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Abstract

This thesis compares style in the ‘Todesarten’ [literally: manners of death] texts by Austrian author Ingeborg Bachmann (1926-1973) with their English translations: the novel *Malina* (*Malina*; Philip Boehm), the novel draft *Das Buch Franza* (*The Book of Franza*; Peter Filkins) and the story collection *Simultan* (*Three Paths to the Lake*; Mary Fran Gilbert).

The fact that Bachmann was a woman significantly influenced the descriptions by German-language critics in the 1950s, ‘60s and ‘70s of the author herself, as well as their evaluations of her work. Bachmann’s extended metaphors, ambiguity, iconicity, transitivity structures and intertextuality suggest that her prose texts, and especially *Malina*, should be regarded as proto-feminist masterpieces whose contemplation of the post-war human condition and society’s treatment of women were far ahead of their contemporaries.

Boehm’s and Filkins’ translation choices show parallels with criticism expressed in German-language reviews. The reduction of the networks of stylistic features in the translations results in a weakening of the links between content, style and politics which are crucial to Bachmann’s texts. These changes mean that the English-language reader experiences Bachmann’s texts in a fundamentally different way. The male translators largely silence what I term women’s language in *Malina* and *Franza*, and consequently conceal much of Bachmann’s proto-feminist message. It is clear that these changes are not necessitated by the constraints of translating Bachmann’s complex texts into English because Gilbert, the female translator of *Simultan*, manages to recreate the texts’ style.
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A Note on the Translation of Titles and Quotations

Unless otherwise noted, all translations of foreign-language quotations and titles not printed in italics are mine.

Translations of titles presented in italics within square brackets constitute published works.

Translations of examples in Chapter 3 followed by a page number are taken from Philip Boehm’s translation Malina, Peter Filkins’ translation The Book of Franza, Mary Fran Gilbert’s translation Three Paths to the Lake and Lilian Friedberg’s translation Last Living Words. Translations of examples in Chapter 3 not followed by a page number constitute my suggestion of alternative options.
Gender and Style in the Translation and Reception of Ingeborg Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ Texts
Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis explores the role of the author’s and translator’s gender in translation by examining style in the ‘Todesarten’ [literally: death styles; ways of dying] texts by Austrian author Ingeborg Bachmann (1926-1973) and their English translations:


The word ‘Todesarten’ translated literally means ‘ways of dying’ or ‘types of death’. It is the title of a cycle of three novels that remained unfinished at the time of Bachmann’s death, with the exception of *Malina*. Bachmann’s estate contains many text fragments that scholars presume she intended to use for the ‘Todesarten’. Albrecht and Göttsche’s five-volume ‘Todesarten’-Projekt (1995) contains all of these together with editorial comments and analyses. The main focus will be on the novel *Malina* because of the novel’s complex style and the unusual circumstances of its German reception. *Malina* contains a list of dramatis personae at the beginning of the book, but otherwise follows the conventions of novel writing, such as the division into distinct chapters, and is therefore a postmodern book according to Barry’s (2009: 87) definition, because of the mix of genres it encompasses. *Malina* is divided into three chapters. The first one introduces the reader to the female narrator, who is listed in the dramatis personae as ‘Ich’ [I] and remains nameless throughout the novel, as well as Ivan, her romantic interest, and Malina, the man with whom she shares an apartment. The narrator’s inner monologue concerning her thoughts about her daily life, her relationship with Ivan, and her environment is interspersed with conversations, business letters that she dictates to her secretary, and the ‘Legend’ of the Princess of Kagran. The second chapter consists in large part of the narrator’s nightmares about atrocities committed against her by a ‘father’ figure, interrupted by conversations with Malina. The third chapter presents the narrator’s conversations
with Malina as well as their increasingly complicated relationship, and culminates in her death when she disappears into a crack in the wall.

As this thesis is intended as a case study, and “evidence from multiple cases is often considered more compelling” (Yin 2009: 53), reference will also be made to the novel fragment *Das Buch Franza* and the short story collection *Simultan*, as both are considered part of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’-cycle. *Simultan [Three Paths to the Lake]* encompasses five stories, of which ‘Simultan’ [‘Word for Word’] and ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ [‘Eyes to Wonder’] are the most relevant (see Chapter 3) because they contain complex networks of metaphors that can be linked to Bachmann’s political views. ‘Das Gebell’ [‘The Barking’] introduces Franza Jordan, the main protagonist of *Das Buch Franza [The Book of Franza]*, and gives the reader a brief glimpse into her family and relationship background. The short story collection was published in 1972 in order to fulfil Bachmann’s contractual obligation to provide the publisher Piper with another book. Some of the stories in *Simultan* were taken from the over 1000 pages she had written for the ‘Todesarten’ (Weigel 2003: 511). My investigation is intended as an individual case study rather than as an empirical study as the latter would require a large sample of source texts and target texts in order to ascribe translational divergence to the translator’s gender. As *Malina* was the only completed text, the examples presented in this thesis outnumber those taken from *Franza* and *Simultan*.

---

1 Bachmann left Piper in protest at their publication of Anna Akhmatova’s poems in a translation by Hans Baumann, a poet favoured by the Nazis (Filkins 2006: 638). *Malina* was published by Suhrkamp, and Bachmann expressed the intention to work with this publisher for future publications in several letters to Siegfried Unseld, Suhrkamp’s editor.
1.1 Aims of the Study

This first chapter of the thesis gives an overview of the possible effects of gender on translation and of the issues that emerged in my analysis of the translations. It also serves as a literature review and explains why this particular case study is suited to an exploration of the question of gender in translation. Lastly, this chapter will explore Bachmann’s as well as the translators’ backgrounds.

These are the aims of my study:

1) I aim to find out whether the source texts and target texts can be seen as women’s writing in the sense that they exhibit characteristics that over the course of this thesis (and especially in Chapter 2) are established as hallmarks of 20th-century women’s writing. Is the voice in the source text gendered, and is this also the case in the target text? These issues are mainly addressed in Chapter 2.

2) I aim to find out how two male translators and one female translator transform texts written by a female author. I investigate the translators’ choices at language level through stylistic analysis in Chapter 3.

3) I aim to find out the likely effect of the author’s gender on the translations and source and target text reception. Chapter 2 discusses Bachmann’s reception in the German-speaking territories while Chapter 4 addresses the Anglo-American reception of the ‘Todesarten’.

Points to be raised in the present chapter include whether women’s writing has a feminine voice and what ‘feminine’ could be seen to mean. The meaning of the terms ‘women’s writing’ and ‘women’s language’ as used in the analysis of source and target texts as well as in literary criticism will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2. The term ‘female’ refers to biological aspects and, in opposition to ‘male’, serves to describe sexual difference, whereas ‘feminine’ denotes the social construction of gender (Moi 1989: 122). Judith Butler provides a useful distinction between sex and gender: “[s]ex is understood to be the invariant, anatomically distinct, and factic aspects of the female body, whereas gender is the cultural meaning and form that that
body acquires, the variable modes of that body’s acculturation” (Butler 1986: 35). ‘Feminine’ could mean a woman’s standpoint, which is not always helpful because not all women have the same views all the time and gender is not the only factor that influences people’s perspectives, but it could also refer to stereotypical views of women. The source and target texts analysed here were produced in a Western context by European and North-American, German- and English-speaking authors and translators between 1940 and 1999. For that reason, in this thesis ‘feminine’ will denote features that would be stereotypically associated by a present-day audience with German- and English-speaking women in 20th and 21st-century European and North-American cultures, while ‘women’s language’ will be used to describe the nexus of style, content and politics that can be found in German-language women’s writing of the 1970s, and especially in Malina. I discuss my reasoning for this term in Chapter 2. Langis, Sabourin, Lussier and Mathieu define masculinity and femininity thus:

[m]asculinity includes traits typical of males which refer to an instrumental, task, and achievement orientation: Masculine persons possess a high level of drive and ambition and are assertive leaders. Femininity contains traits typical of females and refers to a focus on the emotional and expressive aspects of life: Feminine persons are sensitive, responsible, and interpersonally oriented.  

(Langis, Sabourin, Lussier and Mathieu 1994: 394)

These traits are recognisably stereotypical, and it must be borne in mind that Langis et al.’s study is a sociological one. I shall use their definition in order to assess the German critics’ evaluations of Bachmann’s writing and behaviour at public events according to their expectations of masculinity, femininity and their expression in language and literature over the course of this thesis.

Gender differences in language use and conversational style have been studied extensively (for example, by Lakoff 1975; Thorne and Henley 1975; Maltz and Borker 1982; Coates and Cameron 1988; Tannen 1993, 1994, 1995; Holmes and Meyerhoff 2003; Speer 2005). Many of these studies focus on traits that play a part in women’s subordinate position in Western society. One problem arising from these

---

2 Although Malina was not published until 1971, it is thought that Bachmann began work on the Todesarten cycle in the 1940s (Albrecht and Götsche 1995: 616).
studies is that women are often described in terms of their difference from men, but men’s behaviour is only ever implied as the norm from which women differ and is never explicitly specified. Sara Mills, who has published extensively on feminist stylistics, criticises the work of feminist linguists such as Dale Spender and Jennifer Coates, stating that “this type of research has never defined, except by implication, the male norm from which its female speech is supposed to deviate” (Mills 1995: 34). While this may be true, some work on specifically male language use has been published since (for example, Johnson and Meinhof 1997; Coates 2002).

Mills further emphasises that “feminists simply followed the ground rules laid down by male linguists before them. They implicitly accepted that research into sex difference should try to prove that women are in fact inadequate males” (Mills 1995: 34). The examples quoted by Mills include Peter Trudgill’s study (1972) of East Anglian dialects and Deborah Cameron’s (1985: 50) reference to a survey of Malagasy language use: while Trudgill unfavourably highlights the fact that women were more conservative in their use of dialect, Malagasy men’s conservatism is seen positively. Mills concludes that “in many sociolinguistic studies, sexism is operating at the level of hypothesis formation and at the level of interpretation of the results” (Mills 1995: 34). One example that could be seen to support this revolutionary statement is Sally McConnell-Ginet’s discovery (1978) that many women make their statements sound like questions by raising the pitch of their voice. Instead of sharing her conclusion that women demonstrate a lack of assertiveness by doing this, one could posit the view that women try to engage their conversation partner(s) by inviting them to express an opinion, and by doing so exhibit a higher communicative competence.3

Research on language and gender has now moved away from a binary view, so that femininity and masculinity are seen as part of a spectrum and not necessarily linked to biological sex: Mills (1987: 197) has argued against a binary view of writing while Foster (Foster 1999: 434) emphasises the importance of contesting the fixed relationships between sex, gender, and sexuality (also see Bing and Bergvall’s 1996 book, which includes a chapter on binary thinking; and Freed’s ‘Epilogue’ in

---

3 Canale and Swain state that strategic communicative competence “may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence” (1980: 30), thus using a questioning tone or question tags could perhaps be seen as strategies to solve or avoid breakdowns in communication.
Holmes and Meyerhoff 2003 which disputes ‘female’ and ‘male’ as binary categories).

My approach as outlined in 1) above is similar to the one taken by Vanessa Leonardi in her 2007 book on differences in female and male translators’ strategies: she compares Frances Frenaye’s translation of \textit{L’età del Malessere}\footnote{Frances Frenaye (1963): \textit{The Age of Discontent}} (1963) and Stuart Hood’s translation of \textit{La Vacanza}\footnote{Stuart Hood (1966): \textit{The Holiday}} (1962) by Dacia Maraini with Frances Frenaye’s translation of \textit{Cristo si è fermato a Eboli}\footnote{Frances Frenaye (1958): \textit{Christ Stopped at Eboli}} (1958) by Carlo Levi and Stuart Hood’s translation of \textit{Teorema}\footnote{Stuart Hood (1992): \textit{Theorem}} (1968) by Pier Paolo Pasolini. Leonardi gives a comprehensive overview of the subject areas that need to be examined in the context of gender and translation, and positions her work with respect to previous research on ideology and translation: she references Venuti’s views on power relations between cultures (Leonardi 2007: 21), Hatim and Mason’s work on detecting ideology in translation, Robinson’s and Cheyfitz’s postcolonialism, and feminist translation. She attempts to draw a connection between gendered language use outside the field of translation on one hand, and developments in ideology in translation on the other hand (Leonardi 2007: 22). The analytical model used by Leonardi to evaluate the translations, based on a critical contrastive text linguistic approach (2007: 25), is “a useful tool in the analysis of ideology and gender-related issues in translated texts” (Perteghella 2008: n.p.). Her work serves as a very useful starting point for my thesis. My analysis of the translations of Bachmann’s work will be based on Leonardi’s framework in that my analysis makes reference to developments in areas external to translation studies such as feminist criticism and cognitive stylistics; however, it will eventually divert from this as Leonardi’s strict comparison of four translations does not take into account how the source and target texts were received at the time of publication or later, whereas Bachmann’s and especially Malina’s reception is a key element of my case study as I posit that the source texts’ misogynous reception influenced the translators’ choices.

Leonardi reaches some interesting conclusions, namely that the translator’s gender affects their choices in the texts included in her study, and Chapters 3 and 5 of my thesis show the extent to which my own findings are similar to hers. One
noteworthy result of Leonardi’s comparison at grammatical level concerns transitivity: she found that both Frances Frenaye (in her translation of Carlo Levi) and Stuart Hood (in his translation of Pier Paolo Pasolini) used nominalisation, but while Leonardi determines Hood’s nominalisation to be neutral rather than manipulative as it does not change viewpoint or ideological positioning (Leonardi 2007: 236), she notes that Frenaye’s transformation of passive structures into nominalised structures gives rise to “a sense of abstraction and generality and allow[s] concealment especially in terms of power relations” (ibid.: 271). This is very intriguing as nominalisation has previously been examined in the context of gender: a 2003 study of 604 documents belonging to the British National Corpus exploring differences between female and male writing (fiction and non-fiction) found that male writers tended to use marginally more nouns than their female counterparts (Argamon, Koppel, Fine and Shimoni 2003: 334). This realisation, together with the finding that men employed a far greater number of specifiers and determiners, whereas female writers used more pronouns, led the researchers to conclude that men provide more details about classes of things and that women personalise their messages (ibid.). While I did not carry out a quantitative study concerned with the classes of words used by female and male translators, but rather a stylistic analysis which involves the context of the texts’ production and its reception, the findings of the study by Argamon et al. nevertheless provide justification for my investigation: if it is possible to ascertain that women and men occasionally use different language in their writing, it is likely that this can also happen in translation. However, the realisation that there are differences is only the beginning: in my opinion, it is necessary to evaluate both the reasons for and the consequences of differences in language use.

My thesis examines the reception of Bachmann and her work in German-speaking countries and gives an overview of the critics’ evaluation of Bachmann’s personality, appearance and private life (Chapter 2): the extent to which she performed femininity according to the norms of her time stood in the foreground of portrayals by journalists and academics until the arrival of feminism. I shall make brief reference to the reception of other female writers in order to demonstrate that evaluations of appearance and demeanour are a common occurrence in criticism of female writers. Chapter 4 explores the effects of Bachmann’s initially biased reception, as well as the effects of the feminist criticism that subsequently superseded
it, on the translators’ interpretations of the source text and their construction of the target texts.

My study uses theories set out by feminists and stylisticians, such as Judith Butler and Sara Mills, in order to be able to classify the translators’ choices in the context of societal developments. Broadly speaking, feminists “analyze how patriarchy naturalizes male and female divisions, making it seem natural, right, unremarkable that women are subordinate to men” (Wood 2005: 61). The analysis of this process has undergone fundamental changes since it first began. Chapter 2 charts the development of feminism in Germany, while Chapter 4 looks at feminist criticism in the English-speaking world, in order to give an overview of Bachmann’s and the translators’ likely situations and to reflect on their possible resulting ideological viewpoints.

As this analysis of Bachmann translations looks closely at language issues, I adopt a cognitive-stylistic approach to translation, according to which the translator’s cognitive context, understood as a combination of world knowledge and previously-read texts, influences both her/his interpretation of the source text and the way in which the target text is composed. Cognitive-stylistic theories help explain choices made by the translator as they are concerned with readers’ interpretations and their manifestation in the translation. They also include the notion that the target text reflects the translator’s ideology and personal views and can explain translation choices by allowing us to sketch the translator’s potential interpretation based on a textual network of stylistic features.

I shall further involve elements of Linguistic Relativity and Linguistic Determinism: this is essential when analysing potentially gendered language as these theories find explanations for societies in their members’ language use. Humboldt in the 19th century thought that each language expressed a unique Weltanschauung [world view] (Gumperz and Levinson 1996: 2), a standpoint that was later extended by Sapir and his student Whorf. They advanced the distinction between Linguistic Relativity and Linguistic Determinism, and other scholars extended these concepts even further. This is explored in section 1.7.

Ideology will also play a role in this study, as I aim to investigate to what extent Boehm and the other translators may have been influenced by the German criticism of Bachmann’s work and in how far his translation in particular may have been affected by the feminist movement. A translation is a representation of the
translator’s interpretation of the work. Consequently, if Boehm was aware of the German critics’ tendency to evaluate Bachmann’s personality and appearance rather than her work, a phenomenon that is examined in detail in Chapter 2, this may have led him to follow their example by interpreting Malina as purely autobiographical. If, however, he were also aware of feminist evaluations of Bachmann and her work, it seems likely that Boehm would have made different choices in his translation, perhaps preserving elements which are commonly seen as particularly feminine, such as the fragmented structure and the language. These tend no longer to be seen as negative features contributing to a text’s inferior nature because it is no longer acceptable to condemn characteristics associated with women as automatically inferior. Feminism and the way criticism has developed mean that employing literary devices typically seen as feminine can result in iconicity: stylistic devices which are usually seen as feminine may appeal to commonly held beliefs which can produce particular effects in the reader’s mind. Thus the use of fragmented sentences by Bachmann, for example, could be interpreted as an expression of the difficult situation of women. Boehm’s ideological position could determine whether he sees Bachmann’s style as inferior writing and therefore imposes his own, or judges it to fulfil a particular purpose and thus seeks to preserve it.
1.2 Hypothesis

1.2.1 The Influence of the Reception on the Translations

The main hypothesis of this study is that the male translators counteract aspects of the source texts that can be seen as women’s language, and that the female translator preserves these aspects. When I began this research project, I expected to find that the male translators consciously or unconsciously ‘correct’ in the target texts elements that have been seen negatively by Bachmann’s German critics, and alter structures that are predominantly ‘feminine’ as defined in section 1.1, or can be seen as women’s language, as defined in section 2.6.2.

Immediately following its publication, Malina was labelled an “in einem irritierenden Sinne weibliches Buch” [a book that is feminine in an irritating sense] (Rüedi; cited in Albrecht and Göttscbe 2002: 24), therefore it is apparent that Bachmann’s critics considered the aspects that did not meet their approval to be the result of the text’s or Bachmann’s supposed femininity. It must be borne in mind, however, that this type of criticism, which is misogynous by today’s standards, came largely from members of Gruppe 47, a group that consisted primarily of male authors and critics. From 1947 to 1967, the group invited writers to present their work at the yearly meeting and determined the success or failure of some of these authors’ careers through their criticism. If some Gruppe 47 members ascribed the accomplishment of Bachmann’s first poetry collection to the group’s influence, they would have been unlikely to support her literary change of direction. If the translators had access to this type of criticism of Bachmann’s work, these views may have influenced, consciously or subconsciously, their approaches, or they might share these views even without having read about them. Conversely, it is also possible to expect the translators to disagree strongly with a negative view of what they or the critics interpreted as feminine and consequently choose strategies that preserve or even emphasise these elements. The analysis presented in Chapter 3 shows that the male translators appear to have been influenced by the misogynous

---

8 The Gruppe 47 was a group of young antifascist authors who dominated West Germany’s literary scene (though failed to affect its politics) until the early 1960s (Lennox 1998: 57) and counted among its members Heinrich Böll, Günter Eich, Ilse Eichinger, Hans Magnus Enzensberger, Günter Grass, Erich Kästner, Sigfried Lenz and Marcel Reich-Ranicki.
view of Bachmann expressed by German critics in the early 1970s. Chapter 3 and sections 4.5 and 5.4 give further detail about the link between criticism and translation as well as gender and stylistic choice.

In addition to the above assumption, my hypothesis is that feminist criticism has had little effect on the translations by male translators and especially *Malina*: the inclusion of an afterword by male critic and translator Mark Anderson is, in my view, significant in the case of a novel which can be seen to thematise a woman’s speechlessness and eventual eclipse by a man.
1.2.2 The Effect of Gender on Translation: What Could It Be?

This section examines the possible effects that the translators’ gender can have on the target texts. Leonardi identifies different ways in which gender could affect translation:

some translation strategies could modify the ST [source text] author’s ideology either unconsciously, because of a lack of professional competence, a misunderstanding of the ST message or as a consequence of cultural differences between the ST and the TT [target text], or consciously, in order to adapt the ST ideology to that of the [target culture] readership, or to avoid being offensive towards the [target culture] community, or directly to oppose or challenge the ST language and culture, particularly in the case of sensitive texts, such as political, feminist or religious texts. The sex of the translator or of the ST author and/or the ST typology might be the reasons behind these strategies. (Leonardi 2007: 20)

It is difficult to say with certainty which of these factors help explain differences between source and target text, but by exploring the source text’s culture and the translator’s background, it is possible to give indications as to which reasons are most likely. Leonardi’s view suggests that there is a functional aspect to gender in translation: it varies according to situation and audience – the translator adapts to what s/he sees as her/his task and audience. This means that the analyses of the different translations will lead to different overall results depending partly on the translators’ expectations with regard to audience.

