Abstracts
Some Challenges of the Scots Language in Ballad Editing

In the 1930s, the American folklore collector J. M. Carpenter took down (from dictation) a large number of Scottish traditional ballads, largely in north-east Scotland. In many cases, his handling of the written Scots language is impressive, but not infrequently he uses orthographic forms which are either not recognized at all in the various authoritative Scots dictionaries, or else can be attested but only as rare or archaic forms. In addition, in creating fair copies of his collected materials, there is some evidence of a tendency to ‘Scotticize’, substituting Scots forms such as *An* for standard English *And*, for example. Moreover, the ballads – and this is not uncommon with such material – characteristically display a mixing of Scots and English forms.

The editor dealing with these texts faces a number of problems. In particular, it is necessary to emend nonsensical spellings, and to choose an appropriate form of emendation; for example, *enti*, which is not recognized, might be emended as English *into*, Scots *intae*, or *inti* which is recorded more rarely in southern Scots. Because Scots is a language that to a greater extent than English reflects pronunciation, it is necessary to consider how valid it might be to guess whether the written form is meant to represent what the collector (not a native Scots speaker) thought he had heard. Further challenges are posed by variant spellings such as *bonny/bonnie* which apparently have no inherent rationale or significance.

Now that Scots is widely recognized as a distinct language rather than just a dialect, albeit part of a complex of languages more or less closely related to standard English, the editor has not only a scholarly but a political obligation to render Scots accurately. Yet the language itself does not conform to a definitive spelling system, and the necessarily historical nature of the ballads means that in certain cases obscure or archaic forms may well be valid. This paper outlines some of the challenges encountered and the editorial strategy that is being developed for the rendering of Scots in a critical edition.
Mark Bland

Jonson’s Ramist Charts: Edition and Translation

Jonson’s Ramist Charts (announced at ESTS Lisbon 2008) pose a different range of editorial problems than for his poetry, masques, or prose. Unlike Jonson’s English work, the text is multi-linguistic (in Latin — primarily —, Greek, and Hebrew) and requires translation. Further, it draws upon texts in multiple languages that also require commentary. This paper will outline the range of the problems involved and the nature of what editorial intervention may be required, including the creation of facing text and translation, and typographic distinctions required to register variant languages in the original. Further it will discuss Jonson’s sources and their implications for textual commentary, as well as how this might be handled for a typographically difficult text.

Barbara Bordalejo

In Darwin I Trust: the Online Variorum and the Changes to The Origin of Species?

In the early days of this project, I was asked whether I thought that it would be a disservice to Darwin to make it so evident that he had changed his mind. This concern arises because during the last few years the antievolutionary movement (now so prevalent in the United States where it lives under the disguise of the pseudo-scientific Intelligent Design), seems to have gained unprecedented force. Whether or not the Online Variorum could have such effect, was never a consideration of this project. The moving force behind this edition was not to try to present Darwin’s thought in a particular light, but to trace the development of his thoughts through years of laboring over the same work. However, the Online Variorum shows that Darwin’s writing in the Origin developed in a very specific manner. The many changes between editions are not whimsical. Instead, they follow a particular direction that makes evident the shift in status of both author and book. In this paper, I present examples of the different types of changes found in the Origin and offer a hypothesis about why particular changes were implemented.

Michael Boyden

Editing a Sequentially Bilingual Text: The Autobiography of Carl Schurz

My paper highlights some of the ‘genetic’ problems involved in the edition of the memoir of the nineteenth-century German-American statesman and man of letters Carl Schurz, which I am currently preparing for publication in Peter Lang’s ‘New Directions in German-American Studies’ series. In the American context, there are numerous instances of hybrid immigrant autobiographies, which intersperse the English text with words or phrases in the immigrant’s mother tongue, often to obtain an exotic or authentic effect. Schurz’s case is somewhat peculiar (but by no means unique) insofar as he wrote his memoir sequentially in two languages, i.e. he wrote about his youth years in Europe in German, but switched to English to convey his adult life in the United States. For obvious commercial reasons, the memoir was never published in this way. Monolingual versions of the text came out almost simultaneously in Germany and America to serve the respective national readerships of these countries (and to prevent that the largely bilingual German-American community would be content with the English version alone). There are, however, significant divergences between the two authorized editions. Like so many immigrant autobiographies, moreover, Schurz’s life story was first serialized in a monthly magazine, so that we have at our disposal four different versions of the work (not counting the numerous abridgements and adaptations that have come out since): the American McClure edition (1907-8), the German Reimer edition (1906-12), both in three volumes, the monthly installments in McClure’s Magazine (November 1905 to October 1908), and, finally, the actual handwritten manuscript on deposit in the Library of Congress. In my new edition of the book, I want to return to Schurz’s ‘original’ and draw attention to the lacunae in the existing editions. In this way, I hope to show how distinct imagined communities – the American and German readers, as well as the heterogeneous German-Americans – have not only been served different life stories of Carl Schurz but have been actively involved in the construction (through selection, translation, and rewriting) of ‘home-made’ images of a well-known public persona on both sides of the Atlantic.
Hermann B R I N K M A N

*Editing Colour: Foreign Language Coloration as an Artificial Device in Medieval and Early Modern Dutch Poetry*

Situated between French and German cultural centres Dutch literature has always been subject to influences from neighbouring language areas. On several historical occasions, especially during the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times, this has resulted in the formation of artificial and hybrid poetic languages. Political dominance by foreign non-Dutch speaking rulers and the subsequent multilingualism of the court is often said to have been decisive in this process. However, literary culture in the cities, especially in the ones that were largely dependent on international trade, may have been of equal importance. At the end of the fourteenth century a shift from German to French influences takes place on different levels: while the coloration of words remains influenced by German, literary forms start to be derived from French examples. In the fifteenth century however, as the influence of German declines, new words derived from French are introduced in poetic language, which reaches its climax in sixteenth century rhetoricians poetry. As the extent to which foreign language coloration is applied varies from manuscript to manuscript and scribal transmission often obscures authorial intention it is difficult to establish proper standards for representation of this phenomenon in a scholarly edition. Especially where artificial language used by an author interferes with particularities of scribal dialect, editing this type of poetry may pose specific challenges.

Jennifer N. B R O W N

*Translating into Orthodoxy*

In the thirteenth century, the Low Countries experienced a particular kind of grassroots religion, especially in regards to women. Most of this was due to the popularity of the beguine movement and the kind of mystical, visionary piety it espoused and nurtured. *Vitae* of some of these holy women and books written by them spread to many parts of the continent, establishing a firm tradition in France, Spain, Italy and Sweden in addition to the Low Countries themselves. England, however, remains strangely aloof and immune to this spread of affective piety and its accompanying texts. The textual and codicological evidence of interest in continental mysticism in England is next to nothing, and the little that exists insularly is much later than its continental counterparts: almost entirely fifteenth-century.

