SOME THOUGHTS ON COLLABORATIVE TRANSLATION

HARRY AVELING*

Abstract

This article deals with the potentials and problems of co-translation, the production of a target text by two people: one who knows the source language and another who does not. It argues that the processes of translation and co-translation are identical once a preliminary initial target text translation (a "crib") has been established. Drawing on debates relating particularly to the translation of North American Indian texts during the 1980s, it calls for faithfulness to the original source text and also for the "duty of disclosure", through which the translators explain to the new readership their aims, methods of working, and how they have dealt with the various problems they have faced in producing the new target text together.

Keywords: co-translation, crib, American Indian languages, faithfulness, disclosure

Abstrak

Artikel ini membahas kemungkinan dan masalah yang terkait dengan penerjemahan bersama, atau penerjemahan sebuah Teks Sasaran oleh dua orang: di mana seseorang memahami Bahasa Sumber dan seseorang lainnya tidak memahami Bahasa Sumber. Artikel ini menjelaskan bahwa proses penerjemahan dan penerjemahan bersama itu sama ketika terjemahan teks sumber awal pendahulu (atau disebut dengan "*crib*") telah dihasilkan. Merujuk kepada perdebatan terkait, khususnya penerjemahan teks-teks suku Indian di Amerika Utara pada

*Harry Aveling, PhD (National University of Singapore) DCA (Doctor of Creative Arts, University of Technology, Sydney), holds an adjunct appointment as Professor of Translation and Interpreting Studies at Monash University. He has translated extensively from Indonesian and Malay, occasionally from French and Medieval Latin, and helped produce co-translations from Hindi and Vietnamese. In October 2014, he presented the New Zealand Centre for Literary Translation Annual Lecture in Literary Translation Studies at the Victoria University of Wellington.

tahun 1980an, artikel ini menyarankan adanya kesetiaan terhadap Teks Sumber serta adanya "tugas pengungkapan". Melalui "tugas pengungkapan" itu, para penerjemah menjelaskan kepada pembaca terjemahan akan tujuan penerjemahan, metode bekerja, dan bagaimana mereka mengatasi sejumlah masalah yang mereka hadapi dalam menghasilkan Teks Sasaran secara bersama-sama.

Kata Kunci: penerjemahan bersama, *crib*, bahasa suku Indian Amerika, kesetiaan, tugas pengungkapan

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, I am interested in the dynamics of literary translation carried out between one person who knows a particular language and another person who does not but is nevertheless responsible for the production of the final text. I will call the first agent a "translator", the second agent "a co-translator" and this shared activity "collaborative translation", or co-translation for short. I would like to consider the process, its possibilities and potential problems.

2. HOW CO-TRANSLATION BEGINS

There are a number of circumstances in which co-translation can be important, depending on our own work situation and indeed our personal relationship with individuals who might be able to share interesting texts with us.

Teachers of literature are increasingly required to deal with texts that already exist but are translations from languages other than their own – from Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Japanese, Korean, and so on. They may have command of one or two of these languages but certainly not all of them. So they will need to be aware of the texts as translations and to be able to recognise the problems (and opportunities) such texts offer. To strengthen their teaching, they may attempt to solve these problems by comparing the

various existing translations, making their own guesses using texts in the source language and dictionaries, or discussing the translations with other persons who know that source language well. If the world literature project is to be at all meaningful and literary studies are to move beyond isolated national literatures, such teachers will be stretched even further in the future, as South, East and Southeast Asian texts come to their attention, as well as works from Africa, North and South America and the Pacific Ocean region.

Those who teach literary translation are also, from time to time, faced with the challenge of dealing with translations from languages they do not know. This is a consequence of offering courses in translation practice beyond the boundaries of single language departments. It will, no doubt, occur even more frequently in the future because of the increasing diversity of the student body. They will be working with students translating from languages they do not know and will need to work out new teaching strategies for these situations.

More broadly, translators in general and literary translators in particular, sometimes have the experience of meeting someone who says: "I have a manuscript it's a translation from language X. I know that you don't know language X but you do know English (or Indonesian, or whatever their major first language is). Will you collaborate with me in moving this one stage further?" And again, if the text is interesting and the translator is willing, the possibilities for further collaboration can be pursued. Or in different circumstances, sometimes translators may find an already existing, already published, translation into their first language, a translation that they think is half-way decent and that challenges them to take the translated text further. The existing translation may be very literal, it may not be the way the new reader visualises the best translation as being but with a little more work it could be really good. So they decide to undertake that work and produce a new co-translation.

