

Translation and Citation: Creative Entanglements

Marta Pacheco Pinto

Universidade de Lisboa

mpinto6@edu.ulisboa.pt

ORCID: 0000-0002-2043-619X

Matteo Rei

Università di Torino

matteo.rei@unito.it

ORCID: 0000-0002-3239-3553

In Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* (1988), someone asks how newness comes into the world, how it is born. Much-quoted postcolonial studies scholar Homi Bhabha (1994) promptly answered this question by bringing in the migrant experience: newness comes through migration, diaspora, displacement, intersection, and translation. Textual displacements or intersections as enabled by citation *tout court* may also play the role of introducing newness — aesthetic, literary, cultural — into an author's world or a translated text. Yet, particularly when citation serves as a work of textual memory, it may eventually preserve, sustain or re-elaborate what is already known by iterating, recycling, reframing or actualizing what is not new.

Translation and citation are two modes of intertextuality that inform the present issue. When Julia Kristeva theorized the concept of intertextuality in 1969, she expounded on the dialogic and thus relational nature of literature as an interconnected web of texts that are interwoven with one another. In her words, a text always refers to another text through the principles of appropriation and transformation: “[T]out texte se construit comme mosaïque de citations, tout texte est absorption et transformation d’un autre texte” (1969: 146). This way, a text is always a citation of a previous text. In a similar vein, Antoine Compagnon envisaged reading and writing as two sides of an act of citation; reading and (re)writing become inextricable practices of citation: “Écrire, car c’est toujours récrire, ne diffère pas de citer. La citation, grâce à la confusion métonymique à laquelle elle préside, est lecture et écriture; elle conjoint l’acte de lecture et celui d’écriture. Lire ou écrire, c’est faire acte de citation” (1979: 34). It is perhaps too commonsensical to state that all translation — as reading, writing, and rewriting — is citation. Though a mediated citation, at the very least translation embodies a previous, foreign text; as an act of textual transfer, translation presupposes a preceding text shaped in a different language, for a different target audience in a different context, without which translation would not exist. Even the cases of pseudo-translation and pseudo-originality are about a writer forging or dissimulating a citational link. Apropos Jorge Luis Borges and the idea of writing as rewriting, Compagnon argues that rewriting is “une traduction, une citation” (1979: 35). He thus parallels translation with citation and equates both with rewriting, *i.e.*, with appropriation and transformation of texts, languages, forms.

From the Latin *citare*, etymologically citation refers to the process of setting in motion, moving, just as translation, from the Latin *translatus*, means to “carry across”. Translation is therefore inhabited by dynamism, mobility, movement across languages and cultures — in a word, by citation.

As intertextual devices, citations are, as much as translation, about welcoming the other, which emerges under different guises. As the articles in this issue show, discussion of citation cannot dispense with a reflection on hospitality or foreignness. It can neither be approached outside the frame of a theory of intertextuality — from Julia Kristeva to Roland Barthes in the 1960s, from Antoine Compagnon to Gérard Genette in the 1980s. Within Genette's understanding of intertextuality as a relationship of textual co-presence whereby texts communicate and dialogue with one another (1997 [1982]: 1–2), at least three modes of intertextuality are identified, and can easily be displayed in a scale from more overt to more covert intertextuality: quoting, plagiarism, and allusion. Although these three modes of intertextuality

exemplify citation by (re)presenting a previous text, only the first two modes, which are diametrically opposed and dichotomous, are considered in this issue and illustrated with case studies. Quoting is a literal, explicit intertext that is generally typographically marked as such (via quotation marks or italics) and followed by the identification of its original author; in its quality as a foreign textual body, it activates readers' literary or cultural memory. Quoting as performing otherness poses the question of how translators deal with this kind of citationary practice when they are part of an author's creative process (e.g., Dei and Guerinicchio, 2008). By contrast, plagiarism is a covert, non-explicit, hidden citation that inevitably raises ethical challenges. It either seeks to pass off a piece of writing as one's own words or the intertextual reference may be so obviously shared between writer and reader that it dismisses any authorial attribution and becomes symbolic rather than an outrageous appropriation. When does plagiarism constitute a betrayal or a form of flattery (Horta, 2017: 254)?