This paper will look at some of those fifteenth-century texts, such as the Middle English lives of Christina mirabilis and Elizabeth of Spalbeek, and the Middle English translation of the Book of Marguerite Porete, and demonstrate how the English translators of these texts re-shaped what they perceived as heterodox, if not slightly heretical texts, into a profound orthodoxy amidst the English Lollard heretical controversies of the early 15th century – as well as widespread English anxiety about vernacular devotional texts -- by cutting, adding, and shaping. In the end, the English versions of the Low Countries texts retain much of the mystical and visionary qualities of the original, but they are glossed and re-shaped so that the reader has no doubt as to how they are to be read and understood.

Charlotte C A I L L I A U

*Multilingualism and scholarly editing: Willem Kloos*

The Dutch poet Willem Kloos (1859-1938) made his debut with the volume *Verses* in 1894. This extensive volume of poetry contains in addition to approximately 170 sonnets and three fragments in Dutch, five verses in German and three in French. The verses in German were the first Kloos wrote in 1879, when he was seventeen, in reaction to the death of a friend. According to the poet, he wrote his ‘firstlings’ in German, because at the time he was highly influenced by the readings of Von Platen, Goethe and Schiller. Moreover the German language and culture were part of his heritage, since his father’s family was of German descent. The writing in French he attributes to the French ancestors of his mother.
In my paper I will focus on two, according to my opinion, important questions that come with the editing of such a multilingual work of literature. Firstly that is, how much comment does the editor have to provide for the user in those cases and by comparison with monolingual works? Does s/he for instance have to offer a translation of the poem? And secondly, how profoundly does the editor need to intervene? How do we have to assess Kloos’s knowledge of both languages (and the difference between ‘unintended’ and ‘intended’ mistakes)?

On the basis of this case study I will formulate some propositions concerning methods of editing multilingual works in general.

Christopher Callahan

Troubadours in northern France: of macaronic texts and melodic unica

Troubadour song makes its first written appearance as early as the 1220s, in the Roman de Guillaume de Dole and the Roman de la Violette, while the earliest trouvère chansonniers, BN fr. 20056 (troubadour X/trouvère U), ca. 1230-1240, and BN fr. 844 (troubadour W/trouvère M), ca. 1260s, each devote a sizable section to Occitan lyric. Not only do these sources constitute the oldest records of troubadour poetry by several decades, but a third of the songs offer the only extant version of the melody, making these trouvère codices significant sources of information on troubadour music.

When these melodies can be compared with those in BN fr. 22543 (ms. R) and Milan, Ambrosiana R71 sup. (ms. G), the two troubadour manuscripts that preserve music, they show remarkable consistency across time, distance and redactions, indicating that the scribes of X and W worked from written sources in circulation long before the compilation of the major troubadour anthologies.

The evidence for written circulation of the texts is even stronger, for these are written in a hybrid of French and Occitan, preserving Occitan forms in rhyme position and in key lexical items that transmit a distinctly southern aura, while the morphology tends to be native French. This hybrid language attests not only to the popularity of the troubadours in the north, but also to the eagerness of audiences to absorb Occitan language and culture. I wish to argue that the Franco-Ocitan jargon in which these songs are first preserved held the status of ‘lyric language’, as William Paden has posited for literary Occitan: a koïné in which cultural flavor takes precedence over complete comprehensibility. In doing so, I will examine in detail the language and the melodies of mss. X and W and compare them with those of the major troubadour codices compiled in northern Italy in the early fourteenth century.

Hans Debel

Greek ‘Variant Literary Editions’ To The Hebrew Bible? Reflections upon the history of the biblical text

It goes without saying that the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible has been revolutionised by the discovery of the Qumran scrolls. Whereas prior to 1947, the Masoretic Text was considered the central textual witness to the Hebrew Bible, the Scrolls have confirmed the text-critical value of the formerly often disregarded Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch as equally reliable witnesses. Moreover, the scrolls have given impetus to new reflections on the history and development of the biblical text during the period of Second Temple Judaism. Against this background, the four major contributions to this field will be critically reviewed in this paper, viz. (1) the Albright-Cross ‘theory of local texts’, (2) the emphasis of Talmon on the sociological aspect of Gruppentexte, (3) Tov’s dismissal of the notion ‘text-types’ in favour of ‘texts’ and (4) the concept of ‘variant literary editions’ recently introduced in biblical studies by Ulrich. Though this paper will generally argue in line with Ulrich’s hermeneutic model, a plea will be made to extend his outlook on the history of the Hebrew Scriptural text also to the Septuagint. As some of the Greek translators in fact created new editions of the individual biblical books they were translating, their translations witness to the same dynamic process of Scripture’s organic development and do not merely belong to the interpretational tradition.

Burghard Deiener

Intertextual layers in translations: methods of research and editorial presentation
1. Many texts or textual elements are characterized by an intertextual relationship. This may appear in the loose form of a hidden inspiration or in the more strict form of an open quotation. Within this large family, translations constitute one particular species. I will discuss some ways of marking this translational relationship in textual editions.

2. In many cases, the intertextual relationship in translations is subject to firm conventional or even contractual norms. I will explore the editorial advantages that can be derived from this fact. It can, e.g., enable editors to read illegible or ambiguous parts in manuscripts or even to explain and to amend possible corruptions in printed texts.

3. Most translators use dictionaries and frequently they consult earlier translations. In this case a given textual element is related to more than one outside text. I will again demonstrate means of ‘editing’ these intertextual layers and I will show how they can shed light on the development of a text.

4. Finally I will show that translated elements can sometimes carry a meaning which has been obscured in the process of translation. This problem does not necessarily affect the editor, but it can be of crucial importance for the writer of commentaries.

Jeroen De Keyser
Translating and publishing Xenophon in the Renaissance

Long before Xenophon’s writings were printed in the original Greek, Italian humanists were already busy translating them into Latin. In this paper I will concentrate on the contribution of Francesco Filelfo (1398-1481), who as a young man translated two opuscula (Constitution of the Spartans and Agesilaus, 1430), and more than three decades later, for his last and most ambitious undertaking in the field, got back to Xenophon to translate the Cyropaedia (1467), engaging in an explicit polemic with the earlier abridged translation by his colleague Poggio Bracciolini.

