Multiple Translatorship

Hanne Jansen[1] and Anna Wegener

Coining the concept of "multiple translatorship," this introduction discusses the multiple ways in which the translator's agency is intertwined with that of other parties in the process of bringing the translation into the world. Multiple translatorship is considered from three perspectives: multiple translatorship in the translation process (exploring the intricate web of relations between those involved in the translation event), multiple translatorship in the translation product (tracing possible influences in paratexts and preliminary drafts), and authority and authorship in multiple translatorship.

Keywords: translation process, translation product, agents of translation, agency, invisibility, rewriting, literal translation, translatorial habitus, sociology of translation, editing, literary translation, archival research, genetic criticism, actor-network theory, translator authority

Proposant une notion nouvelle, celle de « l'autorité traductive multiple », cette introduction examine les nombreuses manières dont la capacité d'action du traducteur est intimement liée à celle d'autres agents au cours du processus par lequel nait une traduction. L'autorité traductive multiple est envisagée selon trois perspectives : celle de la traduction comme processus (partant d'une exploration du réseau complexe de relations qui se tisse entre tous ceux qui participent à l'événement traductif), celle de la traduction comme produit (selon les traces que divers agents peuvent laisser notamment dans les paratextes et les versions préliminaires d'une traduction), et celle des questions d'autorité et de responsabilité auctoriale dans des contextes d'autorité traductive multiple.

Mots clés : processus de traduction, traduction comme produit, agents traductifs, capacité d'action, invisibilité, réécriture, traduction littérale, habitus du traducteur, sociologie de la traduction, révision, traduction littéraire, recherches dans les archives, critique génétique, théorie de l'acteur-réseau, autorité du traducteur

One of the most important developments in Translation Studies since the mid-1990s has been the growing interest in the translator, both as a presence in the text and an acting subject within a set of social practices. When Lawrence Venuti first published *The Translator's Invisibility* in 1995, he denounced a cultural situation in which translators tended to conceal their work through the use of a fluent discourse aimed at giving translations the appearance of originals rather than translations. For Venuti, the translator's invisibility was determined in part by an individualistic concept of

authorship that on the one hand defined translation as a second-order representation while on the other hand required the effacement of its second-order status with the illusion of transparency. To remedy this situation Venuti issued his well-known call for "foreignizing translations" that would disrupt the hegemony of fluency and draw attention to the translator's interventions. And yet the figure of the translator in his book hovered uneasily between choice and constraint, rebellion and acquiescence, action and passivity: Venuti simultaneously claimed that translators – or freelance translators, at least – always exercise choice in how they translate, while also acknowledging that "fluent domestication" was "enforced by editors, publishers and reviewers."[2]

Since Venuti's argument was published the question of the translator's (in)visibility has indeed been central to the agenda of Translation Studies. Scholars have identified the translator's personal impact on the translated text (as a voice, a thumbprint or a specific style), explored their critical role in conveying, constructing and negotiating cultural identities (both images of the Other and self-images), and denounced their conversely general deplorably low status (economic as well as professional). However, while the translator's agency has been the center of much interest in recent years, the other parties involved in the preparation, publication and reception of a translation, for instance the "editors, publishers and reviewers" that Venuti associates with fluent domesticating translation strategies, have not yet received sufficient close academic attention.

The aim of these two volumes of essays entitled respectively *Authorial and Editorial Voices 1 - Collaborative Relationships between Authors, Translators, and Performers* and *Authorial and Editorial Voices 2 - Editorial and Publishing Practices*, is to develop a body of conceptual and empirical knowledge about the multiple ways in which the translator's agency is intertwined and entangled with that of other active parties to the translation during the publication process. The two volumes bring together selected papers from a conference we organized at the University of Copenhagen in November 2011 entitled *Authorial & Editorial Voices in Translation*. The

conference theme originated from our own work on "united labour" in translation and more specifically from two case studies: Hanne Jansen's exploration of the "translation briefs" that different Italian novelists wrote to their translators to assist them in their work and, perhaps, control it as well; and Anna Wegener's study of the role of a German publisher in shaping the international fortunes of a series of Danish children's books.[3]

The conference was held under the auspices of the international research group Voice in Translation,[4] led by Cecilia Alvstad of the University of Oslo, which explores how different kinds of 'voices' – intratextual, intertextual, and extratextual – contribute to the translation process and understanding translations.[5] As Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov points out in her introduction to *Intratextual Voices in Translation*, a volume of essays from another conference organized by Voice in Translation, the notion of 'voice' is multifaceted and its prolific use within Translation Studies reflects the influence of many different theoretical approaches.[6] In very general terms, *intra-textual* voices are the voices speaking *within* the text, i.e. the narrator(s) and characters as well as possibly more ambiguous entities such as the implied author and, in the case of translated texts, the implied translator, whereas *inter-textual* voices are references to other texts emerging as quotations, allusions, pastiches etc. Extra-textual voices refer to the array of 'real' persons located *outside* the text who all impact the outcome of the text (i.e. translation) in some way – what Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov calls the "situational agents"[7] who, besides the translator, may include, among others, editors, proof readers, critics, and authors. It was precisely these *extra-textual* voices that were the point of departure of the Copenhagen conference.

While the translator is without doubt the central agent of the translation process, publishers, editors, proof readers, literary agents, and even the author of the source text often exert a significant influence over the translator and the translated text, but they almost always do so from some position behind the scenes. By convention they are actually more invisible than the

translators themselves, whose names normally appears on the title-page in accordance with present-day standards; it is thus no easy task to gauge their influence on the translation, nor is it easy to determine the nature of their relationship with the translator. Are they coaches, competitors or coercers? To cite Gideon Toury's highly pertinent questions, do all the parties involved in producing a translation share the same attitudes and aims? Or, does the opaque public surface of the process actually conceal direct or indirect negotiation, "maybe so much as a struggle" and, if so, whose norms have "the upper hand and on what grounds?"[8]

Multiple Authorship, Multiple Translatorship

Literary criticism has long reflected on the notion that literary creation is by no means a solitary activity, but rather co-operative if not actually collaborative. Twenty-five years ago Jack Stillinger coined the term "multiple authorship" to deflate the "individualistic concept of authorship," the idea of a single author "as sole controlling intelligence in a work."[9] Stillinger contested this idea in a number of case studies that not only disproved the idea that collaboration – what he terms multiple authorship – is only a marginal mode of creation, but also demonstrated that collaboration could take on a variety of forms. As he noted, "a work may be the collaborative product of the nominal author and a friend, a spouse, a ghost, an agent, an editor, a translator, a publisher, a censor, a transcriber, a printer, or – what is more often the case – several of these acting together or in succession."[10] Stillinger argued that the concept of multiple authorship would support "a more realistic account of the ways in which literature is created" and contribute to "connect literary works with the social, cultural, and material conditions in which they were produced."[11] However, Stillinger also pointed out that the myth of the solitary author was necessary to the act of interpretation, thus emphasizing the difference between a sociological and hermeneutic approach to the literary text.

Transposing the individualistic concept of authorship to an individualistic concept of translatorship has been a widespread tendency within Translation Studies, no doubt because singular translatorship confers cultural prestige on the translator and, by extension, the field of Translation Studies itself. However, as Stillinger has shown for the concept of individualistic authorship, the notion of singular translatorship cannot be sustained empirically. Accordingly, we draw on Stillinger's insight to coin the concept *multiple translatorship* to signal the reality that, for better or worse, translation is frequently collaborative in nature. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*'s entry, the word collaboration, apart from the sense of traitorous cooperation with the enemy, means "united labour" and is used especially with reference to literary, artistic or scientific works.[12] We will speak of the collaborative nature of translation while simultaneously recognizing, as stated above, that this "united labour" may in fact be characterized by strife, division and divergent allegiances.[13]

The notion of multiple translatorship can be considered from three different perspectives focusing respectively on multiple translatorship in the translation process, multiple translatorship in the translation product, and authority in multiple translatorship. From a process-oriented, 'horizontal' perspective,multiple translatorship can emphasize how agents interact, negotiate and struggle for influence in the various phases leading up to the translated text. The notion of 'voice' here refers to the participants who are "united in the same project but whose viewpoints might diverge."[14] From the product-oriented, 'vertical' perspective, in contrast, 'voice' refers to the traces (or layers) left behind in the translated text by the multiple agents involved, and the object of attention is the translation product and its 'archaeological structure.' From the point of view of authority in multiple translatorship, 'voice' connects to issues of shared responsibility for the translation, which can be investigated by adopting a theoretical framework originally developed in the sphere of attribution studies.

