

AN ACTIVE APPROACH TO TRANSLATION

CONEXIONS BETWEEN TRANSLATION AND FREUDIAN PYSCHOANALYSIS

A DISSERTATION FOR THE DEGREE OF MSc IN
TRANSLATION STUDIES AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

BEATRIZ CABALLERO 9990232

SUPERVISORS:

DR IBRAHIM MUHAWI, DEPARTMENT OF ISLAMIC AND MIDDLE
EASTERN STUDIES

DR HUW LEWIS, DEPARTMENT OF HISPANIC STUDIES

CONTENTS:

Introduction to An Active Approach to Translation	3
The Experience of Translation; A Psychoanalytical Experience	4
The Unconscious	7
Translation and Psychoanalysis: Never Ending Tasks	13
Roles and Translation	14
Step by Step	19
Common Difficulties: Cohesion	20
The Role of Subjectivity	21
Translation: Viaje metapatriarcal de exorcismo y éxtasis	30
Bibliography	39

I was working on the proof of one of my poems all the morning, and took out a coma. In the afternoon I put it in back.

O. Wilde

An Active Approach to Translation

This paper consists of two parts: a) a reflection on the experience and process of translation itself and its relation to psychoanalysis, and b) the translation of an extracts from the book written by Mary Daly *Gyn/Ecology: the Metaethics of Radical Feminism*, which provides a reference for the discussion.

The extract has been taken from the introduction. It was chosen because it provides a very representative and condensed example of the content as well as the style of the book. There, she not only explains and justifies the subject matter of the book, but also establishes some word meanings and play on words (i.e. *to spin, amazing, Spinster*, 1978: 1, 2 and 3 respectively) which are going to constantly come up later in the book because they are essential to its meaning.

The Experience of Translation; A Psychoanalytical Experience

This paper will not focus on the above translation itself. Instead, the translation will be used as a starting point to discuss the process of translation (PT). A comparison between translation and psychoanalysis, mainly in oedipal and phallic terms, has been drawn in the past (see Garovsky, and Steiner, both in Chamberlain, 1988: 319 and 321 respectively). This paper will explore this relationship between translation and psychoanalysis (Freudian psychoanalysis), although from a different perspective. More precisely, I will draw a comparison between the PT and the process of psychoanalysis. This implies the analysis of the elements involved in the PT, these are mainly the source text (ST), target text (TT), author, translator and readership, and their inter-relationship. In other words, these elements will not only often be interpreted in psychoanalytical terms, but they will also be partially psychoanalysed through their relation, role and reaction to the PT. Some of the features here explored can be extended to any PT. Many of them, however, refer specifically to the experience of translating this particular text, though I do not discard the possibility that they could also be extrapolated to other texts of a similar nature.

The feminist reader may be outraged to read of this (particularly when the book here discussed exposes and warns us against the dangers of traditional psychoanalytic practices). That is why I would like to make it clear that only a comparison of certain aspects of psychoanalysis is intended here. By no means have I tried to equate the practice of translation with that of psychoanalysis as a whole. The inconsistencies of such an attempt are clear when one thinks that whereas translation is traditionally a female domain (see Chamberlain, 1988: 314; Simons, 1996: 10, 39-40), psychoanalysis is traditionally a male activity, that whereas translation has in many ways been/is a way for female liberation, creative expression, and assertion of the self (Simons, 1996: 45-51), psychoanalysis has treated femininity itself as an illness (cf. Daly 1978: 266): the father of psychoanalysis describes being a woman in terms of genital deficiency (1964: 166, cf. also *ibid.* 1953: 143-144, 150-152, 371-392, and 1963: 189, 360). Even so, the fact that psychoanalysis is not perfect, that it has failed in treating women fairly, should not mean that we are to discard psychoanalysis all together. Far from this, we should

be aware of its limitations and take whatever insights it can offer. It is only by remembering that the theoretical aim of psychoanalysis is to cure the individual, in the sense of providing the patient with a wider awareness of the self, that the comparison between the process of translation and that of psychoanalysis makes sense, since translation can be/is a transforming experience which has the power to turn us into better translators, scholars, persons, by means of providing the translator with a better understanding of herself and the surrounding world.

To begin with, the process of psychoanalysis and the process of translation share two main characteristics; a) in order to succeed, both processes must assume the existence and the influence of elements which are not an explicit part of the object of their study. b) They also share a common goal, the verbalisation of their findings.

a) The psychoanalyst must know how to listen to the patient's long forgotten language, the language of the unconscious. Not only does the unconscious exist (Freud, 1927: 9), but it also has a major influence and impact on the conscious self. Thus, the object of the psychoanalytic process is the discovery, study and verbalisation of the existing relationship between the unconscious and the conscious. It is not a matter of interpreting, explaining or bringing up into consciousness what lies beneath, although a great deal of this is involved in the process, everything is really about decentering the subject. Decentering him from what he thinks he knows, so that he can see that he is inherently divided. Only by being aware of this dichotomy can the subject live fully. This is part of the process and aim of psychoanalysis. In a way, the position of the translator is very similar to the one of the psychoanalyst. The translator, and very specially in a text of this nature, must decenter the position of the text, of the TT in particular, making the reader aware of the excision between the ST and the TT, so that the reader gains new perspective and awareness in experiencing the text herself (although it can be argued that this is not a requirement for every translation). The PT is the process of rendering a source language (SL) text into a target language (TL), which is in itself a way of decentering; the ST is not only decentered from the SL, but also from the source culture even from the author herself. It is assumed that the text has a form, a style and a content, and that these features, the content in particular, may not only have different readings, but also different levels of reading. These features are not always explicit. Furthermore, the translator must consider the relationship (in terms of influence, intention, etc.) existing between the writer and her text. Thus, the process of

translation consists of discovering, studying and verbalising (in the TL) these features at all different levels, and in doing so, reviving meaning, which was first killed in the ST, into the TT (see Eros and Thanatos, p. 21-23). In Berman's words (2000: 297) "All translation is, and must be, restitution of meaning".

b) This verbalisation can be traced from different angles.

Translation can be described as the process of producing a ST into a TT through the filter of the translator. In other words, the translator verbalises his experience and understanding of the ST into a TL which is materialised into the ST. For women this PT goes even further. As von Flotow puts it, women "[...] translate their private language, their specifically female forms of discourse, developed as a result of gendered exclusion, into some form of the dominant patriarchal code" (1997: 12, cf. also ead. 14, 95; and Spencer, 1980: 11-16). This means that women's complex and rich way of understanding, interacting and expressing themselves, must be canalised, impoverished, into the standard, patriarchal code, so that they are allowed to have a public voice (cf. ead. 1980: 191). The implicit paradox is clear: in doing so, women who publish alienate themselves from other women. They must use men's speech to give women a voice. This is not to say that language itself is some form of patriarchal code. It is more particularly public (often academic) written conventions that are considered to belong to the realm of patriarchy. Von Flotow summarises this idea very forcibly by saying "Gender was a product of patriarchal institutions and *conventional* language was one of these institutions" [emphasis mine]. These conventions leave out more versatile, personal or even intimate styles of writing.

Psychoanalysis is also verbalisation, although from a different perspective. First, psychoanalysis translates¹ the person subject to study into a conceptual framework. Moreover, if we follow Jacobson's division (1959: 114) of the different kinds of translation as intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic, we will soon find that psychoanalysis practices translation in at least two of these senses, the most obvious one being intersemiotic translation. By this, I am making reference to the translation of the semiotic signs of the unconscious (resistance, transference, catharsis, transformation, *lapsus linguae*, the instinctual principles of Eros and Thanatos, sublimation...) into the language of the *ego*, as Freud himself explains using the very

¹ Given that translation is verbalisation, women's discourse and psychoanalysis are also verbalisation by virtue of the *ponendo ponens* rule.

term *translation* (see 1949: 17; 1953: 187; 1963: 213, 310, 506; 1964: 122). Besides this, a process of intralingual translation also takes place, when the therapist refers to the symptoms experienced by the patient in psychoanalytic terms.

This verbalization is, of course, not purposeless. A further parallel can be drawn at this point. It is through translation, the translation of the unconscious signs into consciousness, that Freudian psychoanalysis tries to cure the individual. It is also through translation that the TT reader can be cured, in a metaphorical sense, from her inability to understand and access the ST. And finally, it is through language that Daly encourages women to break free from patriarchy; in order to do so, some kind of translation, also metaphorically speaking, must take place from the language of patriarchy to the language of the Self, so that in the first place the dichotomy is made obvious, and thus the language of patriarchy can eventually be abandoned.

The Unconscious

At this point, I would now like to clarify the somehow seemingly obscure concept of the unconscious in translation. Firstly, the term unconscious in this context is intended to encompass all those elements that affect the production of the TT, and yet are not an explicit part of the ST (cf. Berman, 2000: 286). It is possible to identify several such elements, the most relevant are: a) the subtext, that is, the underlying, the latent content of the text, (cf. Levine, 1991: 7). b) The interests and expectations of the people involved with the text, this is, publishers, readers, translator himself and of course the author. Clarifying them all will be vital for the success of the translation as the skopos theory explains (see Vermeer, 1989: 221; Hatim, 2001: 75). c) And finally, what in psychoanalytical terms is the childhood of the text, that is, previous works by the same or different authors which may be influencing the text to be translated.

a) According to Freudian psychoanalysis, the subject emerges from the distance created by the unconscious between his self (desire) and his saying (consciousness). It is the task of the translator, not his purpose, to bridge this distance. It is his task because the translator must investigate and ultimately know the link between the latent content of the text (subtext) and the explicit one. This could be considered to be the hermeneutic side of translation (see Simon, 1996: 44). Yet, bridging both is not his purpose, since once the link is understood it would be for the translator to decide in

what way such a link is going to be expressed in the TT. As Levine expresses it “ [...] translator’s first and final function is to relate meaning”.

