

PERITEXT OF THE RUSSIAN TRANSLATION
OF WILLIAM HOGARTH'S *ANALYSIS OF BEAUTY*: A CASE STUDY

L. B. Boyko¹, K. S. Chugueva¹, A. K. Gulina¹

¹ Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University
236016, Russia, Kaliningrad, 14 A. Nevsky St.
Submitted on September 26, 2020
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-1-2

*Translation of philosophical texts is a special challenge because of specific philosophical idiom and conceptual complexity of the narrative. It is not surprising that such translations are often accompanied by commentaries where the translator steps out of the shadows to justify the translational decisions. This kind of supplementary text called the "translational peritext" is under study in this paper aiming to reveal the cognitive effort the translation process involves, and to explore the author-translator-reader relationship. The purpose of the article is to analyze paratextual elements in the translation of an essay on philosophical aesthetics in search of answers to three main questions: What does the translator choose to comment on, and why? What is specific about the role and function of translational peritext in philosophical artistic discourse? How do the commented translational decisions affect, if at all, the reader's understanding of the author's stance? The problem of revealing the translator's agency, his/her motivations and decision-making is investigated on the basis of the essay *Analysis of Beauty* by the celebrated 18th century English artist William Hogarth – an influential philosophical treatise whose ideas have never lost their relevance. The paper starts with the brief account of the concept of paratext, its types and functions; it will then proceed to specificities of philosophical translation. In the main part of the article, the background information on the material under study precedes the analysis of the identified commented translational issues.*

Keywords: *peritext, translation, translator, commentator, philosophical, syntax, quotes, proper names*

...translators need to develop an ability to stand back and reflect on what they do and how they do it.

...they have to prove to themselves as well as others that they are in control of what they do;

[that]... like other professionals, they have made a conscious effort to understand various aspects of their work.

Mona Baker. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation

1. Introduction

The epigraph to this paper was chosen to inspire the discussion about the explicit means making the translator visible. The translated text as the end-product of the translation process is only the tip of the iceberg, while the



body of underlying research and acquired cultural knowledge are hidden from the recipient's eyes. A rare opportunity to show at least part of the cognitive effort the translation process involves is provided in annotated translations where comments and notes known as peritext are meant to elucidate key translational issues. The purpose of the paper is to show translational peritext as the end product of a complex cognitive activity aimed to bring the author closer to the reader and to allow profound insight into the mechanics of translation. Based on the English-Russian translation of the seminal 18th-century philosophical treatise by William Hogarth on the principles of art, our study attempts to identify the "hot spots" the translator chose to comment on. We will also discuss the translator's agency in this specific interaction with the reader.

We will try to find answers to the questions as follows:

- What does the translator choose to comment on, and why?
- What is the role and function of translational peritext in philosophical artistic discourse?
- How do the commented translational decisions influence, if at all, our understanding of the author's stance?

The paper starts with a brief account of the concept of paratext, its types, and functions; it will then proceed to discuss the specificity of philosophical translation. In the main part of the article, some background information on the material under study precedes the analysis of the identified commented translational issues.

2. Paratext and translation

The translator's is a humble occupation because most often there is little more than just the translator's name mentioned in a publication, if at all (more on this issue in Gondek, 2011; Flores, Hoff, 2018). Among the few spaces where translators can stand up for themselves are various text forms usually adjacent to the main text or surrounding and supporting the core text (Genette, 1987, pp. 1–4), "an assorted set of practices and discourses of all sorts and all ages" (Genette, Maclean, 1991, p. 262) incorporated into the concept of paratext. Paratext is further subdivided into epitext and peritext, the former consisting of all elements that are outside the focus text, such as interviews, publicity, reviews, etc., and the latter including all the elements that are physically part of a (published) text, such as titles, post- and prefaces, notes, and commentaries – to name but a few. In terms of authorship, the two primary types are authorial and editorial paratexts. Writing a paratextual element can be delegated to a third party (for example, the author of the preface being other than the editor, or the translator providing his/her notes and comments); collectively, such elements are termed the allographic paratext (Ibid., p. 266). Although a text rarely appears 'in its naked state' (Ibid., p. 261), not all paratextual constituents are obligatory for presenting a text. While authorial and editorial paratexts feature quite regularly in their various manifestations and combinations, there are less recurrent paratextual components that may or may not accompany the main text. Indeed, as part of social and cultural practices of publishing, editorial paratext is practi-



cally indispensable in a physical book, which can be explained by this element's mediating role defined by the cultural sphere of the book's life cycle, from its issuing and circulation to reception (Kovacs, 2007, p. 251).

As some texts gather more paratextual elements around them while others get by with a minimum of those, the question arises, why not all texts are equally privileged to be amplified with more paratext. Obviously, a book (or a smaller-scale text) of some repute is more likely to be accompanied by paratext than a lesser-recognized one; it is also more likely to be translated and, thus exposed to public appreciation because that way its circulation obviously increases (Schögler, 2018, pp. 62–63). The value and, therefore, the presence of other paratextual components depend on many factors, such as the type of text, the type of publication, publishing policies, etc. (For example, children's literature is less likely to obtain much paratextual attention than philosophical writing; however, scholarly editions of translations of *Alice in Wonderland* abound in commentaries).