The distinction between translation as a process and translation as a product has been recognized since James S. Homes first mapped out the field of Translation Studies, listing investigations focused on product, process or function under the heading of descriptive studies.[15] In Holmes' view, process-oriented studies were those concerned with what happens in the mind of the translator when he or she translates whereas product-oriented studies focused on examining the output of the translation process, that is, the translated text itself. In recent years, however, the notion of translation process has expanded, coming to refer more broadly to the whole chain of successive events through which a translation comes into being: the selection of the text to translate, the appointment of the translator, the drafting of the translation, its revision by various agents and its 'wrapping' and subsequent marketing in the target area. In this conception the process of translation is understood not as a psychological or cognitive phenomenon related to the individual translator but as a social phenomenon involving multiple agents. In a useful adaptation of Gideon Toury's terminology, Andrew Chesterman distinguishes between the *translation act*, referring to the decision-making processes that take place in the translator's mind, and the *translation event* that unfolds "starting with the client's request for a translation and ending with is reception by other agent on various levels."[16]

An understanding of the translation process as including a translation event involving multiple agents with multiple potentially divergent interests has significant consequences for the concept of translation as product. Besides the translator, the array of individuals contributing to the 'birth' of a translation may comprise literary agents, scouts, sales agents, editors, proof readers and graphic designers (indeed, the number of individuals involved depends largely on the size and capacity of the publishing house). Moreover, the original author can also have 'a finger in the pie' if he or she engages with the translator's work and, in the case of drama translation, directors and actors are often involved in the process as well.

As we shall see, it can be difficult if not impossible to detect vestiges of the involvement of these parties in the translated text itself. They may become visible, however, in the paratextual elements that accompany the translation into the target culture. Translators may be responsible for some paratextual elements, typically foot- and endnotes and more rarely fore- and afterwords, but the bulk of peritextual elements – from covers and titles to illustrations – is usually the work of other agents. Several essays in this book are dedicated to the imprints that these agents have left in paratexts, namely Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar's essay on the allographical prefaces written by figures with a high degree of symbolic capital in Turkey and Marion Dalvai's contribution exploring the complex paratextual apparatus accompanying the various English versions of one of Dario Fo's most popular plays. Indeed, the increased attention paid to paratextual elements in Translation Studies constitutes an important step towards recognizing the many agendas and forms of agency involved in translation. A focus on the translation event rather than the translation act thus calls for a widening of the concept of the translation product as well: the translation product goes beyond the translated text in itself to include all the elements that present and sustain it and, at least in theory, influence its reception in the target culture (i.e. the notion of "broad text" that Siri Nergaard introduces in her contribution to this volume).

"The published text, like a financial balance sheet, serves as a snapshot of the translation's progression. And, as with any set of accounts, it is necessary to look behind the face value of the text to form an understanding of the activity it represents," writes Geraldine Brodie in her contribution to the first volume. In the following paragraphs we will discuss some theoretical approaches and notions which might help us get "behind the face value of the text," shed light on the phenomenon of "multiple translatorship" and grant visibility to those other parties conventionally disregarded by readers and researchers alike.

Multiple Translatorship in the Translation Process

The contextualisation of translation, the basic tenet of the cultural turn, opened the way for a series of questions about the various stages in the genesis of a translation as well as the agents involved. Looking back at this crucial turning point, Susan Bassnett in fact emphasized both processes and agents: "We called this shift of emphasis 'the cultural turn' in Translation Studies and suggested that a study of the processes of translation combined with the praxis of translating could offer a way of understanding how complex manipulative textual processes take place: how a text is selected for translation, for example, what role the translator plays in that selection, what role an editor, publisher or patron plays, what criteria determine the strategies that will be employed by the translator, how a text might be received in the target system."[17]

Descriptive Translation Studies, in its initial phases evolving along the lines of Even-Zohar's polysystem theory and Gideon Toury's model of translation norms, had two main lines of investigation: the conditions determining the transfer of a text from one literary system to another, and how norms operating in the target culture impose certain constraints on translators. A more temporally broad and dynamic (as well as historical) perception of translation was inscribed in these models that took into account both the selection of texts to be translated as well as the impact of the translations on the receiving literature. There was not, however, much methodological attention granted to the specific, material aspects of the transfer process or the agents themselves, the persons responsible for bringing the translated text into the target culture.[18] What rose to the fore in this work was essentially the interaction between texts and systems, with the consequence – what Hélène Buzelin calls the "pitfall" of the "first-generation polysystemic studies" – that these investigations tended to "depersonaliz[e] the translation by restricting themselves to the study of a text corpus."[19] Toury has criticized "linguistically-oriented translation theory for assigning the translator a rather parasitic position"[20] and acknowledged that "many different persons [may]

actually [be] involved in the establishment of a translation."[21] Yet in spite of his having raised numerous highly pertinent issues regarding the many stages of the translation process and the many layers of the translated text, even he remains methodologically rather text-bound when seeking out the strategies employed in specific translations and relating them to translation norms.

André Lefevere took a more explicitly agent-oriented perspective when he introduced "those in the middle," those he calls the "rewriters" (translators, editors, anthologists, and literary critics) who in one way or another all serve to mediate between the original text and the target culture readers. As he noted, these actors regularly manipulate the originals they work with to some extent, "usually to make them fit in with the dominant, or one of the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time."[22] Lefevere paid attention to translators, arguing that they "can choose to adapt to the system, to stay within the parameters delimited by its constraints […] or they may choose to oppose the system, to try to operate outside its constraints."[23] At the same time, he also focused on those who outline the constraints, the "professionals" within the literary system who set up the poetological standards and, on the other side, the "patrons" who exert their power primarily on an ideological level.

In the 2009 volume *Agents of translation*, editors John Milton and Paul Bandia referred explicitly to the whole series of "text producers, mediators who modify the text such as those who produce abstracts, editors, revisors and translators, commissioners and publishers."[24] The agents presented in their volume were primarily high-profile individuals, well-known translators, publishers, intellectuals, journalists, politicians etc. and the editors emphasized their role in bringing about cultural innovation and change. Such influential and enterprising rewriters can also be found in some of the contributions to these two volumes, for instance in Alexandra Lopes' portrait of the Portuguese Walter Scott translator Ramalho de Sousa and in Cecilia Wadsö Lecaros' essay on how the Swedish translator and editor Sophie Leijonhufvud appropriated an early English feminist text

to serve her own emancipatory agenda. This line of agent-oriented studies has produced highly valuable and interesting analyses of how translations can be used to challenge values and power relations within the literary and political systems of the target culture as well as providing intriguing portraits of intrepid agents of translation throughout history who, in pursuing their own agendas, have gone against the prevailing ideological and poetological constraints of the time.

However, a focus on these exceptional, outstanding figures, the Bourdieusian "gate-keepers" or what Chesterman calls "cultural pioneers,"[25] must also be complemented by a closer look at the more humble participants in the translation process. These certainly include the majority of 'ordinary' professional translators, for whom the emphasis on translator's agency captures more a desire for emancipation and empowerment – indeed, a 'call to action' – than a depiction of the actual circumstances of their work. It also includes the whole array of revisors, proof readers, layout artists, illustrators etc. whose influence in the translation event has conventionally been regarded as subordinate and secondary to the decisions of other agents.

