Introduction

> artwork basketwork brainwork breastwork bridgework brushwork
> busywork casework cementwork checkerwork clockwork counter-
> work craftwork crownwork cutwork donkeywork earthwork fancy-
> work fieldwork firework footwork framework fretwork grillwork
> groundwork guesswork handiwork handwork headwork homework
> hotwork housework internetwork interwork lacework lathwork latti-
> cework legwork lifework masterwork meshwork metalwork needle-
> work network openwork outwork overwork panelwork paperwork
> patchwork plasterwork presswork rework ropework schoolwork
> sheetwork spadework stuccowork subnetwork teamwork timberwork
> trelliswork trestlework waterwork waxwork webwork wickerwork
> witchwork wonderwork woodwork work
>
> It has been repeatedly intimated that there is a difference between the
> art product (statue, painting or whatever), and the *work* of art.
> The first is physical and potential; the latter is active and experienced.
> It is what the product does, its working.
>
> <div align="right">(Dewey, 2005, 168)</div>

This book, through its title, affirms, albeit accidentally, a solidarity with
Derek Attridge's *The Work of Literature* (2015), divergent though some
of our understandings are made by differences of objective. I say 'acci-
dentally' because I had settled on my title some years before I heard of
the imminent publication of Attridge's admirable work. Among the
views and positions adopted by Attridge, there are many with which
I wholeheartedly concur: his sympathies with that experiential aesthetics
called 'pragmatist', growing out of the work of John Dewey; his account
of the artwork as a dynamic, an 'act-event'; his proposition that it is
reading which transforms a text into a work, a reading dependent on the
situatedness of the reader, with all its concomitant shifts and revisions;
his highlighting of 'the somatic dimension of literary response'; and his
timely periodic reminders that any singular use of the word 'culture' will

1

lead to dangerous misapprehensions and unjustified argumentative convenience: 'To say that an artist works within, and upon, a particular culture, and that the reader reads within a particular culture, is to simplify a highly complex situation: any individual participates in a variety of overlapping cultures, none of which is stable, all of which are themselves internally divided' (Attridge, 2015, 182). But my concern is with translation rather than literary criticism, and that inevitably entails that our views and preoccupations occasionally diverge.

I have, in recent years, been pursuing the argument that translation should attend more to the phenomenology of reading than it should to the interpretation of texts (Scott, 2012a, 2012b). Translation is an exploration, palpation and inscription into the source text (ST), of readerly consciousness, and this involves not only finding a form adequate to that consciousness – a search which, for me, covers the gamut from free verse (Scott, 2000), in the wake of Yves Bonnefoy's practice, to different kinds of tabular and multi-medial disposition – but also wresting translation from the monopoly of the monoglot reader (with its narrow constraints of fidelity and reliability) and retrieving it for a polyglot reader, able to read the ST.

For Attridge, the otherness/alterity that a work of literature introduces into our experience is a paramount criterion of value. In my account it may seem as if the purpose of reading is, on the contrary, the 'un-othering' of the text and its integration into one's own consciousness. But what I intend is a pursuit of self-enquiry and self-discovery by the reader. Literature is something which constantly calls up, reorganizes, invests with new value, elements that are virtual within us. This, then, is a difference of emphasis more than of kind. What is more properly different is the fact that translation requires us to go beyond the 'willed/active passivity' or 'exposure' (Attridge, 2015, 2–4) of reception, and to reinvent the ST's inventiveness, knowing that it cannot be the same, that we must capture it in a new dimension, or frankly displace or relocate it. Besides, the notions of inventiveness and the other will themselves have another dimension: as translators, our encounter with a foreign language has nothing to do with 'pleasurable exoticism', but with a profound perceptual otherness; we would be unwise to call this particular 'otherness' cultural, since we so easily inhabit it, more acutely perhaps than native speakers. This begins to sound like the *inevitable* inventiveness of the foreign (non-literary, purely linguistic) rather than of the literary, but like the literary it is the bringing out of the language of language, and is integral to the effects achieved by any literary writing.

