If this myth is tragic, that is because its hero is conscious ( . . ) The struggle itself toward the heights is enough to fill a man's heart. One must imagine Sisyphus happy.

“The Myth of Sisyphus,” Albert Camus

The good utopian promises himself to be, primarily, an inexorable realist. Only when he is certain of not having acceded to the least illusion, thus having gained the total view of a reality stripped stark naked, may he, fully arrayed, turn against that reality and strive to reform it, yet acknowledging the impossibility of the task, which is the only sensible approach ( . . .) To declare its impossibility is not an argument against the possible splendor of the translator’s task.

“The Misery and Splendor of Translation,” José Ortega y Gasset

Can a translation ever communicate to its readers the understanding of the foreign text that the foreign readers have?

“Translation, Community, Utopia,” Lawrence Venuti

What will he do with the rebellious text? Isn’t it too much to ask that he also be rebellious, particularly since the text is someone else’s?

“The Misery and Splendor of Translation,” José Ortega y Gasset
The task of the translator is surely to work out a strategy that allows the most insistent and decisive effects of that performance to resurface in the translated text and to assume an importance sufficient to suggest the vital status of stratified or contrapuntal writing in the original.

“The Measure of Translation Effects,” Philip E. Lewis

WHILE THE NATIVE-LANGUAGE READER of Cormac McCarthy is always faced with a daunting challenge, his translator into another language faces what is ultimately an impossible task. McCarthy writes in a quintessential American English, in a stylized idiom idiosyncratic to the wordsmith yet deeply rooted either in the landscape and laconic talk of the southern Appalachian foothill and mountain folk (East Tennessee and thereabouts) or the ranchers, ranch hands, and cowboys of the Texas-Mexico border. To begin with, it is an English that often requires re-Englishing by the reader, a Jakobsonian exercise in intralingual translation, so that even the literate native-language reader himself can embark on an understanding of what McCarthy has written, or at least the lexicon he has used or coined. In his Appalachian novels, it is a familiar, rural and folksy American English—“the raw essence of the area’s uniquely guttural dialect” (Gibson)—a southern Appalachia hillbilly baroque style, as polished and complex as it is plain and earthy, with substandard dialectal roots in the tradition of Twain and Faulkner. It is marked by landscape- and object-specific words, an “unparalleled cataloging of physical and natural details” (Gibson), erudition on display through lexical acuteness. It requires the honest reader to consult a good English language dictionary (and other hermeneutic resources) as an aid to fuller understanding—vocabulary glossed in the margins, incongruous in the genre of the novel, would certainly prove useful—, in effect demanding that s/he too become a translator.

In the end, McCarthy’s English—which pulls the reader into and along its pages of narrative description and dialogue while overwhelming him with the undertow of the alloyed strangeness of the language and style themselves and the heretofore unknown characters and worlds created—is also alien for the native-language reader. In his novel Suttree, McCarthy sums up what any reader of his fiction will recall upon reading one of his novels: “The words of the book swam off the page eerily and he thought he’d never read a stranger tale” (294).

Mike Smith. You’re Not from Around Here: Photographs of East Tennessee.
How do you translate McCarthy’s lyrical prose, a flowing riot of words in Appalachian English cascading one upon another, into Spanish? How can you possibly do it? (The alternative, that a foreign-language reader learn American English well enough to read McCarthy in McCarthy’s English, provides no feasible solution because even for the native-language reader McCarthy requires reading skills honed over years, and still what is written in the native language remains alien.) Age-old issues of what and how, content and form, message and manner, sender and receiver—the nature, limits, and possibilities of translation—rise phoenix-like in the task of translating McCarthy, for his unique voice in American English should somehow remain just so as it is carried into other languages, if only this were possible. [based on Doyle, Michael Scott. “‘A whole new style seemed to be seeking expression here’: Cormac McCarthy’s Outer Dark in Spanish.” Translation Review 72 (2007): 9-25.]

Cormac McCarthy won the 2007 Pulitzer Prize for Fiction for his tenth novel, The Road. The Coen Brothers’ adaptation of McCarthy’s ninth novel, No Country for Old Men, is currently playing in theaters around the country and the world. Before our class begins, try to see this movie (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/No_Country_for_Old_Men_%28film%29), if you can, and of course read the novel (not a difficult read as McCarthy fiction goes) at some point! In No Country, Blood Meridian’s Judge Holden reappears in the guise of Anton Chigurh: “Somewhere out there is a true and living prophet of destruction. . . I know he’s real. I have seen his work” (No Country 4).