An additional element that does not often receive its due attention is the collection of bare economic motives underlying most translation projects. In one way or another most translation agents are obviously 'in it for the money,' the publishers to sell a product and make profit and the translators to earn a living; indeed, challenging norms and constraints imposed by the publishers may not be the most effective way for translators to keep their jobs or be reappointed to future projects. "The influence of 'power' on translation policies," states Deborah Biancheri in her contribution, "manifests itself almost exclusively in the form of economic imperatives;" or, as Mikael Johani puts it even more bluntly in the conclusion to his essay: "Don't mind the authorial, editorial, or translatorial voices, as always, the commercial voices win." Economic imperatives also seem to dictate the strikingly formulaic translation of film titles, as explored in Ken Farø's essay.

A number of works following in the wake of the cultural turn have addressed key questions about processes and agents. Focusing on translation as first and foremost a matter of cultural exchange and influence most often leads scholars to seek out explanations on a structural level (in relation to literary systems, ideology, politics, national, religious or ethnic interests), explanations which have at times come under for being too general, abstract and deterministic to grasp effectively the variety and complexity of real-life translation processes in which individuals interact under very specific conditions and with very different motivations. Emphasizing instead the role of translation as a social practice, the shift that has been termed the "social turn" in Translation Studies[26] implies an increased focus and emphasis on more concrete, prosaic and mundane matters. These include the 'petty' commercial considerations that "condition every stage of the publishing-translating process," as Siri Nergaard notes in her contribution to this book, as well as those 'minor,' less influential or at any rate less visible agents who also participate in the making of a translation. One can think, for example, of the "literal translators" who are often involved in drama translation and translation for children but whose work is usually acknowledged only "in the smallest print of the theatre programme, if at all," as Geraldine Brodie points out, or "in the inside back cover of the English texts in a note," as Chiara Galletti observes in her contribution to this volume.

Structure-Agency Relations in the Translation Process

"Placing people centre-stage" as Chesterman suggests[27] necessarily entails a discussion of the relationship between *agency*, "the capacity of individuals to act independently and to make their own free choices," and *structure*, "those factors of influence (such as social class, religion, gender, ethnicity, customs, etc.) that determine or limit an agent and his or her decisions."[28]

Primarily system-oriented "culturalist" approaches[29] have been criticized for granting too much weight to structure while downplaying or even neglecting the role of agency. While one of the central premises of the cultural turn is an acknowledgment and emphasis on the idea that the

translator is more than the 'mouthpiece' of the author, the translator still appears to be largely confined to a position of subjection – not to the source text or source author in this case but rather to the socio-cultural constraints of the target system. If we are intent on explaining how translations come about and why translators act as they do by referring primarily to "the 'systemic' mechanisms controlling translation in the target culture, notably in terms of the regulation of translation through cultural norms,"[30] there remains indeed little space for the individual translator's decision-making processes, which may be too complex, contradictory and idiosyncratic to fit the general norms. Although the notion of socialization has been inherent in Toury's definition of translation norms from the outset, the high degree of generalization characterizing these norms as well as a rather dichotomistic view of the translator's possible responses (either conforming to prevailing norms or breaking with them altogether) seem to have blocked a more detailed or in-depth discussion on how such norms are actually acquired and dealt with by individual translators.

One of the first to address this question from an explicitly sociological point of view was Daniel Simeoni in his much quoted 1998 paper "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus."[31] Simeoni adopted the Bourdieusian notion of 'habitus' designating "the subject's internalized system of social structures in the form of dispositions"[32] and succeeded in turning it into a keyword in agent-oriented Translation Studies. If it is indeed possible to identify a turn from a cultural perspective to a sociological one, such a shift appears to run mainly parallel with this "redefinition of the concept of 'translational norms' as something that is not 'out there' but *internalized*."[33] The translator's habitus amounts to a vast array of values, norms, cultural habits etc. that are embodied in the process of professional socialization but also acquired through personal experiences outside the professional sphere. While the notion of habitus does account for the internalization of translation norms and values in a more explicit and consistent way, it remains

a matter of debate whether the translator operating with habitus is truly granted much more effectual agency than in Toury's norms model.[34] Some scholars claim that "since fine-grained analyses are lacking […] the notion of habitus seems to confirm all too often what it was supposed to avoid, i.e. the precedence of structure over agency."[35] Others, on the contrary, emphasize how Simeoni refines the Bourdieusian notion by pointing to "the mosaic, the multiplicity and fragmentariness of the *habitus*, the overlappingness of all the many *habitus* we inhabit,"[36] which might in fact explain the variety, idiosyncrasy and sometimes apparent randomness of strategies adopted by different translators within the same professional community or by the same translator at different moments, what Douglas Robinson refers to as "the translator's pandemonium self or disaggregated agency."[37]

Pursuing the idea of multiple translatorship, it is important to note that the final translation product is also a result of actions and decisions not only by the translator, but also by *other* agents. These other agents may constrain the translator's decisions before and during the translation work itself: Ebbe Klitgaard's contribution looks, for instance, at the impact of the editorial program of the literary magazine *Cavalcade* on the Danish translations of Chaucer published in the magazine. Or they may question and change his or her decisions in a subsequent phase: see for instance Nathalie Mälzer's discussion on how a German editor intervened radically in her translation of a French "erotic" novel. Simeoni defines the translating agent as "a 'voice' or pen (more likely a computer keyboard today) that is inextricably linked to networks of other social agents,"[38] but critics of the habitus approach maintain that the specificities of these networks, the processes through which they come together and the multiple agents who constitute them have yet to be thoroughly investigated.

The growing interest in agent-oriented studies, what we might call a move from Translation Studies towards "translatOR studies," to borrow Chesterman's terms,[39] seems to be evolving along

two main paths. One is the socio-historiographic path based on a combination of textual analysis (source texts and translations) and exploration of archival and paratextual material (drafts, correspondences, footnotes, prefaces etc.), exemplified by many of the above-mentioned studies. The other is the strongly empirically oriented sociological track that concentrates on present-day translation practices, turning to broad or even global surveys and statistical material (as in Agnes Whitfield's contribution on the development of translation policies in the English-Canadian publishing industry) or social science fieldwork techniques collecting of data within a specific translation environment primarily from the viewpoint of actors who are directly involved in the translation work.

While not necessarily referring explicitly to such techniques, several case studies in these two volumes nevertheless work in quite similar ways. Specific translation events and environments are in fact described and analyzed from the perspective of those involved in the process, that is, from within. Some studies build on personal experience, such as those presented by Nathalie Mälzer and Monica Pavani, experienced translators from French into German and English into Italian respectively who have translated the texts being scrutinized in their essays, and by Mikael Johani who was involved in a rather problematic collaboration with the translator as editor of the American translation of the Indonesian author Djenar Maesa Ayu's novels. Other contributors have opted to collect their empirical data by "hearing it from the horse's mouth," whether by eliciting personal interviews with the actors participating in the translation project (as Geraldine Brodie does in her study on the multiple voices of theatre translation and Chiara Galletti does in her investigation of the translation of children's literature), or resorting to various kinds of documented dialogue between the parties involved (such as the correspondence between the Swedish author Selma Lagerlöf and her American 'promotor' Velma Swanston Howard presented by Björn Sundmark, or that between the director Peter Zadek and the translator Erich Fried

regarding the translation of Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* into German in Wolfgang Görtschacher's contribution).

One of the most recent moves to conceptualise these relationships has been the adoption of Latour's actor-network theory within Translation Studies. Proponents claim that this explicitly ethnographic and observational approach makes it possible to uncover the above-mentioned specificities of the single translation event while avoiding the risk of an excessively narrow focus on the translator at the expense of other agents, given that it emphasizes precisely "the collective nature of the translation process as well as well as the hybrid character of the *translation agent*."[40] As regards the structure-agent relationship, actor-network theory maintains the axiom that decision-making is first and foremost tied up with actors' specific interactions within the specific network: indeed, the actor-network approach aims "to move beyond deterministic models that trace organizational phenomena back to powerful individuals, social structures, hegemonic discourses or technological effects" and instead seek out "complex patterns of causality rooted in connections between actors."[41] The same line of thought can be found in Michelle Woods' paper in this publication, in which she quotes Francesca Billiani to argue that, rather than being the result of abstract top-down normative regulation, "a network of agents can effect a performative and fluid form of "polymorphous" censorship practices."