According to Sherry Simon, “[g]ender […] is never a primary identity emerging out of the depths of the self, but a discursive construction enunciated at multiple sites” (Simon 1996: 7): a person’s gender is not produced within them, free from influence, but rather it is the combined effect of their socialisation, upbringing, education, and various other factors. Simon’s view echoes Simone de Beauvoir’s famous declaration that a woman is not born, but rather made (de Beauvoir 1973: 301). Similarly, Boehm and Filkins as male translators may not automatically ‘masculinise’ Bachmann’s text in their translations simply because they are men, but they may do so as a result of the society in which they live or as a result of any criticism of women’s writing they have had access to. Furthermore, I argue in section
5.2 that the translator’s cognitive context influences her/his interpretation of the text in the sense that different translators are likely to ascribe different levels of importance to aspects of a text according to their life experience and previously read texts. Whether a translator judges aspects of style or a particular text passage to be significant also depends on individual reading speed. Initial studies, such as that by Cupchick and László (1994; cited in Burke 2011: 165), indicate that women and men tend to read texts differently, and the relevance of this finding for my investigation is examined in section 4.2.

It is possible that a translator would disagree with a viewpoint expressed by the source text author or decide that some sections are irrelevant, and leave out sections of the text. Howard Parshley’s translation of Simone de Beauvoir’s *Le Deuxième Sexe* [*The Second Sex*], discussed in section 3.5, is a case in point. A translator might furthermore be influenced by any criticism s/he has read and approach the text with feelings of antipathy towards its author. In Bachmann’s case, the translators might have certain ideas about her prose writing – they might see it as an inferior type of literature (this attitude would be encouraged by the initial marketing of *Malina*, explained in section 1.6.1) and as a consequence they might not attempt to preserve, for example, effects created by the language in the source text because they focus solely on the plot.

While it was already noted over a decade ago that “theoreticians and researchers now agree that [masculinity and femininity] can coexist within the same individual and can vary independently” (Langis et al. 1994: 394), it has been established that women and men’s conversational styles differ greatly (Tannen 1986, 1994): women have fewer speaking turns, less overall speaking time, and are interrupted more often than men. West and Zimmerman, who first noticed this behaviour, linked it to conversational power struggles (1983: 103), while Tannen notes that silence can also be a means of exercising control (Tannen 1994: 56–7). It is not yet clear in how far the typical conversational behaviour described above is reflected in writing and translation. One way in which it might be paralleled is that works by male authors might be published and translated more often. In fact, male translators win more prestigious translation prizes than female translators (Rude-Porubská 2013: 265).
1.3.1 Previous Research on Gender in Translation

Although there have been several investigations into the way language is used by women and men, not many theorists have studied stylistic differences in translation with special consideration of the translator’s gender; in fact, Leonardi’s 2007 book and an unpublished 2002 doctoral thesis by Gabriela Saldanha are the only studies of this subject I have been able to identify. Sociolinguists (Cameron 1985, Kramarae 1980 and 1981, Coates 1988, Pauwels and Winter 2006, Pusch 1984) have found clear differences in women and men’s styles, syntax and vocabulary, and it would be interesting to find out whether these are maintained in translation.

Valerie Henitiuk (1999: 469; 2008) has studied English translations of Japanese women’s writing from the Heian period (8th-12th century). She argues that subsuming a text written by a woman into the general literary canon means that the author will be read as a man (Henitiuk 1999: 471). This viewpoint will be examined as part of my analysis of the classification of ‘women’s writing’ in Chapter 2.

Henitiuk gives an overview of what she terms the “phallo-translator” (1999: 473) who relies on “ingrained phallocentric assumptions” (ibid.) because of his social context. Henitiuk notes that Sonja Arntzen, the feminist translator of the 1997 version of the Kagerô nikki [The Kagerô Diary], praises the poetic talent of its author whereas Seidensticker, whose translation of the same work was published in 1964, ensures through his introductory remarks that his readers are less favourably disposed towards the quality of the writing, and instead highlights the author’s jealousy which he interprets as the book’s main focal point (Henitiuk 1999: 473). Henitiuk points out that this may be the case because “[p]hallocentric translators may succeed in only superficially translating the woman-as-text, unaware of other, deeper levels of significance” (ibid.: 476). It will be essential to find out whether Philip Boehm can be seen as a phallocentric translator as described by Henitiuk, because women’s experiences and voice are a central theme in Malina. I present my conclusion to this question in section 5.3.

The issue of gender in the translation of western literature has received attention primarily from feminist translation scholars such as Luise von Flotow (1991, 1997, 2007), Sherry Simon (1996), Rosemary Arrojo (1995) and Myriam Diaz-Diocaretz (1985). These scholars look at translation from a cultural perspective, situating feminist translation in the context of second-wave feminism and establishing it as a
natural progression from feminists’ attempts to reform language to make it less sexist. Simon summarises feminist translation thus:

Both feminism and translation are concerned by the way ‘secondariness’ comes to be defined and canonized; both are tools for a critical understanding of difference as it is represented in language. The most compelling questions for both fields remain: how are social, sexual and historical differences expressed in language and how can these differences be transferred across languages? (Simon 1996: 8-9)

Feminist translation theories were first developed in the 1980s and are still being advanced today. Luise von Flotow (1997) and Sherry Simon (1996) have each devoted a book to the subject of gender in translation, both describing the work of a number of Canadian feminist writers, while Myriam Diaz-Diocaretz (1985) explores the same subject through her own Spanish translations of feminist poet Adrienne Rich’s poetry. These scholars approach feminist translation from a cultural perspective, describing the conscious, explicitly described strategies used by translators such as Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood, Suzanne Jill Levine and Barbara Godard rather than examining the unconscious mechanisms that may be at work in translation.

Feminist translation theorists give an overview of strategies the feminist translator has available; they look upon translation as “a kind of literary activism” (Simon 1996: viii). The writers and translators they use as their examples (Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood, Suzanne Jill Levine, Barbara Godard, Nicole Brossard) are all Canadian,9 with the exception of Diaz-Diocaretz’s subject Adrienne Rich. These translators are well-known for translating a number of feminist novels in the 1970s and 1980s, developing strategies suitable to translate the puns and wordplay typical of this type of writing. They also demonstrate the choices available to a feminist

---

9 One might say that the co-existence of English and French in Canada, and the resulting political tension, makes Canadian literature especially suitable for these types of experiments: in an article on Margaret Atwood’s *The Robber Bride*, a novel whose characters reflect the multicultural composition of contemporary Canada, Tolan states that “[b]oth topics – feminism and nationalism – are connected by a quest for power and a quest for identity” (Tolan 2005: 453). Thus she highlights the fact that both Canada’s political and cultural situation as well as feminism can be elucidated by drawing on postcolonial discourse.
translator of misogynist male writing, as in the case of de Lotbinière-Harwood’s translation of Octavio Armand (see Simon 1996: 30). Von Flotow and Simon look at ways in which feminist translators overtly manipulate the text, for example through the inclusion of forewords or footnotes. They do not, however, analyse texts produced by translators who are not overtly feminist, and while feminist translation scholars have laid important foundations for work on gender and translation, there are still many areas that have not been covered.

In addition to analysing feminist strategies, von Flotow and Simon also contributed to Lori Chamberlain’s attempt to move away from the sexist language often used to describe the activity of translation. It is this part of their work that has been the most successful as most contemporary translation scholars would now regard the notion of ‘les belles infidèles’ [the beautiful unfaithful], the idea that translations, like women, are either beautiful or faithful (France 2000: 30), as outdated and also unacceptably sexist, a development which has also been aided by Venuti’s campaigns for translators’ visibility (1995). José Santaemilia, for example, states “‘fidelity’ is a rather useless term” (Santaemilia 2005: 1), which is true unless one states to which specific constituent of the source text one aims to be faithful. In Maria Tymoczko’s view, a translator chooses “an emphasis or privileges an aspect of the text to be transposed in translation (e.g. linguistic fidelity, tone, form, cultural content, or some combination thereof)” (Tymoczko 1999: 24). Such a view of translation is favourable, in my view, because it allows the translator to exercise her/his own judgements.

Another important aspect of the work of feminist translation scholars is the rediscovery of previous centuries’ translators who worked in ways or towards aims that would nowadays be seen as feminist. This survey of protofeminist translators is part of the feminist translators’ endeavour to form a tradition of feminist translation: the practice did not suddenly develop in the 1970s, but is part of a scholarly discipline that had previously been ignored by mainstream patriarchal discourse. Much attention is also paid to feminist translations of the Bible, and I shall make reference to this as relevant when analysing the source and target texts.

The feminist translation strategies described by Flotow (1991) and Simon (1996) are supplementing, prefacing and footnoting, and hijacking (Simon 1996: 14). However, not all feminist translators and translation theorists agree that these are exclusively feminist strategies or that their terminology is unproblematic:
Massardier-Kenney (1997: 57) observes that it is not the strategies themselves which are feminist, “but rather the use to which [they] are put”. *Supplementing*, which “compensates for the differences between languages” (Flotow 1991: 75), according to Massardier-Kenney “looks very much like the old translation strategy called ‘compensation’” (Massardier-Kenney 1997: 57). *Prefacing and footnoting* has become a widely-used practice by translators who are not overtly feminist. *Hijacking* seems to be the most controversial term for Massardier-Kenney: while she concedes that “it is correctly described as feminist since it consists of deliberately ‘feminizing’ the target text” (Massardier-Kenney 1997: 58), she disagrees with the way the term came to be used by feminist translators. It seems that Flotow borrowed it from a critic who opposed de Lotbinière-Harwood’s interference in the translation of Lise Gauvin’s *Lettres d’une autre* [*Letters from an Other*]. One might say that by borrowing a term used by a critic in a derogatory fashion, Flotow has asserted feminist translators’ aim of making a political point; furthermore, feminist translators and linguists have attempted to reclaim words which negatively denote women, such as ‘spinster’. Incorporating a term that describes feminist translation strategies in a negative manner into the vocabulary of feminist translation theory could be seen as akin to this practice. Nevertheless, Massardier-Kenney highlights the fact that the use of the term *hijacking* seems to suggest “that feminism is an unnatural act of violence, that making the feminine visible can only mean distortion and extortion” (Massardier-Kenney 1997: 58). In her view, this can “prevent translators from reflecting upon the actual process of ‘feminizing’ a text” (ibid.).

She further takes issue with the goal of “mak[ing] the feminine – i.e. women – visible in [the] text” (de Lotbinière-Harwood 1991: 101 cited in Massardier-Kenney 1997: 56) because it seems to presuppose “a set, stable definition of the feminine that is independent of context” (Massardier-Kenney 1997: 56). Theories of gender have moved away from this view, a development that started with Judith Butler’s influential work *Gender Trouble* (1994) in which she advocates the concept of gender as performance over the idea of gender as an essential attribute. This notion sees gender as culturally constructed and largely independent of biological sex.

Flotow revisited the topic of gender and translation in a 2007 book chapter which posits the view that the first gender paradigm, shaped by feminist thinking and activism, has been superseded by the second paradigm, echoing Martín’s realisation.
(Martín 2005: 36) that “more and more feminist trends would agree on a self-definition as ‘gender-conscious’ rather than simply ‘woman-centered’”. The second paradigm “departs from prior monolithic visions of gender” (ibid.) and “focuses on gender as a discursive and contingent act, and on its performative aspects” (Flotow 2007: 93). The departure from a binary view of gender has allowed Queer Studies to flourish, a discipline within gender studies that examines the situation of gay and lesbian writers. Interestingly, though, Flotow notes that “while there have been several publications and studies examining gender politics in gay writing […], texts dealing with women’s writing or focused on women’s gender simply appropriate lesbian texts for general feminist/womanist purposes” (Flotow 1996: 18). It seems that while the field of gender studies tries to become more open and inclusive, some inequalities are preserved.
1.3.2 Why Does Gender Matter?

There is no consensus about the extent to which the author’s and translator’s gender influence the production of the target text. As mentioned above, it is no longer sufficient to regard gender as an innate characteristic, but rather theorists have recently argued that gender is a complex construct (see section 1.2.2). Therefore, if gender is not tied to the self, but rather a “discursive construction” (Simon 1996: 7), and if, as a result, women and men are, in principle, presumably able to construct either gender for themselves and to combine masculine (seen as commonly attributed to men) and feminine (seen as commonly attributed to women) elements within themselves (see Langis et al. 1994: 394), does gender really matter, or does any discussion of literary manifestations of gender lead us to regress to an essentialist view of gender?

Simon mentions in her 1996 book that Thomas Mann and André Gide insisted on securing male translators for certain of their books because they believed that “a special match between translator and text was required” which “could not be achieved by imaginative projection” (Simon 1996: 168). She refutes this view by stating that “[s]urely, it has been shown often enough that writing permits the imaginative projection of self into other identities, that membership by birth into a cultural identity is no guarantee of affiliation” (Simon 1996: 168). This would suggest that gender does not necessarily affect translation, and that therefore women and men are equally able to translate texts by authors of either gender. Simon elaborates on her view:

Gender is not always a relevant factor in translation. There are no a priori characteristics which would make women either more or less competent at their task. Where identity comes into play is the point at which the translator transforms the fact of gender into a social or literary project. (Simon 1996: 7)

Her view is contradicted by Leonardi who compared translations by a female and male translator of two novels by Dacia Maraini (a 20th century Italian feminist author) with translations by the same translators of novels by two different male authors. She found that “when a man translates a woman, especially in the case of feminist authors, he seems to be less direct, more disinterested and more detached
from the context, and more prudish as compared to a female translator” (Leonardi 2007: 302) whereas a female translator “seems to pick both the referential and the emotional meaning, maybe because she is closer to the ‘woman’s condition’ than a man could ever be” (Leonardi 2007: 303). In contrast, when a man translates another man, “there do not seem to be significant translational shifts from the ST [source text]” (ibid.), while a woman translating a man “either remains faithful to the text or alters it by marking her presence in the text (through addition, omission, and explicitation)” (Leonardi 2007: 302). These findings suggest that gender can be a relevant factor in translation, and they are significant for the purposes of my study in so far as they provide a model for comparison with Boehm’s translational behaviour. It will be interesting to compare Parshley, Hood and Boehm as this will enable us to move towards discerning a pattern of male translators’ choices.
1.4 Limitations

This thesis is intended as a case study of Ingeborg Bachmann’s work in translation with a specific focus on the effect of the source text and target text authors’ gender. While I would have liked to undertake a study that would allow us to gain broader insights into gender-specific behaviour by female and male translators, this does not yet seem possible.

The preliminary investigations I have undertaken in preparation for this thesis have made it clear that at this point it is difficult to find gender differences in the translations of 20\textsuperscript{th} century German poetry written by women and men.\textsuperscript{10} As part of these analyses I compared as many as six translations of the same poems; the failure to find consistent variations that may reliably be ascribed to the translators’ gender suggests that comparisons need to be carried out on a much larger scale. Furthermore, a theoretical model is needed in order to undertake research of this kind. A case study seems more feasible at this stage of the developments in gender and translation theories because it does not aim to extrapolate general tendencies demonstrated by translators, but instead describes and evaluates different translators’ reactions to different texts and the historical, theoretical and social context of each one.

It is also not possible to compare Boehm directly to the other translators of Bachmann’s work analysed in this thesis for other reasons: Boehm’s is the only existing translation of \textit{Malina}, and although \textit{Franza} can be interpreted as a preliminary study for the novel (Achberger 1995: 130) and was intended to form part of the \textit{Todesarten}-cycle of which \textit{Malina} constitutes the first part, it remained a fragment.

\textit{Malina} and its translation have been selected for this study because of the purportedly feminine nature of Bachmann’s narrative and language use in the view of German critics, and the fact that the novel has only been translated by a male translator: the pairing of a male translator with a novel which is held in high regard by German feminists provides an interesting framework within which to explore questions of the translator’s transformation of the text. The language pair chosen for

\textsuperscript{10} The authors included Rolf Dieter Brinkmann, Paul Celan, Günter Eich, Erich Fried, Günter Kunert, Sarah Kirsch, Friederike Mayröcker, as well as Ingeborg Bachmann.
this study also plays a role in restricting the universality of my findings: English and German have grammatically similar traits, and while German uses grammatical gender,\textsuperscript{11} English generally does not, although Crystal highlights the fact that the pronouns ‘she’ and ‘he’ co-occur with ‘who’ or ‘whose’ whereas ‘it’ co-occurs with ‘which’ (Crystal 1985: 133). Different languages thus provide different opportunities for the translator to experiment with gender markers. Furthermore, Germany and the US (Boehm, Filkins, and Gilbert are all American) have seen similar feminist developments, and there is thus no significant cultural gap in this respect that would need to be bridged by the translator (see chapters 2 and 4 for discussion of the German and Anglo-American feminist movements). For these reasons, it is important to note that this case study is not intended as a basis for direct general conclusions regarding translators’ approaches to literature regarded as women’s writing. Rather, my thesis is intended as an addition to existing theoretical frameworks that focus on the relation between gender and translation, and as a basis from which further work should allow more general conclusions to be extrapolated.

\textsuperscript{11} In German, grammatical gender does not always correspond to biological sex, as illustrated by this extract from Mark Twain’s humorous piece ‘The Awful German Language’: “where is the turnip? / She has gone to the kitchen. / Where is the accomplished and beautiful English maiden? / It has gone to the opera.” (Twain 1996: 543).
1.5 Methodology and Model of Analysis

The model proposed for this case study is based on a comparative analysis of source and target texts as well as a comparison of the German-language reception of Bachmann’s texts with the English-language reception of the translations. My stylistic analysis of the texts attempts to locate ideological shifts reflected linguistically in the target texts. The translators’ choices will be examined in the light of criticism of Bachmann’s work in order to ascertain how far the two are interlinked. Doing this within the framework of a case study will be particularly helpful:

[the essence of a case study, the central tendency among all types of case study, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or a set of decisions: why they were taken, how they were implemented, and with what result. (Yin 2009: 17]

Carrying out a case study of the source and target texts will allow me to understand the effects of the translators’ choices. Of course, case studies are more often used in the social sciences than in literary analyses, and I will only be able to speculate about the reasons and motives behind particular decisions taken by the translators based on their backgrounds and paratextual materials. However, Yin’s explanation of the four different applications of case studies demonstrates that making use of a case study framework is appropriate for the analyses that I intend to undertake. According to him, case studies can:

1) Explain interventions that are too complex for a survey or experimental strategies
2) Describe an intervention and its context
3) Illustrate topics within an evaluation in a descriptive mode
4) Enlighten situations in which interventions have no clear, single set of outcomes.
(Yin 2009: 19-20)

An analysis of the translators’ styles in the context of German and Anglo-American reception is too complex for a survey and unlikely to lead to a single outcome
because of my multiple case structure, thus taking advantage of the more open design of a case study will permit a detailed examination of translators’ choices and source and target text circumstances of publication. Positioning Bachmann and her work within the canon of 20th-century German women’s writing will facilitate a contrastive analysis of the effect of the translators’ ideology on the text classification.

The comparison of the reception in German- and English-speaking countries is presented in Chapters 2 and 4 for several reasons: post-war Germany and Austria provided an environment of specific political and social currents that influenced and were influenced by literature. This unique situation meant that Bachmann was constructed by critics as a specific type of author: she represented new hope (as explained in section 2.3), but she was also examined as a woman author, as the frequent references to her appearance and demeanour demonstrate (this is analysed in detail in sections 2.1 and 2.5.1). The reception by North American and British critics differed markedly from this. Unlike the German-language critics, these critics had no personal relationship with the author, and they wrote several decades later in a different political environment. While their reviews highlight Bachmann’s status, she does not take on the position of a representative of the post-war generation. Section 2.6.1 shows that feminist critics came to a different understanding of the ‘Todesarten’ texts, and Malina in particular. 1984 is understood here as the starting point of the feminist re-evaluation as this is the year in which Sigrid Weigel’s influential Text+Kritik [Text + Criticism] volume was published (Weigel 1984c). This book was the first to present different feminist analyses of Bachmann’s work. The different aspects of reception are compared in order to demonstrate (in Chapter 4, following the stylistic analysis in Chapter 3) that the male translators’ approaches have more in common with the pre-1984 German critics than the post-1984 feminist critics.
1.6 Why This Case Study?

*Malina* was heralded in the German-speaking press as one of the first German feminist novels, and much attention has been paid to the language used by its female author. It would therefore be interesting to see how Philip Boehm as a male translator deals with this. In order to find support for the results of my analysis it makes sense to look at further translations, and as *Franza* was begun before *Malina*, shares some of the novel’s themes, and forms part of the ‘Todesarten’ cycle, it might lead to useful conclusions to look at several parts of the ‘Todesarten’. Exploring translations of these works would demonstrate which strategies translators use, and might as a consequence open up the field of gender in translation to include more variations than those mentioned above. It would also allow us to develop a view of gender in translation that, while still linked to feminist issues, is separate from feminist translation.

However, it will be difficult to separate the two completely because of the noteworthy years of the publication of *Malina* and its translation: Bachmann’s novel was published at the beginning of the second-wave feminist movement (1971) whereas Boehm’s translation was published towards the end (1990). It can therefore be expected that the influence of feminism on literary theory plays a role in the construction of the translation as well as in its reception, and it is my aim to explore the extent of this impact.

This case study will also allow me to explore how far the reception of the author in English-speaking countries differs from that in Germany, and whether this can be said to have influenced the translators; in addition it will be interesting to see whether the translators have shaped the reception in any way. This analysis will then allow me to form hypotheses about whether the gender of the source text author matters.

German literature during Bachmann’s lifetime was dominated by famous male writers, and it appears that Bachmann’s reception in Germany was focused very much on text-external factors (this will be explored in Chapter 2): criticism and biographies of Bachmann draw attention to her personal life, appearance and demeanour. Accounts of her first reading at a Gruppe 47 meeting highlight her quiet voice, which was barely audible because of her nervous tension (Lennox 2002: 22), a report which signals the starting point of a fascination with details of the writer’s
perceived personality: “von da an wird die Reaktion der Kritiker auf ihr Werk bis zu ihrem Tod immer untrennbar an ihre Erscheinung und ihr Auftreten gebunden sein” [from this moment until her death the critics’ reaction to her work will be tied inseparably to her appearance and demeanour] (Lennox 2002: 22). Later on, much attention is paid to her relationships with Max Frisch and Paul Celan.