3. THE STAGES OF TRANSLATION AND CO-TRANSLATION

My own general translation experience is enormously influenced by Robert Bly's *Eight Stages of Translation* (1983), the product of the reflections of someone who is both a major literary translator and a major poet. It will be useful to summarise these stages before moving more exclusively to the wider, ethical, issues of co-translation.

The first stage is that of setting down the literal version, without worrying about the nuances: "English phrases that are flat, prosaic, dumpy are fine," Bly comments (Bly1983: 15). Sometimes grammatical choices are already involved in this process. Bly notes, for example, that when Rilke speaks in the *Sonnets to Orpheus*, No. XXI of the earth *(die Erde)* and a child together, the gender of the child is understood to be feminine in order to agree with the gender of the earth.

The second stage requires asking questions of the text, penetrating the "problems" it presents, being sure that what it said was as fully understood as possible. What do these cultural references mean? Where is denotation and where is connotation? And so on.

Bly then notes that some translators, having done the minimum possible, "just print the literal version" from the first stage, and turn away from resolving the issues raised by close linguistic and critical readings of the second stage. There is a reason for this apparent laziness. These problems "need everything we have learned in literature courses, or from our own writing, and all the [target language] we can scrape up in order to penetrate the 'problems'" (Bly1983: 16).

Having solved these issues as best one can, the third stage requires a return to the literal version of each text and its rewriting in accordance with the structure of grammatical English.

The co-translator enters the task at one of these three stages – the later the better, of course. At any rate, a draft now exists in the target language. We can call this intermediary text "a pony", "a crib", or

whatever one likes. It is doubtful that "there is an essence to the poem that can be maintained in translation and which can be transported through the crib and into English", but at least we do have the content and some indication of meaning, and – if the crib is full enough – details beyond the literal meaning as well (Keeley 1981, cited in Milton 2005).

I'm assuming that the task is indeed to take the draft further and not just "edit the grammar", which is also possible (e.g. Nguyen Thi Kieu Thu 2013). In which case, it is only now that the real process of "literary transfer" or "rewriting" begins. The next stages are similar for translation and co-translation, although the co-translator can only look forwards and never back. For the co-translator, there is always a distance that will almost certainly remain unknown between this first version in the language one actually does know and the original source text in a language one may never know. Hopefully, the co-translator has prepared him or herself by reading widely about the culture and the literary tradition with which he or she is dealing.

Bly's fourth stage relates to "the ear and the ear's memory" (Bly1983: 26). It requires an awareness of the energy of one's own spoken language to know what is a natural translation. The "labor of this draft" rests in asking the ear: "Have you ever heard this phrase spoken?" (Bly1983: 28). This is a crucial question for all translators: could anyone actually say this particular word or sentence in the target language?

The sound of the speaking voice naturally leads (the fifth stage) to tone, "the ear turned inward toward the complicated feelings the poem is carrying" (Bly 1983: 30). Here "we try to be precise about what its mood *is*, distinguishing it from the mood of nearby poems. We try to capture the poem's balance high and low, dark and light, seriousness and light-heartedness" (Bly 1983: 36). Tone is equally important to prose, of course.

The sixth stage requires an attention to the flow of the translation, its meter and rhythm. Obviously this is crucial in translating poetry, where the technical features are more complicated, but it is also important in working with prose texts as well.

Bly's seventh stage involves checking the draft with a native speaker. He suggests that for beginning translators "this stage is very painful" because sometimes we realise that "our best solutions are simply wrong" (Bly1983: 43). But it can also help us to find out more precisely the meaning of certain words that have been bothering us. For the co-translator, this can also reduce false understandings created by the distance from the original text. Intuition, as we will note below, is a dangerous friend.

The last stage is that of making the final draft. The form of the translation has developed throughout the successive rewritings and is consolidated in the final version. Even at this stage, many translators and co-translators find themselves returning time and time again, changing a word here and there, making new adjustments. The last version of the poem is printed after being either "torn from our hands" or simply abandoned. There is no completely final draft (and often no end to the possible further changes).

4. MY OWN EXPERIENCE IN CO-TRANSLATION

Sometimes the co-translator finds the text. Sometimes the texts find us. I have experience of both of these situations. I have worked with Hindi and Vietnamese, neither of which I know to any extent.