My concern with translation also means that I must find alien the confidence of Attridge's evaluative orientations, his ability to identify better readers, his sense of an order which justifies taxonomies and hierarchies of achievement, and which thus usually ensures that the inputs of institutional scholarship are benign and enhancing. Translation is unavoidably transformative, restores literary making to flux, melting or diversifying categorial boundaries, reinventing the processes of reading, expecting that each new version of a ST will re-position us, throwing into question the methods and knowledges that institutional practice might regard as maximally appropriate. Where, for Attridge, it is 'in responding to the handling of form that the reader of a literary work brings it into being as literature' (Attridge, 2015, 267), translation is, for me, in its search for literariness, hostile to achieved form and is concerned with *composing* the decomposition of the ST, by metamorphosis and/or by montage (see Chapter 4), that is, by continuous formal variation and/or by the repeated disaggregation of form into assembled, volatile fragments.

Finally, translation means that my conception of performance differs from Attridge's. For Attridge, performance is the mode of access to the literariness of the literary work; as readers we perform the work in order that it may realize its own inventiveness, as part of our responsibility to and for it: 'What I'm making happen is the work's *own* singular performance' (Attridge, 2015, 221); and it is this performance that creates that slight *décalage* between the work and, precisely, what it performs, what it enacts and puts 'on show', in the mode of 'as if' (Attridge, 2015, 222, 266). For me as translator, on the other hand, performance no longer belongs entirely to the ST. It is part of the translation of the linguistic towards the paralinguistic, of the textual towards the scansional, of the read towards the compositional; in short, performance smooths the way between the ST and target text (TT), since it performs not only the ST in the TT, but also the reader/translator in the TT; and, in this latter sense, it is the instrument or agent of the reader/translator's participation in the *making* of translation.

In Attridge's usage, the 'work' of his title is not the finished product alone, the literary text, the linguistic object; it is the labour put into it by the poet, the work of creation, and it is the work of reception, the transformation of the text in the mind of the reader into a work, a significant change of status, since it confers authoredness, 'event-fulness', experiential value, literariness. I very much share Attridge's desire to reverse Roland Barthes's privileging of text over work, in 'De l'œuvre au texte' ([1971]1984a), although my motives are not identical (see pp. 4–5 below).

But it is also true that my ambitions for the connotations of 'work' inevitably have a slightly larger purview.

The first of my epigraphs at the start of this chapter may seem rather odd, but it helps me to explain what that purview is. In these compounds the –work element moves in two underlying directions: it is the effort to create something, caught *in the midst of* its activity, that is, open-ended and never completed, infinitive (footwork, spadework); and it is a structure suggesting a weave or interlacing (wickerwork, meshwork, trelliswork). Sometimes it is difficult to be certain which of these alternatives applies (lacework, ironwork, fancywork). This list of –work compounds is by no means complete, and I would certainly want to argue, as I have argued elsewhere (Scott, 2012a, 3–4), for the inclusion of 'translationwork':