Incorporation or at least engagement with this approach offers certain advantages when shining the spotlight on 'multiple translatorship,' as we do here. The actor-network theory is specifically designed to explore and describe the intricate web of relations that accrues between the various participants in the translation event without establishing any a priori hierarchical differentiation. As intentionality is not considered a prerogative, all actors involved are taken into consideration, even inanimate entities such as technological resources. This could mean, for example, taking into consideration the impact of book manufacturers or layout artists, who may in fact force translators

or editors "to delete or add a few words or even a whole sentence for purely technical reasons" (to avoid "orphans" and "widows"), as Nathalie Mälzer states in her overview of "typical" book production processes in Germany. Furthermore, the notion of 'network' emphasizes the fact that the translation process is not a linear progression but rather unfolds in a recursive, looping, expanding or even, to use a Deleuzian term, rhizomatic movement.

"Translators are not autonomous individuals producing translations like omnipotent gods out of the fullness of their (textual, cultural, economic, psychosocial) world mastery, but parts of larger translation or translatorial agencies," Douglas Robinson states rather ironically.[42] The actor-network approach might indeed provide a useful framework for exploring and describing "the hybrid, collective and 'networky' character of the translating agent, and a fortiori for that of any translation project."[43] However, one of the limits of the actor-network approach may lie in its specific (and almost exclusive) emphasis on description, which risks getting lost in the concrete and generating data that has anecdotal value but little explanatory power.

If we seek to uncover not only *who* is involved in the process of generating a translation and *how* they interact, but also *why* some of the involved parties end up having "the upper hand," it seems essential that we combine attention to micro-level factors emerging in the specific translation event *together with* acknowledgement of macro-level conditions existing before and outside of the network. Not only does "the symmetry between human and non-human actors [go] too far in erasing distinctions and reducing people to the status of objects,"[44] as it has been claimed, but without at least occasionally stepping outside the emergent network in order to attend to structural factors (institutions, ideology and patronage, for instance), it is not clear "how to treat small and large actors and their power and political differences."[45]

Multiple Translatorship in the Translation Product

The aim of the present book, namely to shed light on the collaborative nature of the translation event, implies that our interest is centered on the translation process rather than the translation product understood as the finalized and published translation. However, while a focus on the translation event entails granting less attention to the translation product, it also involves paying more attention to the material traces left by the process, e.g. rough drafts, manuscripts, typescripts, proofs, etc., that is, the various heterogeneous texts that precede the definite product and document its genesis.

A clear example of a focus on process igniting interest in preliminary drafts and documents can be found in the chapter of *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* dedicated to interim decisions, that is, the provisional decisions translators make on the way to the final translation. Here, Gideon Toury notes that it is impossible to know how many people were involved in the establishment of a given translation and what roles they played in the process as long as the only texts available for study are the source text and the target text. Given this lack of empirical knowledge about how translations are produced, the common solution has been to collapse the various individuals involved into the singular persona of "the translator," "a functional entity mediating between two existing texts, rather than a definite person."[46]

Toury was primarily interested in the act of translation, but he also quite obliquely employed a more inclusive concept of process that encompassed other agents, such as editors and proofreaders (the translation event). In the latter case, however, he spoke not of how the *translation* was created but of how the *target text* came into being, thus replacing the term 'translation' with 'text,' and pointed out that the generation of the target text "may entail different kinds of activity, which may be widely dispersed in terms of both time, space, and agents."[47] Toury stressed that questions of who did what, when and why were not important so long as the study aims were limited to

comparing the source and target texts and describing the relations between them, but such questions became central to any research aimed at shedding light on the translation process.

Toury conceived of the target text as the geological surface layer beneath which older layers were typically deposited. To access these older layers, which corresponded to 'stages' in the composition of the translation, he envisaged two possible scenarios: with sufficient luck, the researcher would have access to evidence that had come into being 'naturally' during the process of translation such as drafts, manuscripts, typescripts, etc. If such documentation did not exist, however, the researcher could elicit it, for instance by conducting experiments in which translators electronically saved successive versions of their work. Toury himself sought to shed light on the translator's decision-making process by investigating how a fragment of a famous German novel had been gradually translated into English. He thus focused almost exclusively on the translator while nonetheless recognizing that some of the final changes to the translation might have been made by the editor or the proof-reader.

Many of the essays collected in these two volumes call our attention to the importance of accessing preliminary versions of the translation product in order to shed light on role divisions in the translation process. Such versions may be preserved in national libraries or in the archives of theatres and publishing houses or be made available by translators themselves. Translations in the making, covered as they are in additions, substitutions and erasures, bear witness to the multiple individuals involved in the translation process and what they did along the way to the final version. In many cases a focus on the translation process (or more specifically on collaboration in translation as in our case) leads the researcher to explore the translation product in its imperfect and preliminary stages and delve into the places where these traces are preserved. One might even say that a call has been issued in some of the pages of these collected essays encouraging researchers to return to the archives (see for example Wolfgang Görtschacher's conclusion to his

essay on Peter Zadek and Erich Fried). At the same time, researchers may need to branch out and consider other possible written sources for gauging the influence exerted on a given translation by the various agents (see for instance Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov's essay on editors' autobiographies as a source for potentially revealing their power over the target text).

Toury himself cautioned that the task of tracing how the translation processes affected the translation product might turn out to be difficult, given the fact that most translators of the past "did not care to keep their drafts"[48] and, where drafts did exist, there might very well be gaps between them that made it difficult to reconstruct translation processes. In emphasizing the basic material conditions for conducting studies of translation processes, Toury can be seen to echo a central concern of the branch of literary studies known as genetic criticism.

The field of genetic criticism, which emerged in France in the 1970s, is concerned with establishing the genesis of literary texts by ordering, deciphering and transcribing manuscripts and analyzing and describing the creative processes that led from writers' notebooks to published texts. In his article "Toward a Science of Literature: Manuscript Analysis," Pierre-Marc de Biasi pointed out that, even though manuscripts have gained new cultural value in that they are no longer considered ugly sites of erasure and correction but rather resources for understanding the writing process and libraries nowadays receive more and more manuscript dossiers from writers, the task of locating all the preliminary texts associated with the writing of a given literary work may take up to several years if the material is dispersed between different public and private holdings.[49] Genetic criticism thus puts us in mind of "the fragile process of text transmission," in Louis Hay's words.[50] We might well hypothesize that the task of gathering multiple translation drafts would be even more arduous, not only because they may be scattered to the four winds but because, unlike those of literary works, the drafts of a translation are often not preserved.

When drafts and other documentary material are preserved and available for study, however, they may be able to shed new light on both the finished product and the power struggle it comprises, that is to say, the quest for authority in the translation process, as we term it below. Michelle Woods' book *Translating Milan Kundera* is based in part on the research she conducted in the archives of Kundera's American translator as well as those of his American publisher. Woods discovered that Kundera's early dissatisfaction with the English language translations "seemed to be forged more in the editing than in the translation process."[51] In fact, core features of his writing style were effaced during editing to make the translations sound more fluent, a fact which provoked Kundera to liken the pen of the editor to that of the censor.

Does Michelle Woods' account of the editor's crucial impact change our perception of the published translations? Or, to pose the question in more general terms, does knowledge of the prehistory of a translation change the way we look at the text ultimately released to the public? Of course it does. Gaining familiarity with the prehistory of translations not only heightens our awareness of key features in the published texts, it also helps us to explain their existence. The prehistory may also reveal that the same text that at first appeared to be a complete and polished entity is in fact, as Siri Nergaard shows in her contribution, the result of random choices and partial interpretations on the part of the various participants involved in the translation process rather than any unified and simple progression.