Weyrauch, author of a 1953 article on Bachmann’s acceptance of the Gruppe 47 prize, patronisingly calls her “ein schönes Mädchen” [a beautiful girl] (cited in Lennox 2002: 22), while the same year’s Der Spiegel news magazine’s portrayal of the author emphasises her “erotisierte Weiblichkeit” [eroticised femininity] (ibid.) to the same extent as her literary work. Gürtler locates the starting point of the biased public perception of Bachmann in the Spiegel story:

Ingeborg Bachmanns Lyrik, vor allem aber ihre Person, wurde schon sehr früh zu einem Mythos hochstilisiert, ablesbar schon daran, dass ihr ‘Der Spiegel’ 1954 eine Titelgeschichte widmete. (Gürtler 1983: 87)

[Ingeborg Bachmann’s poetry, but most of all she as a person, was exalted to the status of a myth very early on, as shown by the fact that the ‘Der Spiegel’ news magazine dedicated a cover story to her in 1954.]

The Spiegel cover story was intended to prove that “Germany could once more [i.e. after the Second World War] compete on the stage of world literature” (Lennox 1998: 57), and propelled Bachmann to instant fame. Hotz (1990) analyses press coverage of Ingeborg Bachmann and reviews of her work, and explores the issues associated with Bachmann’s presentation in the Spiegel cover story in great detail, using a multimodal stylistic analysis of the article in order to demonstrate how a particular image of the poet is created (Hotz 1990: 43-63). Bachmann’s portrayal in the media is discussed in depth in sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5.1.

As mentioned above, the reception of Bachmann’s Frankfurt lectures was dominated by physical descriptions, but “it did not occur to any reporter even to mention the haircut, glasses or voice of Karl Krolow, the third poet to occupy the Frankfurt Chair of Poetics” (von der Lühe 1982: 54), so it appears that female and male German writers met with vastly different journalistic evaluations.

If one believes Malina to be at least partly autobiographical, being aware of this particular view of Bachmann might make it more difficult to read the story as
one of female liberation rather than subjugation. Similarly, *Franza* is commonly interpreted to contain aspects of Bachmann’s life. The translator’s personal interpretation of the source text is significant as this is in part what the readers of the translation receive. They are of course free to form their own interpretations, but the translator can determine the elements from which they are able to choose.

Because Bachmann’s writing, and especially *Malina* and *Franza*, is inextricably linked with questions of gender because of her reception and subject matter, the gender of the translator must not be ignored. The fact that *Malina* in particular has only been translated by a male translator bears resemblance to the situation of Simone de Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex*, and it will be interesting to see whether Boehm’s or Filkins’ strategies show any similarity to Parshley’s.
1.7 Linguistic Relativity: Do Women Use Different Language?

Linguistic Relativity, setting out from the idea that language and thought are interdependent, is the theory that structures and distinctions in one language might not be found in another, and that these differences reflect ways of thinking. Linguistic Determinism can be explained as follows: Sapir assumed that “all of experience is influenced by the particular language one speaks” (Slobin 1974: 120; original emphasis), an opinion shared by Whorf who noted that

> users of markedly different grammars are pointed by their grammars towards different types of observations and different evaluations of externally similar acts of observation, and hence are not equivalent as observers but must arrive at somewhat different views of the world. (Whorf 1956: 221, cited in Slobin 1987: 435)

Sapir and Whorf thus take the view that language determines thought. Slobin, who has conducted studies on language and cognitive development and has written extensively on the Whorfian hypothesis (the name under which the hypothesis of Linguistic Determinism has come to be known) identifies two different types of theory, a ‘strong’ and a ‘weak’ version:

The strong form – often espoused by Whorf himself – holds that the language determines thought and behaviour patterns; that the language is a sort of mold for thought and philosophy. The weak form – usually held today in one way or another – merely asserts that certain aspects of language can predispose people to think or act in one way rather than another, but that there is no rigid determinism: One is not fully a prisoner of one’s language; it is just a guide to thought and other sorts of behaviour. (Slobin 1974: 122)

While some theorists hold the stronger view, Weak Linguistic Determinism, as well as Linguistic Relativity, are more commonly accepted today. These considerations will be useful when exploring so-called ‘women’s language’. Kramarae developed the Muted Group Framework (1981), a theory which suggests that conventional language is inadequate to let women express their experiences because it was formulated by men. She goes further than this and posits that as a result of male-
biased language, women will eventually be unable to think certain thoughts. This view is analogous to Strong Linguistic Determinism. Although he does not make reference to gendered language use, Slobin expresses a more moderate view by stating “one fits one’s thoughts into available linguistic forms” (Slobin 1987: 435), taking a Weak Determinism approach. Bachmann expressed the view that writers should challenge available linguistic forms in a 1971 interview (in Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 83-86) and her essay ‘Tagebuch’ [Diary] (Bachmann 2011: 58-72). The significance of this is discussed in section 5.2.

Mary Hiatt (1977) carried out a computer-based analysis of a 200,000-word corpus taken from 100 fiction and non-fiction books in order to ascertain whether there is a feminine or masculine way of writing. She also attempted to find evidence to refute stereotypical descriptions of women’s style as “more verbose and less logical than men writers (Furman 1878: 183). In order to do this she compared length and complexity of sentences, the use of punctuation, similes and adverbs, and the distribution of adjectives (see Furman 1978: 183). She found that it was possible to find evidence among the texts selected for her study that women’s writing style was different from men’s and, interestingly, also different from men’s perceptions of women’s style, so that instead of writing in a shrill, rambling, irrational, hysterical, hyperemotional or disorganised manner, women were found to prefer conservative expression that was rhetorically more effective than men’s writing (Hiatt 1977: 135).

Although these are interesting results, Hiatt’s understanding of style is problematic: she examines word frequency, but not function or effect. McConnell-Ginet (1979: 466) finds several problems with the study, in particular the assumption that a correlation of a writer’s sex with certain formal features would define these features as gender-specific style. Features commonly interpreted as feminine are also used by male writers. According to McConnell-Ginet (1979: 468), it would be beneficial to look at the way “different experiences, concerns, and consequent strategic orientations of women and men could result in sexlinked differences in the distribution of linguistic forms and processes”. This would be preferable to any construction of a link between stylistic features and a writer’s sex, and McConnell-Ginet advocates for the use of both quantitative and qualitative research methods in order to obtain the most meaningful results.

Regarding word choice as the result of biological makeup is thus not very conducive to achieving conclusive results. It makes more sense to look at gender
issues in a more nuanced manner, for example by examining the interplay between form and content as well as the communicative strategies of writers and translators in the context of their background. In addition, Furman (1978: 184) emphasises the importance of taking into account the reader’s involvement and potential gender bias in the interpretative process. This perspective parallels developments in general reader response and stylistic theories: researchers in these fields have recognised the role played by a reader’s cognitive context in the interpretive process (see, for example, Manguel 1996: 19 or Burke 2011: 141).
1.8  **Text-type Considerations: ‘Women’s Writing’**

The category of ‘women’s writing’ is a problematic and controversial one: does female authors’ writing exhibit characteristics that distinguish it from men’s writing? And what is women’s writing precisely – is it writing exclusively by women, or for women, or both? And further, is all women’s writing also feminist writing? It is unlikely that there is a homogenous group of works authored by women, therefore it is possible to posit the view that ‘women’s writing’ is simply a term used by literary critics in order to ensure female writers do not intrude into the male-dominated canon. “The notion of “femininity” is a fiction created by men”, stated Patricia Meyer Spacks in 1975 (Meyer Spacks 1975: 15), and furthermore, “there is no feminine nature” (ibid.); a similar view was expressed more recently by Alyson Mark and Deryn Rees Jones who state that “it is no longer tenable to hold that there is a specifically ‘feminine’ language” (Mark and Rees Jones 2000: xv). Definitions of women’s writing often risk appearing essentialist. Essentialism should be avoided when it results in or contributes to the designation of women writers as ‘other’. Nevertheless, in my view, it would be useful to gain an overview of strategies and subjects commonly deployed in writing by women, specifically in the German-speaking territories in the 1970s, in order to chart Bachmann’s influence. This is one of the main aims of Chapter 2, and is briefly introduced in the present section.

Looking at this complex area of literature requires caution for numerous reasons. First of all, there are several different terms that can be used to denote different types of writing. Weigel (1984b: 82) refers to the meaning of the term ‘women’s literature’ as “feminist confessional literature”. One must be careful not to assume that the term ‘women’s writing’ encompasses all writing by women or for women, or that it is the same as feminist writing. For the sake of clarity, the term ‘feminist women’s writing’ will be used in this chapter to mean texts written by women with a political, i.e. feminist, motivation. ‘Women’s writing’ will be used to refer to any text written by a female author who has no demonstrable link with the women’s movement, does not overtly identify with a feminist ideology, or whose choice of strategy does not advance the perception of women or even undermines it.

One must also bear in mind that feminist women’s writing exists separately from the feminist movement(s), although the two are linked to some extent. While the women’s movement is interested in women’s position in society and seeks to
change structures and attitudes that serve to oppress women, feminist women’s writing fulfils two functions: there are texts that seek to illuminate the situation of women and are sometimes partly autobiographical or function as a sort of confessional therapy for the author, and there are texts that arise directly from the political movement and are intended to invite people to take part in activism. Examples of this type of literature are presented in Chapter 2.
1.9 Is Women’s Writing Feminist Writing?

Mary Eagleton (2011b: 191) highlights the problems of classifying women’s writing when she asks “[c]an we say that a tradition of women’s writing is a tradition of feminist writing?” Feminism in a text can reside in the author’s intention, so that the writing of self-identified feminists would be feminist writing; it can also lie in interpretation, so that the reader would decide whether a text can be seen to hold a feminist message; and it can also reside in the text’s content, which means that texts concerned with women’s experiences and thoughts would be feminist. Furthermore, women-centred writing is not necessarily always of interest to feminists, and the success of women-authored or women-centred fiction does not correlate with the acceptance of feminist thought in general. Coward (1985) discusses the various reasons why ‘women’s writing’ and ‘feminist writing’ are not synonymous terms. She refers to the example of highly commercial women-centred books such as the Mills and Boon novels (Coward 1985: 230) which are rather far removed from feminism despite the fact that they are about women, authored and read by women, as well as marketed for women.

Barrett (1982: 42) views feminism as “an alignment of political interests” rather than as shared female experience. Feminism based on a shared female experience could only be represented by women and would presumably only concede that men can be pro-feminist, whereas Barrett’s idea would mean that men can be feminists when their aim is to increase women’s equality. Feminist texts can fulfil both of these criteria either separately or simultaneously. They might do this by portraying women’s lives in a way that offers new perspectives, or they might present quasi-utopian or fantastical situations in which gender inequality either does not exist or is reversed, as in Gerd Brantenberg’s 1977 Norwegian novel The Daughters of Egalia, for example, or they might encourage direct political action through “consciousness-raising” (Coward 1985: 225) such as Marilyn French’s novel The Women’s Room (1977). During the early years of second-wave feminist writing, portraying female experience in literature in a woman-centred way was a political act as there was a perceived lack in previous male-centred literature of viewpoints relevant to women. Feminist writing per se, that is, writing in connection with the second-wave feminist movement, began in the latter half of the 20th century (see Coward 1985: 225). Before this, works such as Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s short
story ‘The Yellow Wallpaper’ (1892) and Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own* (1929) attempted to draw attention to women’s confinement to the domestic sphere and social inequalities. These works were important forerunners of later feminist writing.

Kolodny (1985: 47) draws attention to the fact that when writers interpret the world and when readers interpret texts, their interpretative strategies are “learned, historically determined, and thereby necessarily gender-inflected”. This realisation is based on a departure from the New Critics’ conception of texts as self-contained entities (Kolodny 1985: 46) and parallels reader-response theories such as Iser’s (1979) which posit that the meaning of a text is not entirely situated in the text itself, but rather constructed by the reader. Coward (1985: 227) notes that as there is no neutral way of representing reality in fiction, it is important to the way in which this reality is constructed, and what aspects of it. Attitudes and definitions need to be questioned as some of them contribute to the oppression of women in society.

Kolodny also refers to the intertextual nature of fiction, citing Harold Bloom’s idea (1975: 18) of texts as responses to other texts, and notes the inequality in responses to texts written by women. ‘The Yellow Wallpaper’ by Charlotte Perkins Gilman has much in common with Edgar Allan Poe’s stories, in particular ‘The Pit and the Pendulum’ (1842), as both stories are about a person’s reaction to being imprisoned, but while Poe’s story had a positive reception, Perkins Gilman encountered difficulties in publishing hers, and despite the stories’ similarities, they did not reach the same readership. Furthermore, Kolodny (1985: 51) notes that ‘The Yellow Wallpaper’ did not reach readers of women’s fiction despite the fact that the story was a symbolic representation of the real life circumstances of many women at the time. She seeks the reason for this in women’s unpreparedness, and concludes that Perkins Gilman’s story remained a “literary dead end” (Kolodny 1985: 51). Similarly, *Malina* contains a great number of intertextual elements (these will be elucidated in Chapter 3), but for a while also had the status of a literary dead end. Showalter’s concept of ‘gynocriticism’ (2011: 131) seeks to counter the omission of women’s writing from the canon: it is a “female framework for the analysis of women’s literature” (2011: 131).
How writing is classified can affect translation because it gives rise to certain expectations with regard to subject matter or language. Suhrkamp’s extraordinary initial publicity campaign for *Malina* indicates that the novel was seen as women’s writing: the blurb posed the question ‘Mord oder Selbstmord?’ [*Murder or suicide?*], and a newspaper competition invited only female readers to send in a postcard with their justification of whether the narrator committed suicide or was murdered. The three winners would go on a skiing trip with Suhrkamp’s male director. The *Malina* marketing strategy is surprising when one considers that George Steiner coined the term ‘Suhrkamp-culture’ to describe the publisher “which now dominates so much of German high literacy and intellectual ranking” and which “has made widely available the most important, demanding, philosophical voices of the age” (Steiner 1973: 253-255). Siegfried Unseld, Bachmann’s editor at Suhrkamp, is reported to have stated about the publishing house, “here we do not publish books, but rather authors” (Case 2013: n.p.). It is clear, therefore, that Suhrkamp is taken seriously and takes itself seriously.

If Boehm was aware of the initial marketing of *Malina* as writing by a female author intended for women, his translation could have been influenced by this in a way which prevents his readers from coming to their own conclusion regarding the narrator’s fate, or he could have opposed the marketing strategy and translated the text in a way which allows the target text reader more avenues of interpretation.

It is thus important to question the purpose and the effect of the existence of the category of women’s writing. Furthermore, I intend to explore the voice(s) in the text, a task which takes on particular pertinence in the case of *Malina* because of the possible interpretation that all three main characters are facets of the same person. I aim to find out whether the language used by Bachmann’s narrator, Ivan and Malina displays traits which have been established as women’s or men’s language by corpus stylistic studies, and whether the same happens in the translations or if can we discern a translator’s “thumbprint” (Baker 2000: 245). Answering these questions will allow me to decide whether, in my interpretation, the German critics were justified in describing *Malina* as women’s writing and how the translation can be classified. However, while the critics seem to have used the term ‘women’s writing’

---

12 Suhrkamp is a German publishing house.
13 This was provided by Bachmann (Franklin 2000: 39).
in a derogatory fashion when discussing Bachmann’s work, if this category is marked by distinct stylistic elements it is not necessarily of inferior literary value. Knowing what happens when a man translates a female author’s novel will allow us to form hypotheses on power relationships in the translation of such texts.
1.10 Bachmann’s Background

Monika Albrecht and Dirk Götzsche’s 2002 *Bachmann Handbuch* [Bachmann Handbook] gives a very detailed and comprehensive account of the author’s life and work, and offers a year-by-year account of her life. In this section I shall only mention the key stages of Bachmann’s life to allow a general impression, and descriptions of her publications will be limited to the factors that are directly relevant to this thesis.

Ingeborg Bachmann was born in Klagenfurt, Austria, in 1926. The entry of Hitler’s troops into Klagenfurt in 1938 was “a traumatic moment that shattered her childhood” (Lennox 1998: 56), and is an event which has received much attention in Bachmann biographies. Albrecht and Götzsche highlight the fact that on this day, Bachmann was either on holiday or in hospital with diphtheria (Albrecht and Götzsche 2002: 2), but nevertheless, this moment seems to have played a pivotal role in her feelings towards Austria as she displayed “great resistance to Austria’s restoration of pre-war power structures” (Lennox 1998: 56) and its social order which “had restored ‘yesterday’s hangmen’ to places of honor” (Lennox 1998: 59), and in 1953 moved to Italy, never again taking up permanent residence in Austria.

Bachmann studied at the University of Vienna, where she completed a PhD on “Die kritische Aufnahme der Existentialphilosophie Martin Heideggers” [The critical reception of Martin Heidegger’s existentialist philosophy] in 1950 (Gürtler 1983: 86). Philosophy continued to play a role in her life: the work of Ludwig Wittgenstein (Gürtler 1983: 86) especially influenced her writing, and Bachmann took part in radio discussions on their philosophy. In the winter semester 1959/60 she was the first lecturer in poetics at the Goethe-Universität in Frankfurt (Gürtler 1983: 86), a post which was held successively by Hans Magnus Enzensberger, Heinrich Böll, Christa Wolf, Friedrich Dürrenmatt and Günter Grass, amongst others, where she delivered “a series of badly received lectures on problems of contemporary literature” (Lennox 1998: 57). The conferment of the guest professorship upon a writer was contentious (von der Lühe 1982: 35) and the press reports, of which there were many, displayed gratuitous focus on Bachmann’s appearance and demeanour. They were characterised by “dissatisfaction, incomprehension, indignation and
finally open malice” and “laudatory only in very few cases” (von der Lühe 1982: 50).

After being invited to attend the Gruppe 47’s biannual meetings in 1952, Bachmann won the group’s prize for her first poetry collection in 1953 (Lennox 1998: 57) and quickly became a star on the German literary scene. The Gruppe 47 influenced her politically, but its members had mixed views on Bachmann’s political engagement: her former mentor Hans Weigel attacked her in June 1958 for her participation in a protest against the nuclear armament of the German army (Albrecht and Göttscbe 2002: 11), but novelist Heinrich Böll praised the same actions in his Spiegel obituary (Böll 1973).

Bachmann’s oeuvre includes poems, plays, short stories, libretti and several novel fragments. Her first poetry collection Die gestundete Zeit [Mortgaged Time] (1953) expresses “a deep historical pessimism” (Lennox 1998: 59) and voices “the desire to flee a compromised reality” while “[combining] the impulse toward flight with a sober recognition of the impossibility of escape” (ibid.). Her second collection Anrufung des Grossen Bären [Invocation of the Great Bear] (1956) is “generally considered to be stronger poetically, more regular metrically, employing simpler language and more complex symbolism drawn from a variety of Western traditions” (ibid.).

Radio plays were a common literary form after the war because many theatres and opera houses had been destroyed (Achberger 1995: 31), and Bachmann wrote three: ‘Ein Geschäft mit Träumen’ (first broadcast in 1952) [A Business with Dreams], ‘Die Zikaden’ (1955) [The Cicadas] and ‘Der gute Gott von Manhattan’ (1958) [The Good God of Manhattan] (all Lennox’s translations), which were published posthumously in 1976 as Die Hörspiele [The Radio-Plays]. These plays have an emphasis on dream, illusion, irreality and interiority (Lennox 1998: 60), and ‘Der gute Gott von Manhattan’ “connects domination to the question of gender relations” (ibid.). A possible link between this play and the theme of gender and power in Malina and Franza will be explored later.

---

14 Further details and criticism of the reaction to Bachmann’s guest professorship can be found in von der Lühe’s 1982 article and Bareiss and Ohloff’s 1978 bibliography of Bachmann.
15 This conflict can be explained by the competing tensions within the group: some members advocated political activism whereas others preferred a separation of politics and literature. They were, however, united in their opposition to anti-Semitism.
Bachmann’s short stories in her collection *Das dreißigste Jahr* (1961)16 explore “the consequences of Fascism for the postwar period; […] language as a vehicle of cooptation or redemption; and the connection of gender issues to other forms of social control” (Lennox 1998: 61). Her second collection of short stories, *Simultan*17, was published in 1972 and contains the story ‘Das Gebell’ (translated as ‘The Barking’) which “functions as a prequel” to *Franza*, as it introduces Franza and her husband (Franklin 2000: 41).

As stated in several interviews, Bachmann intended to write the *Todesarten*-cycle as “an anatomy of her entire society” (Lennox 1998: 61) which would use a series of female figures to portray “dramas of suffering and passion […] as intrapsychic […], so that the real settings are interior ones” (Lennox 1998: 62), and not the external world, as is the case with previous examinations of individuals’ situation within society. The first part of the cycle remained a fragment and was published posthumously in 1978 as *Der Fall Franza* [The Franza Case]. According to Lennox, Bachmann decided that the narrator of the *Todesarten* was to be a man, Malina, who would tell “the stories of female figures so congruent with the gender norms of their time that they cannot recognise the damage that has been done to them” (Lennox 1998: 63). The novel *Malina* would show that “an unnamed female protagonist cannot write her own book called *Todesarten* [because] she cannot remember what has happened to her” (ibid.).