For various personal reasons, I have been involved in the collaborative translation of texts from within the Hindi *bhakti* (devotional poetry) tradition, as focused on the eighteenth century teacher (*guru*), Sant Charandās (1703-1782), and his two leading disciples, both women, Sahajo Bai (1725-?) and Daya Bai (dates uncertain). I have studied Hindi, although not very far, and I know what

a significant portion of Charandās' vocabulary means in this particular context. But I do not know enough Hindi to translate these texts on my own. Fortunately, I have taught with lecturers at La Trobe University who were experts in the language and they were willing to work with me to produce new translations in English.

In each case, we first of all worked through the poems together word by word, letter by letter, line by line and produced an intermediary text together. Then I took the intermediary text another stage forward, with my colleague's approval of the final versions. Here is an example of one final version of a remarkable poem by Charandas:

On Speaking Wisdom

I have seen many speak of wisdom;
I have seldom seen the signs of wisdom.
Lost in their senses, the wise are corrupted,
They say one thing and do another.

With evil karma and malice in their hearts
They forget about virtue and good works.
With sensual lust throbbing in their veins,
They practice lies, deceit and violence.

They cannot restrain their hearts and senses.
They have no fear of sin.
They speak of wisdom but cause dissent.
They know the secret but ignore it.

Brahma's vow is a heavy burden;
Shukdev knew this, Charandas.

When you are fully human,
Not just wise

But established in wisdom
Then contemplate the Spirit.

(Friedlander and Aveling 2014: 83)

In this case, I am reasonably confident that we have the words and the tone right. The cultural content is not difficult – Shukdev is the teacher, Charandas is the student, and Brahma made a vow of celibacy. The original is written in a form that is parallel to this final version, therefore the similarities there too are not hard to find. Our books have included parallel Hindi-English texts; those who would like to check our translations can do so. We have included notes in the Introductions on how we have gone about the task of producing these final versions (the translations of Daya Bai's poetry are in prose).

Here is an example of a text that found me: taken from the Vietnamese of a woman poet named Le Thi May (born 1949). In this case, literal translations of some of Le's poetry into English were made by students in an MA level class I taught in Ho Chi Minh City in January 2006. The poem below was first translated in a very literal way by Phanh Anh Son, Nguyen Minh Thu and Nguyen Thi To Hanh separately, as part of a class exercise, and then finalised by myself, weaving the translations into what I hoped would be a more poetic version. Our translation of the poem called "Bai hat long chim" (Song about a Bird Cage) reads as follows:

The Bird Cage

I have no cage
To hold the bird,

Only my poor heart
To keep your image.

One day you flew away
Bird from the blue sky.

The beating of your frail wings
Still echoes in my heart.

I have no cage
To hold you here;

By chance, my heart
Was the only cage I had.

The beating of your wings
Rings in my mind.

Because I have no cage
My heart bleeds.

(Aveling 2006: 5)

Again the Vietnamese and English texts are published together, which means that at least some basic comparisons can be made between the forms and the positioning of key words between the two texts. But is this a "good translation", a "faithful representation of the original"? To be honest, I have absolutely no idea. I trust the original translators and their perceptions of the poem in Vietnamese. Some people might argue that we have created a new poem in English and that is all that matters. There was nothing by Le Thi May in English and now there is. I think that these questions of quality and faithfulness are important and this is a point I want to come back to later.

5. WHAT IS A TRANSLATION? A CO-TRANSLATION?

André Lefevere has described translation as one of the ways of rewriting literature – along with interpretation, criticism, historiography and the creation of anthologies (Lefevere 1985: 233). In his opinion, translation is "probably the most radical form ... if you believe that rewriting shapes the evolution of a literature or a culture at least as much as the actual writing" (Lefevere 1985: 241). Co-translation is a form of rewriting which involves two persons in two different kinds of

rewriting: the original translator and the editor of the translated text, the "co-translator". The best intermediary text is a literal version, one produced by a translator who is a speaker of the source language, a draft that is rich in alternative suggestions where these are called for, and appropriate annotations on the background to the text, where these are necessary. So much the better if the original translator is available for the further discussion of difficult points.

Co-translating from languages that one does not know raises questions about the nature of translation itself. Two fairly standard definitions of "translation" are those of Peter Newmark:

> (Translation is) a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or a statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language." (Newmark: 1981: 7)

and Eugene Nida and Charles Taber:

> Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, firstly in terms of meaning, and secondly in terms of style." (Nida and Taber 2003: 12).