None of the essays collected in these two volumes dialogues directly with genetic criticism, but it is obvious that studies of translation processes could also share in some of genetic criticism's central concerns and methodologies, such as techniques for organizing drafts so as to trace the genesis of a text. Toury himself was adamant in stressing the importance of putting the various layers of a translation "in their correct order" to be able to trace out the translator's decision-making process, but he also admitted that it was not always easy to arrange the drafts in such a

way.[52] This task became easier only in cases where the documents were in different hands, "e.g., the translator's, the editor's, the proofreader's."[53]

Children's literature author Aidan Chambers offers an example of a translation being written by different hands in his 1997 essay "In Spite of Being a Translation," which tells the story of collaboration between an author, an editor, a translator and a language consultant. As the editor of Turton & Chambers Publishing, Chambers released a number of modern European children's literature novels in English in the early 1990s, one of which was a novel by the Swedish author Peter Pohl. In the essay, Chambers recounts how he, "a typically English monolinguist,"[54] visited the author accompanied by his own translator into Swedish (Chambers has been translated into numerous languages), how he hired a translator and subsequently commented on the translation by relying in part on input supplied by his own translator (in this project, she worked as his language consultant), how the language consultant corresponded with the author to clarify the deliberate indeterminacies of the plot and, finally, goes on to document the various stages of the translation by reproducing a page of the translator's typescript, his edited version of the same passage and the final published text. Whereas the translator's typescript contained only one correction (a spelling mistake), the edited version was overwritten with commentary and suggestions not only from Chambers himself, but also from his language consultant. Naturally, the negotiations between Chambers, the language consultant and the translator and the back-and-forth of collective decision-making were not perceptible in the printed text itself; to borrow the words of Pierre-Marc de Biasi, the published translation is "closed in its perfected form."[55]

By recounting how the translation came into being, describing the roles played by the participants and reproducing three stages of the emergence of the translation, Chambers also attributed specific features of the translation to the different partners involved in the project. 'I did this, she did that, he did that' characterizes the 'whodunnit' logic of his argument and in fact the question of

attribution cannot but emerge in any study of collaboration, whether it be original literature or translation. Accordingly, many of the essays collected in these two volumes are concerned with *identifying* the many hands involved in the generation of a given translation and their specific role. In his introductory book on attribution studies, Harold Love defines the subject of this field of investigation as "the uniqueness of each human being and how this is enacted in writing."[56] Attributionists are generally concerned with establishing authorship, for instance in anonymous texts or texts that were written by multiple individuals. Where it proves impossible to identify a single individual or tease out the contributions of various individuals, the goal of attribution studies becomes instead one of contextualisation, that is, locating the text in time and place, within a culture and/or established school, and so on.

Collaborative ventures such as the plays that have been partly attributed to Shakespeare have been favoured objects of attribution studies, but the question remains as to whether or not "attempts to distinguish the traces of agency that cohere in pieces of writing"[57] succeed in dissolving the individualistic concept of authorship we have repeatedly referenced. By focusing on distributing personal responsibility for given aspects of given texts, attribution studies (or studies of collaboration in translation) do not truly dispose with the idea of the author/translator as individual; rather, they operate with the idea that several different authors/translators have left their marks in the text. As Andrew Bennett points out, "The work of attributionists is based on a fundamental concern for the integrity of the individual signature, for indelible signs or traces of authorial identities that, they believe, remain in the work."[58] By coining the concept of multiple translatorship, we recognize that we are implicitly operating with the idea that the contributions made by the various agents of translation can, if backed by sufficient external evidence, be distinguished from one another at least to some degree. Indeed, the whole impetus behind the present volumes has been to elicit increased interest in the many *invisible* agents of translation and

their role in the translation process and the construction of the translation as product. However, there may be contexts in which the precise identity and role of the various hands involved in the translation cannot be determined. This could occur in situations where the source text and/or the translation cannot be identified authoritatively and no documentation is available on the translation process, as is the case in many instances of historical translation events.

Authority in Multiple Translatorship

Jack Stillinger identified the possible co-authors of a literary work as ranging from friends to ghosts to translators. This list suggests the many influences that may impinge on the writer and yet, to put it bluntly, can these individuals' contributions really be considered on par with that of the nominal author? Or, to return to the field of translation, is the translator's translatorship really not any different from that of someone like the editor? To consider this question we draw on a useful categorization of four different kinds of authorship that Harold Love provides in *Attributing Authorship*. We seek to apply it to the field of translation with an eye to distinguishing between the contributions made by these various agents. It is not enough to simply note that they all contribute to bringing the translation into the world; we must also ask what they actually do and how their translatorship effectively differs.

Rather than as "a single, coherent activity,"[59] Love defines authorship as "a series of functions performed during the creation of the work," as "a sequence of processes,"[60] and points out that, while these functions or processes are sometimes performed by a single person, they can often be performed collaboratively or by several people in succession. Love thus does not cling to the idea that the author is "the person who originates or gives existence to anything," as in the first definition of 'author' listed in the *OED*. He proposes instead four different kinds of authorship: precursory authorship, executive authorship, declarative authorship, and revisionary authorship.

A precursory author is "anyone whose function as a 'source' or 'influence' makes a substantial contribution to the shape and substance of the work [...]."[61] Among his examples of precursory authorship Love numbers Holinshed's *Chronicle* in Shakespeare's history plays and, within the field of music, other musicians' compositions that were reworked by Franz Liszt. The executive author is the maker of the text, "the deviser, the orderer, the wordsmith, or, in the case of Liszt, the reformulator."[62] Executive authorship can be individual, but it can certainly be collaborative as well. In contemporary Western culture, Love notes, the former arrangement is more prestigious than the latter; the danger, however, lies in the fact that single executive authorship "will be too readily assumed."[63] The declarative author is the one whose name is placed on the title-page of a book. The author's name usually serves to indicate executive authorship, but there is no necessary overlap between the executive and the declarative author, as can be seen in the case of books by statesmen and busy politicians who probably lacked the time to sit down and write the books in question. Finally, the revisionary author is someone who prepares a text for publication by perfecting and polishing it. This task is typically performed by editors and proof-readers but it may instead be carried out by the executive author or, in the case of works that have been abandoned, by another writer entirely.

Applied to the field of translation, this model that posits authorship as a set of linked activities provides us with a more precise vocabulary for describing the contributions various agents make to the translation process and product. On the basis of Love's model one could certainly say that translation always involves precursory authorship, since translations always derive in one way or another from other pre-existing texts. One of the precursory authors of a translation is the author of the original text and yet the original author may also become the executive translator, as in the case of self-translations, or share the executive translatorship with a translator, as in the case of

Kundera with his documented practice of having worked closely with his translators on several occasions.

The declarative translator is the person whose name appears on the title page, but it is clear from the case of books by statesmen and busy politicians that big-name translators, authors and directors may use their visibility to sell translations that were not created directly by them but rather by the kind of invisible figures that Michelle Woods, following Sirkku Aaltonen, dubs "the translator in the attic" in her contribution. It is because there is a name on the title page that a translator can be praised – or blamed – for his or her work. Indeed, much energy has been directed toward criticizing the now-waning cultural practice that fails to acknowledge the work of the translator by explicitly naming him or her.

However, the *crux* of translation as a process occurs in the fraught interplay between executive, declarative and revisionary translatorship. Conventionally, translations are revised and commented on by editors and other readers in a publishing house. Yet, are editors always restricted to the role of revisionary translators and translators to the role of executive ones? It would seem not. In fact, as Love points out, revision cannot always be dis-entangled from primary composition. The process of drafting and redrafting involves "a mingled alternation of composition and various kinds of alteration, including new spurts of composition inspired by revision."[64] Several contributions to this volume explore the difficulty of separating executive and revisionary translatorship. Davide Manenti's essay sheds light on the various kinds of editing performed by Katherine Mansfield, herself as well as by her husband and literary executor John Middleton Murry, and her Italian translator Mara Fabietti. Chiara Galletti shows that the process of translation does not follow the ineluctable logic of a narrative plot but rather evolves by what "Christiane Nord described as the 'looping' movements of translation."