From 1958 to 1962, Bachmann was in an “intense and painful relationship” (Lennox 1998: 57) with the prominent Swiss writer Max Frisch, the decline of which is seen to have partly led to her “physical and psychic collapse and increasing dependence on tranquilizers, sleeping pills and painkillers” (Lennox 1998: 57). She received treatment several times, staying in hospitals in Zurich (December to January and late January 1962/3 and March 1967), Berlin (July/August 1963), Baden-Baden (February/March and November 1965 and September 1966), and St Moritz (February 1967).

Bachmann died in a fire in her Rome apartment in 1973. There has been much speculation about the cause of her death, and a murder investigation was even opened, but the case was closed in 1974. It is now assumed that the medication she

---

16 Translated as *The Thirtieth Year* by Michael Bullock (1987)
17 Translated as *Three Paths to the Lake* by Mary Fran Gilbert (1989)
was taking at the time of her death prevented her from noticing the fire (see Gürtler 1983: 91).
1.11 The Translators’ Backgrounds

All translators whose texts are analysed in this thesis are North American and have translated multiple works by German-language authors.

Philip Boehm, the translator of *Malina*, has won numerous translation prizes and was the recipient of a National Endowments for the Arts fellowship to support his translation of *Settlement* by German writer Christoph Hein. He has mostly translated male writers: 15 of the 19 translations I have been able to find are of works by male authors; however, the female writers whose work Boehm has translated are very well-known: he has translated Karen Duve’s novel *Rain* (together with English translator Anthea Bell who is well-known for her *Asterix* translations and many others), and Herta Müller’s novel *The Appointment* (with English translator and poet Michael Hulse), as well as Herta Müller’s 2009 Nobel Prize acceptance speech. He has also retranslated the anonymously published war diary *A Woman in Berlin* (2005). 18

Peter Filkins, the translator of *The Book of Franza* is an academic, critic and poet as well as a translator and has translated all of Bachmann’s poems published as *Songs in Flight* (1994) and *Darkness Spoken* (2006). He has also translated Austrian writer Alois Hotschnig’s writing and two novels by H.G. Adler. He is a poet and lecturer in German at Simon’s Rock at Bard College, a liberal arts college in Massachusetts. He has been awarded numerous research grants, fellowships and poetry prizes.

Mary Fran Gilbert studied German and English literature in Germany and is the co-owner of a translation and localisation company in Hamburg (Gilbert n.d.: n.p.). She has translated the non-fiction work *Fixed Ideas: America Since 9.11* by North American writer and journalist Joan Didion, but *Three Paths to the Lake* appears to be her only book-length literary translation to date. She won a Hamburger

---

18 *A Woman in Berlin* was published in America in 1954, five years before it was first published in Germany. Although much care was taken to ensure the anonymity of its author, it is now assumed that the diary was written by Marta Hillers, a Sorbonne-educated German journalist and alleged Nazi-sympathiser (Grossmann 2007: 54). The diary was edited by Hans Magnus Enzensberger. Boehm’s retranslation includes previously untranslated parts of the German version.

Lilian Friedberg completed a PhD on the translation of Ingeborg Bachmann’s work in 2004. She has translated three novels and one play by Elfriede Jelinek; one of them, *The Wall* (2005), was commissioned by the author.

---

19 Three of these are awarded annually.
1.12 Overview of Chapters

In Chapter 2, Bachmann’s and Malina’s German reception will be presented against the backdrop of discussions of women’s writing. I give an overview of the history of women’s writing in the German-speaking countries as far as relevant in order to position Bachmann in the context and within the evolution of women writers, and discuss the purpose of this category. The essentialist view of women is particularly relevant to the discussion in the German media of Bachmann and her appearance. I shall compare the way Bachmann was seen in Germany during her lifetime to the way feminist critics interpreted her work in order to ascertain the effect of both approaches on the translation. This section will also look at Howard Parshley’s translation of de Beauvoir’s *Le Deuxième Sexe* because of the criticism (see Simons 1983 and Moi 2002) he has received for his omission of important historical and philosophical details. I would like to see if parallels can be drawn between Parshley’s and Boehm’s approaches to texts which both took on enormous importance in the feminist movement, although Bachmann’s primarily did so within German feminism.

Chapter 3 will be dedicated to the stylistic analysis of the source and target texts. It is especially important to establish similarities and differences between *Malina*, *Franza* and their translations. The chapter is divided into sections on different ways the translators’ views and gender could manifest themselves in the language they use. A discussion of Mark Anderson’s afterword in *Malina* and Peter Filkins’ ‘Translator’s Note’ in *Franza* is also included in this chapter because they are part of the target text and thus constitute a way in which it differs from the source text.

In Chapter 4, I shall give an overview of the translations’ receptions. Particular attention will be paid to the position of translations from German in general, and translations of Bachmann’s works more specifically, in the Anglo-American polysystem. Itamar Even-Zohar’s Polysystem Theory (1990a and 1990b) is used as a framework in order to elucidate the reasons as to why Bachmann’s work in English occupies a niche in the English-speaking world.

Chapter 5 consists of a summary of the findings and analyses presented in Chapters 2, 3 and 4, as well as my overall conclusion with regard to role played by the author’s and translators’ genders. Possibilities for future research are indicated throughout this chapter.
Chapter 2: Reception and Gender in the German-Speaking Territories

This chapter examines the journalistic and academic reception Ingeborg Bachmann’s publications in German-speaking countries received during her lifetime and following her death. The way in which she was evaluated as a person by critics upon the publication of her prose works, especially *Malina*, is analysed and contrasted with the views of feminist critics. In this chapter, I posit the view that Bachmann’s German reception correlates with the translators’ choices: the stylistic analysis carried out in Chapter Three of this thesis shows that Peter Filkins simplified and shortened many of Bachmann’s complex sentences in his translation of *Das Buch Franza* [*The Book of Franza*], while Philip Boehm’s translation of *Malina* failed to recreate the ambiguity, wordplay, metaphors, iconicity, and transitivity structures which considerably enhance the enjoyment and understanding of the text for the source text reader. These texts in translation thus lack to a large extent the complexity, depth and carefully constructed style of Bachmann’s originals, which have been appreciated by critics since the 1980s, yet were originally dismissed during the author’s lifetime.

It is worth asking whether Filkins and Boehm could have been aware of a particular attitude towards Bachmann and whether their approach to their respective translations may have been affected by this as a consequence. Establishing potential parallels between translators’ choices and critiques of the works they have translated further elucidates the questions posed in Chapter 1 of this thesis, particularly whether the male translators demonstrate a tendency to consciously or unconsciously ‘correct’ aspects of the source texts that were negatively highlighted in reviews.

In section 1.2.1, I suggest that feminist criticism has had little effect on the male translators’ approaches to Bachmann’s work. The present chapter explores this issue in the context of German literary publishing and review conventions. The overview of the German-language reception of Bachmann and her works examined in this chapter is contrasted with the English-language reception in Chapter 4. This comparison serves the purpose of clarifying that the source and target texts were published in very different political, social and literary environments, as well as of demonstrating the extent to which Bachmann was presented as a different type of author by critics in both of these languages. Chapter 3 presents the results of a
stylistic comparison of source and target texts in order to establish the translators’ involvement in the texts. Chapter 4 refers to the differences between the texts and their translations in order to hypothesise a link between the male translators’ approaches to Bachmann’s texts and the evaluation of the author as a person by German critics from the 1950s to the early 1980s. This comparison shows that Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ are a special case because of the time in which they were published.
2.1 The Particulars of Bachmann’s Reception

The German-language reception, encompassing criticism from Austria, Germany and Switzerland between 1953 (the publication of Bachmann’s first poetry collection Die gestundete Zeit [Mortgaged Time]) and 2013, has undergone several developments and will be evaluated in this section. An overview will be given of Bachmann’s rise to fame as a poet during the 1950s, the particulars of Malina’s publication and initially unfavourable reception in 1972, followed by an analysis of the novel’s rediscovery by the German feminist movement in the 1980s. The changes that Bachmann’s German-language reception has undergone will be evaluated in the context of Germany and Austria’s post-war societies. Brief reference will be made, in section 2.7, to the poems and diary extracts published in recent years. This means mainly the collection Ich weiß keine bessere Welt [I know no better world] (2000), which contains previously unpublished poems, and Bachmann’s Kriegstagebuch [War Diary] (2010), a volume which contains both the diary she kept during the last year of the Second World War and the letters she exchanged with Jack Hamesh, an Austrian Jewish refugee who returned to Vienna as a British soldier. The publication of both of these books was controversial because, although Bachmann did not expressly forbid their posthumous publication, she also did not express a wish for either of them to see the light of day as she left no instructions regarding her estate (anonymous article in Schardt 2011b: 41). Her siblings Heinz Bachmann and Isolde Moser are in charge of her estate and were thus responsible for the decision to publish these texts. The decision to allow access to these private documents can be questioned.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the perceived role of the author in the production, interpretation and translation of texts has undergone several changes since the debate was opened by Roland Barthes’ 1967 ‘Death of the Author’ (here 1987), an essay in which he argued that “[t]o give a text an author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing” (Barthes 1987: 147). This strong statement suggests that if one interprets a text solely by trying to reconstruct the author’s intentions and her/his context, other, possibly equally valid, interpretations become impossible. Iser’s “implied reader” (1979: 34) constitutes another important step in the shift of understandings of where meaning resides. Recent discussions of Reader-Response-Theory and cognitive stylistics have arrived at the view that “the
style of the text both conveys and creates a cognitive state” (Boase-Beier 2006: 77), suggesting that the text, as well as its author, plays a role in the construction of an interpretation by the reader.

Despite these developments, analyses of Bachmann’s work have until recently sought explanations for her writing in her perceived personality and life, and, if one subscribes to Barthes’ view, by doing so limit the possible interpretations of her work. Readers can gain more from Bachmann’s work when the focus is less narrow. Seán Burke, in his study of the changing role of the author, notes “six cardinal intersections of author and text” (2004: 4-6) which appear throughout the debate concerning Paul de Man’s wartime writings20; these can also be identified in the discourse surrounding Bachmann’s work. Bachmann’s political views during the war were diametrically opposed to de Man’s, but examining Bachmann’s reception according to these “loci of traditional author-centred criticism” (Burke 2004: 4) will be helpful in understanding its complexities. These six points of convergence of an author’s life and work in discussions of the texts produced by them suggest that, while Bachmann might be an extreme case where the amalgamation of personal affairs and textual phenomena in the critic’s mind are concerned, as this chapter demonstrates, her situation is representative of a general trend. The following points are intended to give a brief overview of Burke’s analysis of de Man’s case, which is then adapted for Bachmann’s reception.

1. **Intention**: Because de Man became an important literary figure, it was important to examine the intentions expressed in his early articles in order to ascertain whether his later work also expressed anti-Semitic views. Burke notes that advocates of “anti-intentionalist deconstruction” and of “pro-intentionalist contextualism” are united by their assumption that de Man’s intent matters (Burke 2004: 4). Evaluations of Bachmann’s writing also frequently focus on intention. Reviews of the ‘Todesarten’ fragments address Bachmann’s plan to write a series of books about the ways in which women are silenced (see, for example, Bremer 1978 in Schardt 2011a: 240-243);

20 After de Man’s death, 170 articles for the collaborationist Belgian newspaper *Le Soir* were discovered. These articles express anti-Semitic and pro-Nazi views, and their discovery led to a re-evaluation both of de Man’s career and of the deconstructive movement (see Burke 2004: 1).
thus, it is clear that statements made by the author in interviews or speeches matter to many readers of her work.

2. **Author-ity**: Burke suggests that the views expressed by de Man in his early articles only matter because he became well-known; he further notes that the philosopher Martin Heidegger’s association with National Socialism is seen as more noteworthy than it would be if he had been a “non-discursive cultural [figure]” (Burke 2004: 4). Views expressed by someone who is seen as an authority thus matter more, presumably because they are in a position to influence others through their writing. The viewpoint described by Burke also suggests that texts are often understood as inseparable from their author’s worldview. In Bachmann’s case, the numerous prizes she received, the fact that she was able to exert a positive influence with regard to, for example, Paul Celan’s relationships with publishers, as well as the fact that Bachmann was the first author who was invited to give the Frankfurt poetics lectures in 1959 (Jaspers 2011: n.p.) suggests that she was seen as a literary authority during her lifetime. It is possible that this is a reason why her prose did not fade into obscurity when it failed to impress influential critics upon publication. The Ingeborg Bachmann prize has been awarded annually by the Austrian city of Klagenfurt, her birth place, since 1977 and this, together with the existence of countless academic studies and institutions such as the Ingeborg Bachmann Centre in London, suggests that she is still seen as an important literary figure.

3. **Biography**: De Man’s biography is often invoked in discussions of his culpability (Burke 2004: 5). Bachmann’s biography is frequently referred to in discussions of her writing. Although it is easy to dismiss the search for explanations of her work in her personal life, Áine McMurtry (2012) shows that it is possible to gain valuable insights into the process of Bachmann’s formulation of her views by taking into account the context of the ‘Todesarten’.

4. **Accountability**: Burke notes that when an author is held to account for her/his actions, this concerns the author as a person rather than the figure that can be

---

21 Bachmann’s efforts with publishers on Celan’s behalf are outlined in her correspondence with Celan which was published as *Herzzeit* (2008).
inferred from the text, and authors are thus tied “ethically and existentially” (Burke 2004: 5) to the texts they have written. Although Bachmann did not write politically dubious articles in the manner of Paul de Man, critiques of her prose work seem to hold her as a person accountable for its perceived failings. Reviews of her poetry reading at a Gruppe 47 meeting noted the tone of her voice and posture (Löchel 2003: n.p.). The author’s performance might affect how listeners understand the text, but it should not play a role in the assessment of the quality of a written text.

5. *Oeuvre*: According to Burke (2004: 5), there are different ways one can interpret the relationship between de Man’s wartime writings and his later work: the early writings can be seen as early indicators of his later thoughts; his post-war writings can be seen as an attempt to make amends with regard to his earlier ideology, or the wartime writings can be seen as distinct from de Man’s main oeuvre. Burke seems to suggest that an author’s early work is often discussed in relation to her/his mature work. The discussions which centred on Bachmann’s more recently published texts have followed the same pattern. Until recently, Bachmann’s work has been interpreted as a disjointed body of writings which encompasses critical texts (philosophical essays and speeches), poetry, radio plays, and prose (McMurtry 2012: 6). Reviews of her *Kriegstagebuch* [War Diary] and *Briefe an Felician* [Letters to Felician] prioritise the personal nature of these documents above any insights into Bachmann’s development as a writer which they might provide. The publication in 2000 of poetic drafts discovered in Bachmann’s estate proves that she did not eschew poetry in favour of prose in a radical change of direction as previously thought. McMurtry (2012) demonstrates that Bachmann’s work presents a continuum: her literary compositions explore the ideas she developed in her theoretical writing, while the poetic drafts constitute an early stage of development of the themes which became central to the ‘Todesarten’. The poetic drafts and short stories are thus not somehow inferior experiments, but rather a stage which we need to examine in order to understand fully the complexity of the ‘Todesarten’.

6. *Autobiography*: De Man’s work is usually interpreted in relation to his life; even his theoretical writings are read as either an attempt to hide his history, or as a purposefully developed system which would prevent others from
falling prey to “ideological mystification” in the way that he did (Burke 2004: 6). Interpretations of Bachmann’s work also invoke the author’s life. It was previously thought by some critics that Bachmann’s work, especially Malina, was autobiographical in a rather simplistic way; the author Bachmann has been confused with the “extra-fictional” voice (see Stockwell 2002: 42) of the novel.22 McMurtry’s approach is more nuanced; she suggests that the explanation for aspects of Bachmann’s views regarding the situation of women can be found in some of her experiences. It is also important to note that the extra-fictional voice which we infer will include aspects of Bachmann’s stated intent. This is explored further with reference to Stockwell’s explanations of cognitive deixis (2002: 41-43) in section 2.8. Furthermore, Bachmann herself contributed to this lack of separation between personal thoughts and public writing to some extent. She explained the motivation for her thesis on Heidegger’s existentialism thus: “ich habe damals gemeint mit zweiundzwanzig Jahren, diesen Mann werde ich jetzt stürzen” [I thought then, at the age of twenty-two, I am going to topple this man now] (Kaiser 1985 in Schardt 2011a: 298). She was aware of Heidegger’s anti-Semitic stance during the war and this influenced how she approached his philosophical work. Her statement, which shows Bachmann’s awareness of the futility of her preposterous aim, suggests that there was a link for her between her academic work and her personal views.

This analysis suggests that the figure of Bachmann the author is inextricably linked with her work and readers’ interpretations of it. However, it is important to be aware that although we can, of course, read interviews with Bachmann or letters written by her, we do not have access to her, and cannot fully trust what she says in letters and interviews. The “real reader” does not have access to the “real author” (Stockwell 2002: 42). We know that the real author Ingeborg Bachmann constructed the Malina character Ich, but however many similarities with Bachmann we might see in Ich, this narrator is an invention, and all we have is an “extra-fictional voice” (Stockwell 2002: 42): the impression of Bachmann that we create from her writing, literary.

---

22 Bartsch (1988: 15) notes that German literature in the 1970s tended towards autobiographical writing.
criticism of her work, and her contemporaries’ descriptions. Stockwell notes that the extra-fictional voice differs from the implied author: the latter is different in each piece of writing (Stockwell 2002: 42). The extra-fictional voice tends to be a constant. Achberger refers to the “false reception” (Achberger 1995: 61) of Bachmann’s poetry:

Bachmann became a classic case of ‘misreception’, of conflict between authorial intention and dominant modes of reception. From the first collection of poems in 1953 to the last collection of stories in 1972, her works were consistently read against their author’s intention in spite of her comments in interviews, lectures, and essays, and in spite of the sociocritical thrust of the works themselves. (Achberger 1995: 1)

Achberger recognises that Bachmann belongs to the canon of important German-language writers, and even compares her influence to that of Virginia Woolf on modern English writers (Achberger 1995: 1). She traces Bachmann’s influence to the work of Christa Wolf (who referred to Bachmann in her own Frankfurt Poetics Lecture), Günter Grass, Max Frisch, Thomas Bernhard, Erich Fried and Peter Handke, and it is likely that it extends even further than this, such as to the winners of the Ingeborg Bachmann Prize. There have been documentaries about her life, and Malina was turned into a film with a screenplay by the well-known Austrian author Elfriede Jelinek.

While Achberger’s analysis is in many respects valid, issue can be taken with her use of the word ‘intention’: views of authorial intent and the reader’s involvement in the text have undergone several developments over the course of the last six decades, as discussed above. Although authors can grant readers insight into their creative processes and strategies, it is not certain that these constitute their actual intent. Stylistic features can provide clues to the intention of the speaker (Boase-Beier 2006: 41), and some of the features identified in Chapter 3 of this thesis can correspond to statements made by Bachmann. However, Jean Boase-Beier notes that it is individual readers who infer the author’s intent (2006: 41), and it is thus not stable and unchanging. In addition, it is not uncommon for readers to read texts against the author’s intention; for instance, reading misogynist texts “against the grain” is a useful practice (Walters 1995: 77). While Bachmann’s intent can be
described as feminist (although she did not seem to identify as a feminist) in the sense that the ‘Todesarten’ foreshadow concerns that became central to overtly feminist authors from the mid-1970s onwards (see section 2.2), Malina and the short stories seem to have been read against the grain by the critics whose voices dominate the German literary environment. The following sections will evaluate examples of this as well as the far-reaching consequences of the critics’ approach in light of the English-language translations of Bachmann’s prose texts.
2.2 Wendepunkte: Reception in German-Speaking Countries

The reception of Bachmann’s work in Germany and Austria experienced two ‘Wendepunkte’ [turning points] (Bartsch 1988: 1), so that three distinct phases can be identified: the favourable reception of her poetry in the early 1950s, the ‘fall from grace’ after the publication of the first collection of short stories in 1961, and the feminist rediscovery of her work in the mid- to late-1970s. These phases and their political and societal circumstances as well as their possible effect on the English translations of the ‘Todesarten’ texts will be examined here.

Bachmann frequently referenced the war and its effects on people and society in her poetry and prose, and she was constructed by the media and contemporary writers as a spokesperson for the post-war human condition. Her writing and its reception can therefore not be separated from the circumstances in which they occurred. The socio-political context in Germany and Austria helps to elucidate the circumstances of Bachmann’s text production and the criticism she received. Both Austrian and German society, as was the case for most of Europe, underwent radical changes after the Second World War. While large parts of the world experienced progress which eventually led to, for example, the 1968 student protests in the UK, France, Italy and the United States, the situation in Germany and Austria was possibly more acute as citizens struggled to face the aftermath of the atrocities committed among them and to acknowledge guilt while finding a way forward. The tension which resulted from the reverence for old German icons such as Goethe and Schiller and the need to question the past in order to prevent future state-sanctioned violence provided a stimulating environment for socially and politically critical writers such as those of the Gruppe 47 (see footnote 9 in section 1.2.1).

Austrian politics in the two decades following the war were dominated by the Conservative party: for the 25 years following the war, the country’s Chancellors (Leopold Figl from 1945 until 1953, Julius Raab until 1961, Alfons Gorbach until 1964, Josef Klaus until 1970) belonged to the Conservative ÖVP,\(^{23}\) until Socialist Bruno Kreisky began the reign of the SPÖ\(^{24}\) which would last until 2000 (Bundeskanzleramt Österreich n.d.: n.p.). West German politics underwent similar

\(^{23}\) Österreichische Volkspartei [Austrian People’s Party]

\(^{24}\) Sozialdemokratische Partei Österreichs [Social Democratic Party of Austria]
developments: the Chancellors from 1949 until 1969 (Konrad Adenauer from 1949 until 1963, Ludwig Erhard until 1966, Kurt Georg Kiesinger until 1969) belonged to the Conservative CDU. The election of the first Socialist chancellor (Willy Brandt 1969 to 1974, followed by Helmut Schmidt until 1982; both were members of the SPD) in 1969 (Bundeskanzleramt Deutschland: n.d.: n.p.) signalled a sea-change.