The verbs *to spin* and *to weave* (1978: 1) constitute a good example of the relevance of the subtext. These words belong simultaneously to two different semantic fields; that of typical female skills, and that of movement. In this particular passage, only (explicit) reference to the latter is made, whereas the former meaning remains latent. It cannot be said, however, that one semantic field is here more important than the other, since their meaning is soon linked by the author, and later becomes a key point of her argumentation (see the importance placed on the word *journey*, in that same page, as well as the frequent use made in the subsequent pages, and in fact in the rest of the book, of the word *spinning* as in moving in spirals. Furthermore, an important connexion is established between *to spin* and the keyword *Spinster*, which appears for the first time in page 3). Thus, this subtext is a suggestion; it is a subtle way of introducing this connection to the reader, before doing it overtly. Unfortunately, all the Spanish possible translations are hyponyms of these terms, which implies the necessary loss of at least one of these levels of meaning. Thus, given the proven complexity of these cross-references and their indubitable relevance to the overall meaning of the text, a footnote (see p. 27) explaining to the Hispanic reader the lost implications is imperative.

b) The first thing needed in order to undertake any translation is perspective. Such perspective must be obtained by means of a detailed skopos analysis of the text. (A parallel can be drawn here between the skopos and the function of diagnosis in psychoanalysis. Cf. Freud, 1910: 158). This analysis consists basically of looking into:

i) The nature of the message or more specifically the text-type. This is fundamental in several ways: determining the text-type will help the translator to establish the intention of the author (Reiss, 1971: 161), and therefore to get a deeper and better understanding of the text. It is also very important in that it will greatly determine the translation method to be used (ead., 1971: 166; Newmark, 1981: 21-22, 1988: 12; and Hatim: 2001: 77-78), because the method should be coherent with the text-type of the ST as well as the text-type of the TT, since they might not be the same (Vermeer, 1989: 232). Thus, the radical features of this text will have a decisive impact in those decisions made in relation to the strategy followed to translate the text in itself and in relation to the intended audience.

ii) The type of audience. “It is of paramount importance to make the offer of information compatible with the presumed interest, expectations and knowledge of the addressees” (Hatim, 2001: 77; also cf. Newmark 1981: 20, 140). In the German translation a didactic approach was preferred (see von Flotow, 1997: 21-22, 41). In this translation, however that hasn’t been judged necessary because it is assumed that readership will be reasonably educated and already familiar somehow with feminist issues.

iii) Purpose(s) of the author and translator. This must be taken into account because there must be a consistency between the intentionality of the ST producer, and the way the text is re-expressed in the TL (Hatim, 2001: 76). “The degree of ‘intertextual coherence’ between target and source text [...]”, as Vermeer (1989: 223) puts it, is “[...] defined in terms of skopos”. It is purpose that sets the boundaries of the translator (see Hatim and Mason, 1990: 187).

Luckily for the translator, some of the questions regarding the author have already been answered by the writer herself in her introduction to the book (1978: 1-34). There she explains her motives and her methods, as well as the purpose of the book. However the research of the translator must go further into the author’s background and intentions.

The whole issue of the translator's own identity and interest should also be considered (cf. von Flotow, 1997: 35, 39). In translation, at least in feminist translation (cf. Simons, 1996: 7), the gender of the translator is critical. A radically feminist book, like Daly’s *Gyn/Ecology*, translated by a man could very easily be considered as treason, a tasteless joke and/or would terribly undermine the credibility of the text. This is only just one reason to explain why it is only fair that the reader is provided with information about the translator. An introduction by and about the translator give the reader the chance to understand better, or at least guess in which way the ST may have been affected, or may have changed (even if only subtly) after the translation (cf. Simon, 1996: 154; von Flotow, 1997: 39). Given that reading a translation is like seeing the world through tainted glass, the reader should be given the chance to know at least the shade and intensity of the colour of the glass. As von Flotow (1997: 35) explains, “Translations published in a cultural context affected by feminism are remarkable for the metatexts that draw attention to the ‘translator-effect’, the mark each translator, as a gendered individual, leaves on the work”. The implications of the need for this metatext are: a) the assumption that the author of the text has a particular

purpose in mind when writing it, i.e. encouraging women to start/continue the Journey of female freedom from patriarchy. b) The assumption that the translator is acting according to her own purposes, i.e. rendering the ideas and style of the author into Spanish, so that her reasons and her ways can be understood within the socio-cultural context of her time. c) The possibility that their purposes may differ. d) The need of the reader to be aware of these. This awareness can be achieved by means of an introduction. This introduction will normally contain biographical details of the translation, which is a common trait to feminist translations. But as von Flotow points out with the encompassing word *metatext*, the introduction is not the only resource that the translator counts on to make his presence obvious, prefaces and footnotes are also well-known feminist practices (cf. ead., 1997: 38, 40-41). Thus, these practices serve different purposes, they help to decentre the text, so the reader is aware of the status of translation of the text she is reading, the translator's own subjectivity is accepted and acknowledge, and the purpose/s of the translator are made more translucent².

It is now time to illustrate the importance of skopos with some practical examples extracted from the translation. Having established already that the purpose of the translator here is to convey the ideas and style of the original, so that it can be understood within Daly's socio-cultural context, two guidelines emerge: a) the translation must stay as close as possible to the original, and b) in order to have a better understanding of what Daly was trying to get across, the translator must first establish, analyse, understand and use Daly's same criteria. In other words, the translator must always bear in mind Daly's intentions, and use them as the ultimate guide for decision making. Sometimes the translator will have to face decisions that the author never had to make. The translation of the term *spell* (1978: 12 *et seq.*) offers a good practical example. This recurrent word can be translated into Spanish as *hechizo*, *maleficio*, *sortilegio*, *conjuro* and *encantamiento*. *Hechizo* has to be discarded at once because it is closely related to the term *hechicera* (sorceress). This clearly will not do because in the book it is men who cast these malicious spells on women. The next plausible is *maleficio* (curse/spell), related to *malo* meaning bad. This word looks promising; however it proves to be unsuitable when *dis-spell* has to be translated, because it is a play on words that cannot be reproduced. The terms *sortilegio* and *conjuro* (spell) both

² The purpose/s of those paying for the translation are also to be carefully considered due to very basic practical reasons. This aspect will not be discussed here because of the nature of this particular translation and the obvious lack of such an agent.

present the same problem. Finally, the word *encantamiento* (enchantment). This word can be easily related to the expression *estar encantada*, which originally meant to be under a spell, and nowadays is simply to be delighted (the process is in a way parallel to that of *glamour*). Thus *encantamiento*, although discarded at first for its positive happy connotations, was finally chosen precisely because of them. The convenience of these connotations is particularly clear when the term *dis-spell* comes up, since *des(-)encantar* is a perfectly accepted word. Thus it could be interpreted that most women live happily unaware in the patriarchal order, because they are under its spell. So *des(-)encantar* would mean not only to break the *spell*, but also to release women from that state of ignorant unawareness. It conveys the message that women's real situation is difficult, problematic: it is a struggle.

The word *Self* (1978: 2 *et seq.*) is another example of just how important it is to always bear the writer's intentions in mind. Standard translations for the word *Self* are *Ser* (being), *Mismo/a* (self) and *Yo* (I). *Ser* was discarded because the connotations are not those of be-ing, used by the author in different instances, but those of individuality, it refers to the personal peculiarities that conform the identity. *Mismo*, or in this case *Misma* (the feminine form) constitutes an acceptable although insufficient solution. The word *Misma* is too empty, it hardly conveys any meaning. *Yo*, however, is rich in meaning and the connotations of identity are clear. However, this option has also been discarded because of the too readily contrast between the Self and the other. Thus *Yo* is only used when this contrast is explicitly drawn (1978: 6). In the remaining instances, *Self* has been translated as *Mismidad*. Firstly, *Mismidad* perfectly conveys the issue of identity. Besides this, it is not a very standard word in literary texts, and still it is easily understandable. This has the effect of stopping short mechanical or monotonous reading and inviting the reader to further reflection. Finally, the grammatical gender of the word is feminine, which contributes to further make the point of female identity.

Thus, the translator has to take decisions the writer never made, and yet she must take them in accordance with Daly's intentions. The problem is that even though her purposes for the text as a whole may be relatively clear, each specific block of the text (sentence, paragraph, section...) obeys a particular purpose which is not always easy to determine, and yet is vital. For instance, although Daly herself admits she sometimes has difficulties deciding whether she wants to use *we* or *they* (1978: 22-27). As we know, the English verb forms hardly change in relation to the subject in contrast with the Spanish inflected verbs. Sometimes there are clues as in the case of *Spinster can*

find our way back (1978: 4). *our* leaves no doubt that the subject is we and not they, so the translation goes *Las Puñeteras podemos encontrar su camino de vuelta*. Unfortunately, it is not always this easy. In the case of *Spinsters must melt these masses of “knowledge”* (1978: 8) there are no keys in the text that tell us whether *Spinsters* is meant as they or as we, so the character and intentions of the author must be taken into consideration or even guessed. In this case it has been assumed that the author counts herself as part of this group of women that fight against Androcracy and therefore the *we* form has been used (*Las puñeteras debemos derretir estas masas de “conocimiento”*). It could, of course, also be interpreted as a call for action, and thus translated into the *they* form. In spite of this, the *we* form has taken prevalence, because it has been considered that it does not rule out the possibility of this latter interpretation. Had we chosen the *they* form, the author would have been excluded from the discourse.

