TRANSLATION AS PALIMPSEST

Carmen Toledano Buendía
Universidad de La Laguna

ABSTRACT

This paper intends to explore the intertextual nature of translation through the analysis of a 19th century Spanish translation of *Robinson Crusoe*. The translated literary text is seen as a product embedded in the target literary system, and as such its production, position and reception will be determined by the the network of intertextual relations in which it takes an active part.

The incorporation of English novels in the Spanish literary system during the 18th century is characterized, in general terms, by its late appearance, especially if a comparison is drawn with other European countries, and by French mediation (Montesinos 1980: 15-16). Arguable one of the most illustrative examples is the assimilation process followed by *Robinson Crusoe*. This work, written by Daniel Defoe in 1719, appears for the first time in Spain in 1826 —more than 100 years after it was originally written— in an abridged version for children. Of course many factors may play their part in the fact that a book does not become popular until many years after its initial publication date (e.g.: the target culture is not ready to receive that author, it will not be of interest to readers). In this particular case, among the main reasons, Montesinos cites (1980: 18-19) the success of "other preceding Robinsons". Before the introduction of Defoe's work we had imported different versions and adaptations of the English novel, mostly from French. The first and most famous one was Campe's *Robinson der Junger* (1779-80) translated by D. Tomas de Iriarte in 1789 (*El nuevo Robinsón: historia moral reducida a diálogos*) and republished on several occasions.

From the earliest Spanish translations of Defoe's work, the one published in 1849-50 has been chosen as an illustration of the aim of this paper: to show the intertextual nature of translation. Translation is seen as a palimpsest, an intertextual space where

we can recognize relationships among two or more texts, between specific texts and previous and existing discourses.

This text was published in Madrid in 1849-50[1] and translated by D. José Alegret de Mesa from a French translation. It is a translation of the two parts of Defoe's work (*The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, of York, Mariner* and *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*), although they appear under the same title, presented in two books. The translator modifies the structure of the original text, dividing it into parts and chapters (2 parts and 12 and 8 chapters respectively) introduced by a brief summary of the main lines of the story. At the end of the second volume, a 23 page religious dissertation written by the Abbot Laboudiere in the French text is included. D.J. Alegret de Mesa illustrates the text with a large number of footnotes; some of them were included in the mediating text and others —explicitly specified with *Nota del traductor*— are added by the Spanish translator. In common with many nineteenth-century realist novels and children's literature the book is illustrated with drawings.

An examination of this translation will allow for an understanding of the role of intertextual relations in determining its production, position and reception in the Spanish literary system.

The translated literary text is an aesthetic product embedded in the discourse belonging to the target community, conceived as the society in which the text is incorporated, and participating in its history and discourses within signifing systems. It will, then, be influenced by struggles between innovative and conservative forces which exist within the dynamic structure of the polysystem, occupying either primary or secondary positions. The position of translated literature within the polysystem will determine its intertextual relations, that is, its status as an aesthetic product in relation to other texts and will influence decision-making in the translation process (Even-Zohar 1978: 120-124). To investigate the position of translated literature is to study its articulations with other texts, to analyze the insertion of the material into the textual relations of the system, in other words, to study its intertextuality and iterability. According to Barthes (1986: 52-53) it is this intertextuality that makes the text, i.e. the translation, readable and read in a specific way:

> We know that a text consists not of a line of words, releasing a single "theological" meaning (the "message of the Author-God), but a multi-dimensional space in which are married and contested several writings, none of which is original: the text is a fabric of quotations, resulting from a thousand sources of cultures.

