Cetera, Anna

Translating the translated : the evergreen classics storm the publishing market again

Brno studies in English. 2009, vol. 35, iss. 1, pp. [103]-114

ISSN 0524-6881 (print); ISSN 1805-0867 (online)

Stable URL (handle): https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/105120
Access Date: 30. 11. 2024
Version: 20220831

Brno Studies in English
Volume 35, No. 1, 2009
ISSN 0524-6881

Anna Cetera

Translating the Translated: The Evergreen Classics Storm the Publishing Market Again

Abstract
The paper aims to discuss both the reasons and the corollaries of the newly emergent tendencies in the publishing market based on retranslations of well-acknowledged literary masterpieces. In particular, the paper points to the increasing number of publishing series and individual translations heralded as 're-discovered' classics, and associated phenomena such as: the advertising policies focused almost entirely on the properties of the new rewritings, the increasing focus on a literary translator whose novel and experimental propensity frequently overshadows the status of the original text, and the specificity of adopted (meta)translation strategies which ostensibly reveal the arbitrariness of the translation by e.g. deliberately subverting earlier translations, interpolating interpretive hints, and provokingly revealing the presence of a translator as a self-conscious agent and mediator of meaning.

Key words
Literary translation; publishing market; retranslation; metatranslation

---

A book which is not worth reading for the second time hardly deserves reading it for the first, declares the eighteenth-century German aphorist Karl Julius Weber. Needless to say, Weber's concern lies with the controlled investment of time and thought. A modern publisher, however, is likely to interpret it as a commercial motto which links the promise of success with the anticipation of renewable profits. Books have become cheap and available, and hardly anybody mentions them in their wills, an apparently trivial observation which confirms only the loss of their material value. Viewed from the mercantile perspective, books resemble

prey in a spider's web, slung impossibly in the air, while in fact held fast in the seemingly subtle grip of critical assessments, publishing policies and marketing tricks. Incidentally, the image also contradicts whatever the obscure etymologies of the names seem to imply. Thus the Slavic tongue-twisters, *książka* or *knjíga*, the Germanic bangs, *book* or *boek*, or even the Latin jingle, *liber*, all take their roots in the solid materiality of the object and point to the beech, birch or ash, their trunks or bark, and the laborious effort of shaping the wooden tablets. Today the easy generosity of off-set and digital printing fuels the publishing market with hitherto unknown energy. The growth results not only in the rapid increase of volumes, but also in the surprising mobility of literature which hardly waits before it ventures abroad once it has reached its native readership. Over the years, the literary-minded branches of Translation Studies have grown and multiplied by theorising their interest in the nomadic movements of corpora and the whimsical games of patronage. The studies have anatomised the processes, their chief aim being predominantly that of elaborating on what used to be a footnote in literary history: a massive absorption of foreign material, mingling with the flow of native texts to the effect of obscuring the controlling nature of practices which rendered this amalgamation possible in the first place.

However, my concern lies with the reverse process. Does Translation Studies matter for the literary market? Has the growth of the discipline affected the very processes which the discipline strives to investigate? Or more specifically, do publishers profit from exposing the arbitrariness of translation in a way echoing academic discussions on the subject? In other words, can the fact of a book being translated or, more appropriately, retranslated become an argument in the battle for customers? And if it can, are such trends derivative of the general logic of commerce, or perhaps, should be interpreted as idiosyncratic and local? An attempt to find out the answers calls for adopting a variety of perspectives, including that of writers, translators and critics alike. And yet, trading academic habit for pragmatic intuition, let us side first with the publisher and buyer.

The Best(re)sellers

In 2006, a renowned Polish publisher launched a promotional campaign of a well-known children's bestseller *Peter and Wendy* by J. M. Barrie. The book reached the market bound in an advertising label announcing: "a new translation of a classic work of literature". Naturally, advertising tricks like this one are common, and one can easily spot similar information attached, for example, to Orphan Pamuk's *My Name is Red* (2007), boasting about the 2006 Nobel Prize, or Ildefonso Falcones's *The Cathedral of the See* (2007), where the temptation comes with the announcement of 1.5 million copies sold within a year in Spain alone. However, in as far as reference to a prestigious literary award, or the unusual popularity of a title seem to be habitual baits, what type of immediate commercial merits actually stem from translating works that already have been translated,