The fact that both Austria and Germany elected Socialist Chancellors around the same time suggests that their societies’ general leanings were changing. Jürgen Habermas and Richard von Weizsäcker sought the explanation for the liberalisation of West-German political culture in the youth revolt (von Weizsäcker and Habermas 1988: n.p.). The 1970s saw political polarisation and radicalisation; most notorious are the activities of the left-wing anti-capitalist group RAF, and some attribute the shooting of the unofficial leader of the student protests Rudi Dutschke by a right-wing extremist to the right-wing tabloid Bild’s provocative writing (Schiller 2003: 23). Bild was the “populist flagship” of “conservative newspaper tycoon” Axel Springer’s press empire (Schiller 2003: 23) and had described Dutschke as “the incarnation of disorderliness and revolutionary evil” (Burns and van der Will 1988: 109). As a widely-read publication, it was in a position to influence and reinforce the opinion of a section of German society which would already have been unlikely to support the student movement.

It is thus clear that Austria and Germany were undergoing drastic social and political changes during the time of Bachmann’s writing. These upheavals also made it possible for women and for politically conscious writers of both genders to speak up for equal rights.

Borhau (1994: 34-40) gives a brief overview of trends and concerns of German literature after the war. According to her, some writers such as Günter Grass, Heinrich Böll and Uwe Johnson focused on the possibility of writing as a way of accurately representing the recent past. This phase of German literature was thus concerned with documenting political situations rather than ideas regarding the craft of writing and modes of expression. Hans Magnus Enzensberger, among others in

25 Christliche Demokratische Union Deutschlands [Christian Democratic Union of Germany]
26 Walter Scheel (FDP) acted as Chancellor for ten days in May 1974 after Willy Brandt’s resignation.
27 Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands [Social democratic Party of Germany]
28 Rote Armee Faktion [Red Army Faction] was a group led by Ulrike Meinhof and Andreas Baader which carried out politically motivated acts of violence in Germany.
Kursbuch 15 (1968),\textsuperscript{29} called for a politically engaged literature. Similarly, Erich Kuby (1946: 10) made the following comment:

We did not write because we had set ourselves the goal of becoming writers. We wrote because we felt that it was our duty to issue a warning. It was not easy for us to write; we were left completely to our own devices. Because there was no ethical support system, there was no literary model, there was no tradition. (Cited in Trommler 1971: 13)

This priority changed in the early 1970s (Borhau 1994: 39) when in addition to left-wing values, authors showed renewed interest in aesthetic understandings of literature. This is also the point at which the reception of texts began to be seen by members of the student movement as a subject worth studying because it was seen as a way to democratise the teaching of German-language literature (Borhau 1994: 40). The post-war approach to literature also constitutes the beginning of an interdisciplinary study of literature as it drew on theories originating in the social sciences.

The role and perception of German-language woman-authored writing has come a long way. Weigel, a German academic, explains the difference between the more-or-less synonymous terms ‘Frauenliteratur’ and ‘women’s literature’ thus: the German term originated in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century and originally referred to ‘Trivialliteratur’ [trivial literature] – popular serialised fiction written by women (Weigel 1984a: 53). This historical stage parallels that of 1850s women’s fiction in North American which will be mentioned in section 4.1. In German-speaking countries, this category of Frauenliteratur was most easily available to categorise the texts composed by feminists in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. The National Socialists stopped groups that were trying to advance women’s rights, as well as the avant-garde (ibid.: 58), and women writers in the second half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century thus found themselves without a heritage as there were no recent forerunners whose work could be continued and function as a guide.

\textsuperscript{29} Kursbuch was a literary magazine founded by Enzensberger in 1965 and published by Suhrkamp.
Modern German women’s writing began in 1975, according to Weigel (1984a: 55 and 59), and initially had a rather marginal role (as part of the socialist student movement), whereas North American feminism was more broad and originated in the middle-classes (ibid.: 53). What Weigel (1984a: 55) calls “contemporary women’s literature” originated in this need for political action and thus does not solely refer to literature by women, but also encompasses production and reception. During the early phase, writers examined the ways in which solidarity between women could be encouraged (Weigel 1984a: 74). By the 1980s, the writing had developed into “women’s literatures” (ibid.: 55; original emphasis) and in the process became more differentiated and comprehensive. A focus of the later women’s literatures was also the collation of the history of women’s writing (Weigel 1984a: 74). Part of this was a focus on women writers’ experiences during the National Socialist years in memoirs, such as demonstrated, for example, in Luise Rinser’s autobiography *Den Wolf umarmen* [To embrace the wolf] (1981). According to Weigel (1984a: 75), there was a general interest in ‘Erinnerungsarbeit’ [the work of remembering] in German society at this time, and this encouraged women to examine their past during the Nazi regime. This allowed for gaps in the history of women’s writing to be filled in.

The texts written by politically engaged women in the early 1970s are characterised by autobiographical realism; according to Weigel (1984a: 85) they deal with women’s experiences (relationships or anorexia, for example) while confining themselves to the structures of the male order and treating women as “literary objects”. While Weigel’s article (1984a) gives a comprehensive overview of developments in German-language writing by women from the late 1960s to 1984, this assessment also demonstrates what is often problematic in feminist literary theory. Weigel, an authority on post-war German literature, does not define what it means to treat women as literary objects as opposed to subjects. She notes that *Malina* finally found appreciation when autobiographical narratives began to be seen as an inadequate text type to express women’s circumstances (1984a: 86). The novel, as well as the other ‘Todesarten’-fragments, managed to express utopian ideas of another way of existing through its switch between realistic and dream-like sequences.

Weigel (1984a: 55) cites feminist activists’ non-engagement with *Malina* as a case that illustrates the division between the women’s movement and women’s
literature in the 1970s. Weigel mentions that there was general dissatisfaction regarding a lack of women’s literature at this time, and notes that this was of a qualitative rather than a quantitative nature (ibid.) as there were several well-known female authors (for example, Ilse Aichinger, Friederike Mayröcker, Luise Rinser, Gabriele Wohmann). However, according to Weigel (ibid.), their books failed to address women’s emancipation and needs, and were to a large extent influenced by traditional notions of womanhood as well as the male-dominated publishing market. It seems that many women authors did not write about topics of interest to women in a sufficiently radical manner and thus were initially ignored by the women’s movement.

A statement made by Marie Luise Kaschnitz as part of a lecture on women’s poetry in 1957 demonstrates the way in which Bachmann’s understanding of masculinity and femininity was representative of attitudes during this time: “[f]or the younger and the youngest, the dream world and the world of the subconscious emerge by virtue of their aversion to logic and rationality, as the appropriate realms for women” (cited in Bullivant and Rice 1995: 229). It is also clear that this division of masculine rational thought as opposed to the feminine dream world represents a binary view of gender. Early (1970s) conceptions of femininity differ from the later (1980s) ideas that were influenced by French post-structuralist thought in that they originate from a different viewpoint (Weigel 1984a: 56). At the beginning of the women’s movement, femininity was initially understood as the opposite of rationality, whereas later it began to be seen as “an energy capable of challenging the logocentrism of phallic order” (Weigel 1984a: 57). Definitions like this are problematic because their abstract nature makes it difficult to understand the extent to which they could have an impact on women’s daily lives. Monika Albrecht (2004: 97) notes two decades after Weigel’s article that gender is now just one social category among several (possible others are class, ethnicity, age, and sexual orientation, but this list is not exhaustive), and that feminist scholars at present work in an interdisciplinary fashion, combining gender issues with other political and academic questions.

By 1984, Malina had become “a kind of cult book” (Weigel 1984a: 55). Feminism had moved on and now found that the novel presented the shift in viewpoint that had become necessary. Other novels received similar receptions; for example, Weigel (1984a: 63-64) mentions Marlen Haushofer’s Die Wand [The Wall]
(1968), Unica Zürn’s *Dunkler Frühling* [Dark Spring] (1969), Caroline Muhr’s *Depression. Tagebuch einer Krankheit* [Depression. Diary of a Disease] (1970), and Jutta Heinrich’s *Das Geschlecht der Gedanken* [The Gender of Thoughts] (1972). All of these novels failed to reach a large audience upon their first publication or struggled to find a publisher, but were far more successful when published either in paperback or in a second edition in the late 1970s or early 1980s. Bachmann’s *Franza* fragment also falls into this category as Bachmann had begun writing it in the 1960s, and it was only published in 1978, so during the later phase of German second-wave feminism.

The early second-wave feminist movement30 in Germany had a rather narrow focus. One example illustrating this fact is the publishing house Frauenoffensive’s insistence that books could not portray women negatively (see Weigel 1984a: 64).

Bachmann’s works were published before second-wave feminism had gained a strong foothold whereas their English translations were published after its conclusion. It is difficult to establish the precise beginning of the second-wave feminist movement. However, the dates of publication of key feminist texts give some indication, as do landmarks in the fight for women’s rights. Simone de Beauvoir’s *Le Deuxième Sexe* [*The Second Sex*] was published in France in 1949 (Parshley’s English translation appeared in 1953) and seems to be a very early indicator of the changes that were afoot. Sue Thornham, in *The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Postfeminism*, views Betty Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique* (1963) as the starting point of feminism in the USA (Thornham 2001: 29).

The development of ‘Ecriture féminine’ [feminine writing] by Hélène Cixous followed a few years later in France in the mid-1960s. Ecriture féminine is a way of writing outside of the binary of western metaphysics, and Cixous’ idea of femininity should be understood as that which does not belong to the dominant norm; it is therefore not limited to gender (Kirkley 2013: 318). In the UK, Thornham notes the sewing machinists’ strike at the Ford factory in Dagenham in 1968 to achieve equal pay for women as a key moment in the advent of feminism (Thornham 2001: 31). *The Female Eunuch* by the Australian feminist Germaine Greer was published in 1970 and became well-known throughout the western English-speaking world.

30 First-wave feminism refers to the suffrage movement; second-wave feminism encompasses the renewed interest in women’s rights which spans the 1960s to 1980s.
In Germany, women’s rights activism began at around the same time as it did in the UK, i.e. in the late 1960s. The ‘Aktionsrat zur Befreiung der Frauen’ [action council for women’s liberation] was founded in 1968 by women who did not find their interests represented by the male leaders of the Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund [Socialist German Student League] (Schwarzer 2011: 169); some aspects of the Aktionsrat’s complex relationship with the student movement are documented in feminist journalist Alice Schwarzer’s autobiography (Schwarzer 2011: 169-171). The legalisation of abortion was a key concern of the early second-wave feminist movement in Germany (Ferree et al. 2002: 144). Alice Schwarzer is arguably Germany’s most famous feminist because she has been instrumental in feminist activism for several decades and founded the feminist magazine *Emma* in 1977. She began campaigns against ‘Paragraph 218’ [section 218 of the Basic Law which criminalised the termination of pregnancy] in 1971 and considers this the definitive beginning of German feminism as groups of women began to demand more rights for women in society rather than limiting themselves to equal decision-making power in the student movement (Schwarzer 2011: 235).

Although North American feminism initially had links with advocates of black women’s rights, American and European second-wave feminism of the 1970s is widely regarded as representing the interests of white middle-class women (Thornham 2001: 32). Intersectionality, the awareness that numerous factors such as class, race, ability, sexuality, a person’s education, weight and shape, employment, a person’s status as a parent or non-parent, as well as gender, can interact to place constraints on an individual’s life, only became a concern comparatively late.31 Bachmann does not show any concern with problems that might be experienced by, for example, non-white women specifically; all of her female characters are able-bodied and seem to belong to upper-middle-class Viennese society. This tells us two things. On the one hand, women’s interests were not Bachmann’s primary concern; she could, for example, have included issues faced specifically by Egyptian women in her composition of *Franza*, as Franza travels to Egypt, in order to demonstrate that hardships were also experienced by women outside of Viennese society. On the other hand, the feminism that can be inferred from Bachmann’s texts is a product of its

31 The term ‘intersectionality’ was coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989 (DeFrancisco 2007: 199).
time, and one must not underestimate the revolutionary nature of her views regarding the cruelty meted out to women within romantic relationships.

Similarly, Bachmann’s perseverance with regard to ensuring that her radical ideas reached an audience was remarkable. Although her short stories attracted severe criticism, she carried on with her plan for the ‘Todesarten’. In the process, she began to be represented in the press as a myth rather than a real writer (see Schardt 2011a: 306). The journalistic reception of her work alone encompasses such a large number of articles that two volumes have been dedicated to it by Michael Schardt (2011a and 2011b), and one by Constanze Hotz (1990). The two volumes of Schardt’s collection of criticism comprise over 1500 published pieces of writing pertaining to Bachmann (Schardt 2011a: 312). In addition, countless books and journal articles constitute the scholarly reception of her work. This chapter thus only gives a very selective overview for the purpose of determining to what extent the journalistic and scholarly reception of Bachmann and her work produced her as a woman writer, rather than as a writer, and in what way it could be said to have influenced the translators of the ‘Todesarten’ texts.

Schardt criticises academic evaluations of Bachmann’s reception, including Hotz’s, for taking into account only a limited number of newspaper reviews. It must be borne in mind, however, that Schardt’s and Hotz’s approaches vary greatly: Schardt presents a selection of reviews and articles that are contextualised in a brief afterword. Hotz’s book is an academic study of Bachmann’s image and for this reason does not aim to give readers access to a large number of texts as the emphasis is on critical analysis. Hotz’s study of the Spiegel portrait of Bachmann provides an insightful analysis of how the author’s role in German-speaking countries was constructed. Because Bachmann’s two poetry collections were published to great acclaim, the German-speaking public and critics expected her to follow this up with publications which matched this anticipation. Hotz uses the term ‘image’ to bring across this conflation of Bachmann as a person, her work, and the expectations placed on her (Hotz 1990: 10; 21-22):

Images [haben] ganz entschieden auch lektüreinstruerierende Funktion. […]
Für ein literarisches Publikum übernehmen Images die Funktion der ersten Orientierung über ein Werk und dessen AutorIn. Images […] sind
als Lektüreanregung zu sehen aber auch als Lektürelenkung und als Entlastung von eigener Meinungsbildung. (Hotz 1990: 30)

[Images definitely also inform readings. For a literary audience, images provide a first point of orientation of a work and its author. Images stimulate readers, but also direct their reading and relieve them from having to form their own opinions.]

Hotz seems to suggest that being aware of an author’s ‘image’ can also add another facet to the interpretation of her/his work; however, her view also parallels Barthes’ idea that to refer back to the author is to impose a limit on the text.

Albrecht (2004: 92) notes that since Bachmann’s death in 1973, the term ‘Mythos’ [myth] has been used to refer to her. She compares the construction of Bachmann’s image by the press to that of Marilyn Monroe, who represented a modern and sexualised idea(l) of a woman (Albrecht 2004: 95). Albrecht comes to the conclusion that Bachmann fulfilled German and Austrian society’s need in the 1950s for a public figure who would symbolise a return to old values. Albrecht, as well as Kienlechner (1983) and Long (2011), mentions the perception of Bachmann as a woman who wanted to please men; Kienlechner’s (1983) article draws parallels between Bachmann’s story ‘Undine geht’ [Undine leaves], the author’s life, and Marilyn Monroe. Presumably Kienlechner assumed that Bachmann was prepared to devote efforts to the achievement of a groomed appearance. The author’s image thus activates traditional beliefs regarding women’s subordinate role. At the same time, Bachmann symbolises a new beginning through the themes of her poetry. Considering Bachmann’s (either intentionally or accidentally) childfree, unmarried and financially independent existence, her high educational attainment, as well as the fact that she moved frequently between countries (see Albrecht and Göttscbe 2002), one could say that she led a relatively unusual life for a woman of her generation. However, this seems to have played a smaller role in terms of the public’s perception than how she related to men. Bachmann’s image thus contains elements of different tropes that relate to women: the woman who is concerned with her appearance and

32 Monroe also appeared on the cover of Der Spiegel one year before Bachmann (Albrecht 2004: 95).
has relationships with well-known male writers, the isolated intellectual, the modern woman who earns her own money. Perhaps, as the post-war era was an uncomfortable place, Bachmann’s embodiment of a link between the past and the future contributed to her enduring popularity in German-speaking countries.
2.3  Reception of Bachmann as a Poet in the 1950s

In the 1950s, Bachmann experienced considerable success: she “was celebrated as young poetess, a unique voice” (Brinker-Gabler 2004: 1) and a “harbinger of a new era” (McMurtry 2012: 4). Brinker-Gabler talks of Bachmann’s “aura” (2004: 2), established by her two poetry collections *Die gestundete Zeit* [Mortgaged Time] (1953) and *Anrufung des großen Bären* [Invocation of the Great Bear] (1956). When she was awarded a prize by the influential group of German-language writers Gruppe 47 (see Chapter 1), her fate as the new hope on the literary horizon was sealed. Albrecht (2004: 94) summarises Bachmann’s position by calling her “Hoffnungsträger” [literally: carrier of hope]: the hopes of the German-speaking public and critics were pinned on Bachmann.

Although reviews of her poetry collections are consistently positive and characterised by admiration for her skill as a poet, they also display a tendency to patronise Bachmann. For example, the 1954 *Spiegel* article cites a description of her as “ein schönes Mädchen” [a pretty girl] and refers to her thesis on Heidegger as “ein so verzweifelt anspruchsvolles Thema” [such a desperately demanding topic] (Wagner 1954 in Schardt 2011a: 10), and, together with its description of the author’s unworldly existence in Rome, shut away in her house, typing away at all hours of the day and night, creates an impression of a naïve young person who leads an existence outside of social conventions, is not aware of her limits and as such is made an easy target of ridicule. Despite this, Bachmann was crowned the “Vertreterin der neuen Lyrik” [representative of the new poetry] (Heselhaus 1954 in Schardt 2011a: 16), and Günter Blöcker, who was later the author of some of the harshest criticism of *Malina* and the short stories, even called her a “neue[r] Stern am deutschen Poetenhimmel” [new star in the heavens of German poets] and enthused that “diese Frau hat das Entscheidende, das wirklich moderne, nämlich: den lyrischen Intellekt” [this woman possesses that which matters, that which is really modern, namely: poetic intellect] (Blöcker 1954 in Schardt 2011a: 17; 19). Perceptions of Bachmann as introverted remained into the 1960s. Reviews from this time frequently

---

use words such as “scheu” [timid], “hilflos” [helpless], “schüchtern” [shy] and “nervös” [nervous] to evaluate her public appearances (see von Tilburg 1961, Silens 1961 and Tilliger 1960 in Schardt 2011b: 127, 128 and 155 respectively).

In contrast to this emphasis on her young age and fragility stand later reviews which describe her poems as “herb, kühl, fast männlich” [dry, cold/unemotional, almost masculine] (Anonymous 1961 in Schardt 2011b: 126) and find it necessary to analyse Bachmann’s face: her “fast männlich kinnstark[es] Gesicht, das gegen früher an Frische, ja an Schönheit in gesicherter weiblicher Reife gewonnen hat” [face with its almost masculine prominent chin looks fresher and even more beautiful compared to previous years thanks to its feminine maturity] (Günther 1961 in Schardt 2011b: 130). It is not certain whether the reviewers noticed the irony of defining Bachmann as both masculine and feminine at the same time. Reviews that describe Bachmann in this way date primarily from around 1961 and evaluated her public readings.

The reviews express contrasting views of Bachmann. Her appearance seems to have been of enduring interest, however, as “[d]uring her lifetime, she may well have been the most photographed and filmed woman poet in German-speaking Europe” (Brinker-Gabler 2004: 1). Long (2011: 203) notes that far more photos exist of Bachmann than of any other female author in German of her generation; he comes to this conclusion as the number of images of Bachmann found by a Google image search by far outnumber those of Friederike Mayröcker, Ilse Aichinger, and other well-known German-language authors of Bachmann’s generation. The publication of a volume of photos of an author and their environment, such as Hapkemeyer’s *Ingeborg Bachmann. Bilder aus Ihrem Leben* [Pictures from her life] (1983), is probably also unusual and reflects the level of interest in Bachmann as a person rather than solely as a producer of literature. This interest in an author’s appearance seems to be reserved for women: in an article on the 2009 literature Nobel Prize-winner Herta Müller, Braun mentions that many articles about her work note the author’s “petite frame” (Braun 2013: 238). This suggests that the focus on a female author’s physical appearance was a phenomenon whose practice continued in spite of feminism.

The photo chosen for the *Der Spiegel* cover bears several interesting details. *Der Spiegel* is “Germany’s number-one newsmagazine”, and the cover was “a space reserved every week for public men” (Brinker-Gabler 2004: 1). Bachmann famously appeared on the cover in 1953. Hotz’s exhaustive multi-modal analysis of the cover
photograph and accompanying article (1990: 43-63) highlights the fact that Bachmann, whose appearance seems staged to evoke the idea of a stereotypical existentialist philosopher in a polo neck, looks into the distance rather than directly at the reader, while her face takes up the entire cover page. Through this presentation she simultaneously suggests the opportunity for the reader to get to know her personally, while maintaining distance. The Spiegel cover story was designed to introduce Bachmann to the German-speaking public, and its calculated composition is astounding.

