanda: Uniao dos Escritores Angolanos, 1982).

manifest destiny encoded within the latter term used by Eliot, which Pacheco corrects in his approximations. Pacheco makes a similar critique of Mexican ideologies of racial hierarchies through the mouthpiece of an invented Brazilian heteronym, Aurelio Azevedo Oliveira (1938-1981) and his “posthumous” volume of poetry *Bugraria* (1983) which Pacheco “translates” in full. As he explains in a note, the title comes from the term *bugre*: an urbanized indigenous person who has lost the “authenticity” of his own culture but has not gained the social capital or the “civilized” graces of the society which has colonized his own. This derogatory term recalls a history of dehumanizing language used to describe indigenous peoples in the Western hemisphere, especially after forced displacements. In a footnote to his translation, Pacheco glosses the offensive word *bugre* as a Brazilian equivalent of *naco*, the term used in Mexico to express similar racialized judgement. With this note, Pacheco reveals that he is not translating from Brazilian poetry but rather inventing a voice through which to talk about Mexico.¹²⁰ However, he is borrowing from a longer tradition in Brazil of literature focused on urban poverty: the full name of this heteronym, Aurelio Azevedo Oliveira, recalls the naturalist author Aluísio Azevedo (1857-1913). This Azevedo wrote the Brazilian classic novels *O mulato* (1881) and *O cortiço* (1890), and the latter novel depicts social realities of a Rio de Janeiro community where Portuguese immigrants, indigenous people, former African slaves, and mixed-race people live out their lives in the close quarters of poor neighborhood. The heteronym Azevedo does not take the naturalist, localized, highly

¹²⁰ “*Bugraria*, en el portugués del Brasil, es la región habitada por los *bugres*, el término racista contra el indígena ‘bravío o manso’. Como adjetivo, *bugre* designa al ‘individuo selvagem, groseiro, pérfido, desconfiado’. Sería pues el equivalente brasileño del siniestro término mexicano ‘naco’. Según Francisco J. Santamaría, en principio ‘naco’ quiso decir ‘indio de calzón blanco’. Un cuarto de siglo después de que el *Diccionario de Mejicanismos* recogió éstas y otras infamias, designa al campesino que trata de adaptarse a la ciudades. Es algo bien comprobado que la explotación sólo puede basarse en una teoría de superioridad racial” (Pacheco, *Aproximaciones* 121).

descriptive approach of his nineteenth century namesake in his *Bugraria*. Instead, he writes caustic poetry that takes a more global vision of struggles against social disenfranchisement, stretching from Paris in 1968 to a Rio movie theater where he envisions a potential revenge against the audience for Hollywood Westerns for creating such damaging stereotype about indigenous people worldwide, but a limited, stereotypical revenge.

His approximated heteronyms allow Pacheco to expand languages and the chorus of voices with whom Pacheco dialogues throughout his work. Azevedo Oliveira is Uruguayan born of Brazilian parents, and Pacheco's biography defines his language in the following paradoxical way: "perfectly bilingual, he never wrote a single line that was not in Brazilian Portuguese" (*Aproximaciones* 187, my translation).¹²¹ In the voice of Azevedo Oliveira (1938-1981), Pacheco writes from the position of a Brazilian poet who did not exist but who is his contemporary (born a year before Pacheco) and who shares some of his political concerns. For example, "Rue Vaugirard" (128-9) is about the hope of a change in social and economic relations, which continues to be unfulfilled, from May 1968 in Paris to October in Mexico. The title "Rue Vaugirard" refers to one of the longest streets through Paris. With this reference to the unofficial European capital of Latin America, Pacheco connects his heteronym Azevedo Oliveira even more closely with the fictional Horacio Oliveira, the protagonist of *Rayuela* who lives in Paris.

In the last poem of the collection, titled "Western," the mass-produced and ideologically problematic Hollywood vision of "Cowboys and Indians" serves as the object of a critique of artistic conventions—to attach a limited and stereotyped image on

¹²¹ "[P]erfectamente bilingüe, no escribió un solo verso que no estuviera en el portugués del Brasil" (*Aproximaciones* 187).

top of the shared Western hemispheric experience of genocidal reality (189). Pacheco uses this poem elsewhere in *Aproximaciones* to introduce his translations from the Bierhorst collection. He implies a potential future outcome, obliquely connected to his act of translation: to provoke historical consciousness and identification with indigenous peoples, even if it is a belated identification.¹²² He connects those translations with a poem about Hollywood movies and their role in setting up and perpetuating a series of genre conventions that clearly define who is good and who is bad, who is civilized and who is savage. The poem “Western” sets a scenario that asks why and how they became so prone, so accustomed to know this image.

Y a tal punto estamos compenetrados
con la presentación de un mundo ajeno
que somos los defensores de aquel fuerte
erguido en tierra apache: somos los cruzados
de la última frontera: los depredadores
de esta parte de América: la nuestra
(130)

The audience of children is described as “compenetrados” or “in rapport with, identifying with,” this particular presentation of another world. The poem first defines the space and time of “un día de los cuarentas” and “un cine de Río” in which the conventions of the Hollywood Western are all established and fulfilled: “Sin convención no hay arte: todos

¹²² “No bastó derrotarlos, despojarlos, exterminarlos. También los convirtieron en espectáculo para nuestra diversión (ver el poema ‘Western’ de Azevedo Oliveira). Masas pintarrajeadas, ululantes, diezmables, Masas, no seres humanos. Moscas, hormigas. Un día, el asombro y el remordimiento de saber que no sólo eran como nosotros: éramos nosotros, de extremo a extremo del continente. Por ser distintos los llamaron bárbaros y salvajes” (189).

sabemos / que en ese instante va a escucharse el clarín / los jinetes azules llegarán a salvarnos” (131). Pacheco invokes convention in two key ways. First, as producing the widespread and damaging images of barbarism versus civilization, fixed sides where the “bad guys” shoot arrows and the “good guys” have bugles and blue uniforms. But second, he generalizes the concept that conventions are always necessary to produce to produce art. These two perspectives on convention implicate Pacheco’s own poetic practice and that of any translator. By convention, we must believe that the source text exists when it is labeled a translation, but what can we make of convention if the poem informs us that conventions also encode racial hierarchies and stereotypes. In the final stanza, the speaker erases all the previous markers of place and time, reframing or transposing the conventions into wider and wider geographies:

Inesperadamente no hay clarín ni película
no hay fuerte en tierra apache: sólo favelas
en torno a Río como un aro [sic] de fuego:
O quizá es lo contrario y aún seguimos
en aquel viejo cine:
la multitud de apaches son los pobres del mundo:
De repente se clava
una flecha incendiaria en nuestro asiento. (*Aproximaciones* 131)

When Pacheco’s heteronym Azevedo Oliveira expands the image from the burning fort on screen to the favelas around Río to all the poor of the world, he exploits the idea of a shared image of a ring of fire around a fort. At the end of the pseudotranslation, the use of “nuestro asiento” or “our seat” implicates readers along with the audience-members in

the poem in their position occupying a shared seat of power, identified with those who are consuming the conventional spectacle of the Western movie as entertainment. Using terms Pacheco uses elsewhere, “flecha” can be read as writing or translation—this implicates the genre of poetry, approximation, and translation into the critique of convention. This theme, the use of poetry to reduce democracy through elitist language, features in *Bugraria*, in “Rimbaud en Abisinia” (121-2). As genre with its own conventions—the poem tends to lines of seven, eleven, and fourteen syllables, a modified silva—poetry has not always been as democratic as Pacheco wants to make it, as he shows through his approximations. In fact, the work “Western” took on characteristics of heroic verse precisely when the speaker claimed “somos los defensores de aquel fuerte / erguido en tierra apache,” implying that poets and translators are participating in the conventions that defend this invading, colonizing force. While Pacheco does not resolve these concerns, he does use heteronyms, pseudotranslations, and approximations which never claim to reach the target of the target language to maintain an active and critical relationship with authorship and the cultural authority it entails.

For Pacheco, the genre of the approximation can be flexible enough to include works that he wrote himself but does not claim—works that allow him to ventriloquize other poetic discourses. In his work, I see this gesture as connected to a complex questioning of the possibility of decolonial translation, or translation that participates in decolonial thought. He keeps the decolonial option open by critiquing the language politics of translation within translation itself. Yet he also seems skeptical of his own translations when he undercuts their status with pseudotranslations. Mary Docter uses the concept of Pacheco’s “poetics of reciprocity” to distinguish between his use of citation

and reference from the concept of “intertextuality.” The definition of intertextuality from Kristeva through Barbara Johnson is that no text is a “self-contained literary property” (375) but rather can only be read in relation to the other texts and discourses that animate it. Whereas the term “intertextuality” has become bound up with a series of psychoanalytic anxieties (Bloom) or the idea of destruction of other texts (Kristeva), Docter defines reciprocity as rewriting that does not destroy the source but mutually influences it.¹²³ Pacheco’s work as a translator operates in a similar way: his approximations do more than defy the idea of self-containment for his own texts—they refuse to allow the work of poets as widely known as T.S. Eliot to be self-contained while also refusing to allow anonymous or lesser-known poets to go unheard.

Chapter 2 Conclusions: Ayotzinapa and the Politics of Translation

Tracing the development of the translation genre of the approximation by José Emilio Pacheco from the year 1968 to the year of his death 2014, as it turns out, is also to trace a trajectory from two moments of eruptive violence in Mexico. Forty-three student-teachers from Ayotzinapa Normal School were disappeared from Iguala in the state of Guerrero on September 26, 2014. The *normalistas* were commandeering buses to provide transportation to Mexico D.F. to participate in an action commemorating the 1968 student massacre. While this was a common practice, in this case both local and federal police were involved in stopping the buses, which were never recovered. In the weeks and

¹²³ “Pacheco’s dialogue of multiple voices does not involve violating, destroying, or eliminating one’s predecessors, but rather becomes a collaborative process in which *both* works are energized, transformed, and given new life. Through reciprocity, Pacheco claims that it is possible—quite paradoxically—for the poet to influence his predecessors, to amplify or reframe former works, to write an original poem entirely from previous texts” (Docker 376).

months that followed, many universities and cities in Mexico were awash with street demonstrations. Despite the sensational accusation and flight of the Mayor of Iguala, Guerrero and his wife (the elected officials responsible for the involvement of state police), the federal government has repeatedly attempted to turn the page on the presence of federal agents, and the search for bodies that has only found mass graves that contain other bodies. While the reasons behind their disappearance remain mysterious, these young men should be remembered for their participation in activism as educators training to serve a poor, rural state with high levels of illiteracy. All students at the Normal School study Primary Education, many with an emphasis in Bilingual and Intercultural Primary Education, to serve the local population that speaks indigenous languages including Amuzgo, Mixteco, Nahuatl, and Tlapaneco. The question of where and how speech acts occur in the public sphere in contemporary Mexico is of utmost importance; the lack of federal attention to the disappearance of these forty-three student teachers has drawn sustained international attention.

I want to consider translations with all its errors, strangenesses, elisions, and problems to be a part of the fabric and texture of a contemporary language politics. To critique a translation for clumsiness or inaccuracy—or to refrain from translation in fear of appropriation—is to reject the impulse of bridging gaps rather than to offer a different solution or allow for a next step in a translation process. Although he does not dialogue directly with Haroldo de Campos, Pacheco creates poetry through translation in ways that take some of the ideas of Campos further than he did. My conclusions about the translations of Pacheco speak to the difference between expectations about translation in Mexico and into Spanish in comparison with the translation norms in Brazil influenced

by ideas of cannibal translation and the experimentation of the brothers de Campos. I have demonstrated the significance of his performative interpolation of invented others with his translation of actual others. I read these translators together in order to ask the broader question of whether there is an identifiable ethos or an ethics of translation which places a value on reciprocity at work in these cases. In the case of Pacheco, his use of approximations to create relationships with other poets, translators, languages, or other poetic movements and spaces, indicates that his approximations do attempt to change both source text and target poetry with his translations. Pacheco creates in his translation practice a collective ideal that does not expect every translation to be signed, but rather poses the question of what can be created through the playful “drawing close” that approximation can be—while also holding space for the limitations of translation, the problematic inventions always implicated in any approximation of any other. Pacheco refigures translation as less the province of experts, elites—less as an uncreative or mechanical procedure—than as a long-term and constantly repositioning action that everyone takes part in.

Pacheco elaborates the approximation as a genre of translation that constantly calls into question where and how the reader should position him or herself with reference to works presented translations—as a critic or even censor, invited to check up on charges of plagiarism, mistranslation, or invention; as a naïve reader, willing to accept Pacheco’s approximation as representation of a source text; or as a fellow reader, a co-conspirator and co-creator of any work with equal status along with the author, translator, and any other source texts. Reading translation as writing without authors requires more

of readers because it asks for a greater sense of responsibility in deciding which of these roles to play.

Chapter 3

Reciprocal Translation Praxis in Brazil After Haroldo de Campos:

From Cannibal Translation to Transcreation and (Un)Translation

When José Emilio Pacheco calls his translation practice “both barbarous and cultured,” he unknowingly echoes a major cultural trope in Brazil: the concept of cannibalism as a metaphor for literary creation. Cannibalism, or *antropofagia*, has been figured as a Brazilian indigenous mode of self-authorizing creation central to Brazilian literary production. Oswald de Andrade (1890-1954) first applied the cannibal metaphor to his program for Brazilian *modernista* literature in the 1920s. In the 1950s and 1960s, Haroldo de Campos (1929-2003) championed Oswald and his *antropofagista* camp of the avant-garde movement, placing his ideas at the center of Brazilian experimentalism, reading them backwards into the Brazilian baroque, neoclassical, and regionalist traditions, and also forward into his own mid-century Concrete poetry movement. Along with his brother and life-long collaborator Augusto de Campos (b. 1931, São Paulo), Haroldo gradually brought this practice to bear in the sphere of translation in the 1980s.¹²⁴ I supplement the cannibal metaphor with the concept of a reciprocal gift, in which the destructive, creative act of cannibalism is understood within an obligatory cycle of exchange.

I argue that dynamics of reciprocity in the Brazilian field of literary translation can be best perceived by comparing translation approaches that differ widely, and even oppose one another, but nevertheless give translators great latitude in defining their own

¹²⁴ For the sake of brevity, I will refer to Augusto and Haroldo by their first names when referring to their independent works and I will call them the brothers de Campos or the de Campos brothers when referring to collective activities.

creative tasks. All Brazilian translations or translators should not be viewed as cannibalistic in their approach or execution. However, I posit that the true achievement of the model championed by Haroldo was the allowance it created for a translation to be evaluated as entirely separate from its relationship to a source text. Instead, Haroldo encouraged literary translators to write what he calls a “transcreation,” placing emphasis on the aesthetic achievement of a translation, as understood within the system of the target literature, Brazilian, in the case of his Portuguese-language translations, and ultimately within World Literature.

To appreciate the spread of Haroldo’s ideas to other translators and their extension beyond “cannibal translation,” I examine his self-translation of selections from his long poem *The Left-Winged Angel of History* along with the incorporation of this work into the *cartonera* publishing practice in Lima, Peru. I also examine Augusto’s own contribution to a Concrete poetics of translation by coining the concept of *(in)tradução* in *O Anticrítico* (1986). In a series of works, Augusto both translates and writes essays that comment on his source texts and respond to previous stages in the translation life of Dante’s *Divine Comedy* and of Chilean poet Vicente Huidobro’s *Altazor*. Augusto applies the concepts to his “untranslations” of Euclides da Cunha’s work *Os sertões* in a series of poems excavated from the Portuguese prose, works I analyze as intralingual translations and limit-cases of the concept of “untranslation” and the extent to which Augusto gifts his vision of concrete poetry to other poets with his untranslations.

While Haroldo and Augusto represent the most theoretical literary translators in Brazil, other translators react against their centering of critical theory. For example, Paulo Henriques Britto (b. 1951), a professional translator of the generation after the brothers

de Campos, grounds his ideas on his vast experience with translating between English and Portuguese. As a literary scholar who works against the theories of Haroldo, he produces a theory of non-theory and also identifies an increased interest in what he calls “fidelity” over the past half-century in literary translation in Brazil. Britto incorporates insights gained from translating English into his new “symmetrical” sonnet structure or in his self-translations. Paradoxically, these works betray a close association between translation practice and poetic creation that, I argue, can be understood as benefitting from the broad field of translation praxis opened up by the de Campos brothers.

If the brothers de Campos intertwine theory and practice, and if Britto rejects translation theory to embrace professionalism and completism, Clarice Lispector (1920-1977) can be positioned as somewhere between—or outside of—their perspectives. Instead of using theory to create a fixed identity as a translator (or author) Lispector famously obfuscated her work. She creates no theory, no scholarship, and she has been suspected of not doing the work of the translations she signs as her own—just as she was suspected of not writing her own novels. Yet her translations of stories by Edgar Allan Poe are in their fifteenth edition, a publication success that merits more attention. Their appeal extends beyond their market appeal as the product of an author of increasing celebrity. Her favorite themes, vocabularies, and rhythms can be found in these selections, demonstrating that in some ways her refusal to claim credit for her translations, while also making great interventions into Poe’s prose, performs another kind of self-authorizing. Lispector’s loose translations of Poe achieve something in their own right in a way that can be appreciated by the Brazilian audience because of the translation norms already established by the ideal of cannibal translation. While these

translators do not describe their translations with the same terms of literary cannibalism, these ideas circulated and institutionalized by Haroldo provide grounding in the critical value of translation that they all enjoy even while working against. In this chapter, I will examine a constellation of translation praxis made possible by the originary status of intertextuality in Brazilian literary production.

The Brothers de Campos: From Concrete Poetry to Cannibal Translation

The brothers de Campos are most widely recognized for the International Concrete Poetry Movement of the 1950s and its associated aesthetics that blend poetry, word-art, and graphic design. Along with his brother Augusto de Campos and Décio Pignatari, Haroldo created the collective and magazine called *Noigandres*. These poets chose the name “Noigandres” from a Pound canto about the Provençal poets. Haroldo founded his poetic project as a whole based on ideas that connected creation and translation and which borrowed from Pound and his conception that a poet could use translation to find “treasure” in the poetics vocabularies of older eras and “make them new” in their poems. Some of their concrete poetic works could be considered intersemiotic translations, translating the visual character of writing with the “word-objects in space time” they sought to produce that collapse the verbal, vocal, and visual into one (Jackson viii). Marjorie Perloff has analyzed the concrete poets in the context of their response to Ezra Pound, viewing their work as the key link in Pound’s legacy connecting the contemporary conceptual poets to the Anglo-modernist moment.¹²⁵ Much

¹²⁵ In her chapter “From Avant-Garde to Digital: The Legacy of Brazilian Concrete Poetry,” Perloff defines the Concrete Poets as an “*arriere-garde*” in which a recovery project is combined with a renovation of the materiality of language, a rebellion against “subjectivism and the expressionist vehicle” but which also wanted to “appreciate continuity” with certain selected predecessors (67-8).

like Pound, this group included translation in their program from the establishment of the “Noigandres” group. They took Pound as a guiding figure, naming their group from his poem, but also translating into Portuguese some of the works from the Italian troubadors that he translated into English. In his essay “Futurismo no duecento?” in *Traduzir & Trovar* (1968), Haroldo characterizes his translation of Guido Cavalcanti’s “Donna mi prega” as a part of his engagement with Pound. He is “following the creative stimulation” of Pound’s own translation, but also correcting the tendency in Pound to be “idiosyncratic and prone to fantasy” by consulting literary criticism and the original once again to re-examine its “poetic values.”¹²⁶ He suggests that he is not only adapting Cavalcanti for the Portuguese reader, but also Pound for the postmodern reader.

If the brothers Campos both follow Pound in eliding the roles of critic and translator, Haroldo conflates these positions in a maximal, total project, whereas Augusto does so in a minimalistic way. I contrast their theoretical work with two translators in a more professional sphere: their contemporary Lispector and the next generation as represented by Britto. Haroldo positions himself as a translator and a translation advocate who helps to “integrate Brazilian literature into the broader Latin American context” (Mata 209).¹²⁷ In this description of his project, Haroldo differs from Paz, who does

¹²⁶ “Em minha tradução, procurei seguir os estímulos criativos da experiência poundiana. . . Se a leitura de Pound frequentemente parece idiossincrática e fantasiosa, podendo ser retificada pela consulta a lições filológicas mais rigorosas, é sempre iluminadora sua prodigiosa ‘empatia’ com os valores poéticos do original. . . procurei reproduzir a música do original, através das rimas terminais e internas, de aliterações e mesmo de paronomásias. Deixei o poema sem pontuação, como no manuscrito italiano, para que êle ganhasse uma respiração própria, como um móbil, pelo jôgo de palavra e silêncio . . . Se assim tiver conseguido evocar algo da beleza dêste poema e da amorosa mediação com que Pound o recriou para a sensibilidade moderna, já me darei por satisfeito” (Haroldo de Campos, “Futurismo no duecento?” 48).

¹²⁷ “Mis contactos obedecían a un propósito planeado: exportar la literatura brasileña y de alguna manera contribuir a su integración en el contexto latinoamericano más amplio. Me parecía una pena que yo pudiera leer a Borges y a Cortázar, y que los latinoamericanos de lengua española no pudieran leer a Oswald y a Mário de Andrade. Machado de Assis ya había sido traducido. Como Borges, Machado de Assis es un autor que tiene un lenguaje más neutro, aparentemente, y no ofrece tanta resistencia a la traducción. Mi

describe his translation work as an aesthetic resulting from chance as well as passion.¹²⁸

Haroldo describes his intervention as taking place on multiple levels, including his own translations and also acting as translation “asesor” for others—consultant, advisor, and fellow reader, connecting Spanish-American authors with the Brazilian authors with whom they share an aesthetic.

Paz and Haroldo share some important assumptions, values, and references as translation thinkers; however, they also come to diametrically opposed conclusions and recommendations. Both view literary translation in a system that is related to creation; both credit Ezra Pound. They cite one another in their work,¹²⁹ they share a cosmopolitanism of their poetic contexts, they collaborated as poets and translators,¹³⁰ and both occupy an important place in translation theory within their own countries and are widely claimed as mentors in not only poetic but also translation practice.¹³¹

However, they differ in two key characteristics: the nature of the relationship between creation and translation and the relative importance of planning or chance obsession when choosing and completing translation projects. Haroldo characterizes his contacts

propuesta de introducir nuevos autores, de asesorar traducciones, era un proyecto de cuño cultural” (Mata 209).

¹²⁸ “*Versiones y diversiones*, como su nombre lo dice, no es un libro sistemático ni se propone mostrar o enseñar nada. Es el resultado de la pasión y de la casualidad” (Paz, *Versiones y diversiones* 1974, 7).

¹²⁹ For example, in his forward to *Novas*, Roland Greene describes an event and publication in São Paulo in 1996, where Paz contributed to the *Homenagem a Haroldo de Campos* with Jacques Derrida, Guillermo Cabrera Infante, João Cabral Melo Neto. Paz writes the following poem: “Reflections swarming on the page, confusion / of yesterday and today, the seen / entangled with the half-seen, inventions / of memory, lacunae of reason” (xiv).

¹³⁰ Campos translates Paz’s experimental work *Blanco* (1967) as *Transblanco* (1984), one of the most direct points of convergence between these two translation thinkers, covered in an article by Klaus Meyer-Minnemann (2000).

¹³¹ To name a few poets who are not included in my dissertation but who also cite directly or indirectly their reading of Octavio Paz and Haroldo de Campos, I would include American contemporary poets Charles Bernstein and Jerome Rothberg and Spanish poet Nuria Amat.

with the poetics of other languages as a planned project;¹³² Paz and Pacheco both characterized them as a combination of passion and chance. Paz asserts a distinction between translation and creation in his essayistic works, and attempts to re-assert this difference when editing his translations; Haroldo places translations and creations on the same continuum. Pacheco also tends towards transcreation, and grows ever more creative when he edits his translations, but unlike Haroldo he does not theorize this activity, leaving his readers to decide how to understand his pseudotranslations. In the Brazilian context, because of the placement of ideas of re-writing and avant-garde gesture at the center of literary production, I observe a consistent theorizing of translation practice, even when translation is not figured as criticism.

Haroldo on Oswald: *Antropofagia* as Writing and Translating Strategy

Haroldo develops his theory of translation—and, in fact, his interpretation of Brazilian literature as a whole—based on the second phase of Brazilian *modernismo* associated with Oswald de Andrade and his literary gestures of *antropofagia* (cannibalism) and creating *poesia pau-brasil* (Brazilwood poetry). The avant-garde movement known as Brazilian *modernismo* began with the international or heroic phase from 1922-1924, inaugurated by the “Semana de Arte Moderna” in São Paulo. The second phase is the cannibalist phase from 1924-1928, and the third phase is the institutional or nationalist phase, 1928-45. In multiple essays, Haroldo roots his ideas about concrete poetry, Brazilian literary history, and translation theory in works by

¹³² In an interview with the translator into Spanish of his essays, Haroldo describes how he seeks out contact with other poets of his generation specifically as not based on chance. From the interview with Rodolfo Mata: “Los contactos que establecí no fueron aleatorios, sino que formaban parte de mi proyecto. Busqué autores con los cuales tenía una afinidad electiva, desde el punto de vista estético” (Mata 209).

Oswald and in the cannibal aesthetics he practices in *Poesia Pau-Brasil* (1924) and describes in his “Manifesto Antropófago” (1928). In “A Poetics of the Radical,” Haroldo defines the “state of literary language” in the 1920s at the time of the “Oswaldian poetic revolution” as an elitist caste system which valued poetry as a search of the “*mot juste*” or as “tribune rhetoric” (Novas 202). He names poets Rui Barbosa, Coelho Neto, and Olavo Bilac as the literary expressions of “an oligarch patriarchal regime that lasted until well into the republic” who wrote in “a jargon of castes, a diploma of intellectual ‘nobiliary’” (Novas 202). Haroldo asserts that Oswald addressed the huge gap between this elitist literary language and spoken Brazilian Portuguese: according to his contemporary Paulo Prado, Oswald released Brazilian writers and readers from “the evils of eloquence” (Novas 203). These poetic gestures of rupture reverse the direction of influence: in Brazilian literary representations, Portugal is Brazilianized by the colonization, rather than the opposite.¹³³ Brazilian artists associated with this phase of *modernismo* used the “cannibalism” of cultural forms to ingest and re-signify foreign cultural influences and to process local resources into products for circulation and export.

For Haroldo, the Brazilian literary canon is marked in every period by “cannibal reason,” or an “antitradition” that is based “on the acknowledgment of certain marginal paths or patters alongside the preferential script of normative historiography” (Novas 167). Although it is only labeled as such by the *modernistas* in the 1920s, he claims that

¹³³ Oswaldo de Andrade, for example, created intralingual translations of the colonial document known as the “Carta de Pero Vaz da Caminha” (1500) as poems included in the “História do Brasil” section of his collection *Poesia Pau-Brasil* (1924), a key text in the Brazilian vanguard movement known as modernismo. These small, humorous poems are some of the most literal examples of the movement’s gesture of cultural cannibalism, promoted through poet’s “Manifesto Antropófago” and the *Revista de Antropofagia*. Yet understanding them as “intralinguistic translations” rather than poetic cannibalism invites different axes of comparison. You could read Oswald’s poems as creating a mirror of an indigenous perspective that sees itself reflected so minimally by the Portuguese gaze.

the dominant mode of creating innovative literature or of practicing translation in Brazil since the seventeenth century has been cannibalism. In his essay “O sequestro do barroco na Formação da Literatura Brasileira” (1978) Haroldo reevaluates the baroque poet Gregório de Matos not as a plagiarist or derivative figure but rather as Brazil’s first cannibal poet.¹³⁴ When Haroldo de Campos revalorizes Gregório de Matos, reading him through Oswald, he writes in counterpoint to Antonio Candido in his work *Formação da Literatura Brasileira* (1959) which begins Brazilian literary history with Romanticism in the nineteenth century (Campos *Sequestro* 7-9).

Although Haroldo does acknowledge the contributions of other *modernista* poets, especially those of Mário de Andrade (1893-1945), he does not think anyone went as far as Oswald.¹³⁵ For example, he calls the early works by Mário “still quite traditional, exclamatory, and dotted with rhetorical sentimentality” (*Novas* 204) because “Mário did not question the foundations of rhetoric; he tried instead to lead it into a new bed, to disturb it with the introduction of unusual semantic conglomerates” (*Novas* 204).

Although Haroldo acknowledges the achievement of Mário as “thawing” frozen possibilities, he reserves for Oswald the achievement of entirely altering the landscape of Brazilian poetics, in a way that determined the line of poetry within which he situates his own project of concrete poetry.¹³⁶ While he cannot deny the importance of Mário’s contribution, Haroldo’s vision of the Brazilian avant-garde is so focused on Oswald, it

¹³⁴ In a later essay “Europe Under the Sign of Devoration” (1981), Haroldo defines “razão antropofágica” or “cannibal reason” – and he connects this type of reason with Gregorio de Matos’ translations from Spanish poet Luis de Góngora into Portuguese (48).

¹³⁵ Mário de Andrade and Oswald de Andrade were not related. For clarity, I will follow the Brazilian scholarly practice of referring to them by first name, as does Haroldo in the cited essay.

¹³⁶ “*Hallucinated City*, for all its novelty, still was not the revolution; it was a reform, carrying its sandbags of conciliation and wordiness. The revolution—the Copernican revolution—came with ‘Brazilwood’ poetry. From there emerged an entire line of substantive poetics, of contained poetry, condensed to its essential process of signs” (205).

tends to marginalize other figures in the avant-garde movement, including Mário, who was in São Paulo but who did not use the same aesthetics as Oswald. Other modes of *modernista* poetry located outside São Paulo were even less recognized, such as the more Catholic and catholic modernisms of Murilo Mendes and Jorge de Lima and the magazine *Festa*, or the Northeastern aesthetics of writers such as José Lins do Rego.

While he may marginalize other avant-garde authors, Haroldo's focus on what becomes visible through the lens of the cannibalist creative practice and aesthetic values of Oswald does succeed in bringing renewed interest to certain authors and translators who had been sidelined from the Brazilian literary tradition. These rescued authors include Baroque poet Gregório de Matos (1636-1696) and the translator and anti-monarchical politician Manuel Orodico Mendes (1799-1864). Haroldo describes Gregório de Matos as "our first cannibal" and "our first transculturator" (*Novas* 165). Matos earns this pride of place not for his original poems, dangerous satires that won him the nickname "Boca do inferno," but for his creative, ironic re-writing and translating of two sonnets by Spaniard Luis de Góngora into one new sonnet that "took apart and made explicit the secrets of the baroque sonnet-making machine" (166). Haroldo also claims that Orodico Mendes, while working to translate Homer's *Odyssey*, was the first to develop a theory of translation that included "the idea of synthesis," "creating compound words in Portuguese," and the "technique of interpolation, incorporating verses of other poets" (*Novas* 318-19). Haroldo does acknowledge the defects and excesses of the resulting translation by Mendes, saying "his practice is not as good as his theory" (319). However, he ultimately demonstrates that Mendes was an important figure in the development of Brazilian literature because he integrated translation with creation, rather

than rejecting him entirely as critics before him had.¹³⁷ He also claims that authors including João Guimarães Rosa subsequently used similar neologism and inventiveness with language in ways that echoed Mendes translating Homer. Haroldo draws from these earlier creative translators both techniques of translation practice and theories of translation as a project, a project inextricable from both literary criticism and literary creation. While it is clear that the concept of cannibal reason is central to Haroldo's literary thought, the extent to which his translation practice follows these concepts uniformly has not yet been fully explored by his scholarly reception.

Literary Translation Theory in Brazil: Where Does the Cannibal Belong?

The strength of the Brazilian translation field is notable,¹³⁸ and the conceptual draw of the Concrete poets led to international scholarly attention to their work. As Thelma Médiçi Nóbrega and John Milton have argued, the brothers de Campos “successfully combined their theoretical work on translation and their actual translations in a way that has been unequalled almost anywhere” (257). Yet in English language scholarship, I agree with their assertion that there has been an overbalance of attention to Haroldo's manner of interpreting his own work. Firstly, Augusto is poorly understood as

¹³⁷ “Much ink has been spilled in an effort to disparage Mendes the translator, to criticize his irritating preciosity and the ‘bad taste’ of his compound words. Indeed, it is very easy to take a negative approach to his translations, and from Silvio Romero (who considered them to be ‘monstrosities’ written in a ‘macaronic’ Portuguese) on, that is what almost everyone has done” (Novas 318).

