

Translational and non-translational regimes informing poetry anthologies. Lessons on authorship from two minor Spanish intermediaries of the early twentieth century

Anthony Pym

Published as “Translational and Non-Translational Regimes Informing Poetry Anthologies. Lessons on Authorship from Fernando Maristany and Enrique Díez-Canedo”, *International Anthologies of Literature in Translation*, Ed. Harald Kittel, Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1995, 251-270.

A problem of authorship

It is not easy to locate translation anthologies through secondary sources. Although I spent several years studying the dissemination of French Modernist poetry, my mass of notes mentioned only that Stefan George's *Zeitgenössische Dichter* had been of some importance in its day and that Romantic and early Modernist poetry entered Japan through two anthologies published in the 1880s. There was not much else. Except, perhaps, for the following brief comment in a Spanish essay:

"When the historical anthology *La poesía francesa moderna* was published in Madrid in 1913, arranged and annotated by Enrique Díez-Canedo and Fernando Fortún, there was surprise at the number of translations from French that had been carried out by the Hispanic authors participating in the volume. In addition to the editors there were Juan Ramón Jiménez, Eduardo Marquina, González Martínez, Max Henríquez Ureña, Ramón Pérez de Ayala, and the then very young poet Pedro Salinas." (OLIVIO JIMÉNEZ, 63-64)

The mention of this particular anthology had little to do with its status as an anthology, nor as a collection of translations. What counted was that a good number of the translators were, like George, major poets in their own right, indeed among the greatest of their generations. Had these writers not enjoyed auctorial status, the anthology would very probably have been forgotten.

I soon discovered numerous other translation anthologies involved in the dissemination of French poetry in Spanish. But this entire aspect has been excluded from most secondary sources. It does not concord with the view that literature and intercultural relationships are based on authorship, originality and the single work. Despite the supposed death of the author in literary theory, historians continue to write as if intercultural transfer had nothing to do with processes of translation, transformation and anthologization. Ideologies of authorship continue to hide almost everything else that was going on.

I want to take this exclusion as my point of departure. If the dominant vision of literary history is focused on original authorship as a form of non-translation and non-anthologization, what status can be accorded to the supposed non-authorship of the silent hands involved in conveying, translating and arranging texts? If we are to believe that translation is non-auctorial by definition and anthologization is at least secondary to original creation, should not translation anthologies constitute a particularly non-auctorial genre? This would seem logical. But could it also happen that translation and anthologization, although weakly auctorial activities, are able to function together as a kind of double negative, making translation anthologies rather more auctorial than are non-translational anthologies or more isolated translations? After all, this particular translation anthology was remembered precisely because it was in some way auctorial.

To decide between these two hypotheses virtually means deciding between two ways to fit translation anthologies into current approaches to literary history. I propose to address the problem by looking at a pair of relatively minor and quite different Spanish translator-anthologists. I shall briefly contrast their work, locate them within an international network, and outline the regime specific to their translation and anthologization procedures. My aim is to show not only that the general notion of authorship can provide a meaningful frame for the study of both translation and anthologization, but also that the combination of these two relatively non-auctorial activities can give results that share certain remarkable similarities with the activities of original authors. To tell all, my findings will tend to go against common sense. They will be in favor of the idea that translation anthologies are peculiarly auctorial. It is the more productive working hypothesis for this particular corpus.

Fernando Maristany: the translation anthology as retreat

Following the Spanish note, I located the 1913 anthology in question and remarked the great poets listed therein as translators. But I also noted that the principle editor, Enrique Díez-Canedo, had written a prologue for a further anthology called *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua inglesa* [The hundred best (lyrical) poems in the English Language], published in 1918 and edited and translated by one Fernando Maristany (a Castilian first-name with a Catalan family-name). This was of interest. Especially when I elsewhere found señor Maristany listed as responsible for no less than seven translation anthologies from the same period: a first anthology from various languages (1914), one from French (1917), the one from English (1918) and others from Portuguese (undated), German (1919) and Italian (1920), all brought together in a 650-page *Florilegio* (1920) at about the same time as he published two volumes of his own verse (1919, 1920), then a second anthology from French (1921) plus an anthology of Spanish poets (1921), after which Fernando Maristany found time for several short

stories of his own (1923) before dying in 1924 at the age of 41, no doubt exhausted by a life mainly devoted to translation anthologies. Who was this man? Why had all of this been swept under the carpet of literary history?

I eventually located a few brief biographical sources. The best of them is a letter written by Maristany himself in 1921 (cited at length in Maseras 1923: 20-23), of use to the extent that it can be substantiated through various press reviews. Here is the story.

Born into a wealthy Catalan family in 1883, Fernando Maristany studied engineering but gave up because of an unnamed illness that classically "left his health seriously impaired for the rest of his life". In 1913, at the age of thirty, he published a first volume of his own verse with the very *fin de siècle* title of *En el azul* [In the azure] but withdrew it from circulation. A press review reproduced at the end of his English anthology presumably conveys one of the receptions Maristany was least upset about:

"There is more talk about his personality than his work. He his very twentieth-century, very *gentleman*, disparaging of the Catalan bourgeoisie that surrounds him. [...] Don Fernando belongs to the group of the select, a group which, if rare amongst men of letters, is almost non-existent amongst the wealthy classes, who entertain their leisure hours with novels of dubious taste." (*El día gráfico*, Barcelona, cited in MARISTANY, *Lengua inglesa* 158)

This was followed in 1914 by the first of his numerous translation anthologies, *Poesías excelsas (breves) de los grandes poetas*. The volume was introduced with verse of the translator's own composition and offered to take its delicate reader on a path of "delight and emotion" leading from Dante to the Comtesse de Noailles, without difficulty, without excessive length (most importantly "*breves*") and without any foreign words. But the review Maristany chose to reproduce dealt this time with rather more than his restricted class location:

"The publication of a volume of lyrical verse at a time of war in Europe [1914] indicates inconceivable bravery on the part of the self-sacrificing author [*abnegado autor*], and when the volume brings together poets from the various countries in conflict, the bravery assumes traits of heroism. Heroism and *neutrality*." (*L'esquella de la Torratxa*, Barcelona, cited in MARISTANY, *Lengua inglesa* 161, italics in the text)