In 1959, Bachmann was invited by Theodor Adorno to give the inaugural Frankfurt Poetry lecture. This was clearly an acknowledgement of her status as an author (Brinker-Gabler 2004: 1), but, just as importantly, the invitation can also be seen as an expression of Adorno’s approval. His controversial statement that “[t]o write poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric” (Adorno 1992: 34), said to have been provoked by Celan’s ‘Todesfuge’ [Death Fugue] (1947) according to Franklin (2011: 3), is well-known and often misunderstood. For example, the critic Ruth Franklin explains that Adorno’s statement is often interpreted as a warning against “aestheticizing horror” and “atrocity as an inspiration for literature” (Franklin 2011: 2-3). It has become a central focus of Holocaust writing, as exemplified in the work of literature Nobel Prize-winner Imre Kertész (see Franklin 2011: 122-124). Of course, Adorno’s dictum did not stop poetry from being written, and some argue that what he wanted to achieve was poetry that expresses the unspeakable (O’Brien 2012: 186). Perhaps Adorno saw in Bachmann’s poetry the “critical intelligence” (Adorno 1992: 34) that he called for and not the “self-satisfied contemplation” (ibid.) of his contemporary culture which he disliked. Another possible view is that Bachmann herself rejected poetry in the late 1950s:

Seen as unfit for giving authentic expression to human suffering in its real social context, the lyrical forms for which the poet won acclaim in the 1950s come to be rejected in favour of an experimental mode that takes its starting point in experience of felt pain. (McMurtry 2012: 25)

Based on her philosophical writings and interviews, Bachmann is likely to have been in agreement with Adorno’s view that “the substance of culture […] resides […] in its relation to something external, to the material life-process” (Adorno 1992: 29),
and perhaps Adorno found in her poetry the authenticity of “[standing] in relation to the actual life-process of society” (Adorno 1992: 23) which he accused his contemporary culture of lacking. The following statement by Kertész helps to elucidate the connection between the Holocaust and Bachmann’s understanding of fascism within relationships that she termed ‘die Krankheit unserer Zeit’ [the disease of our time], although he does not directly discuss Bachmann’s writing. The concept of fascism within relationships is analysed with regard to the story ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ [Eyes to Wonder] in section 3.5.

I regard as kitsch any representation of the Holocaust that is incapable of understanding or unwilling to understand the organic connection between our own deformed mode of life (whether in the private sphere or on the level of ‘civilization’ as such) and the very possibility of the Holocaust. Here I have in mind those representations that seek to establish the Holocaust once and for all as something foreign to human nature; that seek to drive the Holocaust out of the realm of human experience. I would also use the term kitsch to describe those works where Auschwitz is regarded as simply a matter concerning Germans and Jews, and thereby reduced to something like the fatal incompatibility of two groups; when the political and psychological anatomy of modern totalitarianism more generally is disregarded; when Auschwitz is not seen as a universal experience, but reduced to whatever immediately ‘hits the eye’. (Kertész 2001: 271)

Bachmann’s poetry and her plan for the ‘Todesarten’ project demonstrate that she understood the Holocaust not as an isolated historical occurrence, but rather as a latent potential for cruelty ingrained in human nature and society. The reference to “Henker von gestern” [the hangmen of yesterday] who “trinken den goldenen Becher aus” [drain the golden cup] (Filkins 2006: 34-5), for example, suggests that this potential for violence continues. *Malina, Franz* and the stories in *Simultan* examine the connection between the “deformed mode of life” and the Holocaust mentioned by Kertész by finding the origin of fascism in the relationships between women and men. Bachmann goes beyond matters that concern Germans and Jews. However, while her work suggests that fascism is part of women’s lived experience, it also runs
the risk of positing a “fatal incompatibility”, in the words of Kertész, between women and men. This is examined further in section 2.6.2 with regard to the question as to whether *Malina* can be regarded as a feminist novel. Bachmann’s attempt to reflect on the link between individual suffering and cultural crisis thus fulfils the demands made by Adorno in his essay. Indeed, one of Adorno’s interests is “the way in which art is related to social conditions” (Wilson 2007: 4), and social conditions, that is, the constraints on and circumstances of people’s daily lives, are, arguably, at the heart of most of Bachmann’s writing.
2.4 How Suhrkamp Orchestrated the Publication of Malina

Malina was Bachmann’s first novel, and it was also her first publication with Suhrkamp. Her decision to leave Piper in favour of Suhrkamp had been discussed in the press (for example in Der Spiegel on 24 July 1967; see footnote 2 in section 1.1), and there were thus great expectations regarding the novel’s publication from both the public and critics.

While Bachmann’s poetry emphasised the need for change and resonated positively with the German and Austrian intellectual elite, when she developed her aesthetic and ideological ideas further in her prose texts, the reception of her work became problematic. Suhrkamp’s publicity campaign for Malina was surprising considering the intellectual calibre of both the publisher and the author. Bachmann gave several public readings before Malina’s publication (Borhau 1990: 136) which served to whet the public’s appetite. Der Spiegel announced Malina in January 1971 as “eine echte Überraschung” [a real surprise] (Der Spiegel No. 5 1971: 119) and portrayed its publication as Suhrkamp’s victory over Bachmann’s previous publisher Piper. The article thus contributes to the portrayal of Suhrkamp as a publisher at the forefront of literature (see section 1.9). The book was summarised as a love story, but also seems to have been marketed as a mystery novel. The following text (cited in Borhau 1994: 52) was included in Malina’s review slip, the information pertaining to the book which was sent by Suhrkamp to reviewers:

Mord oder Selbstmord? [Murder or suicide?]
Es gibt keine Zeugen. [There are no witnesses.]
Eine Frau zwischen zwei Männern. [A woman between two men.]
Ihre letzte große Leidenschaft. [Her last great passion.]
Die Wand im Zimmer, mit einem unmerkbaren Sprung. [The wall in the room with an imperceptible rift.]
Ein Leichnam, der nicht gefunden wird. [A body that will not be found.]
Das verschwundene Testament. [The vanished will.]
Eine zerbrochene Brille, eine fehlende Kaffeeschale. [A broken pair of glasses, a missing coffee cup.]
Der Papierkorb, von niemand [The wastepaper basket, searched by no
durchsucht.
Verwischte Spuren. Schritte.
Jemand also, der noch auf und ab geht, in dieser Wohnung – stundenlang:
MALINA
one.
Erased traces. Steps.
Someone, thus, who still walks back and forth, in this apartment – for hours:
MALINA]

This text, which was found by Hans Höller in Bachmann’s estate (Borhau 1994: 52) and which he presumes was written by Bachmann, alludes to the elements of crime fiction. Heidi Borhau (1994: 49) references Gérard Genette’s point that the fact that the title consists solely of a character’s name suggests a tragedy rather than a novel. The publisher’s review slip further describes *Malina* as “das Buch einer Beschwörung, eines Bekenntnisses, einer Leidenschaft” [the book of an enchantment, a confession, a passion] (Borhau 1994: 53; see also Blöcker 1971 in Schardt 2011a: 138), which gives the impression of a love story. The reader is presented with a puzzling book which is difficult to classify. In fact, Bachmann herself seems to have resisted imposing a genre on her work as she referred to *Malina* as a ‘Buch’ [book] on numerous occasions in interviews and speeches (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 72, 73, 75, 85, 90, 95, 96, 99, 100, 102, 104, 110, 113) and stated “[f]ür mich ist es kein Roman, es ist ein einziges langes Buch” [to me it is not a novel, it is one big book] (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 65).

The riddle of Ich and Malina’s relationship is supported by the peritext (Borhau 1994: 61), which consists of aspects decided by the publisher such as the format, cover, and layout (Genette 1997: 16). During her research in Suhrkamp’s archive, Borhau found that the publisher’s advertising material for *Malina* explicitly made readers aware of the dual character (Borhau 1994: 58). Bachmann acknowledged that the book can hold different meanings for different readers, and emphasised that her main interest lay in the double figure of Ich and Malina (see Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983:104). It is known from interviews that Bachmann had intended Malina to be the narrator of the other ‘Todesarten’ texts (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 95 and 99). By highlighting Ich’s demise in the peritext, Bachmann is able to guide the reader.
2.5 Reception

2.5.1 Reception as a Novelist

Filkins notes “the ambivalent, if not negative, reception accorded Bachmann’s turn to prose with the publication of Das dreißigste Jahr [The Thirtieth Year] in 1961” (Filkins 2004: 26). Critics turned against Bachmann after a five-year publication break when it became clear that she was not going to publish another volume of poetry. By contributing to Bachmann’s initial popularity, they had invested their reputations as literary authorities in Bachmann’s career. There appears to have been a general feeling of dislike of poets who turned to prose. The topic arose multiple times in interviews with Bachmann after the publication of her first story and radio play; for example, Bachmann’s interviewer Walter Höllerer states in 1962 “man sagt immer, es sei eine große Gefahr, wenn ein Lyriker Prosa schreibt” [one always says that it is a great danger when a poet writes prose] (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 38). The antipathy lasted for over a decade and characterised the reception of Malina in 1971. Many reviews of Malina referred to Bachmann’s status as a famous poet (Borhau 1990: 137). For instance, they refer to her as “die Lyrikerin” [the lyricist] and “die Dichterin” [the poetess] and state “man hat dennoch bereits nach der Lektüre der ersten Seiten ihres Erzählbandes den Eindruck, daß die Lyrik das eigentliche Ausdruckselement dieser Autorin ist” [after reading the first few pages of her story collection one has the impression that poetry is the author’s real medium of expression] (cited in Hotz 1990: 103). According to Filkins (2004: 26), it was thought that she had, at best, decided to refuse to write poetry, and at worst, that she had failed as a poet. However, Bachmann’s ‘turn to prose’ was not a turn at all as she had been working on prose during the 1950s (early ‘Todesarten’ fragments) and continued to write poetry in the 1960s and ‘70s.

Revesz seeks the explanation for Bachmann’s supposed turn to prose in her agreement with Adorno’s view on poetry after Auschwitz (see above). “Bachmann scholarship generally views her turn away from the lyric in terms of a Chandos-like ‘Sprachkrise’” [language crisis] (Revesz 2007: 196). Lord Chandos is a fictional poet in Hugo von Hofmannsthal’s ‘Ein Brief’ [‘A letter’] (originally published in 1902) who writes a letter to his mentor Francis Bacon in order to apologise for his recent lack of literary work. He explains that “nichts mehr ließ sich mit einem Begriff umspannen. Die einzelnen Worte schwammen um mich” [no longer would anything
let itself be encompassed by one idea. Single words floated round me] (von Hofmannsth al n.d.: n.p.). The letter was published when Sprachskepsis [language scepticism] occupied German-language scholars such as Friedrich Nietzsche and Ludwig Wittgenstein; they were concerned with the fact that language is inadequate to represent reality because the relationship between signifier and signified is arbitrary (Mittermüller 2008: 29). As Bachmann was influenced by Wittgenstein, it makes sense to assume her absence from literary life between 1956-61 and 1961-71 could potentially have been the result of some form of language crisis. This is one of the differences between scholarly and journalistic evaluations of Bachmann: while the press saw Bachmann’s lack of work in a negative light, as referenced by Filkins above, the academic assumption that Bachmann was grappling with language emphasises her roots in philosophy and the German-language literary canon. It is thus more positive in the sense that the work produced as the result of such a fundamental crisis will be the product of an academic mind capable of deep thought, and can be assumed to be of a high quality.

Borhau (1994: 74) states that Bachmann’s long absence meant that Malina was met with corresponding anticipation. Das dreißigste Jahr [The Thirtieth Year] had appeared ten years earlier, and reviews of Malina commonly contained details of previous publications in order to remind the reader of Bachmann’s former fame (see Hotz 1990: 136-141). Surprisingly, however, the publication of Bachmann’s first novel was met with surprise, disappointment, and even anger. Various reviewers accused her of “Redseligkeit, U n s c h ä rf e, Trivialität” [loquaciousness, diffuseness, triviality] (Neumann 1978: 1135) and “preziöse[m] Seelen-Exhibitionismus” [precious soul-exhibitionism] (Blöcker 1972: 1038), and rejected the book as a “subjektiv-neurotischen Malstrom” [subjective-neurotic maelstrom] (Weber 1975: 17). Reich-Ranicki referred to Malina as the “peinlichen und gänzlich mißratenen Roman” [embarrassing and wholly unsuccessful novel] (Reich-Ranicki 1974 in Schardt 2011b: 79) as well as “ein trübes Gewässer” [murky waters] (Reich-Ranicki 1989: 189).

Borhau (1994: 28) notes that when a text contains a multitude of gaps (“Leerstellen”), this can irritate readers who expect to discover a singular meaning. With regard to reader engagement in general, Michael Burke (2011: 62) mentions Black and Seifert’s (1985) idea that “good literature is that which maximises reminding from the life of the reader”. Critics decide what good literature is.
However, it was highly unlikely that a male critic in the 1970s would have been reminded of aspects of their own life by reading *Malina*. While critics at this time would not have articulated views about text interpretation in Black and Seifert’s terms, it is nevertheless possible that they felt a lack of familiarity and reward. Bachmann herself expressed the following opinion in an interview: “[m]an muss überhaupt ein Buch auf verschiedene Arten lesen können und es heute anders lesen als morgen” [one needs to be able to read a book in different ways, to read it one way today and another way tomorrow] (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 100). The reader of *Malina* plays a role in the construction of the text as s/he has to fill the gaps according to her/his interpretation. Bachmann’s harshest critics saw the novel as an example of bad writing rather than of literary progress. Günter Blöcker, who initially wrote positive reviews of Bachmann’s poetry but later became one of the most negative reviewers of her prose work, also wrote the review of Paul Celan’s *Sprachgitter* [translated as *Speech-Grille* by Joachim Neugroschel] which the poet considered anti-Semitic and which contributed to Celan’s personal crisis (McMurtry 2012: 120).

Interestingly, the way in which the poetic drafts, composed in the 1960s and published in 2000, were evaluated echoes the reception of Bachmann’s prose texts to some extent: critics questioned the need for their publication and dismissed them as inferior to her two poetry collections published in the 1950s because of their personal and emotional nature. McMurtry (2012: 21) cites Reinhard Baumgart, literary critic for the German weekly broadsheet *Die Zeit*, who stated “[n]atürlich sind das keine Gedichte” [of course these are not poems] and referred to the drafts as “die persönlichsten Schmerzdokumente der Ingeborg Bachmann” [Ingeborg Bachmann’s most personal documentation of pain] (Baumgart and Hamm 2000: 61). Peter Hamm, also in *Die Zeit*, takes this further by describing the drafts as “ein Konvolut aus Gestammel und Geheul, aus Hilfe- und Racherufen, Wahn- und Todesfantasien, kurz: der ungereinigte Lebensschlamm” [a collection of stammering and howling, of calls for help and revenge, delusional fantasies and suicidal ideation, in short: the unfiltered slurry of life] (Baumgart and Hamm 2000: 61). However, a detailed study by McMurtry (2012) reveals hidden complexities that link the poems with the ‘Todesarten’. Both of these publications also demonstrate a particular view of Bachmann’s legacy. Speculations regarding the mysterious circumstances of the author’s death in Rome in 1973 continued for several years, as suggested by a
statement published by the Werke editors Christine Koschel and Inge von Weidenbaum (Schardt 2011b: 25-29) in the newspaper Süddeutsche Zeitung in 1980 in which they ask for speculations to be put to rest. Since then, academics and journalists have been engaged in what Weigel terms “germanistische Kriminalistik” [Germanist criminalistics] (Weigel 2003: 412): in the attempt to piece together a picture of Bachmann, they have been combing her texts for indications of details of her personal life, such as her relationship with Celan or a potential foreshadowing of her death. The publication of further texts from her estate such as her Kriegstagebuch [War Diary] can be seen as a continuation of this effort to find the ‘real’ Bachmann.

Despite its complexity and mixed reception, Malina was commercially successful: three editions were published in its first year (30,000 copies) and the novel climbed to second place in the Spiegel bestseller list in June 1971 (Borhau 1990: 248).\textsuperscript{34} It is likely that this success was in part the result of Bachmann’s enduring popularity, which stemmed from her poetry, or the enthusiasm with which Malina was announced, or perhaps the German-speaking public was wary of authorities and consequently took the critics’ condemnation with a pinch of salt.

\textsuperscript{34} Number one was the romance novel Love Story by American writer Erich Segal.
2.5.2 Essentialism and the ‘Neurotic Novel’

Many reviews of Bachmann’s work are marked by an emphasis on perceived personality traits and behaviours that, I would argue, would not have been deemed noteworthy in the case of a male author. The fact that she was a woman seems to be a central concern and is highlighted in different ways; for example, Bachmann’s timidity (see section 2.3) seems to have had a disconcerting effect on male reviewers. An article about Bachmann’s Frankfurt poetics lectures calls her “scheu und fast krankhaft schweigsam” [timid and almost pathologically quiet] (Tilliger 1960 in Schardt 2011b: 155) and persistently questions the author’s suitability for this prestigious role. The notion that Bachmann’s performance fell short of expectations was also expressed in reviews of her first collection of short stories. Marcel Reich-Ranicki used the expression “ungenedekte Schecks” [dishonoured cheques] to describe Das dreißigste Jahr (McMurtry 2012: 5) and another review in the Tagesspiegel (in Schardt 2011a: 240-243) suggests that critics had certain expectations of Bachmann, based on her poetry, that they felt were not met by her prose. This reflects the point summarised by Burke (see above) as ‘accountability’.

Another evaluation of Bachmann is clearly sexist: in what McMurtry (2012: 5) classifies as a “sustained campaign” of attack on Bachmann’s prose work, Reich-Ranicki called Bachmann a “gefallene Lyrikerin” [fallen poetess] (Marcel Reich-Ranicki 1972 review in Reich-Ranicki 1989: 189); he thus combines the idea that the formerly celebrated poet has fallen from grace with the misogynist concept of the fallen woman. This gives an interesting insight into the German-language literary environment as it suggests that some male critics understood themselves to be in charge of ensuring a certain standard was maintained.

Even positive reviews displayed essentialist tendencies: one journalist cited Max Frisch’s enthusiastic evaluation “‘[d]ie Bachmann’: das steht für die unwiderstehliche persönliche Ausstrahlung dieser Autorin, für ihren Glanz” [Bachmann: the name stands for the author’s irresistible charisma, for her glow] (Der Tagesspiegel 1.10.1978 in Schardt 2011a: 240-243; emphasis in original). Although it is possible that an article discussing a male author would mention his charisma, describing any author in these terms seems to be unnecessary objectification; furthermore, Bachmann is defined here through Max Frisch’s appraisal of her, that is, the reviewer evaluates her according to her ability to attract a successful male author.
and to elicit his praise. In a similar vein, Bachmann’s biographical and bibliographic entry in Wilpert’s *Lexikon der Weltliteratur* [Lexicon of World Literature] (1997: 99) includes a reference to the fact that she lived with Frisch in Zurich and Rome between 1958 and 1962, but Frisch’s entry in the same volume (Wilpert 1997: 494) does not mention Bachmann. The entries in *Wilpert* are very short: only 146 words are dedicated to Bachmann’s biography, so one could argue that Max Frisch is given disproportionate importance, especially when one considers the fact that no reference is made to Celan.

Monika Albrecht notices that reviews in the late 1990s and early 2000s began to reactivate worn clichés again such as the importance of love in Bachmann’s creative process and the evaluation of Bachmann in relation to her male partners (Albrecht 2004: 91; 98; 99). These circumstances suggest that although Boehm’s translation of *Malina* was published, and presumably composed, after the feminist rediscovery of Bachmann, it is not surprising that aspects of his translation seem to reflect the misogynist attitude to Bachmann of the 1970s.
2.6.1 Feminist Rediscovery

An article from 1982 about Bachmann proclaims: “[j]etzt dürfen die Frauen reden über Ingeborg Bachmann” [now it’s the women’s turn to talk about Ingeborg Bachmann] (Gronewold 1982 in Schardt 2011b: 31). Until this point, discussions of Bachmann’s work had been dominated by male critics. The reviews of Bachmann’s writings published before 1991 collected in Schardt 2011a comprise 97 articles authored by male critics, 27 by female critics, and 13 whose author remains anonymous or is indicated by initials only. Of course, Schardt acknowledges that it was not possible to include every single review published, and those from the 1970s were particularly numerous. However, the number of reviews of each of Bachmann’s publications included in Schardt 2011a reflects the ratio of the total number of reviews published (e.g. if four times as many reviews of *Three Paths to the Lake* were published as of ‘The Good God of Manhattan’, then Schardt 2011a parallels this in the number selected for inclusion) (Schardt 2011a: 312-313). Considering only the reviews included in Schardt 2011a, while only 14% of reviews before the publication of Malina in 1971 were written by women (4), female critics were responsible for 25% of those published in and after 1971 (23). It is not possible to say whether the reviews selected by Schardt also reflect the total percentage of reviews written by female critics; it is also possible that Schardt’s selection is biased as he acknowledges that articles published by smaller regional newspapers could not always be found, and although all pre-1971 reviews by female critics were published in major newspapers or news magazines, almost half of those from after 1971 were published in smaller regional or church-affiliated publications. Furthermore, articles penned by women were on the whole quite short whereas most male critics were given room for lengthy and detailed analyses.

In addition to the increase in the number of reviews by women, feminist critics also presented more constructive interpretations of *Malina*. Von der Lühe (1984: 132), for example, shows the limitations of an insistence on Ich’s behaviour as pathological. She argues for more differentiated and thorough understandings of the novel that treat the dual personality of Ich and Malina not as a conclusion, but merely as a starting point.

The *Text + Kritik Sonderband* [special issue] edited by Weigel (1984c) encompasses analyses of Bachmann’s work that move away from the former
essentialist emphasis by predominantly male critics of autobiographical aspects of her prose work. Its articles discuss topics as varied as topographies, music, history and memory in Bachmann’s prose and poetry, and therefore give a more complete overview of their significance than the *Text + Kritik* volume dedicated to Bachmann in 1971. The later reception of Bachmann’s work by female academics and critics can be called feminist in the sense that it departs from reductive misogynist statements and brings to light the connections of Bachmann’s work to its wider historical, cultural and literary context.
2.6.2 Is Malina a Feminist Novel?