¹³⁸ Anecdotally, one major indicator of the difference between the sphere of translation in Brazil as compared to the USA is the existence of an online resource titled *Dicionário de tradutores literários no Brasil*. Curated by a research group and edited by three from the Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, scholars Andréia Guerini, Marie-Hélène Torres, and Walter Carlos Costa create and maintain a database of translators, including a biography, bibliography, and sample of their translation work. They have limited their scope to the translations between Portuguese and English, French, German, and Spanish, indicating the strength of the field especially in Western European language pairs, begging the question of the status of translations from indigenous languages or Japanese, which both represent large populations in Brazil.

a translator and poetic intellectual figure in his own right. By close-reading Augusto's "(in)traduções," or his minimalist and minimally translated experiments, I will demonstrate his participation in gifting authors with his eye to discern the elements of a concrete poem, even in works which have markedly different styles or genre norms. Secondly, the diverse and complex translation activity of the Campos brothers and other Concrete poets has been painted with one color, "cannibal translation," understood as a translation that consumes and destroys the original in a conflagration of disrespect and celebration. Critics including Odile Cisneros and Stefan Tobler debate the rightful placement of the cannibal concept. Tobler expresses concern that English language criticism has taken the examples Haroldo uses to define his own practice too much to heart, rather than evaluating a fuller scope of his translations in their own light. He asserts that reading Haroldo's writings "is not the whole story of how he translates, there is no 'everything goes' freedom in his translation. It would be best to look at one of his translations, to see how his **hyperliteral transcreation** works" (Tobler 200). Later in this chapter, I will follow Tobler's direction in my analysis of Haroldo's self-translation of his own poem into English, "The Left-Winged Angel of History." In his essay "Translation as Creation and Criticism" (1962), Haroldo follows Paulo Ronai in defining translation as an art form because it produces a new work, claiming that a translation will necessarily alter source text and culture as well as the target culture and language. Using the semiotic theories of Max Bense, Haroldo distinguishes between the "documentary, semantic, and aesthetic information" contained in any sign/signifier utterance, and he defines "transcreation" as a translation that will prioritize aesthetic information over the other two (315). His notion of transcreation maintains a relationship with a notion of literal

translation, but reverses its values. “The signified, the semantic parameter, becomes just a kind of boundary marker for the ‘re-creative’ enterprise. We are, then, at the opposite end of the ‘spectrum’ from the so-called literal (or servile) translation” (*Novas*, 315-6). Green and Cisneros contend that his practice of translation “also called for a more complex mode of reading—no longer of isolated texts but of their many translations. According to Haroldo, a text’s meaning is revealed, or light is thrown on it, through the history of its various translations” (*Novas* xxxii). These theories by Haroldo have been received—by Britto, for example, and not without reason—as snobbishly rejecting less theoretical translations, or even rejecting translators with a less thorough immersion in the history of World Literature and in the work of other translators even into other languages. However, Haroldo’s insistence on valuing translation history could be understood differently: he makes a strong case for establishing the differences between a re-translation and those others that have come before. Haroldo may be best understood as a theorist of transcultural re-translation.

In addition to these two concerns with broadening our understanding of the style and the participants in a Brazilian translation sphere, I draw attention to the political content of works that could be seen as directed at an elite, art-book consuming audience. Odile Cisneros traces the Concrete poets’ engagement with translation in shifting from primarily aesthetic questions to politicized ones. During the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, she argues, their interest in translation, was focused on semiotics and concerned with creating an “isomorphic” connection that would wed meaning with semantics in an inextricable way, the “perfect phrase” of Fabri. Over time, the idea of translation as a method of digesting and destroying the other but also incorporating the foreign into the self—the

cannibal concept—became a larger part of their metaphors in describing translation. Discussing his essay “Transluciferação mefistofáustica” about translating Goethe’s *Faustus*, Cisneros writes “the agency of the translator is emphasized, in a way that evinces an attitude of rebellion against a purported power differential between original and translation, metaphorically God and Satan” (Cisneros 30). Haroldo and Jorge Luis Borges share an interest in a reversal of the norms of power and value relations between original and translation. As Efraín Kristal explores in *Invisible Work*, Borges consistently presented translation as another version on par with the source text which should be analyzed as such. “A translation can be more faithful to the work of literature than the original when the original fails to fulfill its own potentialities and latencies.” (Kristal 33). Borges views a potential gain in our aesthetic categories when translations are viewed on equal footing with source texts. I concur with Cisneros in her evaluation that, for Haroldo, the gains began as aesthetic and over the course of his career became increasingly political.¹³⁹ However, the political expression of translation does not always correspond to a cannibalist translation model. The success of the cannibal aesthetic has now become such a well-known cultural export that the Brazilian translation field has not been as widely recognized for other styles or dynamics. In short, the panorama of literary translation studies in Brazil, as John Milton argues, has only been partially mapped,¹⁴⁰

¹³⁹ “Concurrently to his work in translation and translation theory, in his work as a literary critic, Haroldo de Campos increasingly addressed ideological questions regarding the position of the Latin American writer vis-à-vis the European tradition. This corresponded to his interests shifting from a primarily formal questions of language to a more political (and politicized) view of translation and culture, particularly the vindication of Latin American cultural production in view of its perceived dependency on European models.” (Cisneros 30)

¹⁴⁰ “A survey of the theory of literary translation in Brazil, then, presents us with a rather patchy picture, one, which I think, would be similar to that in most countries. The profile of the Campos brothers is sharp and crystal clear, and Mário Laranjeira puts forward his argument for translating the *significância* of a poem, but the rest of the field is vague and nebulous. Jorge Wanderley presents us with an outline of the views on translation of the Geração de 45 but fails to find a ‘modernist’ theory or approach to translation.

and the experimentation of Haroldo as a translator can be better understood as one element of a constellation of other approaches that complement his self-theorized work.

From Self-Translation to Social Justice Translation in *cartonera*

To compare translation approaches inspired by Haroldo and his theories, I will examine two distinct moments in the afterlife of his poem “o anjo esquerdo da história,” a selection from *Crisantempo (No espaço curvo nasce um)* (1998). Haroldo self-translated this poem into English and several others included in the anthology *Novas*; his stylistic choices lead me to label it a transcreation. The same poem was also included in a *cartonera* collection, but the translation does not make as many changes to exploit aesthetic information within Spanish order to reproduce the effects of the source. Instead, the logic of the entire collection commemorates his translation theories, because the work is collective, it includes translations by multiple translators, and it also includes a translation of one of Haroldo’s transcreations, fulfilling the assertion that a trascreation is a work of literature in its own right. Comparing the two translations highlights the distinctions between transcreation within the work and cannibal reason as an organizing principle for an edited volume.

In his original poem “o anjo esquerdo da história,” Haroldo treats the subject of historical progress in the relationship between land ownership or land rights to human freedom and self-determination. While his word choices refer to a specific social

And how does literary translation in Brazil fit in with other theories of literary translation? The Campos brothers recognize Pound, Benjamin and Jakobson as their mentors. But most other discussions on translation seldom get away from traditional arguments of form versus content found in Cicero, Jerome and the Augustans. Dryden’s parameters of *metaphrase*, *paraphrase* and *imitation* still guide most references to translation here in Brazil.” (Milton 205)

movement within Brazil, the concepts can be understood as a more global statement against settler-colonialism and in favor of decolonization. His original composition opens with a series of words built around “terra” or “land” in clear reference to the “MST” or the “Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra [Movement of Rural Landless Workers],” a labor movement that was officially consolidated in 1984 along with Brazil’s entrance into democracy but which had its roots in 1970s activism during the military dictatorship. The following are the first fifteen lines of his long, slender poem “o anjo esquerdo da história,” which extends for another two pages:

os sem-terra afinal
estão assentados na
pleniposse da terra:
de sem-terra passaram a
com-terra: ei-los
enterrados
desterrados de seu sopro
de vida
aterrados
terrorizados
terra que à terra
torna
pleniposses terra-
tenentes de uma
vala (bala) comum:

Every line of this opening section plays with the same two groups of words and sounds: “terra” or “land” and “assentar-se” or “settled.” Building on the base word “terra” gives the poet “sem-terra, com-terra, enterrados, desterrados, aterrados, terrorizados, terra-tenentes;” from the double-s letters of “assentar-se” connect it to “pleniposse, passaram, seu sopro, pleniposseiros.” The final line “vala (bala) comum” breaks with both chains of repetition, and the line emphasizes the concept of landless population viewed as surplus from the perspective of the state: buried in common graves, or in a “vala comum,” but also treated as bullets or “balas” in the sense of serving as cannon fodder for a system that uses them up and spits them out. After the repetitive opening lines, this break with the pattern confirms one reading of the previous lines: not that those “sem-terra” are finally given rights, but merely that they are settled in their graves. If the poem aims to express an alliance with the goals of the Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra, the word-play emphasizes the need to give workers more than rights of good deaths, but rather a space to have a good life. While his use of “sem-terra” ties his piece directly to the Brazilian experience of the disenfranchised, this final line broadens his scope. Brazil is not the only country to have a national service requirement in which the poor are far more likely to get placed in positions of conflict or danger: many countries make use of the landless as weapons.

When he translates his poem as “The Left-Winged Angel of History,” Haroldo takes advantage of the many forms of the word “land” in English, expanding his poem by several lines in order to exploit this aesthetic opportunity beyond his use of the word “terra” in the source text. I see this as an example of Haroldo “transcreating” his own work: his “transcreation” does not always correspond to the Portuguese in the semantic or

documentary characteristics, but it produces a similar aesthetic experience in the sense of recreating the repetition of “land.”

the landless men at last
are now settled down on land

landing

full-landed landwards:
from landless they change to

landlords: look at them

landlocked

in their shallow graves
exiled from their life-breath
terrorized
from earth
unearthed

dust that to dust returns

plenipossessors
glebe-patroons
of a commonshared
potter (butcher’s meat) field:

(*Novas* 147; emphasis added)

In Haroldo’s self-translation or transcreation, he adds the highlighted lines in order to maintain the sense that every possible iteration of the word “land” or “terra” is at play. Where the source text describes the landless as “estão assentados [they are settled],” the

transcreation first translates and then expands the image: they “are now settled down on land / landing.” The additional word “landing” calls up images of boats landing ashore, whether they be colonizing fleets or escaping exiles. The source text will later include words that call up this same set of images and relationships to land, as in the subsequent lines “desterrados de seu sopro / de vida” but the transcreation encapsulates this image earlier and with a word that connects back to the key word “land.” In another example of Haroldo exploiting new opportunities for word play in English, he translates “de sem-terra passaram a / com-terra” as “from landless they change to / landlords.” Instead of the direct opposition between “sem” and “com” as neutral prefixes, Haroldo chooses “landlords,” a term that refers to the lording of ownership over those who do not have property. A landlord is not just someone who “has land” as the Portuguese implies: a landlord relies on the landless, charges them rent, and frequently exploits them. If the poem is breaking down the words “terra / land” and “assentar-se / settled” into constituent parts, however, the question of power, who is the “lord” or the “landlord” in the future promised by this leftist angel, comes into question. By pursuing the aesthetic information of repeating “land” as frequently as possible, Haroldo stays true to this underlying question in the poem.

At the end of the cited stanza, Haroldo makes one choice that departs from the general translation manual he uses of prioritizing aesthetic information. Instead, he translates in a way that conveys documentary information, and even expands on the brutal visual image created in the source text. His Portuguese poem places the landless men ultimately, and nihilistically, in their only hoped-for place of ownership and land possession in a common grave. The last three lines describes them as “plenipossesiros

terra-/tenentes de uma / vala (bala) comum” or “plenipotentiaries land- / owners of a / ditch-grave (bullet) in common” (my rough translation). Instead of preserving the rhyming word-pair of “vala” with “bala,” Haroldo chooses to explain this image further with his translation “potter (butcher’s meat) field.” While a potter’s field is a “vala comum” or a mass grave, the off rhyme between “potter” and “butcher” does not stand out, given that the butcher is qualified and explained as “meat.” This idea of the poor as cannon fodder in a war, as bullets, does not come across in the English, where all the reader is left with is a disturbing animalizing (cannibalizing) image of the poor as food. The relationship between the words “potter” and “butcher” do not appear anywhere in the source text; instead, they represent a new choice for an English reading audience, distancing the “landless” from these middle-class jobs by making them the perpetrators of this crime of society. I posit that this is the only example of a truly “cannibal” intervention; the rest of Haroldo’s transformative choices would be better described as transcreation devices.

The Spanish translation of this poem does not transcreate, with the exception of this line. Instead, the volume combines different kinds of homage to Haroldo as a translation thinker. In one of many recognitions of his wide-spread influence soon after his death in 2003, his work was commemorated in Spanish translation in a *cartonera* publication, the cardboard covered books inspired by the Eloísa Cartonera publishing house and literary activism network. In the bilingual volume *el angel izquierdo de la poesía* (2005) the front matter identifies him as a writer of wide impact inside and outside Brazil as founder of Concrete Poetry and an ambitious translator who “tradujo *La Ilíada* de Homero, textos de Goethe, fragmentos de La Biblia, poesía náhuatl, entre otros. ... A

su muerte se encontraba aprendiendo árabe y traduciendo el ‘Paraíso’ de la *Divina Comedia*” (n.p). Although in his lifetime Haroldo tended to work with publishers who could give his works an art-book feel, this different literary space wanted to pay homage the works of Haroldo. Founded by Washington Cucurto, Javier Barilaro, and Fernanda Laguna in 2003 in Buenos Aires in response to the 2001-2002 financial crisis in Argentina, the Eloísa Cartonera publishers quickly spread across Latin America as a methodology for collective, community-driven intellectual production. Taking their name from the “cartoneros” or people who gather cardboard to sell this recyclable material, these groups buy the cardboard at higher rates than usual to construct creatively decorated cardboard book covers. Publishing both new works and classics, the signature style of the press is to package all works with one-of-a-kind cardboard covers decorated in a way that promotes individualized and unique relationships with books as objects. At Eloísa Cartonera, instead of representing marginalized subjects in literary works, “the project seeks rather to incorporate their labor—more generously compensated than on the open market, as the cardboard books’ copyright pages insist—into the sphere of literary production itself” (Epplin 60). They have also been used as a part of literacy programs, as a way to not just allow people access to libraries or create a top-down relationship to literary culture, but instead to involve people in making books from materials at hand.

The presentation of Haroldo’s work in Spanish in the cartonera book *el angel izquierdo de la poesía* does not include the same “transcreation” approach to translation that Haroldo himself favored. But it does exhibit two of his other ideas: the concept of a “laboratory of texts” and in the idea of a “cannibal translator” who will both translate in fragments and also borrow from those fragments at will for use in original works. Held in

the UCLA Charles E. Young Research Library Special Collections, the volume I had access to features a beautiful gold metallic cover, a choice that makes a nod to the art-book publications of the source texts. While each version would bear a unique cover crafted with available and recycled materials, this particular cover provides a reflective surface, implying the self-reflection the poems contained seem to promote, consideration of the political positions of readers and subjects. The Spanish translation of the section of the title poem “el ángel izquierdo de la historia” reads:

los sin-tierra al fin
están asentados en
pleniposesión de la tierra:
de sin-tierra pasaron a
con-tierra: helos
enterrados
desterrados de su soplo
de vida
aterrados
terrorizados
tierra que a la tierra
vuelve
pleniposedores terra-
tenientes de una
roza (fosa) común:
(el ángel izquierdo 89)

The Spanish translation does not need to make as many interventions into the source text: given that Portuguese and Spanish share so much vocabulary, many of the words can remain the same with different spellings. Unlike Haroldo's transcreation with its proliferating "landings" and "landlords," this Spanish translation by Arturo Carrera maintains all the "terras" as "tierra" without adding more. Yet in the final line, the Spanish translation does take on some qualities of transcreation. Unlike the English of this last line "vala (bala) comum," the Spanish translation "roza (fosa) común" manages to keep aesthetic info, or rhyme. The Spanish means roughly "slash and burn (mass grave) common" where "roza" refers to an agricultural practice of cutting old crops down before turning over the soil or burning waste material. Again, like the English, the concept of the poor dead as a "bala" or as "bullet" does not carry through. This moment of transcreation finds a way through a different set of meanings to preserve the political content of Haroldo's poem: those in the mass grave, or the "fosa" have served the land with their bodies through agricultural labor, but only in death do they take any possession of that land.

After these translations of poems by Haroldo, the *cartonera* volume continues to perform other translation concepts he promoted. For example, Gonzalo Aguilar transcreates into Spanish a transcreation by Haroldo of a poem by Maiakovski. Neither "original" is included, in true cannibalist spirit. Additionally, the collection includes the work of five different translators and three editors writing essays, fulfilling Haroldo's vision for a "laboratory of texts" in which translation was a team effort from distinct disciplines and specializations.

The *Anticrítico* and *(In)Tradução*: Translation Theories by Augusto

While Haroldo writes essays and paratexts to theorize his translation practice as a total project along with his scholarship and poetry, I see Augusto framing his critical arguments through hyper-fragmentation of the works he chooses to translate or as poems themselves. While Haroldo tends to receive more attention in the Anglo-American academy, Augusto has also pursued translation projects throughout his career. Unlike the expansive project that Haroldo's translation work encompasses, Augusto's translations tend to be minimalist and condensed, yet powerful and creative translations that make arguments about their source texts while making them accessible in Portuguese. I make this distinction between their translations following the same comparison Gonzalo Aguilar and Charles Perrone draw between the poetic projects of the two brothers.¹⁴¹ In particular, I look at the works Augusto translated from Spanish America as a way to understand his interest in bridging a gap between the two major languages of Latin American poetics, and a way to imagine a different trajectory for Spanish American poetry that would circumvent the surrealist moment. Much like his brother Haroldo, and José Emilio Pacheco as well, Augusto displays interest in re-translation as a response not only to the source text but also to prior translations. Additionally, he incorporates these insights into poems that accompany his translations. For example, in his collection *O Anticrítico* (1986) he translates Cantos I and V of the *Inferno* and introduces them with an essay-poem that compares his translation of the final line of Canto V to the solutions

¹⁴¹ “Haroldo de Campos trabalhou—sobre tudo nas *Galáxias*—a partir da *expansão serial*, e Augusto de Campos buscou uma *síntese minimalista* na unidade da página e na espacialização visual do poema. Os poemas de Augusto de Campos constroem-se não por acumulação e rarefação—como as *Galáxias*—mas por limitação e condensação” (Aguilar 271).

other translators have found to render this key line in Portuguese.¹⁴² His essay poem titled “dante: um corpo que cai” turns this final line of Dante’s canto into a concrete poem that traces an arc of descent down the page, repeatedly, first in his Portuguese translation and then the Italian source:

e

caí

como

corpo

morto

cai

e

caddi

come

corpo

morto

cade

outros

¹⁴² Decades later, conceptual poet Caroline Bergvall would expand on this insightful poetic gesture in her poem “Via: 48 Dante Variations” (2005). In this print and sound piece, Bergvall reads the first stanza of the *Inferno* in forty-seven English translations, along with their name and the year the translation was published, in a repetitive and haunting performance of the movement of this fourteenth-century poem through time and the changes in the English language and in norms of English-language translation. Carlos Soto Román crafted what he calls a “traducción parcial” Bergvall’s poem into Spanish, titled “Vía: 10 versiones de Dante.” I would call it a “transcreation” using the Haroldo de Campos term, because he repeats the conceptual exercise rather than translating any of the words on the page. To my knowledge, there is no Portuguese version of “Via,” although Augusto did anticipate the concept.

verteram essa linha

invertendo

a posição do verbo:

“e tombe, como tomba corpo morto”

(xavier pinheiro)

“e tombe como tomba um corpo morto”

(dante milano)

“e caí, como cai um corpo morto”

(cristiano martins)

o desejo

de chegar mais perto

da precisão especular do original

caddi

corpo

morto

cade

me levou a traduzir o canto V do *inferno*

de trás para diante

a partir do último verso

(Augusto de Campos *Anticrítico* 16)

In this essay-poem, Augusto clarifies some of his own translation method for this particular work. In order to achieve the same falling syntax he discerns and admires in the source text, he must “translate canto V of the *Inferno* / from back to front / starting from

the last verse” (my rough translation). The previous three translations ended with “morto” rather than “cai” in a choice that places the emphasis in the wrong place, according to Augusto’s argument. Unlike his own version, these translations could not be read as concrete poems, with a descending arc landing in the verb “fall;” his essay poem makes this insight clear by beginning with his own elegant solution. As I will discuss, Augusto favored a poem by e. e. cummings in which the theme of falling is dramaticized by the layout of letters on the page. Augusto gifts Dante not only with his own concrete aesthetics but also with those of cummings.

In some cases, Augusto selects poems which already have characteristics as a concrete poem, and he translates them in ways that amplify the visual characteristics included. From the Early Modern period, he translates the poem “The Altar” by George Herbert, with words stacked together in the shape of an altar. He also translates the concrete poem by e.e. cummings known as “l(a)” or as “(a leaf falls)” — a work Octavio Paz also translated. Augusto first coined his term “(in)tradução” or “(un/in)translation” in reference to cummings, and in this case, he refers to his version where the poem is both translated and not translated. Augusto titles his version “so l(a)” indicating the poem could also be read directly across in an unintelligible mix of languages, in addition to the vertical reading:

so	l(a
(l	le
f	af
o	fa

l)l	ll
(ha	s)
c	one
ai)	l
itude	iness

(Despoesia 47)

Laid out horizontally, these two columns of letters would read: “so(l fol)l(ha cai) itude” in Portuguese and “l(a leaf falls)oneliness.” Since this (un)translation includes the source text, Augusto invites the reader to consider the translation in relation and emphasizes the choices he makes that depart from the cummings poem. He adds in an additional set of parenthesis which has the effect of further isolating one letter “l” in the middle of the poem. The lowercase “l” can also be read as a numeral “1” which emphasizes the theme of singularity. He also does not translate “a leaf” as “uma folha” or “a folha” but as “1 folha.” This choice could be read as a “frenchification” of Portuguese. More likely, this change by Augusto makes another use of the numeral 1 to trick the eye into resembling the lower-case letter “l.” All these choices allow him to preserve the double “ll” in the middle of the poem, the two vertical lines which create the sensation of downward motion so important to the text. In addition to these choices, which emphasize or amplify certain concrete elements in the source, Augusto chooses to print the work in two different tones of green ink printed in a fern-like curlicue font, further relating this poem to foliage and to his other works which use characteristics of graphic design. Augusto would use this poem as the cover of his publication of *40 poemas* by e. e. cummings

(1986), giving it pride of place for the way it meshes his own concrete aesthetic with that of Cummings.¹⁴³

Yet in the majority of Augusto's "(in)traduções," both in his collection *Despoesia* (1994) and elsewhere, he is not simply translating other concrete poems into a Portuguese-based concrete poem. Instead, he typically selects a brief fragment of a lyric poem and transforms that fragment into his own concrete poem. For example, in *Despoesia* he includes a selection from "Obra humana" by the Colombian *modernista* José Asunción Silva (1865-1896). Augusto's version is titled "amorse" and dated 1985. The new title references the Morse Code that runs underneath the eight by seven grid of letters that reads:

atravess
ouoespaç
oumescon
didotele
gramadea
mornumfi
odearame

Decoded, the poem reads: "atravessou o espaço um escondido telegrama de amor num fio de arame [passed through space a hidden telegram of love on a thread of wire]" (51). In addition to their arrangement as a grid, the letters themselves need to be decoded because they are all made up of a dot-style typeface in which one or two dots can determine the difference between letters. Augusto creates an interpretive challenge with the atypical

¹⁴³ This publication represents the culmination of a long-standing interest in Cummings; Augusto published ten of his poems in 1960, expanded it to twenty in 1979, before this larger collection.

arrangement of letters, with the mechanical typography he designs, and with Morse code underneath it, all of which creates the possibility for multiple mistaken readings. For example, the first time I read this poem, my eye was not yet attuned to the subtle difference between the letter “l” and the letter “i” because they differ only by the number of dots. The “l” is only two dots taller than the “i,” and so I thought the last words read “num flo de ar ame” instead of “num fio de arame.” This mis-reading would have meant a bending of Portuguese back into Spanish, because “amé” would only mean “I loved” in Spanish; in Portuguese it would need to be “amei.”

In addition to using such a difficult-to-decode typeface, Augusto also inserts another message in Morse code beneath the letters of the fragment of Asunción’s poem. At first glance, one might initially believe that the Morse code is another translation, another way of representing the same letters. Yet on closer examination, it is quickly apparent that the Morse code is a repeated series of four letters, repeated twice on each line. In international Morse code, the letters would be: MORAMORAMORAMORA repeated underneath each of the seven lines of the poem. This could be read as the word “mora” or delay, respite, or the verb “morar” to live, to stay, to remain, or as a deformation of the word “amor” wrapping itself around the grid. Recall that the title is “amorse” in a deformation of “a morse” referencing Morse code, but also a deformation of “amarse” to love one another. In this repetition of these letters, the hidden Morse code poem recalls Augusto’s own concrete poem, “amortemor” (1970), in which the word “amor” is stacked against the word “morte” in a literal fashion. Considering that the source text by José Asunción Silva is a three stanza composition in arte mayor, of which Augusto has selected the final two lines for his concrete “untranslation,” it becomes even

more clear that his new version is drawing Silva's work closer to his own. The source text "Obra humana" is taken from *El libro de versos* (first published in 1923) which was the only collection of poems that the author organized fully and prepared for publication before his death (Carranza in Silva, 19). Silva writes:

En lo profundo de la selva añosa
donde una noche, al comenzar de mayo.
tocó en la vieja enredadera hojosa
de la pálida luna el primer rayo,

pocos meses después, la luz de aurora
del gas en la estación, iluminaba
el paso de la audaz locomotora
que en el carril durísimo cruzaba.

Y en donde fuera en otro tiempo el nido,
albergue muelle del alado enjambre,
**pasó por el espacio un escondido
telegrama de amor, por el alambre.**

(Silva 165; emphasis added)

Deep in the aged jungle
where one night, in early May,
played on the old leafy vine
of the pale moon the first ray,

a few months later, the light of dawn
of the gas in the station, illuminated
the passage of the bold locomotive,
that through the grueling rail was crossing.

And where what may have been in other times the nest,
the dock or hostel for the winged swarm,
**passed through that space a hidden
telegram of love, along the wire.**

(my rough translation; emphasis added)

The setting for the poem by Asunción Silva is eliminated in Augusto's untranslation: there is no longer a jungle, a vine, a moon ray—nor is there the presence of the gas station or the locomotive. In short, he has eliminated the typical *modernista* gesture in which the poet crafts a delicate mixture of technological shine and chrome with the infusion of nature with love and meaning, the Romantic poetry setting of the shine of moonlight. The source text entangles the regionalist trope of the jungle vine with the modernist trope of the telegraph wire. Augusto has pared these more typical *modernista* images down to their core: love through the wires, and the breaking down of language and communication to mechanical pulses.

Augusto in Spanish America: Huidobro and Parra over Neruda

Augusto may have eliminated the mixed metaphors of jungle vine and telegraph wire from this *modernista* poem because of his distaste for the way that aesthetic eventually became incorporated into surrealism, a strain of poetry he disdained. In spite of that well-documented opinion, he won the prestigious Premio Iberoamericano de Poesía Pablo Neruda in 2015. Established in 2004 on the centennial of Pablo Neruda's birth and first awarded to José Emilio Pacheco, this poetry prize is awarded by the Chilean government through "el Consejo Nacional de la Cultura y las Artes de Chile" and comes with an honorarium of 60,000 USD. Despite its name "Premio Iberoamericano," this prize has previously favored Spanish-American poets until Augusto became the first Brazilian poet to win the award. In his remarks accepting the award, Augusto makes it clear which Chilean poets he actually draws from in his own work: Vicente Huidobro and Nicanor Parra, while also giving a nod to Neruda. In an article in *La Tercera*, he is quoted saying: "Agradezco mucho que hayan honrado mi obra y mi trabajo con este premio. Sólo me queda agradecerles este honor. En Chile hay tantos poetas importantes para mí, como el propio Neruda, Vicente Huidobro y Nicanor Parra. Tengo una proximidad poética con ellos muy grande" (Garcia). This prize can be read as a partial reconciliation—or a new encounter—between the Spanish American aesthetic championed by Pablo Neruda of using surrealistic, shocking, emotionally evocative images to pursue political ends or to achieve mass consciousness and the styles favored by Augusto and his visual, pared down, distanced and language-focused approach to poetry where the political impact is sought through the renovation of the language. In fact, when Augusto translates from Spanish to Portuguese, he deliberately chooses poets who he identifies as less surrealistic than their Southern cone compatriots: Vicente

Huidobro and Oliveiro Girondo. I use these translations from Spanish and selected visual poems by Augusto to argue that these works represent a point of both conciliation and divergence between these two strains of Latin American poetics written in Spanish and Portuguese.

Although Haroldo as a critic and Augusto as a poet or an “anti-critic” both express desire to integrate Brazil into Latin American literature, that interest was specifically *not* expressed in the context of the so-called “boom” and its attendant success on the international market as routed through Spain and translated into English. Augusto articulates this perspective in a essayistic poem “América latina: contra-boom da poesia” first published in 1976 in the São Paulo-based literary magazine *Qorpo estranho: criação intersemiótica* and later collected in his book *O Anticrítico* (1986). This poem appears to make the argument that unlike the *boom* of fiction, there was not a space for poetry, in part because the whole market-driven concept is problematic, but also because within Latin American poetry there is less of a shared space or a common market than in other genres of lettered culture. Augusto authorizes his perspective by citing directly from Octavio Paz, to soften somewhat his subsequent critique of Spanish American poetry. He writes:

o boom da américa latina espanhola
só esqueceu uma coisa
a poesia
(como viu octavio paz)

“acho a palavra boom repulsiva”

disse paz
“não se deve confundir
sucesso, publicidade ou venda
com literatura”

a poesia arte pobre

lixo-luxo da cultura

nunca teve lugar
no mercado comum das letras latino-americanas
(onde só os brasileiros não vendem nada)

(O Anticrítico 161; emphasis added)

The phrase “lixo-luxo da cultura” to describe poetry is a reference to the “aestética da fome” movement in Brazil. He also refers to his own poem “Lixo-Luxo” (1965) in which the second word “luxo” or “luxury” is stacked and repeated many times make up one large “LIXO” sprawled across the page, where lots of little “luxuries” add up to “garbage” on a large-scale. In this final line, Augusto betrays resentment that, although the whole enterprise may be repulsive, the fact that Brazilians are not enjoying the boom bonanza still irritates.

This essay-as-poem forms a part of his book *O Anticrítico* in which Augusto writes what he calls “prosa porosa” to get away from what he finds lacking in literary criticism. He does not reject *all* criticism. He names several “critics-critics” he values: Jakobson, Benjamin, Barthes; and also several artist-critics: Pound, Valéry, Maiakóvski, Pessoa, Borges, Cage. In fact, he explores the suggestion he attributes to John Cage: ““a

melhor crítica / de um poema / é um poema' / (cage)” (*Anticrítico* 16). He is primarily reacting against literary criticism that refuses to illuminate literature or make itself clear.¹⁴⁴ Each section of this book includes an essay-poem introduction to an author and then a translated fragment of their work, a fragment selected carefully to illustrate the ideas he emphasizes in his poem essay. Augusto creates a form of anti-criticism and “un-translation” out of his ideas about some of his favorite touch-stones from many traditions. These include the Brazilian: João Cabral Melo Neto and Gregório de Matos receive this treatment. So do classics Dante, John Donne, and the Rubayat of Omar Khayyam by Edward Fitzgerald; fellow minimalists Emily Dickinson, Duchamp, and John Cage; fellow language innovators Lewis Carroll, Mallarmé, Verlaine, Gertrude Stein, and of course the Latin American poets Vicente Huidobro and Oliveira Girondo. I’ve already cited his use of Paz to lay claim for the underestimated value of Latin American poetry. Yet this anticritical essay gets very critical of Surrealism: the exact mode of Spanish American poetry that Paz wrote within for decades, and which also heavily influenced Pablo Neruda. He indulges in a bit of literary nationalism, expressing his vision that: “from oswald to concrete poetry / from joão cabral and joão gilberto / ... [brazilian poetry] created within itself another experimental line / cannibalist and constructivist / that does not have a parallel in Spanish poetry” (my loose translation).¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁴ “O que abomino são os críticos que praticam aquilo que já chame de ‘dialética da maledicência’. Os que não iluminam nem se deixam iluminar. Os desconfiados e os ressentidos com a sua própria incompetência cósmica para entender o criar qualquer coisa de novo. Aqueles a que Pound se referia como a ‘vermina pestilente’: os que desviam a atenção dos melhores para os de 2a categoria ou para os seus próprios escritos críticos.