and well? The answer resurfaces on the back cover where we read: "Peter comes back! This new translation of the classic work of literature *at last* reveals *the whole truth* about Peter, the boy who refused to grow up…" (translation mine, emphasis added). Interestingly enough, even a cursory look at the contemporary Polish publishing market confirms that *Peter and Wendy* (translated three times, with two of these translations appearing after 1980) are in good company when it comes to retranslating the classics. Thus, for example, Lewis Caroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* has as many as eight translations, of which four have appeared after 1980, A.A. Milne's *Winnie-the-Pooh*, and *House at Pooh Corner* have three translations, of which two were published in the 1990s, and at least one of them provoked fierce disputes as Winnie-the-Pooh had been given a mixed gender status, and combined a feminine name with an otherwise masculine identity as a bear.[1] Does this exemplify a new tendency, and if it does, does it pertain to children's literature alone?

Again a brief survey of the market reveals a surprising proliferation of retranslations in *belles-lettres*. Distributed in 2001, the advertising leaflet promoting the new translation of *Lord Jim* by Joseph Conrad consisted almost entirely of references to the fact of retranslation. The inscription "the new translation" appeared above the name of the author and the title, whereas the text below recommended "a new, brilliant, reader-friendly translation of the novel by Conrad". To amplify the appeal of novelty, the text on the reverse side censured the two previous "old-fashioned and imprecise" translations, and then focused on the translator, thus safeguarding the quality of the book neither with the author nor with his protagonist, but with the reputation of the rewriter. In fact the book was but the first in a new series created to meet the allegedly emerging needs of the Polish readership. This is how the publisher introduced the enterprise:

> We are offering new translations of masterpieces of world literature done by leading Polish translators. We believe that the canon will be reread due to the excellent quality of their contemporary Polish … Is it necessary for every generation to have their own translations? No, it is not. But nowadays there *is very strong pressure in Polish Translation Studies and in Polish culture* generally to rediscover all the canonized masterpieces of world literature, to read them again …" (translation mine, emphasis added)[2]

Is this a diagnosis of the readers' needs, or perhaps an attempt to create them by marketing the insights from Translation Studies? Whatever the cause, the list of retranslated classics ever expands and presently includes, e.g. Fyodor Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* (2004), and James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (2005), whereas other translations are forthcoming.[3] If we accept this for a new phenomenon affecting the best-selling literature, should we credit the market with supplying the rationale for such practices, or the discipline with creating the ambience conducive to the trend?

The Trendsetters

Undoubtedly, the emergence of the trend as such may be explained without pointing to the discipline as impinging on the market (Gambier 1994: 416). Accordingly, the retranslations of the classics pertain in particular to the eminent works of prose featuring on the reading lists of educational institutions, to children's literature and drama. In each of these cases there is a different motivation which underlines the publishers' policies. Thus, for example, the frequent retranslation of children's literature stems from both the radical expectations of the small readers who cannot cope with outdated stylistics and register, as well as from the interest of the adult audiences who eagerly discover the hidden ironies and paradoxes, habitually suppressed in the polished translations from the beginning of the twentieth century.[4] In turn, the urge to retranslate plays naturally coincides with theatrical tendencies where subversion has been a recurrent facet of contemporary productions of old masterpieces. Moreover, the specific communicative aspect of performances as if encourages constant efforts to update language and strip it of remote aesthetic conventions which, if sustained, interfere with the illocutionary effect of utterances spoken from the stage. In consequence, the generic specificity of drama, combined with the strength of various appropriating tendencies, result in the creation of a whole class of texts anchored in the oeuvre of a single playwright, Shakespeare being by far the most illustrative example of the pattern.

Similarly, the tendency to retranslate major prose works finds sound justification both in the tempting prestige of the translator's challenge and in the plausibly high number of copies consistently devoured by the educational system. The latter aspect may be particularly relevant to countries where the educational authorities refuse to accept the anthologised excerpts of obligatory works as a replacement of the reading lists consisting of whole texts. Finally, the decision to retranslate often stems from down-to-earth calculations when the cost of a new translation appears smaller than the royalties due to previous translators, or the trouble of identifying their heirs. In fact, it is commercialism that is usually seen as supporting competing translations to boost sales (Venuti 1998: 187). And yet these causes do not entirely explain the scale of the phenomenon, and even more so, the shift of emphasis in advertising policies which put translators in the limelight. Has Translation Studies indeed deepened the awareness of translation issues, incited interest, licensed experiment, and shown the market the path to follow?