There is something of a problem here. Clearly, the co-translator is not working from a source text in the original language, so this is not a translation in the normal sense of the word. (Or, rather, it is an "intralingual" translation, a paraphrase, within the same language, building on the intermediate text, but not an "interlingual" translation, between different languages. See Jakobson 1959/2000.)

Perhaps Margret Amman's definition is more useful:

> We can talk of 'translation' when a source text (of oral or written nature) has, for a particular purpose, been used as the model for

the production of a text in the target culture." (cited in Hatim 2001: 27).

A number of points are important here. Firstly, this definition makes no mention of different languages. In working from an already existing, basic English text or creating a new one, that intermediary text (the crib, pony) itself becomes the "model" for the production of a further text in the target language and its culture.

Secondly, the idea of "for a particular purpose" is also important. The purposes in rewriting the text can vary considerably. One can seek to reproduce the source text fairly closely in the second language. Alternatively, one may want to create a new text that will speak directly to readers of literature in the second language. Some co-translators will even use the intermediate text as a foundation for their own literary work, creating what is in effect a completely new work.

Many things are going on in the work of translation. The first of these is, of course, linguistic transferral. Amman's definition further reminds us that the text is also produced for a different culture from that in which it was created. The term "culture" is very broad. An early definition, that of Edward B. Tylor in 1871, describes "culture" as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by [the human being] as a member of society" (cited by Schusky and Culbert 1978: 5). Further, different cultures have different ideas about what constitutes art and literature, and how those works are to be evaluated (a different "poetics", to use Andre Lefevere's term, 1992: 26). Finally, they also have different ideologies, different sets of "taken-for-granted assumptions, beliefs and value-systems which are shared collectively by social groups" (Simpson 1993: 5).

A co-translation that is primarily oriented to providing insights into the source text and its culture will seek to retain the poetics and ideology of the source text. A co-translation that is oriented to

producing a new text, one that fits comfortably (and even impressively) into the literary tradition of the receiving culture, will be much more influenced by the poetics and ideology of the second culture. It depends on the deliberate intentions (the skopos) of the translator and co-translator.

6. FACING THE READER

For the purposes of our discussion, we may draw on the very interesting work that has been done on the translations of North American Indian language poetry. There are very few people who are skilled in these languages, and collections of Indian verse are of three types. At a scholarly level, there are the pre-World War II field reports, particularly those made by the Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE), which provide the original texts, with literal translations and detailed background information. They are the work, in general, of ethnologists and linguists. There are direct re-printings of these field works, without the original texts. Thirdly there are the paperback anthologies, based on what William Bevis (1974: 694) describes as "contemporary and exceptionally free rewritings of the BAE translations by aspiring poets". These rewritings have been very popular in the United States, especially in giving white middle class youth, in particular, a sense at an emotional level of "what it means to be part of a small, coherent, esoteric group, participating in a meaningful community event" (Huntsman 1983: 92).

Bevis is very critical of these contemporary "editors", who, he suggests, "with little or no knowledge of Indian languages have rewritten older translations and published their revised versions as anthologies of Indian poetry" (1974: 693). He provides a striking example of the difference between these two approaches, the scholarly and the creative, through an analysis of a poem taken from Pawnee. First he cites the version that is printed in William Brandon *The Magic World* (1971):

Earth our mother, breathe forth life

all night sleeping
now awakening
in the east
now see the dawn

Earth our mother, breathe and waken

leaves are stirring
all things moving
new day coming
life renewing

Eagle soaring, see the morning

see the new mysterious morning
something marvellous and sacred
though it happens every day
Dawn the child of God and Darkness

Bevis is able to show that this is very different from the original poem, which consisted of eight stanzas. The first stanza reads in Bevis', admittedly tentative, inter-linear translation:

Ho-o-o
Mother earth you arise now;
Mother earth you arise now;
Dawn is born now;
Mother earth you arise now.

The second stanza repeats this structure in the past tense:

Ho-o-o
Mother earth she has arisen now;
Mother earth she has arisen now;
Dawn is born now;
Mother earth she arisen now.

The poem continues in this way. Stanza three, "Brown Eagle you arise now ..."; four, "Brown Eagle she has arisen now ..."; five, "Brown Eagle speaks in the lodge standing now ..."; six, "We understand your words in the lodge now"; seven, "My son you arise now ..."; and eight:

Ho-o-o
My son he has arisen now;
My son he has arisen now;
Dawn is born now;
My son he has arisen now.