Within Genette's triplex system of paratextual authorship (authorial, editorial, and allographic), of special interest are translator-authored "presentational materials accompanying translated texts" (Tahir Gürçağlar, 2002, p. 44), such as comments and notes. Interestingly, Tahir Gürçağlar holds translator's prefaces to be neither authorial nor allographic but ones that should be handled separately as a fourth paratextual category, for translatorial [prefaces] may contain the information on the translation process, normally absent from authorial paratexts (Tahir Gürçağlar, 2013, p. 93).

It was in search of the translator's voice that Translation Studies (TS) turned to investigating paratext, because one of the huge topics in TS is the translator's visibility. To become visible, translators need to be granted space to express themselves through the paratextual mechanism. (Flores, Hoff, 2018, p. 45). However, not every translated text enjoys the privilege of being commented on, for it is not the translator's choice to have or have not a voice in a publication— it is rather a result of translation policy (Toledano Buendía, 2013). Once the translators are granted a chance to defend their translational decisions, to communicate the difficulties they came across and, therefore, to be heard, they explicate their role as social agents and active participants in the dialogue between the author and the reader. The translator as activist (Barkuzar, Haneen, 2018; Baker, 2007) participates in constructing knowledge and voicing his/her stance. No less important is the fact that this immediate peritext endows the translator with the right to be subjective (Dumas, 2018).

3. Functions of para- / peritext

Paratext by definition provides a space for the interpretation of the main text (Schögler, 2018, p. 72; Nord, 2012, p. 400). Nowhere is translation made better explicit as a cognitive process than in the translator's comments and notes. Apart from knowledge dissemination through equipping the reader with relevant background information, translatorial peritext lays bare the translator's mind at work.



In terms of their functioning, various types of peritext share some common features while differing in others. Thus, notes are described as peritext of two main types: those used to supplement the text in order to inform or explain and help readers by clarifying obscurities, and those with a performative function commenting on the text (Toledano Buendía, 2013, p. 157). The tone of informative notes is defined as “erudite” (Ibid., p. 158) while the ones fulfilling a performative function convey the translator’s opinion and judgement (Ibid., p. 159). Through the peritextual mechanism, the translator is capable of influencing the target reader’s interpretation of the translation – for example, in case some tenets run counter to contemporary beliefs (Ibid., 159). In addition to the explanatory and informative functions, translatorial elements may fulfil a prescriptive one for other translators (Rodica, 2009, pp. 198–200), being “a source of extensive information on the translation methods” (Munday, 2016, p. 52). However, whether the translator, by showing how to go about translation, prescribes solutions or, on the contrary, opens up his/her own doubts and second thoughts, remains to be an open question. There is no doubt, however, that, as spaces of translatorial knowledge-making (Schögler, 2018, pp. 62–63), all peritexts fulfill their educational function in this way too. Another interesting approach to paratextual typology is shown in (Dondukova, 2013): the author suggests cognitive types of translator’s comments described as egalitarian, authoritative, and that of cognitive dissonance. Indeed, a deeper insight into this area where the translator’s policies and sentiment meet is worthy of special attention.

4. Philosophical texts in translation

As was mentioned above, not all writings are amplified with paratext, but translations of philosophical texts require explication more often than not. In terms of translation, philosophical texts present a particular challenge: “But of all the kinds of translation, none is trickier than the translation of philosophy” (Rée, 2001, p. 226). The hindrances of philosophical translation are caused primarily by the obscurity of philosophical writing, or its inherent quality which is “a sensitive and perhaps artfully elaborated documentation of an essentially intractable enigma” (Ibid., p. 227).

From the stylistic point of view, some philosophical writings are closer to technical texts, i. e. the representative texts of Anglo-Saxon analytical philosophy; others are more poetic, such as the philosophical writings of some German-speaking authors. Researchers discuss the subjective factors that influence the translator’s reception process in the pre-translation phase: the degree of familiarity of the translator with the oeuvre of the author whose work he is translating; with secondary sources of commentaries and critical reading; or with the social, cultural and philosophical context in which the respective work was produced. Thus, the translator’s attitude to the target public and the ratio of fidelity to treason would be deeply influenced by the reception process, which in its turn is decidedly dependent on the above-mentioned degree of familiarity. Translators of philosophical texts face a dilemma since they are compelled to oscillate between two translation principles: that of transferring an unaltered message on the one hand, and of preserving the rhetoric which defines the subjectivity of the text, on the other (Vârlan, 2014).



5. Material and methodology

In this paper, we focus on the translational peritext of the 1987 annotated edition of the Russian translation of *The Analysis of Beauty* by the 18th century English painter William Hogarth – a treatise in which the celebrated artist also emerges as philosopher and theoretician of art. We will attempt to garner the translator's stance regarding the relevance of the commented instances by identifying and systematizing them.