Asked to verify the hypothesis, the biggest Polish publishers of *belles-lettres* partially confirm (43%) the impact of Translations Studies on the book market, thereby denying the stigma of marginality which the discipline is said to suffer in the allegedly less subordinate cultures (Venuti 1998: 186).[5] Interestingly enough, when asked where this impact appears most discernible, those who see it rarely point to translator training (33%), and more often to publishing policies (67%) reviewing practices (67%). In turn, while indicating the usual reasons for retranslation, the publishers list the quality of existing translations (86%), copyrights (86%), cooperation with an acknowledged translator (43%), and, seldom,

enhanced marketing strategy (14%). However, the seemingly small advantage of retranslation in relation to marketing contradicts the pressure of Translation Studies which some publishers acknowledge with regard to publishing policies and reviewing. Is not reviewing part of literary marketing? And is it not that the market is one of the major beneficiaries of the intensifying debates on the complexities of literary translation? Naturally, answering this question would require a more extensive and specific survey in which the respondents would be asked, for example, to differentiate between reviews featuring in critical editions, published in the press, or attached to book offers on the Internet. In other words, one would have to investigate the structure of the patronage that the publishers are implicitly referring to, and in particular, separate the traditional impact of the academy from the impact of the professional reviewers operating as agents of the market. Such an analysis would also inevitably expose the paradoxes of the post-communist world. On the one hand, the high rate of translation appears to testify to the weakness of the receiving culture both in literary and economic terms, and justifies the frequently evoked parallel with the developing or postcolonial countries. On the other hand, the existence of the native canon and the strength of critical discourse prevent the situation in which the literary import should be governed by economic laws alone. In other words, what impels retranslation is not only the sober recognition of the marketing effectiveness of the novelty bait. Conversely, at least some of the retranslations of the classics aim at the connoisseur audience eager to engage in an intellectual game of rereading familiar texts and investigating the differences in the translator's approach. Significantly enough, this attitude coincides with the postmodern inclination to tamper with the acknowledged masterpieces, subvert and emulate original authors, and thereby tint literary translation with a gist of amusing, teasing and intelligent playfulness. As if ignoring the inevitable synergy of these tendencies, let us study them one by one.

A Post-Communist Colony?

Examining the statistics records of the Polish publishing market in the years 1945–85 is a boring exercise. But for the initial regeneration, the row of figures remain monotonously unchanged, reflecting the consistency and endurance of the cultural principles of real socialism. The market was dominated by a few state-owned publishing houses which implemented centralized policies, largely ignoring the economic results of their activities. The share of Polish literature was relatively high, whereas most of the translated literature originated in the Soviet Union and fellow communist countries. The market which started taking shape in the late 1980s featured a rapid increase of the number of translated books. Significantly enough, and contrary to the patterns which emerged in West European countries, the changes did not occur gradually. In fact, the radical reorientation of publishing policies have taken place in the last two decades in response to the

abolishment of censorship and state distribution of paper, and the introduction of a market economy. In the wake of the reforms, the share of native literature temporarily increased due the publication of hitherto clandestine texts. Subsequently, however, the evolution featured the regularly increasing share of Anglo-American literature, and the gradual abandoning of old preferences.

The situation stabilised at the turn of the millennium. Currently, approximately 51% of the annual production of books in *belles-letters* are Polish titles, whereas Anglo-American literature represent approximately 26% (Bańkowska-Bober 2006). Similar proportions prevail with regard to the first editions in *belles-lettres* for adults, the works that attract most critical attention and reflect best the dynamics of the literary canon (55% and 29% respectively). If, however, we take into account not the number of titles but the number of copies published, the Polish share suddenly dwarfs to 17%, whereas the British and American input rockets to 60%, and the overall share of literature in translation exceeds 80%. Does this mean that post-communist Poland risks becoming a multicultural colony? (Or, for its worth, a heterogeneous haven?)