Cormac McCarthy, now 74 years old, is from Knoxville, TN. He is considered to be one of America’s greatest novelists:

- “Blood Meridian. . . seems clearly to me the major esthetic achievement of any living American writer” (Harold Bloom, The New York Observer)
- “. . . without parallel in American writing today” (Alan Cheuse, USA Today)
- “McCarthy is a writer to be read, to be admired, and quite honestly—envied” (Ralph Ellison)
- “McCarthy is a born narrator, and his writing has, line by line, the stab of actuality. He is here to stay” (Robert Penn Warren)
“Like the novelists he admires—Melville, Dostoyevsky, Faulkner—Cormac McCarthy has created an imaginative œuvre greater and deeper than any single book. Such writers wrestle with the gods themselves” (Michael Dirda, *The Washington Post Book World*).

McCarthy’s prose is so melodious that it demands to be read out loud. . . His fiction is heroic and somber, awe-inspiring and ruefully comic. . . [He] engages with the tremendous questions of life and death and has the weight to take them on” (Lucy Hughes-Hallett, *The Sunday Times, London*).

“With each book he expands the territory of American fiction” (Malcolm Jones, *Newsweek*).

*El País*, Spain’s literary and cultural arbiter equivalent of *The New York Times*, has recognized McCarthy in Spanish as “sinónimo de grandeza literaria.”

(My own opinion is that he is the best of the best!) For more on this amazing southern writer, please visit The Official Web Site of the Cormac McCarthy Society at [http://www.cormacmccarthy.com](http://www.cormacmccarthy.com), which contains very informative articles.

*Suttree* and *Blood Meridian* are widely hailed as his two greatest novels, although all ten of them are great! This course will consist of reading and comparing these two novels with their translations into Spanish, and will explore issues of literary translation such as dealing with dialect, transculturation, exporting the American South and Southwest, technical discourse embedded within literary discourse, cursing and using expletives across languages and cultures, etc. It will focus on close reading (the act of reading itself) and critical analysis of literary translation—writing about what has occurred in the translations, i.e., literary translation criticism. In sum, we will examine the telling of the story in each language and, therefore, the story being told. This analysis, a mapping of the difference between Murillo’s Spanish and McCarthy’s English, will allow us to explore the nature, limits, and possibilities of translation, how English and Spanish differ in their expressive and evocative capabilities, so as to see more clearly what is difficult to translate, untranslatable, and what is lost (or on occasion gained) in translation. Emanating from within the genius of his dialectal American English, does the genius of McCarthy lie inevitably beyond what any other language is capable of doing for him? What are the implications of the answers to this question?

In order to write literary translation criticism, he must know something about literary translation. Therefore, the semester will begin with our reading of renowned translator Gregory Rabassa’s memoir, *If This Be Treason. Translation and Its Dyscontents*. We will also read Clifford Landers’ *Literary Translation: A Practical Guide* and Esteban Torres’ *Teoría de la traducción literaria*. These texts, along with other theoretical considerations will provide a foundation for the literary translation criticism that we will engage in (see syllabus below and consult Graduate Reading List for TTS Track at [http://www.languages.uncc.edu/masters/index.htm](http://www.languages.uncc.edu/masters/index.htm) or [http://www.languages.uncc.edu/masters/TTS%20Reading%20List.doc](http://www.languages.uncc.edu/masters/TTS%20Reading%20List.doc)).

Formally, there will be quizzes on each of the foundational readings: Rabassa, Landers, Torre, et al. Also required is one short essay (5-7 pp., the length of a substantive review) in literary translation criticism and one longer final essay/article (10-12 pp.). The essays in literary translation criticism (12 point Times New Roman font, 1” margins, following MLA guidelines and format) may be written in either English of Spanish (your choice) and will be graded based upon the following criteria, all of which point to analytical “sophistication”:

- Organization and structure
- Style and clarity of expression
- Depth and rigor
- Originality of analysis and insights

Based on our phone interview-conversation with translator Luis Murillo Fort (see next page), we will work together to record, transcribe, and edit the interview to send out for possible publication.

For the final exam, each of you will make a formal, polished 15-minute presentation based on your final analytical essay/article, as if presenting at a professional conference such as ALTA, ATA, ATISA, CATI or the AATSP.