Grammatical gender poses a similar problem. For instance, in the case of the sentence *Those who attempt to reform the language*, *Those* makes no gender reference in English, however in Spanish it must be specified whether it refers to men or women. Normally, considering that it is a feminist text talking about female efforts, the feminine form would be preferred. However, this decision proves to be particularly problematic, because the author is making a point of women being included to the convenience of the language users only when the implications are not good (1978: 326). Thus, after pondering the repercussions of this part of the context, I finally opted for a more comprehensive a allegedly neutral *aquellos*, the masculine form. Otherwise the text runs the risk of leaving an untruthful, even hypocritical aftertaste.

c) In order to understand the patient’s present state, one of the methods of psychoanalysis is that of anamnesis (see Freud, 1922: 17), to search for the clues in the childhood of the patient (ibid., 1958: 49). Those reminiscences of events now long forgotten are having a major influence in his present personality, and the success of the therapy largely depends on the unravelling of those memories. Similarly, the translator must also look into the childhood of the text (previous texts by the same author, as well as the author’s background), as well as to search for those unconscious reminiscences (other texts and authors that may have influenced the author and of course the text object of our translation). As Chamberlain (1988: 324) puts it, “[...] texts do not emerge *ex nihilo*; rather, both writing and translating depend on previous texts”. The translator must be able to spot the references made to previous works (by the same

author or different ones) in order to be able to understand their relevance and influence and therefore in order to be able to translate them suitably into the TL. An example of a case of anamnesis is offered by the words *reification* (1978: 4) and *reified* (1978: 5), which both point to Luckás George and the Marxist philosophy, although not explicitly.

There is still another sense in which the role of anamnesis is vital to this text. The breaking-up of the word into its morphemes, as well as the etymological and historical meaning of the words is a central device in Daly's argumentation. This is to go back to the childhood of the word, as if it were. The translator, therefore, must be skilful in elucidating these elements from the past and in bringing up the contrast between their past and present meaning, using both to her advantage. This type of anamnesis is particularly challenging for the translator, since it is often difficult to find words in the TL that share not only the actual meaning, but also its history, or its roots, which Daly is so keen to play with (see *verb-ing*, *be-ing* in p. 15??). The translator must keep looking beneath the surface, for that which is there and is not yet being said. It must not only be identified, but most importantly the consequences must also be interpreted.

Translation and Psychoanalysis: Never-Ending Tasks

One further point made in the initial comparison between translation and psychoanalysis which needs clarification. Section a) of pages 2 and 3 may have given the impression that the term *process* and *aim* were used with a certain laxity. There is some truth in such an impression, since at that point both terms being used almost interchangeably. The reason for this is that both, psychoanalysis as well as translation, are everlasting activities. In other words, the boundaries of process and aim melt at some points, so that in certain respects it is difficult to say when one ends and the other starts. Surely, they both have short term, achievable goals; in the case of psychoanalysis that is the cure of the analysand and in the case of translation the production of the TT. However it cannot be said that these activities have a sense of completeness. Very much on the contrary, they are not, they cannot be complete nor finished. If we take the existentialist Sartrean approach and understand existence as a project in itself, then the psychoanalytical process of increasing human understanding

of himself (which coincides with the aim) goes on for as long as the subject may live. In Ortega's (1937: 50) words "[...] human tasks are unrealizable. The destiny of Man - his privilege and honour- is never to achieve what he proposes and to remain mainly an intention, a living utopia". As Ortega (1937: 49) describes it, translation is an utopian activity, however "[...] to emphasis its impossibility is very far from depriving the occupation of translation of meaning, [...]" (ibid., 1937: 54). Translation is utopian and necessarily incomplete, unfinished in many ways (cf. Simon: 1996: 165). Incomplete because of the necessary losses that must be assumed in the process. Unfinished from the point of view of the translator, who feels the need to alter the resulting translation every time she goes back to it, and of course, also from the text's perspective. The TT is inherently open to being re-translated, re-written, re-thought, (cf. von Flotow, 1997: 49). Using psychoanalytical terminology, translation is constant desire. There is a constant tension (latent and/or patent) between the ST and the TT, between our object of desire and reality, between the intertwined combination of meanings, form, connotation, word puns, culture, style... and the limitations that the other language places upon us. Thus, the text is constant desire because it can never be fully possessed, fully translated. Therefore claiming to have a successful, complete and comprehensive translation of a text is to kill it, is to kill its possibilities, its potential, in the same way as to claim that a human-being has fully completed the journey of self-knowledge involves death at many different levels. Thus, translation (and also psychoanalysis), as a process, is eternal, it never finishes, but on the contrary, it is open to continuous reinterpretation, improvement, re-reading, rewriting (cf. 1997: 24).

Roles and Translation

Freud was well aware of the tension that exists within the human-being. According to Freud (1949: 2-5), the soul, the mind was divided into three parts which interact with each other. These are the *ego*, mostly conscious and subject to the principle of reality, the *superego*, an internalised authority trying to impose its rules upon the *ego*, and the *id*, mostly unconscious, subject to the principle of pleasure, which tries to make the *ego* fulfil its desires (see ibid, 1927: 19-53).

A parallel could be drawn here with the PT. The translator is clearly the *ego*, the conscious part of the self, the part who must face reality and yet satisfy at the same

time the demands of the *id* and the *superego*. In translation the *id* is the ST. This is so because the ST is for the translator a compound of desires crying out to be fulfilled, that is, a compound of meanings, puns, allusions, stylistic resources which must be translated. All these elements of the ST remain on the domain of desire because although they clearly exist in the ST, they are still to be rendered into the TT, task which the translator knows is often not possible to do in full. It is a desire because it is what the translator is wanting to do, is trying to do, and still knows he will not always do. The reason why he will not always succeed in doing so is the principle of reality, this is the TL. The TL dictates what is and what is not possible, acceptable, so the translator (*ego*) has to refrain from fulfilling those desires which are thought to be dangerous for the *ego*. In other words, the translator is always restricted by the dictations of the TL (principle of reality). He must obey all sorts of grammar, semantic, spelling and phonetic rules so that the translation is acceptable. This is not to say that all these rules must be strictly observed; there are of course ways of bending and stretching such rules, but in the end the translator must always abide by them for the sake of convention. The abandonment of these rules would mean for the translator the unintelligibility of her work, just as much as the abandonment of the principle of reality means in psychoanalysis insanity for the mind. And finally, it is possible to interpret the TT in terms of the *superego*, since it represents authority and restrictions. The TT places all sort of restrictions on the translator, not allowing certain renderings, certain meanings, certain connotations, puns, allusions to come out in the TT, at least not in exactly the same way as they are in the ST, that is, literal translation must most times be discarded because it would often be nonsensical, misleading or simply not acceptable in the TL. The *id* (ST) is pushing the *ego* (the translator) to fulfil its desires according to the principle of pleasure (SL). However this is not always possible straight away (only seldom is literal translation possible), thus the libidinal charges have to be displaced from the censured original objects to different objects that count with the approval of the *ego*. In translation this means that translating literally from the original is not possible most of the time; instead translation must be achieved in different ways, i.e. equivalent effect. A good example of the use of this strategy is that provided by the word *spinster* (1978: 3 *et seq.*). *Spinster*, as the author herself explains, originally referred to the woman who spins, whereas nowadays it is a deprecating term for an unmarried woman. The difficulties for the translation of this word are multiple. It is important to choose a word whose meaning has also changed through the years, at

both levels regarding the referent as well as the connotations, that is to say that, nowadays it must also be a deprecating term. Besides this, it should also make reference to a traditionally womanly occupation, preferably related to spin, weave, and which at the same time evokes somehow the idea of circular, spiral movement. It is clearly a multilevel word with the peculiarity that all those meanings are very relevant to the content and coherence of the text. Explaining all this to the reader can only result in the loss of form and style of the text, thus it is far more convenient to find an equivalent term. The compromise reached is the word *puñetera*, which nowadays is used to refer to an annoying woman, a woman who always wants to get her own way (unfortunately the idea of being unmarried is lost). Originally the word described a woman whose occupation was to embroider cuffs (which implies sewing in spirals). Obviously to embroider is not to spin; however, the connection is easy to make. Both words can be considered equivalent in this context.

Another complex example of this strategy is the one offered in the sentence *as the name of our verb-ing, be-ing Selves* (1978: 5). The use of the hyphen clearly highlights the process the verbs are describing. For this reason *be-ing* has been rendered by *proceso-del-ser*. The idea of process could have been conveyed by simply saying *si-endo*, which successfully transmits the idea of process (gerund) plus a positive determination to do so, *sí* (yes). However the gerund of *ser* (to be) is so irregular that any connection to the word *ser* as in *creature* is lost, it does not express the process of being who we are, with all the complexities implied by that. Because of the recurrence and relevance to the argumentation of this term, I opted for a self-explanatory solution that successfully conveyed all these levels of meaning: *proceso-de-ser*. There is only one instance of this expression where this solution is insufficient—that is in the next paragraph which says *it is be-ing in the world* (1978: 6). Here it means not only to be part of the world but also to be in the world, two different connotations included in the English to be for which the Spanish uses two different verbs, therefore both of them were used in this case, the resulting translation was *es el proceso-del-ser/estar en el mundo*. However meaning is not always so essential. This will be illustrated going back to the original example, examining the word *verb-ing*. Here no solution was found that could possibly convey this play on words so *expresión*, a different play on words was used instead to create an equivalent effect. *Expresión*, not only means as a whole to express oneself, but once it is divided it refers to

the process of liberation, that is, of leaving external, social pressure (*presión*) behind, turning it on something from the past (*ex*), something that is no more.