The whole picture of the peritextual part in the edition under study comprises the Editor's Note, a brief untitled foreword, a most substantial article "William Hogarth and his Analysis of Beauty" (Alexeev, 1987; further referred to as *The Article*), Footnotes, and Endnotes. The most elaborate analysis of translational issues is given in the endnotes which make the centerpiece of our study here. The editorial Foreword contains a few general remarks on the translational challenges. Here, among the hurdles that had to be overcome in translation, the editor briefly mentions the cumbersome syntax and flamboyant style, wrongly spelt proper names, and imprecise quotations (Hogarth, 1987, p. 5). Other peritextual elements are not related to translational issues.

For the purposes of our research, we reached out beyond the Russian translational peritext and used other available sources directly related to the Analysis. Some translational choices commented on by Alexeev necessitated cross-checking with the only other Russian translation (uncommented) of *The Analysis* by A. Sydorov. Likewise, H. Jansen's (uncommented) French translation of 1805 came in helpful. In order to confirm and verify some thoughts shared in the peritext under study, we also referred to the editor's notes provided for the English edition of the treatise. Although the latter is also uncommented, this text helped us to contrast and compare some points of interest.

6. Discussion

6.1. Background

The Analysis of Beauty, a momentous – if highly polemical – work on the sum and substance of art, was written in 1753, and to the present day it remains to be a widely acknowledged philosophical essay. Further amplifying his undisputedly "new and revolutionary" (Hogarth, 2010, p. 15) artistic oeuvre, Hogarth's book contributes to the tradition of thinking about artistic practices as much as it does to the lore of "universalizing theoretical aesthetics" (Ibid., p. 15). Ch. Davis, the author of the Introduction to the 2010 commented edition, notes that the *Analysis* opens a view onto the great pictorial satirist's "mind and mentality thus disclosing knowledge that cannot be gained from his paintings and prints alone, nor from the exterior facts of his biography" (Ibid., p. 16).

Deemed a landmark in the history of artistic thought (Hogarth, 2010, p. 8), Hogarth's essay enjoys quite a peculiar status. On the one hand, from the



very outset its author did not write it as a learned treatise for his fellow artists but rather intended to influence fluctuating ideas of taste of both the artistic and dilettante communities. Hogarth intentionally avoids overloading his work with technical terms, which explains why the *Analysis* is described as “the first sustained *anti-academic* treatise in the history of aesthetics” (Ibid., p. 9 – our emphasis). On the other hand, however, the *Analysis* undoubtedly has made history of aesthetic thought (Hogarth, 1987, p. 6), as it lies out the theoretical foundations of visual art. Ch. Davis in his Introduction emphasises the author’s uncanonical empiric approach to art theory, to that end quoting F. Antal, “The book’s real significance lies in its revolutionary approach to art theory on the part of an experienced painter – an empirical and psychological approach, no longer based on the customary vague phrases – its amazing wealth of new observations and the way it stresses variety in art in contrast to a belief in cut-and-dried mathematical proportions.” (Hogarth, 2010, p. 11).

The treatise belongs to the category of texts worthy of international attention and, therefore, demanding translation – it did ‘achieve canonicity’ (Schögler, 2018, p. 72), and very shortly after publishing, too. The overwhelming acclaim of this philosophical treatise explains why it was translated into German already the next year after publication; soon after that the Italian translation came out (1761); much later (1805) it was translated into French. The very first Russian translated version was published in 1936 (Hogarth, 1936), but it was neither commented (except for a brief introductory note), nor did it contain the full text of the treatise. The first scholarly edition – an annotated translation – came out in 1958 (Hogarth, 1958), to be republished in 1987. The key words here are ‘annotated’ and ‘scholarly’, and it is the latter that requires some deliberation. In line with the above-discussed general approach to differential treatment of texts, we should remark that not every “canonised” text is honoured to come out in a scholarly edition – a long-form publication involving in-depth academic research, and it is one more reason why profound analytical commentaries accompanying a seminal philosophical work are worthy of special attention.

Both the Russian annotated editions of the book contain extensive commentaries by the academician M.P. Alexeev whose exhaustive study done for the 1st edition (1958) was further supplemented with more comments and notes from his archives in the 1987 version – the one under study in this paper. The peritext in this edition comprises a short Foreword authored by the editorial board followed by a brief untitled (apparently by M.P. Alexeev) Preface. The latter is important as it specifies that the translation was made using the very first, author-supervised publication of 1753; however, the later 1955-edition came very helpful: along with the authentic core text it contained “Rejected passages from the manuscript, drafts and autobiographical notes” (Hogarth, 1987, p. 5). Alexeev used in the notes. Although the analytical piece “William Hogarth and his *Analysis of Beauty*” by M.P. Alexeev is termed ‘article’ in Russian, it is, in fact, a 100-page-long scholarly paper on W. Hogarth’s life, creative work and theoretical achievement. The rest of the peritextual ingredient – footnotes and extensive endnotes – are also authored by Alexeev.



6.2. *Translator vs commentator*

It is important to note that the actual translator's name is only given on the title page; meanwhile, all the comments and notes, including the translation-related instances, belong to the academician M.P. Alexeev who is also named as translation editor. This interesting observation brings about the translator's agency issue. With all due respect to the unquestionable authority of the academician, the question arises why the translator (P. Melkova) is not given her share of peritext. Is it a case of deep mutual understanding and ideal collaboration between the translator and the academic editor, which resulted in delegating the translational revelations to the scholar?