Filelfo was an excellent graecist – maybe the best in the West before Poliziano – and a keen manuscript collector, and his translations’ manuscripts are punctuated with philological, orthographical and translational marginalia in both Latin and Greek. It’s not a coincidence, then, that Filelfo’s translation still figures as an unequivocal indirect witness to the ‘original’ text in the critical apparatus of most modern Greek Xenophon editions, but a study of Filelfo’s Greek sources reveals a more complicated picture – and so does the edition history of his translations. Both teach us not to take Filelfo’s received text at face value, although it was the standard version Europe read Xenophon in for more than a century: Filelfo’s Cyropaedia edition was printed as early as 1477, forty years before the Greek editio princeps (Giunta, 1516). Together with both opuscula and Xenophon translations by other humanists it was subsequently reprinted in most sixteenth century bilingual Greek-Latin and monolingual Latin Xenophon editions, up to and including Stephanus’ annotated ‘critical’ editions.

Jeanine De Landtsheer
Towards Justus Lipsius’s Diva Sichemiensis sive Aspricolis (1605)

Around 1600 a modest statue of the Holy Virgin in Zichem (near Diest and Leuven) became increasingly popular by a flow of miracles, soon attracting people from all over Brabant and much further away. On 8 September 1603, the feast of the Virgin’s birthday, about 20,000 pilgrims prayed at the shrine, although it had not yet been confirmed as a place of worship by the Archbishop of Mechelen, Matthias Hovius. He asked Johannes Miraeus, who was to be enthroned bishop of Antwerp in May 1604, and Philip Numan, municipal secretary of Brussels, to gather and examine as many testimonies of alleged miracles as possible. They also prepared versions for print; Numan worked on the Dutch and the French version (Leuven: Zangrius, 1604), whereas Miraeus started with the Latin translation. In the first half of 1606 a Spanish and an English translation appeared as well. Meanwhile Lipsius had published his Diva Virgo Halleensis in the summer of 1604 and he was urged to take care of the Latin version of the Diva Sichemiensis. Numan sent him a copy of the French translation, Miraeus his nearly finished Latin manuscript (now Leiden, UB, ms. Lips. 47). Lipsius’s Diva Sichemiensis appeared in the summer of 1605. I will compare the vernacular versions with each other, and examine the evolution between the original version and Miraeus’s and Lipsius’s text.
Erica Durante
To see despite the languages, to see through books: Borges in his library

A personal library – particularly that of a writer – is a space where very different texts and languages circulate, where choices regarding the author’s literary and poetic itinerary will sometimes be evident, sometimes unexpected. Jorge Luis Borges (1899-1986) was not only an exceptional reader, but also a theorist of the library as an all-embracing literary object, pre-existing all writers and actualizing his own holistic vision of literature. A native speaker of Spanish, Borges was introduced to English in his childhood and to German during his adolescence before discovering, much later, through the readings of English poets, Dante’s Italian. Literature, and later on its teaching, are at the origin of an intellectual journey which will bring him, rather belatedly, to learn Old English and Icelandic. The study of an important part of his personal library provides, on the one hand, a unique opportunity for an authentic examination of how, through his readings, the author learned other languages, both ancient and modern. On the other hand, it allows one to follow the true ‘biography’ of his writing, as well as the genesis of his literary thinking.

Paul Eggert
Writing in a Language Not Your Own: Editions As Argument about the Work

In 1912 upon his first visit to the Continent D. H. Lawrence, brought up in England as a Congregationalist, found himself writing about Bavarian and Austrian Alpine cultures, especially their expressions of Catholic piety in wayside chapels and shrines that he found along the route he took. He was trying to earn a living by writing about them, but he was an ambitious thinker. What does an editor do when he or she learns that the author, in rendering and translating Bavarian and German inscriptions, has made some basic errors of interpretation and has normalised some of the German? Similarly, with Joseph Conrad, who wrote exclusively in his third language, English, what does the editor do with the author’s non-conventional usages? Conrad’s contemporary, Henry Lawson, the finest Australian short-story writer of the 1890s, was nearly deaf for most of his life yet found subtle ways of rendering the characteristic idioms and speech rhythms of a series of down-at-heel character-narrators. Like Conrad, he staged first-person storytelling situations where idiomatic language becomes the potent vehicle of truth-telling effects. This paper probes the dilemmas occasioned for editors by these ‘translations’ and uses the evidence to show that editions are a form of argument about the work. The editor is portrayed as unavoidably entwined in the reading text established, whether this be a text of a version or a final-intentions text. The paper argues that there is no external, objective position available to the editor and proposes that we distinguish between a broader editorial policy for the work as against editorial policy for the text.

Daniel Ferrer and Geert Lernout
James Joyce’s Personal Library

Writers are always readers too and for some writers, the art of reading became an integral part of their creative work. In Finnegans Wake James Joyce described the result of this practice with the word ‘stolentelling’ and it is in the case of his last work that we have a set of surviving notebooks in which Joyce copied words and phrases from his reading during the sixteen years it took him to write his most ambitious last book. These more than sixty notebooks are in the process of being edited by Vincent Deane and ourselves, and although they also contain original material (rare first drafts and some autobiographical notes) the vast majority have a source in Joyce’s immensely varied reading. He read newspapers, journals and magazines, but also a great variety of books, from extremely specialized scholarly publications to the most mundane books. With the edition of the notebooks it is possible to reconstruct Joyce’s library, both in terms of the limited number of his books for which we have the actual copies he used (as in the so-called Trieste and ‘Personal’ libraries) and in those cases where we don’t but where evidence of his reading has survived. The aim is to reconstruct the writer’s virtual library of all the books he read and used in his own writing. It is hardly surprising that such a superlatively multilingual book as Finnegans Wake should derive from a multilingual library. The complex process of multilingual note taking that this library generates is emblematic of the role of writers’ libraries as transactional spaces between multiple idioms.
Jan Gielkens

J.B. Priestley translated by Willem Frederik Hermans – or not?

The Dutch writer Willem Frederik Hermans (1921-1995) had strong opinions on many things – translations and the translating business was one of them. As a reviewer of hundreds of books he often made remarks on the quality of translations. As a writer in a language not spoken by many people he wanted to be translated into the main languages, and he blamed many people and institutions for the fact that this did not happen enough or not at all. As a translator his production was modest: it fits into Volume 19 (of 24) of the Volledige Werken, the ‘Complete Works’ of Willem Frederik Hermans. This volume will be published in 2015, and it will contain four of Hermans’ translations Zonlicht op zaterdag (1947) by the English writer John Boynton Priestley (Daylight on Saturday, 1943), Kraters in lichterlaatje (1954) by the French vulcanologist Haroun Tazieff (Cratères en feu, 1951), Tractatus logico-philosophicus (1975) by the Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein (1921), and De martelgang van de dikzak (1981) by the French writer Henri Béraud (Le Martyre de l’obèse, 1922).