> When I speak of a work of art (*œuvre d'art*), the two nouns are mutually enhancing: the art is more art because it has achieved a certain 'workdom'; the work has a greater self-sufficiency because it has achieved the status of art. In this work, there is no more work to be done. An artwork (*travail d'art*) is a completely different matter: it is rather nondescript, as if the label had been chosen because no other label (painting, sculpture, etc.) had been quite suitable, or was sufficiently rough, ragged, uncertain. But the –work compound has its advantages: it designates a work which might be plural in the materials it uses, which is never sure if it is finished, which is generically hybrid, which is not easily circumscribed in any sense. The –work compound reveals a resistance to assimilation, the search for something which cannot be described, is mobile, elusive, taxonomically and interpretatively awkward. It is also a characteristic of the –work to be in continual negotiation with the idea of art. If I say 'photowork' rather than 'photograph', I am casting doubt on the aesthetic confidence of the central medium, photography. So, what then would it mean to undertake a translationwork rather than a translation?
>
> The notion of work as *travail* is central to the thinking of Roland Barthes. It is an integral part of the Text's refusal to be a Work, to be a closed configuration of meaning. Instead, work cultivates the plural, defers the signified and constantly interferes with the signifying process: 'le Texte ne s'éprouve que dans un travail, une production' (Barthes, 1984a, 73) (the Text is experienced only in a work, a production). Elsewhere, Barthes confronts the meaning of *travail* more squarely:
>
>> D'autre part, cette même exploration métaphorique devrait être menée sur le mot *travail* (qui, en fait, bien plus que *signifié*, est le vrai corrélat de *signifiant*) … je l'analyse comme suit: associé au problème du texte, il s'entend dans l'acception que lui a donnée Julia Kristeva, de *travail pré-sens*: travail hors du sens, de l'échange, du calcul, dans la dépense, le jeu; je crois que c'est cette direction qu'il

faut explorer; encore faudrait-il prévenir certaines connotations: éliminer complètement l'idée du *travail-peine*, et peut-être se priver . . . de la métonymie qui donne à tout travail la caution prolétarienne. (Barthes, 1984b, 95–6)

Secondly, this same metaphorical exploration should be carried out on the word *work* (which is, in fact, much more so than *signified*, the true correlative of *signifier*) . . . I analyse it as follows: in connection with the problematics of text, it is to be understood in the sense given it by Julia Kristeva, of *pre-semantic work*: work outside meaning, outside exchange, outside calculation, in outlay of energy, in game; this, I think, is the direction to be explored; one would, however, need to pre-empt certain connotations: to eliminate completely the idea of *work-effort* and perhaps exclude . . . the metonymy by which all work is endowed with a proletarian guarantee.

As the first of the Barthesian quotations here makes clear, translationwork belongs, rather confusingly, to his notion of the text, rather than to his notion of the work; that is, translationwork is subversive of boundaries and categories, is interested in the mechanisms of language rather than the results of composition, disseminating the signifier and the authorial presence that might lie behind it, deferring the signified, producing the plural of meaning, residing in an inevitable intertextuality, reducing the distance between reading and writing to a minimum. But while happily assenting to all this, I want to reclaim 'work' for translationwork in two further senses: (a) translation is text, yes, but it also turns text into work, i.e. something not with an author, but with self-multiplying authors, something which is an ongoing, cumulative project, something which is constantly outgrowing its textuality and thus outgrowing the ST, understood as that which justifies it and to which it is subservient; the ST becomes more means than end; (b) translation is struggling to establish itself as an alternative literature, with alternative understandings of what the literary is and with alternative visions of literature's relation to the other media/arts and to its physical support, the page.

The second epigraph at the start of this chapter not only aligns my own thinking with that of John Dewey's so-called Pragmatist aesthetics (see Shusterman, 1992), but also allows me to insist that translationwork includes the work of translation, a process of working on a text (ST) which is a working on an audience, so that the translation itself is more agent than object, not the transfer of a text from one language to another, but the conversion of a responsive energy through a creative energy into the trigger of another responsive energy. In translation, a text is a conduit,

a working more than a work. As we have already intimated, this working is very much to do with the body, with somatic response, an engagement of the body in the ST such that it can inform the production of the TT.[1]

There is a further way in which I would like to think of the work of literary translation, namely fieldwork. Fieldwork, too, is intended as a conduit, but the translation it undertakes, from interviewing members of the indigenous community, observing, collecting, to summarizing account, is, in the standard critique, an erasure of dialogue by monologue, of the contingent, changing and circumstantial by patterns of coherence and confirmation, by a closed semiotic system of behaviour and symbolism. How exactly should one conduct a translational fieldwork, a fieldwork of the multicultural, heterogeneous and mutable, a fieldwork of genuine interlocutory exchange?