As literary devices, citations — in the form of epigraphs, (direct) quotations, or references (indirect quotations) — draw attention to their own difference and unveil a text's organic nature and polyphony, in addition to highlighting writers' intimate engagement or affinities with the world outside their own. Citation materializes a foreign presence as a subtle or, on the contrary, a more obvious invasive practice resulting nonetheless from an act of hospitality, whereby a textual fragment of a foreign body is welcomed into another textual body, sometimes in quite unexpected ways.

Citing as a vehicle for conflating and promoting voices or experiences is also a common practice in the media, particularly in news writing. A phenomenon that has recently attracted attention is that of translingual quoting, which Lauri Haapanen and Daniel Perrin describe as the process of news writing when “the original discourse on which the quote is based is translated during quoting” (2019: 18). If one opens up this proposal of selecting and recontextualizing information and extends it beyond the mediatic realm, translingual citation would be about citing a text originally written in another language and interlingually translating it for citing purposes.

In keeping with translingual citation, in *Translation as Citation: Zhuangzi Inside Out* (2017), comparatist Haun Saussy follows a twofold approach to translation and citation by considering:

a series of translations that do not so much *make* an expression in the target language as *find* it (thus reversing the sequence in which the original necessarily precedes the translation), as well as renderings that do not express the original content in words that already existed in the target language, but *import* words or constructions (via loan words, calques, transliterations) directly from the source to the target language. (2017: 2–3; emphasis in the original)

Whereas the first translation mode is about the translator citing from the repertoire (lexical, phraseological, idiomatic, etc.) available in the target language, the second is about citing the source text itself, rendering foreignness visible in particular through non-translation or transliteration. Hence, the first mode favours what Lawrence Venuti (1995) has termed domestication, while the second promotes

foreignization. Ultimately translating as a labour of language is about finding a solution in the target language that readers recognize fully or in part as pertaining to their language community. In the case of retranslation, the solution that seems best may be imported from the preexisting target text to the new translation. Either way, translation is as much a fact of the target culture (Toury 2012 [1995]) as specifically of the target language. For various reasons, whether linguistic, stylistic, metrical, or fictional, it may however be necessary to resort to a direct quotation from the source repertoire. Cicero, for instance, is well known for dismissing lexical borrowings from the source language, since he sees them as an effortless solution for “translators who do not know how to express themselves”; yet this does not imply that “I should not have the right to use a Greek word whenever Latin is unable to offer an equivalent” (1992: 47). Regardless of how it is approached, translation is citational in nature. This character turns the spotlight on citation as a potential metaphor for translating, which has implications for the conceptualization of translation and authorship/translatorship.

The present issue addresses the creative entanglements between translation and citation by following a twofold approach: translation as citation and citation in translation. It is organized in three sections — articles, interviews, and reviews — that point in different but complementary directions. The five articles explore topics such as plagiarism (*verbatim*, translated or edited) as part of an author’s creative writing style and as a crucial factor in textual composition (Salomé Honório); citationality in translation as a feature of postmodern literature that travels itself in translation (Gyöngyvér Jenei); translingual citation as inextricable from a programmatic dialogue with authors from the canon (Elisa Rossi); translation, rewriting, news translation, citation, and the power to reshape geopolitics (Rita Bueno Maia); and translation as citation of domestic repertoires (Teresa Fernandes Swiatkiewicz).

The first article is by Salomé Honório who offers a case study of authorial performativity by U.S. writer Kathy Acker (1947–1997). This performativity includes citation and pseudo-citation, translation and pseudo-translation, as well as other forms of textual appropriation. Acker’s work is shown to be particularly grounded in programmatic plagiarism. To illustrate the poetic and conceptual efficacy of this intentional act of textual transgression, with obvious ethical and political implications, special focus is given to the novel *Blood and Guts in High School* (1984). It exemplifies Acker’s challenge of authorial authority and rejection of originality by parodying Erica Jong’s feminist novel *Fear of Flying* (1973) and engaging with other voices, some in translation. It is the case of Mohamed Choukri’s *Jean Genet in Tangier*, in Paul Bowles’ English translation (1973), Genet’s *A Thief’s Journal*, in Bernard Frechtman’s translation (1964), and Sappho’s lyrics. Honório elaborates on the implications of these textual borrowings or rewritings that use translation as a means of reframing action and ultimately agency.