The initial transcription includes "some musical notation". It also includes an explanation of the ceremonial setting of the poem. This is a five day success and friendship ritual, and the participants are gathered in a large circular lodge, arranged so that the first rays of the sun will enter the door and strike the central fire area. Four songs are to be sung, tracing the progression of dawn and the simultaneous waking of life; this is one of them. The two friends are being linked as a ceremonial father and son. Finally, there are comments from the original Pawnee informant on the second stanza:

> The leaves and the grass stir; all things move with the breath of the new day; everywhere life is renewed.
>
> This is very mysterious; we are speaking of something very sacred, although it happens every day.

And on the fifth and sixth stanzas:

> It is the breath of the new-born Dawn, the child of Night and Tira wa atius, which is felt by all the powers and all things above and below ...
>
> He tells her (the brown eagle) ... that now he knows the meaning of the signs in the east; that night is the mother of day, that it is by the power of Tira wa atius moving on Darkness that she gives birth to the Dawn.

The new poem is very far from the original; it ignores the form and much of the content of the original and mixes the commentary into the verse. Bevis concludes that Brandon has distorted the imagery, form and the dramatic situation of the original, and destroyed its "spirit" (Bevis 1974: 695-698).

In his own defence, Brandon has entitled the poem "Pawnee: The Birth of Dawn, from the Hako". He has also added a note to the poem: "Adapted from Alice C. Fletcher, 'The Hako, A Pawnee Ceremony,' Twenty-second Annual BAE [Bureau of American Ethnology] Report," from 1900-1. But he does not feel under any absolute obligation to simply repeat this source text. As he candidly insists in his introduction: "My only criterion has been, do the lines feel good, moving? ... All that we want from any of it is the feeling of its poetry. Let the ethnologists keep the rest" (cited in Bevis 1974: 695). Brandon has a different purpose for his work; he is interested in creating a new poem, not in documenting a foreign art form. Is this justifiable?

7. FACING THE ORIGINAL SPEAKER

Bevis does not think that this is at all justifiable. He recognises that translators (and co-translators) have choices: "does the translator seek, at one extreme," he asks, "to compose excellent poems in English, or at the other, to document some aspects of a foreign art form?" (Bevis 1974: 693). However, he has no doubt about his own preference: "I wish to measure the Plains and Southwest poetry translations against the highest documentary standard: how well do they allow us to enter the imaginative world of the Indian art?" (Bevis 1974: 694).

The reasons for Bevis' dissatisfaction are primarily political and ethical ("ideological" in Lefevere's terms). The translations increase "our control but not our understanding of Indians by putting words into their mouths" (Bevis 1974: 695). By seeking to make things "more explicit for whites" (Bevis 1974: 700), they "acculturate" Indian culture

through the imposition of European literary and religious values. They deny "the strangeness of an alien culture" (Bevis 1974: 693, 701), producing a misleading representation of Indian literary aesthetics, and they rely on bad anthropology (Bevis 1974: 700).

William C. Clements (1981) agrees with Bevis and focuses his criticisms on a similar work to Brandon's *Magic World*, Jerome Rothenberg's *Shaking the Pumpkin: Traditional Poetry of the North American Indians* (1972). This is a book of almost 500 pages. It includes poems that are variously described as being "translated by Jerome Rothenberg", "edited by Jerome Rothenberg", "adapted by Jerome Rothenberg", "taken from ...", "based upon ...", "improvised ...", and so on. Clement's article is ironically entitled "Faking the Pumpkin: On Jerome Rothenberg's Literary Offenses". In this article, Clements concludes that *Shaking the Pumpkin* "is a dangerous book, which perpetrates alarming misconceptions about the nature of Native American verbal art (Clements 1981: 194).

Clements suggests four very specific and overlapping reasons why Rothenberg's domesticating approach, facing the new audience, is unacceptable. His first criticism is that Rothenberg misquotes his sources. He insists that: "Tampering with [the spoken or written words of others] through changing word choice or sentence structure, through shifting of emphasis, through omitting without the proper ellipsis, or through adding without proper bracketing constitutes fraud" (Clements 1981: 195). The original author suffers because this is not what he intended to say. The reader suffers because of the assumption that the poem is an accurate representation of the original. The reader is expecting to learn what Native American poetry is like and what is presented is nothing like the original at all. The reader's trust is betrayed (Clements 1981: 195).