If it is standard practice, after Malinowski, to describe fieldwork as participant observation, where the word-order is significant, shifting from the interlocutory to the descriptive, from the nominative/vocative to the accusative, the task of the translational fieldworker is to reverse that order, to make of translation not an account of the encounter with the ST after the event, but the encounter-in-action, the interlocution between *an* I and *a* you, not a treatment of *the* it (where the distinction between the indefinite article and the definite article is crucial). As this happens, translation necessarily impurifies itself. By that I mean that 'scientific' conclusions are invaded by autobiography, by fictional embroideries, by the projections of the listening/reading consciousness. Reading itself is the multiplication of the raw experiences of the reader thanks to the trigger of the text. It is as if the potential achievedness of the text, its coherence as a textual community so to speak, were being undone by the need to restore interlocution. And this restored interlocution includes the transnational and transmedial currents that texts are traversed by. This is not a case of special cases, like refugee camps, migrant communities, exophonic writing, diasporic writing; it is a case of all cases; because even supposing these traversals were not evident in a text, they are inevitably brought to a text by its readers, usually in the form of some comparative or inter-medial response.

Can translation, then, look towards a methodology? Or is part of the work of translation to resist methodologies? The question of methodology is integral to translation studies' ability to constitute itself as a discipline. We are familiar with the strategies available for this process of 'disciplinarization': Gideon Toury's *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995), for example, is preoccupied with the development of a categorial

terminology, with structured flows of activity, with degrees of representa-
tiveness, with regularities of behaviour/norms, with translation's systemic
position; his empirical approach has as its objectives models, averages,
probabilities, the construction of a history, the development of practical
methodologies grounded in theory.[2] What emerges is a certain orthodoxy
vested with academic authority and legitimization; henceforward, the
subject has a language for being thought (see, for example, Munday,
2001, and subsequent editions). What further consolidates the orthodoxy
is a system of scholarly reference, preferably self-limiting but necessarily
historically cumulative, and this system of reference is in its turn endorsed
by pedagogical aids: introductions to, companions to, encyclopaedias and
dictionaries of. But the more that the discipline acquires this kind of
substance, the more it is likely to be constipated by it, and the more the
substance acts as an implicit form of censorship (the exclusion of the
heterodox). I look upon my own model of translation as heterodox, not
to say heretical. The reasons are clear: the favouring of the polyglot reader
above the monoglot reader, the paginal above the textual, the tabular above
the linear, the paralinguistic above the linguistic, the multilingual above
the bilingual, the multi-medial above the verbal. But my quarrel is not so
much with any present orthodoxy as with the attitudes that make the
construction of an orthodoxy necessary in the first place. Like comparative
literature, translation is not so much a discipline as a natural activity of the
reading mind. It may have to be a discipline for institutional purposes, but
in becoming so, it only creates problems for itself: how to speak to other
disciplines (interdisciplinarity), how to reconcile different mind-models
(critical/creative), how to justify itself (relevance, outreach, transferability).
The notion of indiscipline might be as attractive for translationwork as for
comparative literature (see Ferris, 2006). In writing this book, I have
sought to do bibliographical justice to the estimable and insightful work
done in translation studies, but I have also wanted to imply that too much
valuable translational writing lies beyond the borders of the anglophone
canon, and, more crucially, that translation should look elsewhere, to an
alternative, lateral bibliography, if it is to replenish its thinking.

Much of translation's need to imagine itself as a discipline might be
attributed to its devotion to the single version (fairest of fair copies)
designed for the monoglot reader. I have elsewhere expressed my concerns
about the aesthetic and ethical shortcomings of a translation practice
designed for the monoglot reader (Scott, 2012a, 15–17); I want here to
mention three further shortcomings, which threaten to jeopardize the
broad ambitions for literary translation outlined in this book. The first of