Undoubtedly a man of encyclopedic knowledge, M.P. Alexeev was not only an outstanding researcher of wide scholastic interest but also a polyglot. An expert in Hogarth's cultural heritage, he was more than competent to comment on translation, with his huge experience in translating and editing translations from English, German and French. His article preceding the translated text is generally acknowledged as the most profound Russian-language analysis of the great English artist's oeuvre to date. The cultural commentaries, historic references and the analysis of polemics around the treatise are absolutely invaluable as they present a worldview of the artistic community of the 18th century England and continental Europe.

For obvious reasons, neither the author of the comments nor the translator can be approached with our questions (they lived and died in the previous century), but we can make an educated guess about their collaboration. P. Melkova could be commissioned a translation which later underwent editing and elaborate analysis by academician Alexeev who, as an ethical person, acknowledged her part by mentioning her name on the cover. In all likelihood, however, there was a very close cooperation between the translator and the academician. (It should be noted that P. Melkova was an eminent figure in the realm of 20th-century English-Russian translation). Given that peritext belongs to the sphere of research and explication, it is only reasonable to leave the scholarly part to be done by a scholar. It is of no less importance that, with his impressive background, Alexeev also enjoyed a more established position to be entitled to incorporate translational notes in the extensive body of the peritext. With this in mind, we will further alternatively refer to the author of the comments as "translator" or "commentator".

6.3. *Translational peritext in the Russian edition of *The Analysis**

The better part of the peritext in the 1987 Russian edition of *The Analysis* is devoted to the artist's biography and various cultural references of encyclopedic nature. For our purposes, we focused on the translation-related comments most of which emerge in the endnotes and are just briefly mentioned in the editorial Foreword and in the untitled introductory piece (presumably by Alexeev). As it appears, three types of translational challenges the commentator chose to discuss are united by the same principle — they are all about the imperfections of the source text: faulty syntax, incorrect



quoting, and the use of proper names. Another category of comments is different: it deals with tackling the principal concepts in the translation. The lexical cluster of comments includes such words as *grace*, *sublime*, *connoisseur*, and the phrase *и je ne sçai quoi* functioning as terms in the treatise. They are of crucial importance for the whole of Hogarth's philosophical system and as such merit a more detailed consideration in a separate paper (see in this volume). Therefore, below we will consider three categories of the translational challenges identified by the commentator: Syntax, Quotes, and Proper names.

6.4. Syntax

The syntax of the treatise required the translator's special attention, for the very length of sentences in the treatise was obviously a challenge – those containing up to 200 words are not infrequent in *The Analysis*) Consequently, the sentences are complex and hard to grasp, although Hogarth had involved some of his friends to correct the style of the manuscript (Hogarth, 1987, pp. 217–218). Interestingly, the commentary to the English edition also contains a remark not just on the complexity of syntax and exceedingly generous placement of commas but also the resulting rumours about the authorship of the treatise: “One may wonder if this reflects Hogarth's uncertainty in expressing his thoughts in writing, or is a result of the intervention of one of his pre-publication readers attempting to bestow greater clarity upon Hogarth's thoughts. Immediately following the initial publication of the *Analysis* Hogarth's critics loudly claimed that the artist's friends had written it for him”. (Hogarth 1753, p. 16). Whatever the reason for the unwieldy syntax, the translator's ultimate aim is to make the target text (TT) readable and fully permeable, and the textbook solution would be to break an overloaded syntactical construction into smaller ones. The cumbersome syntax and excessive punctuation (alongside spelling errors) are apparently viewed as a translator's routine technical challenge – therefore, the fact is just indicated in the comments, but the actual translational solutions are never detailed. Although dealing with such authorial imperfections is an obvious cognitive challenge for the translator, the reader is informed, but not burdened with it. Why then does it still earn a mention? Can hedging be the reason for sharing concerns about imperfections of style and syntactical hurdles? Or is it because the translator is seeking appreciation for overcoming such difficulties? The latter could be a reason, because the addressee is supposed to be a well-educated audience whose opinion matters. Assuming that, in the case of intellectual texts, the translator-commentator is on a par with the reader, we can suggest that such instances should be regarded as snippets of the translator/commentator's “stream of consciousness” – cognitive milestones signalling of cognitive dissonance where the translation process slowed down. Although the syntactical hurdles in the text under study are but scantily mentioned, the very presence of the commentary on them testifies to the cognitive challenge they pose.