For practical reasons I have adopted a more restricted definition of intertextuality than those of Barthes and Kristeva. This concept of intertextuality would include two groups of textual relations working on the text: intertextual or covert relations and intratextual or overt relations. Trying to visualize this idea we could say that they work along two axes: a horizontal and a vertical one. The horizontal axis is made up of the relations of the TT (target text) with the target discursive tradition in which is incorporated, previous and subsequent texts in time with which the TT establishes diverse kinds of relationships. It is a sphere of intertextual or covert relations which would roughly coincide with the concepts of metatextuality, architextuality and hypertextuality devel-

oped by Genette (1989: 13-14).[2] The generic profile of the text (architextuality) cannot only be regarded as the process of ascribing the TT to a specific target literary genre, but also as a translation in itself. Translations sometimes can constitute "identifiable (sub)systems of their own" with their own discursive and textual charcterization (Toury 1995: 29). The TT incorporates features which have come to be associated in the target culture with translations and are recognized and acknowledged by readers. These features add an extra meaning, which is also textual. Also, along this axis we would plot the relation between a work (hypertext) —the TT— and other pretext/s (hypotext) —source text (ST), other translations of the same text, etc.— which have preceded it (hypertextuality). The TT is a text derived from other temporaly preexisting text/s —either known or unknown, either real or unreal (as in the case of pseudotranslations, where a concrete text may never have existed)— that presuppose a set of specific transformations. Finally, we could plot along the intertextual axis the sort of relationship that the TT establishes with preceding texts and discourses. This is a critical link, since every translation involves a critical commentary and a re-evaluation of the original text (metatextuality). The act of translating partakes of the general nature of intertextuality: an eternal deference that always goes back to more, ulterior texts, to textuality.

Along the vertical axis, another set of textual relations, intratextual or overt, are positioned. These textual practices, which could sanction Genette's concepts of intertextuality, paratextuallity and again hypertextuality (1989: 11-12-14), are punctual/actual and explicit relationships. The hypertextual relation, labelled by Genette as "descriptive or intellectual", whereby a metatext talks about another text. This practice would belong to a different order from that existing along the horizontal axis, in which the metatext may well not talk about the text, but it could, nevertheless, not exist without it. The relation between a text and its paratexts: titles, subtitles, prefaces, footnotes, epilogues, illustrations... These texts —paratexts—, inserted physically into the text, are seen as a fully integrated part of the work (text= metatext + paratexts) by the reader and create a setting of understanding by imposing patterns of signification that are textual, intertextual. Finally, what Genette describes as intertextuality or the effective existence of a text in another one.

This terminological paradigm should not be understood as a typology which aims at separation and sharp delimitation of translation textual relations. It is a form of representation of textual relations ranging from the implicit to the explicit. The various headings represent a web of relationships which allows for overlapping and interaction. The TT is made up of a network of textual relations *in absentia*, virtual, that are evoked by the text and elicited/actualized in the act of translating and interpreting. At the same time, a network of relations *in praesentia* is created among those texts existing physically within the same textual space, being an overt, tangible or sensible relation. There is no need for intertextual/intratextual relationships to always be of the same kind, the nature and extent of these relationships vary across cultures, within a culture and over time. But it is important to bear this interaction of overt and covert textual relations in mind so as to understand that translation is not the result of a one-way transformation exercise, but a network of textual relations in which the text is created and received and of a specific socio-cultural situation.

This construction written on the target textual tradition can be represented through the old image of a palimpsest, where on the same parchment one text is written on top

of others. The palimpsest is seen as an intertextual space where the new text is inserted, absorbing and destroying at the same time the previous texts. It is a space where meaning intersects so that no text can have meaning without those previous texts, nor can previous texts —as long as we interpret them ideologically— make sense without the texts produced afterwards. The translation is enmeshed in history but at the same time influences the history in which it finds itself. The incoming text does not hide the previous texts but let them be seen through itself, by transparency, thereby it is always read in relation to other texts. Every rewriting creates a set of textual relations that modifies our view of the past and that makes the new text readable. In this parchment the translated text is engraved as a relational process rather than a transfer process of static structures and products from one language to another.