Furthermore, as Nathalie Mälzer's case study included in this publication illustrates, editors do not always limit themselves to improving and correcting a text; they may also add entire chunks of their own invention to a translation in order to satisfy a specific genre expectation in the target culture. The original author may also intervene so substantially in the revisionary phase that one may justifiably ask if, in so doing, he or she does not become a sort of co-executive translator. In an essay published in 2007 Marilyn Booth, the translator of a Saudi chick lit novel into English, recounts how the original author "requested that she be permitted to revise my translation without consulting me. […] In the end, I was given only the opportunity to read the final text and decide whether I wanted my name to appear on the title page."[65] In other words Booth was asked if she wanted to 'own the words,' so to speak, by appearing as the declarative translator.

The interplay between executive, declarative and revisionary translatorship is intricate because declarative translatorship entails responsibility: translators may be held responsible for features of the translations that derive from the revisionary phase and which they did not themselves produce. Indeed, one valid motive for uncovering the dynamics of the translation process may be to relieve translators of some of the burden of having a name, the responsibility of declarative translatorship, and to reveal that they do not only act, but are also acted upon, that they are not only agents but are at times subject to other people's decisions.

Love's definition of authorship as a "repertoire" or "a series of functions" raises important questions about *authority* that may also be applied to the field of translation. Who decides: the executive, the declarative or the revisionary translator? Where does one form of authority end and another begin?

In most of the papers collected in these volumes, revisionary translators have more authority than executive ones; typically, translators must be prepared to follow the instructions or accept the interventions of editors. When Vera Blackwell, the translator of Václav Havel in Michelle Woods'

contribution, protested against the ways Havel's plays were being edited for the Anglo-American stage, she was blacklisted by London and New York theatres and told that she was "nur eine Übersetzerin," only a female translator. However, other case studies depict the opposite situation, such as the account by Indonesian editor and journalist Mikael Johani in which, as mentioned above, he was essentially forced to agree with every decision made by the American translator of Djenar Maesa Ayu's novel. "My hands were tied, my mouth gagged," Johani writes. Because the translator-editor relationship was embedded within the Occident-Orient relationship, the executive translator in this case was granted the right to enforce the editor's obedience. It is thus clear that the case studies in this book do not provide one single answer to the above-listed questions about authority in the translation process. Rather, they suggest that precise answers can only emerge from an examination of the languages involved, the concrete context in which the translation process takes place and the status of the various agents involved in the process.

Multiple Cases of Multiple Translatorship

The case studies provided by the contributions to these two volumes are set in an array of historical and contemporary contexts and involving a rich variety of languages, including Czech, Danish, English, Finnish, French, German, Indonesian, Italian, Portuguese, Swedish, and Turkish.

The first section of volume one, *Theatre Translation: Collaboration or Conflict*, focuses on theatre translation, a field populated by multiple agents that generally prioritizes the 'speakability' or 'performability' of the dramatic text. In the first paper, Michelle Woods makes a case for the existence of covert market censorship in Western societies by investigating how editors, publishers and directors domesticated Václav Havel's plays in the 1960s and 1970s in order to make them "commercially viable" in an Anglo-American context. In the following article, Marion Dalvai shows how Italian playwright Dario Fo's permission to freely adapt his texts has influenced the English-language translations and/or versions of *Accidental Death of an Anarchist.* By exploring

the paratexts to the many different editions of this play, she reveals a fundamental dissonance between the heavily adapted play texts and the paratextual apparatus which, in contrast, stresses faithfulness, authenticity and truthfulness to the original. In Wolfgang Görtschacher's 'narrative' of a translation event, we find the translator and the director engaged in "united labour" throughout all the stages of the translation process. His paper highlights the crucial role that archival material such as director's copies and unpublished correspondence play in enabling the research to gauge how so-called third parties have influenced the translation product. The subsequent article by Geraldine Brodie also adds personal interviews to the list of empirical material required for identifying the contributions made by the many collaborators involved in the "theatrical reality" of translated drama texts. This is also and especially true, as she points out, for hidden agents such as the literal translators, who are often executive translators but very seldom declarative ones.

The five papers in the next section, *Authors and Translators: Polyphony and (In)visibility*, investigate different kinds of relationships between translators and authors and different ways of sharing, claiming or ceding authority over the translated text. In exploring the invisible literal translator, Chiara Galletti presents a study of "four-handed performances" in the translation of children's literature classics, such as Tove Jansson's *Moomin* books. On the basis of "insider" documentation (working notes, email communication, preliminary drafts, etc.) she illuminates the intricate and markedly recursive nature of collaboration between literal translators and adapters, the latter often renowned poets or children's literature writers. Björn Sundmark's paper explores the intimate and very unequal author-translator relationship between Selma Lagerlöf and Velma Swanston Howard, documented through many years of personal correspondence (totaling over 400 letters), that exposes both authorial intervention and a high degree of self-effacement and submissive behavior on the part of the translator. In contrast, as Cecilia Wadsö Lecaros shows in her contribution, the Swedish translator and editor Sophie Leijonhufvud more powerfully

appropriates Dinah Mulock's *A Woman's Thoughts about Women* for her own feminist agenda by introducing an additional authorial voice and redefining the implied readership of the text. The complex question of who is behind the "I" of the translated text is also central to the paper by Alexandra Lopes who shows how the original complex web of fictional authorial voices in a Walter Scott novel is replaced in Ramalho de Sousa's Portuguese translation, by a contradictory polyphony of extra-textual voices emerging from a wealth of footnotes by the original author, the intermediary French translator and editor and the Portuguese translator himself. The last paper in this section presents a dialogue between a professional translator, Monica Pavani, and an "alert reader," Emilia di Martino that originated from the latter's hypothesis that traces of editorial interventions could perhaps be detected in the published Italian translation of Alan Bennett's *The Uncommon Reader*. In this paper they present their joint reflections on translatorial choices, editorial practices and the translator's relationship with the source text and the target public.

The second volume that opens with a section entitled *Editorial Intervention*, featuring four contributions, focuses more specifically on the role of the editor and the many different ways that revisionary translatorship (in the sense defined above) might be exerted. Davide Manenti's contribution discusses Lefevere's notion of rewriting in relation to both translational and non-translational editorship, comparing how Katherine Mansfield's notebooks have been rewritten or manipulated by the author herself, her husband and eventually the translator. He queries if insights into the translation process may also help us understand (pre-translation) editorial processes better. Mikael Johani offers a personal essay exploring how global power structures can determine relations between the original author, editor and translator. Ebbe Klitgård shows how the editorial policies of an elite Danish literary journal imposed radical changes on the translations it published in terms of literary genre. As Klitgård documents through a detailed analysis of the source texts and different Danish versions of the target texts, the journal turned Chaucer's narrative poetry into short

stories in an operation that might indeed be called a "genre-diktat." Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov's essay calls for alternative and reliable sources of information to trace the editors' voice in translated texts and assesses the relevance of resources that translation research has yet to examine, namely editors' autobiographies.

The six contributions assembled in the final section, *Publishers, Paratexts and Translation Policies*, view the translation event and translation product from a broader perspective. The focus here is on institutional contexts such as publishing houses, translation bureaus and distribution companies that lay down the constraints translators are obliged to comply with and on paratextual elements that serve to grant visibility to the ideological or commercial motives of these parties. This section begins with Sehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar's exploration of the various functions of allographical prefaces written by literary critics, politicians or other prominent cultural agents in Turkey. She shows how the allographical preface writers often deviate significantly from the main task of the preface genre, that of presenting a text, by using digressions that give clues as to their ideological inclinations and constitute a resource for understanding how a given translation is positioned in the target culture. Ken Farø's paper delves into the translation of feature films and illustrates how economic interests lead to systematic and radical title changes, a "play-it-safe" strategy that is employed by distribution companies without any input from the translator. Deborah Biancheri argues against the "pseudo transparency" policy adopted by the majority of Italian publishing houses through an analysis of the Italian translation of Dermot Bolger's *The Journey Home*. Stylistic domestication combined with unmediated preservation of foreign elements may give the impression of easy accessibility, but the author argues that this approach is actually a way of "silencing through negligence." To allow "newness to enter the world" and create visibility for the translator, Biancheri joins Dalvai and Nergaard (in this volume) in calling for a more extensive use of forewords, footnotes and other means of critical mediation in translation.