Spain of course remained neutral throughout the First World War, making considerable economic gains as a result. But Spanish intellectuals were very divided over the issue. Liberals and the left were in favour of the Allies; the military and the right were in favour of the central powers. One might thus expect a multilateral anthology including English, French and German texts to be read as a political statement from an a-political man. The reviewer's term "*autor*" with respect to Maristany is thus a significant description of a translator with something to say. But Maristany was not quite Thomas Mann. Virtually at the end of the war he sided more with the winners, bringing out his French and English anthologies. In his prologue to the latter we discover that despite

the virtues of neutrality, "of all the foreign Parnasses, the English is closest to our spirit" (xvi). The terms of this relation are moreover topically militaristic:

"It is too often forgotten that [the translation of foreign poetry] is the way voices and forms of other peoples enter our poetry, and that, in the realm of the intellect, there is no sterile conquest. One must rejoice in the victory of capturing a given thought in strict words." (MARISTANY, *Lengua inglesa* vi)

Translation is not just a form of infiltration designed to correct one's own culture. It is also a conquest over foreign thoughts. Public battles may thus be fought and won in the private space of the translator. But exactly for whom could Maristany have been fighting?

The nominal second person of these early anthologies is of aristocratic pretensions: "*refinado lector*" (*Poesías excelsas* 5), "*culto lector*" (*Lengua francesa* 9), all in the intimate second person and with external guarantees of good taste: "Here I offer you [*te ofrezco*] a work, most of whose originals are *officially* amongst the best in the world" (*Poesías excelsas* 5, italics in the text). Or again, "...these poems have already been accepted in the best anthologies in France" (*Lengua francesa* 8), as if the translator were presenting a letter of reference. The reviews accepted the corresponding social location: "...a delicious feast for a refined mind" (cited in *Lengua inglesa* 170). And yet Maristany's prologues also locate a wider purpose, identified with service to his "*patria*" (*Poesías excelsas* 5), with "the culture of Spain and Spanish America" (*Lengua francesa* 10) and with "general culture" (*Lengua inglesa* xv). Despite the intimate second-person discourse, there is a public cause to be served, significantly through the Castilian language rather than the Catalan of the Barcelona bourgeoisie. Maristany was not translating just for his personal pleasure. Nor was he merely serving the regional class he had been born into. His attention was directed towards a wider national and international frame - as wide as a European war -, where part of his expressed purpose was to "popularize" foreign poetry (*Lengua francesa* 10), to reach readers beyond his own social milieu.

The first anthology of translations from French would indeed appear to have enjoyed a certain success, running to three editions and, if we can believe Maristany himself, selling some 16,000 copies (cited in Maseras 1923: 21). And yet there is no indication that any of his other anthologies or original works met with similar success. This may partly be attributed to a lack of potential public. Spain at that time had virtually no middle class. Once one left the wealthy families of the aristocracy and those who had profited from colonial trade (Maristany's own family wealth appears to have been based on cotton imports), the only bourgeoisie to speak of was in Barcelona, which was precisely the class whose language Maristany chose not to use.

But our translator was no street-fighter anyway. Having been noted in various Barcelona circles as a monocled and elegant *señorito*, he soon retreated to a country

residence near Sitges where, from 1916 to 1920, he translated and published most of his anthologies of poetry, reaching what he himself described as a rate of "about one anthology every six months" (in Maseras 1923: 21). One imagines him as a belated Des Esseintes, translating poetry as an elegant though private way to pass the hours and remain on the fringe of literary circles. And yet this was not a permanent retreat to the non-authorship of translation. There was a return to original creation. In 1919-1920 Maristany published a much-altered version of the verses he had withdrawn in 1913. The new version was probably at the insistence of the Portuguese poet Teixeira de Pascoaes, who prologued the 1919 edition. Then came an even more significant change. In 1920 our translator-poet decided to return to city-life and succeeded in convincing his Valencian publisher to set up an office in Barcelona. One supposes that Maristany's family wealth played some part in this new undertaking, although the 16,000 copies of the French anthology would also have been profitable enough to finance further publishing ventures. The result was that Maristany became literary editor for the Cervantes publishing house in Barcelona. From this position he launched *Las mejores poemas líricos de los mejores poetas* [The best lyrical poems by the best poets], a series of monographic translation volumes. One of these volumes comprised his own versions of Teixeira de Pascoaes, no doubt to return previous favours and encouragement. In 1921 Maristany further used his new position to leave the field of translation and edit an anthology of Spanish poets. In 1923 he published *Gusano de luz*, a series of short stories full of Lords and Ladies and young aristocratic Englishmen speaking aesthetic philosophy. Maristany's poetry then became the object of a monographic study by Alfonso Maseras, a young writer apparently seeking to gain editorial favours in exchange for copying out long citations from mediocre reviews. Interestingly enough, Maseras's study is presented as the introduction to a French translation of Maristany's own verses (that is, the translator was to be translated) and includes references to translations of Maristany into English, Portuguese, Italian and Armenian. I have been unable to locate any of these translations, if indeed they were ever published. One suspects they were intended as a minor homages that could be exchanged for return translations and even for inclusion in Maristany's "Best of the best" series, which was very much oriented towards contemporary foreigners. But the return favours were unlikely to come, for the poet-translator-cum-editor died the following year.

For Maristany, the path of translation would appear to have begun in frustrated authorship and eventually led back to authorship, culminating in a certain limited influence: the translator was to be translated. One might even suppose the project to translate a Portuguese anthology brought him the friendship and support needed for the return to authorship. Maristany thus appears to have used translation as a form of socialization, or at least a strategy against absolute marginalization. But his translation anthologies unambiguously correspond to a period of retreat from literary society. They

never really led to the kind of popularization the translator at one stage listed amongst his purposes. Fernando Maristany would not be remembered by the history of authorship.