Contra esses eu sou. E é a eles que este meu livro — crítica de amor e de amador, crítica via tradução criativa — dirige a seta do seu ‘anti’. Mas a minha meta é outra. A minha meta é a poesia, que — de Dante a Cage — é cor, é som, é fracasso de sucesso, e não passa de uma conferência sobre nada” (Augusto, *O Anticrítico*, 10)

¹⁴⁵ de oswald à poesia concreta
de joão cabral e joão gilberto

This vision of the superiority of Brazilian poetry plays a rather unusual role here in an introduction to and an argument for his choice to represent Spanish American poetry with selections from Vicente Huidobro and Oliveira Gironde. Augusto describes surrealism as an “irritation between us” which “(no matter the name it goes by) / impregnates the mass of Spanish American poems / with an unbearable metaphorizing rhetoric / that does not question language” (161). The classism and gender issues within these word choices should be noted and critiqued; Augusto sounds like a poet protecting the elite sphere from the “masses,” or protecting the “masculine” sphere of serious political poetry from the disruptive “feminizing” force of becoming “impregnated” with the sentimentality of surrealism. His claim that Brazil did not suffer from this “mal” or “disease” because the country was already surrealistic enough echoes the assertion of Alejo Carpentier about “lo real maravilloso.” Yet despite this harsh critique of the “mass” or “majority” of Spanish-American poetry, he does say there is something there which Brazilian readers should get to know better: “e no entanto / há algo nessa poesia / q merecia ser mais conhecido por aqui [who deserve to be more known here]” (161). He names Huidobro and Gironde as the poets who are *not* surrealists, who are “rare pioneers” (162) who “não quer titilar sentimentos / nem subornar más-consciências / poesia de linguagem / e não de língua / quorpo estranho” (163).

Augusto translates only a brief portion of the poem *Altazor* (1931 publication, written between 1919 and 1930) by Vicente Huidobro into Portuguese. This poem

da pc à tropicália
criou-se uma outra linha experimental
antropófago-construtivista
que não tem paralelo
na poesia espanhola

notoriously includes the phrase that the “poet is a little god” who makes worlds of his own, and it breaks down language to mere sound elements, an interpretive challenge to readers and translators alike. Yet Augusto does not choose that famous section, or the one with the repetitive use of the construction “Molino de viento” playing on the word “viento” — the poem offers many attractions to the experimental translator. Instead of choosing these famous portions that have become representative of the Spanish avant-garde tradition, Augusto selects a portion from the middle of Canto IV, one of the portions published first in French in a literary journal in 1930. Not only does the multilingualism of the source text drive his selection process, he also goes so far as to include the French text as the original rather than the Spanish version published with the entire poem. In his translation of Huidobro, Augusto honors and brings forward the fragment, the record of the long journey this poem took with its creator, an homage to the “failure” of this work to cohere rather than to the version Huidobro published as a whole.

As René da Costa argues, it is clear that Huidobro wrote this section first in French. Even in his translation into Spanish, he needed to retain the structure of French words in order to achieve the reference to the musical scale, do re mi etc. He bases this argument on the fact that the key word “rossignol” in French never gets translated entirely into Spanish as “ruiseñor.” Instead, Huidobro chooses to “hispanize” the French word by creating a new spelling: “roseñor.”

mais le ciel préfère le **ro**dog nol

son enfant gâté le **roré**gnol

sa fleur de joie le **romi**gnol

sa peau de larme le **rof**agnol

sa gorge de nuit le rossolgnol
le rolagnol
le rossignol
(*O Anticrítico* 166)
mas o céu prefere o roudonol
seu filho mimado o rourenol
sua flor de alegria o rouminol
sua pele de lágrima o roufanol
sua garganta de noite o rousolnol
o roulanol
o roulsinol
(*O Anticrítico* 167)

In Augusto's version, presented on facing page with the French in which Huidobro first wrote the poem, he is able to show that Portuguese provided a home for this word-play in a more natural way: the word is already "rouxinol."

Augusto chooses dynamics of fragmentation in order to highlight the following concepts: poems by others connect with his own work; the experimentation within language rather than the use of language to experiment on reality; and both Spanish-American poetry and Brazilian poetry have experienced this nutrification with language traditions from all over the world, which has been bent to local conditions. While he did not expressly retract his harsh critiques of surrealism when he accepted the Pablo Neruda prize, this untranslation of Huidobro does symbolically move his own work in relation

with the Spanish-American tradition, giving a possible alternative trajectory for admirers of *modernistas* like Asunción Silva and *vanguardistas* like Huidobro.

Intralingual (Un)Translations and *Os sertões dos Campos*

Augusto deploys the same techniques of selection, reduction, and re-configuration in a series of “(in)traduções” he makes from a Brazilian source text. *Os sertões dos Campos: Duas vezes Euclides* (1997) by Augusto and Haroldo de Campos is a hybrid work where Augusto uses “intralingual translation,” translation within one language, to operate on a classic of the Brazilian canon *Os sertões* and create untranslations of this sociohistorical treatise. I analyze this generically hybrid work as an intralingual translation because Augusto connects it with Oswald’s poems made from cannibalizing other texts, when he describes his poems as “obtained” from the Brazilian classic *Os sertões* (1902) by Euclides da Cunha. The collection can be read as a translation within one language, a translation that is “intralingual” (Jakobson).¹⁴⁶ Published as a joint work, the volume puts the twin concepts of “translation as criticism” and “criticism as translation” into dialogue.¹⁴⁷ Haroldo’s contribution is an essay about his experiences translating *Os Sertões* into German; together, the paired sections posit that translation within one language can be critically revealing and that a translation can still relate to the

¹⁴⁶ The term intralingual translation comes from Roman Jakobson in his essay “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation.” He outlines three major forms of translation, or, three “ways of interpreting a verbal sign” (139): intralingual, interlingual, or intersemiotic. Much translation practice and scholarship focuses on the second two varieties, interlingual (also favored by Jakobson as “translation proper”) or intersemiotic (adaptation). The case of intralingual translation tends to be explored through fictional accounts of this practice, as in Jorge Luis Borges’s famed “Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote” (1939) or in contemporary conceptual writing, as in the “constraint of uncreativity” practiced by poets such as Kenneth Goldsmith in “Day” (2003), where the poet writes a complete transcription of every word and number in one issue of the *New York Times*.

¹⁴⁷ Haroldo de Campos calls Augusto’s work a “releitura” and he calls his work a “transposição” (9). Together their pieces form a “dupla leitura reciprocamente complementar” (9).

source culture.¹⁴⁸ In a brief introduction to this double text, Haroldo de Campos describes the work of Augusto as “intuito de retrazar as veredas de poesia” (9) [purpose to retrace the paths of poetry, my translation]. Using the word “veredas” or “paths” in this context, in the context of the writing and re-writing of Brazilian canonical literature, must also set off echoes from the title of the later work *Grande Sertão, Veredas* (1956) by Guimarães Rosa. The two brothers discovered that by coincidence they were both working on *Os sertões* by Euclides da Cunha. Augusto’s text had already been published, but the essay by Haroldo was for a seminar at the Instituto Goethe in São Paulo for the occasion of what he calls “transposição do livro para o alemão” (9) by Berthold Zilly. When Haroldo calls the two texts “reciprocamente complementar” (9), he is not referring directly to gift theory. However, he does refer to reciprocity and implies that each translation has something to offer and to receive from another translation of that same work. In my focus on Augusto’s portion of this joint volume, I see his intralingual (un)translations as a conversation with the source text, with critical scholarship on that source text that found it lacking, and with the “cannibal reason” of the Brazilian avant-garde as described by Haroldo.

¹⁴⁸ Campos often displays this reciprocal concept in the titles of his translations. He uses recognizable Brazilian classics interpolated into the source texts to draw attention to the two-way exchange of aesthetic information taking place: Brazilian Portuguese taking from a source text, but giving back a new third text to connect the source to the Brazilian tradition. His translation of parts of Goethe’s *Faustus* is listed under “Criticism” in *Novas*, the edited volume by Antonio Sergio Bessa and Odile Cisneros. The misleading title *Deus e o diabo no “Fausto” de Goethe* (1977) interpolates the film directed by Cinema Novo director Glauber Rocha called *Deus e o diabo na Terra do Sol* (1964). Campos also tends to give his translations titles that make an argument about a text, which foregrounds his idea of translation as criticism and cannibal reason (Pires Viera 106). She also reads the editorial composition of Campos’s translated volumes as blurring between the lines of original production and translation. “It is also worth highlighting that, at the end of the book, the section ‘Works by the Author’ actually lists de Campos’ work, which suggests the articulation of a space conventionally deemed marginal or even irrelevant as compared to the original author’s centrality – that is, stresses the translator’s own production.” (Pires Viera 106).

He references Oswald de Andrade as a model, drawing from the same work as Haroldo emphasizes in his argument for a “cannibal reason” at the heart of Brazilian literary innovation.¹⁴⁹ Augusto uses his translations to argue against a scholarly trend that evaluates the poetic content and style of *Os sertões* as a deficit.¹⁵⁰ He cites several Brazilian critics who have written about the Parnassian or excessively poetic qualities of this historiographic essay as though they were weak points of the work.¹⁵¹ In a sense, Augusto uses his intralingual translation to remove the over-emotionality of the style without removing the poetic density. Some of the qualities he identifies as problematic in Spanish American poetry may be present in this classic Brazilian narrative—but in his transcreated versions, there is a political impact without the emotional manipulation of lyricism or surrealistic detail. The process of taking sections of text unchanged to produce another work is connected not only to the Oswald avant-garde and to other poets of that period such as Guilherme de Almeida. Augusto also connects this work to the minimalist experimental modernism of John Cage and his concept of “writing through” ().¹⁵² He

¹⁴⁹ “Usei de maior liberdade na reconstrução de ‘O prisioneiro’ (596), mas mesmo aqui não houve nenhuma modificação textual. Só a disposição tipográfica é nova, dispensada a pontuação. Com igual desenvoltura Oswald recortou os escritos dos nossos primeiros cronistas-viajantes nos poemas de *Pau Brasil*” (Augusto de Campos, “Transertões” 33).

¹⁵⁰ These experiments with literary intralingual translation ask what kinds of “form” can be found in the “inform” text of the original geographical-historical essay on the War of Canudos (1896-1897) in the Brazilian backlands, or the *sertão*: these poems challenge notions of where beauty comes from. They explore an irreverent treatment of a canonized work in order to question the use the state makes of its self-image of the subaltern as central. Augusto reacts to two models of translation: the operation of the avant-garde *Pau Brasil* cannibalizing the colonial documents and the material of *Os Sertões*.

¹⁵¹ Augusto Meyer calls it in English “o *fine excess* da poesia” (15) and for Eugenio Gomes the work suffers from its “eco do tantã parnasiano” (15). For Augusto, these scholars fail to appreciate the genius of Cunha when they reject his poetic language; to prove his point, he writes poems that encapsulate Cunha’s work within the very same lines of verse that these other critics have disparaged as superfluous. In his method of harvesting lines of poetic verse from Cunha’s prose, Campos is following in the footsteps of another avant-garde poet Guilherme de Almeida who did a similar experiment in 1946 (Augusto de Campos, “Transertões” 12).

¹⁵² “Uma outra experiência foi criar o soneto composto com os dodecassílabos euclidianos (poderia ser a minha “sonoterapia 3”), desmontando e remontando frases, um pouco no espírito de John Cage “writing through” textos alheios, como operação crítico-pragmática de exploração prospectiva da linguagem poética virtual.” (Augusto de Campos, “Transertões” 33)

directly connects the poems with the pages of the source text, giving a code and asserting how little he changed the words on the page, that the poems “foram obtidos sem alteração do texto ou da pontuação. Em geral apenas recorto as linhas para pôr em evidência os ritmos mais expressivos” (32). Augusto prefaces his poems with an essay that reveals his sources, methods, and intentions. He specifies that he worked with the 37th edition of the work edited by Francisco Alves (1995) and he includes page numbers with all of the phrases he cites in his essay—phrases he crafts into poems gives his own titles.

As a whole, Augusto’s exercise puts to the test the critiques other scholars have made of the source text, subjecting it to a similar operation but with much more critical assessment of the poetic element within the prose text. Augusto is specifically in dialogue with Augusto Meyer and Eugênio Gomes, but also a more generalized characterization of the text as generically imprecise and difficult to identify, not as scientific or as historically trustworthy as it aspires to be, specifically because of the poetic quality of its prose. Augusto is not simply converting prose into poetry in an “alquimia verbal” (33). More than a transformation based on rules outside the source text, he uses editing techniques to demonstrate that these very poetic structures give the text its value: “O que se pretende é demonstrar o quanto as estruturas poéticas—no seu adensamento rítmico, plástico e sonoro—contribuíram para dar ao texto o ‘tonus’ peculiar que é a sua marca impressionante. Em muitos dos mais altos trechos do seu livro, naqueles precisamente em que ele se revela mais original e persuasivo, recorreu Euclides aos métodos da poesia” (33). Augusto argues that, contrary to previous readings, these poetic stretches are the portions that contribute to the work’s expansion from the realm of the didactic or of reportage to the realm of literature.

In my interpretation of the poems themselves, they work along with the essay to point to ways the source text was also working with poetic resources. In many of the selections, Augusto uses the technique of re-lineation to emphasize rhythmic qualities already present in the poem. For example, the first poem “Soldado” includes a repeated line “braços longamente abertos” (35) calling the reader to think about how repetition is used even in prose to slow down the reader, or to create a sense of the monotony of war that the author experienced. The poem “Rodeio” creates the jerk-stop motion of a rodeo with use of numerous *esdrújulas* or dactylic words, *pie quebrado* or short one-word phrases, and punctuation that breaks up lines:

De repente
estruge ao lado um
estrídulo tropel de cascos sobre pedras
um
estrépito de galhos etralando
(37)

Translated simply, the lines read: “Suddenly / roared in from the side a / **shrill** clatter of hooves on stone / a / **din** of branches crashing,” but the words “shrill” and “din” fail to capture the rhythmic charm of the two matching dactyls. While the prose text did not include the line breaks to emphasize the two galloping words “estrídulo” and “estrépito,” Euclides da Cunha still did select these terms to describe the dramatic entrance of his horseman, announcing the “vaqueiro” with these noisy words before he even appears on the page. In the poem “Monte Santo,” the theme is the false and pathetic attempts of innocent or naïve believers to reach heaven. Heaven is “o *el dorado* apetecido,” which

speaks to the colonial history of the New World, in Spanish. These poems present images, either static or in motion, sometimes moving between languages or moments in South American history, and Augusto emphasizes poetic and imagistic characteristics rather than the text's narrative qualities that move a story forward in time.

The poem "Os crentes" changes that pattern, taking on a more narrative quality. This draws attention to the lack of narrative that came before. It tells the story of the blind following of the believers behind "o profeta" and Augusto makes the poem clear mostly through the title. The next poem "A igreja nova" continues the more narrative mode of the previous, and is formally close to the structure of a *silva*. He tells the story of "o edificio monstruoso" that is the new church produced by "o Conselheiro," who is named for the first time in this poem. The narrative trend continues with "Tocaia" which narrates the defeat of the rebels. The title, which means "ambush" or "blind" in the sense of a duck blind, implies that the defeat was inevitable; in the same way the poem is structured around a repeated anaphora that creates inevitability, a forward-driving predictability.

While all of Augusto's "intralingual translations" gift the poetic register of *Os sertões* with critical value and attention, the poem "O prisioneiro" does so in a way that refers back to Augusto's own poetry the most. He describes the poem "O Prisioneiro" and claims that he "changed this one the most, but still did not change it at all." Building a concrete poem out of a prose sentence, he breaks down a description of a prisoner in Canudos War, placing lines in the shape of a Christ figure on the cross.¹⁵³ In this poem, he creates a performative translation theory of visual concrete translations—change that does not involve semantic change at all.

¹⁵³ The sentence reads "Um suspeno pelas axila entre duas praças, meio desmaiado, tinha, diagonalmente, sobre o peito nu, a desenhar-se num recalque forte, a lâmina do sabre que o abatera" (Cunha 457).

um
suspense
pelas axilas entre duas praças
meio
desmaiado
tinha
diagonalmente
sobre o peito nu
a desenhar-se num recalque forte
a lâmina do sabre que o abatera.
(*Os sertões dos Campos* 49)

Augusto also uses his neologism “(in)tradução” to label one version of this poem. On the back cover, Augusto presents this poem in red, with a background of the sentence, printed in grey in larger font, and represented as prose. That source version reads: “Um suspense pelas axilas entre duas praças, meio desmaiado, tinha, diagonalmente, sobre o peito nu, a desenhar-se num recalque forte, a lâmina do sabre que o abatera.” Within the text of the book, the poem is titled “O PRISIONEIRO” (49). But the paratextual material gives a different title to the concrete poem as it appears on the back cover. “4a capa: *Intradução: Prisioneiro de Euclides*” is the title Augusto de Campos gives to the version displayed in two ways at once. Not all of the line breaks Augusto adds to this phrase were

already implied by the commas. But many of them are, supporting Augusto's perception that the poem was already present in Euclides da Cunha's text.

As with the other (un)translations analyzed, in "The Prisoner," Augusto uses concrete poetry to bring out something that is already in the text: references to a teleological retelling of the Christ narrative which the rebels were drawn to in the figure of the Conselheiro. However, Augusto's interpolation of his concrete aesthetics in some ways obscures meaning, while he does let all the words remain. The word "diagonalmente" in the original is referring to the mark left by a blow with a saber, a wound on the prisoner's body. Because of the placement of the word at a diagonal, there is a "transposition" of the word into the figure of Christ on the cross, into his legs set at an angle, or into the drape of cloth that in most images modestly covers his genitals, or a combination of both. The diagonal in the poem by Augusto is the body of the prisoner – in the source text, it is the wound left by the armed forces on their prisoner. Significantly, this choice makes the violence of the text both more visible and less visible. It connects the drama of the Conselheiro with the very Christian teleology his movement capitalized on or exploited. But it also camouflages the wound of the secular prisoner, it turns his saber wound not into the stigmata of Christ but into his clothing, his body, his modesty. This suggests that re-animating the Christian myth in Brazil requires a certain erasure, an erasure of the more widespread and banal violence that exists in an effort to elevate the moral violence against the elite few.

The Professional Cannibal Translator: Paulo Henriques Britto

The brothers de Campos practice and project a comprehensive vision for literary translation, one that spans classic World Literature and other parts of the Brazilian tradition. But their view has its critics, because the idea of “transcreation” presumes participation in an elite literary circle and access to a specialized knowledge base of literary works and their discourses. In his article on “Literary Translation Theory in Brazil,” John Milton calls the program envisioned by the de Campos brothers, and their own self-promotion of that vision, an “authoritarianism of rupture” (198). Citing Jorge Wanderley, he enumerates the elitism in the attitudes displayed by the Campos brothers: (1) “imposition on the reader,” (2) demand that the “translator/poet *must* break with tradition” to be “worth considering,” and (3) “snobbery towards other ‘ordinary’ translations” (198).¹⁵⁴ In my view, “transcreation,” “untranslation,” and other creative translations function as gifts that offer readers freedom in how to read a translation. Yet for scholars including Milton, Wanderley, and to a certain extent Britto, the Campos brothers’ insistence on performing experimental translations as ruptures working against (or putting themselves above) those translations driven by accessibility to the public, seeking and appealing to new readers, or marketability, actually represents a failure of the democratic values the Campos brothers claim to support. In the remaining sections of this chapter, I analyze two translators who do not draw from the experimental thought of the Campos brothers: Paulo Henriques Britto and Clarice Lispector. Beginning with Britto, who specifically critiques the Campos model, I argue that he nevertheless expresses creative agency as translator in a way that benefits from the Campos expansion of what

¹⁵⁴ “This [snobbishness] can be seen in Haroldo de Campos’ comments on ‘inferior’ translations of *The Raven* in *Deus e o Diabo no Fausto de Goethe*: ‘Veamos agora como se comportam diante do mesmo texto-amostra as traduções comuns, *naturais*, destituída de um projeto estético radical’” (Campos cited in Milton 198-9).

counts as a translation in Brazil. I further argue that, as a poet, Britto also receives gifts from his translation process, regardless of how separately he would like to maintain his two practices.

Paulo Henriques Britto holds a prime place in the Brazilian literary sphere for the virtuosity, diversity, and sheer volume of literary works he has brought into Portuguese from English. A prize-winning translator, poet, and critic, by 2015 Britto had translated around 120 books between English and Portuguese. His authors include prose masters Henry James, William Faulkner, Don DeLillo, and Thomas Pynchon, and poets Lord Byron, Wallace Stevens, and Elizabeth Bishop. His literary awards include the prestigious Prêmio Portugal Telecom de Literatura Brasileira for his poetry collection *Macau* (2004) and the Prêmio Paulo Rónai in the translation category for *A mecânica das águas* by E. L. Doctorow (1995). His translations of other poets do not belong in the same category as the activities of Paz, Castellanos, Pacheco, Augusto or Haroldo de Campos. Where these poet-translators included translations within their own chapbooks and collected works, compiling editions of their translations, Britto represents a more professional and completist approach to translation.¹⁵⁵ For example, his first collection of poems by Elizabeth Bishop, *Poemas do Brasil* (1999) brings together poems that reflect the arc and trajectory of her time in Brazil. He includes most of her works that mention Brazil or take place in Brazilian spaces, and includes some that only reference her departure, such as his masterful rendering of “One Art,” analyzed below. His later

¹⁵⁵ In *A Little History*, Ammiel Alcalay argues that translators could benefit from translating much more than the final, published versions of their authors works, and should seek out essays, drafts, journals, letters, and other informal examples of a writer’s voice and translate those fragments as well as the works that receive the consecration of publication.

volume *O Iceberg Imaginário* (2001) includes many more poems, organized according to the books Bishop published in her lifetime.

Britto characterizes the distance between theories and practices of translation in Brazil as a “mismatch.” I take his point, but I also understand this divergence as a reflection of a diverse field in which a wide range of texts are acceptable as translations, representing for scholars like Maria Tymoczko the health of a translation community. In his book *A tradução literária*, Britto cites Gregory Rabassa in a defensive pose against those who would label him a “dinosaur” for not theorizing his work as a translator. While it has to be said that there is something cruel about calling translation theorists “hyenas” in reaction to their dismissal of his approach, Britto’s citation of Rabassa can be read in a more ironic tone than the source text itself. Whereas Rabassa is defending himself in a sphere where the value and existence of translation is limited (to 3% of the books published), Britto is operating in a literary market where he has been able to make a living as a literary translator, and he is not the only one. Instead, he is calling attention to the mismatch in discourse rather than an actual threat to the practice of a market-driven, faithful, or non-theorized translation manual.

Identifying as a professional translator, Britto is invested in maintaining a distinction between translation, poetic creation, and literary criticism based on his practical experiences working in these three fields and on his observations of the current translation market in Brazil. This divide provokes two major questions: first, what are the costs, for Britto, of conflating theory and practice—why does he maintain so firmly that theory is not helpful in the act of translation? And second, does his approach to translation, as he claims, reflect a growing “faithfulness” in the practice of literary

translation? In his article “Tradução e ilusão” Britto argues that “[d]espite the existence of powerful currents in the field of translation studies that emphasize the autonomy of the translated text vis-à-vis the original, today’s literary translators produce versions that are far more faithful to the original than in the past. Availing ourselves of Friedrich Schleiermacher’s concepts of foreignization and domesticization in translation, and of Jiří Levý’s notions of illusionist and anti-illusionist translation, a possible explanation emerges for this mismatch between theory and practice” (Britto 27). The question remains: is Britto as untheorized as he claims? Does a particular translation manual arise out of his own work as a translator; do his essays on the specific choices a translator must make rise to the level of a theory? When Augusto himself also labels his poetic translation collection *O Anticrítico*, where does that relate to Britto’s own rejection of theory, if at all? I posit that they are different manners of rejecting a theorization of literature: for Augusto, language itself is broken down, but for Britto, he learns from translating how to break down poetic forms and build them into his own. Where Augusto rejects literary criticism or theory by writing poems that are “porous prose,” or sentences that he has chosen to “aerate” with line breaks, Britto will use his experiences translating Bishop to experiment with writing in English and inventing his own approaches to fixed forms, including his “symmetrical sonnets.”

Translation as a Gift of Formal Experiment: Symmetrical Sonnets

The original poetry Britto collects in *Macau* (2003) and *Tarde* (2007) tends to wield the tools of poetic tradition and form with a humorous and light handed touch. They do not break down language, although in some poems there appears to be a

breaking down of the body and the lyric subject. Instead of experimenting on the level of words, he experiments with forms, building elegant lines, sonnets and pseudo-sonnets with the humble materials of the every-day. Both include poems in English as well as Portuguese; both include poems that demonstrate the gifts Britto receives as a translator and incorporates into his own work. In *Tarde*, the section titled “Quatro Autotraduções” draws the most overt connection between his translation activity and his writing original poems. One poem “Soneto simétrico” is a Portuguese version of the English poem in *Macau* included in the section “Sete sonetos simétricos” where he reworks the sonnet form and rhyme scheme.

Yet more than these acts of self-translation, I propose that the very experiments with formal qualities in these “symmetrical sonnets” represent a greater display of the gifts Britto received through translating poems from English. Not all of the sonnets take the same form: some have five stanzas of two, three, five, three and then two lines, creating perfectly symmetrically-sized stanzas. In the poem beginning “Em torno de uma mesa sem toalha” (41), he even creates a perfectly symmetrical rhyme pattern. In some cases, there is merely an opening and closing stanza of two lines, creating a question that remains unanswered instead of the traditional sonnet that proposes a problem, complicates it, and then resolves or concludes it in the end. I read these sonnets as a unique mash-up of two strains of the sonnet tradition: the Petrarchan and the Shakespearean, both of which influenced Britto as a reader and as a translator. Britto responds to the sonnet tradition going back to Petrarch and arriving in Portuguese through Italian and through Spanish. He echoes this Romance language tradition when he uses extreme enjambment and with the division of concepts into stanzas of three or four

lines. But he is also responding to his engagement with English language poetry and history of sonnets in English, with the two-line “turn” both at the start and the finish. His “symmetrical” form offers opportunities to combine the verse structures of Petrarchan and Shakespearian sonnets. In this example, he begins with an echo of Andrew Marvell’s “To his coy mistress” and the line “Had we but world enough and time,” but swerves:

As if you had the world or time to try it,
the nerve, the will—what else?—the peace and quiet.

No; all you have is an odd sort of urge
that gets you going with no proper aim
in mind. Maybe a vague desire to merge
with something that you couldn’t even name
if someone asked you what it was, in fact.
And yet you make a move. The rules of the game
are far from clear. No matter: you must act
because you must. Because you don’t know why
you must. Because you sense the cards are stacked
against you: yes, that’s just what makes you try.

There shouldn’t be anything facile about it.
Or else you could certainly do without it.

(Britto, *Macau* 43)

In the ten-line central section, Britto plays with phrases that could be associated with either erotic conquest or with literary pursuits. The speaker muses about an “odd sort of urge / that gets you going” and “a vague desire to merge.” Both phrases could be read as expressions of erotic desire, until it becomes clear that the object of desire is “something that you couldn’t even name” putting it into the more metaphysical terrain of a “tradition” or a “literature.” Again, “make a move” could be a romantic gambit, an approach, as could “rules of the game,” but the speaker once more swerves away from the clear-cut goals of the seducer to the more self-obscuring, paradoxical aims of the writer: “you must act / because you must. Because you don’t know why / you must” are not lines to convince a beloved.

In addition to Britto’s combining of the meta-literary with the erotic tradition of the sonnet, his formal games with these symmetrical sonnets could also be read as obliquely responding to Elizabeth Bishop and her own experiment with the sonnet form in her late poem “Sonnet” (1979). The title and the fourteen lines mark the poem with the traditional form, but the other attributes do not correspond. Most lines have only two metric feet; the rhymes resist pattern. In my reading, Bishop has given her readers a sonnet cut in half and turned upside-down. The last lines “flying wherever / it feels like, gay!” can be read multiple ways, depending on the shift in meaning of the final word from a neutral synonym for “happy” to a colloquial label for homosexuality. Yet it is difficult to avoid seeing Bishop’s use of this word as a reference to her own homosexuality. Britto includes a note on this challenge to translators, without resolving

the question, but accepting that his translation, “feliz,” will not give his readers everything the English reader might perceive in the poem.¹⁵⁶

In his poem “Ossos do ofício” Britto also shows the gifts he received as translator. In this subtle villanelle, he responds to “One Art” by Bishop, which he translated marvelously. Both poets combine the use of this restrictive and repetitive form with a slight breaking of that form. Britto’s dwells on a meta-commentary about accepting and embracing the challenges of putting thoughts into words, or into poetry, whereas Bishop’s poem is about accepting loss as an of the human condition, loss that gains value when it becomes fodder for literature. In Britto’s villanelle, the speaker is a poet, repeatedly frustrated with the limits of poetic language to express thought in the first refrain line that “O que se pensa não é o que se canta” or “What one thinks is not what one sings.” Yet the second refrain takes a common idiom “atravessado/a na garganta” which means to be annoyed by something, and makes it literal over the course of the poem—not only is the poet “annoyed by rhyme” or “com a rima atravessada na garganta,” but this also becomes literal, the rhyme is stuck in the poet’s throat. Language is, it turns out, perfectly expressive—if not of thought, or rationality, at least of feeling.

O que se pensa não é o que se canta.

Difícil sustentar um raciocínio

com a rima atravessada na garganta.

Mesmo o maior esforço não adianta:

¹⁵⁶ “A última palavra do poema original, *gay*, tem o significado tradicional de “alegre”, “animado”, além do mais recente de “homossexual”. É possível que a autora tivesse em mente uma discreta alusão ao homossexualismo, mas não fui capaz de reproduzir esse efeito na tradução” (*O Iceberg Imaginário* 350).

da sensação à idéia há um declínio,
e o que se pensa não é o que se canta.

Difícil, sim. E é por isso que encanta.
Há que *sentir*—e aí está o fascínio—
com a rima atravessada na garganta.

Apenas isso justifica tanta
dedicação, tanta autodomínio,
se o que se pensa não é o que se canta,

mesmo porque (constantação que espanta
qualquer espírito mais apolíneo)
a rima atravessada na garganta

é o trambolho que menos se agiganta
nesse percurso nada retilíneo,
ao fim do qual se pensa o que se canta,
depois que a rima atravessa a garganta.

(Britto, *Tarde* 44)

The poet's frustration peaks in the middle stanza, where the beautifully achieved metric regularity of the previous lines is disrupted. The poet complains "Apenas isso justifica tanta / dedicação, tanta autodomínio" and with the claim of "so much dedication, so much

self-discipline,” that discipline is lost. But only for a moment. Eventually in the final lines, both refrains are reversed, and the poet finally thinks what he sings, once the rhyme has ceased to annoy and has passed through his throat: “ao fim do qual se pensa o que se canta, / depois que a rima atravessa a garganta.” Much like Bishop’s v “One Art,” the reward for the losses of the writerly life is the writing itself. In his translation years earlier of Bishop’s villanelle, Britto translates with an unusual choice in the refrains—a strong choice that changes the poem significantly. Where Bishop’s first line is “The art of losing isn’t hard to master,” the first refrain remaining stable. She bends the form, only repeating the last word “disaster” rather than the full refrain. In order to adhere to the same structure, and also to the negative formulation of Bishop’s lines, Britto chooses to render the first line as “A arte de perder não e nenhum mistério,” with the repeated corollary “não é nada sério.”