Although literary scholar Bettina Bannasch states convincingly that “Struktur und Perspektive der späten Erzählungen, die Darstellung der Gesellschaft […] können ohne Zweifel als ‘feministisch’ bezeichnet werden” [the structure and perspective of the later stories, the portrayal of society can without a doubt be termed ‘feminist’] (Bannasch 1997: 57), the case is not quite that clear-cut. From a twenty-first century perspective, Malina contains elements that seem both essentialist (the consistently negative portrayal of male characters) and radical (the suggested link between fascism and relationships). This section examines the position of the novel among other books written by women and published in the 1970s in order to demonstrate the way in which Malina foreshadows the central themes of German-language feminist writing from this time.

Albrecht (2004: 109) dismisses as “Wunschvorstellung” [wishful thinking] any interpretation of sections of Malina as feminist. She refers to the ‘Spiegelszene’ [mirror scene] in a draft of Malina which includes the sentence ‘Es gefällt mir, wenn ich […] mit den geschminkten Augen, vor mich hinstarren kann mit dem tiefen Wohlgefühl, nur noch eine Maske zu sein, […] eine Kopie einer Kopie einer Kopie […]’ [it pleases me when I can, with made-up eyes, stare into space with the profound sense of comfort that I am merely a mask now, an imitation of an imitation of an imitation] (Albrecht and Göttscne 1995 vol. 3.1: 58). Albrecht sees this sentence as the only occasion on which Bachmann seems to foreshadow Judith Butler’s influential deconstruction of the concept of gender, specifically her idea of gender as ‘a kind of imitation for which there is no original’ (Butler 1991: 21).

Although Albrecht is an authority on Bachmann’s writing and, because of her work on the ‘Todesarten’-Projekt with Dirk Göttscne, possesses unique insight into Bachmann’s process of text composition, I have to disagree with her view of Bachmann’s lack of feminism.

As demonstrated in Chapter 3, the style of Malina is feminist. Bachmann wrote the ‘Todesarten’ before the second-wave feminist movement had gained momentum. However, Malina shares features with explicitly feminist writing from the later 1970s, and, as demonstrated in the following sections, also presents a more complete and abstract treatment of the features identified by Weigel (1984a and 1984b) as feminist. Although Malina was composed earlier, its feminist style is more
complex than that of works by other authors who followed. Usually, one would expect later works to exhibit a higher level of complexity and abstraction because they benefit from advancements in theory and society, and from the fact that interested readers would be able to rely on the knowledge gained from previously published writings. Bachmann was not a feminist theorist; however, the novel contains concepts that were only theorised later, as in the case of Butler’s view of gender. In my view, although Bachmann did not necessarily articulate feminist views and express them in order to help other women, she experienced injustices (in her relationships and through observation of the world around her) that she sought to explore in her fictional writing (see also section 5.3 for my view of a letter to Celan drafted by Bachmann on 27 September 1961).

Rosalind Coward (1985: 231-232) notes that one feature which distinguishes feminist novels from women-centred romance fiction is the author’s presence, either in the autobiographical aspects of the text or as part of the narrator. Although Coward does not discuss the notion of the inferred author, the idea that the reader builds a mental image of the author based on her/his interpretation of the text, this criterion of the author’s involvement applies to Bachmann in the case of Malina. However, according to Coward, feminist authors whose presence can be discerned in the text take on a representative role so that the experiences portrayed are generalised. This is not true of Ich in Malina in a comparable way because her actions, in my view, frequently alienate the reader and this, as well as the novel’s non-linear nature, makes it clear that this character functions as a symbolic representation rather than as an actual figure.

Bachmann did not identify as feminist, although she realised that she had enjoyed more freedom than many of her contemporaries as she travelled frequently and was self-sufficient from an early age (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 109). Weigel (1984a: 53) notes that women writers often rejected an affiliation with women’s writing as this category in German publishing had a problematic history (see above). In a subsequent article (1984b: 4), she explains that the promotion of women’s literature brings with it a normative effect, which means that it becomes more difficult for a new aesthetic to be established. Although Weigel made this assessment in 1984 and feminism has undergone developments since then, her statement that “[w]omen authors fear the identification with and relegation to the social periphery that comes with special status” (Weigel 1984a: 54) makes sense and
is likely to apply to writers who represent other marginalised groups. The lack of literary representations of women’s lives began to be remedied in the mid-20th century, but this in turn also led women authors to be concerned that they would always be expected to write about women’s experiences. The classification of writing by women as ‘women’s writing’ could lead to content reduction and self-limitation (Weigel 1984a: 54), which links in with Kramarae’s ‘Muted Group Theory’ (1980; see Chapter 1): if publishers only publish neatly-marketable woman-authored books about a narrow range of topics, it would not be surprising if this led to a reduction in women’s desire to write about other topics. This process would be akin to self-censorship. However, technological advances partly solve this problem as the internet, for example, makes it easier for women to reach a wide audience without the need to rely on a publisher’s approval. It is possible that Bachmann perceived the same issues and inequalities as feminist theorists, but her medium was literature.

Annette Kolodny (1985) analyses two short stories by Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Susan Glaspell, and she shows that male readers in the 19th century were inadequately trained to understand their texts as part of a female tradition. The same is true of the critics who dismissed Malina in 1971. Bachmann’s novel bears several of the hallmarks of early second-wave German feminist women’s writing. Weigel gives an overview of common themes of this era’s writers. “Autobiographical writing” (Weigel 1984a: 70) is seen especially in the context of the Second World War. National Socialism, as well as political events in general, is portrayed as an invasion of women’s private sphere. However, these are not conventional autobiographies, but rather fictional prose that “rescue[s] women’s experience from the ever residual realm of the ‘private’” (Kolkenbrock-Netz and Schuller 1982: 154). Accordingly, autobiographical texts serve to add women’s voices to the general discussion. According to Weigel (1984a: 71), these texts aim to be representative rather than to express a singular experience. This is the role McMurtry (2012) ascribes to Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts. However, Weigel appears to view autobiographical writing as inferior to fiction as she links “stronger fictionalizing” with “increased professionalism” (Weigel 1984a: 73). She notes (ibid.) that women after the Second World War often used their own histories as material for their writing because other material was not available to them. Bachmann, on the other hand, was an experienced and celebrated poet and had already published a collection
of short stories (Das dreißigste Jahr; 1961) when Malina was published. In her case, using aspects of her own experiences does not suggest a lack of professionalism. Bachmann’s writing is characterised by the “conscious literary effort” that Weigel (1984a: 73) finds lacking in most women’s autobiographical writing at this time.

Interrogation of the father-daughter relationship is a sub-theme of autobiographical writing of this time. Weigel discusses novels that present their authors’ fictionalised accounts of their own relationships and thought-processes, such as Ruth Rehmann’s Der Mann auf der Kanzel. Fragen an einen Vater [The Man in the Pulpit. Questions for a Father] (1979). Malina’s middle chapter, which consists of cruelties committed by the ‘father’ towards Ich, can be read in this manner when one considers the fact that Bachmann is unlikely to have supported her own father’s pro-Nazi stance. However, the ‘father’ in the novel is usually understood as a symbolic figure (see Chapter 1). Bachmann’s prose texts do not refer to mothers to a great extent. Ich’s mother in Malina is only briefly mentioned in relation to the ‘father’, and the other fragments and stories deal with the protagonists’ relationships with men. ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ [‘Eyes to Wonder’] includes a second female character in addition to the protagonist, but their relationship does not play a role in the story as their characters are contrasted to such a large extent that their significance extends beyond the plot.

Another common theme of literature by women in the 1970s is that of couples in the process of separation (Weigel 1984a: 77). Novels such as Brigitte Schwaiger’s Wie kommt das Salz ins Meer [How Does the Salt get in the Sea] (1977) and Hannelies Taschau’s Landfriede [Country Peace] (1978) deal with the constraints placed on women by marriage. These form part of the confessional literature mentioned above, but as these topics were not openly talked about at the time, they also prompted discussion. Weigel mentions Ingrid Bacher’s Das Paar [The Couple] (1980) as an example of a novel which thematises the conflict between autonomy and self-sacrifice (Weigel 1984a: 78). The female protagonist sacrifices her ambitions in order to look after her partner after an accident. Although Ivan does not suffer any misfortune, Ich is similarly at risk of sacrificing her own identity. Ivan expresses his dislike for the book she is in the process of writing, entitled ‘Todesarten’, and encourages her to write a cheerful book. Ich attempts to write a book with the title ‘Exsultate Jubilate’ [exult, rejoice; the title of a motet composed by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart in 1773], but does not succeed. A traumatic
separation is alluded to, but only the state of Ich’s emotion is conveyed rather than any details. Weigel (1984a: 79) views the positive response to Bachmann in the early 1980s as a result of her work’s emotional intensity because women’s literature at this time had a tendency to reduce love to sexuality, which is not the case in the ‘Todesarten’ texts.

‘I’-narratives are another feature characteristic of work by women authors in the 1970s and early 1980s. Weigel summarises Judith Offenbach’s *Melancholie für Fortgeschrittene* [Melancholia for the Advanced] (1980), Monika Feth’s *Examen* [Exams] (1980s), Elisabeth Albertsen’s *Das Dritte. Geschichte einer Entscheidung* [The Third: Story of a Decision] (1977), Margit Heide Irgang’s *Einfach mal jasagen* [Just say yes] (1980) and Herrad Schenk’s *Abrechnung* [Settlement] (1979) as documentary texts rather than as highly literary texts (Weigel 1984a: 80-81). She understands the aim of these books to be the immediacy of personal experiences and the enabling of the reader to identify with the protagonist. Weigel equates literary refinement with reflection, so that these popular books which were intended to evoke authenticity did not allow reader and author to progress to a useful analysis of problematic circumstances, but solely allowed a moment of catharsis for both. *Malina*’s narrative presents a first-person perspective to the extent that its protagonist is referred to as ‘Ich’ in the dramatis personae at the beginning of the book and remains nameless throughout the novel. The way in which Bachman’s autobiography and the novel were conflated by critics forms the main focus of the earlier parts of the present chapter. At this point, it suffices to say that although aspects of *Malina* can be interpreted as Bachmann’s attempt to understand the wider significance of her experiences, the novel is highly literary because of its level of abstraction and density of stylistic points of interest. It is thus not an autobiographical ‘I’-narrative in the same sense as other books arising out of similar constraints and emotional struggles.

*Melancholia for the Advanced* was financially successful because of its sensationalist portrayal of a lesbian relationship and life with a disabled person, but it did not advance women’s emancipation. Weigel (1984a: 82) notes that this book is also an example of critics’ desire to categorise books of this type as “women’s literature” in a pejorative sense. Feuilletons discussed writing by women authors in a
simplistic manner without distinguishing between different styles. Women’s writing became known as mostly autobiographical writing which lacked the significance to effect social change. Critics made a distinction between literature by women and “women’s literature” (Weigel 1984a: 82). The result of this was that the potential destabilisation of cultural structures, which could have been achieved by thematising social power inequalities, was contained. Weigel terms this phenomenon “Deprofessionalization and Marketing” (1984a: 82-83).

“The Language of the Body: Chronicles of Illness” is another concern of German-language women’s writing during the second-wave feminist movement (Weigel 1984a: 84). Weigel emphasises that what she terms “authentic texts” are those written as a therapeutic measure rather than those intended as literature from the outset. Anorexia and depression form a large part of the focus of this kind of literature, as exemplified by Maria Erlenberger’s *Der Hunger nach Wahnsinn* [The Hunger for Insanity] (1977), Caroline Muhr’s *Depressionen. Tagebuch einer Krankheit* [Depressions: Diary of an Illness] (1970) and Katharina Havekamp’s *... und Liebe eimerweise* [...] and Buckets of Love] (1977), all of which are based on the authors’ personal experiences of mental illness. The latter discusses causes as well as social and psychological theories of anorexia in sequential order. This kind of account works to add women’s perspectives to discussions that were until then dominated by male psychoanalysts and medical professionals (Weigel 1984a: 85). Bachmann’s novel fragment *Franza* is an exploration of the female protagonist’s mental illness. She discovers that her husband, a prominent Viennese psychiatrist, kept a file on her, and she subsequently travels to Egypt where she suffers several misfortunes and eventually dies.

The above categories documented women’s private realities while utilising the structures of the “male order” (Weigel 1984a: 85). This meant that women were still treated as literary objects, although Weigel does not explain what this means, and as it can be argued that women were, and still are to some extent, often treated as objects in society, it is hardly surprising that this would be expressed in their writing. The positive reception of Bachmann’s work by feminists was the result of their

---

35 *Feuilletons* represent a crossover between journalism and literary writing: they are part of broadsheet newspapers, but have literary ambitions and contain articles about the arts (Reus and Harden 2005: 154).
discomfort with the autobiographical authentic writing (Weigel 1984a: 86). Bachmann, according to Weigel, succeeds in presenting a utopian state of existence, and also departs from formal norms to which other women writers adhered. Her content is radical and her writing is complex; the extent of this and the challenges for the translator are discussed in Chapter 3.

As demonstrated above, Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts show several thematic similarities with other texts composed by women writers in the 1970s and early 1980s. However, while other writers do not tend to depart from accounts of personal experiences as demonstrated by Weigel, Bachmann questions the structures that enable and encourage cruelty against women. Bachmann’s use of the above themes is more abstract and advanced than their treatment by writers whose work was published after her death. The ‘Todesarten’ texts can therefore be called proto-feminist. In addition, because Bachmann’s work represents a later stage of feminist thought than the other books published in the 1970s discussed above (although temporally it precedes them), these books made it possible for Malina to be received more positively in the 1980s.

Section 2.3 above examines the ‘Todesarten’ in the context of Adorno’s views and refers to a passage by Kertész in which he describes the risk of viewing the Holocaust as the “fatal incompatibility of two groups” (Kertész 2011: 271). I state in my discussion of Adorno and Kertész that Bachmann’s notion of fascism as an element in relationships between women and men describes a global issue. However, because Malina and the stories in Simultan only describe romantic relationships between women and men, Bachmann’s feminism runs the risk of appearing outdated and limited to present-day readers. Feminism has moved beyond a view of men as a united group personally concerned with the oppression of women. Nonetheless, in my view, Bachmann’s feminism still has relevance today. It is not necessary to limit her views of the mistreatment of women by men to heterosexual relationships. It would be more beneficial instead to understand ‘die Krankheit unserer Zeit’ [the disease of our time] as a metaphor for the state described by Kertész (2001: 271) as a “deformed mode of life”. This means that the ‘Todesarten’ would be a warning against inauthentic existence and relationships in general.
2.7 Publication of Fragments and Other Writings from Bachmann’s Estate

Surprisingly, there have been no or few reviews of Bachmann’s *Frankfurter Poetikvorlesungen* [Frankfurt Poetics lectures] (1980) or *Briefe an Felician* [Letters to Felician] (1991) (Schardt 2011a: 308). A possible reason for this is that *Briefe an Felician* was composed while Bachmann was eighteen years old, and, like her *Kriegstagebuch* [War Diary], does not constitute a serious literary text comparable to her poems or later prose. It is possible to categorise *Briefe an Felician* and the *Kriegstagebuch* as belonging to the collection of texts that pertain to Bachmann’s biography rather than as literary texts. Although they might allow insight into the development of Bachmann’s skills as a writer, their publication seems to have been allowed by her siblings in order to satisfy the public’s curiosity about Bachmann’s life. The lack of reviewers’ interest in the *Poetikvorlesungen* could be a result of their academic nature: academic texts are not usually reviewed in the newspapers that published reviews of Bachmann’s poems and prose works. The lectures themselves were discussed in newspapers in 1969, but these discussions treated them as a sort of spectacle by describing Bachmann’s demeanour, who she talked to, and how little she said in the seminars that accompanied the lectures. The articles did not analyse the content of her lectures to any great extent which would give the reader an overview of Bachmann’s approach to issues in contemporary poetry.
2.8 Paratexts

The concept of ‘paratext’ in this section refers to the materials that accompany the texts of the novel, fragments and short stories in the source and target texts: the introductions, translators’ notes, afterwords and glossaries in Ingeborg Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts and their translations. These types of text are not, strictly speaking, part of the novels and short stories, but as they constitute mediation between text and reader on the part of the author, translator or publisher (Kovala 1996: 119-120; Borhau 1994: 41) and can influence the reader’s reception and perception of the main text (Genette 1997: 1), it is necessary to understand the way in which they contribute to the reader’s understanding of the target texts, and how they have potentially influenced the reception of the translations. According to Gérard Genette, “in principle, every context serves as a paratext” (Genette 1997: 8): all text produced in response to a text and the circumstances of its publication can be called its paratext. Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar notes that as a translation is produced chronologically after the source text, it comments on the text and therefore is part of the source text’s paratext (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002: 46). However, she emphasises that regarding translations solely as paratexts could result in neglect of the effects a translation can have on the target culture (ibid.). Although Genette (1997: 405) sees translations as holding “paratextual relevance”, he excludes them from his analysis of paratexts because of the level of depth required for this kind of study. This thesis considers the German and English books to possess their own respective paratexts. Kovala (1996: 120) notes that literary translation occupies a specific position in the literary system, and that the paratexts of translations can potentially influence their reception.

Genette distinguishes between the peritext (1997: 16; see section 2.4), which includes aspects decided by the publisher; the public epitext (Genette 1997: 344), which comprises interviews and comments made by the author; and the private epitext (Genette 1997: 371), which encompasses letters, diaries or communications.

Paradoxically, paratexts can exist without the text to which they refer (Borhau 1994: 43): this applies to a translation of *Franza* that Tess Lewis was commissioned to produce by the publisher Marsilio. Although the translation was never published as the publisher encountered financial difficulty before the contract with the Bachmann estate was signed (personal correspondence from Tess Lewis 14...
April 2010), we know that its title was going to be ‘The Franza Case’ because Marsilio listed the translation in ‘Books in Print’, a database of bibliographic information used by many booksellers.

The “allographic paratext” (Genette 1997: 9) comprises those parts of a book written by someone who is neither the author nor the publisher. Anderson’s afterword in Malina and his introduction to Three Paths to the Lake thus constitute part of the translations’ allographic paratexts. They are not part of the original texts’ paratexts because Bachmann had no involvement in their selection, composition or translation whereas, presumably, Philip Boehm and Mary Fran Gilbert, or at least their publisher Holmes and Meier, did.

In the case of Malina, the publisher’s peritext, a factual paratext, includes its history and calibre: Suhrkamp has been called “der Verlag der deutschen linken Intelligenz” [the publisher of German left-wing intelligence] (Krüger 2000: 656). Founded after the Second World War, it has published works by most well-known German-language philosophers and authors as well as translations of major foreign authors’ works.36 Suhrkamp represents almost the entire world’s intellectual elite (Borhau 1994: 46) as its list encompasses canonical texts by authors from every continent. Authors whose works are published by Suhrkamp consequently appear as serious writers because of this reputation. Holmes and Meier, the American publisher of Malina’s translation, on the other hand, is a small company that publishes a few biographies of mostly little-known personalities, a small assortment of books on Area Studies, several books concerned with Jewish history and Holocaust Studies. Its small fiction list consists almost entirely of translations. It is also the publisher of Three Paths to the Lake, the translation of Simultan. Holmes and Meier seems to address the interests of several small niches of readers, which, I would expect, allows it some freedom. Philip Boehm’s name is displayed on Malina’s cover, for example, and this, with the exception of series marketed explicitly as translations, is still not common practice.

36 Suhrkamp’s list includes “such critics as Adomo, Benjamin, Szondi, and Hans Mayer; playwrights from Brecht and Frisch to Peter Weiss; novelists like Koeppen, Nossack, Handke, Walser, and Uwe Johnson; poets from Bachmann and Eich to Enzensberger, Sachs, and Krolow--not to mention such international stars as Proust, Shaw, Levi-Strauss, Milosz, Allende, Paz, Joyce, and Kundera” (Ziolkowski 1991: 702).
The cover of the first German edition of Malina showed a photograph of Bachmann (Borhau 1994: 46) and this, as well as her name on the cover, is also part of the factual paratext. By this point, Bachmann had probably become recognisable to many people because of her numerous public readings, the Frankfurt Poetics Lectures and her early success in the 1950s. Although Bachmann’s name is shown on the cover of all translations, it does not represent the same image for the target text audience because of the countries’ differences regarding recent history and the literary polysystem. Bachmann was a central literary figure in Germany and Austria, as suggested by the fact that her books were published by two major publishers, the literary prizes she was awarded (such as the Büchner Prize, 1964), and the number of sold copies. I was unable to find out the number of copies sold as both Piper and Suhrkamp’s policies prevent them from being shared, but, for example, the editions of Malina published within the past 40 years number in the mid-20s. Translated literature, on the other hand, often occupies a peripheral position (Even-Zohar 2004: 166).

Paratexts are modified or discarded in order to reflect the relationship between the text and its readers (Borhau 1994: 42). They “reflect the conventions of the target culture at a certain time” (Koş n.d.: 60), and in the case of a large publishing house such as Suhrkamp, there are likely to be preferred formats, such as the author’s photograph on the book’s cover. English-speaking readers of Malina possess different knowledge from its German-language readers. This means that the cover needs to be changed as a minimum, and prefaces and glossaries might become necessary. Kovala notes that print, font, layout, binding and decoration of a book “may evoke connotations by which the reader draws implicit conclusions about the work and which influence the reader emotionally (Kovala 1996: 123), although not all of these are significant for mediation (ibid.: 124).

Von Flotow points out that “the translator (and the team made up of editor, copy editor, revisor, publisher) have considerable leeway in how they prepare and present a text for a new readership” (von Flotow 2011: 7). This explains the inclusion of a map of Vienna and its surrounding area in Malina’s English version. The map is puzzling as it does not show any of the places that play a role in the novel, with the exception of Marchfeld, and is, in fact, rather unclear. I assume, therefore, that it is not meant to be read as an actual map, but rather fulfils a different function simply through the fact of its inclusion in the book. It may have been useful for the reader to
have a more detailed map of Vienna in order to understand the characters’ movements, although this is irrelevant to the plot of the novel. The map is in German and is thus incomprehensible to anyone who does not possess detailed knowledge of the area and/or knowledge of German. The conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the map’s purpose is not to inform the reader about geography, but rather to serve as a visual introduction to a foreign world in order to aid the reader’s immersion even before the beginning of the novel itself.