Enrique Díez-Canedo: the translation anthology as a public manifesto

A far more public figure, Enrique Díez-Canedo is perhaps less intriguing. The details of his life and publications can be found in Fernández Gutiérrez (1980, 1984). Born in Badajoz in 1879 (four years before Maristany), he studied law but fancied himself as a poet, publishing the obligatory *fin de siècle* verse in Madrid (1906, 1907) and Paris (1910), where he was a secretary at the Ecuadorian embassy from 1909 to 1911. But his auctorial activity was always mixed with translational ventures. He translated the Catalan poet Eugenio d'Ors in 1905; a volume of hybrid "*versiones poéticas*" appeared in Madrid in 1907; he translated Francis Jammes in 1909, then a small anthology of Portuguese poets was published in Paris in about 1910; further "*versiones poéticas*" were published in Paris at about the same time. Díez-Canedo returned to Madrid in 1911 to teach art history at the Escuela de Artes y Oficios and French at the Escuela Central de Idiomas, eventually becoming the director of the latter institution. He went on to translate numerous authors including Montaigne (1917), Heine (1918), La Fontaine (1918), Webster (1920), Baudelaire (1920), Paul Fort (1921) and Whitman (1924), as well as presumably commissioned works on art history (1909) and Ireland (undated, published by the Irish Republican delegation in Madrid). He also edited translations of Verlaine (1921-26) and an anthology of Spanish prose (1922). There then followed a quite spectacular public career. In 1927 he was sent on an official mission to Chile; in 1935 he became a member of the Real Academia de la Lengua; in 1936 Azaña named him as the Republic's ambassador to Argentina. When the Republic approached its end in the Civil War Díez-Canedo resigned from his diplomatic post, briefly returned to Spain and then went into exile in Mexico, where he was offered a university post in 1938. It was then in Mexico that he completed works including an anthology of Spanish poets (1940), translations from Croce (1942) and Mérimée (1943), and a revised version of the French poetry anthology (published in 1945). He died in exile in 1944, at the age of 65.

Like Maristany, Díez-Canedo would appear to have moved towards translation partly as a result of frustrated authorship. His early verse did receive kind comments from poets of the order of Unamuno and Juan Ramón Jiménez, but such receptions probably had more to do with his personality than with any strictly literary quality. The stage of highly personalized translation - the early "*versiones poéticas*" and the work on d'Ors and Jammes - was itself quickly breached in favour of group work, editing, teaching and translation on command, responding to publishers' requests rather than

personal caprice. As a cultural organizer and commentator on the fringe of active political circles, Díez-Canedo was known and well liked by almost all the reformist intellectuals in Madrid. He would later be remembered as "El Bueno", perhaps translatable as "a good bloke". His translation work was a far more significant mode of socialization than was Maristany's. For Díez-Canedo, translation was part of a path that led towards a public career, definitively abandoning literary authorship.

Although Díez-Canedo was the central organizer behind the 1913 French translation anthology and translated about 20% of the texts in the volume, the anthology itself is remembered because of the names of his more illustrious collaborators. Díez-Canedo was an efficient intermediary, but he was never in the literary limelight. Indeed, given the international relations of the time, one might see this 1913 anthology as the translational equivalent of an aesthetic manifesto. In the same way as relatively minor literary figures (Moréas for the Symbolists) had traditionally brought nineteenth-century poets together to sign a group statement of principles, so Díez-Canedo had united these translator-poets on the side of French culture. Having formed a group statement, he remained a secondary figure within it.

The importance of such a manifesto-like statement was not necessarily limited to the approaching European war that would determine receptions of Maristany's early work. Spain had virtually been left out of European affairs since 1874, but its new conquests in Morocco were recognized in a treaty signed with France on 27 November 1912. The preface to Díez-Canedo's French anthology had been signed just one month previously, on 20 October 1912, at a moment when Spanish intellectuals were debating a new vision of their country's place in the world. This period is usually seen as a major historical watershed for Spain. On 8 February 1913 Ortega y Gasset, then aged 30, publicly rejected the inward vision of the previous generation and called for a new Spain based on "*democracia y competencia*". In October 1913 there was a manifesto setting up a pro-democratic Political Education League, signed by a group of mostly young Madrilenian intellectuals including Ortega y Gasset and Manuel Azaña, many of whom were to rise to public office with the Republic in 1931 (of which Azaña was the President). Díez-Canedo became a member of the League in 1914. Much of its project was based on the role of the intellectual in public education, seen as a necessary first step towards the difficult implantation of popular democracy in a country with no developed middle class. In the history of Spanish ideas, 1913 separates the inward pessimism of Unamuno's *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida* from the aggressive optimism of Ortega's call to action. One vision was directed inwards and backwards; another went outwards and forwards.

Enrique Díez-Canedo's French anthology most definitely fits in with the reforming optimism of the Madrilenian intellectual group rising alongside Ortega. On the other hand, the Fernando Maristany of the translation anthologies might be seen as a belated

beholder of Unamuno's tragic vision, unwilling to recognize or adequately respond to the lack of a Spanish middle class, hoping to serve their *patria* from a position of intellectual retreat and isolation.

Description of the anthologies

For the sake of comparison I shall restrict my descriptions to just two volumes: the 1913 collective anthology edited by Díez-Canedo and Fortún, and Maristany's 1917 anthology. This enables us to consider the French source culture as virtually identical in the two cases. But what interests me more is the possibility that these two texts can be positioned at opposite ends of a range of translation anthologies. Díez-Canedo's work was based on socializing and didactic strategies; Maristany's anthology was implicated in a far more aristocratic and individualist problematic. Between these two extremes, what the texts have in common as translation anthologies should tell us something about the historical norms pertinent to the genre.

Díez-Canedo's 1913 volume *La poesía francesa moderna* is 375 pages long, includes texts from 59 French poets, rendered by a total of 28 translators. About a quarter of the translations had been done specially for this volume, most of them by Díez-Canedo himself. No original French texts are presented, although the titles have been left untranslated when they are also the first line of the poem. Almost all the translations respect the original form. Rhyming verse is rendered as rhyming verse - semantic or syntactic complications usually being sacrificed to verse form -, prose poems remain prose poems, and *vers libres* basically become fragmented prose. Contrary to common practice at the time there are no Hispanicized names (i.e. Baudelaire is "Charles" and not "Carlos", although Hugo has an accented "V́ctor" in the prologue).