The art of losing isn’t hard to master;
 So many things seem filled with the intent
 To be lost that their loss is no disaster.

 —Even losing you (the joking voice, a gesture
 I love) I shan’t have lied. It’s evident
 the art of losing’s not too hard to master
 though it may look like (*Write it!*) like disaster.
 (Bishop 166-7)

A arte de perder não e nenhum mistério;
 tantas coisas contêm em si o acidente

de perdê-las, que perder não é nada sério.

.....
—Mesmo perder você (a voz, o riso etéreo
que eu amo) não muda nada. Pois é evidente
que a arte de perder não chega a ser mistério
por muito que pareça (*Escreve!*) muito sério.

(Bishop translated by Britto, *Poemas do Brasil* 185)

Like Bishop's use of the form, Britto maintains the first refrain line precisely the same, and the other he alters as the poem moves forward. But his translation choices to preserve the rhyme and flexibility of these lines meant significantly altering the semantic meaning and register of these key phrases. Bishop's "isn't hard to master" becomes "não é nenhum mistério" in Britto's translation, and her "is no disaster" is transformed as "não é nada sério." Both phrases combine the metaphysical of "mystery" and "mastery" with an every-day expression. Yet Britto eliminates some of the physicality of "master and disaster" with "misterio" and "sério," preferring instead to maintain the rhyme, and even the connection with the English word "master" in his translation "misterio." Britto draws on the works he translates in his own poetry, demonstrating that he receives gifts of formal insights through his work as a translator. Additionally, while he claims to eschew theory, instead describing the translator's work as constructing a convincing pastiche that gives the illusion of Bishop, in analyzing some of his more formally precise translations, he clearly does so with an eye to preserving aesthetic relationships rather than semantic meaning, which is a value the brothers de Campos each promote in their own way.

Clarice Lispector as Translator and Adapter: Gifts and Products Mixed Together

What happens when an act of translation is excluded from the possibility of reciprocity or denied the status of a gift? In the case of Clarice Lispector, this denial may have contributed to making her efforts as a translator invisible despite their success on the literary market. Unlike the Campos brothers and Britto, the translations by acclaimed Brazilian author Lispector have received scant or wary critical attention. Her works translated into English and into Spanish have received study, but her own translations have been largely dismissed. And yet, her translations of stories by Edgar Allan Poe have remained in print and widely circulating in Brazil since the first edition in 1974.¹⁵⁷ I argue that, because her translations were presented as an adaptation for a children's or juvenile literary market, and studied primarily in their character as product rather than also as a gift, the care with which she reconstructed these stories in Portuguese has not been fully appreciated. The interventions her translations make in Poe's work are on full display in a story titled "The Devil in the Belfry" in which she creates a different narrative voice and reverses the relationship between her readers and Poe's characters by avoiding the distancing effects on which Poe relied.

Given renewed interest in Clarice Lispector, coupled with the rise of translation studies and Luso-Brazilian literary studies, it is not surprising that her work in general and the translations of her works into English in particular have received scholarly attention. Tace Hedrick reads English language translations and advocates for new

¹⁵⁷ Lispector first published seven stories in 1974 under the title *7 de Allan Poe* (Technoprint), then added eleven more to a new edition published in 1975, under the title *O gato preto e outras histórias de Allan Poe* (Ediouro). In her bibliography, Denise Bottman clarifies that in 1985 the publisher changed the title of the subsequent editions and re-printings to *Histórias extraordinárias de Allan Poe*. Lispector's translations of Poe remain in print and in wide circulation; I cite from the fifteenth edition (Ediouro 1996).

translations that take into account the concepts of “*écriture féminine*” that so interested Lispector with more care to preserve the details of her stylistics in English language translations. Benjamin Moser, author of the first English language biography of Lispector *Why This World* (2009), successfully persuaded the publisher New Directions to publish under his editorship a carefully produced and critically acclaimed series of retranslations of her novels and short stories.¹⁵⁸ Two Spanish Language academic journals have published special issues on Clarice Lispector: *Revista Cerrados* in 2007 and *Espéculo* in 2013. In his article “Clarice Lispector Tradutora” Edgar César Nolasco does not examine the translations from other languages published under her name, but instead understands her writing as a process of translating her reading habits. In the case of her last novel *A hora da estrela* (1977), Nolasco interprets this work as a translation or a rewriting of the French novel *La Dentellière* (1974) by Pascal Lainé. While Severino J. Albuquerque did write an article in 1999 “Reading Translation Queerly: Lispector’s Translation of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*” the article relates more significantly with queer studies than translation studies. Albuquerque also explores the ambiguous provenance of Lispector’s translations as connected with her financial situation: “As part of these money-making attempts [including writing for women’s magazines and ghostwriting for celebrities], it is widely accepted that Clarice agreed to add her by-then famous name to a number of translations done by others. It is not clear, however, precisely which of the several translations attributed to Clarice are her own work and which are not” (Albuquerque 694-

¹⁵⁸ Most recently, *The Complete Stories of Clarice Lispector* (Trans Katrina Dodson, 2015) was awarded the PEN Translation Prize for Prose. The project began with retranslations of five of her most critically acclaimed novels: *The Hour of the Star* (Trans Ben Moser, 2011), *The Passion According to G.H.* (Trans Idra Novey, 2012), *Água Viva* (Trans Stefan Tobler, 2012), *A Breath of Life* (Trans Johnny Lorenz, 2012), and *Near to the Wild Heart* (Trans Alison Entrekin, 2012).

5). He connects the lack of certainty about the authorship or attention paid to her translations to the mystery she cultivated in many areas of her public persona: “[i]n an existence, such as Clarice’s, so defined by ambiguity and evasiveness it is almost fitting that this authorial uncertainty would surround her translation of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*” (ibid). While her works grow in acclaim, her translation work has not kept up.

Several Brazilian scholars have paid attention to Lispector’s translations of Poe as a part of studies of the reception and translation of his work in Brazil, but these works of comparative descriptive translation analysis do not do much to illuminate insights achieved through her translation choices. Instead, they tend to dismiss her translations as adaptations for a children’s literature market. In his article analyzing the reception of Poe within Brazilian literature, Carlos Daghljan gives her only one line: “Clarice Lispector (1925-1977) reescreveu, com êxito, onze contos de Poe para o público infanto-juvenil” (46). Merely commenting on the “success” of her “rewritings” for the “children’s/juvenile public” without analyzing or citing the translations themselves or even the paratexts or reviews, as he does with other instances of Poe’s Brazilian legacy, is another instance of associating her work primarily with its financial character as an exchange of services for a particular market. In his dissertation project, Fabiano Bruno Gonçalves systematically compares eight different translations of Poe’s story “The Tell-Tale Heart” into Portuguese. His evaluation of Lispector’s translation tends to attribute her choices to the fact that hers is an adaptation and not a translation. Frequently, he analyzes a citation in the other seven versions only to say that the passage was omitted in Lispector’s adaptation. And in one case where she did translate the passage in question, when he compares hers to the seven other versions, he finds her translation of a casual

phrase “a mais espontânea, talvez por se tratar de uma adaptação” (Gonçalves 101). This may be the case, but it is equally possible that Lispector’s translation is the most “spontaneous” or “natural” simply because that was the effect she chose as the best reflection of Poe’s phrase. In their article “Edgar Allan Poe em português: os limites entre tradução e adaptação” Élide Paulina Ferreira and Karin Hallana Santos Silva come the closest to appreciating the artfulness of Lispector’s translations. They call into question the distinction between translation and adaptation by drawing on comparative analysis of two Portuguese versions of Poe’s collection *Tales of the Grotesque and Arabesque* (1840), both titled *Histórias Extraordinárias* by Lispector (Ediouro: 1985) and by Breno Silveira (Abril, 1975). Their analysis finds many points in which both translation and adaptation make similar adjustments with reference to the source: altering the title of his story collection to match with Baudelaire’s title (23-4); the unmarked removal of sections of Poe’s text (24-5); altering the age of a character to match the age of majority in the target culture of Brazil (25-6); adding material or condensing paragraphs without remark (26-30); using more simple syntax than Poe (30); and adding in or removing modifying adverbs or adjectives that clarify but also interpret (30-32). “Os dados coletados confirmam o que demonstra Amorin, ou seja, que tanto tradução quanto a adaptação criam uma imagem do original na cultura de chegada” (33). The authors conclude that differences between adaptations and translations may have more to do with the publisher’s desired marketing strategy than any observable aspect within the text (34). Yet the conclusion of this comparative analysis reverts to a market-oriented perspective, in which the classification of “adaptation” is about the cultural capital Lispector brings to Poe’s work as a famous writer in her own right. These investigations have not included

serious interest in the literary qualities of the translations she published, perhaps because the realities of her situation in the literary market made her translations seem less valuable as a part of her artistic work product. In the following section I first draw from her biography to illuminate why this impression came about; I then analyze three of her short story translations to argue that her translations do demonstrate carefully-made aesthetic choices that reflect her interest in allowing Poe's work to be a field on which her own sensibilities are enriched by his and on which his stories can gain from being voiced using her own set of writerly interests and Brazilian vocabularies. In other words, I argue that careful analysis demonstrates that her adaptations were not meant merely to fit a new public, a children's market, in the sense of dumbing down the stories or responding merely to a fixed manner of adaptation. Instead, her changes show that she was thinking about her own literary sensibilities: at times, she makes changes that complicate rather than simplify, and she draws from her own interests to enhance and emphasize certain aspects of Poe's works.

She translated actively during a time of great economic instability and professional uncertainty in the mid 1970s (Moser 339).¹⁵⁹ In his biography, Moser dismisses her translations for three main reasons: they were not done with great care, she took on the work primarily for the money she could earn, and it was rumored that Lispector did not translate the works attributed to her hand (Moser n433). Lispector's translations provoke curious ambivalence in what is otherwise an opinionated and decided literary biography; Moser vacillates between language of cheapness and

¹⁵⁹ "To try to make ends meet, she began to translate English and French works, often for Álvaro Pacheco's Artenova. For another publisher, she adapted classics for children, including the stories of Edgar Allan Poe and Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*" (Moser 339).

language of value when describing her work as a translator. This ambivalence attaches to both the selection of works to translate and the execution of the translations. Moser acknowledges both that she translated for money and did not always choose her texts and that she did have a choice in some cases, choices that may have allowed her to translate works that she connected with, both personally and aesthetically. In the case of *Burning Lights*, the Yiddish memoir of Marc Chagall's first wife Bella Chagall, Moser imagines her connection to the material as a biographical attraction to another individual from the same Central European Jewish background.¹⁶⁰ Moreover, he remarks on how frequently she translated works connected to her own interests even in the case of the trade fiction: "it is nonetheless remarkable how many of them deal with the same themes of crime, sin, and violence that so often appear in her own work. There were the Poe stories and *Dorian Gray*, there were two novels by Agatha Christie, and there was Anne Rice's *Interview with the Vampire*" (Moser 339). Moser goes on to evaluate the effort applied to her translations, but his conclusions are drawn from letters in the publisher's archive at Artenova, communications between Lispector, her editor Álvaro Pacheco, and his assistant Anna Maria da Silva Telles Watson.¹⁶¹

Her work as a translator was not distinguished, and she seems to have thrown her translations together in off hours. 'I work quickly, intuitively,' she said. 'Sometimes I check the dictionary, sometimes not.' This

¹⁶⁰ "She presumably translated this from the English or French, but the story of Mrs. Chagall's childhood in Vitebsk, today in Belarus, would have kindled the memories of the stories her family told her about their own past" (Moser 339).

¹⁶¹ In a footnote, Moser explains the provenance of these critiques, but not of the rumors that her translations were not her own. The citations come from a "Letter from Anna Maria da Silva Telles Watson, Editora Artenova, April 26, 1976" and he goes on to support the reading that Clarice did not complete these "bad" translations herself: "Watson may have been on to something. Rumor has it that in order to help her friend, Olga Botelli's sister Helena did many of her translations for her" (Moser 433n).

lassitude was partly inspired by the pittance she was paid. Álvaro Pacheco, who paid translation by the page, remembered the pathetic spectacle of Brazil's greatest writer coming to his office with a few pages at a time.

This did not encourage her to do her best. In 1976, one of Pacheco's assistants chastised her translation of a French book. Among its faults were 'entire sentences omitted,' 'words translated by deduction, or by the closest sound to a Brazilian word,' 'modification of the meaning of words and even reversal of the sentence's meaning.' She concluded haughtily, 'I think that you have been assisted in this translation by someone who did not take the work very seriously.' (Moser 340)

These letters provide invaluable information about Lispector's translation work and how it was read and evaluated by those involved in their publication. Yet, without closely reading the translations themselves, we are in danger of dismissing these elements of her translation manual as ineffectual or unconscious, whereas they may indeed have been active choices that allowed her to produce valuable work. In other words, the same mistrust that characterized the reception of her own writing, dismissing it as instinct or magic, may have affected the reception of her translation work. What can we see when we take her translations seriously and learn from them? What can we see when we look for the gifts exchanged in these acts of translation rather than dismissing them for participating also in the market economy of the publishing industry?

Poe in Brazil: Lispector's Translation Manual

Lispector's translation manual has been described negatively by her publisher and ambivalently by the author herself. Their descriptors cited above can be summarized as (1) operating on intuition rather than dictionaries or logic; (2) omitting full sentences freely and without note; (3) translating based on sound; and (4) changing or even reversing the meaning. Reading her versions of Poe stories bears out some of these qualities, but I must also add a number of other elements to her translation manual: (5) freedom to add a new frame to a story, either through a new epigraph or a new opening paragraph or position for the narrator; (6) reducing the number of unfamiliar details or elements of otherness, making Poe's curiosities seem more uncannily familiar; (7) freedom to use unmarked language where the source was marked and vice versa; and (8) freedom to use forms of Brazilian orality where forms of orality from other geographies was used in the source. I would argue that these elements betray her participation in not just the financial market of translation production; she is also receiving and giving translational gifts with this work.

In one example of thematic relationship, Lispector chooses to translate "The Oval Portrait" as "O retrato oval." The story fits with Lispector's interest in the plastic arts and ekphrastic writing, a way of questioning the artifice of the written word through descriptions of artworks that pursue the same tension. The source text describes a genre of painting, the "vignette," a genre of writing that matches her own work, especially her novel *Água viva*. While her translation maintains the general outline of the story, Lispector adds on an epigraph from a poem by Poe, an epigraph that foreshadows the surprise ending of the story

... E a morte invade

Os meus sentidos, na ilha peregrina,
Tão de leve, que nem sequer presente
O adormecido que ela está presente.

Do poema 'Al Aaraaf', de E. A. Poe (Lispector 121)

[And death invades
my senses, on the travelling pilgrim island,
so lightly, that it is not even foreseen
by the sleeping one that she is there]

*From the poem "Al Aaraaf," by E. A. Poe (Lispector 121, my
translation)*

But O that light! – I slumber'd – Death, the while,
Stole o'er my senses in that lovely isle
So softly that no single silken hair
Awoke that slept – or knew that he was there.

Original selection from "Al Aaraaf" (Poe 64)

Lispector draws her epigraph from Poe's long epic poem "Al Aaraaf," a lesser-known long epic that was not particularly well-received in his lifetime. Not only does she choose this epigraph to suit her adaptation of the story, she also adapts the poem in her translation to draw out the underlying theme of perception of death in the midst of beauty, the concept that an artist's ability to comprehend beauty is connected to an ability to ignore—to be ignorant of—death and mortality. Her translation eliminates the "single silken hair" that remains undisturbed from the image of the sleeper, instead simply focusing on what is approaching unapprehended—death—and the idyllic treatment of the

space in which that force is invading. Instead of Poe's less specific "lovely isle" she chooses "ilha peregrina," implying that Al Aaraaf, this realm of sleep or dream where the poem goes, may be a moving island, or a destination of pilgrimage.

Her translation also de-emphasizes the elements of Poe's story that emphasize the artificiality of the frame of this painting. For example, she eliminates entirely the sentence that emphasizes that the narrator was *not* taken in by the realism of the painting, which would have been impossible due to the extremely ornate frame and the contrived placement of the subject:

The portrait, I have already said, was that of a young girl. It was a mere head and shoulders, **done in what is technically termed a *vignette* manner; much in the style of the favorite heads of Sully.** The arms, the bosom and even the ends of the radiant hair, melted imperceptibly into the vague yet deep shadow which formed the back ground of the whole. The frame was oval, richly gilded and filagreed **in *Moresque*.** As a thing of art nothing could be more admirable than the painting itself. But it could have been neither the execution of the work, nor the immortal beauty of the countenance, which had so suddenly and so vehemently moved me. Least of all, could it have been that my fancy, shaken from its half slumber, had mistaken the head for that of a living person. **I saw at once that the peculiarities of the design, of the *vignetting*, and of the frame, must have instantly dispelled such idea — must have prevented even its momentary entertainment.** (Poe 611)

O retrato, como já disse, era de uma jovem. Cabeça e ombros. Para baixo, o resto do busto tornávasse imperceptível, jogado no vago sombreado que constituía o fundo. Ali desapareciam também as pontas louras do cabelo.

A moldura era oval, em filigrana dourada.

Como arte, nada podia ser mais admirável do que aquela pintura. Mas não fora isso que me tocara, estou certo. Não fora a execução da obra, nem a imortal beleza do rosto. Nem o trabalho de minha imaginação, despertada de seu quase adormecimento pela semelhança daquela cabeça com a de uma pessoa viva. (Lispector 124)

While Lispector's translation preserves many of Poe's detailed phrases, she eliminates the phrases that refer to technical elements of the composition of this work of art. She does not name the style of the painting as specifically the *vignette*; she describes the frame as oval and filigreed in gold, but does not name it "Moresque" as Poe does; and, even more significantly, she eliminates the sentence in which the narrator asserts that the startling effect of seeing this painting could not have been produced by any even momentary mistake of the painting for a real head *specifically* because of the complexity and artificiality of the frame in which the portrait appears. In "O retrato oval" Lispector eliminates the signals of artificiality in the description of the gilded frame of the portrait or of its specific art historical qualities or references within the story. This elimination allows her space to reconstruct that element of the narrative with an artificial framing of her own, the poem "Al Aaraf" borrowed from Poe, in which the foreshadowing of death which makes the artifice of the story stand out all the more. She removes the emphasis of

artifice in the plastic arts in order to replace that insight with one about the literary art of the story.

In her translation of “Metzengerstein,” she expands on the definition of metempsychosis provided by the Poe story. Not only is her definition more extensive, it also provides more clarity than the source text. Poe’s story confuses the matter greatly, providing no clear definition of the “doctrine of Metempsychosis,” describing the “Hungarian superstition” as an more extreme version of the “Eastern” one, both of which remain unnamed and uncited.

But there were some points in the Hungarian superstition which were fast verging to absurdity. They—the Hungarians—differed very essentially from their Eastern authorities, for example. ‘*The soul,*’ said the former—I give the words of an acute and intelligent Parisian—‘*ne demeure qu’une seule fois dans un corps sensible: au reste—un cheval, un chien, un homme même, n’est que la ressemblance peu tangible de ces animaux.*’ (Poe 37)

This definition is troubled, because he claims it comes from the Hungarians, who are different in their definition from the Eastern authorities, but then he gives the citation “from an intelligent Parisian” using a quote, which he begins in English but then continues in French. I would translate the definition as the following: “The soul does not reside only once in a feeling body [body with sense, sensitive self-aware, sensing]: as for the rest—a horse, a dog, even a man, it is nothing more than the barely tangible resemblance of these animals.” Using a series of details that distribute and confuse the value of this information and definition, Poe manages to convey the general idea that the “doctrines of Metempsychosis” are associated with the idea of the soul’s rebirth into

other bodies, human or animal, without making any claims to the truth value, provenance, and extent of the believers in this doctrine.

In contrast to this refusal to define this key concept, Lispector adds in her own definition of metempsychosis and places it above the text of the story as a second additional epigraph.¹⁶²

(História de imaginação sobre a metempsicose. Metempsicose = Teoria da transmigração da alma de um corpo para a outro. Passagem da alma de um corpo para outro. Doutrina segundo a qual a alma pensante imortal pode animar sucessivamente corpos diferentes. Nossa vida seria uma série de metempsicoses. Na Índia, a alma humana, parcela da universal, devia sofrer os males de um grande número de existências, bem como a purificação da virtude e do coração, antes de se reunir novamente à alma universal. Muitos afirmam que a alma é imortal e tem como campo de atividade a incomensurável série dos mundos.) (Lispector 147)

[Fictional story about metempsychosis. Metempsychosis = Theory of the transmigration of the soul from one body to another. Passage of the soul from one body to another. Doctrine according to which the thinking immortal soul can animate successive different bodies. Our lives would be a series of metempsychoses. **In India**, the human soul, piece of the universal soul, must suffer the trials of a great number of lifetimes, much

¹⁶² The only epigraph in Poe's story comes from Martin Luther; Lispector translates it into Portuguese rather than leaving it in Latin. She even translates his name: "'Vivo, era uma peste. Morrendo, serei tua morte.' *Martinho Lutero*" (Lispector 147). This is consistent with her general "translation manual" to move everything into Portuguese rather than leaving anything Poe wrote in a language other than English in that other language.

like a purification of its virtue and heart, before reuniting once again with the universal soul. **Many agree** that the soul is immortal and has a field of activity an incommensurable series of worlds.] (My translation)

Unlike Poe's oblique framing of the concept of metempsychosis, Lispector gives a clear and declarative definition immediately, using sentence fragments that sound cited from a dictionary or an encyclopedia in their authoritative formulation. She also names the doctrine as from India rather than simply "Eastern" and gives that definition pride of place rather than focusing attention on the more extreme version coming from Hungary. With her reframing, she emphasizes the universality of this doctrine, the endurance of the concept itself through time and different cultures, rather than focusing on the divisions among different sects of the belief or the diverse nations and languages of its believers. She makes this change of emphasis in several ways: providing a clear definition, giving her citations all in Portuguese rather than putting them in French, not naming any of the sources. Whereas her publisher's assistant merely critiqued her translations as haphazard, I argue that careful analysis reveal her choices to be wholly deliberate when making cuts, changes, or even reversals in the meaning, register, or structure of Poe's stories. In spite of known instances where Lispector signed translations she did not write (Albuquerque 695), I assert that the addition of this extensive epigraph on metempsychosis supports the claim that Lispector did in fact author these translations of stories by Poe.

I read her translation of Poe's story "The Devil in the Belfry" as a commentary on fascism and rigidity within a society as a response to small internal differences rather than foreign invasions. In Poe's story, the order-obsessed residents of the town of Vondervotteimittiss "have adopted these three important resolutions: – 'That it is wrong

to alter the good old course of things:’ ‘That there is nothing tolerable out of Vondervotteimittiss:’ and – ‘That we will stick by our clocks and our cabbages’” (Poe 422). When a stranger arrives on the horizon, the citizens are amazed, and then appalled, when he dances up to the top of their clock tower and the clock strikes “Thirteen” hours for the first time. His tale ends with an appeal to the “lovers of correct time” (Poe 426) to banish this disruptive element. The Brazilian Portuguese version by Lispector transforms Poe’s story by eliminating his construction of Germanic character types, doubly distanced from the reader by a historically obsessive narrator, and replacing them with a consistently causal oral register that creates more commonalities between the characters, the narrator, and the readers themselves.

First published in 1975, in “O Diabo no campanário” Lispector takes even more steps to rewrite the framing devices of her source text than in the previous two stories discussed. She does not make any attempt to recreate the qualities of the language Poe uses, which include the production of a faux German accent during the direct speech of his characters. She also appears to alter the setting and the relationship of the narrator to the information, especially during the first part of the story that sets the stage. Poe’s story is about xenophobia as related to an obsession with traditions, order, and details and an attendant rejection of any foreign or supplementary elements that come from outside. Lispector’s translation/adaptation presents a less consciously chosen, more habitual interest in order—habit rather than institutionalized historiography governs her narrator. Also, the element from outside that disturbs the order of this town is not depicted with the same foreign qualities or air of self-satisfaction; her invader is foreign, but small, poor,

broken—the subaltern other of the Brazilian class system as a legacy of race-based slavery more than the exotic foreigner of Poe’s story.

Poe’s story begins with multiple paragraphs of faux historiography, while also performing the uncertainty of all of his information. After the narrator self-authorizes as a trustworthy accountant of the information available, he names himself as one who “aspires to the title of historian” (Poe 419). He then goes on to refer to the “united aid of medals, manuscripts, and inscriptions, I am enabled to say, positively, that the borough of Vondervotteimittis has existed, from its origin, in precisely the same condition which it at present preserves” (ibid). The narrator-historian cannot give any other details with certainty, not the date of this origin, nor the origin of the town’s name, but he gives a series of sources to consult and suggestions of the possible etymology of Vondervottemittis, to comply with his promise that, as historian, he will do the best he can with the materials available to him. From this beginning in a mood of frustrated historian, the story takes on an increasingly allegorical unfolding, describing a town where all inhabitants participate in the rituals of women making sauerkraut and pork, children playing and teasing cats, growing cabbages in the garden, and men looking at clocks and obeying the central clock tower to which all houses are subject.

Clarice opens her version of the story with a narrator who rejects the title of historian and actively names the lack of knowledge and information that Poe’s narrator performs.

A cidade chamava-se Vondervotteimittiss. Não sei quase nada sobre o seu significado. Se algum leitor estiver interessado em saber, poderei indicar as fontes de informação. Não creio, porém, que a consulta vá adiantar

muito. **É tudo muito complicado. E desnecessário. O que interessa mesmo, ah, esqueci de dizer logo no início: é o melhor lugar do mundo.** Ou *era*. E é sobre isso que lhes quero falar.

...

Não sou historiador. Portanto, não lhes falarei da data de sua origem, de sua importância no meio das outras cidades. Esse é mesmo um caso à parte. Sei que é um lugar muito antigo. Tudo ali é antigo e se conserva como no começo.” (Lispector 134)

Unlike Poe’s narrator, the “aspiring historian,” Lispector constructs a voice of indifference, generality, and limited attention. Her narrator does not want to get into the complications of historical materials and sources, where Poe’s narrator delights in doing so. Instead, this narrator barely remembers to emphasize that the important fact about this town is that they have preserved their traditions, that nothing has changed there, ever.

Lispector also alters significantly the linguistic markers that characterize the people inhabiting this place. While the narrator of the story by Poe does not name the location of Vondervotteimittiss, the local dish is sauerkraut, and the inhabitants, when they speak in the language of the every-day rather than in the language of the state (which is the language of the clock in their beloved belfry) Poe constructs a dialect that is readable as a combination of German-accented English and German. There is even a moment when this dialect slips into the narrator’s discourse:

‘One!’ said the clock.

‘**Von!**’ echoed every little old gentleman in every leather-bottomed arm-chair in Vondervotteimittiss. ‘Von!’ said his watch also; ‘von!’ said **the**

watch of his vrow, and ‘von!’ said the watches of the boys. [The clock continues to strike and the townspeople continue to echo in accented tones.]

But the big bell had not done with them yet.

‘*Thirteen!*’ said he. [...]

‘**Der Teufel!**’ groaned they, ‘**Dirteen!** Dirteen!! — **Mein Gott**, it is Dirteen o’clock!!’ (Poe 425)

When the narrator describes “watch of his vrow” he is referring to the wife or the “frau” of “every little old gentleman” in the community. This is the only moment when the narrator uses the same accented language as the town’s residents, revealing that this historian likely has close ties to the town and its traditions, despite his scholarly distance displayed in the opening pages of his story. Lispector’s version elides these two different languages, the language of the clock and that of the residents: ‘Uma!—disse o relógio. — Uma!—repetiram todos os senhores em suas cadeiras. [...] ‘—O Diabo!—gengeram. Treze! Treze! Santo Deus, são treze horas!’ (138-9). She cuts out the mention of the watches of the wives, but more importantly, she does not construct any accented dialect for the townsfolk, and instead of using German words “Der Teufel” or “Mein Gott” she directly translates them as “O Diabo” and “Santo Deus,” domesticating what was foreign in the source text. In her translation, Lispector figures her narrator as closer to the townsfolk, and all of the characters in the story speak the same language as the clock and the same Brazilian Portuguese as readers of Lispector’s version.

Lispector’s version also reverses the description of the stranger who causes this horrific experience. The habitual striking of the bell becomes a nightmarish supplement

and disturbance to the order of the town as the clock strikes thirteen after the arrival of the stranger who invades the clock tower. Poe describes him as “a very odd-looking object” (Poe 423):

By the time that it wanted only three minutes to noon, **the droll object in question** was perceived to be a very diminutive foreign-looking young man. He descended the hills at a great rate, so that **everybody had soon a good look at him**. He was really the most finicky little personage that had ever been seen in Vondervotteimittiss. His countenance was of a **dark snuff-color, and he had a long hooked nose, pea eyes, a wide mouth,** and an excellent set of teeth, which latter he seemed anxious of displaying, as he was grinning from ear to ear. What with mustachios and whiskers, there was none of the rest of his face to be seen. His head was uncovered, and **his hair neatly done up in *papillotes*. His dress was a tight-fitting swallow-tailed black coat, (from one of whose pockets dangled a vast length of white handkerchief,) black kerseymere knee-breeches, black stockings, and stumpy-looking pumps, with huge bunches of black satin ribbon for bows.** Under one arm he carried a huge *chapeau-de-bras*, and under the other a fiddle nearly five times as big as himself. In his left hand was a gold snuff-box, from which, as he capered down the hill, cutting all manner of fantastical steps, he took snuff incessantly **with an air of the greatest possible self-satisfaction**. God bless me! — **here was a sight** for the honest burghers of Vondervotteimittiss!

To speak plainly, the fellow had, in spite of his grinning, an audacious and sinister kind of face; and as he curvetted right into the village, **the odd stumpy appearance of his pumps excited no little suspicion; and many a burgher who beheld him that day, would have given a trifle for a peep beneath the white cambric handkerchief which hung so obtrusively from the pocket of his swallow-tailed coat. But what mainly occasioned a righteous indignation** was, that the scoundrelly popinjay, while he cut **a fandango** here, and **a whirligig** there, did not seem to have the remotest idea in the world of such a thing as *keeping time* in his steps.

The good people of the borough had scarcely a chance, however, to get their eyes thoroughly open, when, just as it wanted half a minute of noon, the rascal bounced, as I say, right into the midst of them; gave a *chassez* here, and a *balancez* there; and then, after **a pirouette** and **a pas-de-zephyr**, pigeon-winged himself right up into the belfry of the House of the Town-Council (Poe 423-4).

Poe uses an abundance of loan-words in this passage to enrich his description of the physicality of the invading stranger with an air of a exoticized dancer, doing the fandango or practicing the balletic moves of the *chassez* or the *pirouette*. Not only an outsider arriving in town, but his language of movement betrays his foreignness even without him uttering a word, and Poe takes pains to construct that foreign element by peppering his description with dance terms in French and Spanish, some even marked with italics. He

also arouses much curiosity, indignation, suspicion: in short, he gets a big reaction from the citizens immediately on arrival.

Clarice describes the stranger with less detail than Poe, as she does in many instances. Yet she also changes one important element: her stranger is insignificant where Poe's was fascinating.

Faltando três minutos para o meio-dia, todos puderam verificar que o estranho objeto era um homem. Muito pequeno, parecia vir de outras terras.

Desceu do morro com grande pressa. **Era realmente a pessoa mais insignificante, menor, que se vira por ali.**

Sua pele era escura, o nariz recurvo, olhos redondos, boca larga. Vivia rindo, de orelha a orelha. Pelo menos, dava essa impressão. Bigode, barba. E nada mais se podia ver no seu rosto. **Cabelos encaracolados.**

Vestia um terno apertado, com cauda negra de pinguim. **Sapatilhas achatadas.** Para dizer a verdade, apesar do riso, o tal sujeito tinha um rosto sinistro.