> Neither the foreign text nor the translation is an original semantic unit; both are derivative and heterogeneus, consisting of diverse linguistic and cultural material which destabilize the work of signification, making meaning plural and differential, exceeding and possibly conficting with the intentions of the foreign writer and the translator. (Venuti 1992: 7)

The resulting emphasis of this definition on the dynamic nature of texts leads to a critique of the translation as something isolated and self-contained which encloses a unique and true meaning outside the limits of time and space. Then, it would challenge the close and static concept of translation involved in most source-oriented theories. The translator constructs the text intertextually reinstating it as influence and source. There is an interchange between the translator, the previous literary or cultural corpus and the reader which puts the text in its own historicity and elicits potentially new readings which did not exist in the ST. Each translation activates/stirs up its own textual and historical value, its own text to bring along and its own story to tell.

This is the case of all the adaptations and versions[3] that precede the translation of D. José Alegret in time. These hypotexts create a literary corpus made up of rewritings for children of the English hero's adventures in which the moral aspects of the story are emphasized. Thereby, when Defoe's novel is imported, the Spanish reader is already familiar with this character; the translation of Defoe's novel absorbs an establilshed tradition of Robinsonades, which exist *in absentia* in the text, that interfere in its reading and interpretation. This is a very interesting and a particular process of reception as regards the exact position of the "real" *Robinson Crusoe* in the Spanish polysystem: a hypotext is converted into a hypertext. There is an inversion of the usual chronological order in the assimilation of a foreign work: instead of having in the first place the translation/s from the ST and later the development of different versions or adaptations, firstly we receive/translate adapted versions of *Robinson Crusoe* and then the "proper" translation. It is obvious that this inversion, and consequently the readers' particular set of expectations concerning Robinson's adventures, should have played an important role in the interpretation and position of Defoe's novel. The public reader linked the hero with a specific type of literature and with a specific symbolic world which creates a specific effect of signification.

But the reading of Defoe's work as juvenile or children's literature is not only a consequence of this literary tradition to which the text is attached; it is also the result

of the mediator system's influence from which the Spanish translation comes. Another layer of the palimpsest can be read through our translation. As Toury (1995: 133) points out with reference to the German mediation in the translations into Hebrew of English literature during the Enlightenment:

> [...] a text which was conceived of as appropriate from the point of view of the *target* literature (e.g., as a potential fill-in for a certain gap) could well have been encountered in translated form. In fact, a translation tended to be selected for translation [...] on the basis of its position in the *mediating* system, with no regard for the position of its own original in the source literature. Consequently, what was nominally second-hand translation, was functionally —that is, in terms of the structure of the target culture and the prospective position of that text within it— tantamount to first-hand translation.

We are dealing with a second-hand translation from French, which was a common practice during the 18th and 19th centuries in Spain.[4] The introductory role played by the mediator system enriches the target polysystem, for it opens the way to foreign cultures that would otherwise be unknown. But, at the same time, it involves a filtered way of access through which the mediating culture reveals its own points of view and aesthetic criteria. The Spanish translation inherits the didactic and moralizing interpretation that the French makes of *Robinson Crusoe*[5] and which fits perfectly into the Spanish tradition and the reader's expectations.

However, as Culler points out, the textual space in which every text is held is not to be confused with its origin:

> [...] "intertextuality" leads us to consider prior texts as contributions to a code which makes possible the various effects of signification. Intertextuality thus becomes less a name for a work's relation to particular prior texts than a designation of its participation in the discursive space of a culture: the relationship between a text and the various languages or signifying practices of a culture and its relation to those texts which articulate for it the possibilities of that culture. (Culler 1981: 103)

Like Culler, I have no wish to state that all translations are governed by an *explicit* intention on the part of the translator to rewrite what went before. Rather any translation is dependent on the existence of that pre-existing corpus —texts, conventions, rules and norms— of which writers and readers have an implicit knowledge and on which we construct meanings. Translation as a practice of intertextuality is not a direct reference to other earlier texts —ST, original text (OT),[6] and the target textual tradition— but a manipulation of those texts. New intertextual operations are carried out in the process of translating and assimilation that transform a ST into a TT: the translator does not represent/create the original but presents another original.