6.5. Quotes

The reader of the translation is forewarned in the Foreword about some inexact quoting in the source text (ST). The imprecise citing of John Dreyden's translation (from Latin) of the poem *The Art of Painting* (by Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy (Du Fresnoy), 1611–1665), is dealt with in Note 10 (Hogarth, 1987, pp. 209–210). According to Alexeev, only 1.5 line from Dufresnoy's original poem is reproduced correctly. The underlined segment in the quotation below represents what is left from Dufresnoy in Hogarth's text: "Du Fresnoy, in his art of painting, says *large flowing, gliding outlines which are in waves, give not only a grace to the part, but to the whole body; as we see in the Antinous, and in many other of the antique figures: a fine figure and its parts ought always to have a serpent-like and flaming form; naturally those sort of lines have I know not what of life and seeming motion in them, which very much resembles the activity of the flame and of the serpent.*" (Hogarth, 1753, p. 21) (punctuation and spelling retained; emphasis added). As it appears, Hogarth rather quotes Dreyden's comments on the poem *Observations on the Art of Painting* significantly reducing them, but not the poem itself which runs as follows in the original: *Membrorumque sinus ignis flammantis ad instar, // Serpenti undantes flexu...;* (Engl.: *Gulf members, like a fire, laden // serpent coils*).

The translator also notes that the numbers of the quoted verses are confused: in fact, Dreyden's translation contains similar ideas in verses 87–96, not in verse 28, as Hogarth states it. These observations of imperfect citing allow the translator to assume that Hogarth probably did not have at hand the book he was quoting but simply cited from his own – not quite accurate – notes. Such attention to detail on the part of the commentator reveals more than just his scholarly attitude to the text; it also draws a picture of Hogarth's intellectual space.

The next quote is also deemed wrong as it is not found in Dreyden's translation of Du Fresnoy's, according to Alexeev. However, whether he means the one in the footnote (A) or another in the same paragraph mentioned above (B) is unclear. Here they are:

A. "See Dreyden's translation of his latin (sic.) poem on Painting, verse 28, and the remarks on these very lines, page 155, which run thus, "It is difficult to say what this grace of painting is, it is to be conceived, and understood much more easy than to be expressed by words; it proceeds from the illuminations of an excellent mind, (but not to be acquired) by which we give a certain turn to things, which makes them pleasing." (Ibid., pp. 21–22).

B. "But to say the truth, this is a difficult undertaking, and a rare present, which the artist rather receives from the hand of heaven than from his own industry and studies'.

Hogarth does not seem to care much about the accuracy of citing. Another case is the wrongly quoted title "Le Brun's passions of the mind" Translated into Russian after Hogarth's version «Лебренувы душевные состояния». The original title was *Conférence de M. Le Brun... sur l'expression générale et particulière*, further republished under various titles, as we come to know from Prof. Alexeev (Hogarth, 1987, p. 236).



Why should imprecise quoting be interesting from the translational point of view? Whatever the ST's faults, the translator chooses to stick to the author's text as closely as possible anyway. It is a well-justified strategy that shows the translator's respect for the author: trespassing the author's territory would be ethically – and historically – wrong. However, mistakes and imperfections are never left without notice on the translator's part if he/she has a voice. They require clarification both for the sake of the inquisitive reader and for the translator establishing his/her territory of a cultural communicator (Britto, 2007, pp. 202–203). Such notes are indicative of the translator's excellence and reliability – as if he/she were saying 'I have researched it, trust me'; they are also informative and enlightening.

6.6. *Proper names*

The commentators in both the Russian and English editions of *The Analysis* note that the original text of the treatise is full of minor and major linguistic imperfections and "inconsistent usage" (Hogarth, 1753, p. 122). Among such cases are numerous proper names that are either mis-spelt in the ST or spelt in an unconventional manner (according to contemporary standards). In part, it is explained by the ever-present problem of rendering proper names in different languages; it is not surprising therefore that, in the absence of any standardization in Hogarth's time, names were spelt by the ear. The translation keeps to the 20th-century spelling norm "by default", but certain cases require clarification in the comments to avoid confusion.

For example, according to Alexeev, Hogarth is not alone in mis-spelling the name of the then-fashionable royal portraitist Sir Pieter (Peter) Lely, alias Van der Faes 1618–1680, as his name used to take various shapes in English: Lilley, Lily, Lylly, and even Lelio (Hogarth, 1987, p. 237). However, Hogarth's spelling "Lilly" leads to confusion because there was a second-rate artist Edmond Lilly (died 1716). Two things are important here in terms of commenting on translation. Firstly, the correct cultural contextualisation for the identification of an individual artist; secondly, the spelling and pronunciation of the name in Russian. In English, all the graphic forms (except Lelio) have the same sound shape [lili]; in Russian, Pieter Lely's name is spelt Лели and pronounced as [leli].

Another case is the French artist Jacques Christoph Le Blon (1670–1741) whose name takes the form "James Christopher le Blon" in Hogarth's text. Alexeev remarks that it is not without a reason that Hogarth anglicizes the name, for the latter had lived in England for the better part of his adult life (Ibid., p. 215). The anglicized name is therefore retained in the Russian text: "Этот трактат был... переведен на английский Джеймсом Кристофером ле Блоном" (Ibid., p. 112), although in Russian his name normally takes its Germanized form – Якоб Кристоф Леблон. This note is important both because it helps to identify the right individual, and it shows the translator's conscientiously differential treatment of names in translation.