Different reasons made Hermans translate these books. In the case of Le Martyre de l’obèse, he did it for fun: he just had the feeling that he had to translate this quirky book by right wing writer and journalist Béraud. The Tractatus – the first translation of this book into Dutch – Hermans translated as an admirer of Wittgenstein, about whom he wrote several articles. The book on volcanos by Tazieff was translated as a scientific activity: Hermans was a physical geography teacher at the University of Groningen at that time. Priestley is a different story: Hermans translated Daylight on Saturday for the money. The Volledige Werken will edit these translations as if they were texts by Hermans himself. We don’t see any great difficulties: three of the four books only exist in one version, the Tractatus had five editions during the author’s lifetime. The Wittgenstein book is the best documented translation we have in terms of correspondence, correction copies etc. But the most interesting case is Priestley, because it did not appear under Hermans’ own name. The publisher was not impressed by the quality of the translation, Hermans refused to edit his work within a certain amount of time, somebody else did it and a pseudonym was chosen for the publication.

My paper investigates some questions we have to ask ourselves editing these translations, like: why do we publish these translations anyway, why should we treat them the same way we treat other texts by Hermans, and, in the Priestley case: are we editing a text by Hermans – or not?

John Gouws

The editorial problem of Deneys Reitz’s Commando

Reitz, the son of F. W. Reitz (President of the Orange Free State and from 1898 Secretary of State to Paul Kruger), wrote the first version of his youthful experiences during the course of the Anglo-Boer War in Dutch, while in exile in Madagascar, following the defeat of the Boers by the British. Later, under the influence of Jan Smuts, he changed his hostile attitudes to the British, and ended a distinguished military career as a Colonel in the Second Royal Scots Fusiliers on the Western Front in 1918. In the mid 1920s Smuts persuaded him to translate and revise the work in an attempt to effect a reconciliation between English and Afrikaans-speaking South Africans. The original Dutch manuscript survives, as does the translation/revision with annotations and comments by Reitz’s wife. The printed version takes on board the suggestions, and so differs from the manuscript. In addition, there are many illustrations, drawings and newspaper cuttings interleaved in the manuscript translation that did not see the light of day in the published versions.

Stephen Guy-Bray

Translation and English Literary History: A Case Study

In the standard account of English literary history, the Renaissance is inaugurated largely by the translations of Petrarch by Sir Thomas Wyatt and Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey in the 1530s and 1540s and by the printing of many of these poems in Tottel’s Miscellany (1557). By translations I mean not only that Wyatt and Surrey produced English versions of specific sonnets from the Rime Sparse, but also that the sonnet form was for the first time used in
English, initially with the Italian rhyme scheme and then in the rhyme scheme invented by Surrey. Wyatt and Surrey’s sonnets are an example of *translatio studii* that has proved indispensable to literary history, but there are two problems with this history. One is that English uses of Petrarch predate the early sixteenth century: Chaucer mentions Petrarch in the prologue to the ‘Clerk’s Tale,’ which was written approximately 150 years earlier. The other is that the introduction of Petrarchan love sonnets into English is often seen as part of *translatio imperii*; in this case the rule or empire is not political power but rather the dominance of heteroeroticism as a poetic subject. According to this version, Wyatt and Surrey begin what we could call the translation of poetic affect and focus from same-sex to mixed-sex bonds. This translation was accomplished partly by English literary historians, but primarily by editors. Beginning with Tottel, editors of poetic anthologies (and, later, editors of the works of Surrey and Wyatt) have sought to present these poets as writers who were primarily—or, at least, most memorably—concerned with the love between a man and a woman. In this paper, I want to compare Petrarch’s sonnet ‘Amor, che nel penser mio vive et regna’ with the English versions by Wyatt and by Surrey in order to consider the various kinds of translating work done by English editors and literary historians.

Therese Kaiser and Axel Gellhaus

*How to edit Celan as a translator*

Already as a secondary school student Paul Celan started to translate and his translation work accompanies his poetic work continually. Among his papers there are published and unpublished translations from eight languages. The documents are of considerable importance with regard to quality and quantity. Not only does their range equal that of his own poetic work; the working process that can be reconstructed in detail also offers a deep insight into a hermeneutic process that is intensely connected to his own work. For the *Bonner Celan Ausgabe* there are quite a number of conceptual problems due to the extent and the non-linearity of the working process. Those problems and approaches to an editorial solution are covered by the two-part presentation. After a general introduction to the topic, the second part of the lecture tries to discuss characteristic features of Celan’s translations of American poetry and focuses on possible consequences of a non-linear working process for the editing of the translations, also with respect to the possibility of a digital edition.

Nicholas A. E. Kalospyros

*Taming variants: The role of the first Latin translations in the textual tradition of Polybius*

After Niccolò Perotti’s attempt towards the Latin translation and redaction (16th c.) of the *Histories* of Polybius from Megalopolis, two editions accompanied with Latin translations by the editors engaged were also circulated: in 1609 by Is. Casaubon and in 1789-1795 by J. Schweighaeuser, both great classical scholars. Although Perotti’s and Casaubon’s translations of Polybius show that they both translated the Greek text according to sense, sometimes even paraphrasing, and although Schweighaeuser reinforced critical elements set out by previous editors, the translations of Casaubon and Schweighaeuser were underestimated but never doomed to oblivion, beyond textual scholarship, because they offered various handling of ancient variants and solved certain textual problems, in a way that we could pose concrete paths in the direction of Polybius’ textual tradition. Furthermore, conjectural additions and variant readings in their interrelation formed a strong element, which we have to take into account in order to fulfill recent and modern editions of the Greek text. This desideratum in the history of classical scholarship—of a new understanding of scholarly philological translation, into which variants have been incorporated—is the target of my paper, focusing on examples taken from the III. Book of Polybius and giving a high interest to the sources and tools used by the editors/translators.

Nathalie Mauriac

*Genetic edition as translation: Proust’s manuscripts’ multiple tongues*
One could say that some modern literary drafts (contrary to fair copies or printing manuscripts) are foreign, even exotic, objects. They first appear to us not as verbal devices, intended to mean, but as enigmatic pictures that attract, at best, aesthetic attention. Yet they are the intense arena where the text is under production. As such, they deserve editorial attention. The ‘genetic’ scholar, as s/he may be called, has to unlock their many tongues. First and above all, the tongue of the writing process, which involves layers of spatial dissemination. How can we translate this process for readers’ benefit? Secondly, because they are essentially destined to the writer’s personal use, drafts display in many instances a sort of ‘private’ idiom. The genetic editor then reverts to being a textual scholar, whose job is to try and elucidate the web of internal references and elliptic notes, while drawing attention to ungrammaticalities, as traces of a foreign element in the ‘mother’ tongue.