The second point Clements makes is that the co-translator has substituted his own European intuition to suggest what the author

should have said, how he should have written had he been writing in English, rather than what he (or she) did say in the original language. Rothenberg resets lines, omits material, provides "free renderings" of the original sources, in order to represent what the original oral performance should have been, even though he has no evidence that such performances even existed (Clements 1981: 199). Rothenberg is simply "guessing" (Clements 1981: 201).

Clements' third point suggests that because Rothenberg misrepresents his original material, he is thereby implying that his renderings must necessarily be better than the originals: "he knows what constitutes Native poetry better than the ethnologists or Native performers" (Clements 1981: 201). Rothenberg has a "romantic" preconception about the poetic nature of all Native American verbalisation and the closeness of Native Americans to Nature that leads him to misrepresent the non-poetic and to distort the contents of his texts (Clements 1981: 201).

And finally Rothenberg's guiding idea of "total translation" is unfulfilled. Rothenberg suggests that the task of translation is "accounting not only for meaning but for word distortions, meaningless syllables, style of performance, etc." (Rothenberg 1972: 466) -- the whole culture, poetics and ideology, as we have suggested above. Clements suggests that Rothenberg fails to represent the "experience of oral culture in print" (Clements 1981: 202) and relies instead on "typographic manipulation" and the frequent use of "highly unconventional formats, often approaching concrete poetic forms" (Clements 1981: 203).

Clements has a strict conception of what the purpose of translating poetry from another language should be and in this Rothenberg obviously fails miserably.

8. THE IMPORTANCE OF DISCLOSURE

Who are we translating for and how do we justify this to our audience? Bevis and Clements have argued that as translators and co-translators, we do have a responsibility and that responsibility is ultimately to the original artist.

Brian Swann (1987: 253) provides some guidelines for collaborative translations from the oral tradition, which are applicable to all translations. In brief these state:

a. The scholar's knowledge has to be the bedrock on which the poet builds.
b. The poet's ego should be left at the door, and the scholar should not be pedantic.
c. Works translated should be culturally significant to the group whose expression is being translated.
d. We should try to create a similar response in the second audience as in the first.
e. The translator should aim at a balance between identity and difference – "the delicate line between absorbing the 'other' and keeping it 'other'" (Swann 1987: 248).

This is very ascetic advice. There is a political dimension to all of this. Translators have the power to represent a particular writer and a particular culture. If they represent the original text only in terms of their own culture, then they are misrepresenting it; they are using their power in a very arbitrary, colonial way to control the other. This is Australian aboriginal poetry, North American poetry, as I think it should be.

There is also an aesthetic responsibility. Writers do often draw inspiration from writers in other cultures and languages for their own writing and there are good reasons why they should. However, if they are going to say, for example, that this is what Native American poetry

is like in the original – or Lorca, or Chairil Anwar – and they leave half of it out, then that is not what Native American poetry, Lorca or Chairil Anwar, is like at all. It is what that writer is like and the reader should be aware of this too.

Perhaps there is a middle way and it is simply that translators and co-translators, poets and scholars, have a duty of "disclosure" (Andrew Wiget cited in Swann 1987: 249). If the translator and co-translator say that "this is my translation and this is what I've done with it", then the reader has at least been warned. This is the ethical responsibility to ensure that readers know what is being done with the original text, why it was done in this particular way, what the aim was, the purpose, what has been lost, what has been retained, what has been changed. One way of doing this is by leaving the rough edges in the final text, the compromises and alternatives (Wiget in Swann 1987: 249). Another is by way of footnotes, introductions, essays on the craft of translation and specific translations, by raising the profile of what translators do. Publishers are not used to these practices but they are worth persevering with in the effort to educate the wider public about the art of translation.

These are heavy responsibilities. They commit the translator to poetry, to scholarship, to honesty and integrity, and of course to humility. Should we expect anything less from those dedicated not to "faking the pumpkin" (Clements 1981) but to "recovering the word" (Swann and Krupat 1987)?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to record my gratitude to the following scholars for their assistance in the preparation of this paper: Dr Patricia Afable, Dr William M Clements, Mr Jeffrey Shane, Dr Lucy Thomason, and Dr Phillip L Thomas. A preliminary version of this paper was presented to The Literary Translation Seminar, sponsored by the University of

Western Sydney, 1-2 October 2010. More recently, I have been encouraged to take up these issues again through discussions with colleagues at the New Zealand Centre for Literary Translation, Victoria University of Wellington – Dr Marco Sonzogni, Assoc. Prof. Stephen Epstein and Assoc. Prof. Jean Anderson.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aveling, Harry (2002). *Finding words for secrets: Reflections on the translation of Indonesian poetry*, Centre of Southeast Asian Studies Working Papers, No. 116, Monash Asia Institute, Monash University, Victoria.