D. José Alegret de Mesa's *Robinson* establishes a relation of architextuality with all the previous adaptations and versions which allows the reader to assign the TT to a specific literary system, in this case children's literature. At the same time, the TT establishes a metatextual relation, a commentary relation, with the corpus of

Robinsonades that it absorbs, as it happens with the French translation which it comes from, in the same way that Michel Tournier's novel *Vendredi ou les limbes du Pacifique* is, among other things, a commentary on Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. Translations absorb the textual and discursive tradition of the cultural system which hosts them while, at the same time, exerting an influence on it.

> [...] every individual text is of course unique; it may be more or less in tune with prevailing models, but in itself is a novelty. As such, its introduction into a target culture always entails some change, however slight, of the latter. (Toury 1995: 27)

Having examined the intertextual relations of the horizontal axis which determine the assimilation of *Robinson Crusoe* and its position into the Spanish polysystem, I will now deal with the vertical axis of textual relations, what I have termed intratextual relations; that is, texts *in praesentia* which interact within the text and determine its reception and interpretation. The translator becomes a co-producer, taking on responsibility for the text's meaning. His interpretation determines the decision-making during the process of translating and limits the texts within the novel, the potential readings that this text may elicit.

According to Shavit (1986: 171), the peripheral position occupied by children's literature and literature for young people enables the translator to manipulate the text in such a way that it performs a didactic function and is coherent with the reading ability and comprehension capacity of the readership. The conventional strategies used to convert a work for adults into children's literature or literature for young people consisted in modifying those parts of the text that were not considered appropriate or suitable for ethical or cognitive reasons. Different hypertextual and intertextual operations, such as omissions, additions or substitutions, are carried out for lexical, stylistical or/and ethical reasons. In our text, the translator does not modify the integrity (the whole text, the content) of the ST: as it has already been said, it is a translation of the two parts of Defoe's work. However, he makes use of other textual mechanisms to manipulate and convert it into a book for young people.

The paratextual relations create a variable environment which, as Genette (1989: 11) states, provides one of the privileged sites for the pragmatic dimension of the work, that is to say, of its action on the reader. The title and subtitle on the front page play an introductory role: "*Aventuras de Robinsón Crusoe. Seguidas de una disertación religiosa por el abate Laboudiere, Traducidas de la última edición francesa e ilustradas con notas por D. José Alegret de Mesa, Abogado del Ilustre Colegio de Madrid*". All paratexts create in the minds of the readers certain definite associations, based on education, tradition, history and culture. They determine the ontological, purposive, generic nature of the text the reader is interpreting, imposing simultaneoulsy patterns of signification that may not be explicitly realized in the internal body of the text. Here, the paratext establishes a relationship between the new text and the known pre-existing corpus of the "Robinson tradition", or at least this is expected. Reading the name of Robinson Crusoe, the reader may wonder what kind of relationship exist between this character and the other Robinsons, as any reader would do with reference to the *Ulysses* and *The Odyssey*, or Unamuno's *La vida de don Quijote y de*

Sancho Panza según Miguel de Cervantes and Cervantes' *Don Quijote*, thus establishing a hypertextual relationship. The reader immediately locates the text in a specific poetic discourse, developing certain expectations with reference to the plot, genre, potential reader the text is addressed to. Since the reference to a text evokes the reference to a set of potential meanings stored in the codes of a genre.

These adventures are followed by a "disertación religiosa" written by an abbot. Its mention in the paratext and its physical incorporation as an epilogue or commentary elicit some textual relations with the hypotext. A religious tract is expected to carry a moral and ethical message, in this case with reference to Robinson's adventures. Obviously, it is not every text that would *a priori* render itself available to a religious epilogue of this type. In fact, over 23 pages —already present in the French version— addressed to the young readers, the abbot emphasizes the moral lessons and Christian values that can be learned from the reading of the book. He also alerts the reader to possible misinterpretations of some remarks that Robinson makes on Catholic doctrine:

> La citada obra manifiesta un tan profundo conocimiento del corazón humano, una pintura tan natural de los acontecimientos de la vida que todas las edades son en ellas reconocidas, y pueden tomar escelentes lecciones [...].
> Sin embargo, por lo mismo que Robinson abunda desde el principio al fin en sentimientos religiosos, conviene consignar para utilidad de los lectores, lo que presenta de conforme á los principios fundamentales del cristianismo. Como por otro lado sucede que Daniel de Foe, acérrimo protestante, manifiesta repetidas veces las preocupaciones de su comunión contra la iglesia católica, no es menos importante el señalar sus errores: Hé aqui lo que me ha determinado á componer una *Disertacion religiosa*, en la cual se encontrase todo á la vez, la proclamacion de las verdaderas creencias, y la corta rectificacion de las equivocaciones que han podido escapársele. (Disertacion religiosa, volume II, pp.1-2)

But this dissertation, apart from being a defense of the Catholic religion, is an implicit declaration of the didactic intention of the translator. In this case the hypertextual relation existing between *Robinson Crusoe* (hypotext) and the dissertation (hypertext) becomes also a metatextual relation, since the hypertext becomes a commentary, that is, a metatext.

Following the information on the front page, it says that the text has been translated from the latest French edition. But this edition is not marked as being translated, so that it is considered functionally as the ST.[7] This fact is emphasized by omitting the name of the original author, who is only mentioned in a footnote,[8] and giving the name of the translator. D. José Alegret de Mesa not only translates, but also illustrates with notes, thus acquiring a superior status to that of the translator in that the notes presuppose a critical dimension.

The translator modifies the structure of Defoe's work, as we said, by dividing it into parts and chapters and introducing each of these chapters by a brief summary of the main events of the story. This new distribution and these intertexts aim to facilitate the reading process and to adapt it to the potential reader. The reader knows in

advance the content of the chapter, s/he is helped to understand the development of the plot and, at the same time, her/his attention is drawn to events that will take place this facilitating a reading which is fixed *a priori*.

D.J. Alegret de Mesa also includes a large number of footnotes announced, as we have seen, on the title page. These paratexts have a dual aim and create different kinds of intratextual relations. On the one hand, he revises the content of the historical record, reinterpreting it, rebuking the orthodox English version of the facts. In those cases in which Robinson's behaviour could be seen as setting a bad example for the reader, the translator takes on the responsibility of warning the reader. For example, when Robinson criticizes the Spanish character or the Spanish conquest of the New World, the translator gives examples and makes statements in an effort to refute these claims and blame the English for their equally reprehensible behaviour:

> Muy lejos detrás de la luna [...] alli habia, decia señalando mis vigotes, hombres blancos y barbudos como yo; y que estos habian matado á muchos hombres. Por lo que comprendí que designaba á los españoles, cuyas crueldades en América se han estendido por todas aquellas regiones, habiendo en cada una de ellas terribles recuerdos que se transmiten de una en otra generacion (1).
> (1) Está visto que el autor nos profesa un ódio, que raya en manía: ¿qué recuerdos quedarán de sus compatriotas en la India? ¿Cuáles son los que quedan en algunas ciudades de España, como Badajoz, San Sebastian y otras, cuando arrojaron á los franceses y entraron en ella como amigos, saqueando, talando y cometiendo toda clase de crímenes, crueldades y excesos?[9] ¡Y todo esto en el siglo XIX! Por último, á medida que vaya el autor prodigándonos finezas, se las devolveremos, á fin de que algun otro escritor inglés no nos venga tambien algun dia á echarnos en cara que los españoles somos poco corteses y carecemos de galantería. (*Nota del T.E.*) (Volume I, p. 211)

The same ideological revision found in the dissertation with reference to religious questions, is also attempted by the translator in the notes with reference to the historic content. Thereby the same metatextual relation is established between the text and the footnotes.