Indeed, some of the aspects of the current situation in Poland fit very well into Jacquemond's (1992) discussion of translational inequalities which underscore the relations of the dominant and dominated cultures, in particular with regard to large-scale translations of the literature of the hegemonic culture for the masses. Significantly enough, the easy colonization of the post-communist market was made possible due to the absence of an adequate interim period in which native publishers could have become stronger and more independent, before they were exposed to another form of expansiveness. Consequently, the sore economic weakness of the newly established private publishing houses on the one hand, and the unmanageable size and regressive mentality of the surviving state-owned giants on the other, made them all largely incapable of competing with publishing potentates better acquainted with capitalism. Last but not least, many post-communist readers saw the entry of foreign literature as a desirable sign of cultural openness which people, locked up behind the Iron Curtain, had long been denied. Thus, paradoxically enough, they reached for foreign literature precisely to reaffirm their sense of independence and triumph over the past.

The post-colonial and post-communist parallel breaks down, however, when there is a well-established native canon which provides a sound counterbalance to the influx of foreign bestsellers. Shaped by the aesthetic and ideological preferences of the past, the recycled canons both prevail and mutate in the form of literary reference, parody and pastiche. Amalgamated with the local classics, the translations of foreign masterpieces succumb to the same pressures, and undergo similar transformations by becoming prey to (re)interpreters and (re)writers. Understandably enough, modern translators, trained to acknowledge the arbitrariness of their choices, can hardly look upon the (de)construction of literary texts in silence.

A Plaything

There is hardly a Polish translation with a more extraordinary history than Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange,* a piece of dystopian fiction popularised by Stanley Kubrick's movie. With the first translation completed in the 1970s, the text was not published until 1990, when it was no longer threatened with the censors' interference. The risk of censorship stemmed from the strategy adopted by the translator, Robert Stiller, who based the equivalent of the degenerate language of Burgess's protagonists, with its primitive syntax and buckled word register, on a mixture of Polish and Russian, thereby, as it might have been understood, incriminating the Soviets with the collapse of moral standards. In 1999, however, Stiller offered yet another translation of the novel. This time, the vehicle of linguistic erosion became English, thus underscoring the dangers of Anglo-American supremacy. In an essay attached to his translation (subsequent edition), Stiller sniggered:

> When some people heard … that I was doing two different translations of the same novel, they instantly knew that it was yet another of my, ha, ha! eccentric pranks … I do not care if those who see it only as a refined literary game, or an experiment in stylistics and translation, are pleased or angered. My aim has been achieved in either case (2004: 224, translation mine).

Never tired of provoking his readers, Stiller a few years ago announced his plans for yet another version of *A Clockwork Orange*, featuring German as the perpetrator of linguistic change.

Stiller's attempts to incite the audience find a fitting counterpart in the witty inventiveness of Tomasz Biedroń who, in 1994, published his translation of Virginia Woolf's *Orlando*. The necessity of coping with the androgynous nature of Orlando without violating the rigid constraints of Polish flexion put the translator in a playful mood to the effect of adding a new character to Woolf's story. Thus Biedroń invented a non-existent Polish poet, a great admirer and translator of Orlando's poetry. This trick allowed Biedroń to include this fake translator's translations into his own translation, and, additionally, interpolate a few footnotes in which he offered some amusingly patronizing comments of the work of his fictitious predecessor. The clever formula made it possible for Biedroń to signal his major predicaments and elucidate interpretative variants without producing a stylistic clash with the predominant mood of the story. What is more, the translator's manipulations elaborated on the provocative bias of Woolf's narrative, and added a new layer to its literary dimension. Considering these examples, can translators become jesters, teasingly parading in and around the text, sneaking in-between the lines, peeping from footnotes and prefaces, and denying what has been said by pointing to what might have been said instead? And how shall we classify the results of their endeavours: are we dealing with metafiction or metatranslation?