One habitually mis-spelt name in the ST is that of the Italian artist and author Giovanni Lomazzo (1538–1600) spelt as "Lamozzo" (Ibid., pp. 206–207). Alexeev notes that various incorrect spellings are retained in all other edi-



tions of the treatise, but he does not make an attempt to make a guess why. However, Ch. Davis in his Preface to the English edition suggests an interesting version: “He never refers to Lomazzo correctly as ‘Lomazzo’, calling him instead usually “Lamozzo” and occasionally even, somewhat ridiculously, “Lemozzo”. Possibly Hogarth did not really care to get Lomazzo’s name right, preferring to flaunt his ignorance, and revealing perhaps a trace of ambivalence toward a precedent that might seem to pre-empt his discovery” (Hogarth, 1753, p. 10). Duly following the rules, the Russian translator puts the name right as Ломацио in the TT; likewise, all other proper names take their regular graphic shapes. Among them are the names of the Flemish painter Van Dyck spelt as “Vandyke” and the great Italian Michelangelo (Michael Angelo) are easy to place, and they simply get their established Russian counterparts in the TT. Indeed, all the names are easily recognizable, as the commentator of the English edition notes: “most of these will be obvious to many readers, ones who will also recognize that “Peter de Cortone” refers to the Roman baroque painter, Pietro da Cortona” (Ibid., p. 122). Judging by the conventional spelling of these proper names in the TT, the Russian translator maintains a similar stance (so does the French translator).

The question persists: why comment on what otherwise would have been unnoticed by the reader since in the TT nothing seems to be wrong with the names? The answer could come from the very nature of scholarly commentary, given that philosophical text requires precision and exactness. Apart from showing the translator’s mind at work and revealing how much research is involved in the translation process, the commentator not only restores the true picture of the original text but adds an attitudinal touch to the image of the author. The ultimate aim of commentary therefore appears to be creating new knowledge about the author and the epoch. Interestingly, comments also show us the difference in contemporary practices of dealing with proper names in translation compared to those at the time when the actual translation was done. For example, today, we do not translate but transliterate magazines’ titles; meanwhile, in the comments under study, *The Tatler* and *The Spectator* are provided with their Russian counterparts *Болтун* and *Зритель* accordingly (Hogarth, 1987, pp. 213–239). However, *The Gentleman’s Magazine* is left in the original spelling (Hogarth, 1753, p. 239).

7. Conclusion

In the annotated translation of W. Hogarth’s *Analysis of Beauty*, the overall translational component of peritext (discussion of issues overtly pertaining to translation) does not exceed 10 per cent of the whole body of the commentary, comprising lexical issues – proper names among them – alongside textual fragments (quotes) and minimal syntactical observations. Leaving the terminology-related comments for investigation in a further study, we can sum up that the discussed notes on syntax, quotes, and proper names are brought into focus for commenting first and foremost because there is a need to deal with the imperfections detected in the original text. Such comments fall under the above-mentioned “authoritative” type. Alongside establishing his/her territory, the translator fulfils the role of enlightener



and educator for the readership. While putting the wrong things right the commentator simultaneously throws the author's writing process into relief. A broader picture of bringing the work into being created in the notes enhances the reader's understanding of the author's stance completing the artist's philosophy with the snippets of his living image.

Cervantes famously compared translation with the wrong side of Flemish tapestries. Extending it to the translation-commentary relation, we could compare translation as an end-product to the front side of the tapestry, the wrong side then being the translational peritext – it shows the machinery of translation along with all the “knots and whatnots” of the original. Translational peritext gives us an opportunity to view translation as a heuristic process. By its very nature, philosophical discourse invites commentary, and comments become part and parcel of philosophical discourse in their turn. Peritext shows translation as by far more than a mere transfer of knowledge to a new intellectual space but as a knowledge-making process. Peritext builds on the created knowledge thus expanding the reader's horizons. Translation viewed as a means of constructing cultures and contributing to cultural enrichment surpasses the boundaries of interlinguistic exchange of information emerging as a precondition of any social and humanitarian knowledge (Rebrii, 2018).

References

- Alekseev, M.P., 1987. William Hogarth and his “Analysis of Beauty”. In: W. Hogarth. *Analiz Krasoty* [The Analysis of Beauty]. Leningrad. pp. 7–115 (in Russ.).
- Baker, M., 2007. Reframing Conflict in Translation. *Social Semiotics*, 17 (2), pp. 151–169.
- Barkuzar, D. and Haneen, A., 2018. The translator as an activist: reframing conflict in the Arabic translation of Sacco's Footnotes in Gaza. *The Translator*, 24 (2), pp. 147–165.
- Britto, P.H., 2007. As condições de trabalho do tradutor. *Cadernos de Tradução*, 1 (19), pp. 193–204.
- Dondukova, G.P., 2012. Principles for defining the boundaries of a translation commentary. *Vestnik Buryatskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Ser.: Romano-germanskaya filologiya* [Bulletin of the Buryat State University. Vol.: Romano-Germanic philology], 11, pp. 65–69 (in Russ.).
- Dumas, F., 2018. Le paratexte en devenir dans la traduction. Genèse et fonctions du paratexte traductif. *Atelier de traduction, Section Dossier thématique*, 30, pp. 103–118.
- Flores, V.d.N. and Hoff, S.L., 2018. Le dire des traducteurs: une analyse de paratextes de traduction. *Atelier de traduction, Section Dossier thématique*, 30, pp. 33–47.
- Genette, G. and Maclean, M., 1991. Introduction to the Paratext. *New Literary History*, 22 (2), pp. 261–272.
- Genette, G., 1987. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated from French by J.E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gondek, H.-D., 2011. On the Translation of Philosophical Texts and Philosophical Translation Theories. *Filosofsko-literaturnyj zhurnal “Logos”* [Philosophical Literary Journal “Logos”], 5–6 (84), pp. 193–211 (in Russ.).
- Hogarth, W., 1936. *Analiz Krasoty* [The Analysis of Beauty]. Translated by A. A. Sydorov. Moscow (in Russ.).