The volume is organized according to clearly didactic criteria. It is divided into five historical sections, each of which is introduced by a one-page overview. Each individual poet is then introduced by a brief biography and bibliography. The educational content is reinforced by a critical bibliography at the end, which lists general studies, author studies (in French and German), and other anthologies (six of them non-translational, plus the Granthoffs' 1912 *Die lyrische Bewegung in gegenwärtigen Frankreich. Eine Auswahl*). In academic terms, the notes generally reflect good scholarship - except for a few tall tales retold - and the bibliography remains of interest today.

Translation anthologies by several hands should logically be "author-oriented" (FRANK & ESSMANN 30), since it is not possible for the reader to focus on the personality of a singular translator-anthologist. But is this the case here? It is true that each translator's name appears only in relatively small type at the end of the

corresponding translation or block of translations and that the editors of the volume sign their translations only with their initials. However, a Verlaine translation by Juan Ramón Jiménez was and remains most likely to be read in a "translator-oriented" way, precisely because the translator is an author in his own right. This is particularly true when the original text is well known. There is thus in this case a very real difference between two possible modes of reception. The auctorial status of the translators means that the general theory does not apply. Further notions are needed.

Here we run into a very practical problem. Is the implied reader of this text supposed to know French? If not, why give the bibliographies, predominantly in French? If so, why give the Spanish translations? And if the volume is supposed to help the reader move towards an understanding of the foreign language, why not give the French originals alongside the translations? Exactly who was the reading public supposed to be? If Díez-Canedo's purpose was didactic, exactly whom did he set out to teach?

I suspect the peculiar mixture of prestigious translator-authors within a heavily didactic frame basically left this impressive piece of work without any extensive target public. The volume might have been of interest to the translating poets themselves or to a student with independent access to the originals. But such people would hardly have needed the translations anyway. Moreover, someone like Maristany's "*refinado lector*", although perhaps interested by the translations, would have surely have found the didactic frame of dubious taste. Stymied by a marketing error, a volume ostensibly oriented towards foreign authors was instead remarked because of its manifesto-like function and the auctorial status of its translators. As such, it remained without any immediate reprinting or second edition.

Turning to Maristany's *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua francesa* we find a volume of 203 pages presenting 46 French poets from Villon to Samain, all translated by the one hand and presented without the French originals. The only Hispanicized name is "Augusto" Dorchain, although Hugo is once again an accented "Víctor". All translations preserve formal equivalence, with rhyme, and there are no prosified forms in sight. The anthologist obviously believed in the priorities of fixed-form verse.

The didactic frame is limited to the poets' dates of birth and death, and a brief introduction on the selection criteria. But this does not mean Maristany entirely shunned didactic strategies. His prologue announces that the following *Antología general* will give a brief history of French poetry, albeit written by another hand. Didactic functions are thus admitted but kept separate from the translator-author himself. Maristany does not confuse his reader: no previous knowledge of French is required; if lessons are to be given, he will not be the teacher; his translations must stand or fall as texts in themselves. This simplified marketing strategy no doubt contributed to the volume's reasonable commercial success. But given Maristany's

private income, he was more likely to be as fundamentally indifferent to mercenary strategies as Díez-Canedo was unsuccessful.

It is not my intention to give a literary appreciation of the way these two translators rendered French verse, since my prime concern is the anthology form itself. But a taste of what we are dealing with may at least be gleaned from two fairly representative versions of a well known original:

IL PLEURE DANS MON CŒUR

Il pleut doucement sur la ville

Arthur Rimbaud

Llanto en mi corazón
y lluvia en la ciudad.
¿Qué lánguida emoción
entra en mi corazón?

Trans. Enrique Díez-Canedo

HOY LLORA EN MI CORAZÓN

Llueve dulcemente sobre la ciudad

Arthur Rimbaud

Hoy llora en mi corazón
Como llueve en la ciudad.
¡Oh, qué lánguida emoción
Penetra en mi corazón!

Trans. Fernando Maristany

The most striking point is perhaps the insignificance of the differences. If Maristany uses a longer metre to give himself more room for the logic of the content (primarily to render the connective "comme"), Díez-Canedo is the more technically skilled versifier and seems less worried about exact syntax. But the public reception of these two versions would probably have been about the same. Both might have been appreciated as moderately clever; neither was about to challenge the reader's powers of comprehension or preconceptions about poetry. Indeed, a shared tendency towards simplification could well be more significant than any actual differences. Interestingly enough, isolated verses in Maristany's first edition were criticized for being too literal and were subsequently corrected in the second edition. For example, the last line of Mallarmé's *Les fenêtres* ("Au risque de tomber pendant l'éternité") was originally rendered as:

Temiendo caer durante la entera eternidad

When justly criticized as "hard and cacophonous", the translation became the phonetically and metrically simpler, though semantically inexplicable,

Temiendo despolmarse desde la eternidad

This can be contrasted with the once again shorter version in the Díez-Canedo volume:

á riesgo de caer toda la Eternidad

which similarly opts for a path of lesser difficulty.

Yet the crucial differences lie not so much in how the translations were carried out as in what was translated.

Preselection through an international network

Although Díez-Canedo's bibliography lists seven previous anthologies, the introduction claims the editors "have not followed any of the anthologies published in France, although many of them have been used for details" (5). The selection is indeed original and remarkably coherent, tracing French post-Romanticism from Bertrand, Nerval and Baudelaire through to the Symbolists, post-Symbolists and contemporaries who were younger than Díez-Canedo himself (the last poet included, Georges Tournoux, was born in 1886). The choice of poets for the last section could probably have benefited from greater home-ground screening. Indeed, one suspects they were picked because personally known to Díez-Canedo during his stay in Paris in 1909-1911. Most of them were not included in his 1945 revised version of the anthology and almost all of them have since disappeared from literary history. The overall volume nevertheless presents a rich and diversified range, firmly centered on what are to my mind correctly named as the "Masters [not members] of Symbolism" (Corbière, Laforgue, Rimbaud, Verlaine and Mallarmé).