Sébastien Moureau

_Editing a translation of which the original is lost: some questions and proposals of answer._

In this paper, I will list some problems appearing while working on a translation of which the original is lost. I will specifically be interested in Latin translations of Arabic treatises, since the text I am editing, the _De anima in arte alchemiae_ of pseudo-Avicenna, is one of these cases. The major questions I will attempt to answer are: How can we recognize that a Latin text is a translation of an Arabic treatise when we do not have the original nor any mention of it in other Arabic texts? What kinds of textual proof can we find? In the case of pseudepigraphical texts directly written in other languages than the one of the author to whom it is attributed, what kind of information can we find to prove that the text is not a translation of a lost original? What are the major problems that an editor faces when he edits this kind of text, and how can he solve them? I will attempt to answer these questions in a more practical than theoretical way, trying to suggest useful methods by using precise examples. The major aim of the paper is to share the experience I had by editing a Latin translation of a lost pseudepigraphic text written in Arabic.

Markus Mülke

_Poetry as translation - Translation as philology?_

Already among his contemporaries, Hieronymus of Stridon was famous more as philologist and translator than as theologian. Modern research has shown how strongly philological perspective and translation activity were interdependent and influenced each other in this authoritative interpres christianus. Helpful insights can be found in the numerous texts in which he not only discusses philological and translational questions and problems, but also theoretically motivates his own textual decisions. By two examples shall be shown that Hieronymus uses his concepts of translation and philology in a surprisingly broad manner: (1) The first Latin biblical poetry (!), written about 330 C.E. by the Spanish presbyter Juvenecus, is justified against inner Christian criticisms as translation ‘paene ad verbum’ of the New Testament’s holy word. (2) The necessity of revising the Latin text of the New Testament is motivated through the application of the concept of philological truth on the different versions of the Vetus Latina.

Vincent Neyt, Mark Nixon, Dirk Van Hulle

_Samuel Beckett’s Personal Library_

Beckett’s efforts to ‘translate’ diverse aspects of European culture can be regarded as a starting point of his career as a bilingual author. In order to study this form of intertextual translation, this paper examines the role of Beckett’s personal library and his reading traces in the production of his texts. Based on our research on Beckett’s personal library, still preserved in his apartment in Paris, this paper will examine the impact of multilingual source texts on the development of Beckett’s poetics, investigate the possibility of visualizing different ‘reading layers’, and suggest a method of ‘editing’ the library and making it available in a digital environment.
Outi PALOPOSKI
Translation, publishing house practices and newspaper reviews

In Finland, the process of editing translations prior to their publication was born out of a concern for the purity of the Finnish language at the turn of the 20th century. It took some time to root itself in the normal practices of publishing houses but once established, it became a rather invisible practice, where language engineering interests were sometimes coupled with a desire to check on the relations between the translation and the original. The practice of ‘editing’, when announced at the title page of a translated novel, was variously called correcting, revising, editing or renewing.

A study of revised translations reveals a number of different practices not necessarily transparent in the term used in the paratexts: ‘to correct’, for example, may mean linguistic updating or checking of the contents. Newspaper reviews of edited translations give another angle to the study: translations are normally expected to date (hence the need for editing), whereas originals are not. In my presentation, I will first briefly sketch the birth of the practice and then draw on these two sets of data, edited translations and newspaper reviews, to comment on the often problematic relation between translations and their originals. The claim that originals do not need revision is further examined with additional material from Finnish classics that have been edited for republishing. The data are from the first half of the 20th century.

Gregory S. PAULSON
The effects of a Latin scribe on a Greek text: Textual alterations in Codex Bezae

Codex Bezae, a 5th century bilingual manuscript, is an excellent example of how a Latin scribe created a Greek version of the Gospel of Matthew that is conducive to a Latin reader. The scribe was actively engaged in improving the text he was copying by smoothing idiosyncrasies in the Greek language, such as altering confusing genitive absolutes and changing singular verbs to plural when they modify neuter plural nouns. For example, in Mt 10:29, the scribe changes the verb from 3s to 3p to match the neuter plural subject. Although it is a grammatical error (since neuter plural nouns take singular verbs in Greek), the grammatical construction coincides with Latin, which was the scribe’s mother tongue.

In addition to philological alterations, the scribe amended the text in other subtle ways. He employed words and phrases verbatim from the context and gospel parallels when adding information to clarify text. For example, in Mt 18:10, the scribe reiterated ‘the ones who believe in me’ from 18:6.

The scribe identified potentially difficult readings in the Greek text of Matthew and altered them to create variants more amenable to a Latin reader. Possible grammatical mistakes, such as changing the idiosyncrasies of the Greek into ‘incorrect’ grammar, seem to have the air of intentionality behind them because the changes appear logical in Latin grammar. In the end, these methodological improvements created a vivid and reader-friendly text in which difficult readings were smoothed for Latin readers who were not well acquainted with Greek grammar.

C. H. PERAITA
Typographical translations: Justus Lipsius’ Politicorum libri in its vernacular editions

The typographical language of Lipsius’ Politicorum libri (1589) is a crucial element of the compositio of that peculiar work. The page lay-out --designed by Lipsius himself, probably in collaboration with Plantinus-- displayed the author’s inventive methods and compositive strategies. It emphasized in precise ways the commonplace dimension of the manual, the use of Classic authors. The reader could identify immediately each sententia (more than two thousand) within Lipsius’ method of articulating and integrating commonplaces in his own arguments. The humanist considered the typographical design, the visual display of the page, indispensable for a correct understanding of the work. In fact, Moretus’ Latin editions displayed in the first page a notice to future printers: ‘Printer, whoever you are, I ask you not to reprint this work without consulting me or without having obtained my orders to do so. I have maintained small distinctions in this work, in the Punctuation, the Spaces between items, in the Notes and in the distinctions of Words, which are not easy for you to reproduce, but which cannot be neglected or upset without damage to the work’. 
All Latin editions of *Politicorum libri* followed the complex typographical design of the *editio princeps*. Across 17th century Europe the work was disseminated by different printers without changes in its fundamental features, including its more material dimension of typography. Something different happens with the numerous vernacular editions of *Politicorum libri*. All of them redesigned and adjusted Lipsius’ typographical language. They refashioned the noticeable display of *sententiae* and provided a visual uniformity to the page, transforming the text from a compendium of commonplaces into a dense treatise. The work was not conceived and presented any more as a manual integrated by myriads of fragments articulated with Lipsius’s words but as a continuum of thought, a compact structure of arguments. Textual changes, cultural adaptations but mainly variations in the typographical design of vernacular editions fashioned a different text. My study focuses on those changes and accommodations in Bernardino de Mendoza’s Spanish translation. In this case, an exceptional document has survived, which allows examining in privileged ways decisive adaptations of *Politicorum libri* to the Spanish edition: the printer’s copy, the manuscript supervised by Mendoza, licensed by the Consejo de Castilla and used by the Royal Typographer to print *Los seis libros de las Políticas* (Madrid, 1604).