O andar saltitante, rodopiava aqui e ali, e não parecia ter nenhuma idéia a respeito do ritmo nos passos. Foi assim que se lançou num vôo, exatamente para o alto do campanário. (Lispector 138)

In the version by Lispector, this invader is described with much less rich detail, and he is labeled insignificant. He may be understood as racialized in both stories, with dark skin, a large mouth. His racialized characteristics are partially but not entirely associated with a

black body; Lispector might have chosen “cabelos encrespados” or “kinky hair” instead of “curly hair” or “cabelos encaracolados” for her rewritten description. Yet the poverty and utter insignificance of this character stands out most: his shoes are not “odd stumpy pumps” as in Poe’s story, but “sapatilhas achatadas” or broken-down, worn-out shoes. He also appears with none of the “self-satisfaction,” he is not a “sight for the honest burghers,” he does not “excite suspicion” or “righteous indignation” or any reaction at all. Instead, he is described as “a pessoa mais insignificante, menor, que se vira por ali.” His poverty, his racialized facial characteristics, and his insignificance cast him as a completely different figure within Brazilian society: the subaltern individual from the interior who arrives unseen and unwanted to the big city, closer to Lispector’s character Macabea from *The Hour of the Star*, than to the leprechaun-like character described in Poe’s story. The stranger is an invader from within, a threat to order not for his whimsical, exotic dancing but rather for his sinister, but insignificant, poverty. Lispector translated this story in 1974 or 1975, when Brazil was in the midst of a military dictatorship, and when Lispector was working on her novel about Macabea, the insignificant secretary from the Northeast whose wants and habits are almost unimaginable to her educated narrator. I argue that she gives Poe’s story a treatment that connects it to Brazilian realities and tensions between desire for order and the existence of vast social and economic inequality.

When Poe concludes his story, the narrator confirms his alliance with the residents of Vondervottemittiss: “Affairs being thus miserably situated, I left the place in disgust, and now appeal for aid to all lovers of correct time and fine kraut. Let us proceed in a body to the borough, and restore the ancient order of things in Vondervotteimittiss by

ejecting that little fellow from the steeple” (Poe 426). Lispector’s narrator concludes with similar sentiments, adding in the value of peace, calm as what will be restored once this new element is expelled:

“Com as coisas neste lamentável estado, parti daquele lugar, com grande desgosto. Agora peço a ajuda de todos os que amam a hora certa e uma boa conserva de repolho. **E a tranquilidade.** Vamos seguir juntos para lá e restaurar a antiga ordem de coisas em Vondervotteimittiss, expulsando aquele sujeitinho da torre do grande relógio” (Lispector 140). When she uses the word “tranquilidade,” adding it in for emphasis when in many cases in the story she eliminates words and phrases, she is emphasizing the perversity of a society that seeks to create peace and order by expelling some of its subjects, specifically the smallest, poorest, and weakest of them.

Lispector’s publisher critiqued her translation manual for being haphazard or inaccurate; and her published translations have been called into question by subsequent scholarship because of her financial need for the money she earned as a translator. But by paying close attention to the material she adds to Poe’s stories, what gifts she brings to the field of translational exchange, we can better see that she likely produced these translations and that her process was not haphazard but rather designed to fit her political moment and her own writerly interests.

Chapter 3 Conclusions: Literary Gifts and Political Alliances

In conclusion, I suggest that further research is needed to connect these modes of literary translation as theorized by the Campos brothers and practiced by others with the expression of similar ideas in other art forms in the same era. The reader-driven,

cannibalist, transcreating translation may be thought of as a version within literary works of the arguments made by Paulo Freire in pedagogy and Augusto Boal in theater, and put into practice by theater companies such as Teatro Arena or Teatro Oficina, for example. These audience-driven forms of knowledge and art production began during the military dictatorship, and their cultural resistance to hegemony was inextricably related to political forms of resistance.

Later in 2015, after receiving the Neruda prize, Augusto de Campos also accepted a Brazilian honor from the Ministry of Culture. He expressed particular pride at accepting this award from Dilma whom he always admired for her activism and participation in Brazil's struggle for democracy. The presidencies of Dilma Rouseff and her predecessor Lula represented the culmination of the attempts to revise the Brazilian body politic that the MST and other resistance movements in the 1960s worked so hard to bring about. Sadly, the year 2016 marks a moment that has threatened these advances made by widely popular presidents from the Worker's Party, when the lower house of congress voted to impeach Dilma for the corruption scandals during her administration. However, many of those voting for her impeachment are directly under investigation for corruption, whereas the charge against Dilma was by association. After the lower house voted, Dilma was suspended and immediately the new interim president Michele Temer appointed an all-male cabinet and implemented other changes that reflect setbacks for progressive interests. For example, the Ministry Culture that awarded the prize to Augusto is one which Temer immediately subsumed within the Ministry of Education. After widely publicized protests and sit-ins by artists and musicians, he reversed this decision and reinstated the Ministry of Culture. But this is one sign of the modus operandi of this

“soft” coup government. The cultural gestures of unification in South-South alliances expressed by the Campos brothers and others were supported by Dilma’s governmental support for economic relations that also favor south-south connections. As Noam Chomsky commented in his special session at the annual Latin American Studies Association conference in New York City in 2016, these are the alliances the neoliberal USA is happy to see dissolving under this new regime.

Chapter 4

Brazilian *Modernismo* Journeys from São Paulo to Caracas:

Gift Exchanges Between Translation Theorists¹⁶³

How should an avant-garde classic be translated? How might a translation mediate between experimentalism and canonicity? And, what happens when translations become fields on which competing translation theories come together? In this chapter, I study a moment that brought twentieth century Mexican and Brazilian translation theories into dialogue in order to fit Brazilian *modernismo* into a new transnational and decolonial Latin American canon organized by Ángel Rama at the Biblioteca Ayacucho. I use the archives at this state-sponsored publishing house to understand the negotiation between the concerns of bringing the Brazilian avant-garde to Spanish-American readers with scholarly context and the concerns of a translator interested in applying the artist-driven translation theories of Haroldo de Campos and Octavio Paz. In the course of this editorial process, the letters reveal a significant polemic about the right way to produce a literary translation of an avant-garde work. Reading the resulting volumes through these letters, we understand editorial inconsistencies not as “errors” but more as signals that the translation has been turned into a field on which an exchange of cultural forms is taking place: exchanging untranslatables and exchanging translation theories and strategies.

Macunaíma: o herói sem nenhum caráter (1928) by Mário Raul de Morais

Andrade (1893-1945) is a central text of Brazilian *modernismo*. Borrowing stories and

¹⁶³ Much of this chapter was published as the article “Brazilian Transcreation and World Literature: *Macunaíma* Journeys from São Paulo to Caracas.” *Journal of World Literature*. 1.3 (2016): 316-314. I reprint it here with permission from the publisher. Additionally, citations from the letters held in the archive at the Biblioteca Ayacucho publishing house are included with permission from Edgar Páez and Shirley Fernández.

narrative techniques from indigenous cultures and European avant-gardes, this novel provokes debate about the placement of indigenous and European cultural forms in Brazilian culture. Haroldo relates the structure of *Macunaíma* to the cannibal as a national allegory of Brazilian cultural production as elaborated by Mário's contemporary Oswald de Andrade. Gilda de Mello e Souza understands the work as a melancholic critique expressing the mutability of human nature and the impossibility of finding a stable self. Despite their divergent analyses, both Brazilian scholars act as "agents" of the Spanish translation of *Macunaíma* by Mexican poet Héctor Olea. First packaged as an artful "transcreation" by the Spanish publishing house Seix Barral (1977), the re-edition of the same translation by the Biblioteca Ayacucho in Venezuela (1979) adds an extensive critical apparatus that responds to the tension between interpretations. Letters from the Biblioteca Ayacucho archive demonstrate that the Spanish translation was also influenced by debates over the novel as avant-garde art, literary ethnography, or Brazilian national allegory. I focus on the conversations between translators and editors over the correct treatment of "untranslatable" elements.¹⁶⁴ By including two incompatible translation approaches—transcreation and thick translation—the Ayacucho edition remains consistent with these debates and with the unresolved paradoxical treatment of cultural hybridity at the heart of the text.

In addition to these inconsistent approaches encouraged by the editorial participants, the translation by Hector Oléa also represents a combination of translation concepts and ideas about Latin American literature from Haroldo de Campos and Octavio Paz. Haroldo and Paz both played important roles in connecting literary spheres across

¹⁶⁴ Olea labels a Brazilian idiom "untranslatable" when defending his recreation of the phrase in Spanish.

the “Tordesillas Wall” dividing Brazilian cultural spheres from those in Spanish-America. While Paz had first learned of the Concrete poets from Brazil during a visit with e. e. cummings in 1959, it was not until Haroldo wrote him directly in 1968 that the two intellectuals established contact and began several fruitful collaborations.¹⁶⁵ Paz published a special supplement with essays and select poems by the Noigandres group in *Plural* in 1972, and Haroldo translated *Blanco* (1966) by Paz as *Transblanco* (1986). For further information on their relationship and collaboration, see the works by Rodolfo Mata, who also translated essays and interviews by Haroldo for an audience in the Mexico D.F. intellectual sphere. In *Children of the Mire* (1974) Paz recognized the Concrete Poetry movement as the greatest impact Brazilian literature has had on Spanish-American literature.¹⁶⁶ Haroldo aspired to use this new recognition to make Brazilian literature from all eras more accessible and relevant to the Spanish readership in Latin America. In an interview between Rodolfo Mata and Haroldo in 1996, his translator Mata brings up the relationship between “Hispanic America” and “Portuguese America.” Mata asks: “Es curioso constatar la dificultad de intercambio que existe entre críticos, poetas y novelistas de la América hispánica y de la América portuguesa.”¹⁶⁷ ¿Cuál ha sido su

¹⁶⁵ In his essay “Haroldo de Campos y Octavio Paz: del diálogo creativo a la mediación institucional,” Rodolfo Mata describes the delayed encounter between the two great authors. While Paz had heard of the Concrete Poets during a visit with e. e. cummings in 1959, and expressed interest in knowing more, they did not come into direct contact until Haroldo reached out to Paz in 1968, writing him a letter and sending him works by the Noigandres group.

¹⁶⁶ Olea cites this perspective in order to position his own translation as creating a bridge between avant-garde spaces that were mutually isolated: “interrogándose sobre poesía latinoamericana (W), el escritor mexicano [Paz] expone: ‘ningún poeta brasileño importante (Bandeira, Drummond de Andrade, Murilo Mendes, Cabral de Mello): ninguno de ellos ejerció influencia sobre la poesía hispanoamericana’. Siendo por primera vez contemporánea a los demás hombres, nuestra ‘presencia aliada’ de poesía y rebelión indicaría que fue a la poesía concreta brasileña a quien le cupo el papel de excepción a la regla” (Paz cited by Olea 241).

¹⁶⁷ This term was far more frequently used to describe the territory now known as Brazil during the Portuguese colonial period, before the First and Second Empire (1822-1889). The Brazilian Republic does not tend to be called “America portuguesa” and within this interview, Campos quickly pivots to use “lector de lengua brasileña” (207).

experiencia en este plano? ¿Cuál ha sido el papel cultural de las traducciones?” Haroldo responds to this question by implying that, in his experience, Spanish-language readers need translations more than the Brazilian readership. He had access to Spanish language poetry—and he lists Vicente Huidobro, Federico García Lorca, Juan Ramón Jiménez, Pablo Neruda, and César Vallejo—where his contemporaries had little access to Brazilian poetry except thanks to him.¹⁶⁸ The very fact Paz did not come into contact with Concrete poetry until Haroldo sent him their publications directly speaks to the reality of Haroldo’s impression. In this final chapter, I will evaluate the effect of Haroldo’s role in the “gestión” of the transcreation by Hector Olea of *Macunaíma* for Seix Barral, followed by his diplomacy in re-packaging this creative translation within the critical edition of Mário’s *Obra escogida* for Biblioteca Ayacucho. In addition to mediating in practical ways between editors and translators, he also needed to mediate between different “translation manuals” to arrive at common ground.

Reading Ayacucho’s Archives: A Publisher’s “Translation Manual”

Archival records of translators and publishers prove fertile ground for scholarship in Translation Studies. During a visit to the Biblioteca Ayacucho offices in July 2013, I read folders of correspondence exchanged during the editorial process for the critical

¹⁶⁸ “En mis cursos de secundaria, el español era materia obligatoria. ... al contrario de mis interlocutores latinoamericanos, que siempre tuvieron muchas dificultades con el portugués. Cabrera Infante leyó a Machado de Assis en inglés. Cortázar leía portugués con enorme dificultad, haciendo un gran esfuerzo ... En resumen, mientras yo tenía la posibilidad de conocer la literatura española e hispanoamericana por la experiencia directa de la lectura en su lengua original, mis interlocutores de lengua española, casi por regla general, descubrían a autores como Oswald de Andrade y Mário de Andrade, **por las referencias que yo mismo les daba**, sin lograr tener acceso a los originales en portugués” (207). Although his prolific and important role as an ambassador for Brazilian literature cannot be overestimated, Campos may be exaggerating the exclusivity of his role as the culture broker of Brazil for the Latin American literary sphere. For example, Pacheco translates some of the original poems of Francisco de Loanda, an Angolan poet who translated Brazilian poetry into Spanish and published in Mexico.

editions of three volumes representing Brazilian *modernismo*: *Arte y arquitectura del modernismo brasileño* edited by Aracy Amaral (1978), *Obra escogida. Novela, cuento, ensayo, epistolario* by Mário de Andrade edited by Gilda de Mello e Souza (1979), and *Obra escogida* by Oswald de Andrade edited by Haroldo de Campos and David Jackson (1981). The values and priorities expressed by the participants in this bilingual conversation—along with the timing of information and allocation of financial resources—all contribute to a picture of the publishing house’s formal and informal “translation manual” at that time. Their archive includes documents and correspondence from the conception of a project to sending approved proofs to the printer, though not the proofs themselves. The “translation manual” evident from the ample material available includes the costs of translation, legal considerations about copyrights, concerns about the readability of Brazilian literature, the varied statuses accorded different editors and translators, and a desire to display a set of discernable parallels with Spanish-American culture. Rama does not want the Latin American canon to be formed under a “World Literature” rubric framed by academics outside of Latin America. He takes concrete steps to enact a self-determining “translation zone” within Latin America, inviting scholars and translators from Brazil and Spanish-America to participate. The first Spanish publication framed the novel, perhaps falsely, as a stand-alone avant-garde art object, extracted from its context. This edition presents the reader with a transparent translation, smooth, complex, and uninterrupted by explanations. All commentary is confined to the “Prólogo” by Haroldo and the “Posfacio” in which Olea discusses his translation methods. The Venezuelan edition presents a fuller picture of the challenges inherent in translating, or even merely reading the work. If a work of World Literature must circulate

and also become a part of a new literary system outside its source culture, the Ayacucho *Macunaíma* does so more than the Seix Barral edition by provoking debate amongst the agents of translation involved.¹⁶⁹

At Biblioteca Ayacucho, Rama sought to re-center a literary canon from a pan-Latin American perspective, and his communications with those involved in the “Colección Clásica” reflect his priorities. In his 1981 essay “Biblioteca Ayacucho as an Instrument of Latin American Cultural Integration,” Rama writes that his publishing goals represent a “struggle against fragmentation and lack of communication that has lasted for centuries” (80-81). I understand his project as decolonial because Rama attributes the isolation of Latin American cultural producers to the colonial legacies and neoliberal realities of their countries and institutions:

[S]ince the origins of Latin America, everything has conspired against internal communication and the development of a common cultural discourse, due to its evolution within the administrative system of the colony, the monopolizing regimes of the Spanish and Portuguese monarchies and conflicts between them, the subsequent fragmentation from wars of independence, imperialistic interventions aimed at consolidating internal divisions and strengthening separations, and lastly to the interventions of economic monopolies ... Perhaps Brazil represents the best example of this elusive integration (*30 años* 80-1).

¹⁶⁹ “[Claudio] Guillén’s cautionary focus on actual readers makes good sense: a work only has an *effective* life as world literature whenever, and wherever, it is actively present within another literary system beyond that of its original culture” (Damrosch, “Where” 212; emphasis in original). Damrosch asks if this higher bar for World Literature represents a return to the national. In the case of *Macunaíma* at Ayacucho, I contend that the re-orientation was around Pan-Latin Americanism. Returning the work to Venezuela in Spanish was more true to its ambivalent Brazilianism than the first Spanish edition.

When Rama founded Biblioteca Ayacucho with an editorial board in 1974, he had already critiqued proponents of the “boom” of Latin American literature, including Emir Rodríguez Monegal. Arguing that the very term indicated the capitalist logic driving that literary phenomenon,¹⁷⁰ he took the opportunity in Caracas¹⁷¹ to operate with a different ideological model, an alternative to the Latin Americanism presented in the literary journal edited by Monegal in Paris, *Mundo Nuevo* (New World). Studying Latin American and USA intellectual relations during and after the Cold War, Deborah Cohn demonstrates that institutional and ideological alliances did not always match and lines were not always clearly drawn, as in the “case” that arose around accusations that the journal *Mundo Nuevo* received CIA funding (Cohn 17-24). Cohn contextualizes the 1952 McCarran-Walter Act, McCarthy-era legislation, which severely curtailed the circulation of many Latin American intellectuals in the USA (37-63). While Rama always identified as a socialist and not as a communist, when the University of Maryland invited him to join their faculty, first as a visiting member and then with a tenured post, the State Department denied him visas and permanent residency (Cohn 45-8).

This editorial project fashions a particular Latin American literary canon around the idea of Venezuela as the cradle of Latin America’s revolutionary history and nineteenth century independence movements with Simón Bolívar figured as savior. Rama proposed the publishing house in 1974 to recognize the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Ayacucho in 1824, celebrated as a decisive victory against the Spanish by Bolívar and

¹⁷⁰ Rama “considered the effect of this marketing phenomenon on Latin American literature in a negative light, to the extent that by promoting some few writers, it marginalizes the rest and displaces poetry and the Latin American essay, disseminating almost solely novels” (Blixen 46).

¹⁷¹ His presence in Caracas was both choice and necessity. Rama was teaching there in 1972, but the military coup in Montevideo on June 27, 1973 forced Rama into exile (Blixen 47-9).

South American independence fighters. The concept revived the 1924 project by Venezuelan *modernista* Rufino Blanco Fombona, another editor who included Brazilian literatures within his canon. The name creates a teleological heritage, from the Battle of Ayacucho, to the commemoration by Fombona, to Rama's renewal of a Venezuelan publishing firm compiling a Latin American canon of continental scope (Ortiz 12-14).

In the case of *Macunaíma*, Brazilian *modernismo* fits Rama's ideology for his canon particularly well, as it centers the indigenous cultural content of Brazil over and above Portuguese contributions. Lúcia Sá understands the central narrative as a "language quest" rather than a "magical object" quest, as do Haroldo and Souza (67). As *Macunaíma* changes shape and location, his language also transforms. In her reading, this linguistic journey is visible when the non-European formal elements are studied.¹⁷² Andrade's novel goes beyond reforming the language of Brazil, but also implicates its government and land policies. Sá claims that all debates over *indigenismo* in literary or sociopolitical spheres stem from land rights concerns (xxv). If Brazilian and Spanish-American literatures share indigenous mythic structure—more than shared European heritage—this may have implications for indigenous cultural claims to rights and visibility, or even land and property.¹⁷³ While this volume is outside the scope of my project, the same goals are apparent in the Ayacucho collection of colonial documents edited by Darcy Ribeiro, *La fundación de Brasil. Testimonios 1500-1700* (1992).

¹⁷² Sá draws out the "language quest," which "can only be understood if we carefully read those stories that others have considered unimportant in the narrative structure or have disregarded in favor of supposed European prototypes ... what Ellen Basso calls 'pragmatic creativity,' in other words, a hero whose behavior changes from situation to situation" (67-8). The "language quest" and "pragmatic creativity" of the novel's hero map onto the task of the translator.

¹⁷³ "[C]laiming the historical importance of Indians in the formation of Brazilian society, one is dangerously close to accepting their ancestral rights to land" (Sá xxv).

Biblioteca Ayacucho continues with the same goal: to make Latin American culture accessible to a broadly-conceived Latin American audience.¹⁷⁴ There is a centralized printing press, the “Imprenta de la Cultura,” for all the national publishing houses (Monteávila, Perro y la Rana, etc.).¹⁷⁵ Distribution has also been nationalized for the past 6-7 years, the “Distribuidor Nacional de Libros” places the Ayacucho volumes in all the national and international book fairs, in the “Librerías del Sur” in the train stations and public plazas, in public celebrations,¹⁷⁶ all opportunities to insert their books in the public space.¹⁷⁷ The prices of the books are often very competitive; anecdotally, at a recent book fair in Buenos Aires, students left with armfuls of books because of good prices. The digitalization project began in 2007; all works in public domain are available for free download as searchable PDFs, which includes much of their catalogue. Some works cannot be distributed online because another party holds the copyright.¹⁷⁸ Even when a work is not available for free online, their prices are low. Rama set the horizon they continue to work from: although he died in 1983, editor Elizabeth Coronado said during my visit in 2013 “perhaps Ángel Rama left Venezuela, but he never left Ayacucho,” a warm tribute to his legacy. She defined that project as the recuperation of the memories of Latin America from the archives and libraries of Europe and the USA.

¹⁷⁴ In the past fourteen years, Ayacucho has launched more accessible book imprints to reach audiences beyond their academic readership. These include children’s editions and pocket-sized volumes printed parallel to the book spine for easy one-handed reading on public transit.

¹⁷⁵ There has been a lot of trouble recently with a long wait time at this printing press due to paper shortages. There are private alternatives, which can sometimes speed up the process.

¹⁷⁶ Two years ago, there was a Bicentennial for what they call the “Campaña Admirable” when Bolívar fought from Colombia to Venezuela without losing a single battle.

¹⁷⁷ Distribution, sales, and publicity are managed by the same national organization. Statistics about sales should be available through the National Library, but I have not had the opportunity to find data on the sales or distribution of Brazilian modernism in particular or the “Colección Clásica” in general.

¹⁷⁸ Carmen Balcells (1930-2015), the celebrated Spanish agent who managed many “Boom” authors, held copyright, so no PDF is available for the Ayacucho titles by Julio Cortázar, Gabriel García Márquez, Carlos Fuentes, or José Donoso. Maria Kodama owns Jorge Luis Borges’s rights; his work is not digitalized either.

The work Rama did was often transcribing materials that could only be found when he was working as visiting professor. Huidobro was doing the same during his travels, when the Biblioteca Nacional de Chile was so problematic during the dictatorship. Biblioteca Ayacucho has always sought a more international profile than a national one; their continued participation in book fairs all over the continent is an example of this commitment. They have also always enjoyed and emphasized the participation of academics from all over Latin America.¹⁷⁹

Framing Brazilian *modernismo* for Spanish-American Readers

These attitudes of the ethical and pedagogical value of creating exchange among Latin American spaces were evident in the letters Rama wrote to Brazilian intellectuals. When he asks for their contributions, he privileges Brazilian *modernismo*. Literature students in Brazilian universities *begin* with this avant-garde movement before studying earlier periods. Rama insists that, while Brazilian publics may be familiar with these works, they are unknown in Spanish America.¹⁸⁰ He also imagined a reciprocal benefit for Brazilian literary discourse: “This effort seeks to enrich the Spanish-American culture in which Biblioteca Ayacucho circulates ... and also functions as a challenge to Brazilian culture, which should attempt a similar project of systematic diffusion of Spanish-American literature, philosophy, and history” (Rama, *30 años* 83). When inviting Antonio Candido, Haroldo de Campos, Darcy Ribeiro, and Aracy Amaral to participate

¹⁷⁹ Argentine Daniel Divinsky was the first director of distribution; Uruguayan Hugo García Robles also worked in distribution, to name a few examples beyond the Brazilian scholars and the Mexican and Argentine translators already named in this chapter.

¹⁸⁰ In a letter to Brazilian contributor Aracy Amaral, Rama claims: “for Spanish America, Brazilian ‘modernism’ is an unknown animal” (29 June 1976).

as volume editors, he points to the ignorance of Brazilian literature within Spanish-American letters as a sign of continued isolation from other sources of its own culture. His attempt to redress this isolation also represents an opportunity for Latin America to tell its own story, rather than have its story routed through German anthropologists, French literary magazines, USA American intellectuals, or Spanish publishing houses. To decolonize the Latin American canon, translation between the former colonies of Spain and Portugal is needed, recovering a shared past.¹⁸¹ Candido echoes Rama in his reply, writing in Portuguese that he wants “to strengthen ties between our two peoples of Latin America” (Letter August 6 1975).

Rama’s vision of Brazil, in particular, determined the curation and execution of the editions—despite the ambivalence about the level of transparency or opacity expected from these translation works.¹⁸² He included scholars from both prevailing interpretations of this period in three volumes on Brazilian *modernismo*. He never attempted to resolve this debate; his interest lay in positioning Brazil on his map of Latin American cultural production. The same tension or unresolved questions about how to incorporate Brazilian literature responsibly into a Spanish-language canon can be read in the unpublished letters between Rama and the scholars of Brazilian letters he invites to collaborate with

¹⁸¹ Walter Mignolo and Freya Schiwy point out a persistent assumption in Translation Studies and theory: that translation occurs only in reference to the coloniality of European powers and “presupposes the macronarrative of Western civilization from the Greeks to the invention of the alphabet through modern/colonial and European languages. Not all translation involves Europe or the United States. Certainly there have been translations from Chinese to Taiwanese or from Argentinean Spanish to Brazilian Portuguese” (Mignolo and Schiwy 4).

¹⁸² The extensive chronologies at the end of every volume present a tenuous version of the unity Rama imagines between Brazil and Spanish America. Biographical information stands on one side of the page, facing a split column of historical information “Brasil y América Latina” and “Mundo exterior.” Presumably when matched with “Brasil,” the region “América Latina” can only mean “Hispanoamérica.” While this scholarly apparatus creates a clear inside and an outside of the cultural canon shared by Brazil and Spanish America, it stops short of unifying those two categories.

him. He prefers Brazilian scholars to American ones,¹⁸³ and yet he does not always take their advice about what is valuable within Brazilian literature. One example can be found in the communications between Aracy Amaral and Rama around the volume *Arte y arquitectura del modernismo brasileño (1917-1930)*. In response to the invitation to edit this volume, Amaral at first tries to convince Rama to abandon his plan for the volumes on Brazilian modernism and its documents. From Amaral's perspective, this period has received enough scholarly attention already and she encourages Rama to collect an anthology of more contemporary Brazilian works. Rama insists, and points to the legacy of Iberian competition between the Spanish and the Portuguese competition for imperial dominance as a reason for the ignorance of the Brazilian literary tradition in Spanish-speaking America.¹⁸⁴ For Ángel Rama, there seemed to be some strategic advantage to positioning his editorial project as decolonial in its repositioning of Brazilian literature. He may not have been aware of all the challenges involved in translating the materials he wanted to include in his editions of Brazilian literature, especially the hotly contested canon of Brazilian *modernismo*.

Even within the Brazilian *modernismo* selections, he commissioned representative participation from both sides of the major debate about the period: whether it is primarily a nationalist allegory born of European forms (Souza) or universal experimentation (Haroldo). As series editor, he grouped the Brazilian *modernismo* volumes to attempt to share some editing needs. Within this Brazilian canon the archive clearly shows that the

¹⁸³ For example, he only invites American scholar K. David Jackson to complete the chronology for the Oswald de Andrade volume once someone else has fallen through.

¹⁸⁴ "Me explico: para Uds. se trata de un período prácticamente agotado. He seguido con atención la bibliografía del cincuentenario y estoy de acuerdo con que así lo perciban. Pero Ud. sabe que para América Hispánica el 'modernismo' brasileño es un animal inexistente" (Rama, Letter to Amaral, 29 June 1976).

group dynamic of Brazilian *modernismo* — a quality of many avant-garde movements— still conditioned its reception, even 50 years later. He ends up editing *modernismo* as one unit with different volumes, some focused around author and others focused around genre. He influenced the outcome by choosing the participants, guiding their choices, keeping them motivated with exchange of cultural and social capital, giving feedback to shape their editorial or translation processes, and contracting future work to keep the translators going. One important insight to gain through reading the publication archive is the sense of a drama. A narrative unfolds through the timing of communications, the mood of relationships that can be reconstructed through archival materials, piecing together the full story from a folder of old papers, typed letters, telegrams, handwritten notes, invoices, and carbon copies.¹⁸⁵ Who receives priority and power is readable through these materials, the order of responses, which needs are met first with the resources available to the publisher, and more.

First, Ángel Rama began to communicate with Antonio Candido de Mello e Souza (b. 1918), Candido accepts his invitation to Caracas in a letter on August 6, 1975. In a series of friendly and diplomatic letters, Rama writing in Spanish and Candido in Portuguese, they agreed on their shared goal in working on these volumes with the intention to “estreitar os laços entre os nossos povos da América” (Candido, Letter to Rama, 6 August 1975). In his response, Rama discusses a visit he will pay to Candido in São Paulo. He asks for advice about how to include “los monstrous sagrados” namely

¹⁸⁵ In general, the folders are organized chronologically from the end of each project to the start. In some cases, different projects from different folders converged, in a few cases because of misfiled letters but more frequently because translators, editors, and prologue writers communicated about multiple elements of different projects at once. Many of the translators and editors for the Brazilian volumes worked on portions of multiple projects. The archival record shows the way they shared work, commented on one another’s work, threatened to quit, reframed the terms of their participation, and changed the final outcome of the edition through these ever-changing negotiations and re-negotiations of their collaborations.

Carlos Drummond and Jorge Amado in the project, but only Amado does end up being collected in the volume. He asks for Antonio to serve as his “man in Brazil” and take on the role of selecting texts. But what the letters reveal is that he asked many different people to do that, create lists of the Brazilians needed to include in the new Latin American canon. In a letter to Candido, he writes “Como bien sabes, tú eres nuestro hombre en Brasil, guía y consejero de nuestra biblioteca” (Rama, Letter to Candido, 20 January 1976). It was in communication with Candido where Rama expresses his primary interest in Brazilian letters: he wants more representation from the colonial era, from the Imperial period, and he wants texts with historic, sociological, and folkloric importance. He does not specifically ask for any literary genres.

Rama also asked Aracy Amaral for a similar list, and Amaral tries to convince Rama to include the more recent poetic movements, including concretism and neo-concretism. After some convincing by Rama, Amaral selects a variety of essays, letters, and reviews for a volume about the plastic arts during the Brazilian Modernism movement. The “in house” translator Marta Traba, Ángel Rama’s wife, was almost completely absent from the archival record.¹⁸⁶ Her name appears in the volume, but it was not even clear from the archival materials whether or not she was paid for her work. This volume could not be reedited because none of the permissions for publication or translation were secured, and it contained hundreds of photos and other images.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁶ Her work was not represented in the archival materials for these translations from Brazilian *modernismo* nor did they appear in the folder for the other translation she completed of the *Cartas americanas* by Alexander von Humboldt (1980).

¹⁸⁷ The archive shows that Amaral made Rama aware of this difficulty in a letter dated 24 April 1977, but he did not take action at that time to secure the necessary rights. On 23 Oct 2001 there is a memo exchange between the President of the publishing house, Alfredo Chacón, from the editor Oscar Rodríguez Ortiz about the possibilities of a reedition of this work. Ortiz responds that it is impossible because: “Se plantea un grave problema con los derechos de autor: ni para los textos ni para las reproducciones fotográficas se gestionaron u obtuvieron en su momento (1978) las debidas autorizaciones, o las mismas no están en el

Although they are invited to prepare critical editions for a Spanish-American audience, both Haroldo and Souza take the opportunity to pursue the debates they've already been engaged in within the Brazilian academy about how to read these works. Haroldo writes his prologue framing Oswald as the center of the Brazilian modernist movement, which makes it more clearly a precursor to his own Concretist poetry movement.¹⁸⁸ He also promotes his method of translation or “transcreation” by defending the ideas of his student, Héctor Olea.