Maristany, by contrast, does not even pretend to have made a personal selection. His opening remarks and indeed his title refer directly to Auguste Dorchain's *Les cent meilleurs poèmes (lyriques) de la langue française*, first published in Paris in 1905. As we have seen, this French preselection is offered as a guarantee of the volume's quality and good taste. But there are several deviations from the French anthology. First, since one of Dorchain's principles of composition was to exclude living writers - his anthology is very much a "dead poets' society" -, Maristany logically considered himself free to add a few poets who had died since 1905: Sully Prudhomme, Coppée, Verhaeren, Moréas and Guérin. Second, the Spanish translator also smuggled in a few names of not inconsiderable importance - Rimbaud, Rodenbach and Mallarmé -, whom Dorchain had presumably omitted because they were suspect of decadence, difficulty, or both. Maristany justifies these second additions by claiming they also appear in "the best French anthologies". But he then adds:

"Having studied various different Parnasses, we have reached the conclusion that a poem is beautiful or otherwise quite independently of any tendency or school." (8)

This could mean the reader should fear no bombs from "decadents" or any other label. However, in conjunction with the principle of preselection in France, it also implies that the anthology is constructed on a mode of authorship organized in terms of a natural hierarchy, if not of natural selection. The best will eventually enter the canon, despite accidents of unkind birth or temporary exclusion. And the best will win out simply because it is the best, since just as beauty is truth is beauty, success justifies success. No other criterion need be mentioned.

Maristany applied similar selection procedures in his other anthologies: 80 of his 100 English poems were from Adam Gowans' *The Hundred Best (Lyrical) Poems in the English Language*, first published in 1903. More importantly, his continued use of this particular title-form made no secret of his desire to work within the same ideology of authorship and its secondary organization. He never stopped paying homage to natural selection of "the best". It was then quite fitting that he should launch and edit *Los mejores poesías líricas de los mejores poetas* : "the best of the best" was all he ever sought. The underlying ideology also supported his immediate commercial competitors like the "Biblioteca Universal" and collections of lesser allure, in many respects equivalents of the nineteenth-century *Classiques pour tous*, designed not so much to protect delicate sensibilities as to promote high culture amongst an incipient middle class. When translational, these volumes often incorporated the principles of what Kahn has called "verbürgerlichende Übersetzung" (1963: 304), simplifying and "sweetening" original texts in a way that omitted virtually all complex syntax and possibly vulgar material. Hence Dorchain. Hence, also, Maristany's need to explain away his addition of possible "decadents". The best had to be fit for immediate and unproblematic consumption.

Within this general ideology, our particular case found a more specific anchor through the Ruskinian title *The Hundred Best*... Here Maristany connected not only with Dorchain but with an entire network of non-translational anthologies. Centered on the British firm Gowans & Gray, the network had developed from the above-mentioned English *Hundred Best*, of which some 50,000 copies had been printed between 1903 and 1907 (a further 42,000 copies of a *Second Hundred Best* would be printed by 1920). The commercial success of the English venture was then no doubt behind Dorchain's *Cent meilleurs* of 1905 and would further explain why, when this latter volume had raced through four reprintings in less than a year, the numerous re-editions (see bibliography) were to form an international sales network linking Gowans & Gray (London, Glasgow) with Librairie A. Perche (Paris) and, from 1907, G.W. Jacobs (Philadelphia). These highly conservative non-translational anthologies were of undoubted success, presumably finding the money of those who wanted to educate themselves or their family - or wanted to appear to be doing so -, and in any case certainly finding American money. The network then expanded to take in the Spanish

Cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua castellana published in 1908 and compiled by Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, which soon enjoyed similar success in the United States. Finally, Richard Meyer's *Die hundert besten Gedichte der deutschen Sprache; Lyrik*, published 1909, looked set for similar success until torpedoed by the First World War. The numerous editions of these volumes through to the 1950s (except for the German volume, which nevertheless resurfaced in 1924) indicate there was considerable money to be made from publishing poetry anthologies in the original language.

Remarkably enough, our two Spanish translator-anthologists were both involved with this non-translational network, and not just as translators. Maristany and Díez-Canedo edited anthologies of Spanish poetry, in both cases with the title *Las cien mejores...* (in 1921 and 1940 respectively). But the relations that brought them their material and determined their titles did not necessarily determine what they actually did in their translation anthologies. To address this second question we need to go beyond the material level of the network. We need to talk about regimes.

Non-translational and translational regimes

Regimes are most simply defined as "sets of governing arrangements organizing relations of interdependence" (KEOHANE & NYE 19). Although the notion comes from negotiation theory, I have elsewhere tried to indicate how it could be applied to translation history (PYM 140-150). In the present context, its applicability is perhaps best explained on the basis of the non-translational "Hundred Best" network (the Gowans & Gray circuit), the governing arrangements of which might be extracted as follows:

- *Only nations with continuous traditions can have anthologies.* This fundamental precept involved a form of reciprocal recognition between the main cultures of European Romanticism, excluding the numerous small nations and regions that were nevertheless developing post-Romantic literatures at the time.

- *Texts should be selected by authorities within the source culture.* In keeping with the principle of reciprocal recognition, the "best" texts should arise from within each national culture, in the way that Darwinian natural selection determined the survivors within each milieu.

- *The anthologizer should be an authoritative source-culture figure external to literary authorship.* The anthologizers were mostly established literary historians and academics presumably above the ruck of competing literary schools and fashions, since it was only from such an external position that the best could be recognized as such.

- *Only dead poets should be included.* If natural selection was to follow its course, it had to be allowed time to do so. The necessary belatedness of the anthologist thus

promoted cultural conservatism, reinforcing the externality of the anthologizer and usually obliging exclusion of the most challenging or vital contemporary elements. Given the dates of the anthologies, this principle also had the effect of according what nowadays seems enormous priority to Romantic poets.

- *A natural elite embodies distinctive superiority.* Since such selection was in a sense naturally predetermined, the only criterion worth mentioning was that of "the best". The texts were there because they deserved to be there, and the reader knew they deserved to be there because they were there. This is the way a dominant culture justifies itself by reference to its dominance, becoming a model for social mobility quite independently of any criteria of content. As Bourdieu has appreciated - and Mallarmé well before him -, the resulting books do not actually have to be read. What counts is their external distinction.