Aveling, Harry, ed. (2006). *Selected Poems by Le Thi May*, Asian Studies Papers, Translation Series, Bundoora.

Aveling, Harry and Peter Friedlander (2005). *The Songs of Daya Bai: Daya Bai ki Bani*, Prestige Publications, New Delhi.

Aveling, Harry and Sudha Joshi (2001). *Sahaj Prakash: The Brightness of Simplicit,*. Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi.

Bevis, William (1974). "American Indian Verse Translations," *College English* 35, Mar., pp. 693-703.

Bly, Robert (1983). *Eight Stages of Translation*, Rowan Tree Press, Boston. Brandon, William,.ed. (1971). *The Magic World: American Indian Songs and Poems*, Morrow, New York.

Clements, William M. (1981)."Faking the Pumpkin: On Jerome Rothenberg's Literary Offenses," *Western American Literature* 16, Nov., pp. 193-204.

Clements, William M. (1996). *Native American Verbal Art*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson AZ.

Friedlander, Peter and Harry Aveling, Harry (2014). *The Treasury of Devotion: Sant Charandas's Bhaktipadarth*, Prestige Publications, New Delhi.

Hatim, Basil (2001). *Teaching and Researching Translation*, Longman, Harlow.

Huntsman, Jeffrey F (1983). "Traditional Native American Literature: The Translation Dilemma", in (ed.) Brian Swann, *Smoothing the Ground: Essays on Native American Oral Literature*, University of California Press, Berkeley, pp. 87-97.

Jakobson, R. (1959/2000), 'On linguistic aspects of translation', in L. Venuti (ed.) *Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, London, pp. 113-118.

Keeley, Edmund (1981). "The State of Translation", in *Modern Poetry in Translation*, No. 41-42, Mar., pp. 7-18.

Lefevere, Andre (1985). "Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm", in ed. Theo Hermans *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, Croom Helm, London, pp. 215-243.

Lefevere, Andre (1992), *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of* Literary *Fame*, Routledge, London.

Milton, John (2005). "The Translation Workshop", available online at: www.johnmilton.pro.br/art.gos/2005-workshop.pdf, accessed 17th September 2010.

Newmark, Peter (1981), *Approaches to Translation*, Pergamon, London.

Nguyen Thi Kieu Thu, ed. (2013), *Don Nhan Truyen Ngan Duong Dai Nam Bo: Embracing Life, Contemporary Short Fiction from Southern Vietnam*, Ho Chi Minh City General Publishing House, Ho Chi Minh City.

Nida, Eugene and Charles Taber (2003), *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Brill, Leiden.

Osho (2001), *The Last Morning Star*, trans. Harry Aveling and Sudha Joshi, Rebel, Pune.

Paul, Sherman (1986). *In Search of the Primitive: Rereading David Antin, Jerome*

Rothenberg, and Gary Snyder, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge.

Rothenberg, Jerome, ed. (1968). *Technicians of the Sacred: A Range of Poetries from Africa, America, Asia & Oceania*, Garden City, New York.

Rothenberg, Jerome, ed. (1972), *Shaking the Pumpkin: Traditional Poetry of the Indian North Americas*, Garden City, New York.

Rothenberg, Jerome (1983), "Total Translation: An Experiment in the Presentation of American Indian Poetry", in (eds.) Jerome Rothenberg and Diane Rothenberg, *Symposium of the Whole: A Range of Discourse Toward an Ethnopoetics* University of California Press, Berkeley, pp. 381-393.

E.L. Schusky, E.L. and T.P. Culbert (1978), *Introducing Culture*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood-Cliffs NJ.

Simpson, P. (1993), *Language, Ideology and Point of View*, Routledge, London.

Swann, Brian (1987), "A Note On Translation, and Remarks On Collaboration", in (eds.) Brian Swann and Arnold Krupat, *Recovering the Word: Essays on Native American Literature*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 247-54.