Jonatan Pettersson

*Translation universals and manuscript transmission*

A medieval translation often diverges from its source text in many ways, and it has often been said that it is impossible to state whether these divergencies stem from the translator or from the process of manuscript transmission. However, within Translation studies it has been noted that translations in general seems to carry specific features compared to original texts, e.g. translations tend to be longer than the source text, they are more explicit and they tend to disambiguate the source text. Some of these features have even been proposed to be *universals* of translation. As these universals are thought to be a product of the specific interlingual process of translation, the question arises if the same kind of changes vis-à-vis the original also occurs in the intralingual process of copying manuscripts. If not, these ‘translation universals’ might help us to decide if the differences between the text in a medieval translation and its source text are due to the translator or to scribes in the transmission. In my paper, I will discuss some of the proposed translation universals, taking my examples from Old Norse translations of Latin secular literature.

Santiago Pérez Isasi, Josu Bujuesca, Carmen Isasi, Violeta García

*On digital editions of multilingual translations: the case of Saint Francis de Sales’s Introduction to the Devout Life and the Andrés de Poza project*

This paper aims at showing some of the theoretical and practical issues raised during the development of the Andrés de Poza Project for the digital edition of multilingual and multiversion literary and notarial texts. Specific examples will be given in relation to the digitalization process of Saint Francis de Sales’s *Introduction to the Devout Life*, in its original French text and its translation into Spanish, Basque and English. This will allow us to present some of the critical decisions involved in the digitalization process (which version to edit from a wide textual tradition, how to edit it, how to align the different versions of the text) and also some of the most prominent profits of this process, such as the development of studies on *electio verborum* or vocabulary selection, the gathering of information on linguistic change and variation, the creation of specialized search tools for non-contemporary texts or the development of multilingual glossaries. We also aim at showing how the parallel digitalization of several multilingual versions of a text can provide important information not only about its process of transmission and reception in a wider European context, but also about the original text and about the multilingual versions themselves.

Purificación Ribes Traver

*Ludwig Tieck’s pre-romantic appropriations of Jonson’s Volpone and Perrault’s Le Chat Botté as Herr von Fuchs (1793) and Der Gestiefelte Kater (1798)*
This paper deals with the translating strategies employed by Ludwig Tieck during the 1790s as a means of bringing English and French classical texts close to his German contemporaries. His free versions of Ben Jonson’s *Volpone* and Perrault’s *Le Chat Botté* bear Tieck’s personal mark, particularly his daring employment of metatheatrical devices in order to draw a critical reaction from his audiences. Readers and spectators alike are constantly reminded of the artificial nature of the translated texts, a fact which favours their questioning of the politics or aesthetics portrayed in them.

It is not surprising that a pre-romantic German writer as outstanding as Tieck resorts to the systematic employment of romantic irony both in his *Herr von Fuchs* (1793) and in *Der Gestiefelte Kater* (1798), since he was persuaded of the centrality of this device for a detached —and therefore universal— approach to literature and life. That is why he freely develops those sections of Jonson’s and Perrault’s hypotexts which he finds more suitable for this kind of approach. And, although contemporary politics —particularly the different reactions elicited by the French Revolution— are addressed in his updated versions of these texts, it is the aesthetic, literary and educational issues that he ironically handles by means of the Socratic couples which he creates for both plays.

A number of interesting parallelisms can be found in the topics which Tieck ironically addresses in both versions by means of the contrasting attitude of his ignorant and self-sufficient *alazon* and his subtle *eiron*, who pretends to share the alazon’s viewpoints while unveiling his inner contradictions.

It is on the features, similarities and differences of Tieck’s masterful instances of romantic irony that our analysis will centre. Attention will also be paid to the reasons why, in spite of sharing similar distancing techniques, *Der Gestiefelte Kater* enjoyed great success during the 1920s whereas *Herr von Fuchs* was completely ignored. The success of Stefan Zweig’s 1926 free version of *Volpone* rendered an unearthing of Tieck’s *Herr von Fuchs* unnecessary. This fact explains why *Der Gestiefelte Kater* has been repeatedly edited ever since, whereas the old edition of *Herr von Fuchs* still retains its Gothic type, which turn readers —and theatre managers— to more accessible editions.

It is high time a modern annotated edition of this masterful example of creative translation allowed Tieck’s *Herr von Fuchs* the high recognition it undoubtedly deserves as the most accomplished German adaptation of Ben Jonson’s *Volpone*.

Peter Robinson

*Lost and found in translation: transforming text to bytes*

Some fifteen years ago, Elizabeth Solopova and myself defined manuscript transcription as follows: ‘Transcription for the computer is a fundamentally interpretative activity, composed of a series of acts of translation from one system of signs (that of the manuscript) to another (that of the computer).’ The paper will elaborate this view, pointing out that transcription shares a fundamental characteristic of translation: that in the shift from manuscript text to computer screen, there is both loss and gain. Computer systems are rigid, and a computer font has only so much space for individual characters, where handwriting is endlessly inventive, and the act of transcription reminds us of this divide at every moment: that is the text lost in translation. However, the attempt to bridge the divide can bring an understanding of the choices made by each scribe, almost at a level beneath the scribe’s consciousness: that is the text found in translation.

Michelle M. Sauer

*Fragments & Revisions of Middle English Anchoritic Texts*

This paper will look at how the fragments of the Wooing Group and an extension of it, *A Talkyng of the Loue of God*, deliberately change the perception of Jesus as well as the idea of enclosure. In the first phase of ‘translation,’ Jesus is the ideal spouse, and the anchoress is encouraged to spend her time in contemplation and prayer. The second phase of ‘translation’ demonstrates a shift in perspective about Jesus—he is a mystical lover but also taskmaster—and enclosure brings with it responsibility to the outside world.

The Wooing Group includes the title piece, *fie Wohunge of ure Laured* (*The Wooing of Our Lord*), *On Lofsong of ure Loured* (*A Song of Praise Concerning Our Lord*), *On wel swu›e God Ureisun of God Almihti* (*An Exceedingly Good Orison to God Almighty*), *On Lofsong of ure Lefdi* (*A Song of Praise Concerning Our Lady*), as well as the two
fragmentary renditions of the final two pieces, *On Ureisun of Lourede (An Orison to Our Lord)*, and *fe Oriesun of Sciente Marie (An Orison to Saint Mary)*. All are thirteenth century pieces written in the West Midlands dialect J.R.R. Tolkien christened the ‘AB’ language, *fe Wohunge* survives in only one manuscript, London, British Library, MS Cotton Titus D.xviii (ff. 127r-133r), and the other three pieces of the *Wooing Group* are not found with it; instead, they are found at the end of *Ancrene Wisse* in London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero A.xiv. The fragments are found in other prayer collections.