Sometimes however, it is not possible to satisfy the *id* immediately, so its desires must be repressed, which is not to say suppressed, because such impulses will fight to get satisfaction in different ways through dreams, jokes or *lapsus*, for instance. (In terms of translation, there are sometimes elements of the ST that cannot be translated, and yet the translator tries to leave clues for the reader in the form of compensation, or enriching the content so that it points out to these missing, repressed element/s). When one or several of the levels of the translation has to be sacrificed, more often than not, the loss will be at the stylistic or graphical level. Someone may say that the content has been given priority over the form. However this does not mean that the translator has turned her back to the form. On the contrary, she must be very aware at all times of its importance, because it contributes decisively to the style and impact of the text. What to do to keep the balance? The strategy of compensation offers the solution to this problem (see Freud, 1910: 46). In this particular text, this often means dissecting words which are not dissected in the original, or using an oblique (/) to link different meanings, always following the criteria explained by the author herself (1978: 22-27). In instances like *maze/haze* (1978: 2) the graphic play on words must be sacrificed to the benefit of the content (This particular case will be further explained at a latter point in the paper). This means failing to transmit the fresh and sharp style of the writer. Thus, words like *tras-fondo* and *Re-cobrar*, where the divisions were not present in the original, are now split to compensate, making always sure that we stay faithful to the general purpose of the text. The key word *Background* will now be explained, as an example. *Background* (1978: 2 *et seq.*) can be rendered by *Fondo* or *Trasfondo*. These are deep and comprehensive words, but still fail to transmit the richness of the SL term. This is the reason why the word used in the translation is *tras-fondo*; richer connotations that suit the context perfectly spring up when the word is split up. *Tras*, as *trans* does, suggests the feminist trip is one that goes further, there is more to it than what can be ordinarily perceived. Of course, this device also helps to preserve the style of the author, by compensating with this breaking up of a word which was not altered in the first place, thus making up for others that could not be dissected or played with in such a way.

The TT also represents censorship. It is not at the stage where the translator is working from the ST, but towards the TT when different kinds of censorship are used;

the most obvious case being when certain elements must be omitted because they are offensive, or maybe simply not acceptable in the target culture. In the case of this text, Daly is making a special point of using potentially offensive and politically incorrect words, precisely to invert this effect. This practice will prove to be particularly problematic for the translator for multiple reasons. Because of the status of these words themselves, because of the difficulty of finding equivalents for those words in the TL (see *Spinster*, p. 12), and finally because of the resistance that these terms arouse (this point will be discussed at some length later). It is the *superego* who decides what a sensitive issue is according to the internalised authority (the conventionality and customs of the target language and target culture respectively) and it is the *ego* (the translator as a person who can detach herself from the ST, and source culture, as well as from the target language and target culture, enough to make decisions) who must ultimately decide what attitude or strategy is going to be adopted towards such sensitive issues. No word or phrase has been omitted in this translation as a result of censorship. There are two main reasons for that; as Goddard and Patterson (2000: 94) put it, “[...] women are seen as having limited vocabularies [...] They are also described as being rather delicate, easily offended and oblique”. Thus, if offensive and impolite terms were omitted simply because they are not considered proper, then we would be reinforcing the view denounced by Goddard and Patterson, which is not at all desirable for a feminist translation. Besides this, Daly uses these terms as part of her strategies for exorcising patriarchy from women. Therefore, to censure her use of the language would be to sabotage her text.

The censorship of the *superego* (TT) does not only rule over content, but also over form and style. Thus, it can also be observed in far less sensitive matters. For instance, the sentence *these three sources are inseparable, intertwined* (1978: 1), can be translated into Spanish literally, without altering meaning nor order, and still be perfectly correct. However, and in spite of the fact that no rule has been strictly speaking broken, the *superego* has chosen to make some changes. The order has been altered. The reason for this is that the word *inseparable* is more comprehensive than *intertwined*. *Inseparable* would make sufficiently the point and a further specification would only result tedious. If, however, the first word used is *intertwined* and then *inseparable*, the latter comes as the next logical step, it is the natural conclusion, thus it results in a fluent reading sentence (the same strategy has also been used in p. 6 *peeling off the layers of mind-binding and cosmetics*). As we can see, there is no existing rule

forcing these changes; however, the superego has internalized the language conventions in such a way that it cannot allow these sentences to be translated following the order in which Daly wrote them. Besides this, as has already been pointed out, the verb *to be* is translated into Spanish by two different verbs *ser* and *estar*. In this case both verbs must be used since the adjective has different requirements from the past participle (the same happens later 1978: 4 *the barriers are multiple and intertwined*, and on the same page *both are dead, inert*).

Step by Step

According to Freudian psychoanalysis, the development of the human personality is linked to the development of the different sexual stages (see Freud, 1949: 10-15). These stages are the oral, anal, phallic, and after a latent period the genital stage. The development of these stages is not mechanic nor progressive; instead the different stages are superposed one on another without excluding each other. The focus of the libido of the individual widens with every new stage he attains. Conflicts or difficulties at any of these stages will have a later repercussion on the subject's personality. Once again, a parallel can be drawn with the process of translation. It can be said that translation always takes place at different stages or levels. Each one of them is more comprehensive than the other, so the translator has to widen the focus of her attention, so that more elements are included. These levels are (following Baker's model, 1992: 5) word level, collocations and idioms, grammar level, level of the text... In order to achieve a successful translation the translator must provide a suitable translation at all these levels (which as in the case of psychoanalysis are not mechanical, nor excluding); failing to do so will result in the meaning being obscured due to all sorts of different translation pitfalls. This is so from the point of view of translation as a process; however, it is also possible to view translation as a product, in this case different levels can also be established. Following Hervey and Higgins (1992: 20-22), these levels are mainly interlineal, literal, faithful, balanced, idiomatic and free translation. Unlike in the case of psychoanalysis, and translation as a process, these levels exclude each other, although this does not discard the possibility of finding two or more of them in the same text, they will always appear juxtaposed, never superposed.

Common Difficulties: Cohesion

One of the difficulties that psychoanalysis has to face is cohesion. It is not merely a matter of translating isolated signs from the unconscious into consciousness, it is also necessary to form a cohesive body so that the consciousness can find them coherent. This problem is, of course, familiar to the translator. Cohesion difficulties of different nature have aroused. The following paragraphs will be dedicated to their analysis.

The phrase *It involves dangerous encounters [...]* (1978: 1), where the pronoun makes reference to the previous sentence, exemplifies this sort of problem. The pronouns *esto* (this) and *ello* (it) are hardly used in Spanish as the subject of a sentence. Normally, they are simply omitted because; they can be extracted from the context. In the case of this sentence, however, it is not only a matter of meaning, but a matter of cohesion, therefore it cannot be omitted. The strategy used here has been to use a relative sentence instead. The advantages of this device are that the cohesion is maintained, and the sentences flow naturally. The disadvantage is that the style of the author consisting of short and sharp sentences cannot be kept. This loss does not seem to be so significant when the styles of Spanish and English language are compared. In Spanish literary text it is quite normal to often find long subordinate sentences, a feature not so often present in the English ones. Therefore this device is the result of a global translation, a translation that deals with the text as a whole and it adapts itself to the style of the TL rather than sticking to individual sentences.

Another issue regarding cohesion is: should the same (key) term always be translated into the same word, in order to preserve the cohesion of the text? Or should cohesion be over-ridden by stylistic considerations? The word *arena*, for example, has been given two different translations: *ruedo* (bull-ring), when it was used in reference to game and domestication (1978: 7), and *teatro romano* (Roman theatre) when the playful aspect and its dangers are emphasised. Thus, when the same word in English is used in different contexts making also different references (a reference that cannot be conveyed by the same Spanish word), then a different word is used, hoping that the coherence gained will somehow make up for the cohesion lost.

The Role of Subjectivity

I hope that, at this point, the parallel between translation and psychoanalysis has been sufficiently established. Now, I will attempt a different approach focusing on the subjective processes that take place during the course of a translation and of psychoanalysis. From this perspective, the figure of the translator is mainly identified with that of the patient of psychoanalysis, because they are both people engaged in the personal process of decentering the subject, as explained at the beginning of the paper.

The first these subjective processes is resistance. This is a very frequent phenomenon experienced by the patients subjected to psychoanalysis, a part of the patient does not want to be cured (see Freud, 1910: 56, 138, 1927: 71). Freud (1964: 18-19) describes resistance as "[...] a force, separate from the subject's conscious will, which was refusing to collaborate with the investigation". This experience can be easily related to translation (cf. Berman, 2000: 286, Levine, 1991: 8). First, it can be said that the ST itself keeps resisting translation, it does not want to be translated, evades translation by means of its complexity, of the number of connotations which do their best to hide from the translator, and certainly put up a fair fight before (if at all) being translated. Secondly, because of the nature of the text, provoking and full of controversy, even the reader experiences a certain resistance to it as Susan Leigh Star puts it in her brief introduction to *Gyn/ecology* "When I began the book, I had a great deal of resistance to these" [Daly's linguistic devices]. In as much as the translator is the master reader, she experiences this resistance in at least two directions; as the agent, she resists to going on reading the text (see Freud, 1964: 100), resistance to translate it, and as a recipient of the resistance of the text in the sense above explained. This is particularly true in the case of radical (cf. Von Flotow, 1997: 14) and aggressive texts like the one in question, which have also been called resistant literature.