these relates to an observation made by Alberto Giacometti in an interview with André Parinaud: 'Les signes, même les signes du passé, ne se stabilisent jamais. Ils surgissent, ils disparaissent. On croit qu'il y a des œuvres d'art qui ont acquis une stabilité; ce n'est pas vrai' (Giacometti, 1990, 276) (Signs, even signs from the past, never achieve stability. They erupt into existence, they disappear. People believe that there are works of art which have acquired a stability; it's not true). Clearly those notions which must play a considerable role in translations for the monoglot reader – fidelity, reliability, equivalence – can only come into operation with texts reckoned to have achieved stability at the point of translation (even if of a temporary kind). But texts are constantly traversed by change, changes in the way they are perceived (by different readers at different times) and in the uses to which they are put. It is only translation for the polyglot reader (who can already 'possess' what is mercurial in the ST) that can engage with change and itself become the agent of change. This last claim might be put more unequivocally: translation is not about preserving the ST, but about releasing the ST's (potential) volatility, about setting the ST in motion.

The second shortcoming derives from elements of Mary Louise Pratt's definition, in an ethno-colonial context, of a 'contact zone', as 'an attempt to invoke the spatial and temporal copresence of subjects previously separated by geographic and historical disjunctures, and whose trajectories now intersect' (Pratt, 1992, 7). The term 'contact zone' is designed to capture 'the interactive, improvisational dimensions' of these encounters.[3] If the dialogue between ST and TT might be described as a contact zone, it is one that the monoglot reader cannot inhabit. Indeed, quite the contrary: by deferring to the demands of the monoglot reader, there is every likelihood that far from generating contact zones through translation, the translator will, unwittingly perhaps, perpetuate visions of the frontier between languages, that is, a barrier to be crossed rather than a shared space to be occupied. The notion of frontier, in its turn, implies cultural boundaries, cultural retrenchment, non-developmental relationships, circumscribed language-systems.[4]

Relatedly, and third, one might claim that the notion of frontier also tends to reinforce a static view of the native, an image of spaces of dwelling, of opposed geographical positions, and in this sense translation – and I mean particularly literary translation – in the face of complex patterns of diasporic dispersal and global communication technologies, takes on a rather anachronistic look. Elsewhere in the translational world, these factors are an active element in translational consciousness. Translation is itself an act of diasporic dispersal, of sending the ST on transcultural/

transnational journeys; not, that is, a process of domestication, of drawing a text into a culture and naturalizing it, as an immigrant, as something which has taken the decision to stay, but rather sending the ST out as an exophonic text, in a guise that might coincide with any one of a range of diasporic manifestations: guest-worker, expatriate, exile, fugitive, refugee, traveller, economic migrant. And we may stop to wonder whether translation has not only given the ST a diasporic range, but has also, as the TT/TL, given *itself* a diasporic mission, projecting itself out of its territory and into an international marketplace of multiplying ethnicities, as an agent in the development of complex intercultural formations. At all events, it is one of the purposes of this book to ensure that the literary translational project should not be held to ransom by the monoglot reader, even though translation for the monoglot reader remains an indispensable service in translational practice. Our whole argument is that translation must free itself from the stranglehold of translation for the monoglot reader if it is to realize its true potentialities in a range of fields.

I have argued elsewhere (Scott, 2014) that what I seek is not so much a theory of translation as a philosophy of translation. Translation is not primarily a periodic exercise of skills, nor a profession, though it may also be these things, but rather the pursuit of particular kinds of knowledge and self-knowledge, the knowledges that derive from reading, knowledges that we must learn how to write, in the practice of translation. Translation does not *use* knowledge (history, dictionary, thesaurus); it *comes to* knowledge. Translation is not an objective, something that one can repeatedly be done with when completed, something that works itself out in a (re)solution. Translation is a mode of literary being through which one engages, in translation-specific ways, with epistemology, with ecology, with ethnography/anthropology, with the relationship between language and perception, with the relationship between the written and the oral, with the relationship between languages and between literatures, with aesthetics. Translation, then, is a weighty undertaking; the translator, in addressing the varied challenges of individual texts is always equally addressing the fortunes and future of translation not only as a medium, or art, but also as an agent of consciousness and being-in-the-world.