For each class, you are asked to identify several passages or translation units (e.g., words, sentences, paragraphs) that you think pose particular problems for translation. The directionality of this consideration will normally be from McCarthy’s English into Murillo’s Spanish, but we will also explore “reverse reading” possibilities. In an article that I am currently working on, tentatively titled “McCarthy’s *Suttree* as a Translation of Murillo’s *Suttree* (So-o-tray-eh): ‘¿Quién es este otro? Yo no soy otro,’” I explain “reverse reading” as follows:

Normally, translation analysis proceeds from Point A, the bona fide SLT, to Point B, the target language text (TLT) so that the two can be compared sequentially by referring the TLT back to its source. One first reads the SLT, then compares a subsequent reading of the TLT back to, and back and forth, between both texts:
SLT (McCarthy’s English Suttree) → TLT (Murillo’s Spanish Suttree), then SLT / TLT

The technique of “reverse reading,” however, is an inversion of the traditional or expected reading process whereby the translation is read first as if it were in fact the SLT, the predecessor to itself as a translation into the TLT that was formerly the English SLT. Instead of examining how and how well Murillo translates McCarthy, it reverses the order of analysis to consider how and how well McCarthy might represent a translation of Murillo. It reprioritizes reading in favor of the language of the readers of the Spanish translation, for whom Murillo’s translation is indeed the primary text, their SLT, then compares this reading of the Spanish Suttree with the English Suttree as if the latter were now the translation rather than the source language.

SLT (Murillo’s Spanish Suttree) → TLT (McCarthy’s English Suttree), then SLT / TLT

By reprioritizing the traditional sequencing of the two novels, reverse reading serves as a heuristic strategy to help map out further the expressive differences between English and Spanish and the limits and possibilities of translatability. Reverse reading provides us with a different perspective on what Murillo and McCarthy do (can do, are required to do) in their respective languages.

A highlight of the course will be a 45-60 minute conference call with translator Luis Murillo Fort in Barcelona, scheduled for March 26, to talk to him about his translations of Cormac McCarthy, particularly Suttree.

NOTE. The University has enacted “The UNC Charlotte Code of Student Academic Integrity,” presented in the “University Regulation of Student Conduct” section of the UNC Charlotte Catalog. Cheating, plagiarism, fabrication and falsification are expressly forbidden, i.e., one may not intentionally or knowingly present the work of another as his or her own, and one may not invent or alter information for use in any academic exercise. If you are using the ideas and words of another person, you must cite the source. Be especially careful when using internet sources—I will check these! All students are required to read and abide by the “Code of Student Academic Integrity.” Any violation of this Code will result in disciplinary action as provided in the Code. This is serious business with very serious consequences! You may also access the Code online at: www.uncc.edu/policestate/ps-105.html.

LEARNING DISABILITIES. Students with documented disabilities who require accommodations in this class must consult with and formally access services as soon as possible through the UNC Charlotte Office of Disability Services. Students must follow the instructions of that office, located in Fretwell Building #230, for securing appropriate accommodations.

GUIDELINES. Come to every class very well prepared. Your active, high-quality participation is expected. Should extenuating circumstances require that you miss a class, you are expected to notify me in advance.

GRADE DISTRIBUTION.

10% = Class Participation (attendance, quality and quantity of informed discussion and contributions, leadership of discussion on assigned topics, improvement)
15% = Three major quizzes on literary translation (foundational readings)
15% = Short essays (5-7 pp.) in literary translation criticism
15% = Phone interview with Luis Murillo Fort (recording, transcription, and editing to send out for possible publication)
30% = One longer, end-of-semester essay/article (10-12 pp.) in literary translation criticism
15% = Conference paper presentation (final)

GRADING SCALE
A = 90-100 POINTS
B = 80-89
C = 70-79
D = 60-69
F = BELOW 60

REQUIRED TEXTS.

**NOTE: THIS SYLLABUS IS SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION DURING THE COURSE OF THE SEMESTER.**

---

**Week 1**

### January 9

Introduction to the course. Syllabus, texts, sample articles (which will be provided to you as pdf attachments as the semester progresses):

- ______ “Five Translators Translating: Reading *Blood Meridian* from English into English, Spanish into English, and English into Spanish.” Ms. 54 pp., 16,311 words. Forthcoming in *Translation Review* (74).

(NOTE: In response to a request to see some of my own thinking about translation issues, I have included some of my own representative articles on different aspects of translation.)

Representative issues in translating CM: Doyle presentation of “Dealing with Dialect: Cormac McCarthy’s *Outer Dark* and *Blood Meridian* in Spanish”
Week 2
January 16

Week 3

Week 4

Week 5

Week 6
13 Esteban Torre’s *Teoría de la traducción literaria*, pp. 7-37. *Blood Meridian - Meridiano de sangre* (Chapters IX-XIII).

Week 7

Week 8

Week 9

Week 10

Week 11

Week 12
*26* **CONFERENCE CALL TO TRANSLATOR LUIS MURILLO FORT.** *Suttree*, pp. 176-234.

Week 13

Week 14
9 CIBER CONFERENCE – NO CLASS MEETING. *Suttree*, pp. 294-352.
April 16

Week 15

Suttree, pp. 353-411.

Week 16

23


NOTE: We will meet in COED 402 during the scheduled final exam period on Wednesday, May 7, from 5-7:40 p.m., so that I can return your graded final essays in literary translation criticism to you. At this final meeting, each of you will have 15 minutes to present your final work (as if at a professional conference).