Gilda de Mello e Souza was responsible for the selection, prologue, and notes for the *Obra escogida: Novela, cuento, ensayo, epistolario* by Mário de Andrade, published in 1979 at the Biblioteca Ayacucho. She wants to promote Brazilian scholarship on Andrade that she agrees with; namely the allegorical reading of Cavalcanti in *Roteiro de Macunaíma* as opposed to the structural approach of Haroldo. It also happens that she and Antonio Candido were married; in her communications with Rama, she always sends greetings to his wife, Marta Traba.

Rama began reaching out to Haroldo de Campos on January 27, 1976. He asks for the same list of important and representative Brazilian authors, but also asks him specifically to be volume editor for the works of Oswald de Andrade, determining the response to a certain extent to include Brazilian *modernismo*. Haroldo suggests working with Héctor Olea as translator for the selected works of Oswald de Andrade; he emphasizes that the most challenging part will be the translation of new works, and

expediente del libro. Aunque en esa época regía en Venezuela otra Ley de Derechos de Autor, sí había conciencia en Ayacucho del problema. Se menciona de hecho en una carta de la preparadora Aracy Amaral (24/4/77 se adjunta)” (Ortiz, Letter to Chacón).

¹⁸⁸ Along with his brother Augusto de Campos and Décio Pignatari, he founded the “Noigandres” group in 1952, also launching Concretismo as a poetic movement that would have international impact on visual poetry and linguistic experimentation.

acquiring the rights. Although their communications begin in 1976, the soonest of the three, around the Oswald de Andrade *Obras escogidas* (1981) this work reaches publication after the Mário de Andrade *Obras escogidas* (1979) and a selected volume of essays *Arte y arquitectura del modernismo brasileño: 1917-1930* (1978) translated by Ángel Rama's wife Marta Traba. After getting Haroldo de Campos and Gilda de Mello e Souza to agree to edit volumes for Oswald de Andrade and Mário de Andrade, respectively, he then makes the suggestion that those two along with the volume about the Art and Architecture of the movement should all use the same chronology. He proposes this in a letter to Gilda on September 10, 1976. Rama also suggests that they can use the “psicólogo argentino Santiago Kovadloff” for the other translations.

The letters, when read along with the editorial choices as they appear represented in the published volumes, expose the urgency and speed with which Rama was producing these critical editions. Olea, the most careful translator, motivated by “transcreation” as a theory of translation, ends up slowing down the publication process for Oswald de Andrade. The Oswald volume was one of the first initiated for the “Colección Clásica” and certainly the first to begin the process in the group of Brazilian *modernismo* texts. Rama wrote to Haroldo before Souza, certainly before Amaral. Yet, the translations done for the Mario de Andrade version were mostly by Kovadloff, who worked quickly and in a situation of economic distress—with the exception of *Macunaíma*. It was not the rights to the translation that caused any delay; the Seix Barral rights to Olea's translation were under Biblioteca Ayacucho contract by October 15, 1976.¹⁸⁹ The *Arte y arquitectura del*

¹⁸⁹ On 15 Oct 1976, a representative from Seix Barral named Joan Reventos writes back to Ángel Rama in order to agree that they will give the rights to Biblioteca Ayacucho to republish Héctor Olea's translation of *Macunaíma* within their Selected Works volume.

modernismo brasileño volume that was “begun” last ended up reaching the publishers first, in December of 1978. In some ways, you could say that Rama’s choice to simply publish this translation work as quickly as possible, without securing author rights or engaging in debates about translations, represented his reaction to the challenges he faced in editing the other two translated volumes of Brazilian *modernismo*.

While this chapter is centered around an analysis of the *Macunaíma* translation and its specific achievements and qualities, there is a useful comparison available with the other major literary translation of Brazilian modernism done by the Ayacucho editorial team. Much like the Mário de Andrade volume, it reflects different approaches to translation and different ideas about what that process entails. Although it did not spark as much debate, the *Obra escogida* of Oswald de Andrade demonstrates some of the inconsistencies in process of editing translations. With Haroldo acting as volume editor, the work contains three different descriptors for the translated material within it: *transcreación*, *traducción*, and *versión*. The process took longer than the other volumes related to Brazilian *modernismo*, in part because of the changing assignments of the different translators, Héctor Olea, Santiago Kovadloff, and Mária Russoto.

An Argentine psychiatrist, Santiago Kovadloff practiced literary translation without the same connection to the university life that the editors or other translators enjoyed. During the late 1970s and early 80s, as the economic situation in Argentina declined, he continues to ask for more payment. While he does not respond favorably, Ángel Rama does at least acknowledge Santiago Kovadloff in his requests for more money. In a letter dated 6 April 1978, he ends his letter with the sign off “abrazo de, AR.” But then, in a handwritten note added onto the letter, almost as a PS or an

afterthought, he writes “No hemos tenido variación en nuestras tarifas ni preveo que las tengamos por el resto del año. Desde luego el [sic] mejor al respecto a poesía que a prosa” (Rama, Letter to Kovadloff). It appears that one of the strategies Rama used his communications to keep Kovadloff focused on the pleasurable and intellectual challenges of translation for their own sake rather than for money. He wanted the “body” of his letter to only include the “important” information related to their relationship: what he needed from Kovadloff, what the editorial process was going to look like. He then relegates to a non-necessary “post scriptum” the information about the financial relationship between Ayacucho and the translators involved in their publication projects.

Looking carefully at the labels Héctor Olea gives his translations demonstrates a variable translation manual. He sometimes calls his work a “Transcreación” as in the case of the *Memorias sentimentales de Juan Miramar* and sometimes as “Traducción” as in his translation of the “Manifiesto de poesía ‘Palo-del-Brasil’,” “Manifiesto Antropófago,” and the “Cantar de los Cantares para Flauta y Vihuela.” While these different labels may have been imposed by the volume editor Haroldo, or even by Rama as series editor, they could also indicate the principle Olea maintains in his “Posfacio” that to “transcreate” is a fundamentally different activity than to “translate.” He is not putting all of his translation works, even of the same author, into that same category.

Although Olea was initially invited to complete both Oswald novels, *Serafin Ponte Grande* was ultimately translated by another translator and is labeled “Versión al castellano: Mária Rusotto” (161). She includes 102 notes, many of which simply state “Así en el original (N. de la T.)” in order to indicate a phrase or citation in another language that was in that language in the original. While these notes do emphasize the

polyvocality of the novel, the overall effect is mechanistic, resulting in a line of identical footnotes at the bottom of a particularly playful page.

In Olea's translation of Oswald's "Manifiesto Antropófago," we can observe a different translation manual guiding the inclusion of notes; different from both his "transcreation" and from the work of Rusotto. He only includes three footnotes labeled "N. De T," and he does not use them to point out that there were multiple languages in the original: he trusts the reader to deduce that any text not in Spanish appeared that way in the original.¹⁹⁰ Instead, his notes focus on providing the comparative angle for the Spanish-speaking reader familiar with or interested in the parallels between "indigenismo" or "vanguardismo" in the Brazilian and Spanish-American contexts. For example: "La *Cobra Grande* (víbora-víbora) es una figura mitológica del indigenismo brasileño, temida por su maldad, ya que al tomar la forma viperina, voltea las embarcaciones. Similar al Jagüey de las leyendas ribereñas cubanas (N. de T.)." (68). This is the note explaining the line "En el país de la 'víbora-víbora'." While Olea positions himself against the explanatory footnote in another essay, you could argue that the text itself already sets aside the phrase "víbora-víbora" as something that needs a gloss, needs explanation, by putting it in quotation marks. Olea's notes are fewer and more informative than Russotto's.

Another one of his notes contains a mini-argument in support of Haroldo's interpretation of the Tupí poetry as an example of concrete poetry before the fact. Unlike the words in English and French that he does not translate or mark as different, when

¹⁹⁰ The most well-known example, of course, would be the line "Tupí or not tupí, that is the question." (67) which does not need any footnoting for the reader to deduce that the phrase was in English in the original.

Oswald's manifesto incorporates a poem in Tupí-Guaraní, Olea does choose to give this citation a full translation and gloss. The body of the text and the footnote read as follows:

Ya teníamos comunismo. Ya teníamos lengua surrealista. La edad de oro.

Catiti Catiti

Imara Notiá

Notiá Imara

Ipeyú

(Oswald de Andrade 69)

Este poema *tupí-guaraní* / pre-concreto (como lo definiera Haroldo de Campos) fue extraído por O. De Andrade del libro *O Selvagem*, de Couto de Magalhães, dentro del mismo espíritu con el que el autor se valió de textos de cronistas del Brasil colonial. Se trata de una invocación a la Luna nueva:

Lunanueva Lunanueva

Arresopla en fulano

En Fulano arresopla

Recuerdos de mí

(Olea in Oswald de Andrade 69)

Going beyond simply providing an informative translation of the poem, Olea's note adds in an argument about interpretation, and even an expansion on Oswald's original concept not a necessary informative note. Oswald used the Tupí poem to assert that there was a pre-Columbian "golden age" in which "communism" and "surrealist language" had already been achieved. Olea adds to this the idea that this "golden age" also included

Concrete poetry: every literary and political innovation that Brazilians (or their European colonizers) could hope to claim had been anticipated by the cultures indigenous to the region. Olea's ethical assumptions are different than Russoto's: he assumes the reader will understand English, French, Italian—or at least understand the avant-garde gesture with which they are incorporated into Andrade's Portuguese. But he also assumes the reader would not understand the Tupí-Guaraní poem without a footnote. Unlike Oswald, who never translated this text he cannibalized, Olea wants readers to understand not just the words, but also his own understanding of the reasons behind including them, in the particular way they appear. Given the frustration Olea expresses that his translation of *Macunaíma* is being transformed without his participation by the critical apparatus added to the new critical edition coming out of Biblioteca Ayacucho, he could have used the process translating the Oswald manifestos to try to rescue some of the creative control or singularity of vision that he had enjoyed with the first Seix Barral publication but which was not happening with Ayacucho, as will be discussed below. His note about the “Ready-Made” of concrete poetry serves the purpose of the “Posfacio” to *Macunaíma*: explaining his own translation strategies while providing information about the source text. He uses the same term from Duchamp, the “Ready-Made” to describe the translation strategy he uses in *Macunaíma* to mix Brazilian nordestino culture with Guatemalan and Mexican indigenous cultural forms, such as his solutions to the songs contained in Chapter 16 where he includes the “Danza del Torito” as a replacement for the song and dance known in Brazil as the “Bumba meu boi.”

Although Olea chose not to use footnotes for his “transcreation” of *Macunaíma* for Seix Barral—and as we see in the next section he angrily rejects the Ayacucho

editorial model that plans add them to his translation—it appears he was not above using one in this particular context. However, this is limited use of an explanation, in moderation. It is also an explanatory note added to a manifesto, a work which could be read as more didactic and pedagogical in its own structure, more welcoming to scholarly apparatus. This comparison indicates that his rejection of the work that Gilda de Mello e Souza added to his translations, through notes and explanations, was not only in the concept of adding notes to literature in general, but in the execution, and their different perspectives on the relationship between literary criticism and literature.

When he learns of the Ayacucho publication of his translation, Héctor Olea had been working on new translations of works by Oswald de Andrade as a part of the volume edited by Haroldo. That project had already generated differences of opinion between Rama and the translator, primarily over the timeline and payment for his work. Although his letters to the general editor often go unanswered according to the archival record, Olea appears to remain committed to the project. Haroldo mediates between the two parties, ultimately proposing the resolution that Olea receive Ayacucho “Colección Clásica” volumes in addition to his honorarium for his translations for the Oswald volume. However, after Rama gets the rights from Seix Barral to republish Olea’s 1977 version of *Macunaíma*, he sends Olea a letter to ask him to review Souza’s notes and make sure they coincide with the translation. First, he had written to Souza on October 2 1978, raising her honorarium, and writing: “Al coordinar las notas con el texto hemos encontrado que en algunos casos, como prevíamos, no son necesarios porque la solución encontrado en español es suficiente explícita, pero en otros casos tenemos contradicciones entre la solución dada por el traductor y la interpretación que tú ofreces.

Estamos escribiendo a Héctor Olea y remitiendo el material para que él vea esos casos” (Rama, Letter to Souza). Then Rama writes to Olea on October 3, 1978, asking him to review the notes and the translations. He implies that there were errors in the Seix Barral edition that could be corrected at this moment. And he raises the rate for translation work to 10 dólares per every 500 words, referring to the project they had already been working on, the manifestos and novels of Oswald de Andrade.

Souza’s notes likely caused the same inconsistencies and difficulties for the work Santiago Kovadloff had done on Mário de Andrade Obras escogidas volume, which includes all the critical apparatus and all the creative work except for *Macunaíma*. These issues are predictable, if the practice was for the Brazilian scholar to produce a set of notes in relation to the source text in the source language, rather than consider the translation and the notes it requires for the target language and culture. On 15 Nov 1978, Rama writes to Kovadloff to ask him to do the same editing process as Olea.¹⁹¹

When Kovadloff writes back, his tone is incredibly different when compared to Olea’s. He writes a handwritten note on 25 November 1978, fundamentally accepting the changes and suggestions from Rama, Souza, and the Ayacucho “revisor de estilo.” In a few cases, he asks for clarification on a few changes, but instead of rejecting them, he simply asks how they work, because he does not see that they say the same thing as his translation. His tone is humble and inquisitive; he does not personalize the differences in

¹⁹¹ “Te adjunto uno de los cuentos de M. De Andrade, con las correcciones que introdujo nuestro revisor de estilo, sobre las cuales querría tu opinión. En algunos casos se trata de optar por un término más abarcativo de toda la comarca hispanoamericana (menos regional), en otros casos de líneas faltantes en la traducción y en otros de posibles lecciones alternativas para la versión española. Te ruego lo examines con atención. Hay también casos que son impuestos por las anotaciones de Gilda de Mello: si ella anota que el lenguaje de un personaje es popular, respondiendo a una fonética hablada de baja clase, nos encontramos que se genera una incoherencia con la nota si la traducción ha sido en fluido y correcto español” (Rama, Letter to Kovadloff, 15 Nov 1978).

interpretation, instead he asks “¿Quiere decir lo mismo?”. If it is personal, he speaks from his own understanding: “No veo la equivalencia.” In fact, Kovadloff avoids taking ultimate responsibility for the details of the editorial review of his translation. He cannot judge the “universality” of his Spanish, given his position as a “rioplatense,” and so he simply advises Rama that it does not need to be reviewed further, at least not by him.

Te reitero que, en términos globales, el trabajo realizado sobre mi traducción me parece atinado. No me parece imprescindible que lea todo el material a menos que lo estimes indispensable. Creo que bastará con que algún rioplatense cambie ideas con el corrector de estilo allá en Caracas para eliminar las dudas más gruesas (Kovadloff, Letter to Rama, 25 Nov 1978).

While Kovadloff’s letter represents simply a different response to a request for corrections than what Olea offers, it is also a refusal to complete the task Rama has requested. Kovadloff has already asked for more payment, several times, and so it is not surprising that he is unwilling to go through the painstaking process of examining all the editorial notes with his translation to check for alignment.

***Macunaíma* as World Literature: Transcreation and Thick Translation**

As the work travels from São Paulo to Barcelona to Caracas, the agents of the Spanish translation also negotiate between two seemingly incompatible methods: transcreation and thick translation. Olea studied with Haroldo in São Paulo, and he labels his translation a “transcreation,” the term coined by his Brazilian translation mentor. Since a transcreation prioritizes aesthetic information, the transcreation may naturally be

opposed to a translation produced for a critical edition, where the critical apparatus is pointing back toward the source culture. For the context of the Latin American canon produced at Biblioteca Ayacucho, I contrast transcreation with thick translation. Kwame Anthony Appiah defines “thick translation” as the translation method appropriate to the politics of translation in a postcolonial setting.¹⁹² He locates the need for thick translation within academic institutions and pedagogical contexts where “what counts as a fine translation of a literary text—which is to say a taught text—is that it should preserve for us the features that make it worth teaching” (426). He argues that glosses and contextual information best support decolonial pedagogy when they make up for the information deficit created by power imbalances between source and target cultures. In thick translation, Appiah imagines a political utility for translation similar to that pursued by Uruguayan intellectual Ángel Rama at the Biblioteca Ayacucho: a pedagogically-minded translation can promote intercultural competence and combat racial or ethnic stereotypes in the target culture. Producing a thick translation that responds to these concerns necessitates including contextual information beyond the norms of a critical edition. The two editions measure the distance between transcreation and thick translation as “translation manuals.” Olea transcreates Andrade’s process of combining colloquial language from regions throughout Brazil. In doing so, Olea draws from the broadest possible lexicon of Spanish-American vocabularies and interpolates cultural details from indigenous and Afro-Latino communities. He rewrites Andrade as often as he translates the words on the page. The Seix Barral edition presents his work unmarked by

¹⁹² Appiah takes his term from anthropologist Clifford Geertz’s notion of “thick description.” He focuses on English translations of African oral literatures and the context necessary to understand culturally situated proverbs in Twi.

explanations, and Olea defines his logic and methods of transcreation in a “Posfacio.”¹⁹³ When Rama purchases the rights to Olea’s translation from Seix Barral, the text receives different treatment when he incorporates it into the Biblioteca Ayacucho Colección Clásica, a project the Venezuelan government sponsors. Following Rama’s direction, the Mário de Andrade volume editor Souza adds explanatory notes that refer back to Andrade’s many sources. Reading letters exchanged among these “agents of translation”¹⁹⁴ in the publishing house archive demonstrates the incompatibility between these two translation manuals from the perspective of those participating in the process. The resulting volume includes slippages that draw attention to the simultaneous use of two incompatible translation manuals. Combining creative recreation with culturally situated explanation puts into practice what Emily Apter calls a “‘worlded’ minoritarian comparatism” in the specific Latin American “translation zone” (Apter *Translation* 45). Apter understands the “translation zone” as sites that are “in-translation” but also “theaters of war” (6). I view Latin American translation zones as those spaces where indigenous and African languages enrich Portuguese and Spanish, but which also carry in language the memory of the violent coloniality that produced these linguistic mixtures. The varied translation values held even by scholars with shared ideological goals highlight the paradox at the center of the source text: *Macunaíma* performs cultural mixture as a simultaneously celebratory and melancholy act.

¹⁹³ The title of this afterword is the first of many loan-words and portmanteaus Olea invents, both in this essay and in his transcreation. “Posfacio” is not a word in Spanish as an antonym of “Prefacio” or “Preface.” With these stylistic devices, Olea writes in a fertile mixture of invented words, words in other Latin languages, representations of informal speech and the attendant changes to orthography, and etc.

¹⁹⁴ In *Agents of Translation*, John Milton and Paul Bandia propose that “agents of translation are much more than gate-keepers” (10). Instead of focusing on the intentional, they incorporate unintentional consequences and the “casual and personal way in which ideas gain currency” (12).

The novel follows Macunaíma on an ambivalent journey from his home in the Amazon through São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and back. He succeeds in his quest to recover a powerful amulet stolen by his antagonist, the cannibal giant and Peruvian-Italian merchant collector Piaimã Venceslau Pietro Pietra—but he loses it again. Trickster hero Macunaíma acquires new regional idioms and habits through contact with new communities. Yet he ultimately fails to gain any stable character or retain any material gains. I follow Alfredo Cesar Melo in understanding this paradox as central to the text, as he writes in “Macunaíma: Between Critique and Praise of Transculturation.”¹⁹⁵ The journey of *Macunaíma*—both the character and the book—shines through the Ayacucho edition as a series of exuberant and yet failed translations, a celebration of cultural hybridity and contact that also critiques assimilation.

My analysis focuses on *Macunaíma*'s journey from São Paulo through Barcelona to land in Caracas as a newly consecrated Latin American classic in Spanish.¹⁹⁶ However, the work has a longer history in becoming World Literature in the two-step process defined by David Damrosch: “first, by being read *as* literature; second, by circulating out into a broader world beyond its linguistic and cultural point of origin” (*What* 6). Andrade completed the first step when he rewrote indigenous legends collected by German

¹⁹⁵ “The novel contains elements that elevate Brazilian hybridity and at the same time critically examines the aims of anthropofagic appropriations and suggests another type of hybridism for Brazilian culture, which I call subaltern, which valorizes cultural exchanges between countries of the Southern Hemisphere” (Melo 205). This translation is mine, as are all the following unless otherwise indicated.

¹⁹⁶ Not the first to translate *Macunaíma*, Olea succeeded in incorporating his transcreation into another literary system. Prior translations include the Italian by Giuliana Segre Giorgi (1970) and the French by Jacques Thiérot (1975). Margaret Richardson Hollingsworth translated several chapters into English during Andrade's lifetime, but she did not complete or publish her translation. The Argentine artist Carybé produced a Spanish translation along with illustrations; his images appeared in an illustrated Portuguese edition in 1957, but his translation remains unpublished to my knowledge, despite mention of a possible Argentine edition (Lopez 407-9). Andrade describes reviewing Carybé's translation manuscript months before his death in 1945 (“Em cartas” 280-5). Unfortunately, colonialist ideology mars the English translation by E.A. Goodland (1984), where words like “devilish” characterize Afro-Brazilian cultural forms, which are celebrated in the source text, not demonized (Braz 190).

ethnographer Theodor Koch-Grünberg. In *Vom Roraima zum Orinoco: Ergebnisse einer Reise in der Nordbrasilien und Venezuela in den Jahren 1911- 1913* (published 1916-1924), Koch-Grünberg collected stories from indigenous cultures including the Taulipangue and Arecuná along the river Orinoco that runs through Venezuela and the state of Roraima in northern Brazil. Not the first to record or repurpose these legends, Andrade critiqued English missionaries for naming the Christian God “Macunaíma” when translating their bible into the indigenous language (Campos, “Prólogo” 13). Giving the first *literary* treatment to the story of Macunaíma and his brothers, Andrade develops a style of creative orality and weaves stories together in what Campos calls a “mosaic,” an “archifábula, una *fábula ómnibus*” (15).¹⁹⁷ Kimberle López provides a complete discussion of Brazilian *modernismo* as a movement responding to European avant-garde Primitivism. She concludes that the cosmopolitan authors of *modernismo*, while Brazilian, viewed indigenous cultures with the same “imperial eyes” as European authors (Mary Louise Pratt qtd in López 35).¹⁹⁸ Conversely, José Luiz Passos connects the novel to a Brazilian narrative tradition, using *Macunaíma* to identify a series of central tenets in its precursors: the *malandro* or trouble-maker protagonist, the centrality of racial mixture, and morbid irony. “[A]fter Mário de Andrade, Manuel Antônio de Almeida, José de Alencar, and Machado de Assis can be read in a Macunaimac way” (19). Passos demonstrates that, while the work’s structure may be borrowed, the character

¹⁹⁷ Campos builds on *Morphology of the Folktale* by Russian formalist Vladimir Propp: the “proto-fable” elements of fairytales obey a “law of transferability,” serving the same function in multiple stories. For Campos, Andrade’s artistic achievement lies in his elaboration of an “arch-fable” in which elements of indigenous legends maintain their function but are put together in a larger mosaic. “[Andrade] could creatively play with the *variable* elements on the basis of the schema. In this way, he produced a synthesis, an amalgam, a mosaic-tale” (“Prólogo” 16).

¹⁹⁸ López asks “whether, in his cannibalistic appropriation of material from Koch-Grünberg, Andrade can avoid adopting the same sort of ethnographic authority ... [given that he] made his own ethnographic journey, from May to July of 1927, in the middle of the period when he was writing *Macunaíma*” (32).

formation Andrade applies to *Macunaíma* is Brazilian beyond a re-appropriation of the Primitive exotic.

The Brazilian literary field continues to debate *Macunaíma* and its representation of Brazilian modes of cultural hybridity. The divergent views of poet-scholar Haroldo de Campos¹⁹⁹ and critic Gilda de Mello e Souza²⁰⁰ capture the debate.²⁰¹ Campos centers his interpretation on the cannibalistic metaphor from the “Manifesto Antropófago” (1928) by Oswald de Andrade. Oswald declared cannibalism to be Brazil’s major cultural contribution, reframing the indigenous practice of honoring the enemy through ritually consuming and absorbing their body into one’s own as an aesthetic practice of creative destruction. Mário de Andrade published a chapter of *Macunaíma* in *Revista Antropofágica*, the central magazine of the cannibal phase of Brazilian *modernismo*. While the author claimed he did not intend *Macunaíma* as a cannibalistic or allegorical work, the reception has understood it as both.

Souza counters Campos’s description of the work as a “mosaic,” instead labeling it *bricolage* as defined by Claude Lévi-Strauss. She understands the combination of elements as functional rather than aesthetic because of similarities between Andrade’s research in musicology and the composition of *Macunaíma*. In fact, Andrade subtitled his work *Uma rapsódia* (A Rhapsody). Emphasizing its European heritage, Souza demonstrates that the piece borrows structurally from Portuguese music and novels of chivalry (*caballerías*) and the picaresque (“Prólogo,” xli). Adopting a psychoanalytic

¹⁹⁹ With his brother Augusto de Campos and Décio Pignatari, he founded the “Noigandres” group in 1952, launching Concretismo, a poetic movement of international impact on visual poetry.

²⁰⁰ Married to sociologist Antonio Candido, Souza tends to be associated with his Marxist thought.

²⁰¹ For Melo, both sides of this debate fail to accept that “it is more productive to extract critical developments from ambivalence than to attempt to resolve [the ambivalence] by eliminating one of its dimensions” (217).

approach, her analysis relies on interpreting the ending as melancholic. When the character Macunaíma abandons Brazil, she views this ending as a satirical comment on an inability to construct the right national “mask” rather than a celebration of a national cannibalism and conflagration of past influences. Countering Campos’s reading of *Macunaíma* as “an affirmative, anthropological book” (xlvi), she also negates Olea’s translation.²⁰² Instead, she views the work as a pessimistic, ambivalent representation of an indeterminate Brazilian identity. Even when she questions nationalistic readings of the novel—citing the author’s pride at borrowing from multiple geographies—she does not explore the Venezuelan connection.

One cannot say that the protagonist of this book, whom I extracted from the work of the German Koch Grünberg, could be the Brazilian Nation. He is as Venezuelan as he is ours, if not more, so ignorant of the stupidity of borders that he wanders into the “land of the English” as Macunaíma calls British Guiana. The fact that the protagonist may not be absolutely Brazilian pleases me greatly (Andrade qtd. in Souza, “Prólogo” xxii).

Souza shows her interest in the author’s borderless vision of South American culture as embodied by the character Macunaíma. Yet she does not use the author’s perspective to refute the conflation of the character with the Brazilian nation. Instead she primarily cites the author in order to counter Haroldo’s vision that the work is nationalist in a positive sense, rather than an ambivalent one. Focusing on Andrade musicological research misses

²⁰² “In spite of the author’s warnings (which in this case correspond with what objective analysis demonstrates) Macunaíma was considered—and continues to be today—an affirmative, anthropological book, in other words, as an avid, acritical incorporation of European values by Brazilian culture. The reading I proposed departed from this triumphant interpretation to revisit the pessimistic indications of Mário de Andrade, according to which the work is ambivalent, indeterminate, and more of an open, cloudy field for debate than the definitive mark of truth” (Souza, “Prólogo” xlvi).

the chance to highlight the transcreation as fulfilling the hope Andrade expresses that he could depict the specific and localized culture of the Orinoco Delta as more valuable and coherent than the cultures divided by arbitrary borders between Venezuela, British Guiana, and Brazil, or between Spanish, English, and Portuguese.

Héctor Olea's Spanish-American *Macunaíma*: Tactics of Transcreation

Olea asserts that translating this Brazilian work into Spanish-American idioms represents new myth-making; he describes his de-territorialized Spanish as an artistic act promoting a shared cultural imaginary in the Americas. Quoting Argentine poet Enrique Molina, “America is a mirror that invents itself” (“Posfacio” 241), he claims:

Assimilating the *homo brasiliensis* into ourselves is an attempt to ritualize the American myth. To reflect on our own reflection. To reveal and redeem priceless traditions so that they may be seen by everyone. To identify a utopia we have in common in a pluralistic language that rediscovers its own transplant. (241; emphasis in original)

Referring to Campos, who prioritizes “aesthetic information” in translation (244), Olea outlines the tactics he deploys to transcreate *Macunaíma*. Much like Souza, he justifies his treatment of the work by citing the author, defining a “supertranslation” as one that “captures the ‘dynamogenesis of the original’” (Andrade qtd. in Olea, “Posfacio” 244). Olea’s transcreation strategies include: linguistic recreation of orality by transferring phonemes or deforming words through apheresis, interpolation of Spanish-American expressions or folkloric details, inventing new portmanteaus, “desgeografización” or geographic displacement, rewriting wordplay, transferring idioms from Spanish-

American dialects, and stretching Spanish syntax to create a mood of oral speech—just as Andrade stretched Portuguese. To achieve the effect of geographic dislocation, Olea points out his use of Spanish diction marked by the gaucho culture that straddles both sides of the Brazilian and Argentine border (250). He also includes various names for flora and fauna to expand regional associations. For example, after researching manioc and popcorn, two widely adopted staples of Amerindian food culture, he places different names for the same root or grain in different parts of the work (255). Olea “avoid[s] the interference of explanatory notes” with these techniques (244). He freely invents or combines words, or alters orthography, all to recreate effects rather than translating for information, because many of these stylistic details have “scant functional meaning” (244). Olea draws on another concept from Campos: translation as a “laboratory of texts,” a vision of teams of poets, translators, and linguists, crafting translations together and granting all versions equal status (*Novas* 325). To apply this concept, Olea checked his draft against the French translation, not just the source text (248). Creating his own neologism for his process, he calls it “Tradiducing: deducing the tradition. Reinventing patience, slow-paced things” (245). In Spanish “Tradecir: deducir la tradición,” the words “decir” [to say] and “traducción” [translation] also echo in Olea’s portmanteau.

Olea adheres to the poetic, experimental, and cannibalistic sides of *Macunaíma*—simply put, he remains faithful to Andrade’s work as a practice, as an elaboration of ideas rather than a completed whole. He creates a translation that draws on connections between literary traditions: “*Reconstruction and restoration* of oral or popular literature are constants in the work of the modernist writer [Andrade]. His ethnographic and musicological studies are faithful demonstrations of his interest in *mobile or movable*

traditions” (245; emphasis in original). Olea treats the source text as a series of experimental representations of oral speech in written text, representations he recreates in Spanish.²⁰³ He emphasizes the indigenous, Afro-diasporic, oral, and profane elements of the novel, molding a poetic trajectory and tradition in a particular way. Privileging these aesthetic elements, he uses “untranslatables” as points of contact between Brazil and Spanish-America. Márcia Moura da Silva focuses her linguistic analysis on Olea’s treatment of indigenous terms. She finds that his translation displays loyalty and respect for the Tupi linguistic interpolations. In her evaluation, his translation manages to avoid some of the pitfalls of respect or norms of fidelity the translator will often have for the author precisely because Olea chooses Tupi words as his object of reverence. Moura da Silva posits that Olea gave himself freedom to intervene into the work because he prioritized creating a convincing transcreation of indigenous characteristics (122). Doing so without explanatory footnotes, Olea turns the original into a practice that he repeats in order to demonstrate the underlying connections between the Brazilian and Spanish-American cultures in their shared incorporation of indigenous cultures. Concluding his “Posfacio,” Olea refutes the commonplace that translation is always a loss. Instead, he imagines that his translation responds to a “subterranean internal grammar” (259). He envisions a mystical, messianic connection among indigenous languages of the Americas—a connection that can be tapped into even in the present-day, even through the colonial languages of Spanish and Portuguese.

²⁰³ Heloisa Costa Milton characterizes his translation as an “homage to the Brazilian writer [that] activates a circuit which reaches at least two poles in two directions: Brazilian and Spanish-American narrative in their possibilities of dialogue” (69). Her comparison of Olea’s Spanish and Andrade’s Portuguese demonstrates his many departures from semantic meaning in order to preserve elements of rhyme and rhythm.