One of the purposes of this book, then, particularly in Parts I and II, is to expand that neglected context of argument, to give an idea of what larger issues are in play in translation. Of course, any translation sets out to give an account of a specific ST, but the translation of an ST is also the ground on which translation, as a literary mode and as a philosophy of language, acts out what it sees as its linguistic field of operation and as its distinctive

literary role. If this seems to imply some diminution of (respect for) the ST, in the interests of what translation wants to put at stake, then, given that the polyglot reader can be reckoned to fully possess the ST as it is, whatever the vagaries of its after-life, we should not allow an overdeveloped concern for the inviolability of the ST to put limits on the ambitions of translation. This crucial distinction, between the ST as text to be translated and the ST as a diagnostic instance of the creative process which informs translation, is too often overlooked. Part III returns to a consideration of the linguistic and typographical means of translation, the languages of the page rather than of the text, in an attempt to head off arguments about 'tricks' and 'effects' and to bring some understanding of what kinds of expressive resource visual paralanguages might put at our disposal.

This book has, therefore, a differentially weighted three-part structure, and both macrocosmic and microcosmic ambitions. Part I (Thinking One's Way into Translation: Concepts and Readings) is a sequence of twelve sections of varying length, reflecting on concepts and issues central to translation and to translation as work, principally through a critique of certain chosen texts.[5] This is not to imply that there is a range of canonical critical texts that any thinking about translation must address, but merely to initiate a series of open-ended discussions on a selection of topics designed to help me towards an argumentative position and a practice. No act of translation has any real value unless it opens up questions about its own assumptions, about the nature of language and linguistic relationships, about languages' ability to travel, about how it should engage with alterity and how participate in what I want to call an oceanic anthropology.[6]

Part II (Translation among the Disciplines) is devoted to the extensions of literary translation into wider conceptual environments, and its first two chapters are partly informed by Tim Ingold's anthropological thinking. What is peculiarly sympathetic to my own persuasions in Ingold's approach is the phenomenological spirit of his particular brand of anthropology, its attention to the basic functions of human living, its emphasis on the relational as against the constructed, on psycho-physiological engagement as against cognitivism and conceptualism, and its declared affinities with the philosophical preoccupations of Henri Bergson, Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Gilles Deleuze, a triumvirate to whom my own argumentative positions continue to owe much. Chapter 1 proposes that translation should be instrumental in deepening the reader's environmental engagement, in three senses: in a fuller inhabitation of the environment presented by the ST; in the better understanding of language itself as an

ecology; and in doing proper justice to the environment, the 'outside world', of the act of reading. These propositions involve our thinking about linguistic biodiversity and about hunter-gathering as an appropriate model of translational practice, and are worked through in translations of Stéphane Mallarmé's 'Mes bouquins refermés sur le nom de Paphos' and Arthur Rimbaud's 'Au Cabaret-Vert'. Chapter 2 considers the danger of treating language as the source of ethnic and cultural identity and explores ways in which translation might counter such tendencies, through polyvocal arrangements, by cultivating nomadism, and by elaborating processes of becoming rather than of being, objectives exemplified in translations of lines from Guillaume Apollinaire's 'Les Soupirs du servant de Dakar', and in three French translations of lines from Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. Chapter 3 examines the difference between a comparative literature of literary history and a comparative literature of the reading mind, particularly as this latter reflects the new perceptual and epistemological habits of a post-historical and digital age. Given its preoccupation with the phenomenology of reading, translation needs to develop means adequate to the post-historical, and what these might entail is assessed in a study of Tom Paulin's translation of André Chénier's 'On vit; on vit infâme. Eh bien? Il fallut l'être' and of varied translations of Goethe's 'Über allen Gipfeln'. Chapter 4 suggests ways in which aesthetics fails translation, particularly in its habit of privileging qualities of formal stability, organicity and wholeness, and how that failure might be put right: by promoting a blend of metamorphosis and montage as the appropriate aesthetic for translation; by more intimately allying the sub-aesthetic to the aesthetic; and by formulating an aesthetic of the dynamic. These arguments are pursued through translations of a passage from Colette's *La Vagabonde*, lines from Blaise Cendrars's 'Tour' and the first line of Mallarmé's 'Victorieusement fui le suicide beau'.