Hogarth, W., 1958. *Analiz Krasoty* [The Analysis of Beauty]. Translated by P.V. Melkova. Leningrad (in Russ.).

Hogarth, W., 1987. *Analiz Krasoty* [The Analysis of Beauty]. Translated by P.V. Melkova. Leningrad (in Russ.).

Hogarth, W., 2010. "To see with our own eyes": Hogarth between native empiricism and a theory of "beauty in form". *William Hogarth: The analysis of beauty* (London: Printed by John Reeves for the Author, 1753) [pdf] FONTES 52. Available at: http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/artdok/1217/1/Davis_Fontes52.pdf [Accessed 13 March 2018].

Kovacs, S., 2007. Discourse analysis and book history: literary indexing as social dialogue. *Variants*, 6, pp. 243–262.

Munday, J., 2016. *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. Vol. 4. London: Routledge.

Nord, C., 2012. Paratranslation – a new paradigm or a re-invented wheel? Perspectives: *Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 20(4), pp. 399–409.

Rebrii, O.V., 2018. Translation as a means of constructing cultures: philosophical foregrounding. *Cognition, Communication, Discourse, Series "Philology"*, pp. 64–71.

Rée, J., 2001. The Translation of Philosophy. *New Literary History*, 32 (2), pp. 223–257.

Rodica, D., 2009. Translators' prefaces as documentary sources for translation studies. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 17 (3), pp. 193–206.

Schögler, R., 2018. Translation in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Circulating and Canonizing Knowledge. *Alif Journal of Comparative Poetics*, 38, pp. 62–90.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş., 2002. What Texts Don't Tell: The Use of Paratexts in Translation Research. In: T. Hermans, ed. *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*. pp. 44–60.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş., 2013. Agency in allographic prefaces to translated books: An initial exploration of the Turkish context. In: H. Jansen and A. Wegener, eds. *Authorial and editorial voices in translation 2 – editorial and publishing practices*. pp. 89–108.

Toledano Buendía, C., 2013. Listening to the voice of the translator: A description of translator's notes as paratextual elements. *Translation & Interpreting*, 5 (2), pp. 149–162.

Vârlan, C.-I., 2014. Difficulties and constraints in translating philosophical texts. Mechanisms of reception and the (in)stability of meaning. *Diversité et Identité Culturelle en Europe*, 11 (2), pp. 69–82.

The authors

Dr Lyudmila B. Boyko, Associate Professor, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia.

E-mail: boyko14@googlemail.com

Kristina S. Chugueva, Independent Researcher, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia.

E-mail: KSCHugueva@gmail.com

Alexandra K. Gulina, Independent Researcher, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Russia.

E-mail: s.gulina@gmail.com

To cite this article:

Boyko, L.B., Chugueva, K.S., Gulina, A.K. 2021, Peritext of the Russian translation of William Hogarth's Analysis of Beauty: a case study, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 12, no. 1, p. 34–49. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-1-2.



ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПЕРЕВОДЧЕСКОГО ПЕРИТЕКСТА
(на основе перевода на русский язык труда по философской эстетике
«Анализ красоты» Уильяма Хогарта)

Л. Б. Бойко¹, К. С. Чугуева¹, А. К. Гулина¹

¹ Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта
236016, Россия, Калининград, ул. Александра Невского, 14
Поступила в редакцию 26.09.2020 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-1-2

Переводы философских текстов представляют особую сложность из-за специфичности средств выражения в философском дискурсе и концептуальной сложности самого дискурса. Неудивительно, что такие переводы часто сопровождаются комментариями, в которых переводчик «выходит из тени», пытаясь объяснить свои переводческие решения. В настоящей статье рассматриваются комментарии к переводному тексту, называемые переводческим перитекстом, с целью выявить, какие когнитивные усилия задействованы в процессе перевода, а также каково взаимодействие между переводчиком, читателем и автором. Цель статьи заключается в том, чтобы проанализировать паратекстуальные элементы в переводе эссе по философской эстетике в поисках ответов на три основных вопроса: Что переводчик предпочитает комментировать и почему? В чем особенность роли и функции трансляционного перитекста в философском арт-дискурсе? Как комментируемые переводческие решения влияют – если вообще влияют – на понимание читателем позиции автора? Проблема активного участия переводчика, его мотивации в принятии решений исследуется на материале эссе «Анализ красоты» известного английского художника XVIII века Уильяма Хогарта. Программный философский трактат художника не теряет своей актуальности до настоящего времени. Статья начинается с краткого изложения концепции паратекста, его типов и функций; затем будет рассмотрена специфика философского перевода. В основной части статьи дается справочная информация по исследуемому материалу, за которой следует анализ выявленных комментируемых переводческих проблем.