Nathalie Mälzer sketches a step-by-step map of the typical book production process in big German publishing houses and then proceeds to illustrate a series of specific measures publishers take to "redesign the product to commercial ends," including extensive editorial revising of translations and inventing new titles and book covers to accommodate prevailing book design conventions in the target culture. Siri Nergaard investigates both peritextual and epitextual strategies employed by the Italian publishing house Iperborea to introduce translated Scandinavian literature to a new readership. She emphasizes that the publisher usually has the last word and urges translators to become more directly involved in the publishing process as a whole so as to influence the various paratextual elements (e.g. front and back covers, images, illustrations, and fore- or afterwords) that give meaning to the translation itself. In the final contribution, Agnes Whitfield provides a far-reaching overview of author-translator-publisher communication at English-Canadian literary presses from the 1960s to the present day. Working from the premise that publishing companies are the main institutional site in which the translation event takes place, Whitfield shows how these sites structure internal communication between authors, translators and editors while at the same time exploring how such internal practices reflect the broader political, cultural and economic factors affecting the publishing world, from market forces and distribution networks to government politics.

The contributions to this publication offer irrefutable evidence that multiple translatorship may take indeed many different and complex forms. Case studies seem particularly effective in bringing to light the very variety, specificity and contingency that characterizes the ways in which the translational agents relate to each other, the ways in which authority over the translated text is distributed, and the ways in which the translation event evolves as a whole. As Kaisa Koskinen states in a suggestive paper on possible causal explanations in Translation Studies, "any case is a complex knot of details, influences and potentially relevant factors, and one needs a holistic

approach to account for that complexity."[66] It is not within our aims, and even less within our power, to propose any form of single holistic explanatory model (if such a model indeed exists). Rather we want to emphasize the importance of flexible and comprehensive approaches (stressing the plural) to grasp the many possible hows and whys of multiple translatorship. At the end of the day, despite their conspicuous variety, we are confident that delving into the case studies can nonetheless reveal patterns and regularities – if only the very fact that behind every translation is a multiple translatorship.

Notes

[1] The work of Hanne Jansen, carried out as part of research project *Voices of Translation: Rewriting Literary Texts in a Scandinavian Context*, was supported by the Research Council of Norway in collaboration with the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Oslo [project number 213246], see http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/research/projects/voices-of-translation/index.html

[2] Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility* (London & New York: Routledge, 2008), 2nd edition, p. 12.

[3] Hanne Jansen, "The author strikes back. The author-translator dialogue as a special kind of paratext," in *Tracks and Treks in TS. Selected papers from the EST Congres, Leuven 2010*, eds. Magdalena Bartlomiejczyk, Reine Meylaerts, Sonia Vandepitte and Catherine Way (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2013). Anna Wegener's study is part of her ongoing research project on the translation and reception of Karin Michaëlis' *Bibi* books in Italy in the interwar years.

[4] See <http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/research/groups/Voice-in-Translation/index.html>.

[5] Selected papers from two other conferences organized by the research group have already been or will soon be published: *La Traduction des voix intra-textuelles / Intratextual Voices in Translation*, eds. Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov and Myriam Suchet (Montréal: Éditions québécoises de l'oeuvre, collection Vita Traductiva, 2013) and *Voice in Retranslation* (forthcoming in a special issue of *Target*, vol. 27, no. 1).

[6] See Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov's introduction "Voice in the Field of Translation Studies," in *La Traduction des voix intra-textuelles / Intratextual Voices in Translation*, pp.1-9.

[7] Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov, "Voice in the Field of Translation Studies," pp. 4-5.

[8] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995), p. 184.

[9] Jack Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. vi.

[10] Jack Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of the Solitary Genius*, p. v.

[11] Jack Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of the Solitary Genius*, p. 183.

[12] We are indebted to Andrew Bennett's book *The Author* for directing our attention to the vast literature on literary collaboration. See Andrew Bennet, *The Author* (London & New York: Routledge, 2005), pp. 94-107.

[13] Functionalist approaches quite early on took interest in the roles and interaction of the other participants in the translation process besides the translator (especially the commissioner and the target consumer), as Sharon O'Brien points out in her article on "Collaborative translation" in *Handbook of Translation Studies,* vol. 2, eds. Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011, pp. 17-20). Generally, however, the notion of "collaborative translation" is used with reference to collaboration between two or more translators involved in the same translation project.

[14] Hélène Buzelin, "Translations 'in the making'," in *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, eds. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007), p. 141.

[15] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, p. 10.

[16] Andrew Chesterman, "Bridge concepts in translation sociology," in *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, eds. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007), p. 173.

[17] Susan Bassnett, "The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies," in *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*, eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998), p. 123.

[18] See Reine Meylaerts, "Translators and (their) norms. Towards a sociological construction of the individual," in *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*, eds. Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger and Daniel Simeoni (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008), p. 91: "[…] in particular, by focusing on the study of various and variable norms as the "very epitome" (1995:53) of a target-oriented approach, Toury's model for Descriptive Translation Studies has privileged collective schemes and structures instead of individual actor."

[19] Hélène Buzelin, "Translations 'in the making'," p. 142.

[20] Riitta Jääskeläinen, "The Changing Position of "the Translator" in Research and in Practice," *Journal of Translation Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1 (2007), p 2.

[21] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, p.183.

[22] André Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 8.

[23] André Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, p. 13

[24] John Milton and Paul Bandia, eds. *Agents of Translation* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009), p. 1.

[25] Andrew Chesterman, "The Name and Nature of Translator Studies," *Hermes*, vol. 42 (2009), p. 15.

[26] See Michaela Wolf, "Introduction. The emergence of a sociology of translation," in *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, eds. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007), p. 5; and Michaela Wolf, "Sociology of translation," in *Handbook of Translation Studies.* vol. 2, eds. Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011), p. 341.

[27] Andrew Chesterman, "Bridge concepts in translation sociology," p. 176.

[28] See "Happening Architecture. A Socio-constructivist approach to social housing design," <http://www.sumaarquitectura.eu/musa_archivos/Page903.htm>. Website last accessed 10 October 2013).

[29] Daniel Simeoni talks about the "culturalist paradigm" in "Translation and Society: The Emergence of a Conceptual Relationship," in *In Translation. Reflections, Refractions,*

Transformations, eds. Paul St-Pierre and Prafulla C. Kar (Delhi: Pencraft International, 2005), pp. 3-14.

[30] Douglas Robinson, *Who translates? Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001), p. 142.

[31] Daniel Simeoni, "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus," in *Target*, vol. 10, no. 1 (1998), pp. 1-39.

[32] Reine Meylaerts, "Translators and (their) norms. Towards a sociological construction of the individual," in *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*, eds. Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger and Daniel Simeoni (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008), p. 93.

[33] Hélène Buzelin, referring to Daniel Simeoni, in "Unexpected Allies. How Latour's Network Theory Could Complement Bourdieusian Analyses in Translation Studies," *The Translator*, vol. 11, no. 2 (2005), p. 203.

[34] See Daryl R. Hague, "Prophets and Pandemonium: creativity in the translating self," in *New Voices in Translation Studies*, vol. 5 (2009), p. 19: "Translators perpetuate these 'particular ways' − normative translation behaviors − as they produce what others consider acceptable translational discourse. Whether translators can question or change these normative behaviors is the subject of sharp disagreement."

[35] Reine Meylaerts, "Translators and (their) norms," p. 94.

[36] Douglas Robinson, *Who translates? Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason*, p. 143.

[37] Douglas Robinson, *Who translates? Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason*, p. 143.

[38] Daniel Simeoni, "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus," p. 452.

[39] Andrew Chesterman, "The Name and Nature of Translator Studies," *Hermes*, vol. 42 (2009), pp. 13-22.

[40] Hélène Buzelin, "Agents of translation," in *Handbook of Translation Studies,* vol. 2, eds. Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011), p. 9.

[41] Andrea Whittle and André Spicer, "Is Actor Network Theory Critique?," *Organization Studies* vol. 29, no. 4 (2008), p. 616, <http://oss.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/611>. Website last accessed 10 October 2013.