Part III (The Paginal Art of Translation) aims to complete a project which has busied me from the outset of my work in literary translation: a poetics of the translational page, where the translational page is a field of linguistic and literary energies, and also an image of readerly consciousness, of the translator's imagination. Chapter 5 opens with reflections on the variables of paginal space, and goes on to investigate the interplay of rhythm and margin in the translation of a paragraph of Charles Baudelaire's prose-poem 'Les Veuves'. Rhythm is inevitably the common denominator of all these practical enquiries into textual unfolding in space and time, and in Chapter 6 it is an intimate companion of the vagaries and possibilities of punctuational language as explored in translations of

a stanza from Alphonse de Lamartine's 'Le Vallon' and Rimbaud's 'Le
Dormeur du val'. Chapter 7 is devoted to the translational complicities of
rhythm and typeface in their undoing and diversification of cultural
assumptions, in their re-engineering of spatial and temporal principles
and of what translation can consequently make available in the way of
cultural alternatives; here the textual materials are Paul Verlaine's
'Mandoline' and lines from Thomas Kinsella's 'Finistère'. All these chap-
ters (5, 6 and 7) have, as a bearing leitmotif, the argument that translation
should be a re-imagined version of scansion, and Chapter 8 addresses this
proposition directly. It considers literary scansion's potential affinities with
modern dance notation and avant-garde musical scores and suggests that
translation-as-scansion might pursue similar objectives. This idea is put to
the test in a translation of A. E. Housman's 'Into my heart an air that kills'.
The Conclusion sets out from the assertion that translation composes the
decomposition of the ST, and goes on to explain how it prefers under-
standing to intelligibility, frees a text from its own culture and resists the
conventional notion of the Other. This is all, finally, to promote not
a postmodern version of translation but the idea that translation is con-
stitutionally postmodern.

   What, then, is our initial, working attitude towards the ST? The answer
lies perhaps in the words of Hilary Mantel. It is true that Mantel is
a novelist – where my concern is principally with poetry – and has in
mind the partnership between a living author and living translator (herself
and her Dutch translator Ine Willems), but allowing for that, one would
still endorse her words:

> It is possible for two minds to meet, and treat the translation as a new work.
> The novel then reverts to its unformed, unfinished state, as work in
> progress . . . I cannot consider a book finished when it leaves my hand.
> It must be read, translated, interpreted, and no two readers, even two readers
> who share a language, have the same experience. A great deal of the power of
> a book lies anterior to words, and beyond words. The power lies in the
> images that the word creates, each image unique to one reader and each
> image shifting, fluid, endlessly renewable. But still, I depend on the trans-
> lator for the words that will spring that image. (Mantel, 2013, 73–4)

In such circumstances, the role of the translator is difficult to imagine: to
treat the ST as something unfinished, ongoing; to write into translation the
idiosyncrasy of the individual reader, the inimitability of each reader's
experience; to translate words towards images, to translate words so that
images will be 'sprung', so that readers will be able to find and occupy their
own experiential spaces. What is particularly rewarding for me is that

Mantel's emphasis is all towards the reader, is on the translator's ability to do justice to readerly consciousness, to its eccentricities and associative privacies. Translation has for too long and too exclusively, perhaps, believed that translation is a problem of text, is about linguistic intransigences and text-inherent meanings. But a translation oriented on the reader, where the reader is the translator, will release translational practice into a capacity actively to incorporate the very consciousness which 'constructs' it, each time it is read, and thus constantly to reinvent its literary effects and effectiveness.