In contrast, the other group of footnotes is aimed at adapting the vocabulary of the text to the level of comprehension of the readers. The translator gives definitions of navigation terms, idioms, cultural elements, geography and currency equivalents:

> Por un viaje a guineas: es un equívoco que usaban los marineros, porque iban á la costa de Guinea á comprar, ó mejor dicho, á caza de negros. De este escandaloso é inhumano tráfico resultaba que se llenaban de guineas, que es una moneda de oro inglesa, cuyo valor es de 100 reales de vellon. (*N. del T.E.*) (volume I, p. 19)

This manipulation, seen as a hypertextual practice, makes use of an unusual procedure for the adaptation of adult books to the needs of children. Adaptations of this type more often involve quantitative and qualitative changes made *directly* in the hypotext.

It should be pointed out that a proportion of these footnotes were already in the French translation —50 out of 99— and are translated literally by D.J. Alegret. For this reason French equivalents for English currencies, weights and measures that are nonsense for the Spanish reader are sometimes found. The notes added by the Spanish translator —explicitly specified with *Nota del traductor*— extend the number of definitions and explanations and make historical comments. These notes or paratexts interrupt the evolution of the text and the voice of the translator almost becomes one with the story. He draws attention to certain specific cultural and historical assumptions which lie behind the expectations concerning the children's novel and restrict the potential readings of the text. The translator reaches outside the fictional world to an external field of reference: the objective world, specific ideology, historical facts, dictionary definitions, geographical explanations, etc. These intratextual relations give the appearance that the fictional character existed in the real world, that is, that he is a real character incorporated into fiction.

Just to mention briefly the function played by the illustrations included in the book. H. Van Gorp (1978: 113) in his typology of metatexts, includes the illustrations as an intersemiotic operation stating that "un texte littéraire peut être amplifié par des illustrations, qui sont souvent le reflet d'une interprétation particulière du texte (p.e. dans la littérature enfantine)." These drawings complete the verbal text eliciting images of Robinson's story. Obviously, these images destroy the claims of the written text to being subjective in that they impose a visually reality.

As it was stated above, the manipulation of the text shows the prevailing concept of children's literature and reveals an implicit reader of the period. The text fits and is readable according to a particular set of expectations concerning children's novels and Robinson's behaviour, being a clear manifestation of the temporal and historical nature of aesthetic presuppositions. Nowadays, it would be unthinkable to explicitly convert —making use of footnotes and commentaries— an adventure novel into a book on geography, grammar or ethics. D. José Alegret de Mesa intended to write and rewrite a text for young people and the main function of this kind of literature was to educate. His method of translating and adjusting the ST in order to make it appropriate and useful for the intended reader, will depend upon the inter/intratextual relationships established among the TT and the existing tradition and the prevailing literary and aesthetic models. The translation's shape is made by the repetition and transformation of other textual structures. New intertextual operations are carried out in the process of translating and the assimilation that transforms a ST into a TT: the translator does not create the original but other originals. The predominance of certain operations over others produces different translations/texts, opens and closes new avenues of thought which reflect the intentional changes that take place during the transmission of the text and which will determine its assimilation in the TC. That is, it articulates a possiblility of reading the palimpsest in the target culture. The space and possibilities of meanings that could be activated in *Robinson Crusoe* are closed off by the entry of the translation. The network of possible texts —ideological, religious, social, historical, mythical, racial...— which have given rise to the multiple readings and writings of Defoe's work, are perceived under another paradigm governed by the historical and cultural conditions within the recieving polysystem.

Notes

[1] I have only found these translations pre-dating this one: the already mentioned *El robinsoncito o Aventuras de Robinsón Crusoe, dispuestas para la diversión de los niños*, Paris: J. Smith, 1826; *Aventuras de Robinsón Crusoe*, escritas en inglés por Daniel de Foé, publicadas por primera vez en castellano. Paris: Pillet Ainé, 1835; *Aventuras de Robinsón Crusoe*. Traducidas del francés. Barcelona: Verdaguer, 1837; an abridged version of the first part in 52 pages, *El Robinsón de los niños o Aventuras las más curiosas de Robinsón Crusoe contadas por un padre a sus hijos*, Madrid: Boix, 1841; *Aventuras de Robinsón Crusoe por Daniel Defoi*, Madrid: I. Boix, 1843; and *Aventuras de Robinsón Crusoe*, escritas en inglés por Daniel Defoe. Méjico: I. Cumplido, 1846.