Thus, the first difficulty or rather resistance experienced was to actually get used to the language, the style used (some would say abused) by the author. Words are often not used with their conventional meanings, but rather with their original or etymological meaning, which the reader is not always familiar with. Besides this, the writer has a certain taste for using offensive terms, that is terms of perfectly innocent original or literal meanings, that have been turned against women to deprecate them. Words are broken up to point to certain implications that otherwise would ordinarily be

lost, or to simply create new play on words. Finally new words are coined, this device creates powerful tools to express that what according to the writer cannot be expressed by means of patriarchal language (see 1978: 330). Every word is intentional; every choice is deliberate (see 1978: 22-27). The result is resistance, that is, an initial shock that hopefully later leads to a greater awareness of the usage of language. This resistant language has to be a feature of the TT as well. This has been achieved by means of replicating the author's devices into Spanish of course often falling back on equivalence and compensation, but never giving up the Daly's manipulation of words into the claws of ordinary submissive language. This point will be illustrated with examples:

- Words used with their etymological meaning rather than with the conventional one. The title, *Gyn/ecology*, can successfully be rendered as *Gin/ecología* and it will maintain its conceptual and graphical characteristics. The same happens with *Paradise* (1978: 6-7), *Paraíso* into Spanish. This is so because Daly usually chooses to recover the etymological meaning from very old words that, luckily for the translator, share the same roots in English and in Spanish.

- Words with neutral objective that have been used as deprecating terms against women. One of the examples that Daly chooses to make her point is the animal kingdom. In the TT, some of the animals have been changed for different ones so that the same effect is achieved in Spanish. Thus, "the bunnies, the bitches, the beavers, the squirrels, the chicks, the pussycats, the cows, the nags, the foxy ladies [...]" (ead. p. 7) becomes "a los conejitos, a las perras, las víboras (vipers), las leonas (lioness), las pichoncitas, las gatitas, las vacas, las burras (female donkeys), las zorras [...]"

- Words that have been broken up. *Stag-nation* provides a good example of the technique as well as of the difficulties: "the image is one of stagnation (in a stagnation) as suggested by the expression" (ead. p. 8). Stagnation means *estacamiento*, no movement. The word has been explicitly split to make reference to its components: *stag* which means exclusive, place where women are not allowed, and *nation* as in country. There is no word in the Spanish language that would convey all three meanings. Therefore the compromised reached has been to choose an altogether different word; a word that can be divided in such a way so that the style and form are kept, and which meaning is still in accordance with the author's intentions, it succeeds in creating an equivalent effect. The word in question is *alie-nación* (alienation). As a whole means to make someone (women) feel excluded, not being part of something.

Alien as different, excluded and nation remains the same. Sadly the meaning of no movement is lost, however there is also a gain, a clear reference to Marxism, a connection that Daly herself draws earlier by using the word *reification* (ead. p. 4).

-Words are coined. A recurrent example of this is the word *Hag-ocracy* (ead. p. 3). A literal translation was attempted here: *Arpia-cracia*; however, it resulted in a cacophony, thus a different word with a similar meaning was used. The solution came in the form of *Hechicer-ocracia* (from *hechicera* meaning *sourceress*). Curiously enough, the new words that Daly coins would be described by Freud as condensations, since they condense at least two different concepts into one single unit. This is interpreted by the father of psychoanalysis as one of the manifestations of the unconscious (1964: 107). By pointing this out, I do not intend to imply that Daly is not fully conscious of the meanings and ideas she was expressing with the words she coins. Rather, what is being suggested here is that these condensations are the result of very deep psychological and possibly also emotional internal processes of the author. Levine explains how “Puns hide (hence reveal) pain” (1991: 13), which in my opinion can be extended to wordplay in general throughout Daly’s text (this point will be expanded later in p. 21).

Daly’s words are so heavily charged with meaning, that the translator often struggles to find equivalent in the TL even when no wordplay is involved. For instance: *the Otherworld* (1978: 1). There are two straight forward translations for this expression; *el Mundo del Otro* (meaning that it is a world that does not belong to us, it belongs to the other) and *el Otro Mundo*, (meaning a world other than this) this would be perfect if it were not because in Spanish it is often used to the world of the dead. Thus, to convey the idea of a world different to this one, but still in the realm of the living, I have been forced to use the somehow artificial expression *el Mundo de la Otredad*, which succeeds in suggesting a deep meaning and in creating an almost instant resistance to the text, this time as a result of its complicity.

Resistance leads to transference. In the process of psychoanalysis, a very strong emotional link between patient and therapist (and mainly in this direction) is created. As Freud (1949: 38) puts it "This transference is ambivalent: it comprises positive and affectionate as well as negative and hostile attitudes towards the analyst [...]". It would be fair to say that a similar kind of emotional bond is established in the process of translation, the translator may experience such intense feelings for the text (and

through it for the author, once again particularly in texts of this nature) as those of love, envy, hate and even obsession.

During this process of transference, the translator reproduces many of the elements or features discovered in or about the author; that is at the beginning of the PT there is a tendency to literal translation. After this initial period, it is usual to stop the process of translation, even if it is only for a short while, so that the translator can detach himself from the text, so he can gain perspective. Something very similar happens at this stage in psychoanalysis. After the transference, the patient of psychoanalysis tends to break off the therapy (see Freud, 1922: 21).

In this process of transference, there is a whole palette of emotions that keep coming up, influencing, tingeing the translation. What is more, these feelings are often ambivalent. The more the translator loves the text (perhaps because it expresses her own thoughts on the subject, or maybe because she really enjoys the stylistic form in which it is written, etc.) the more likely it is that at the same time she may also experience for example jealousy, for not having come up with those ideas first, for not having written it herself... Loving the text may also lead to hate. Hate for being forced to translate such a beautiful text in another language, in which part of the inherent identity of the text would necessarily be destroyed. She may come to hate the text for being so beautiful, precise, eloquent, emotive, witty...and yet so resistant. And of course, obsession may be the most widely experienced of all, although at different levels of intensity. Translation is no 8 to 5 job. It is a job that requires all of the translator's time and expertise, the more he knows about life and the world the better for the translation.

As regarding time, the translator is working on her translation even at times were she is not aware of doing so. Sometimes, the solution to a translation difficulty may be triggered by a perception, or realisation of something apparently completely unrelated, sometimes, the answer may even come in a dream (Freud's answer to this experience is that the activity in which the subject is engaged, PT, goes on even when the ego is not aware, it is therefore taking place at a preconscious level, that is subject to being conscious, thus the solution to the problem suddenly springs up into the translator conscious mind, see 1927: 32). In this sense, the translator is obsessed with his job, because it is a job that he is constantly doing, almost all the time at all different levels. When reading a translated text, she often catches herself wondering what such and such expression may have been in the original, when listening to a joke or a witty

remark her mind instantly analysis the difficulties involved in its translation. Many of these daily exercises often provide important clues for the current translation at hand. Obsession in as much as life is being viewed in terms of translation, that is, in as much as translation occupies centre stage in the translator's life.

Of course, the translator could also hate the text because it is contrary to her principles or views, she may disagree with the contents and/or hate the style. I will not explore this case, which is highly discouraged here. The difficulties involved in the ordinary process of translation multiply and the chances of success diminish, in the same way as a psychoanalytic treatment gets far more complicated and the success of the therapy is less likely when the patient is there against his will, or he hates the psychoanalyst as a person, and/or the psychoanalytic methods.

A mechanical translation, one in which the translator does not question the text and no feelings arise in the process, is difficult and not desirable to achieve. Similarly, the process of psychoanalysis is very unlikely to succeed unless the patient gets personally involved in the therapy.

Only critical reading can provide the tools for a truly comprehensive reading, and for the understanding of the content and range of the text, in the same way as only personal involvement can provide the creativity and flexibility necessary for translating, only personal involvement/experience can place the translator in a position close enough to the writer for her to become not just any writer, but the writer of the author's book. It is often said that every psychoanalysis patient becomes/wants to become a therapist. Mary Daly herself points to this feature of psychoanalysis (1978: 274). It can be said that the translator experiences a parallel situation; she becomes a writer herself through the process of translation.

All this personal and emotional involvement makes of translation and psychoanalysis a cathartic experience (it is not by chance that psychoanalysis as a therapeutic method was formerly known as *catharsis*, see Freud, 1953: 77). The translator transforms himself through translation. No translator can be static. Far from that, the constant exercise of critical reading that translation implies, is a source of personal and intellectual transformation in a similar way to which psychoanalytical therapy transforms the individual. Even the writer has to analyse herself in order to make certain choices (see the use of we or they, 1978: 25). She realises what she feels

as she writes, and so does the translator by means of taking part in this process as she herself becomes a decision-maker as well.

In this sense, translating acts, in a way, as a therapy for the translator: the emotional, psychological, social background, i.e. The unconsciousness, is brought up by each one of the possibilities that she provides as tentative translation. Thus, her initial brainstorm of possibilities is for the translator an open door to her unconsciousness, in much the same way as the *lapsus linguae* of the ordinary patient of psychoanalysis are important keys for the therapist to his patients unconscious. Even her initial mistakes or those not so fortunate choices made at the beginning of the PT, may be saying a lot about the psyche, and more particularly about the unconscious side of the translator, if he chooses to analyse the meta-process of translation.

This text is particularly suitable for this kind of meta-analysis because of its richness in wordplay. As von Flotow (1997: 20-21) puts it, “For feminist writers such as Mary Daly or France Théoret, women live in exile in patriarchal language punning expresses their pain, but it is also a way to fight back. Translating puns, on the other hand, has proven to be a form of ‘pun-ishment’ in much feminist work” (see also ead., 1997: 20-21). Levine (1991: 13-14, 17-18, 20) takes this link even further and establishes a relationship between puns and pains. So now that we know of the pain condensed and expressed by the writer in these wordplays and puns, it is vital for the translator to be very aware of this fact. The translator will have to see this pain, its range and its very root, so that she does not render an empty pun, but instead her puns are wordplays are loaded with this very pain. This pain can easily be seen in the expression *mindbinding* (1978: 8), closely related to *footbinding*. By coining this expression she equates the painful physical mutilation which Chinese women have been subjected to for thousand of years (and that is usually thought to be in distance and time) to the more subtle, but equally painful and dangerous (if not more) psychological mutilation of women in our present society. This equation was difficult to maintain in the TT, since noun and gerund cannot be combined with this effect in Spanish. Thus, it was translated into a more aggressive image, *torniquete mental*, which because of its painful and dangerous connotations is still linked to *footbinding*. From another perspective it is also possible to relate wordplay and pain for the translator if we consider the amount of trouble the translator has to go through in order to translate wordplay, which subjected to the suitable meta-analysis will reveal more insides about the translator’s unconscious. The willing translator can, therefore, also

transform himself, through the meta-analysis of his translation. It is a two ways therapy: on the one hand, the translator is psychoanalysing the text itself by means of deep-reading it, establishing connections, meanings, connotations, allusions, that normally escape to the ordinary eye. On the other hand, she is psychoanalysing herself as explained above.