Even though the above provocative strategies should be seen as an exception rather than a rule, they are not as rare as one would expect. In fact, many re-translators ostensibly reveal the arbitrariness of their rewriting by augmenting the clash with earlier versions, interpolating interpretive hints, and revealing their presence as self-conscious agents and mediators of meaning. What is more, the mischievous, impish, and altogether misbehaving rewriters hardly hesitate to tint the acknowledged masterpieces with trademarks of their individualistic, idiosyncratic and possibly eccentric approach. Significantly enough, this postmodern inclination to playfulness and subversion finds a powerful ally in the non-prescriptive bias of Translation Studies which has so expressively underscored and authorized the translator's freedom in defining equivalence. Have we become witness to some bizarre marriage of publishing trends, theoretical insights, and literary preferences? Is it possible that the interest in literary translation, flourishing in countries where the book market feeds on it, has finally bred tendencies trading in self-conscious exposure of the tricks of the trade? And last but not least, is it possible that one of the ways Translation Studies matters for literary translation is by travestying the role of a literary translator?

Certainly, elements of similar strategies have been already described, though they are usually interpreted from a different critical perspective. Theo Hermans, for example, evoking Sherry Simon's phrase "the translator's signature", points to the instances of deliberate literalism which serve to signal "linguistic and cultural otherness" (1999: 144). Consequently, Hermans links literalism and annotations with an attempt to safeguard the uniqueness of the source text for the price of exposing the limitations of translation, which in turn he interprets as a form of the translator's self-reflexivity or autopoiesis (1999: 145). Understood in this way, self-reflexivity denotes the translator's insistence on underscoring the untranslatability of the source text, or the difference with some previous translations. In none of these cases, however, is self-reflexivity a desired effect itself but remains a by-product of the radical focus on the original text.[6] Furthermore, the kind of self-reflexivity discussed by Hermans implies a somewhat regressive analysis of alternative solutions, whereas the liberal employment of metaliterary strategies in literary translation promotes inventiveness, invites subversion, and permits interpolation. In this sense, metatranslation is a game trading in (un)faithfulness.

Ricochet

While commenting on the specificity of translated literature, Gideon Toury observes that "there are good reasons to regard translations as constituting a special system, or "genre" of their own within a culture" (1995: 139), thus stressing both their generic autonomy and explicit ties with the target culture. However, the emphasis put on the interaction with the target culture diminishes with the definition of an assumed translation, firmly anchored in "the existence of another text, in another culture and language, from which it was presumably derived by transfer

operations and to which it is now tied by certain relationships" (1995: 145). Flexible as it seems, the definition upholds the customary binarism of Translation Studies, the safe monogamy of one source and one copy. And yet the current publishing trends imply that the traditional wedlock comes under fire of the libertine desires of experimentalists. The relationship becomes increasingly multiple, and new translations are fathered by their sources *and* some other translations of the same text. Significantly enough, while pondering over the implications of multiple translations of a single author, Mary Snell-Hornby sees them as potentially harmful to the myth of such writers as Homer or Shakespeare viewed as "monolithic" and "universal", and forming "a static canon to be venerated by scholars and disciples" (2006: 165). Consequently, the growing proliferation of vastly differing translations proves "the instability of the apparently stable canon" notes Mary Snell-Hornby, and adds after Susan Bassnett, it "exposes the fallacy of universal greatness" (Bassnett 1998: 135 qtd by Snell-Hornby 2006: 165). As long as these observations indeed underline the effects of retranslation on authorial status, they refuse to recognize the implications of this trend for the practice of literary translation. Perhaps the most perceptive commentary on the latter relationship came from George Steiner who wrote in 1992 in the preface to the second edition of *After Babel*:

> If I was to rewrite the book now, it is the question of the morality of appropriation via translation and of what I designate as 'transfiguration'- where the intrinsic weight and radiance of the translation eclipses that of the source - which I would want to hammer out at great length. The dilemma seems to me of central importance precisely in an age in which deconstructive criticism and self-advertising scholarship dismiss texts as 'pre-text' for their own scavenging (1992: xvi-xvii).

It appears that retranslation may not only occasionally reduce the source text to 'a pretext', but it may further diminish its importance by reorienting the readers' interest to alternative translations. In this sense, the common generic status of translations suggested by Gideon Toury would imply not only their attachment to the target culture, but also the way in which these texts may potentially interfere with subsequent translation practices. It is precisely this afterlife of translations which seems to suffer greatest neglect in the systemic theories of translation, habitually focusing on the circumstances conditioning the initial entry of the text into the target culture.[7]