- *Anthologies should respond to market criteria.* The limitation to 100 was not only elitist but also made these "pocket anthologies" (9.5 x 14 cm., just over 150 pages) financially accessible to a middle-class market aspiring to the values of high culture.

- *The one anthology can supply both national and international markets.* The purchase of these volumes as (read or unread) textbooks meant they could find a foreign market without translation, particularly in the United States. The one condition was presumably that there be nothing to damage the refined sensibilities of the young. But the whole regime was oriented towards cultural conservatism anyway.

In sum, the principles of this *non-translational* regime would have enabled literary transfers to take place within the specific network concerned. When these principles were upset - for example by the outbreak of war with Germany, which had recently been incorporated into the network -, the regime's priorities were clarified. The English anthologist Gowans did not hesitate to put his translation and editing skills in the service of anti-German war propaganda. There was no question of cultural understanding transcending armed conflict. The most important principle in this regime was that the world was divided into nations whose corresponding cultures were subject to rules of natural selection.

In Spain, a clear nationalist priority can be seen in Menéndez Pelayo's authority as the editor of the networked *Cien mejores*, based in part on the 14-volume anthology of Spanish poetry he edited from 1890 to 1916. This huge earlier anthology is worth some attention, since it was from a slightly different but not incompatible regime. Disregarding the principles of natural selection and easy consumption, Menéndez Pelayo used the anthology as part of his programme to lay the bases of modern Castilian philology, separating a Roman-Christian orthodoxy from the "decadent" foreign unorthodoxies of Jewish, Arabic and Protestant influences. He virtually created a national identity through resistance to foreign and progressive culture (GUMBRECHT & SÁNCHEZ), repressing the interculturality that Spain is only now

beginning to rediscover. This enormous anthology thus carried out the ethnic cleansing presupposed by Menéndez y Pelayo's *Cien mejores* volume.

Although Díez-Canedo and Maristany were certainly in touch with the non-translational "Hundred Best" principles, they would have opposed the associated nationalism of an editor like Menéndez Pelayo. Simply because their main work was the promotion and representation of *foreign* cultures, simply because they were involved in *translation*, the regimes of their translation anthologies were to differ significantly from a reciprocal nationalism that rejected influences and kept outsiders' thoughts locked up in outsiders' languages. Theirs was quite a different relationship to authorship.

The fundamental distinction between translational and non-translational anthologies thus lies in principles that go beyond obvious aspects like the ability or inability to supply an international market. We have already touched upon several of these rather more complex principles. But let us now bring them together as possible elements of a *translational* regime for anthologies:

- *The translator-anthologist may make auctorial statements.* Whereas the non-translational regime depended on the authority of the source-culture anthologizer as an external guarantor of authors, Díez-Canedo and Maristany tended to disclaim such authority for themselves. Díez-Canedo was involved in group work alongside names of far greater stature; Maristany constantly referred back to the authority of source-culture anthologies and introduced his translational anthologies with his own verse. This positioned the translator-anthologists far closer to their actual texts than was the case in non-translational anthologies, allowing them a partly auctorial status. A translator-anthologist could be read as making a statement in a war-time situation or as organizing a politico-literary manifesto. The greater degree of authorship also enabled writers to produce translation anthologies out of frustration with individual creation. Moreover, as in the case of Maristany, it provided sufficient contact with the world of literary authorship for a return to original publications.

- *Nationalist and internationalist positions are not absolute.* Whereas the non-translational regime was actively nationalist in that it placed partisanship above cultural understanding, the translational anthologizers appear to have distanced themselves from much of the authority assumed by such a stand. Díez-Canedo translated from French and then from German at the end of the war; Maristany was interpreted as neutral and then distanced that position by translating from French and English. Their divisions of their world were far from clear-cut.

- *Commercial criteria do not have first priority.* If either of these translator-anthologists ever hoped to rival the commercial success of the non-translated anthologies, their market calculations left much to be desired. Not only are their volumes too large for most pockets (11.5 x 19 cm.) but they were rather expensive,

being for the most part rather longer than the more-controlled non-translational versions. Díez-Canedo was working for a public that had no real need of translations; Maristany had turned his back on the only class and language that might have brought him significant public prestige, the Catalan bourgeoisie. However, as I have argued, these translation anthologies also had non-commercial importance as modes of socialization.

- *Form should have priority over content.* A non-translational regime has to play all its cards in the moment of selection. But a translational regime necessarily introduces post-selection modifications, deciding which source-text aspects are to have priority. In the case of this particular translational regime, priority is given to criteria of form, ostensibly because of a Parnassian association of poeticity with verse. For Maristany, a prose translation "can assist curiosity or scientific work, but is dead at birth" (*Lengua inglesa* vi). This criterion also justifies sacrifice of the complex thought and ambivalent syntax of the more "difficult" poets.

- *Special attention should be paid to contemporary poets.* Although Maristany respects the "dead poets' society" principle in the case of his French anthology, his additions to Dorchain are very much oriented toward the poets in favour at the beginning of the twentieth century. In the 1920 version of this same anthology (the French section of the *Florilegio*) the principle is broken by the addition of no less than six living French authors. In the Díez-Canedo anthology, where the "dead poets" principle is not at all respected, the bias in favour of the present is even more pronounced, leading the volume into a gallery of nowadays unknown names. The translational regime thus allowed greater risks to be taken in the selection process than did the non-translational regime. This could be because the greater cultural distance diminished the risk of contamination. But the principle was also supported by the simplification process allowed by the moment of translation.

These then would be the general principles of a regime for translation anthologies in a particular historical location, related to a particular network of non-translational anthologies and in touch with a particular ideology of authorship. But I think most of the principles could be of more general application, if only because they have been extracted from two very different cases at opposed poles of the one genre. Can this procedure be validated?