Also the text goes through a cathartic process; in a way the ST dies, so that it can be reborn in the form of the TT. This transformation is best illustrated by the psychoanalytical principles of Eros and Thanatos (Freud, 1949: 5-9). Eros and Thanatos are, according to psychoanalysis (see *ibid*, 1922, 62-74, 1927: 54-67), the two instincts present in every human being. Eros representing creation and thanatos destruction. They are no less present in the PT, which is a combination of a rationalized destruction, that of the ST. This destruction is only partial, since it is moderated by the principle of reality and the ego. Eros, of course, corresponds to the creation process manifest in the TT, which is also subjected to the same constrains.

A rationalised destruction must take place, the destruction of the ST. The text is dissected, analysed and interpreted, only to conclude that some meanings cannot be rendered, that some elements of the style cannot be maintained, that often rhythm must be altered. By means of the destruction of the constituent elements of the ST, the source text identity itself is partially destroyed.

In contrast with this, the PT also implies some creation, the creation of all those figures that were lost, this lost must be compensated. Thus, destruction and creation complement each other; one gives existence to the other, they are two sides of the same coin. Without assuming this necessary destruction, translation would not be possible in practical terms. As Ortega says translation is an impossible task (1937: 49-50). It an impossible task in the sense that a perfect, complete and comprehensive translation is not possible. On the grounds that translation is not within the reach of the human being. Reality is dual; there are two sides to every existing object or thought which are often perceived as opposites, (cf. Freud, 1974: 213-215), although they are only aspects of a more comprehensive reality. Destruction and creation are just two sides of a much wider process; existence; in the case of translation that is the existence of a text. Humans have internalised this duality in the form of instincts, which in the case of the translator are expressed in the act and nature of the PT itself; destruction and creation. As Levine (1991: 7-8) puts it “Something is destroyed-the form of the original-but meaning is reproduced through another form. A translation in this light becomes a

continuation of the original, which already always alters the reality it intends to re-create”.

This is, of course, a global transformation of the text. But the text is also transformed in more particular instances. Some meanings, and some wordplays are lost, but others are created (cf. ead., 1991: 39-45), and yet the text retains its identity. For instance, the extract *the internalized Godfather* (1978: 1), makes reference to the Christian tradition as well as to the dark mafia character of the film *The Godfather*. In Spanish, *el Dios-Padre internalizado* makes no reference whatsoever to the mafia; however, the religious implications are much stronger than in the English. In the Hispanic world, religion is very closely associated to pain. This is so much so, that the very experience of joy or happiness is morally wrong (especially if a woman is experiencing it). Thus, it makes a great deal of sense that Daly wants women to exorcise God the Father from themselves (ead. p. 2). So although part of the meaning was necessarily lost, destroyed in the PT, a new meaning, a new connotation was also created in the same process, exemplifying the paradox of the impossibility/possibility of translation.

In so much as translation is a creative process, it is a sublimation process as well (see Freud, 1949: 14; 1953: 163-164; 1963: 390). Undoubtedly, there are well known techniques and devices which can be learned and taught. These are an invaluable source of help for the translator; however they are clearly not enough. Translation is a creative activity which continually requires lateral thinking. This creative process will now be illustrated with the following example: *a maze/haze of deception [...] is an amazing process* (1978: 2). The strategy most frequently used for this translation has been brain-storming. A straight-forward translation for this terms is clearly insufficient since the Spanish words do not share the same roots (*laberinto*, *niebla*, *sorprendente*), and the *a-mazing* word play would be just not possible. To solve this problem the first strategy was to find synonyms for this words that would hopefully leave more room for games. This was a futile attempt. The next logical step was to think of different semantic fields that would convey the ideas of difficulties to find the way (*maze*), and difficulties to see the way (*haze*), and that at the same time could be somehow related to surprised (*a-mazed*). The word *a-mazing* itself was highly problematical, as not any synonym for *surprising* would do; it had to include the negative prefix *a* to convey that one is counteracting the maze. The solution came finally in the form of an equivalence

a-mazing was translating as *a-sombrante*, which can be read as to break free from the shadows (*sombras*). Unfortunately the graphic/phonic word play of *maze/haze* had to be sacrificed and rendered as *laberinto de sombras* (maze of shadows) so that a connection with *a-sombrante* could be established. Considering that not all levels could be conveyed, the choice of keeping the play on words of *a-mazing* rather than *maze/haze* was imperative, because although this is the only instance of the text in which the latter is found, the former keeps recurring all along the book. This process must be described as creative, so in as much as this so, from a psychoanalytical point of view it can be said that it constitutes a sublimation of the instincts.

It can, of course, be argued that translation is much more than this, which is true. However this paper has no reductionist aspirations. In other words, this work does not constitute an attempt to reduce translation to psychoanalysis; on the contrary the reader will be encouraged to view and experience the process of translation widely, the reader will be invited to expand the experience of translation as far as her subjectivity and perceptions take her. Because experience in its many senses has been considered the key to translate Mary Daly, and because translating her has evoked many psychoanalytical processes in the translator, I have decided to analyse this translation process through the light of psychoanalysis, but never to reduce the process of translation to it.

VIAJE METAPATRIARCAL DE EXORCISMO Y EXTASIS (1978: 1-9)

“Todas la diosas-madre hilan y tejen¹... Todo lo que existe sale de ellas. Tejen el tapiz del mundo entretejiendo el origen y el fin, “los hilos aparecen y desaparecen rítmicamente”.

Helen Diner,
Mothers and Amazons.

Este libro trata sobre el viaje de las mujeres que “llegan a ser”, esto es, feministas radicales. Aquí describo y trazo toscamente el viaje. Digo “toscamente” a modo de vaguedad y de juego de palabras. No sabemos exactamente que hay en el Otro Lado hasta que llegamos; y el viaje es “tosco”. El trazado hecho aquí esta basado en nuestro conocimiento del pasado, en las experiencias del presente y en las esperanzas del futuro. Estas tres fuentes están entrelazadas, son inseparables. La consciencia feminista radical describe espirales en todas direcciones, des-cubriendo el pasado, creando/re-velando el presente/futuro.

El radical proceso-del-ser de la mujer es en muchos aspectos un Viaje al Mundo de la Otredad. Es tanto un descubrimiento como una creación de un mundo distinto al patriarcal. El patriarcado parece estar “en todos sitios”. Incluso el espacio y el futuro han sido colonizados. Como regla general, incluso los escritores de ciencia ficción más imaginativos (supuestamente los futuristas que más se aventuran en pronósticos) no pueden/quieren crear un espacio y un tiempo en el que las mujeres lleguen más allá del papel de azafatas espaciales. Tampoco se puede decir que esta colonización exista simplemente “fuera” de la mente de las mujeres, claramente confinada a instituciones que podemos físicamente dejar atrás. Sino que más bien, también está internalizada, enconándose en las mentes de las mujeres, incluso en las mentes feministas.

Así pues, el Viaje implica un exorcismo del Dios-Padre² que hemos internalizado en sus varias manifestaciones (su nombre es religión), lo que implica peligrosos encontronazos con estos demonios. Dentro de la tradición cristiana, especialmente

¹ N.T.: *spinning and weaving* en el original, que además de hilar y tejer, también significan moverse en círculos, o espirales y zigzaguear respectivamente.

² N.T: *Godfather*, que además de significar Dios-Padre, también significa Padrino, con todas sus implicaciones.

durante el medievo, los espíritus malignos a veces se asocian con los “Siete Pecados Capitales” en ambos sentidos, como personificaciones y como causas. La siguiente es una lista convencional de estos pecados: orgullo, avaricia, ira, lujuria, gula, envidia y pereza. El viaje feminista revela que estos han sido radicalmente mal-llamados, es decir, “entendidos” inadecuado y perversamente. Son expresiones particularizadas del uso general de “maligno” para victimizar a las mujeres. Nuestro viaje implica confrontaciones con las manifestaciones demoniacas de lo maligno.

¿Por qué se ha visto “adecuado” en esta cultura que la trama de un famoso libro y película (*El exorcista*) se centre en un Jesuita que “exorciza” a una niña que está “poseída”? ¿Por qué no hay ningún libro ni ninguna película sobre una mujer que exorcice a un Jesuita? Desde una perspectiva feminista radical está claro que el “Padre” es precisamente el que no puede exorcizar, porque está aliado e identificado con El Poseedor. El hecho de que él mismo esté poseído no debería constituir la principal preocupación de las mujeres. Es un error ver a los hombres como víctimas dignas de compasión o como navíos que han de ser “salvados” a través del auto-sacrificio femenino. Por más poseídos que los hombres estén por el patriarcado, este es el orden que *ellos* han establecido; son ellos los que se alimentan a costa de la energía que les roban a las mujeres. Es una trampa imaginar que las mujeres deberían “salvar” a los hombres de la dinámica de la posesión demoniaca. Somos nosotras mismas las que tenemos que expulsar al Padre de nosotras, convirtiéndonos en nuestras propias exorcistas.