About Willems's translation of *A Place of Greater Safety*, Mantel has this to say:

> I feel enlightened by the discussions we have held, even though we have only been looking at the first dozen pages of the book. It is as if my unconscious assumptions are coming to light: as if the book's resources are being mined. It feels deeper than any editing process I have ever undertaken, and much more revealing. (Mantel, 2013, 75)

This quotation perhaps challenges us to question the distinction between composing and editing, writing and arranging, that we are in the habit of making. Many would argue that it is real enough: that editing is essentially an interventional act on an already existent text, possibly temporary in its aims and effects, while composing brings a new text into existence, on the understanding of its formal perpetuity. Such a distinction necessarily casts translation as an editing process. But it might equally be argued that this distinction is a false one, for two reasons: first, because the conventions of composition have changed; with the advances in recording technology, from the phonograph on through magnetic tape to digital technology, the manipulation and 'sampling' of recordings have become a commonplace of compositional techniques (see Katz, 2010). Secondly, with the burgeoning of graphic poetics, our willingness to see layout and other typographical features (typeface, punctuation, diacritical marks) as intrinsic to the activity and expressivity of linguistic material has much increased. But we must, nonetheless, add an important caveat. It might seem that our increasing sensitivity to, and acceptance of, the expressive centrality of typographical and dispositional decisions would mean that the integrity of all texts is constantly at stake, unless justice is done, with meticulous punctiliousness, to those typographical and dispositional decisions. And this would be true. But it does not entail our believing that such products depend for their effectiveness on their fixity or apartness or autonomy. The picture of the translational world that we want to generate is one in which each

translation is viewed not as a tinkering with a master-copy, nor as a second-order derivation, but as a composition, whose very coming into existence is, as with the ST before it, conditional upon its being multiplied, on its attracting variations, on its inwardly contesting, or holding in precarious tension, its own apparent finality.

Anyone who has sampled those examples of the 25,000 covers inspired by George Gershwin and DuBose Heyward's 'Summertime' (1935) reviewed in James Maycock's 2011 film 'Gershwin's "Summertime": The Song that Conquered the World', and has seen the variety of musical styles it was assimilated into – blues, rock, folk, reggae, hip-hop, soul, samba, disco, etc. – and the variety of singers and musicians who adapted it to their voices or instruments or musical traditions, will have no difficulty in understanding the aims and operations of the translational model I propose. And, as in the world of musical covers, we are used to painters and photographers undertaking creative investigations of the work of famous forebears. We are familiar with Picasso's multiple explorations of Velasquez's *Las Meniñas* (c. 1656) (forty-four paintings), of Delacroix's *Femmes d'Alger* (1834) (fifteen paintings) and of Manet's *Déjeuner sur l'herbe* (1863) (twenty-seven paintings), all with their numerous preparatory sketches, explorations which are 'laboratories of the image', pretexts for stylistic and compositional experimentation with perception (Bernadac, 2008). Similar examples are legion. We remember the 2000 National Gallery exhibition entitled *Encounters* (see Morphet, 2000), for which, among other things, Frank Auerbach transferred Constable's *The Hay Wain* (1821) to London, to *Park Village East* (1997–8), and Cy Twombly executed three studies of Turner's *Fighting Temeraire* (1838). More recently, in his home town of Montauban, Ingres's treatment at the hands of posterity has been the subject of another exhibition (see Cuzin, Salmon and Viguier-Dutheil, 2008): Francis Bacon's rendering (1983) of Ingres's *Oedipus and the Sphinx* (1808–25) was one of the exhibits, and most recently Bacon has been the subject of exhibitions at the Hermitage and the Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts devoted to his 'translations' of the masters (Geitner, Morel and Winner, 2015). There is, it seems to me, a direct homology between these translations by practising artists and translations by what we might call *practising* readers; it is just that we have no concept of the practising reader, and thus no idea what the concept might entail. To create this concept and to examine its implications are central to this book's purpose.