Although Díez-Canedo's is a didactic anthology and Maristany's is a far more personal affair, I believe both models did indeed operate within the one overall regime. Both accepted basic translational and anthologizing principles and then added subsidiary criteria. The most obvious evidence of their practical compatibility is the existence of mutual back-scratching associated with translation anthologies as modes of socialization. Díez-Canedo prefaced Maristany's anthology from English (1918) and wrote a positive review of Maristany's own poetry (1919), respectfully talking about the

interest of literature and the importance of translation so as not to comment on the sometimes dubious qualities of the Maristany's verse or the alien ideal of the one-man translation anthology. In return, Maristany accepted Díez-Canedo's 1921 versions of Paul Fort as a volume for his own "best of the best" series. There was undoubtedly some disagreement about how a translation anthology should be tackled. But the regime was such that, with both translator-anthologists commercially outflanked by the non-translational regime, there was more room for collaboration than for competition between them. The translational regime thus facilitated exchange between rather different models. It distinguished the translator-anthologists' common ground from the regime for non-translational anthologies and paradoxically brought them both towards quite auctorial social functions.

Conclusion: the need for dialogue with literary history

I have tried to show how translation anthologies can be understood within a general frame of authorship and how they can have a very special relationship to auctorial strategies. But the methodological implications of this approach could give rise to several misunderstandings.

First, my argument is not simply based on the fact that many translators of poetry were and remain original poets, nor that most original poets have also at one time or another translated poetry. All this is well known; virtually none of it is remarked in general literary histories. My argument is that the imbrication of translational and auctorial activities can only have an impact on literary history when translating poets are brought together by someone like Díez-Canedo or they attempt a long-term anthology project like Maristany's. Special prominence comes from the explicit *combination* of translating and anthologizing activities. Translation anthologies are not a subset of one activity or the other. They belong to the intersection of translating and anthologizing.

Second, I am not saying that all translation anthologies are auctorial by definition. I am merely pointing out what I believe to be a slightly paradoxical historical relation. My original expectation was that this genre would be so non-auctorial as to be of virtually no historical importance. I now believe the genre to be surprisingly auctorial and of mostly untapped historical importance. Of course, the more general applicability of my findings must be tested inductively. But to do this we need more information on the identity and social location of translator-anthologists.

Third, I am not saying that research should suddenly forget about reading texts and start looking exclusively at writers (be they authors, translators or anthologists). But I would like to suggest that, given the general marginality and ephemerality of translation anthologies, a long look at writers may well be the only way of establishing any

substantial relationship with phenomena of text transfer. Let me explain why. If a text is translated and anthologized but not distributed and read (due to low print runs, absence of second editions, or inclusion in a vast data bank), then that text cannot really be said to have been transferred into the receiving culture. The printed page must be analyzed, but it is not in itself proof of transfer. One must somehow attempt to assess how many printed pages went to how many actual readers. And when this line of empirical research becomes unprofitably difficult (as is often the case with translation anthologies), one must locate alternative modes of literature transfer, perhaps partly disregarding the active role readers are supposed to take in demand economies. The social position and function of the translator-anthologist would seem pertinent to one such mode, since such intermediaries are able to bring together other *writers* and make them look in a particular direction or expose them to a range of outside influences, regardless of the felt desires of non-writing readers. Such a command economy enabled Baudelaire to instigate the European cult of Poe, not so much by translating but by socially promoting the American among his friends and acquaintances. Authoritarian or paternalistic strategies should not be underestimated.

Fourth, I am not saying that the study of translation anthologies should lose itself within the traditional study of authors. Quite the contrary, I believe this new object of research has the potential to change the way literary history is being written. But one should not fool oneself about the historical weight of translation anthologies. A history of anthologies will never replace a history of authors. It can at best reinforce or complicate general notions that come from more prominent literary activities. Díez-Canedo and Maristany were unavoidably *minor* cultural intermediaries. It would thus be as wrong to turn one's back on authors as it would be to write as if the world had no need of translation anthologies. Future dialogue should be based on initial recognition of the wider frame of authorship, and then on the ways translation and anthologization can work within or against that frame.

Works Cited

- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *La distinction: critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Minuit, 1979.
- DÍEZ-CANEDO, Enrique. Trans. Eugenio d'Ors. *La muerte de Isidro Nonell*. Madrid: El Banquete, 1905.
- . *Versos de las Horas*. Madrid: Imprenta Ibérica, 1906.
- . *La visita del sol*. Madrid: Pueyo, 1907.
- . *Del cercado ajeno; versiones poéticas*. Madrid: M. Pérez Villaviciencio, 1907.
- . Trans. Francis Jammes, *Manzana de Anís*. Barcelona: E. Domenech, 1909.
- . *La sombra del ensueño*. Paris: Garnier, 1910.
- . *Imágenes; versiones poéticas*. Paris: Ollendorff, undated (1910?)