Rama encourages his volume editor Souza to give as much context as possible to give the *Obra escogida* a “thick” descriptive layer. In a letter to Rama, Souza gives what may be the first sign of a problem. She writes that she “is finishing the notes for *Macunaíma*, which ended up being a lot, perhaps too many” and will eliminate the unnecessary ones later (Souza, Letter to Rama, 7 October 1976). In his response, Rama emphasizes that he wants as many notes as possible, to retain the responsibility—and control—to decide which are necessary from the perspective of the Spanish-American reader. He refers to a previous experience with Walnice Nogueira Galvão who did not provide enough information for the translated edition of *Os sertões*, an issue he wants Souza to avoid.²⁰⁴

Although Olea composed a transcreation, the editors Souza and Rama treated his work as a transparent and direct reproduction of the Brazilian literary text, identical to the source for the purposes of producing a scholarly critical edition. Additionally, they explain historical, cultural, and linguistic details incorporated into the literary work. I am calling this particular scholarly edition a “thick translation” for its aim to make up for a lack of information the new readership would have about the cultural context of Brazilian Amazonian geographies and environments. In her explanations, Souza frequently references notes Andrade prepared in 1930 for a never-completed English translation by Margaret Hollingsworth (“Notas” 113). Treating this unpublished, incomplete translation as an idealized ghost, Souza’s notes gain an aura of authorized legitimacy, in spite of the

²⁰⁴ “With respect to the annotations, I suggest you do not cut too much what you have done, since perhaps it would be better to leave it to us, this task that relies on an understanding of the Spanish-American reader. Above all because we’ve had a bad experience with Walnice Nogueira Galvao [sic] who turned in a set of notes too slim for a book so in need of historical, geographical, and linguistic information as *Os Sertoes* [sic], such that we had to ask her to redo the work” (Rama, Letter to Souza, 18 October 1976).

fact that these explanations were intended for an English readership, not the audience for a Spanish translation. Using Andrade as evidence also presumes that the best translator of a work, if possible, would be the author. In fact, there is no reason to privilege an author's perspective on their work in translation.

The Value of Incompatibility: Untranslatables as Inflection Points

When he learned of the Ayacucho publication of his translation, Olea was working on new translations for the Oswald de Andrade volume edited by Campos. That project had already generated differences of opinion between Rama and the translator, primarily over deadlines and payment for his work. When Rama wrote to Olea asking him to review the notes by Souza to ensure they coincided with the translation, Olea responded with a detailed and critical letter, explaining to Rama precisely why his views on translation are diametrically opposed to those in place at Ayacucho. After voicing some surprise that he was not consulted sooner, he expressed deep concern over the incompatibility of the explanatory notes with this poetic work. Olea explained that his transcreation made notes unnecessary by letting the text speak for itself as much as it did in the original. He objected to particular notes that defined certain untranslatables he had chosen to leave unexplained.

Annotating (in note 2 pag. 39) PORÉM JACARÉ ABRIU? NEM ELES! (literally untranslatable to Spanish) demonstrates a naïve position of skeptical arrogance, not only with respect to translation itself but also an aprioristic ignorant blindness

to colloquial Spanish and of the diffusion of popular linguistic forms across borders (Olea, Letter to Rama, 11 November 1978).²⁰⁵

In this complaint, he asserted that Spanish-speaking readers would be able to make up for missing information by applying their own understanding of popular speech.

In his letter, Olea also argued that the notes mislead the reader by explaining specific words in Portuguese that come from Tupi-Guarani words with Spanish “equivalents” where no equivalence was desirable or necessary, especially in the case of Amazonian flora or fauna. “It’s not the same to say: IANDU CARANGUEJEIRA is a poisonous spider, because the text itself makes that implicit” (Letter to Rama, 11 November 1978). Olea pointed out the ethical dimension to this concern by arguing from authorial intention. He claimed that “Andrade was only interested in these terms for their specific use-value in the contemporary metaphoric symbiosis of Luso-Tupi terms in the profuse Brazilian lexicon. If the author only included these words for their character as Luso-Tupi hybrid terms, then to translate them is to create foreignness in the translation where none existed in the original” (Olea, Letter to Rama). Souza justifies her addition of explanatory notes by referring to authorial intent because Andrade included this information in his notes for the English translation.

The first publication of Olea’s transcreation presents the Spanish-speaking reader with the difficulties of Andrade’s Brazilian Portuguese without any explanatory footnotes and with reconstructed wordplay and regionalisms. The second publication by Ayacucho adds an introduction and extensive footnotes authored by Souza and translated by

²⁰⁵ The untranslatable phrase is “But did the lizard open [the door]? Not for them!” where “lagarto” is nonsense expressing playful disdain: the mood is conveyed contextually.

Santiago Kovadloff.²⁰⁶ Although the archival record shows that Rama sought Olea's help to find common ground between the critical apparatus and the translation, the volume itself maintains many inconsistencies, despite the translator's emphatic protest. Olea pointed out that the anthropological, note-heavy presentation of the text obscured its lightness and irony, claiming that to "attempt to explain poetry is to have no faith in poetry" (Letter to Rama). Did Rama respond? I found no direct response in the archive, and Olea's general complaint remained unaddressed: there are 439 notes in the Ayacucho edition. Despite his input, it remains evident that the volume editor created notes for the Portuguese original rather than the translation.

Olea also objected to explanations where the context tells the story adequately. Writing to Rama, he pointed out the example of fishing techniques on the Orinoco river: "I ask myself, or rather, I'm asking you, what is the reason for explaining what BATER TIMBO means" (Letter to Rama, 11 November 1978). As Macunaíma and his family struggle to find enough to eat, they try many methods, filling the chapter with specialized vocabulary for tools and methods of fishing.

Macunaíma quiso divertirse un poco. Dijo a sus manos que aún había mucho mije, mucha guabina, mucho careperro y pez-banana, todos esos peces de río; que fueran a *embarbasco* las aguas! y Maanape respondió:—Ya no se encuentra más *barbasco* [Macunaíma wanted to have himself some fun. He said to his bros that there were still lots of mije, lots of guabina, lots of careperro and banana fish, all those river fish: why don't we go *embarbasco* the water! and Maanape replied:

²⁰⁶ Argentine psychiatrist Kovadloff translated without much institutional support. As the Argentine economy declined, he asked repeatedly for better pay. Rama could not increase the rate, though he did offer Ayacucho volumes. Kovadloff eventually wrote that he could no longer translate for the press.

But there's no more *barbasco*] (*Obra escogida* 7; emphasis added).

This scene reads as communicative: the main idea is the abundance of Macunaíma's language, the descriptive lies he tells to pique the hunger of his brothers, in contrast with the absence of food and hunting tools his brothers encounter. The scene describing their fishing method is less about an ethnographic representation of an indigenous practice and more about a storytelling trope, the trickster and his tall tales. Souza annotates: "*Embarbascar (bater timbó)*. Reference to the indigenous custom of beating the water's surface with the branches of the timbó: a venomous plant that would contaminate the water and kill the fish to be collected after" (115; emphasis in original). The note supplements the translator's solution with the original expression and a useful explanation. While Olea objected to these notes, they successfully allow multiple versions of the same concepts or practices to co-exist. Instead of presenting the smooth assumption of translatability, the Ayacucho edition performs the untranslatability of localized cultural practices.

Conflicting Translation Manuals as Cognitive Highlighter: Reading Translation for Geographic Dislocation and Interpolated Traditions

Once I read the letters exchanged by the agents of translation at Ayacucho, I could see the *Obra escogida* volume in a different light. Olea critiqued conflicts between his transcreation and the paratextual apparatus. Alert to the different translation manuals at play, additional tensions became visible. By treating Olea's transcreation as a direct mirror of the source text, the references Souza adds do successfully provide contextual

framing that would aid pedagogy. However, in some instances, the “thick translation” ignores or explicitly negates the creative rendering Olea chose.

In her prologue, Souza describes the two catchphrases Macunaíma repeats as “inversely symmetrical” key concepts expressing the “profound ambivalence” of the work (xxx). Kovadloff translates them for the prologue as “¡Ay qué pereza! [what laziness / I’m so tired / I’m such a slacker]” and “muchas hormigas y poca salud son los males de Brasil [many ants and meager health are the banes of Brazil]” (xxx). Souza positions Macunaíma’s slogans as opposites; the first is an “apologia for idleness” whereas the second references chronicles by colonial administrators bemoaning the poor health of the region, their fears that their investment might infect and kill them (xxx). In his notes for the uncompleted English translation, Andrade asserts that the phrase is relevant to “the satirical sense of the book and has been created rhythmically in the form of a proverb” (Andrade qtd. in Souza, xxx). Kovadloff includes the Portuguese phrase and explains his translation even further: “The phrase in Portuguese says: ‘Muita saúva e pouca saúde os males do Brasil são.’ The *saúva* is a type of giant, voracious ant common to Brazil (N. del T.)” (translator’s note in Souza xxx).

While her analysis glosses these invented proverbs, Souza does not account for Olea’s transcreation into colloquial Spanish. For the prologue, Kovadloff chooses the most direct translation of “Ai! que preguiça ...” (*Macunaíma* 7) which is “¡Ay qué pereza!” (xxx). However, Olea opts for another Spanish word: “—Ay! qué flojera!” (*Obra escogida* 3).²⁰⁷ Particularly common in Mexico, “flojera” is widely used to express

²⁰⁷ It bears mention here that the English translation by Goodland for this phrase is not particularly adequate: more profane and angry than the Portuguese catchphrase, “Aw! What a fucking life!” (3) is another example of the English translation creating a threatening other out of the Brazilian trickster-hero.

the same laziness or enervated energy as “pereza,” but also connotes physicality, slackness or weakness. Given that Macunaíma and his family frequently complain of uncomfortable hunger and food insecurity, the term “flojera” fits their everyday lives even better than “preguiça.” Olea also invents a rhyming idiom—as did Andrade—to convey the whimsical nihilism of Macunaíma’s worldview: “‘Mucha tambocha y poco bizcocho, / Luchas son que al Brasil dejan mocho’ [Lots of ants and few biscuits / Are the struggles that make Brazil fall short]” (*Obra escogida* 52). Olea’s transcreation, unlike Kovadloff’s version, maintains the playful rhyme, or “aesthetic information,” while altering “semantic information.” Olea removes the reference to health, adding instead the idea of food scarcity, again an apt choice given the prevalence of hunger in *Macunaíma*.

In one example of interpolation, Olea adds references to Afro-Cuban cultural forms where the source text represented Afro-Brazilian religion. When Macunaíma journeys to Rio de Janeiro, he attends a *candomblé* ritual for Exú to gain enough strength to get his amulet back. Olea interpolates “la Virgen Caridad de Cobre” (*Obra escogida* 37) the Patron Saint of Cuba, where Andrade includes the Saint of the Azores, “Nossa Senhora da Conceição” (*Macunaíma* 55). As Heloisa da Costa Milton points out, the chapter title “Macumba” in Portuguese appears as “Bembé-Macumba” in Spanish. These references to Cuban *santería* and other local beliefs “effectively fulfill the function of a glossary or a collection of footnotes with respect to the reception of the text” (Milton 64). Olea also adds Afro-Cuban author Nicolás Guillén to a list of “macumberos” where the source text included only Brazilian and French artists practicing *negrisme*.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁸In addition to adding three *bemberos*, Olea interpolates the Central American colloquialism *bochinche* to express their party-making where Andrade used a more commonplace phrase *fazer a festa*: “E pra acabar todos *fizeram a festa* juntos ... Então tudo acabou se fazendo a vida real. E os macumbeiros, Macunaíma,

Y para acabar todos *hicieron el bochinche* juntos ... Entonces todo acabó volviéndose a la vida real. Y los macumberos, Macunaíma, Jaime Ovalle, Dodó, Manú Bandeira, Blaise Cendrars, Ascenso Ferreira, Raúl Bopp, Antonio Bento, *Pierre Verger*, *Peque Lanusa [sic]*, *Nicolás Guillén*, todos esos bemberos salieron hacia la madrugada [And everyone ended up *partying* together ... Then everything went back to real life. And the macumba-players Macunaíma, Jaime Ovalle, Dodó, Manú Bandeira, Blaise Cendrars, Ascenso Ferreira, Raúl Bopp, Antonio Bento, *Pierre Verger*, *Peque Lanusa [sic]*, *Nicolás Guillén*, all those bemberos went out until dawn] (Andrade, *Obra escogida* 41; emphasis added).

Souza adds a note that does not work against Olea's solution, but misses the chance to point out his expansion of the literary game Andrade plays. Her note explains this list as an example of the author's mix of "real and fictitious elements" (126), and she gives biographical information about the poets listed by Andrade without mentioning the three figures added by Olea. He adds Pierre Verger (1902-96), a French photographer and student of African religious diasporas who initiated himself into *candomblé* in his adopted home of Salvador. Including Verger reminds readers that to "look" at an Afro-Brazilian ritual means looking at a forcefully transplanted cultural form that many have since adopted and adapted. Peque Lanusa [sic] likely refers to Argentine poet José Luis Lanusa (1903-76); he wrote *cancioneros* and studied the *gaucho* tradition in Argentina. By adding Lanusa, Olea connects the Argentine *gaucho* with *bembero* culture in Brazil. Given Mário's study of music, gauchesco poetry and negrismo have a logical connection because both poetic traditions incorporate popular musical forms into a literary culture

Jaime Ovalle, Dodó, Manu Bandeira, Blaise Cendrars, Ascenso Ferreira, Raul Bopp, Antônio Bento, todos esses macumbeiros saíram na madrugada" (*Macunaíma* 63; emphasis added).

that gets elevated to the level of national heritage. Nicolás Guillén (1902-1989) is the most well-known parallel Olea adds; in *Motivos de son* (1930) and *Songoro cosongo* (1931) he incorporates Afro-Cuban music into his poetry.²⁰⁹ Olea's Spanish translation interpolates recognizable but geographically displaced representations of Afro-Latino cultures to draw in the Spanish-American reader.

In his Posfacio, Olea writes about this parallelism available between the Afro-Cuban poetic voice created in the same period by poet Nicolás Guillén as when Mário de Andrade composed his polyvocal novel. While he does not refer to this mention of Guillén by name, Olea does reveal another moment in Chapter 5 when he used a citation from Guillén's poetry as a "Ready-Made" phrase for a moment connecting tropical flowers with the black female body. While this replacement is problematic for many reasons, Olea's persistent search for a connection already available in the literature of the Spanish-speaking Américas bespeaks his conviction that a translation can reveal connections.

Otra técnica de traducción creativa —muy empleada por el pre-romántico brasileño Odorico Mendes—, es la *interpolación*, que introduce versos de otros poetas cuando la imagen de éstos se compagina con la frase del autor escogido. Fue así como en decasílabos heroicos acomodó los hexámetros homéricos, algunas veces injertando líneas de Camoens [sic]. Es innegable la preocupación que tuvo Mário de Andrade para ubicar *la mulatería* en sus amplios ensayos e investigaciones sobre el tema de *la negritud*. De tal modo que Nicolás Guillén, entre otros, no le fue ajeno. Un paralelismo

²⁰⁹ Unfortunately, Olea ignores the contributions of Lydia Cabrera, the Cuban ethnographer whose work provided foundational research for Guillén and other artists and writers interested in Afro-Cuban cultures.

figurativo entre: “Guajiru (*Chrysobalanus Icaco*, rosácea) cheirando sobaco de prêta” (MAC, V) y “Caimitos (*Lucuma caminito*, saponácea), morados como el sexo de las negras” (Pt), salta a la vista. Lejos de fidelidad botánica, en *hiatos oliendo como el sexo de las negras*, la fusión sugerida vincula el traducir al proceso creativo (Olea, “Posfacio” 245).

Given the fact that his translation cites Guillén directly in Chapter 5, we can read the moment in Chapter 7 as Olea the translator citing some of his own sources, just as Andrade was citing his own sources in his original work.

The Spanish translation interpolates new information to draw the Spanish-American experience closer to the Afro-Brazilian experience presented in the original. In the English translation, the opposite movement is in place — there are interpolations that are designed to create distance between the source culture and the target language culture. One sign that the translator perceives a greater cultural distance that he needs to make up for through interpolation is a need to explain these occupations more explicitly than in Spanish. The “bemberos” or “macumberos / macumbeiros” are described as “celebrants of the macumba” in Goodland’s translation. This choice also separates Macunaíma from the other names more emphatically: “Macunaíma and his fellow celebrants of the macumba” (59). Adding in “fellow celebrants” conveys an added specificity of religious fraternity to the group. This could be read as a distancing, exorcizing translation choice. Unlike the Spanish translation, there is no playful addition of Langston Hughes or any other USA practitioner of Negritude.

Olea also uses the strategy of interpolation to add in different lyrics for a Spanish-American version (*Danza de Toritos*) parallel to the Northeast Brazilian dance (*Bumba-*

meu-boi). In this case, thick translation obscures and counteracts Olea's decolonial transcreation that replaced the Northeast Brazilian ritual of the Boi-bumba with a Guatemalan ritual. For Souza, this song performs Brazil's connection to Portuguese music, citing Andrade's musicology to make this point, that Brazilian folk rounds are descended from songs by Portuguese *jograis* or troubadours:

[In] *Macunaíma*, Mário de Andrade transposed to literature, in an intentional and critical manner, the conflict he observed with such sharpness in music between the European tradition inherited from Portugal and the local, popular, indigenous, or African manifestations ... independent of the successive masks that may confer on his narration a savage aspect, its central nucleus continues to be *firmly European* (Souza, "Prólogo" xxxiv-v; emphasis in the original).

For Souza, the interpolated songs represent the European foundation of Brazilian letters, assembling the raw materials of Brazilian every-day life into Portuguese musical structures. While Olea acknowledges the shared cultural history from the Iberian Peninsula ("Posfácio" 247), he is less interested in tracing those origins than in offering a comparative vision of the many different Western Hemispheric iterations these cultural forms have taken in different spaces.

Olea draws inspiration from the many Latin American versions of the Bull dance, not from the European "raw material." This reversal of values is lost through Souza's introduction and interpretive notes, where she instead understands this element as Iberian Portuguese cultural forms gain new life in Brazil. Olea claims greater authenticity for his interpolation of a "cantiga hispanoamericana" rather than translating the Brazilian folkloric verses: "I found it more authentic to intercalate into the Mariandradian text the

Ready-Made of some fragments of the Refrains sung in the Dance of the Bull instead of trying to reproduce in Spanish the stanzas of Boi-Espacio that appear in the rhapsody” (247). Using the term “rhapsody,” he recalls *Macunaíma*’s subtitle and musical composition, justifying his own variations on the theme.

Olea also interpolates idioms from popular speech into the text. For example, he remixes a Brazilian nursery rhyme with a similar game from the Central American lexicon, reproducing the aesthetic function of wordplay and child-like repetition—recognizable moods even if the reader does not recognize the song. Where the source text reads “chegou o domingo pé-de-cachimbo” (*Macunaíma* 82), Olea adds the nonsense word “chingolingo” borrowed from a dice game from Central America. His transcreated rhyme reads: “llegó el domingo-chingolingo pie-de-cachimbolimbo” (*Obra* 55). Souza adds a note that glosses and translates only the original:

The expression *Domingo pé de cachimbo* pertains to a nursery rhyme that goes:

“Hoje é domingo / pé de cachimbo / cachimbo é de barro / que bate no jarro.”

Translated to Spanish in a more or less textual way that also tries to preserve the rhythm, we would have: “Hoy es domingo / pata de pipa / pipa de barro / que rompe el jarro” [Today is Sunday / leg of pipe / pipe made of clay / that breaks the jug] (Souza, “Notas” 130; emphasis in original).

In this case, her note offers her own values of translation, alternative to the translation in hand. Olea preserves the mood without explanation; Souza explains the context but translates creatively to “preserve the rhythm.” The translation manuals conflict, but the Ayacucho edition includes all three versions, enriching the reader’s experience.

Olea interpolates Spanish American terms and lexicon not just when they are autochthonous cultural forms but also when they are the avant-garde incorporation of brand-name and machine vocabulary. Andrade's novel uses the avant-garde gesture to incorporate brand names and machines into poetic writing in a chaotic enumeration of disparate categories that characterizes many of Macunaíma's overwhelmed reactions at the chaos, the diversity, and the difference of São Paulo from his home. He describes cars and other machines as animals that are not actually animals but rather machines. "As onças pardas não eram onças pardas, se chamavam fordes hupmobiles chevrolés dodges **mármons** e eram máquinas" (Lopez 38). In his translation, Olea changes some of the car models cited to make sure they are all recognizable to an expanded readership. "Los pumas no eran onzas pardas, se llamaban forcingos hupmobiles chevrolés dodches **hispano-suizas** y eran máquinas" (Mário 24). Olea's translation removes one brand less recognizable to a Spanish speaking audience and replaces it with "Hispano-Suiza" broadens the geography to carmakers in Spain as well as the USA. This "desgeografización" is one example of Olea's use of the strategy for a European mood of avant-garde prose, namely the focus on the machines in the city, the incorporation of brand name automobiles in a poetic prose.²¹⁰

In one example of the diverse lexicon Olea compiles, he adds references to locally produced alcohols to expand *Macunaíma's* geographical reach. At the *candomblé* celebration in Rio, the hero tries a new alcoholic beverage: "cachaça," a sugarcane brandy popular in Brazil.²¹¹ Cachaça comes from regions associated with the sugar

²¹⁰ The text I am primarily thinking of is "The Futurist Manifesto" from the Italian Futurists. There should be other examples of cars in vanguardista prose.

²¹¹ "Macunaíma provou pela primeira vez o cachiri temível cujo nome é cachaça" (*Macunaíma* 47).

industry and slave labor, not the territory Macunaíma calls home. He previously had only tasted “cachiri,” fermented liquor made from manioc by the Wayana, an indigenous culture in the region of French Guinea. Olea recreates this geographical displacement, but in Spanish-American diction. In Spanish, Macunaíma encounters a new version of his familiar drink *chicha* called *guaro*.²¹² “Chicha” is maize liquor associated with Venezuela, close to Macunaíma’s home; “guaro” is cane-sugar liquor from Central America, an apt parallel for *cachaça*. Olea could have left the reference to *cachaça*, reminding readers this episode takes place in Rio. Instead, he broadens the geography of local products the Spanish-speaking Macunaíma experiences.

At times, Olea chooses phrases associated with Mexican Spanish, such as the verb “ningunear.” Macunaíma causes commotion at the São Paulo Stock Exchange, tricking his brothers into attempting to hunt tapir. When a mob tries to lynch him for the disturbance, he deflects their rejection with typical aplomb and insists on his belonging.

“O quê! *quem que é desconhecido!*” berrou Macunaíma desesperado com a ofensa [“What?! *which who is the stranger!*” bellowed Macunaíma, exasperated at the insult] (Andrade, *Macunaíma* 92). “Qué qué! *a mí ninguno me ningunea!*” —berreó Macunaíma desesperado por la patochada [“What what?! *nobody nobodys me!*” —bellowed Macunaíma, exasperated at the slap in the face] (*Obra* 62; emphasis added).

The Spanish expression fits the context perfectly. Analyzed by Octavio Paz in his treatise on Mexican identity, “ningunear” means to ignore, to give the cold shoulder—literally, to nobody another person. Olea took the opportunity to interpolate this idiomatic Mexican

²¹² “Macunaíma probó por primera vez la chicha temible cuyo nombre es guaro” (*Obra* 37).

expression where none appears in the source. It would be outside the scope of this essay to determine the extent to which the experience of “ninguneo” would speak in the same way to all Spanish speakers. I can cite Octavio Paz and his generalization of the “silence” or “gap” inherent in much Mexican slang or informal, typical words and usages.

Sería un error pensar que los demás le impiden existir. Simplemente disimulan su existencia, obran como si no existiera. Lo nulifican, lo anulan, lo ningunean. Es inútil que Ninguno hable, publique libros, pinte cuadros, se ponga de cabeza. Ninguno es la ausencia de nuestras miradas, la pausa de nuestra conversación, la reticencia de nuestro silencio. . . . Es una omisión. Y sin embargo, Ninguno está presente siempre. Es nuestro secreto, nuestro crimen y nuestro remordimiento. Por eso el Ninguneador también se ninguna; él es la omisión de Alguien. Y si todos somos Ninguno, no existe ninguno de nosotros. El círculo se cierra y la sombra de Ninguno se extiende sobre México, asfixia al Gesticulador y lo cubre todo. En nuestro territorio, más fuerte que las pirámides y los sacrificios, que las iglesias, los motines y los cantos populares, vuelve a imperar el silencio, anterior a la Historia. (Paz, Laberinto 181)

Although Paz makes it clear that this insult is circular and annihilating, and so potentially applicable to any dialectical and self-reflexive human subject, he also associates it firmly with Mexican national symbols as notable and stereotypical as the pyramids. Introducing this culturally specific term in his translation, without any indicators or labels, Héctor Olea breaks from the national identification of the “ninguneo” to produce it here, in

Macunaíma's experience in São Paulo. The universal aspect of Paz's nationalist work is introduced into this nationalist moment in the Andrade novel.

Chapter 4 Conclusions: World Literature as Mobile Untranslatables

The Biblioteca Ayacucho critical edition of *Obra escogida* by Mário de Andrade could be dismissed for failing to present a coherent whole. Instead of regarding its inconsistencies as failures, I use editorial correspondence to understand them as a productive negotiation between the values of transcreation versus thick translation in the publisher's translation manual. Gerard Aching locates resistance to World Literature within Latin American studies, which he attributes to a tendency to favor opacity and non-standard language in the Latin American literary field.²¹³ Olea reproduces the opacity of the text and puts it into motion rather than making the narrative transparent for a wider audience. The conflict between transcreation and thick translation is not resolved. Nevertheless, the very un-smoothness of the Caracas publication speaks to the poly-vocal Brazilian *modernismo* movement. The creative devouring of the source text becomes visible as Olea's transcreation responds to Campos's theories of Brazilian translation.

²¹³ Latin American literary criticism has received the rubric of World Literature with general skepticism, as outlined by Guillermina de Ferrari in her introduction to *Critical Utopias: World Literature According to Spanish America* (2012 special issue of *1616: Anuario de Literatura Comparada*).

Conclusions

Reciprocity and Literary Translation in the Digital Age

The literary translators in each of my chapters would agree that translation is a creative act—but they stake out different positions on where that creativity goes, to whom the gifts of their creative translation efforts are given. Comparative analysis allowed me to identify multiple performances of generosity and thymotic spirit within literary translation. In their commentary on translations or *versiones*, Octavio Paz and Rosario Castellanos agree that literary translations have a target in mind, and the precision of hitting the target of an analogous work is important. Yet comparing their translation theory and practice demonstrates that Paz idealizes the possibility of a gift that does not add interest, that separates his function as a translator from that as a writer. Conversely, Castellanos accepts the translation process as a gift of relief from and perspective on her own “oficio” as a writer and as a chance to try on a different avatar. In the approximations by José Emilio Pacheco, the process receives his creative gifts more than any target audience. He performs translations in such a way that critiques them while also expressing some hope in the value of that critique. The theories of Haroldo de Campos relate the Brazilian tradition of cannibalizing past works to the combination of translation and criticism he practices, in which he is gifting the present with a new version of their past. His brother Augusto de Campos coins the term “untranslations” to describe his selected fragments from which he crafts concrete poems out of lyric works or prose. Professional translators Paulo Henriques Britto and Clarice Lispector receive new insights they import into their own work. While they eschew theory, they do give something of their own creative obsessions to the works they translate. Lastly, the

transcreations by Hector Olea met with the ideals of a critical edition in the Biblioteca Ayacucho project of translating Brazilian *modernismo*, giving new life to an old debate about the period.

To take the next step in my research into concepts of gift exchange as expressed through literary translation, I see two related pathways. The first would be an expanded attention to the archives of literary translators as sources of valuable insight. The second would be the inclusion of modes of digital literature, both as a tool of writing and as a platform of publication. Given that writers and translators now have extensive digital archives, these two future directions will inevitably connect. My project prepares me for future research into the increased possibilities for literature enacted as gift exchange in the new publication realities offered by the digital age. The dissertation project prepares me with knowledge of the relevant translation tradition to analyze contemporary translators using new media tools to respond to or extend the Latin American translation tradition studied in my dissertation. The definitions of legibility, appropriation, translation rights or copyrights, and the very possibility of originality have been transformed by digital modes of writing and readership.

Augusto de Campos represents a key cross-over figure: he began to use Flash videos to rewrite some of his poems into brief “poem-clips” (2003) viewable as videos online. His “(in)traduções” project continues with several examples that are only digital. How do these new translations relate to previous versions, and what new publics do they imagine for his poetry? In addition to this self-translation activity, his work has also received the attention of experimental translators. Canadian poet and translator Paul Legault curated a group of forty artists to produce an exhibition of visual, textual, and

digital translations of the word-thing concrete poems by Augusto de Campos, called *telefone sem fio* (2010). Legault wrote a manifesto responding to this project and another collective translation experiment with English-to-English versions of Shakespeare's sonnets. In his "Manifesto of the New Translation" (2012), Legault references Pound and the twitter version of *carpe diem*, #yolo, in the same breath. In another example of digital writing that draws from the concrete poetry tradition, Argentine poet Romina Cazón uses gifs to re-create poetic effects she sees in contemporary poets from across Latin America. Her "poemas de código binario" flash with numbers that move into shapes that recall some of the themes of the poets they are named after. For example, the gif "Dolores Dorantes" begins with a randomly spaced series of butterflies (made out of strings of numeral 1s and 0s). The seemingly random movement of the gif brings them into a neat order and disperses them again, repeatedly. Cazón's gif poem condenses one of the insights within Dorantes' recent book *Estilo*, in which a series of numbered prose-poems repeatedly feint towards a narrative order, but then swerve away, interrupting the sequence or going back to an earlier moment in the narrative of a violent seduction that keeps happening. I would argue that Cazón's series can be understood as translations in the sense of Augusto's "untranslations" because of this extreme reduction and the use of visual signs.

If Augusto and Cazón represent examples of translators who create their translations online with digital tools, there is also another set of translation projects that rely on the new network of communication between writers or the new publication opportunities available to translators. Is the gift-giving behavior of poets and translators more possible through online publication? How do blogs and online literary magazines

connect spaces that were once separate, and how do translators take advantage of new presentation possibilities, and what resulting effects can be observed in translations produced using digital means? For example, although the result was a print anthology, Jen Hofer's anthology of Mexican women poets *Sin puertas visibles* (2003) relied on social networking communications to seek out a wide variety of contributors. Some poetic translation in the USA offers the gift of the expansion of a public sphere in Mexico beyond the capital city. Online literary journals focused on works in translation provide new possibilities of presentation that go beyond facing-page bilingual editions, such as the inclusion of voice recordings, use of images, hyperlinking texts, and more. These sites include *Words Without Borders* and *Asymptote* in English; *Modo de Usar & Co* and *Não gosto de plágio* in Portuguese; and *Círculo de poesía* and *Transtierros* in Spanish.

Contemporary literature is marked by increasingly democratic access to the world of literature and the coexistence of many aesthetic sensibilities in a space where the production of literary texts has expanded along with access to education. It remains to be seen how digital publication will change literature. Authors are increasingly expected to also serve the public as performers of their persona, making themselves available to not just at public appearances but on a more regular basis through blogs and even in a conversation with readers on social media platforms including twitter. These changes cannot avoid creating new aesthetic qualities. For Craig Dworkin and Kenneth Goldsmith, conceptual poets and editors of the anthology *Against Expression* (2012), what they call "uncreative writing" responds aesthetically to the digital age which has sped up the circulation of texts and flattened relationships between texts. Just as expressionism and later on other forms of abstract art answered the question that

photography posed to realist painting, uncreative writing is the new experimental literature—operational rather than creative—including algorithm-aided poetry, Flarf made from google-searches, text art, and more. Contemporary literary production is highly diversified—this aesthetic of reacting to new technologies to execute a new literary experimentalism co-exists with other aesthetic projects of realism, memoir, representational literature of different sectors of society, auto-fiction, and socially engaged writing.