Ключевые слова: перитекст, перевод, принятие решений, создание новых знаний, переводческий комментарий, философия

Список литературы

- Baker M. Reframing Conflict in Translation // *Social Semiotics*, 2007. Vol. 17, №2. P. 151–169.
- Barkuzar D., Haneen A. The translator as an activist: reframing conflict in the Arabic translation of Sacco's Footnotes in Gaza // *The Translator*, 2018. Vol. 24, №2. P. 147–165.
- Britto P. H. 2007. As condições de trabalho do tradutor // *Cadernos de Tradução*, 2007. Vol. 1, №19. P. 193–204.
- Dumas F. Le paratexte en devenir dans la traduction. Genèse et fonctions du paratexte traductif // *Atelier de traduction, Section Dossier thématique*. 2018. Vol. 30. P. 103–118.
- Flores V.d.N., Hoff S.L. Le dire des traducteurs: une analyse de paratextes de traduction // *Atelier de traduction, Section Dossier thématique*. 2018. Vol. 30. P. 33–47.
- Genette G. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge, 1997.



Genette G., Maclean M. Introduction to the Paratext // *New Literary History*. 1991. Vol. 22, №2. P. 261–272.

Kovacs S. Discourse analysis and book history: literary indexing as social dialogue // *Variants*. 2007. Vol. 6. P. 243–262.

Munday J. *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. 4th ed. L., 2016.

Nord C. Paratranslation – a new paradigm or a re-invented wheel? // *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*. 2012. Vol. 20, №4. P. 399–409.

Rebrii O. V. Translation as a means of constructing cultures: philosophical foregrounding // *Cognition, Communication, Discourse*. Series «Philology». 2018. №16. P. 64–71.

Rée J. The Translation of Philosophy // *New Literary History*. 2001. Vol. 32, №2. P. 223–257.

Rodica D. Translators' prefaces as documentary sources for translation studies // *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*. 2009. Vol. 17, №3. P. 193–206.

Schögler R. Translation in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Circulating and Canonizing Knowledge // *Alif Journal of Comparative Poetics*. 2018. Vol. 38. P. 62–90.

Tahir Gürçağlar Ş. Agency in allographic prefaces to translated books: An initial exploration of the Turkish context // *Authorial and editorial voices in translation 2 – editorial and publishing practices* / H. Jansen, A. Wegener (eds.). Montreal, 2013. P. 89–108.

Tahir Gürçağlar Ş. What Texts Don't Tell: The Use of Paratexts in Translation Research // *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues* / T. Hermans (ed.). L., 2002. P. 44–60.

"To see with our own eyes": Hogarth between native empiricism and a theory of 'beauty in form'. William Hogarth: The analysis of beauty (London: Printed by John Reeves for the Author, 1753) // *FONTES* 52. URL: http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/artdok/1217/1/Davis_Fontes52.pdf (дата обращения: 13.03.2018).

Toledano Buendía C. Listening to the voice of the translator: A description of translator's notes as paratextual elements // *Translation & Interpreting*. 2013. Vol. 5, №2. P. 149–162.

Vârlan C.-I. Difficulties and constraints in translating philosophical texts. Mechanisms of reception and the (in)stability of meaning // *Diversité et Identité Culturelle en Europe*. 2014. Vol. 11, №2. P. 69–82.

Алексеев М.П. Уильям Хогарт и его «Анализ красоты» // Хогарт У. Анализ красоты. Л., 1987. С. 7–115.

Гондек Х.-Д. О переводе философских текстов и о философских теориях перевода // *Философско-литературный журнал «Логос»*. 2011. Вып. 5–6 (84). С. 193–211.

Дондукова Г.П. Принципы определения границ переводческого комментария // *Вестник Бурятского государственного университета. Сер.: Романо-германская филология*. 2012. Вып. 11. С. 65–69.

Хогарт У. Анализ красоты / пер с англ. А.А. Сидоров. М., 1936.

Хогарт У. Анализ красоты / пер. с англ. П.В. Мелкова. Л., 1958.

Хогарт У. Анализ красоты / пер. с англ. П.В. Мелкова. Л., 1987.

Об авторах

Людмила Борисовна Бойко, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Россия.

E-mail: boyko14@googlemail.com



Кристина Сергеевна Чугуева, независимый исследователь, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Россия.

E-mail: KSCHugueva@gmail.com

Александра Константиновна Гулина, независимый исследователь, Балтийский федеральный университет им. И. Канта, Россия.

E-mail: s.gylina@gmail.com

Для цитирования:

Бойко Л.Б., Чугуева К.С., Гулина А.К. Особенности переводческого перитекста (на основе перевода на русский язык труда по философской эстетике «Анализ красоты» Уильяма Хогарта) // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2021. Т. 12, №1. С. 34–49. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2021-1-2.