I propose to examine the two phases of translation within the Wooing Group. The first occurred near the time of original recording. The two fragmentary pieces are not exactly the same as the originals. The differences between the fragments and the whole pieces reveal a focus on the suffering Christ’s body emblazoned in a suggestive manner. The fragments also retain a focus on blood and its permutations, offering a glimpse of early blood piety devotions. Finally, the fragments demonstrate pleas for intercession, alongside freedom from temptation. It is interesting that the title piece of the group is not reproduced; instead, only one copy of it remains. This type of ‘translation’ reinforces the anchoritic nature of the texts while demonstrating the importance of contemplation and traditional enclosure.

The Wooing is the focus of a later ‘translation.’ The late-fourteenth/early-fifteenth century text *A Talkyng of the Loue of God (A Discussion of the Love of God)* is comprised of large portions of *The Wooing*, along with St. Anselm of Canterbury’s *Liber Meditatio et Orationum* and original work. This work is extant in two different manuscripts, and evidence suggests that *A Talkyng* was intended for a male monastic audience.

There are several translation issues here. The most obvious is the gendered implication of taking a text written for women and rewriting it for men. In places, this was accomplished only by changing pronouns, resulting in a ‘cross-dressing’ text. There are a number of other changes, however, especially concerning word choices. For instance, where the Wooing has ‘kiss’ or ‘embrace,’ *A Talkyng* uses ‘suck’ or ‘roll.’ The overt sensual references demonstrate a shift in focus towards mystical union with Christ. Similarly, *A Talkyng* alters passages to reflect a heightened sense of penance and forgiveness, rather than escape from sin and temptation. Indeed, several of the other texts collected in the same manuscript include forms of examinations of conscience and other penitential pieces. Finally, the passages in the Wooing focusing on the internal connections between anchoress and Christ are altered to expand that relationship to the external community. Contemplation of Christ leads to better relationships with the world.

Overall, these differing versions, ‘translations,’ demonstrate the changing qualities of enclosure, variants of blood piety, and an increased expectation that cloistered religious bear responsibility to the betterment of the world beyond prayers for the soul.

---

**Peter SHILLINGSBURG**

*Start-up Scholarly Editing in Australia, South Africa, and India*

Difference in schools of editorial theory and practice is perhaps a cultural issue. What the goals of editing are or should be; what the history of those goals have been; and what national or regional success there has been in funding those goals and practices may together account for much of the disagreement that seems to exist in the world(s) of textual criticism and scholarly editing. That idea informs observations from my own experiences in European textual studies conferences, in helping to start the Australian Colonial Texts Series, in conducting a textual studies workshop in South Africa (a country with 12 official languages and literatures), and in helping to organize a bi-lingual collected works of Rabindranath Tagore in Bengal. It is remarkable how much agreement can be found.

---

**Paulius V. SUBACIUS**

*Multilingual persons, monolingual texts*

Literate persons rarely use only one language. Texts, however, are usually monolingual. Multilingualism is not a hindrance to a person’s integrality. A higher percentage of insertions in second or more language are a great challenge to the integrality of the text. A good literary text is heteroglossial (Bachtin) even if it is monolingual. A person usually remains monolingual even when using several languages. The historical change in the competence for recognizing the variety of voices in a text is dilatory. The combination of languages in which a certain community operates historically changes much more rapidly. In this paper we plan to discuss this dialectic using the example of the 19th c. poet Antanas Baranauskas who composed in the Lithuanian and Polish languages.
An author usually uses different languages to address different audiences. A publication appeals to a ‘single’ audience. Therefore, the publication of the Works of a multilingual author faces the danger of remaining ‘in between’ audiences. A change in the prevalent combination of languages used distances such a publication from the contemporary reader more than the historical changes in one language. The relationship between two texts in different languages is radically different than two texts in the same language. The editions of a work in one language compete internally in the same social-cultural sphere, appeal to the same reader. Editions of the same work in several languages appeal to different audiences.

The problem of a multilingual edition at the micro level reveals itself in the edition of the macaronic text. The potential meaning of insertions in other language changes more rapidly. Insertions, whose function was to demonstrate the author’s intelligence, can lose this role because the social prestige of languages is changing. Phrases in another language, expressing specific matters not yet expressible in the native language, can lose this function in a short time. The efforts to retain the authenticity of phrases in another language in a contemporary edition distances today’s reader from adequately understanding such a text in which the language competence of the synchronous audience is supposed. The historical temporariness of a macaronic text as a social dialect makes especially clear the opposite results of choosing different orientations for editing. The conflict between documentation and readability in editing a multilingual text is much more acute than in editing a monolingual one.

Andrew Hacker
Crossing Borders with Modernist Magazines

This paper draws upon the work of the Modernist Magazines Project to consider what we can learn about the textual history of modernism from the phenomenon of the ‘little magazine’ in the period. Many ‘little magazines’ moved across borders (e.g. Broom, Little Review), and others quite self-consciously considered themselves in a transnational light (e.g. Transatlantic Review; transition). This paper thus considers how the form of the ‘little magazine’ was translated across different national boundaries, being inflected by national cultures and practices.

Andrea S. Thomas
Maeterlinck’s L'Oiseau Bleu, from Moscow to Hollywood

It is clear that popular culture can alter the way a literary work is perceived, but less often considered is the extent to which popular culture can alter the text itself. When Gerard Genette pondered this question, he suggested that divergent interpretations always preserve a single, monolithic text. A closer look at the example of Maurice Maeterlinck’s iconic L’Oiseau bleu, however, provides compelling evidence that interpretations can also lead to divergent texts.

At its first performance in Moscow in 1908, Maeterlinck’s dreamlike féerie about a brother and sister’s quest for the elusive bluebird of happiness was considered injouable. In part owing to its technical challenges, by 1976 the play had become a vehicle for many, often lavish adaptations in Hollywood, designed to flaunt the technical achievements of its producers. Three productions are considered in this paper: the first French performance, directed by Konstantin Stanislavski in 1908; the Hollywood 1940 version starring Shirley Temple; and the novel 1976 USSR-USA co-produced film, starring Elizabeth Taylor. Whereas Americans embraced Maeterlinck for his cheerfulness in times of crisis, Parisian audiences had come to regard L'Oiseau bleu's Americanized optimism as proof that Maeterlinck had compromised his integrity. Éditions Fasquelle nevertheless released a new edition in French after the 1976 film, which established a different text from that of the first 1909 edition, including several alterations destined to make the piece more light-hearted. An analysis of these texts reveals that the shifting aesthetics we commonly associate with movie adaptations can also play an important role in changing literary texts themselves.