---

1 His first four novels are set in or near the Appalachian mountains: The Orchard Keeper (1965), Outer Dark (1968), Child of God (1974), and Suttree (1979). His fifth through ninth novels are set in the desert southwest of the Texas-Mexico border: Blood Meridian, Or the Evening Redness in the West (1985), All the Pretty Horses (1992), The Crossing (1994), Cities of the Plain (1998), and No Country for Old Men (2005). His tenth and most recent novel, The Road (2006), is set in an anonymous, bleak, ash-colored post-apocalyptic landscape whose terrain (from the mountains to the sea) could be a topography from a state such as North Carolina. For more on McCarthy and his works, visit the excellent Official Website of the Cormac McCarthy Society at http://www.cormacmccarthy.com/.

ii In his essay “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation,” Russian linguist Roman Jakobson identifies the first of “three ways of interpreting a verbal sign” as “intralingual translation or rewording (. . .) an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language” (145).

iii The Official Website of the Cormac McCarthy Society contains a “Translations” section in the “Resources” link which provides translations into English of the Spanish language passages that McCarthy incorporates in his novels Blood Meridian, All the Pretty Horses, The Crossing, and Cities of the Plain. In this article I am interested in the problems of translation proper, Jakobson’s interlingual translation, of McCarthy’s American English into Spanish.

iv This image of a “guttural dialect” is given by Mike Gibson: “In an article that seems destined to become something of a classic, Knoxville Metro Pulse writer Mike Gibson looks at McCarthy's non-Western canon as well as his life in and around Knoxville; the article includes interviews with several people who knew McCarthy during his East Tennessee days.”

v In his essay “Problems of Translation: Onegin in English,” Vladimir Nabokov, an advocate of fidelity as literalism in translation, prescribes “translations with copious footnotes, footnotes reaching like skyscrapers to the top of this or that page,” as compensation for the translator’s (reader’s) ignorance.

vi For example, even to an American such as me, who was raised and has lived, worked, and traveled in the Appalachian piedmont and mountains of Virginia and North Carolina, and who has visited neighboring East Tennessee.

vii In his essay “The Misery and Splendor of Translation,” the Spanish thinker José Ortega y Gasset writes that “it is utopian to believe that two words belonging to different languages, and which the dictionary gives us as translations of each other, refer to exactly the same objects” (96). The essay discusses translators as either good or bad utopians: “The bad utopian thinks that because it [translation] is desirable, it is possible,” while “the good utopian, on the other hand, thinks that because it would be desirable to free men from the divisions imposed by languages, there is little probability that it can be attained; therefore it can only be achieved to an approximate measure” (96, 98-99). By Ortegian, I refer to the “good utopian” translator who recognizes the impossibility of translation while at the same time proceeding to translate with this full awareness, the Sisyphean consciousness of Camus.

viii Friedrich Schleiermacher: “Either the translator leaves the writer alone as much as possible and moves the reader toward the writer, or he leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the writer toward the reader” (42).

ix Rabassa writes in his essay “If This Be Treason: Translation and Its Possibilities,” that “Some books are very mulish about being ‘led across’” (24). But moving the reader toward a mulish source text that is alien to begin with is also very problematic.

x Dynamic equivalence is the “quality of a translation in which the message of the original text has been so transported into the receptor language that the response of the receptor is essentially like that of the original receptors.” The focus is on message and meaning transfer, as opposed to formal correspondence or literalness (200-201).

xi Readership typology includes the following, drawn from the discourse of reader-response criticism: the “real” reader (the actual person with book in hand—Gibson, Iser); the “autonomous” reader (there is the book and here am I—Michaels); the “mock” reader (a reading persona or role assumed by the “real reader”—Gibson); the “implied” reader (“a textual structure anticipating the presence of a recipient without necessarily defining him”—Iser) who approaches the “virtual” or “assumed” reader (whom the author imagined as a reader of what he/she has written—Prince); the “informed” or “at-home” reader (who knows the language in which the text is written and “has literary competence”—Fish); the “gap” reader (who fills in the blanks and vacancies of indeterminacy by “[supplying] the missing links”—Cohen, Iser); the “trace” reader (who tracks down “the multiplicity of traces” that help fill in the “gaps” in a reader’s understanding—Doyle); the “hypothetical” reader (“the one upon whom all possible actualizations of the text may be projected”—Iser); the “ideal” reader (who “would understand perfectly
the least of the author’s words, the most subtle of his intentions”—Prince); and the “super” or “multiple” reader (Riffater, etc. For more on readership typology, see Jane Tompkins, (Reader-Response Criticism) and Wolfgang Iser (The Act of Reading and The Implied Reader) and bibliographies in these works.