Dentro de una cultura poseída por el mito de la maldad femenina, el nombrar, escribir y teorizar sobre el bien y el mal ha constituido un engañoso laberinto de sombras. El viaje de la mujer hacia la plenitud consiste en abrirse paso a través de este laberinto, y saltar al espacio abierto, lo cual es un proceso a-sombrante.

Abrirse paso a través del Laberinto Machista es a la vez exorcismo y éxtasis. Es avanzar en espiral a través de y más allá del primer plano del padre que es el ruedo. Este movimiento espiral implica irse enfrentando a los demonios que bloquean los distintos umbrales conforme cruzamos una tras otra las puertas hacia las cámaras más oscuras de nuestra tierra natal, que constituyen el Tras-fondo de nuestra Mismidad. Tal y como Denise ha señalado, el Tras-fondo es el reino de la realidad salvaje de la Mismidad de las mujeres. La objetificación y la alienación tienen lugar cuando estamos atrapadas en el primer plano monodimensional, que está centrado en lo masculino. Así pues, los monitores del primer plano, los maestros de los mitos, crean imágenes

prominente y eminentemente olvidables de la mujer en su arte, literatura, medios de comunicación de masas; imágenes diseñadas para moldear a la mujer conforme a los propósitos de los hombres.

El Tras-fondo en el que el viaje feminista avanza en espiral es el reino salvaje de las Arpías y las Hechiceras. Es Hechicer-ocracia. Los demonios que intentan bloquear las puertas a los espacios profundos de este reino a menudo toman formas fantasmales/espectrales, comparables a los gases nocivos no detectables por la percepción sensorial normal. Cada vez que nos adentramos en un espacio más profundo, estos gases abrumadoramente fantasmales tienen como cometido paralizarnos, atraparnos, de manera que seamos incapaces de ir más allá. Cada vez que conseguimos superar su efecto abrumador, más sentidos entumecidos vuelven a la vida. Nuestros ojos interiores se abren, nuestros oídos interiores se desbloquean. Recobramos la fuerza necesaria para atravesar la siguiente puerta y la siguiente. Este movimiento hacia el interior/exterior es el proceso-del-ser. Es el tejer del tapiz cósmico. Es la danza espiral hacia el Tras-fondo.

El proceso espiral requiere la búsqueda de las fuentes de los gases fantasmales que se han filtrado hasta penetrar en las cámaras más profundas de nuestras mentes. “El camino de vuelta a la realidad consiste en la destrucción de nuestra percepción de la misma”, afirma Bergson. Sí, pero estas percepciones engañosas se implantan a través del lenguaje; el siempre persuasivo mito del lenguaje, transmitido abierta y subliminalmente a través de la religión, “el gran arte,” la literatura, los dogmas de la profesionalidad, los medios, la gramática. De hecho, el engaño está incrustado en la textura misma de las palabras que usamos, y es aquí donde nuestro exorcismo puede comenzar. Así pues, por ejemplo, la palabra *puñetera*³ se usa habitualmente como término peyorativo, pero sólo puede funcionar así cuando es aprehendido a un nivel exclusivamente superficial (primer plano). Su significado profundo, que se ha estancado tanto en el Tras-fondo que tenemos que describir grandes espirales hasta poder recuperarlo, es claro y poderoso: “una mujer cuya ocupación es hacer puñetas, coser”. No hay razón para limitar el significado de este verbo rico y cósmico. Una mujer cuya ocupación es hacer puñetas participa en el movimiento giratorio de la creación. Aquella que ha elegido su Mismidad, que define su Mismidad, por elección, ni en relación a los niños ni a los hombres, que tiene su propia identidad, es una

³ N.T: *Spinster*, cuyo significado más actual es el de solterona, aunque originalmente significa hilandera.

Puñetera, un derviche gigante, que gira en un nuevo espacio/tiempo. Otro ejemplo lo constituye el término *glamour*, cuya primera definición según la primera edición del Meridiam-Webster es “un hechizo mágico”. Originalmente se creía que las brujas poseían el poder del glamour, y de acuerdo con los autores del *Malleus Maleficarum*, podían por medio de su glamour causar la desaparición del “miembro” masculino. En su uso moderno, este significado casi ha desaparecido en el Tras-fondo, y el poder del término está enmascarado y asfixiado por imágenes del primer plano tales como las asociadas con la revista *Glamour*.

El viaje es multidimensional. Los distintos significados e imágenes conjuradas por la palabra no son nítidamente distinguibles. Podemos pensar en viajes místicos, de aventuras, búsquedas, en la expansión de nuestras capacidades, en progreso físico e intelectual. De manera que también las barreras son múltiples y están entrelazadas. Estas barreras no son meros bloques inamovibles, sino que más bien son como lenguas engañosas que evitan que escuchemos a nuestra Mismidad, conforme parlotean incesantemente en la Torre de Babel que es la erección de la falocracia. Las voces y los silencios de Babel penetran todos nuestros sentidos. Son las prolongaciones invasoras del enemigo de la capacidad auditiva, soñadora, creativa de la mujer. Se dice que *Babel* viene de una palabra Asirio-Babilonia que significa “puerta de dios”. Cuando las mujeres atravesamos esta barrera múltiple compuesta de engaños eyaculados por “dios” podemos empezar a vislumbrar las verdaderas puertas hacia nuestros adentros, que son las Puertas de la Diosa.

Las Puñeteras podemos encontrar nuestro camino de vuelta a la realidad al destruir las falsas percepciones que nos han sido infringidas a través del lenguaje y de los mitos de Babel. Tenemos que aprender a des-encantar el lenguaje de la falocracia, que nos tiene bajo el encantamiento de la ruptura. Este encantamiento escinde abierta y subliminalmente las percepciones que tenemos de nuestra Mismidad y del cosmos. El viaje a nuestro Tras-fondo significará reconocer que ambos el “espíritu” y la “materia” que se nos presentan en el primer plano del padre, son materializaciones, condensaciones. No son realmente “opuestos”, ya que tienen mucho en común: ambos están muertos, son inertes. Esto se desenmascara cuando comenzamos a ver a través del lenguaje patriarcal. Así pues, el término latino *texere*, que significa tejer, es el origen y la raíz de ambos *textil* y *texto*. Es importante para las mujeres poner de manifiesto la ironía de esta escisión de significados. Puesto que nuestro proceso de tejer cósmico ha sido atrofiado y minimizado hasta el nivel de la manufactura y

mantenimiento de los tejidos. Mientras que la ocupación en sí no tiene nada de degradante, la limitación de la mujer al reino de “la rueca” ha mutilado y reducido nuestro Derecho Divino al tejer creativo, a remendar calcetines. Si miramos el término *texto* y lo contrastamos con *textil*, vemos que representa la otra cara de las condensaciones esquizoides de tejer/hilar. Los “textos” son el reino de los hombres; son el reino de la palabra materializada, del espíritu condensado. En la tradición patriarcal, coser y tejer es para chicas, los libros son para los chicos.

No es de extrañar que muchas mujeres sientan repulsión por el reino de la rueca, que ha sido literalmente el lugar de explotación y prisión de los cuerpos y espíritus femeninos. No es de extrañar que muchas mujeres hayan visto en el reino masculino de los textos una atractiva vía de escape de la ciudad-tumba del mundo textil, que ha simbolizado el confinamiento/reducción de la energía femenina*. El reino de los textos producidos por hombres se ha presentado como el terreno ideal a alcanzar, puesto que hemos sido educadas para olvidar que el “conocimiento” profesional es un proceso robado. Como comenta Andree Collard, en la sociedad de policías y ladrones, aprendemos a olvidar que los policías son ladrones, que ellos nos lo roban todo: nuestros mitos, nuestras energías, nuestra divinidad, nuestra Mismidad.

Las mentes de las mujeres han sido mutiladas y calladas hasta tal estado que el “Espíritu Libre” les ha sido grabado como una marca de fajas y sujetadores en vez de como el nombre de nuestra ex-presión, de nuestro proceso-del-ser. Tales marcas tachan a la mujeres de “Imbéciles”. Imbecilizadas, las mujeres creen que los textos escritos por los hombres (bíblicos, literarios, médicos, legales, científicos) son “verdad”. Así manipuladas, ansían la aceptación como dóciles mujeres-escaparate que recitan los textos de los hombres, empleando la tecnología para los fines de los hombres, aceptando las mentiras de los hombres como si fueran la verdadera textura de la realidad. El patriarcado nos ha robado nuestro cosmos y nos lo ha devuelto en forma de cosméticos y de revista *Cosmopolitan*. Ellos se han inventado nuestro cosmos, nuestra Mismidad. Avanzar en espirales más profundas hacia nuestro Tras-fondo es pecar valientemente contra los Pecados de los Padres. Conforme nuestros sentidos van volviendo a la vida podemos ver/oír/sentir como hemos sido engañadas por sus textos. Comenzamos a des-liar nuestras mortajas. El proceso de exorcismo, de quitarse las

* No deberíamos olvidar que las vidas de incontables mujeres se han consumido en las fábricas explotadoras de los fabricantes textiles, así como también en el tedio diario que implica coser, remendar, lavar y planchar.

capas de cosméticos y los vendajes del torniquete mental, es el movimiento que va más allá del sentido patriarcalmente impuesto de la realidad e identidad. Este proceso de desmitificación, que a-sombra Las Mentiras, *es éxtasis*.