The discussion of Acker’s experimental fiction paves the way for envisioning other forms of intertextuality as symptoms of postmodernist writing. In this sense, Gyöngyvér Jenei proposes examining the role of literary citations of Rainer Maria Rilke’s late poems in Thomas Pynchon’s novel *Gravity’s Rainbow* (1973) and how this intertextuality is rendered in Hungarian by János Széky (2009). Jenei

highlights the intricate citational nature of the novel, which interweaves real and fictitious intertextuality, along with other practices of multilingual citation. It is claimed that this interweaving of texts has a disorientating impact on readers and intentionally exposes them to foreignness. To illustrate the workings of citationality in Pynchon's novel, Jenei zooms in on the author's appropriation and (re)translation of Rilke's poetry, particularly *Duino Elegies* and *Sonnets to Orpheus*. Not only are the effects of Pynchon's citations examined but also those resulting from how the Hungarian translator deals with the existing Hungarian translations and Pynchon's postmodernist intertextuality and writing.

Elisa Rossi's article considers the figure of Portuguese poet Jorge de Sena (1919–1978), who accompanied his literary production with intense activity in the field of poetry criticism and translation. As the author recalls, the results of his translation efforts can be seen in projects associated with individual authors (as in the case of Constantine P. Cavafy, Emily Dickinson as well as Fernando Pessoa's *English Poems*), and also in the organization of large collections of poetry. It is in this context that the encounter and confrontation with Petrarch's work take place, the developments and implications of which are analysed in Rossi's article from a perspective that intersects Translation Studies and the concept of intertextuality.

The following article is also about intersections, which are framed within the *Skopos* theory and involve Portuguese colonial history, translational action, geography, periodicals, and the impact of citation. Rita Bueno Maia focuses on a historical episode relating to a colonial dispute in Africa between Portugal and France that came to be known as the "Question of Casamance" (1836–1839). Maia examines the agency of the Second Viscount of Santarém (1791–1856) as a three-stage translation programme intended to support the Portuguese claim to the territory on the historical grounds that the Portuguese were the first to arrive in Guinea and thus the Casamance region. The three stages of that programme are conceptualized as pre-translation, consisting of the Viscount's intralingual translation of a fifteenth-century Portuguese chronicle and his scholarly monograph on Portugal's historical priority; translation (co- and self-translation) into French of the Viscount's monograph; and post-translation, *i.e.*, citations of the chronicle and the monograph in scientific and political periodicals of international repute. These stages are examined on the basis of the Viscount's published correspondence between 1836 and 1845; the post-translation phase is given special emphasis. The underlying argument is that these rewritings and their citation, itself a type of rewriting, can sway public opinion and succeed in creating consensus for an idea — or claim.

The argument presented in the last article is also developed within the *Skopos* theory framework. Drawing on Christiane Nord's concept of (literary) translation competence in combination with the concepts of translational literacy and intertextuality, Teresa Fernandes Swiatkiewicz puts forward a hypothesis that we would like to describe as the hypothesis of intertextual memory in translational writing. Fernandes tries to show that during the translation process, translators inscribe the memory of texts written (directly) in the target language into their translations in that language. She does so by focusing on a parallel corpus of selected (European) Portuguese literary translations made directly from Polish, published

between 1990 and 2010. The translational writing examined reveals translation techniques which impose intertextual references that are not suggested by source texts. Such techniques are categorized as quotation, syntactically adapted quotation, topicalized quotation, syntactic calque, and quotation *qua* idiomatization. The traces left by these procedures are shown to be forms of authorship/translatorship.

The Interviews section includes testimonies collected by Marta Pacheco Pinto that engage with Fernandes's hypothesis of intertextual memory in translational writing. The first interview is with the Spanish translator of Virginia Woolf, Itziar Hernández Rodilla. Not only does she share her experience in translating the British novelist but also her reflections on Woolf's intertextuality and how she deals with it in her translations. The second interview, in Portuguese, was jointly made with an Italian author and her Portuguese translator, Serena Cacchioli and Sofia Andrade, respectively. This piece is centred on the author's first book in Portuguese, *Demasiado estreita, esta morte* (2023) — how it came to be, the challenges posed by the collaboration in translation, and the intentional creation of literary affinities with Portuguese literary tradition.