And yet retranslation of the canonical works appears to be a literary phenomenon in its own right which, perhaps, would require a specific research model to account for the individualized motivations underlying the unrelenting efforts to rewrite the same text, without a radical change of aesthetic preferences or linguistic standards within the target culture. The existence of such a group of texts alters the traditional image of translators as imprisoned between the properties of the source text and the demands of the target culture, but it also redefines their

obligations towards their readership. It is also in this context that the potential impact of Translation Studies on the literary market appears most discernible. Thus, whether willingly or not, by underscoring the dependence of translation strategies on the preferences of the receiving cultures, the discipline has shown translations as a necessary product of by-gone preferences, and intensified the temptation to renegotiate the borrowing. Secondly, by destabilising the notion of translation equivalence, the non-normative translation theories sanctioned the plurality of approaches and authorized experiment, which incidentally coincided with the self-conscious tendencies of postmodern literature. Finally, by upholding the importance of translation as a cultural practice, Translation Studies has created a new type of discourse on literature in translation, a reviewing policy which the book market could either ignore or learn to commercialise. However, commercialising breeds two tendencies. In as far as one of them is competition, the other one is the degeneration of the literary and linguistic standard of the source text which in turn works against the basic ideas of the discipline which would prefer to think of translation in terms of art rather than production. This trend my be difficult to stop, especially when the market teaches Translation Studies that the book which is not worth translating for the second time hardly deserves translating for the first. And if so, the discipline may be hit by a ricochet.

While discussing the interdependence of Translation Studies and Polish publishing policies, I have asked more questions that can be answered at the present moment. The trends, though observable, are only beginning to take shape, and it is the next decade or so which will show the true scale of the phenomenon. What we need to remember, however, is the specific situation of the post-communist countries where the strength of the native literary canon is effectively counterbalanced by the continuous influx of foreign bestsellers. Notwithstanding the effects of current policies in book marketing, the trends which emerge in post-communist countries may also be similar due to the common past they share. Thus the publishing markets in these countries were first dominated by a few state-owned publishing houses and stifled by censorship, then, following the introduction of a free-market economy, they witnessed a rather uncontrolled boom of ephemeral private publishers, and finally, they have begun to stabilize relatively recently, assuming that the global financial crisis allows the use of this term at all. One of the aspects of this stabilization is negotiating the balance between the native and the foreign. Presently the consistent import of literature in translation testifies to the strength of foreign canons which is further augmented by our old sentiments for the forbidden fruit. Needless to say, the share of foreign books in the publishing market will only increase if our readers learn to take sophisticated pleasure in juxtaposing alternative translations of the same text. The translators certainly stand ready to engage in the game.

Notes

1 I do not take into account Polish adaptations and translations based on French or Italian rewritings which in some cases would double the number of available versions of the story.

2 Authored by Adam Pomorski, the text comes from the announcement of the series called "Znakomita kolekcja" [Superb Collection], displayed on the publisher's website http://www.znak.com.pl/full.php3?seria=HZ, downloaded 27.11.2007. The name of the collection is also a play on words based on the publisher's name ("Znak"), featuring as a morpheme in the Polish adjective *znakomita* (superb). The example of the Znak series, along with the subsequently referred cases of retranslating Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*, and Virginia Woolf's *Orlando* I discuss also in my Polish article (2007: 96–100).

3 Naturally, neither the declarations of the publisher, nor the success of a single series reflect the strength of the trend as such, and more comprehensive data is necessary. The Polish National Library does not monitor retranslations specifically, but it offers an annually updated list of foreign literary works with the biggest number of editions in the post-war period. The examination of the titles republished within the last decade habitually reveals a coexistence of several translations of such bestsellers as *The Lord of the Rings* by J.R.R. Tolkien (three translations), or *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild* by Jack London (both six translations).

4 The retranslation of children's literature has been a frequent object of critical inquires, underscoring the importance of their "readability" (Du-Nour 1995), as well as the variations in the choice of strategies (Paloposki and Koskinen 2004).

5 I refer here to my pilot survey as of December, 2007. The respondents were seven big publishing houses, jointly representing approximately 22% (in terms of the number of titles) of the annual production of *belles-lettres* in Poland in 2005.

6 In the context of the discussion of self-reflexivity, Hermans also employs Luhmann's concept of second-order observation which differentiates between the translator's relation to the source text, and his relation to somebody else's translation, thus introducing the theatre-within-theatre perspective to Translation Studies (1999: 147–148). However, the following discussion pertains to the epistemological dimension of the discipline rather than to the practical or descriptive aspects of literary translation.