Viajar hacia el centro es movimiento en todas direcciones teniendo el Yo como centro. Borra las pseudo-dicotomías implantadas entre la realidad del Yo y del “otro”, mientras desenmascara la irrealidad tanto del “yo” y del “mundo” tal y como se los retrata, traiciona, en el lenguaje del primer plano de los padres. Adrienne Rich ha escrito:

Al acercar la luz del pensamiento crítico para que influya en su visión, en el mismo acto de *hacerse más consciente* de su situación en el mundo, una mujer puede sentir como se pone más en contacto que nunca con su inconsciente y con su cuerpo.

Avanzar hacia el Tras-fondo/Centro no es mirarse el ombligo. Es el proceso-del-ser/estar en el mundo. El primer plano que los padres ofrecen está lleno de señuelos duales etiquetados de “pensamiento” y “acción”, que nos distraen de la realidad tanto al nivel del conocimiento profundo como de la acción externa. No hay auténtica separación posible.

El viaje es en sí mismo la participación en el Paraíso. Esta palabra, que se dice que viene de los vocablos iraní *pairi* (que significa “alrededor”) y *daeza* (que significa “muro”), se usa habitualmente para conjurar la imagen de un amurallado jardín de los placeres. El Paraíso Patriarcal, tal y como se proyecta en las mitologías religiosas Occidentales y Orientales, se retrata como un lugar o un estado en el que las almas de los justos disfrutan de la gloria eterna después de la muerte, es decir, del cielo. A pesar de los intentos teológicos de darle una apariencia más viva, la imagen que proyecta es la de alie-nación (en una nación alienada) tal y como sugiere la expresión vida después de la vida. En contraste con esto, el Paraíso de la espiral cósmica no esta amurallado. Sino que más bien, es un movimiento incontenible, teje alrededor de y pasados los muros, dejándolos en el pasado. Se mueve hacia el Tras-fondo, que es el centro de la Mismidad en movimiento, habilitando a la Mismidad para que actúe “exteriormente” en el cosmos conforme va despertando a la vida. Este movimiento metapatriarcal no es para Después de la Vida, sino que es Vivir en el ahora, des-cubriendo la vida.

Una definición primaria de *paraíso* es “parque de los placeres”. Los muros del Parque Patriarcal de los Placeres representan el padecimiento de estar perpetuamente estacionado, confinado en al parque del pasado. Un significado básico de *parque* es una “reserva de ganado”. El primer plano de los padres es precisamente este: un ruedo donde el lado salvaje de la naturaleza y de la Mismidad de las mujeres es domesticado, preservado. Es el lugar para la preservación de las mujeres, que son la “propiedad privada” de los padres, que pueden ser servidas a los Amos del Parque depredador, para servirles a su capricho. El Paraíso Patriarcal es el teatro romano, el lugar donde se silencian los ruegos y peticiones de las mujeres, donde la ley es: Complacer a los Patrones. Las mujeres que se liberan de los muros del Recreo de los Playboys que las aprisionan, están entrando en el proceso que constituye nuestra aventura/ventura. Este es el Paraíso que va más allá de los límites del “paraíso”. Ya que nuestro paso por este proceso requiere romper los muros, esto significa liberar al ganado cambiando las reglas del juego, cambiando los nombres de los juegos. Ir más allá del primer plano, que es el Recreo de los Playboys significa dejar libres a los conejitos, a las perras, las víboras, las leonas, las pichoncitas, las gatitas, las vacas, las burras, las zorras, a las brujas y a las viejas, de manera que puedan por fin empezar a darse nombre a sí mismas.

He acuñado el término *metapatriarcal* para describir el viaje, porque el prefijo *meta* tiene múltiples significados. Incorpora la idea de “postpatriarcal”, puesto que significa que ocurre después. Pone al patriarcado en el pasado sin por ello negar que sus muros/ruinas y demonios aún sobreviven. Puesto que *meta* también significa “situado detrás”, sugiere que la dirección del viaje es hacia el Tras-fondo. Otro significado de este prefijo es “cambio en, transformación de”. Éste, por supuesto, sugiere el poder transformador del viaje. Con ello no quiero decir que el movimiento de la mujer “reforma” el patriarcado, sino que transforma nuestra Mismidad. Puesto que *meta* significa “más allá, trascendente”, contiene un correctivo inherente a las nociones reductoras del mero reformismo.

Este proceso metapatriarcal de hacer frente a lo desconocido también implica una conversión continua de lo previamente desconocido a lo familiar. Puesto que lo “desconocido” es la sabiduría robada/escondida, congelada y almacenada por los Abominables Hombres de las Nieves de la Academia Androcática, las Puñeteras debemos derretir estas masas de “conocimiento” con el fuego de la Furia Femenina.

Las expediciones Amazonas a los adentro de los “campos” que los hombres tienen bajo control, son necesarias para abandonar las cuevas de los padres y vivir a la luz del sol. Un problema crucial para nosotras ha sido aprender como re-poseer justamente al tiempo que evitamos quedarnos atrapadas durante demasiado tiempo en las cuevas. En las universidades, y en todas las profesiones, los omnipresentes gases venenosos van ahogando gradualmente las mentes y los espíritus de las mujeres. Aquellas que llevan a cabo las expediciones necesarias corren el riesgo de amilanarse en el molde de la mistificada Atenea, la dos veces nacida, que olvida y niega a su Madre y hermanas, porque ha olvidado su Mismidad original. “Re-nacida” de Zeus, se vuelve la Niña de Papa, la mutante que sirve los propósitos del amo. La mujer-escaparate, encadenada, poseída, “sabe” que es libre. Ella es una herramienta útil del patriarcado, especialmente contra su hermana Artemisa, que sabe mejor lo que se hace, respeta su Mismidad, establece lazos con sus hermanas, y se niega a vender su libertad, su derecho de nacimiento original, por un montón de respetabilidad.

Las a-sombrantes Amazonas deben ser conscientes de los métodos masculinos de mistificación. En otro lugar he discutido cuatro métodos que son esenciales para los juegos de los Padres. Primero, hay un *borrado* de la mujer. (La masacre de millones de mujeres quemadas por brujas ha quedado borrada de la erudición patriarcal.) Segundo, hay una *inversión* (Adán da a luz a Eva, Zeus a Atenea, en el mito patriarcal). Tercero, hay una *falsa polarización*. (El “feminismo” definido por los hombres ha sido dirigido contra el “sexismo” que los hombres definen en los medios patriarcales). Cuarto, hay una *inversión y conquista* (las mujeres-escaparate están entrenadas para eliminar a las feministas de las profesiones patriarcales). Conforme vamos más allá en el viaje patriarcal, encontramos capas más y más profundas de estos patrones demoniacos implantados en la cultura, en nuestras almas. Estos constituyen constricciones mentales comparables a los vendajes de los pies que mutilaron a millones de mujeres chinas durante miles de años. El liberarse capa por capa del torniquete mental/social que ello implica es la esencia de este a-sombrante viaje.

Las Puñeteras no somos sólo A-sombrantes Amazonas que extirpan capas de engaños. Las Puñeteras somos también Sobrevivientes. Debemos sobrevivir, no meramente en el sentido de “seguir viviendo”, sino en el sentido de vivir más allá. Tomo que sobrevivir (del latín *super* más *vivere*) significa vivir por encima, a través, alrededor de los obstáculos que nos arrojan al camino. Esto es difícilmente el muerto

“seguir viviendo” de los escaparates poseídos. El proceso de las Sobrevivientes es meta-vivir, el proceso-del-ser.

Bibliography:

- Baker, M. (1992) *In other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, London and New York: Routledge (2001 ed.).
- Berman, A. (1985) "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign", in Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 2000, 2nd edition 2001, pp. 284-297.
- Chamberlain, L (1988) "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation", in Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 2000, 2nd edition 2001, pp. 314-329.
- Daly, M. (1978) *Gyn/Ecology: the Metaethics of Radical Feminism*, London: The Women's Press Ltd. (1984 ed.).
- Freud, S. (1910) *Two Short Accounts of Psycho-Analysis*, Middlesex: Pelican. (1966 ed.).
- ___ (1922) *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, London: The International Psycho-Analytical Press.
- ___ (1927) *The Ego and the id*, London: Hogarth Press (1942 ed.).
- ___ (1949) *Outline of Psychoanalysis*, London: The Hogarth Press Ltd. (1979 ed.).
- ___ (1953) *On Sexuality*, London: Penguin. (1991 ed.)
- ___ (1958) *On Creativity and Unconscious*, New York: Harper & Row. (1965 ed.)
- ___ (1963) *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Middlesex: Penguin. (1974 ed.).
- ___ (1964) *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Vol. II. Middlesex: Penguin. (1986 ed.).
- Goddard, A. and Patterson, L. M. (2000) *Language and Gender*, London: Routledge.
- Hatim, B. (2001) *Teaching and Researching Translation*, Essex, England: Longman.
- Hervey, S. and Higgins, I. (1992) *Thinking translation*, London: Routledge, reprinted 1997.
- Jakobson, R. (1959) "On Linguistic Aspects of translation", in Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 2000, 2nd edition 2001, pp. 113-118.

- Levine, S. J. (1991) *The subversive Scribe. Translating Latin American Fiction*, Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf Press.
- Newmark, P. (1981) *Approaches to translation*, Oxford: Pergamon Press, 2nd edition 1982.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1937) "The Misery and the Splendor of Translation", in Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 2000, 2nd edition 2001, pp. 49-63.
- Reiss, K. (1971) "Type, Kind and Individuality of Text. Decision making in translation", in Venuti, L. and Baker, M. (eds.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 2000, 2nd edition 2001, pp. 160-171.
- Simon, S. (1996) *Gender in Translation*, London, Routledge.
- Spencer, D. (1980) *Man Made Language*, Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- von Flotow, L. (1997) *Translation and Gender*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Vermeer, H.J. (1989) "Skopos and Commission in Translation Action", in Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 2001, 2nd edition 2001, pp. 221-232.