[2] Genette in *Palimpsests* (1982) elaborates some of his early theories and offers new definitions of intertextual relations. He emphasizes the globality of the notion "transtextuality" and distinguishes five subcategories: intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality and architextuality.

[3] Following the above mentioned adaptation by Campe, there were others such as *Continuación de la historia moral del nuevo Robinson* published in 1799; *Tratado de educación o segundo viaje de Robinson*, translated from French in 1804 by Francisco de Clemente Miró; *Los dos robinsones o aventuras de Carlos y Fanny* written by Francois Ducray Duminil in 1792 and translated into Spanish in 1805; *El Robinson Suizo* by Wyss written in 1813 and translated in 1841; *El Robinson de 12 años* by Madame Mallés de Beaullieu, 1818, and translated in 1830.

[4] As Montesinos points out (1980:77), the selection policy of literary works and polysystems was dictated almost exclusively by France, not only with reference to French works but to other literatures as well. So the French translations became almost the only source for Spanish translators. This mediation is not only a result of the greater difficulty in finding English originals or the inferior knowledge of the English language in comparison with French, but mainly due to the hegemonic role played by France in the European culture at that age.

[5] It is important to point out that in France *Robinson Crusoe* is not received as a didactic work till Rousseau includes it in his *Emile* (1762) as an essential reading for the instruction of the 'natural' man. (Streeter 1936:66)

[6] When we are dealing with second hand translations I would draw a distinction between "original text," or the text which the mediating translation comes from, and "source text" or the mediating text which functions as the original for the target text.

[7] The mention of the French origin is clear evidence that the public attitude towards mediation in translation is not only welcome but also a sign of prestige and a label of success which editors take advantage of. We should not forget that the reader's attitude towards second-hand translations is not stable through history and it can move from periods of full acceptability to others of complete rejection. In fact, as Toury (1995: 133) points out: "this type of activity was bound to diminish as the concept of translation changed, and in direct proportion to a growing emphasis on the reconstruction of the source-text features".

[8] The Spanish translator makes reference to the original author and his nationality in various footnotes. However, his name is only mentioned in one of the footnotes and in the religious dissertation.

[9] Here the translator is making reference to the dubious behaviour of the English troops when, led by the Duke of Wellington, they left Portugal to defeat Napoleon's troops during the Spanish Independence War (1813).

Works Cited

Barthes, Ronald. *S/Z*, Paris: Seuil, 1979.

— "The Death of the Author." *The Rustle of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986. 49-55.

Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs*. London/Henley: Routledge, 1981.

Defoe, Daniel. *Aventuras de Robinsón Crusoe*. Madrid: D. Nicolás Cabello, Establecimiento Tipográfico de A. Vicente, 1840-59 [1719].

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." *Literature and Translation*. Eds. J. Holmes et al. Leuven: Acco, 1978. 117-127.

Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsestos: la literatura en segundo grado*. Madrid: Taurus, 1989 [1982].

Kristeva, Kristeva. *Desire in Language*. New York: Columbia UP, 1980.

Montesinos, José F. *Introducción a una historia de la novela en España en el siglo XIX*. Madrid: Castalia, 1980.

Shavit, Zohar. "Translation of Children's Literature as a Function of Its Position in the Literary Polysystem." *Theory of Translation and Intercultural Relaltions*. Eds. I. Even-Zohar and G. Toury. Special issue of *Poetics Today* 2.4 (Summer/Autumn 1981): 171-179.

Streeter, H.W. *The Eighteenth Century English Novel in French Translation: A Bibliographical Study*. New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies, 1936.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.

Van Gorp, Hendrik. "La traduction litteraire parmi les autres metatextes". *Literature and Translation*. Eds. J. Holmes et al. Leuven: Acco, 1978. 101-116.

Venuti, Lawrence, ed. *Rethinking Translation*. London/New York: Routledge, 1992.