Mikas Vacekauskas
Lithuanian Book Factory In The Second Half Of 19th Century: Translation, Compilation, Plagiarism Or Creative Work?
During the period of the ban on the Lithuanian press (1864–1904), printing of books in Lithuanian (Latin) alphabet was forbidden in Lithuania. Despite the ban, Lithuanian books were written, prepared and published. They were published not in Lithuania but mostly in the territory of Lithuania Minor that used to belong to the Kingdom of Prussia. Religious literature made up about a half of such publications. A considerable part of Lithuanian literature was prepared, published and distributed in an organised way. One of the more prominent episodes of this activity was the ‘Lithuanian book factory’ that was organised in 1874–1889 by the priest Martynas Sederavičius in Sudargas rectory (Suvalkai province), right on the border with the Kingdom of Prussia. The main aim of Sederavičius and his team (Juozas Antanavičius, Serafinas Laurynas Kušeliauskas and Antanas Vytartas) was religious education of the people and the nurturing of the Catholic faith. The repertoire of books consisted almost exclusively of religious practice and religious didactic literature. About fifty books that were highly popular and enjoyed repeated impressions were published. All books were published counter-factionally: none of them had the author, translator or editor, the real location and date of preparation or publishing indicated. Work was organised in several stages: preparation of books, their publishing and distribution. The authors of the Sudargas environment would write and prepare a large variety of religious texts, translate and compile German, Italian, and Polish religious literature. They would add original inserts to translated and compiled texts, and would adapt them to the Lithuanian readership. At times the sources of translations and compilations would be indicated. These authors lacked any literary aspirations; they did not pay any attention to the authorship, and did not consider the issue of originality or plagiarism. The main aim of their creative work and activities was the salvation of their souls and those of Lithuanian Catholics in the presence of forced Russification and threatening Orthodoxy.

Karina Van Dale-Oska and Ronald Haentjens Dekker
Collaborative editing with eLaborate

The internet offers many new possibilities for textual scholars, leading to changing ways of organizing edition projects and in publishing the end results. The Huygens Instituut makes use of ‘eLaborate’ (www.e-laborate.nl), specially developed by the research and development team of the institute. eLaborate is an online service which enables groups of researchers to collaborate in making a text edition and to publish it online in one go. This approach turned out to be a great help for editors to test and develop their ideas about digital text editions in comparison to printed editions. Several projects already resulted in a digital edition on the internet.

The paper will give an overview of the ideas behind eLaborate. It will sketch the technical choices made by the developers, which are based on the wish to relieve the editor from having to learn and use (e.g.) XML. eLaborate helps the editors to concentrate on the content of the text and on the editorial work, while the developers take care of the (automatic) technical translation to a valid source format in the underlying database and keep these processes invisible to the editors.

The paper will also point out how working with eLaborate has introduced new ways of collaboration for textual scholars and has changed aspects of the organization and the content of this type of work.

Wim Van Mierlo
Collaborations for an Irish National Theatre: Mediating the Manuscripts of W.B. Yeats, George Moore and Lady Gregory

George Moore once suggested flippantly that in order to solve the problem of creating an ‘authentic’ Irish voice for the Irish National Theatre he should write a play in French, which Lady Gregory could translate into English so that Tadhg Ó Donnchadha could render it into Gaelic, which Lady Gregory could translate back into English. The idea, though tongue in cheek, seems proto-Beckettian in its absurdity, but it opens a door to gaining insight into creativity and collaboration. After all, Beckett too found that by writing in a language not his own he could circumvent the issue of style, but whereas Beckett tried to get away from the dead wood that was the English language, George Moore and Lady Gregory (and with them W.B. Yeats) were faced with the issue of creating an authentic dialect idiom that was not really their own.

This anecdote about ‘translation’ raises some admittedly large questions: Why do authors collaborate? How do authors collaborate? And how does it affect their creativity, style and the creation of voice? It is not my purpose to
answer these questions directly, but use them as a means to underpin some observations about creativity in the manuscripts and modes of collaboration.

I basically identify two types. The first is a ‘responsive’ mode, whereby one writer reacts and responds to the writing by the other. A complex example of this mode is found in *Diarmuid and Grania* by W.B. Yeats and George Moore, a play (as is evident from the convoluted genetic dossier) that evolved very slowly as Yeats and Moore in turn (but usually out of sync, with Moore at one point translating one of Yeats’s Acts into French) drafted and redrafted each other’s versions. The second mode operates according to a ‘division of labour’, which we find in Yeats’s collaboration with Lady Gregory on *Where There is Nothing* and *Unicorn from the Stars*. For these two genetically related plays, Moore supplied a plot outline, which was enlarged by Yeats, who invented the symbolism and themes, and written by Lady Gregory, who came up with the dialogue and dialect. Yet it is precisely in this mode that the separation of plot development from writing dialogue and inventing themes and imagery that we see how creation works, as the work is more than the sum of the individual authors’ contribution.

It goes without saying that multiple authorship moves beyond the traditional concept of literary creation, yet it might help to disentangle some of the layers in the creative process. Where ‘critique génétique’ rightfully stresses fluidity in the composition process, collaborative creative processes reveal a different ‘procedural’ element. Translation, therefore, as a means to create an ‘authentic’ style or voice is perhaps less circumstantial than is apparent, and might well lead to a different way of conceptualizing the creative procedures in composition histories.

---

**Eveline van Staalduijn-Sulman**

*Hannah’s Journey Through Time and Languages: 1 Samuel 2:1-10 in Hebrew, Aramaic and Latin*

Hannah’s Song (1 Sam. 2:1-10) is an interesting piece of Hebrew poetry. The Song clearly is more than a song of one woman, the mother of Samuel. It has a function for the entire Books of Samuel. The Aramaic translation (Targum) gave it, therefore, a prophetic function: Hannah predicts the fate of the people of Israel from her son Samuel onward to the coming of the Messiah. This translation is based on various rabbinic interpretations. Throughout the ages this Targum gradually grew, which is visible in the various extant manuscripts. This growth was possible, because the Targum is a translation of the Hebrew Bible, not the sacred text itself. It is even used to ventilate Jewish feelings against the Christian city (and church) of Rome. When Christian theologians in Renaissance Spain became interested in the Targum, also Hannah’s Song was translated into Latin, a Latin based on the Vulgate text. This translation shows traces of Christian re-writing and even political (and church-political) signs. The Aramaic text in the Antwerp Polyglot and its Latin translation are more re-worked and end up to be a ‘Christian Targum’. The paper will end with examples of editions of the Targum so far, and with questions and proposals on how to deal with the multilingualism of some of its manuscripts and early editions.