The issue concludes with two reviews. Maria Filomena Molder authors a review essay triggered by her reading of the recent republishing of *Zara. A Polyglot Edition* by Portuguese poet, philosopher, and translator Antero de Quental (1842–1891), first published in 1894 and re-edited in 2022 by Andrea Ragusa as a specimen of end-of-century polyglotism. This collection of multilingual citations of the same poem, “Zara”, produces a multiplication effect that ultimately foregrounds translation as a hermeneutic exercise. On the one hand, translation is shown to be a relation of friendship. On the other, translation being an act of reading, there will be as many translations as possible interpretations of a text. Esther Gimeno Ugalde reviews a two-volume commemorative bilingual anthology of short stories from Brazil, *Contos do Brasil: 200 anos de literatura brasileira/Erzählungen aus Brasilien. 200 Jahre Brasilianische Literatur* (2022). This celebratory Portuguese–German edition of Brazilian literature marks the 200th anniversary of Brazil's independence. The German translations provide a diachronic glimpse into Brazilian literature and, in this way, document and cite a multiplicity of Brazilian literary voices, with whom many German-language readers are not familiar.

Works Cited

- BHABHA, Homi (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Routledge.
- CICERO, Marcus Tullius (1992). “Extract from *De finibus bonorum et malorum*.” In *Translation, History, Culture: A Sourcebook*, edited by André Lefevere. Routledge, p. 47.
- COMPAGNON, Antoine (1979). *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*. Seuil.
- DEI, Adele, and Rita GUERINICCHIO (eds) (2008). *Il libro invisibile: forme della citazione nel Novecento*. Bulzoni.

- HAAPANEN, Lauri, and Daniel PERRIN (2019). “Translingual Quoting in Journalism. Behind the Scenes of Swiss Television Newsrooms.” *Journalism and Translation in the Era of Convergence*, edited by Lucile Davier and Kyle Conway. John Benjamins, pp. 15–42.
- HORTA, Paulo (2017). *Marvellous Thieves. Secret Authors of the Arabian Nights*. Harvard University Press.
- GENETTE, Gérard (1997 [1982]). *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. University of Nebraska Press.
- KRISTEVA, Julia (1969). *Sèméiotikè. Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Seuil.
- RUSHDIE, Salman (1988). *The Satanic Verses*. Viking.
- SAUSSY, Haun (2017). *Translation as Citation: Zhuangzi Inside Out*. Oxford University Press.
- TOURY, Gideon (2012 [1995]). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Revised Edition*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- VENUTI, Lawrence (1995). *The Translator’s Invisibility*. Routledge.

Marta Pacheco Pinto (PhD in Translation History, 2013) is an Assistant Professor at the School of Arts and Humanities of the University of Lisbon. She is a member of the Centre for Comparative Studies at the same university, where she coordinates the project MOV — *Moving Bodies: Circulations, Narratives, and Archives in Translation*. She was the principal investigator of the TECOP — *Texts and Contexts of Portuguese Orientalism: International Congresses of Orientalists (1873–1973)* project, which was funded by the Portuguese research council in 2016–2019 (PTDC/CPC-CMP/0398/2014). Her research interests range from the history of translation in connection with Portuguese Orientalism to fictional representations of translators and genetic translation studies. Recent publications include the coedited books *Reframing Translators, Translators as Reframers* (Routledge, 2022); *Genetic Translation Studies: Conflict and Collaboration in Liminal Spaces* (Bloomsbury, 2021); and *Iberian and Translation Studies: Literary Contact Zones* (Liverpool University Press, 2021).

Matteo Rei (PhD in Modern Languages and Literature, 2010) is an Associate Professor in Portuguese and Brazilian Literature at the University of Turin, where he is part of the research group *Identity and Alterity: Iberian Languages and Literatures in Italy*. He has published papers on late nineteenth-century Portuguese literature and Gil Vicente’s theatre. He has also authored a book on the work of Raul Brandão (2011) and has edited Eugénio de Castro’s *Belkiss* (2016). He is a member of the editorial board of *Rivista di Studi Portoghesi e Brasiliani*.

© 2023 Marta Pacheco Pinto and Matteo Rei

Licensed under the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).