My approach to the prior generation was already conditioned by contemporary perspectives on translation. In the realm of the digital production and consumption of texts, we have become hyperaware of the collectivity, reciprocity, and instability of the written word. Readers have no choice but to see a translation as one of many performances of a work, for different readerships. The digital performance of translation may be the next avenue for understanding elements of generosity and reciprocity within literary translation.

Bibliography

- Aching, Gerard. "The 'Right to Opacity' and World Literature." *1616: Anuario de Literatura Comparada* 2 (2012): 33-47. Print.
- Aguilar, Gonzalo Moisés. *Poesia concreta brasileira: as vanguardas na encruzilhada modernista*. São Paulo: Edusp, 2005. Print.
- Ahern, Maureen, ed. *A Rosario Castellanos Reader: An Anthology of Her Poetry, Short Fiction, Essays, and Drama*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994. Print.
- Albuquerque, Severino J. "Reading Translation Queerly: Lispector's Translation of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 76.5 (1999): 691-702. Print.
- Algazi, Gadi. "Introduction. Doing Things with Gifts." *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-Modern Figurations of Exchange*. Eds. Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner, and Bernhard Jussen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003. 9-27. Print.
- Amaral, Aracy, ed. *Arte y arquitectura del modernismo brasileño (1917-1930)*. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho, 1978. Print.
- . Letter to Ángel Rama. 21 October 1977. TS. Folder 47. *Arte y arquitectura del modernismo brasileño: 1917-1930*. Ed. Aracy Amaral. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- Andrade, Mário de. "Em cartas." In Andrade, *Macunaíma*. São Paulo: Livros Técnicos e Científicos, 1978, 249-85. Print.
- . *Macunaíma*. Trans E. A. Goodland. New York: Random House, 1984. Print.
- . *Macunaíma*. (*El héroe sin ningún carácter*.) Preface by Haroldo de Campos. Transcreation and Posfacio by Héctor Olea. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1977. Print.
- . *Macunaíma: o herói sem nenhum caráter*. Ed. Telê Porto Ancona Lopez. Rio de Janeiro: Livros Técnicos e Científicos, 1978. Print.

- . *Obra escogida. Novela, cuento, ensayo, epistolario*. Ed. Gilda de Mello e Souza. Venezuela: Biblioteca Ayacucho, 1979. Print.
- Andrade, Oswald de, Haroldo de Campos, and David Jackson. *Obra escogida*. Caracas, Venezuela: Biblioteca Ayacucho, 1981. Print.
- Aparicio, Frances R. *Versiones, interpretaciones y creaciones: Instancias de la traducción literaria en Hispanoamérica en el siglo veinte*. Gaithersburg, MD: Ediciones Hispamérica, 1991. Print.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Thick Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2000. 417-29.
- Apter, Emily. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. London, New York: Verso, 2013. Print.
- . *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2006. Print.
- Balderston, Daniel, and Marcy E. Schwartz. *Voice-overs: Translation and Latin American Literature*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002. Print.
- Barón, Palma Emilio. *T.S. Eliot en España*. Almería: Universidad de Almería, Servicio de Publicaciones, 1996. Print.
- Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Multilingual Matters, 1998. Print.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens*." Trans. Harry Zohn. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London/New York: Routledge, 2000. 15-25. Print.
- Bernard, Judith. "Myth and Structure in Octavio Paz's 'Piedra de Sol.'" *Symposium: A Quarterly Journal in Modern Literatures* 21.1 (1967): 5-13.

- Bierhorst, John, ed. *In the Trail of the Wind: American Indian Poems and Ritual Orations*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux: 1971. Print.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence. A Theory of Poetry. Second Edition*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.
- Blixen, Carina, and Alvaro Barros-Lemez. *Cronología y bibliografía de Ángel Rama*. Montevideo: Fundación Ángel Rama, 1986. Print.
- Bishop, Elizabeth. *O Iceberg Imaginário e outros poemas*. Seleção, tradução, e estudo crítico de Paulo Henriques Britto. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2001. Print.
- . *Poemas do Brasil*. Seleção, introdução, e tradução de Paulo Henriques Britto. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1999. Print.
- . *Poems, Prose, and Letters*. Eds. Robert Giroux and Lloyd Schwartz. New York: Library of America, 2008. Print.
- Braz, Albert. "Traducing the Author: Textual (In)fidelity in E. A. Goodland's Translation of *Macunaíma*." *Graphos* 9:1 (2007): 189-94. Print.
- Bohning, William H. "Andrés Bello's Imitations of Victor Hugo." *Hispanic Review* 13.1 (1945): 60-7. Print.
- Boll, Tom. *Octavio Paz and T.S. Eliot: Modern Poetry and the Translation of Influence*. London: Legenda Modern Humanities Research Association and Maney Publishing, 2012. Print.
- Borinsky, Alicia. "José Emilio Pacheco: Relecturas e historia." *Revista Iberoamericana* 56.150 (1990): 267-73. Print.
- Bottmann, Denise. "Alguns aspectos da presença de Edgar Allan Poe no Brasil." *Tradução em Revista* 8.1 (2010): 1-19. Web. 25 June 2015.

- Bradú, Fabienne. *Los puentes de la traducción: Octavio Paz y la poesía francesa*. Mexico D.F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2004. Print.
- Britto, Paulo Henriques. "Augusto de Campos como tradutor." *Sobre Augusto de Campos*. Eds. Flora Süssekind and Júlio Castañon Guimarães. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Casa de Ruy Barbosa / 7 Letras, 2004.
- . *Macau*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2003. Print
- . Personal Website of Paulo Henriques Britto. Web. 30 June 2015.
- . *Tarde*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2007.
- . "Tradução e ilusão." *Estudos Avançados* 26.76 (2012): 21-7. Print.
- Brooker, Jewel Spears. *Approaches to Teaching Eliot's Poetry and Plays*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1988. Print.
- Brotherston, Gordon. *Book of the Fourth World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. Print.
- Campos, Augusto de. *Despoesia*. Coleção Signos. Ed. Haroldo de Campos. São Paulo: Editora Perspetiva, 1996. Print.
- . *O Anticrítico*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1986. Print.
- Campos, Augusto de and Haroldo de Campos, eds. "Poesía concreta: configuración / textos." Trans. Antonio Alatorre. *Plural* 8 (Mayo 1972): 21-28. Print.
- . *Os sertões dos Campos: duas vezes Euclides*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Sette Letras, 1997. Print.
- . *Traduzir & trovar (poetas dos séculos XII a XVII)*. São Paulo: Edições Papyrus, 1968. Print.
- Campos, Haroldo de. *El ángel izquierdo de la poesía. Poética y política. Antología bilingüe*. Ed. Gonzalo Aguilar. Traducciones de Arturo Carrera, Roberto Echavarren, Daniel García Helder, Reynaldo Jiménez, Andrés Sánchez Robayna. Textos de Augusto de Campos and

- Jorge Schwartz. Lima: Sarita Cartonera, 2005. Print.
- . Letter to Ángel Rama. 10 April 1976. TS. Folder 84. *Obra escogida* by Oswald de Andrade. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- . *Novas: Selected Writings*. Eds. Antonio Sergio Bessa and Odile Cisneros. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 2007. Print.
- . *O sequestro do barroco na formação da literatura brasileira: o caso Gregório de Mattos*. Salvador, Bahia: Fundação Casa de Jorge Amado, 1989. Print.
- . “Prefacio. *Macunaíma: La fantasía estructural*.” In Andrade, *Macunaíma*, Seix Barral, 7-21. Print.
- Candido, Antonio. Letter to Ángel Rama. 6 August 1975. TS. Folder 56. *Obra escogida* by Mário de Andrade. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- Casanova, Pascale. “Literature as a World.” *New Left Review* 31 (2005): 71-90. Print.
- Castellanos, Rosario. *El uso de la palabra*. Ed. José Emilio Pacheco. México, D. F.: Ediciones de Excélsior, 1975.
- . *Juicios sumarios; ensayos*. Xalapa: Universidad Veracruzana, 1966. Print
- . *Materia memorable*. México D.F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1969. Print.
- . *Mujer de palabras: Artículos rescatados de Rosario Castellanos. Volumen I*. Ed. and Intro. by Andrea Reyes. México D.F.: Conaculta, Lecturas Mexicanas, Cuarta Serie, 2004. Print.
- . *Mujer que sabe latín*. 1973. México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1995. Print.
- . *Obras II. Poesía, teatro y ensayo*. Ed. Eduardo Mejía. Mexico D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1998. Print.

- . *Poesía no eres tú. Obra poética: 1948-1971*. México D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1972. Print.
- Cisneros, Odile. "From Isomorphism to Cannibalism: The Evolution of Haroldo de Campos's Translation Concepts." *TTR: Traduction, terminology, rédaction* 25.2 (2012): 15-44. Print.
- . "Multinaturalism: Ecocritical Perspectives from the South." *Literature and Identity* 3.1: (2013): n.p. Web. 11 June 2015.
- Cruz, San Juan de la. "Cántico espiritual." *Poesía lírica del Siglo de Oro*. Ed. Elías Rivers. Madrid: Cátedra, 1989. 164-70. Print.
- Cunha, Euclides da. *Backlands: The Canudos Campaign*. Ed. Ilan Stavans. Trans. Elizabeth Lowe. New York: Penguin Books, 2010. Print.
- . *Os sertões*. Ed. Walnice Nogueira Galvão. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1985. Print.
- Daghlian, Carlos. "A recepção de Poe na literatura brasileira." *Fragmentos* 25 (2003): 45-54. Print.
- Damrosch, David. *What Is World Literature?* Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003. Print.
- . "Where Is World Literature?" *Studying Transcultural Literary History*. Ed. Gunilla Lindberg-Wada. Berlin; New York: W. de Gruyter, 2006. 211-20. Print.
- Darío, Rubén. *Prosas profanas y otros poemas*. Ed. Ignacio M. Zuleta. Madrid: Castalia, 1987. Print.
- Debiki, Andrew. "Perspectiva, distanciamiento, y el tema del tiempo: la obra lírica de José Emilio Pacheco." *La hoguera y el viento: José Emilio Pacheco ante la crítica*. Ed. Hugo J. Verani. Mexico D.F.: Ediciones Era, 1993. Print. 62-80.

- Derrida, Jacques. *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money*. Trans. Peggy Kamuf. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1992. Print.
- . *The Monolingualism of the Other; or, The Prosthesis of Origin*. Trans. Patrick Mensah. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998. Print.
- Dickinson, Emily. *The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Ed. Thomas H. Johnson. Boston/Toronto: Little, Brown & Company, 1960. Print.
- Docter, Mary. "José Emilio Pacheco: A Poetics of Reciprocity." *Hispanic Review* 70:3 (2002): 373-92. Print.
- Dowdy, Michael. "'Of the Smog': José Emilio Pacheco's Concussive Poetics of Mexico City." *Hispanic Review* 79.2 (2011): 291-316. Print.
- Durán, Manuel, ed. *Antología de la revista Contemporáneos*. México D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1973. Print.
- Echevarría, Roberto González, Emir Rodríguez Monegal and Rolena Adorno. "Interview: Octavio Paz." *Diacritics* 2.3 (1972): 35-40. Print.
- Edwards, Magdalena. "The Translator's Colors: Elizabeth Bishop in Brazil and Elsewhere." Diss. UCLA, 2007. Print.
- Eliot, Thomas Sterns. *Collected Poems 1909-1962*. 1963. New York: Harcourt, 1991. Print.
- . *Cuatro cuartetos (Traducción de José Emilio Pacheco)*. México D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1989. Print.
- . *Cuatro cuartetos. Versión, introducción, y notas de Vicente Gaos*. Madrid: Ediciones Rialp, 1951. Print.
- . "East Coker: Aproximación y notas de José Emilio Pacheco." Trans José Emilio Pacheco. *Letras Libres* 181 (Jan 2014): 20-29. Print.

- . "East Coker: Traducción de Gustavo Díaz Solís." Caracas: Asociación de Estudiantes de Letras, 1965. Print.
- . "The Dry Salvages: Versión y notas de José Emilio Pacheco." Trans. José Emilio Pacheco. *Letras Libres* 154 (Oct 2011): 20-32. Print.
- . *The Waste Land*. Ed. Michael North. A Norton Critical Edition. New York: W.W. & Norton and Company, 2001. Print.
- . *The Waste Land / Tierra Baldía. Poesía en el mundo* 29. Trans Ángel Flores. Monterrey, Mexico: Ediciones Sierra Madre, 1960. Print.
- Epplin, Craig. *Late Book Culture in Argentina*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014. Print.
- Ferreira, Élide Paulina and Karin Hallana Santos Silva. "Edgar Allan Poe em português: os limites entre tradução e adaptação." *Domínios de lingu@gem: Revista Eletrônica de Linguística* 5.3 (2011): 20-37. Web. 9 September 2014.
- Franco, Jean. *The Decline and Fall of the Lettered City: Latin America in the Cold War*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 2002. Print.
- Friis, Ronald. *José Emilio Pacheco and the Poets of the Shadows*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2001. Print.
- Gardner, Helen. *The Composition of Four Quartets*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978. Print.
- García, Javier. "El poeta visual brasileño, Augusto de Campos, gana Premio de Poesía Pablo Neruda." *La Tercera*. [Santiago, Chile] Web. 23 June 2015.
- Godelier, Maurice. *The Enigma of the Gift*. Trans. Nora Scott. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999. Print.
- Gonçalves, Fabiano Bruno. "Tradução, interpretação e recepção literária: Manifestações de

- Edgar Allan Poe no Brasil.” Diss. Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, 2006. Print.
- Gordon, Samuel. “Los poetas ya no cantan ahora hablan (Aproximaciones a la poesía de José Emilio Pacheco).” *Revista Iberoamericana* 56.150 (1990): 255-66. Print.
- Granados, Jorge Fernández. “José Emilio Pacheco, la negra fábula del tiempo.” *Espéculo: Revista de estudios literarios: Universidad Complutense de Madrid*. (2003). Web. 06 July 2014.
- Greene, Roland. “For Love of Pau-Brasil.” *Unrequited Conquests: Love and Empire in the Colonial Americas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999. Print.
- Guerini, Andréia, Marie-Hélène Torres, and Walter Carlos Costa, eds. *Dicionário de tradutores literários no Brasil (DITRA)*. Núcleo de Pesquisas em Literatura e Tradução (NUPLITT). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC). Web. 30 June 2015.
- Guillermoprieto, Alma. “Introduction.” *The Book of Lamentations*. By Rosario Castellanos. Trans. Esther Allen. New York: Marsilio Publishing, 1996. Print.
- Gutiérrez, Norma. “‘Aproximaciones’ el exitoso adios del Jose Emilio Pacheco.” *El Informador* (2009). Web. 10 Aug 2014.
- Guzmán Moncada, Carlos Alberto. “La palabra en el desierto: José Emilio Pacheco y T.S. Eliot.” *Arrabal* 1 (1998): 243-9. Print.
- Heilbron, Johan. “Responding to Globalization: The Development of Book Translations in France and the Netherlands.” *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*. Eds Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, Daniel Simeoni. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins Translation Library, 2008. 187–199. Print.

- Helgesson, Stefan and Pieter Vermeulen, eds. "Introduction: World Literature in the Making." *Institutions of World Literature: Writing, Translation, Markets*. NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2016. 1-20. Print.
- Honig, Edwin. "Conversations with Translators, II: Octavio Paz and Richard Wilbur." *MLN* 91 (1976): 1073-98. Print.
- Jackson, K. David, ed. *Haroldo de Campos: A Dialogue with the Brazilian Concrete Poet*. Oxford: Center for Brazilian Studies, 2005. Print.
- Kovadloff, Santiago. Letter to Ángel Rama. 25 November 1978. TS. Folder 56. *Obra escogida* by Mário de Andrade. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- Kristal, Efraim. *Invisible Work: Borges and Translation*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2002. Print.
- . "Jorge Luis Borges y Octavio Paz: Poéticas de la traducción y traducción poética." *Studi Ispanici* 5 (2002): 261–270. Print.
- . "Philosophical/Theoretical Approaches to Translation." In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, eds. Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014, 28-40. Print.
- Lispector, Clarice, trans. *Historias extraordinárias de Allan Poe. Selecionados e reescritos por Clarice Lispector*. By Edgar Allan Poe. 15th Edition. Rio de Janeiro: Ediouro Publicações, 1998. Print.
- Loanda, Fernando Ferreira de, ed. *Antologia da nova poesia brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Livros de Portugal, 1965.
- . *Panorama da nova poesia brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Editorial Orfeu, 1951. Print.
- . *Poemas*. Luanda: União dos Escritores Angolenos, 1982.

- López, Kimberle. "Modernismo and the Ambivalence of the Postcolonial Experience: Cannibalism, Primitivism, and Exoticism in Mário de Andrade's *Macunaíma*." *Luso-Brazilian Review* 35: 1 (1998), 25-38. Print.
- Lopez, Têlé Porto Anaconda. "Traduções de *Macunaíma*." In Andrade, *Macunaíma*, Livros Técnicos e Científicos, 407-15. Print.
- Mata, Rodolfo. "Haroldo de Campos y Octavio Paz: del diálogo creativo a la mediación institucional." *Anuario de estudios latinoamericanos*. Mexico, 2001. Web. Aug 24, 2014.
- . "Hispanoamérica desde Brasil: Entrevista con el poeta y crítico Haroldo de Campos." In *De la razón antropofágica y otros ensayos*. Selección, traducción, y prólogo de Rodolfo Mata. México D.F.: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 2000. 205-26. Print.
- Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift. The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Trans. W.D. Halls. Forward by Mary Douglas. New York: W. W. Norton, 1990. Print.
- Melo, Alfredo Cesar. "Macunaíma: entre a crítica e o elogio à transculturação." *Hispanic Review* 78: 2 (2010), 205-27. Print.
- Mignolo, Walter. *The Idea of Latin America*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. Print.
- . and Freya Schiwy. "Transculturation and the Colonial Difference: Double Translation." In *Translation and Ethnography: The Anthropological Challenge of Intercultural Understanding*, eds. Tullio Maranhão and Bernhard Streck. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 2003, 3-29. Print.
- Miller, Martha LaFollette. "The Ambivalence of Power: Self-Disparagement in the Newspaper Editorials of Rosario Castellanos." *Reinterpreting the Spanish American Essay: Women Writers of the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Ed. Doris Meyer. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995. 167-76. Print.

- Milton, John. "Literary Translation Theory in Brazil." *Meta: journal des traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal* 41.2 (1996): 196-207. Print.
- . and Paul Bandia, eds. *Agents of Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2009. Print.
- Milton, Heloisa Costa. "Macunaíma no reino hispânico (A propósito de tradução)." *Revista de Letras* 33 (1993), 55-70. Print.
- Monteiro, Júlio César Neves. "As duas vidas de um conto de Clarice Lispector em espanhol." *Revista Cerrados* 16.24 (2007): 273-8. Print.
- Moreira, Paulo. *Literary and Cultural Relations Between Brazil and Mexico: Deep Undercurrents*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Print.
- Moser, Benjamin. *Why This World: A Biography of Clarice Lispector*. Oxford, New York: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.
- Moura da Silva, Márcia. "Análise da tradução de termos indígenas em Macunaíma de Mário de Andrade na tradução de Héctor Olea para o espanhol." Diss. Florianópolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, 2009. Print.
- Munguía, Enrique, trans. "'El páramo' de T.S. Eliot." Introducción y traducción de Enrique Munguía. *Contemporáneos: Primer número de poesía* 26-7 (1930): 7-32. Print.
- Negrín, Edith y Álvaro Ruiz Abreu, eds. *Pasión por la palabra: Homenaje a José Emilio Pacheco*. Mexico D.F.: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 2013. Print.
- Nerval, Gérard de. *The Chimeras*. Trans. Peter Jay. Essays by Richard Holmes and Peter Jay. Redding Ridge, CT: Black Swan Books, 1984. Print.
- Nóbrega, Thelma Medici and John Milton. "The Role of Haroldo and Augusto de Campos in Bringing Translation to the Fore of Literary Activity in Brazil." Milton and Bandia, 257-

79. Print.

Nolasco, Edgar César. "Clarice Lispector Tradutora." *Revista Cerrados* 16.24 (2007): 263-72.

Print.

O'Connell, Joanna. *Prospero's Daughter: The Prose of Rosario Castellanos*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995. Print.

Olea, Héctor. Letter to Ángel Rama. 11 November 1978. TS. Folder 84. *Obra escogida* by Oswald de Andrade. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.

---. "Posfacio." In Andrade, *Macunaíma*, Seix Barral, 237-66. Print.

Ortega y Gasset, José. "The Misery and the Splendor of Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader. First Edition*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2000. Print. 49-63.

Ortiz, Oscar Rodríguez, ed. *30 años de Biblioteca Ayacucho (1974-2004)*. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho, 2004. Print.

---. Memo to Alfredo Chacón. 23 October 2001. TS. Folder 47. *Arte y arquitectura del modernismo brasileño: 1917-1930*. Ed. Aracy Amaral. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.

Oser, Lee. "Coming to Terms with 'Four Quartets.'" *A Companion to T. S. Eliot*. Ed. David E. Chinitz. Chichester, U.K.; Malden, MA : Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. Print. 216-27.

Oviedo, José Miguel. "José Emilio Pacheco: La poesía como 'Ready-Made'" *Hispanamérica* 5.15 (1976): 39-55. Print.

Pacheco, José Emilio. *Aproximaciones*. Ed. Miguel Angel Flores. Mexico: Editorial Penélope, 1984. Print.

---. *Ayer es nunca jamás*. Caracas: Monte Ávila Editores, 1978, Print.

---. *El reposo del fuego*. Mexico D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1966. Print.

---. *Irás y no volverás*. México D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1973. Print.

- . *Los elementos de la noche*. Mexico D.F.: UNAM, 1963. Print.
- . *No me preguntes cómo pasa el tiempo (Poemas 1964-1968)*. México D.F.: Joaquín Mortiz, 1969. Print.
- . *Siglo pasado (Decenlace). Poemas 1999-2000*. Mexico D.F.: Biblioteca Era, 2000. Print.
- . *Tarde o temprano. 1ª edición*. México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1980. Print.
- . *Tarde o temprano: poemas 1958-2009. 4ª edición*. Ed. Ana Clavel. México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2009. Print.
- Passos, José Luiz. *Ruínas de linhas puras: quatro ensaios em torno a Macunaíma*. São Paulo: Annablume, 1998. Print.
- Paz, Octavio. *The Collected Poems of Octavio Paz: 1957-1987*. Ed. Eliot Weinberger. Trans. Eliot Weinberger, Elizabeth Bishop, Paul Blackburn, Lysander Kemp, Denise Levertov, John Frederick Nims, and Charles Tomlinson. New York: New Directions, 1987. Print.
- . "Elizabeth Bishop, or the Power of Reticence." *Elizabeth Bishop & Her Art*. Eds. Lloyd Schwartz and Sybil P. Estess. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983. 211-13. Print.
- . *El laberinto de la soledad*. Ed. Enrico Mario Santí. Madrid: Cátedra, 1998. Print.
- . *Los hijos del limo; del romanticismo a la vanguardia*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1974. Print.
- . *Obras completas. Vols. 11 and 12. Obra poética I and II*. Edición del autor. Mexico D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1994. Print.
- . *Sunstone. Piedra de sol*. Trans. Eliot Weinberger. New York: New Directions, 1991. Print.
- . *The Siren & the Seashell and Other Essays on Poets and Poetry*. Trans. Lysander Kemp and Margaret Sayers Peden. Austin & London: University of Texas Press, 1976. Print. 173-9.
- . *Traducción: literatura y literalidad*. Barcelona: Tusquets Editor, 1971. Print.

- . *Versiones y diversiones. Primera edición.* México DF: Joaquín Mortiz, 1974. Print.
- . *Versiones y diversiones. Segunda edición.* México DF: Joaquín Mortiz, 1978. Print.
- . *Versiones y diversiones. Segunda edición bilingüe, revisada y aumentada.* Ed Nicanor Vélez. Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg Círculo de Lectores, 2000. Print.
- Peña, Karen. *Poetry and the Realm of the Public Intellectual: The Alternative Destinies of Gabriela Mistral, Cecilia Meireles, and Rosario Castellanos.* Leeds: LEGENDA/Modern Humanities Research Association/Maney Publishing, 2007. Print.
- Pérez, Alberto Julián. *Revolución poética y modernidad periférica.* Buenos Aires: Corrigedor, 2009. Print.
- Perloff, Marjorie. *Unoriginal Genius: Poetry by Other Means in the New Century.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2012. Print.
- Pires Vieira, Else Ribeiro. "A Postmodern Translational Aesthetics in Brazil." In *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline*, eds. Mary Snell-Hornby, Franz Pöchhacker, and Klaus Kaindl. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1994, 65-72. Print.
- . "Liberating Calibans: Readings of *Antropofagia* and Haroldo de Campos' Poetics of Transcreation." In *Postcolonial Translation Theory*, eds. Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi. London: Routledge, 1998. Print.
- Pitol, Sergio. "José Emilio Pacheco, Renacentista." *Letras Libres* 37 (2002): 34-36. Web. Nov 2 2014.
- Poe, Edgar Allan. *The Complete Stories.* Intro. by John Seelye. New York: Knopf, 1992. Print.
- . "Al Aaraaf." *The Fall of the House of Usher and Other Writings.* Ed. and Intro. David Galloway. London: Penguin Classics, 1986. 54-66. Print.

- Poniatowska, Elena. "Entrevista." With Cynthia Steele. *Hispanamérica* 18. 53-4 (1989): 89-105. Print.
- Quine, Willard Van Orman. *Word and Object*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1960. Print.
- Rama, Ángel. Letter to Antonio Candido. 20 Jan 1976. TS. Folder 56. *Obra escogida* by Mário de Andrade. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- . Letter to Aracy Amaral. 29 June 1976. TS. Folder 47. *Arte y arquitectura del modernismo brasileño: 1917-1930*. Ed. Aracy Amaral. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- . Letters to Gilda de Mello e Souza. 10 September 1976. 18 October 1976. TS. Folder 56. *Obra escogida* by Mário de Andrade. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- . Letter to Haroldo de Campos. 27 January 1976. TS. Folder 84. *Obra escogida* by Oswald de Andrade. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- . Letter to Héctor Olea. 3 October 1978. TS. Folder 56. *Obra escogida* by Mário de Andrade. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- . Letters to Santiago Kovadloff. 6 April 1978. 15. Nov 1978. TS. Folder 56. *Obra escogida* by Mário de Andrade. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- . "La Biblioteca Ayacucho como instrumento de integración cultural latinoamericana." In Ortiz, *30 años*, 63-93. Print.
- Rangel López, Asunción del Carmen. "La pulsión por el viaje de José Emilio Pacheco: su periplo al romanticismo." Diss. Universidad Autónoma de México, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas. 2011. Print.
- Reid, Alastair. "José Emilio Pacheco In Translation." *Literatura Mexicana / Mexican Literature: Papers Presented at a Conference Held November 6-7, 1992 at the University of*

- Pennsylvania Department of Romance Languages*. Ed. José Miguel Oviedo. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993. 182-9. Print.
- Resende, Beatriz. "A Formação de Identidades Plurais no Brasil Moderno." *Fronteiras Imaginadas: Cultura Nacional/Teoria Internacional*. Rio de Janeiro: Aeroplano: 2001. 83-96. Print.
- Reventos, Joan. Letter to Ángel Rama. 15 October 1976. TS. Folder 56. *Obra escogida* by Mário de Andrade. Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- Rinsler, Norma, ed. *Les Chimères*. By Gérard de Nerval. Intro. and Commentaries by Norma Rinsler. London: The Athlone Press, 1973. Print.
- Rodríguez-Alcalá, Hugo. "José Emilio Pacheco y 'La poesía que sí se entiende.'" *Hispanérica* 7.20 (1978): 45-8. Print.
- Sá, Lúcia. *Rain Forest Literatures: Amazonian Texts and Latin American Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004. Print.
- Sánchez-Prado, Ignacio M. "The Pre-Columbian Past as a Project: Miguel León-Portilla and Hispanism." *Ideologies of Hispanism*. Ed. Mabel Moraña. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2005. Print. 40-61.
- Sapiro, Gisèle. "Translation and Symbolic Capital in the Era of Globalization: French Literature in the United States." *Cultural Sociology* (2015): 1-27. Web. 19 Nov 2015.
- Schwarz, Roberto. "Misplaced Ideas: Literature and Society in Late-Nineteenth-Century Brazil." *Misplaced Ideas: Essays on Brazilian Culture*. Ed. and Intro. by John Gledson. London/New York: Verso, 1992. 19-32. Print.
- Segura Estrella, Sergio. "José Emilio Pacheco y los elementos de la escritura." *Tema y variaciones*. 21 (2003): 297-312. Print.

- Sharp, Corona. “‘The Unheard Music:’ T.S. Eliot’s ‘Four Quartets’ and John of the Cross.”
University of Toronto Quarterly 51.3 (1982): 264-278. Print.
- Shaw, Donald L. *Spanish American Poetry After 1950: Beyond the Vanguard*. Woodbridge:
 Tamesis, 2008. Print.
- Silva, José Asunción. *Obra poética. Nueva edición, corregida y aumentada*. Ed. Jesús Munárriz.
 Intro. by María Carranza. Madrid: Hiperión, 2002. Print.
- Sloterdijk, Peter. *Rage and Time. A Psychopolitical Investigation*. Trans. Mario Wenning. New
 York: Columbia University Press, 2010. Print.
- . “What does a human have that he can give away? An Interview with Peter Sloterdijk by
 Sjoerd van Tuinen.” Trans. Sebastian Olma. *Giving and Taking: Antidotes to a Culture of
 Greed*. Eds. Jake Brouwer and Sjoerd van Tuinen. Rotterdam, Netherlands: V2
 Publishing, 2014. 8-25. Print.
- Soto-Duggan, Lilvia. “Realidad de papel: Máscaras y voces en la poesía de José Emilio
 Pacheco.” *INTI, Revista de literatura hispánica* 18-19 (1983-4): 245-69. Print.
- Souza, Gilda de Mello e. “Prólogo. El tupí y el laúd” and “Notas a Macunaíma.” In Andrade,
Obra escogida, ix-lvi; 113-49. Print.
- . Letter to Ángel Rama. 7 October 1976. TS. Folder 56. *Obra escogida* by Mário de Andrade.
 Biblioteca Ayacucho Archive.
- Stanton, Anthony. *Inventores de tradición: Ensayos sobre poesía mexicana moderna*. Mexico
 D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1998. Print.
- Tobler, Stefan. “Haroldo de Campos: Poet and Theorist of a Unified Field in Literary
 Translation.” *Thinking Translation: Perspectives from Within and Without*. Eds. Rebecca
 Hyde Parker and Karla Guadarrama García. Boca Raton: Brown Walker Press, 2008.

195-206. Print.

Tymoczko, Maria. "Cultural Hegemony and the Erosion of Translation Communities." A Companion to Translation Studies. Eds. Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014. 165-78. Print.

Vendler, Helen. *Last Looks, Last Books: Stevens, Plath, Lowell, Bishop, Merrill*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011. Print.

Venuti, Lawrence. "The Poet's Version; or, An ethics of translation." *Translation Studies* 4.2 (2011): 230-47. Print.

Verani, Hugo J., ed. *La hoguera y el viento: José Emilio Pacheco ante la crítica*. Mexico D.F.: Ediciones Era, 1993. Print.

---. "José Emilio Pacheco: La voz complementaria." *Revista de Critica Literaria Latinoamericana* 24.47 (1998): 281-92. Print.

Weiner, Annette B. *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992. Print.

Williams, William Carlos. *Veinte poemas*. Trans. and Prologue by Octavio Paz. México D.F.: El Colegio Nacional / Ediciones Era, 2008. Print.

Words Without Borders, eds. "(In)verse: Poets Translate Each Other." Participants: Flávia Rocha, Idra Novoy, Melcion Mateu, and Rowan Ricardo Phillips. Web. 27 April 2016.

Young, Robert J. C. "Philosophy in Translation." *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Eds. Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014. 41-53. Print.

Zanetti, Susana Emilce. "Traducciones, versiones y homenajes en la poesía de José Emilio Pacheco." *Orbis Tertius* 15.16 (2010). Web. Nov 10 2014.