- *Pequeña antología de poetas portugueses*. Paris: Excelsior, undated (1910?).
- & Fernando FORTÚN, eds. *La poesía francesa moderna. Antología*. Madrid: Renacimiento, 1913. (Revised version as *La poesía francesa del romanticismo al surrealismo. Antología ordenada por Enrique Díez-Canedo*. Buenos Aires: Losada, 1945).
- Trans. Montaigne. *Páginas escogidas*. Madrid: Calleja, 1917.
- Trans. Heinrich Heine. *Páginas escogidas*. Madrid: Calleja, 1918.
- Trans. La Fontaine. *Fábulas. Traducidas en verso*. Madrid: Calleja, 1918.
- "Fernando Maristany, *En el azul...*". *El Sol*. Madrid, 30 April 1919.
- Trans. Charles Baudelaire, *Poemas en prosa*. Madrid: Calpe, 1920.
- Trans. Paul Fort, *Poesías líricas*. Barcelona: Cervantes, 1921. (In the series *Las mejores poesías líricas de los mejores poetas*).
- Ed. Paul Verlaine. *Obras completas*. Madrid: Mundo Latino, 1921-26.
- Ed. *Prosistas modernos*. (Spanish). Madrid: Instituto-Escuela, 1922. (3rd ed. 1925; 4th ed. 1933; 5th ed. 1934).
- *Algunos versos*. Madrid: La Lectura, 1924.
- Trans. Walt Whitman. *Hojas de Hierba*. Madrid: Calpe, 1924.
- Ed. *Las cien mejores poesías españolas. Nueva colección formada por Enrique Díez [sic.] Canedo*. Mexico City, New York: Nuestro Pueblo, 1940.
- DORCHAIN, Auguste. *Les cent meilleurs poèmes (lyriques) de la langue française*. Paris: F. Gittler, 1905. (1st ed. Dec. 1905; 2nd ed. March 1906; 3rd ed. April 1906; 4th ed. August 1906; Reprinted Nov. 1906; 5th ed. Feb. 1907; 6th ed. July 1907; Reprinted Nov. 1907; Reprinted March 1908; Editions in Paris, A. Perche, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1913 "imprimé en Angleterre", 1914, 1919; Editions in Philadelphia, G.W. Jacobs, 1907, 1912, 1919 "Printed in Glasgow", 1920, 1922 "Nouvelle édition", 1925, 1927, 1931 "Printed in England", 1946; Edition in London: Grant Educational Co., 1951).
- FERNANDEZ GUTTIÉRREZ, José María, ed. *Enrique Díez-Canedo. Antología Poética*. Salamanca: Ediciones Almar, 1980.
- *Enrique Díez-Canedo: su tiempo y su obra*. Badajoz: Diputación de Badajoz, 1984.
- FRANK, Armin Paul, & Helga ESSMANN. "Translation Anthologies: A Paradigmatic Medium of International Literary Transfer". *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 35.1 (1990): 21-34.
- GOWANS, Adam Luke, ed. *The hundred best poems (lyrical) in the English language*. ("Pocket Anthologies no. 1"). London: Gowans & Gray, 1903. (Reprinted 1904, 1905, 1906, Feb 1907, Sept. 1907 "completing 50,000").
- Ed. *A second hundred of the best poems (lyrical) in the English language*. ("Pocket Anthologies no. 2"). London and Glasgow: Gowans & Gray, 1910. (Reprinted Sept. 1920 "completing 42,000").
- Trans. *The Organization of the Army, by Treitschke*. London: Gowans & Gray, 1914.
- Trans. *A month's German newspapers (December 1914)*. London: Gowans & Gray, 1915.
- GUMBRECHT, Hans Ulrich, & Juan José SÁNCHEZ. "Fortschrittsresistenz als Nationalbewußtsein: über Strukturen von 'Zeit' in der spanischen Gesellschaft des XVIII. und XIX. Jahrhunderts". *Fortschrittsglaube und Dekadenzbewußtsein im Europa des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Ed. Wolfgang Drost. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1986. 189-201.
- KAHN, L. G. "Bürgerlicher Stil und bürgerliche Übersetzung". From *Shakespeares Sonette in Deutschland*. 1935. Reprinted in *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Ed. H. J. Störig. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.

- KEOHANE, R. O. Keohane & J. S. NYE, "International Regime Change". *Power and Interdependence*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.
- MARISTANY, Fernando, trans. & ed. *Poesías excelsas (breves) de los grandes poetas. Traducidas directamente en verso, del italiano, alemán, inglés y francés*. Barcelona: A. López, 1914.
- *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua francesa. Traducidas directamente en verso*. Valencia: Cervantes, 1917. (2nd ed. c.1918; 3rd ed. c.1921, completing 16,000).
- *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua inglesa. Traducidas directamente en verso*. Prólogo de Enrique Díez-Canedo. Valencia: Cervantes, 1918. (Parallel edition in Buenos Aires, 1918; 2nd ed. in Barcelona: Cervantes, 1921).
- *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua portuguesa. Traducidas directamente en verso*. Prólogo de Ignacio Ribera-Rovira. (Listed in other anthologies; edition not located; texts included in *Florilegio*, c.1920).
- *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua alemana. Traducidas directamente en verso*. Prólogo de Manuel de Montoliu. Valencia: Cervantes, 1919.
- *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua italiana. Traducidas directamente en verso*. Prólogo de Carlos Boselli. Carta abierta de Guido Mazzoni. Valencia: Cervantes, 1920.
- *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) españolas. Prefacio y selección del autor [sic.]*. Barcelona: Cervantes, c.1921. (3rd ed. in Barcelona: Cervantes, 1940).
- *En el azul... Rimas*. Prefacio de Teixeira de Pascoaes. Valencia: Cervantes, 1919.
- *La dicha y el dolor. Poesías originales*. Prefacio de Manuel Montoliu. (Second volume of *En el azul...*) Barcelona: Cervantes, 1920.
- *Florilegio. Las mejores poesías líricas griegas, latinas, italianas, portuguesas, francesas, inglesas y alemanas*. Prefacio de A. Bonilla y San Martín y Seis. Barcelona: Cervantes, c.1920.
- *Antología general de poetas franceses (1391-1921)*. Prólogo de Alejandro Plana. Barcelona: Cervantes, 1921.
- *Gusano de luz: Selección de novelas breves*. Barcelona: Cervantes, c.1923.
- MASERAS, Alfonso. *La obra lírica de Fernando Maristany. (Prólogo destinado a la edición francesa de las poesías de este autor)*. Barcelona: Cervantes, 1923.
- MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, Marcelino, ed. *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos desde la formación del idioma hasta nuestros días*. 14 volumes. Madrid: Viuda de Hernai, 1890-1916.
- Ed. *Las cien mejores poesías (líricas) de la lengua castellana*. Madrid: V. Suárez, 1908. (Editions in Madrid, V. Suárez, 1908, 1910, 1918, 1925; Jointly in Philadelphia, W. Jacobs, 1910, 1911, 1915, 1916, 1918, 1919, 1919, 1921, 1924, 1930 "The 'Hundred Best' Series, no. 3", 1932, 1937, 1940, 1954; Undated editions in Buenos Aires and Havana).
- MEYER, Richard Moritz. *Die hundert besten Gedichte der deutschen Sprache. Lyrik*. Berlin: W. Weicher, 1909. (Edition in Berlin, Weicher, 1911; In Philadelphia, Jacobs, c. 1911; In London, Gowans & Gray, 1924 jointly in Philadelphia; In Paris, Perche, 1924).
- OLIVIO JIMÉNEZ, José. "La conciencia del simbolismo en los modernistas hispánicos (algunos testimonios)." *El simbolismo*. Ed. José Olivio Jiménez. Madrid: Taurus, 1979: 45-64.
- PYM, Anthony. *Translation and Text Transfer. An Essay on the Principles of Intercultural Communication*. Frankfurt/Main, Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, Vienna: Peter Lang, 1992.