[42] Douglas Robinson, *Who translates? Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason*, p. 187.

[43] Hélène Buzelin, "Unexpected Allies. How Latour's Network Theory Could Complement Bourdieusian Analyses in Translation Studies," p. 216.

[44] Debra Howcroft, Nathalie Mitev and Melanie Wilson, "What We May Learn from the Social Shaping of Technology Approach," in *Social Theory and Philosophy for Information Systems*, eds. John Mingers and Leslie Willcocks (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2004), p. 355.

[45] Debra Howcroft, Nathalie Mitev and Melanie Wilson, "What We May Learn from the Social Shaping of Technology Approach," p. 355.

[46] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, p. 183.

[47] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, p. 183.

[48] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, p. 185.

[49] Pierre-Marc de Biasi, "Toward a Science of Literature: Manuscript Analysis and the Genesis of the Work", in *Genetic Criticism*, eds. Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer and Michael Groden (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), p. 46.

[50] Louis Hay, "Does "Text" Exist?" *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 41 (1998), p. 68.

[51] Michelle Woods, *Translating Milan Kundera*, (Clevedon, Buffalo and Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2006), p. viii.

[52] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, p. 187.

[53] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, p. 187.

[54] Adain Chambers, *Reading Talk* (Gloucestershire: Thimble Press, 2001), p. 132.

[55] Pierre-Marc de Biasi, "Toward a Science of Literature: Manuscript Analysis and the Genesis of the Work", p. 37.

[56] Harold Love, *Attributing Authorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 4.

[57] Harold Love, *Attributing Authorship*, p. 32.

[58] Andrew Bennett, *The Author,* p. 98.

[59] Harold Love, *Attributing Authorship*, p. 39.

[60] Harold Love, *Attributing Authorship*, p. 46.

[61] Harold Love, *Attributing Authorship*, p. 40.

[62] Harold Love, *Attributing Authorship*, p. 43.

[63] Harold Love, *Attributing Authorship*, p. 43.

[64] Harold Love, *Attributing Authorship*, p. 47.

[65] Marilyn Booth, "Translator v. author: *Girls of Riyadh* go to New York," *Translation Studies*, vol. 1, no. 2 (2008), p. 201.

[66] Kaisa Koskinen, "Agency and causality: towards explaining by mechanisms in translation studies," in *Translators' agency*, eds. Tuija Kinnunen and Kaisa Koskinen (Tampere: Tampere University Press, Tampere Studies in Language, Translation and Culture, Series: B 4, 2010), p.171.

Bibliography

BASSNETT, Susan. "The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies." In *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*. Eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998, pp. 123-140.

BENNETT, Andrew. *The Author*. London & New York: Routledge, 2005.

BIASI, Pierre-Marc de. "Toward a Science of Literature: Manuscript Analysis and the Genesis of the Work." In *Genetic Criticism*. Eds. Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer and Michael Groden. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004, pp.36-68.

BOOTH, Marilyn. "Translator v. author: *Girls of Riyadh* go to New York." *Translation Studies*, vol. 1, no. 2 (2008): 197-211.

BUZELIN, Hélène. "Unexpected Allies. How Latour's Network Theory Could Complement Bourdieusian Analyses in Translation Studies." *The Translator*, vol. 11, no. 2 (2005): 193-218.

_____. "Translations "in the making"." In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Eds. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007, pp. 135-169.

_____. "Agents of translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies,* vol. 2. Eds. Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011, pp. 6-12.

CHAMBERS, Adain. "In Spite of Being a Translation." In *Reading Talk*. Gloucestershire: The Thimble Press, 2001, pp. 113-137.

CHESTERMAN, Andrew. "Bridge concepts in translation sociology." In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Eds. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007, pp. 171-183.

_____. "The Name and Nature of Translator Studies." *Hermes*, vol. 42 (2009): 13-22.

DELABASTIA, Dirk. "Status, origin, features. Translation and beyond." In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*. Eds. Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger and Daniel Simeoni. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008, pp. 234-246.

HAGUE, DARYL R. "Prophets and Pandemonium: creativity in the translating self." *New Voices in Translation Studies*, vol. 5 (2009), pp. 16-28

HAY, Louis. "Does "Text" Exist?" *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 41 (1988): 64-76.

HEKKANEN, Raila. "Fields, Networks and Finnish Prose. A Comparison of Bourdieusian Field Theory and Actor-Network Theory in Translation Sociology." In *Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2008*. Ed. Dries De Crom. 2009, pp. 1-22. Available online: <http://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/files/hekkanen.pdf>. Website last accessed 10 October 2013.

HERMANS, Theo. *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1999.

HOWCROFT, Debra, Nathalie MITEV and Melanie WILSON. "What We May Learn from the Social Shaping of Technology Approach." In *Social Theory and Philosophy for Information Systems*. Eds. John Mingers and Leslie Willcocks. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2004, pp. 329-371.

JÂÄSKELÄLEINEN, Riitta. "The Changing Position of "the Translator" in Research and in Practice." *Journal of Translation Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1 (2007): 1-15.

JANSEN, Hanne. "The author strikes back. The author-translator dialogue as a special kind of paratext." In *Tracks and Treks in TS. Selected papers from the EST Congres, Leuven 2010*. Eds. Magdalena Bartlomiejczyk, Reine Meylaerts, Sonia Vandepitte and Catherine Way. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2013, pp. 247-266.

KOSKINEN, Kaisa "Agency and causality: towards explaining by mechanisms in translation studies." In *Translators' agency*. Eds. Tuija Kinnunen and Kaisa Koskinen. Tampere: Tampere University Press (Tampere Studies in Language, Translation and Culture, Series: B 4), 2010, pp. 165-185.

LATOUR, Bruno. "On Actor-Network Theory: A Few Clarifications." *Soziale Welt*, vol. 47, no. 4 (1996): 369-381. Also available online: <http://www.nettime.org/Lists-Archives/nettime-l-9801/msg00019.html>. Website last accessed 9 July 2013.

LEFEVERE, André. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

LOVE, Harold. *Attributing Authorship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

MEYLAERTS, Reine. "Translators and (their) norms. Towards a sociological construction of the individual." In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*. Eds. Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger and Daniel Simeoni. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008, pp. 91-102.

MILTON, John and Paul BANDIA, eds. *Agents of Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009.
O'BRIEN, Sharon. "Collaborative translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies,* vol. 2. Eds. Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011, pp. 17-20.

ROBINSON, Douglas. *Who translates? Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.

SIMEONI, Daniel. "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus." *Target*, vol. 10, no. 1 (1998): 1-39.

_____. "Translation and Society: The Emergence of a Conceptual Relationship." In *In Translation. Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*. Eds. Paul St-Pierre and Prafulla C. Kar. Delhi: Pencraft International, 2005, pp. 3-14.

ST. ANDRÉ, James. "History." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Eds. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha. London and New York: Routledge, 2009, 2nd ed., pp. 133-136.

STILLINGER, Jack. *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

TAIVALKOSKI-SHILOV, Kristiina, and Myriam SUCHET, eds. *La Traduction des voix intra-textuelles / Intratextual Voices in Translation*. Montreal: Éditions québécoises de l'oeuvre, Collection Vita Traductiva, 2013.

TAIVALKOSKI-SHILOV, Kristiina. "Voice in the Field of Translation Studies." In *La Traduction des voix intra-textuelles / Intratextual Voices in Translation*. Eds. Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov, and Myriam Suchet. Montreal: Éditions québécoises de l'oeuvre, Collection Vita Traductiva, 2013, pp. 1-9.

TOURY, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.

WHITTLE, Andrea and André SPICER. "Is Actor Network Theory Critique?" *Organization Studies* vol. 29, no. 4 (2008): 611-629. <http://oss.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/611>. Website last accessed 9 July 2013.

WOLF, Michaela. "Introduction. The emergence of a sociology of translation." In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Eds. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007, pp. 1-36.

_____. "Sociology of translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies.* vol. 2. Eds. Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011, pp. 337-343.

WOODS, Michelle. *Translating Milan Kundera*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Limited, 2006.