7 Symptomatic here is the dispute stirred in 1997 by Itamar Even-Zohar with the publication of his article 'The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer', and in particular Anthony Pym's insistence on the conceptual (ir)relevance of terms such as import, transfer and integration of foreign goods (1997: 359). The question of the re-import of fully integrated, and therefore successfully transferred items, never arose in either of the texts.

References

Bańkowska-Bober, Krystyna et al. (ed.) (2006) *Ruch wydawniczy w liczbach LI:2005. [Polish Publishing in Figures.]* Warsaw: Polish National Library.

Barrie, James M. (2006) *Piotruś Pan i Wendy*. Translated by Michał Rusinek. Kraków: Znak.

Bassnett, Susan (1998) 'The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies'. In: S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (eds.) *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 123–140.

Burgess, Anthony (1990) *Mechaniczna pomarańcza: wersja R*. Translated by Robert Stiller. Warsaw: Alternatywa.

Burgess, Anthony (1999) *Nakręcana pomarańcza: wersja A*. Translated by Robert Stiller. Kraków: Etiuda.
Burgess, Anthony (2004) *Mechaniczna pomarańcza: wersja R*. Translated by Robert Stiller. Kraków: Etiuda.
Cetera, Anna (2007) 'Przypomnienie tłumacza: Rzecz o elementach metaprzekładu we współczesnych tłumaczeniach prozy angielskiej'. In: Richard Sokoloski et al. (eds.) *Warsztaty translatorskie IV / Workshop on Translation IV*. Lublin-Ottawa: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL – Slavic Research Group, University of Ottawa, 89–105.
Conrad, Joseph (2001) *Lord Jim*. Translated by Michał Kłobukowski. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
Du-Nour, M. (1995) 'Retranslation of children's books as evidence of changes of norms'. *Target* 7(2), 327–346.
Gambier, Yves (1994) 'La retraduction, retour et dètour'. *Meta* 39(3), 413–417.
Hermans, Theo (1999) *Translation in Systems.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
Jacquemond, Richard (1992) 'Translation and Cultural Hegemony: The Case of French-Arabic Translation'. In: Lawrence Venuti (ed.) *Rethinking Translation*, London and New York: Routledge, 139–58.
Paloposki, Outi and Kaisa Koskinen (2004) 'A thousand and one translations: revisiting retranslation'. In: G. Hansen, K. Malmkjær and D. Gile (eds.) *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 27–38.
Pym, Anthony (1997) 'Note on a Repertoire for Seeing Cultures'. *Target* 9(2), 357–361.
Snell-Hornby, Mary (2006) *The Turns of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Steiner, George (1992) *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Stiller, Robert (2004) 'Burgess a sprawa polska'. In: Anthony Burgess *Mechniczna pomarańcza*. Kraków: Etiuda, 219–239.
Toury, Gideon (1995) 'The Notion of 'Assumed Translation' - An Invitation to a New Discussion'. In: H. Bloemen, E. Hertog and W. Segers (eds.) *Letterlijkheid, Woordelijheid / Literality, Verbality*. Antwerpen/Harmelen: Fantom, 135–147.
Woolf, Virginia (1994) *Orlando*. Translated by Tomasz Biedroń. Poznań: Zysk i S-ka.
Venuti, Lawrence (1998) *The Scandals of Translation.* London: Routledge.

Anna Cetera is Assistant Professor of English at the University of Warsaw where she teaches courses on Renaissance Drama and Literary Translation. Her primary interests include semiotics of drama and theatre, and broadly understood cultural exchange. Her most recent publications include a book on drama translation (*Enter Lear. The Translator's Part in Performance*, Warsaw University Press, 2008) as well as articles on the Polish reception of Shakespeare, and early modern travel writing. She has also written and presented papers on the publishing market, specifically with regard to literature in translation. She edits the new critical series of Polish translations of Shakespeare published by Warsaw University Press.

Address: Dr. Anna Cetera, Institute of English Studies, University of Warsaw, ul. Nowy Świat 4, 00-497 Warsaw, Poland. [email: a.cetera@uw.edu.pl]