The glossary at the end of the book can be seen to fulfil almost the opposite function: it can be referred to at any point during the reading of the novel and provides explanations of German, Italian, French, Hungarian and Greek phrases. The original text does not include a glossary so that its reader is forced to make use of contextual knowledge in order to understand the non-German parts, endure incomprehension, or consult a dictionary. While the target text explicates reference points left obscure in the source text, the inclusion of a glossary could also be an act of compensation for the fact that Boehm has made some translational choices that foreignise the text (for ‘foreignisation’ and ‘domestication’, see Venuti 1998). Austrian place names, for example, are used in the translation, but Boehm’s own impression of his style is that it also falls into the category of foreignisation. His ‘Translator’s Note’ (1990: vii) alerts the reader that he has “attempted to capture the wordplay of the original as well as its unique rhythm” and “Bachmann’s unusual punctuation”. Such a translation strategy means that the target text would be composed according to the norms of the source culture rather than the literary norms that govern the target culture. Whether Boehm has succeeded in his approach can be questioned (and is in Chapter 3); however, as this is how he viewed his own translation, he or the publisher might have found the glossary necessary in order to avoid potentially alienating the English reader.

Paratexts pertain to the text, but also to advertising, and are therefore a liminal space (Genette 1997: 2). In order to explain his approach, Genette asks his readers “how would we read Joyce’s Ulysses if it were not entitled Ulysses” (Genette 1997: 2): the allusion to the Odyssey means that the reader approaches the book with a set of expectations which s/he looks to confirm or dismiss in the process of reading. The titles of Bachmann’s texts similarly influence the reader’s perception: a reader who is completely unfamiliar with the novel is likely to think that the title Malina refers to a female main character whose first name is Malina (see also Borhau 1994:
49) since names ending in ‘-a’ are usually feminine in Europe. Surnames of Eastern European and Slavic families usually have different endings according to whether a person is female or male, so that, for example, a sister and brother would usually share only the first part of their surname and each use the appropriate gender-specific ending. Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak, Latvian Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, Albanian and Macedonian feminine surnames often end in ‘–á’ or ‘–a’ (Financial and Banking Information Infrastructure Committee (FBIIC) 2006: 10; 11; 16; 18; 23; 29; 30; 31). According to the FBIIC’s register of common names, the vast majority of first and family names ending in ‘-ina’ (like Malina) are feminine. Bachmann’s Malina is a man, and his sister’s name is Maria Malina. ‘Malina’ is a family name rather than a first name. The Dictionary of American Family Names (Hanks 2003) locates the origins of the name Malina in Czech, Slovak, Polish and Ashkenazi Jewish history and notes that it could also be derived from the Czech word ‘malý’ and/or the Polish word ‘maly’ [both mean small].

Ich and Malina can be interpreted as two facets of the same character (see, for example, Summerfield 1976) and it is possible that Bachmann intentionally played with readers’ expectations regarding the protagonist’s gender and whether Malina would actually be the main protagonist. Bachmann envisaged that only Malina, the part representing masculine rationality, would survive at the end of the novel in order to become the narrator of the other ‘Todesarten’ texts as the story of women’s destruction could only be told by a man (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 87; 93; 95).

The reader’s expectations are further confounded by the description of the book as a ‘Roman’ [novel] and the inclusion, in the case of the first edition, of a text as part of the review slip (discussed in section 2.4 above), which seemingly portrayed the novel as an example of crime fiction. The genre-mixing that can be found in Malina makes it an example of postmodern writing (see Barry 2009: 87; see also section 4.2 for further analysis of genre-mixing in the novel).

Paratexts link material aspects of a book (the cover image, the words on the page) with the conscious participation of the reader, that is “the knowledge, experiences, memories, feelings and emotions that the reader brings to a reading of the book” (Stockwell 2002: 136). Paratexts thus link autonomous objects (physically
tangible objects) and heteronomous objects (abstract ideas) (Stockwell 2002: 135).\footnote{This distinction is made in phenomenology (Stockwell 2002: 135).}

Aysenaz Koş notes that the reader encounters the paratext even before the main text (Koş n.d.: 60). Several German editions of Bachmann’s work feature the author’s face on the book cover. One potential effect of this is that readers might expect the text to be autobiographical: the use of Bachmann’s photo could lead the reader to equate the author as a person with the narrator or one of the characters. As demonstrated by many of the reviews, the author Ingeborg Bachmann is often confused with Ingeborg Bachmann the extra-fictional voice. The extra-fictional voice which we imagine when we read Bachmann’s texts can include aspects of her stated intent.

In the case of *Malina*, Bachmann has gone to some lengths to construct links between herself and Ich, which an astute reader would notice. For example, Ich lives in the Ungargasse, as did Bachmann (Annan 1992: n.p.). Furthermore, Ich is in the process of writing the ‘Legend’, whose ‘ Stranger’ can be interpreted as Paul Celan, and which repeatedly emphasises that “ein Tag wird kommen” [a day will come], an ominously prophetic declaration that Bachmann describes in an interview as a personal principle:

> I don’t believe in materialism, this consumer society, this capitalism, this monstrosity that goes on here, these people getting rich, who have no right to get rich at our expense. I really do believe in something, and I call it ‘a day will come.’ And one day it will come. Well, it probably won’t come, because they’ve always destroyed it for us, for so many thousands of years they’ve always destroyed it. It won’t come, and yet I believe in it. For if I can’t go on believing in it, then I can’t go on writing either. (cited in Annan 1992: n.p.)

Bachmann is the real author; Ich is writing a book whose descriptions also seem to fit *Malina* and is thus *Malina*’s implied author.\footnote{See Peter Stockwell’s analysis of Thomas More’s Utopia in Stockwell 2002: 100.} However, Stockwell notes that “[e]ven fictions which seem absolutely realist are still examples of discourse worlds. The simple test of alternativity from our actual discourse world is to ask whether the
fiction is part of that world” (Stockwell 2002: 95). Parts of Malina, especially the nightmares in the second chapter, are not part of our world because they contain supernatural aspects, such as Ich talking on the telephone while in the middle of a lake. The ‘Legend’ in the first chapter is also rather far removed from our world.

“The ‘closeness’ of alternate discourse worlds to the actual discourse world is a matter of accessibility to its conditions” (Stockwell 2001: 95). Stockwell notes four conditions that determine the distance between fiction and the actual discourse world: the accessibility of objects (does the alternate world contain the same objects as the actual world, and do these have the same properties?), time (do both worlds exist in the same present, and do they have the same history?), nature (are both worlds subject to the same natural laws?), and language (do both worlds share the same language principles and cognitive patterns?) (Stockwell 2002: 95).

Assessing Malina according to these conditions, the middle chapter of the novel is the furthest removed from our actual discourse world; while the first chapter is the closest, the nightmares in chapter two describe situations and events which are unlikely to happen (e.g. talking on the telephone while drowning on an island). The sheer number of Ich’s misfortunes also removes Malina’s discourse world further from our actual world. The world of the ‘Legend’ seems to have different natural laws as, for example, a flower turns into the Stranger.

In reading Stockwell’s thoughts on discourse worlds, it becomes clear that the critics who immediately saw a connection between Ich and Bachmann herself came to this conclusion because of the “principle of minimal departure” (Stockwell 2002: 96). When we read a text, our default position is to assume it reflects the actual world until this is proven not to be the case. Large parts of Malina are set in 20th-century Vienna, as indicated by descriptions of places, people, interactions and activities. Although Ich can be assumed to have an occupation, and possibly even a prestigious one as she employs a secretary, her behaviour is occasionally startling, such as the constant writing and discarding of letter drafts. Text world theory explores the way in which literature evokes a ‘world’ through the construction of characters, imagery and the choice of words. Texts offer a framework onto which readers map their experiences and in doing so create a context (Stockwell 2002: 92). Discourse worlds are the reader’s interactions with the possible worlds represented in a book – both what happens in the story and the reader’s interpretation (Stockwell 2002: 93). Stockwell and other stylisticians concerned with text worlds (such as Gavins 2007)
do not mention whether translations are perceived as a different type of representation of fictional worlds compared to texts originally written in the audience’s own language. When translations are marked as foreign (for example, through the inclusion of the translator’s name on the cover), it is clear that their fiction is not part of the audience’s discourse world, so they are further removed than non-translated books. It is not clear whether Stockwell’s four steps can be applied to translations in the same way.

While Ich’s surprising behaviour could simply be interpreted as an indication that she harbours a dark secret that affects her daily life, literary critics appear to have instead compared Ich with Bachmann’s behaviour during her public appearances. Several articles (see section 2.5.2) give the impression that Bachmann appeared unstable and uninterested in social norms and expectations to a certain extent, especially during her Frankfurt poetics lectures. Blöcker describes Ich in *Malina* as “ziemlich unverschlüsselt die Autorin in Person” [rather clearly the author herself] (Blöcker 1971 in Schardt 2011a: 138). Bachmann responded to a question regarding the autobiographical nature of her novel in an interesting way: “[e]ine Autobiographie würde ich es nur nennen, wenn man darin den geistigen Prozeß eines Ichs sieht, aber nicht das Erzählen von Lebensläufen, Privatgeschichten und ähnlichen Peinlichkeiten” [I would only call it an autobiography in so far as the mental process of a self is concerned, but not the account of life events, private matters and similar embarrassments] (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 88).

Ich is therefore probably not an autobiographical version of Bachmann. It is possible to consider Ich a conceptual blend. Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner (1994; 1996; 2002) and Stockwell (2002) describe the process and function of blending, which is based on the idea of mental spaces (Boase-Beier 2011: 67). Reviews of *Malina* produce a blend of Bachmann and Ich: the person described by critics is neither solely a truthful image of Bachmann nor Ich. Put simply, blending “involves mapping between two spaces”, and “conceptual blends are the mechanism by which we can hold the properties of two spaces together” (Stockwell 2002: 97). The two spaces have different properties: for example, Ingeborg Bachmann is a woman, a writer, etc., whereas Ich is a woman and a character in a novel, and has a complex relationship with the world around her. During the act of blending, the “real space” person is projected into a new “hypothetical space” and “certain properties of the base space are carried over” (this forms the “generic space”); from this the
“blended space” arises (Stockwell 2002: 98). In the case of Ich, certain of Bachmann’s properties are carried over into the generic space. Fauconnier points out that “[t]he generic space contains what the inputs have in common” (Fauconnier 1997: 152). In the case of Bachmann and Ich, the generic space would include the fact that they are both women who carry out some form of writing and have had a difficult relationship with a man that has led them to experience some degree of emotional instability.

When Bachmann composed Malina, she had been experiencing an intense personal crisis. The poems she composed in the late 1960s document this crisis (see McMurtry 2012), as do the last letters she sent to Paul Celan. Letters occupy a grey area between fiction and reality: Bachmann was close to Celan and is likely to have written to him about her actual feelings, but writing letters also requires a degree of selection as they are not usually written as a stream of consciousness, but rather are structured in a logical way in order to convey information. There are parallels between the ideas expressed in a draft letter to Celan (from 27 September 1961; see section 5.3) and the emotions experienced by Ich. Bachmann’s conception of the ‘Todesarten’ was a conscious attempt to use her experience of crisis in order to examine society and draw wider conclusions about the relationships between women and men.

In addition, the name of Malina’s protagonist also suggests a blend: Ich is the German word for the first-person singular and as a result suggests Bachmann herself as the writer. However, we know that we do not actually have access to Bachmann through the text, so Ich is a character who we imbue with characteristics that we have assigned to Bachmann according to our interpretation. This situation is further complicated by the fact that Ich could be a blend of Ich and Malina, combining emotional and rational traits until rationality prevails and supersedes the elements of which Ich was previously composed. Because much has been written about this aspect of the novel (see Summerfield 1976 for a thorough analysis), it is not going to be discussed here.

A blend is not fixed (Boase-Beier 2011: 95), although it can be. For example, Boase-Beier uses the examples of a unicorn, which is a blend containing elements of both a horse and a mythical creature, and a teddy bear, a blend of a bear and a person (Boase-Beier 2011: 58). Usually, however, a blend requires our active participation (Turner and Fauconnier 1999: 398), which means that “[s]omehow we have to invent
a scenario that draws from the two analogues but ends up containing more” (Fauconnier and Turner 2002: 20). A blend is more than the sum of its parts, therefore. This idea applies to representations of Bachmann as a ‘myth’ discussed in sections 1.6 and 2.2: in the public perception she became more than a writer, and her characters also gained additional facets.
2.9 Afterwords

In general, it is probably not unusual for works of literature to contain fore- and afterwords. However, in my view, Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ constitute a special case because all of the explanatory material was provided by men. This fact parallels her idea that, following Malina, the other ‘Todesarten’ texts would be narrated by a man because Ich, the female narrator, has been silenced (see point 1. in section 2.1). Malina contains Philip Boehm’s ‘Translator’s Note’ and Mark Anderson’s ‘Afterword’. Franza contains both an ‘introduction’ and a ‘translator’s note’ (no capitals in the original) by Peter Filkins. Three Paths to the Lake contains an ‘Introduction’ by Anderson. For comparative purposes, Last Living Words (2005), Lilian Friedberg’s collection of translations, contains a ‘Critical Introduction’ by Dagmar C.G. Lorenz, Friedberg’s former thesis adviser who has published widely on 20th-century women’s writing. Michael Bullock’s translation The Thirtieth Year (1995) includes an ‘Introduction’ by Karen Achberger who is a Bachmann expert.

Anderson’s afterword to Malina was commissioned by the publisher (Boehm; personal correspondence). Reviewers received the afterword positively, describing it as “well-informed and insightful” (Taylor n.d.: n.p.) A review in Publishers Weekly (no author name provided) presents Anderson’s afterword as a necessity that explains Bachmann’s obliqueness and veiled references to Austrian history. A reviewer in LA Times shares this view: “[i]t would help to know one’s way in Bachmann's culture. Even without a cultural map, the stories are rich and stunning, but one is grateful to Mark Anderson for showing the way, for generous helpings of background information and erudition, and for his translation of short passages from languages other than the German” (Slocum Hinerfeld 1990: n.p.). The afterword is evidently seen to compensate for the novel’s perceived shortcomings.

To a certain extent, the afterword to Malina can be seen to echo the “deictic shifts” (Stockwell 2002: 46) in the novel. Section 3.6.2 explains my position with regard to the function of deictic shifts in the ‘Legend of the Princess of Kagran’, which is summarised here in order to explain my views on Anderson’s afterword. The deictic centre, the perspective from which the reader orients herself/himself in the fictional world of the novel, in Malina changes multiple times. Often, the reader is encouraged to take on the perspective of Ich, but in the third chapter, the deictic
centre shifts increasingly to Malina as he evaluates Ich and becomes more vocal. This shift is achieved when direct speech in the novel gradually supersedes narration. According to Stockwell (2002: 48), the reader expects the deictic shifts between characters, narrator(s) and extra-fictional voice to be balanced. They are balanced in the case of the ‘Legend’ in the first chapter of Malina: while the deictic centre shifts to the Princess, at the end of the ‘Legend’ it returns to Ich when the Princess tells the Stranger that they are going to meet again in front of a window with flowers. Windows did not exist in the time of the ‘Legend’, and at this point the reader becomes aware that Ich is writing the ‘Legend’. However, at the end of Malina, the deictic centre shifts to Malina when he answers the telephone, and the reader does not return to the level of Ich.

When Ich disappears, Malina’s perspective is the only one that remains. As Ich was the narrator, this deictic centre disappears. Bachmann stated that Malina’s voice would be the only one left, so that he could narrate the other two ‘Todesarten’ novels. This is indeed the case when one considers the deictic shifts. Deictic shift theory is part of cognitive stylistic methods for the analysis of fictional texts. However, in my view, it is worth bearing in mind the parallels between Bachmann’s fictional text and its treatment by the editor. At the end of the novel, instead of being left to ponder the significance of its final words ‘It was murder’, upon turning the page, the reader is confronted with Anderson’s viewpoint. The focus shifts from the question of ‘what did Bachmann do here’ to ‘what does Anderson think about what Bachmann did’. Anderson’s voice supersedes the silence left by Bachmann.

The next chapter presents the results of my close textual analysis of the translators’ choices.
Chapter 3: Text Analysis

This chapter presents the findings of my analysis of Ingeborg Bachmann’s 1971 novel *Malina* (here Bachmann 1995; translated as *Malina* by Philip Boehm; 1990), the 1972 collection of short stories *Simultan* (here 1997; translated by Mary Fran Gilbert as *Three Paths to the Lake* in 1989) and the novel fragment *Das Buch Franza* which was published posthumously in *Werke* [Works] (ed. Koschel, von Weidenbaum and Münster) in 1978, followed by an annotated edition by Albrecht and Göttzsche in 2004 (here Bachmann 2008; translated by Peter Filkins as *The Book of Franza*; 1999). The main focus will be on *Malina* because of its complexity and possible feminist nature, while the other works will serve to throw further light on the ways in which translators can master the challenges which Bachmann’s writing poses for them.

On occasion, reference will be made to *Malina*’s French translation by Philippe Jaccottet and Claire de Oliveira (1973; here 2008), the Italian translation by Maria Grazia Manucci (1973; here 2003), and the Spanish translation by Juan J. del Solar Bardelli (1986; here 2003). In addition to Filkins’ English translation of *Franza*, I also considered Magda Olivetti and Luigi Reitani’s Italian translation (2009). In the case of *Simultan*, comparisons are drawn between Gilbert’s English translation, Hélène Belletto’s French translation (1982; here 2008) and Ippolito Pizzetti’s Italian translation (1980; here 2012). All analyses referenced in this chapter are included in Appendix I, II and III, while additional examples which add further weight to the conclusions drawn in this chapter are included in Appendix IV, V and VI. An analysis of two sample pages is included in Appendix VII.
3.1 Method of Analysis

My analysis of Bachmann’s texts and their translations will focus on style since “[s]tyle encompasses the mental pictures the words convey and the cognitive effects they elicit” (Boase-Beier 2010: 36). Stylistic analysis allows us to form hypotheses regarding the effect of Bachmann’s style on the source text reader and the effects that the target text reader experiences, as well as the way in which the translator’s choices affect how the target text reader’s perception differs from that of the source text reader.

The writer Juan Gelman holds the view that “what is really in a literary work is not the subject it deals with, but the medium it’s working in, its language” (cited in Parks 2007: 241). This is echoed by Boase-Beier’s view that style forms part of a literary work’s content and meaning (Boase-Beier 2011: 12). Bachmann’s characters are not very active: with the exception of Malina’s middle chapter, the narrative in the novels and short stories is not an account of events or physical activity, but rather takes place inside the characters’ minds. For this reason, I argue that Bachmann’s style is of fundamental importance for our understanding of the message she is trying to convey. This is why the comparison of source and target texts will focus on the translation of style. The aim is to find out to what extent the translators focus on different aspects of Bachmann’s style.

Identifying linguistic habits and stylistic patterns is not an end in itself: it is only worthwhile if it tells us something about the cultural and ideological positioning of the translator, or of translators in general, or about the cognitive processes and mechanisms that contribute to shaping our translational behaviour. (Baker 2000: 258)

The analysis of the stylistic differences between Bachmann’s texts and their translations has been undertaken with the following broad aims: to investigate the translators’ possible cognitive processes and whether it is possible to detect markers of their ideology in the target text. In order to do this, I shall address the question of how the comparison of the source and target texts can enhance our interpretation of the source text. In addition, I have also looked for ways in which a better understanding of the German text after comparison with its translation can itself
allow us insights into translators’ strategies. Tim Parks suggests that comparing the source and target texts can be very useful:

[B]y looking at original and translation side by side and identifying those places where translation turned out to be especially difficult, we can arrive at a better appreciation of the original’s qualities and, simultaneously of the two phenomena we call translation and literature. (Parks 2007:14)

Comparing the source text with the translation will elucidate aspects of the original whose significance might elude the reader who focuses solely on the German text, because phrases and words that are difficult to translate will draw attention to their function and meaning in the source text. In addition, the comparison will tell us which elements of Bachmann’s texts are difficult or impossible to recreate in English, and which of these are given priority by the translator. Parks references George Steiner’s remark that literature that seeks to break its public linguistic mould also necessarily seeks untranslatability (Steiner 1975: 183 cited in Parks 2007: 242). Bachmann explicitly seeks to break the public linguistic mould as she thought language renewal was essential after the atrocities of the Second World War (see sections 2.5.1 and 5.3). She often uses the German language in unconventional ways, leading the reader to think about the meaning and significance of the words and puns she uses.

Parks, who in his book Translating Style analyses Lawrence’s Women in Love, a work of literature marked by a similarly unconventional use of English, remarks that these unconventional expressions only have effects on the reader because of the language they subvert: the “loopholes” (Parks 2007: 55) in language used by authors like Lawrence and Bachmann might not exist in the same places in other languages, and the translator cannot simply impose unconventional expressions on the target text. So perhaps the language Bachmann uses is in some instances untranslatable. Aspects of Bachmann’s writing that have been highlighted by critics and academics are, for example, its musical nature (Achberger 1988; Weigel 1999: 135), emotional intensity (McMurtry 2007), complex sentence structure and style (Friedberg 2004: vi; McMurtry 2007: 553; Trufin 2010: n.p.), and use of philosophical ideas (Weigel 1999: 74-133). The translators are likely to be able to
recreate only some of these in the target text, and perhaps it is possible to discern a hint of the translator’s ideological leanings through her/his translational choices.

Mona Baker identifies two factors to which differences between the source and target texts can be attributed: the individual translator and the source text (features of the source language, a particular social group’s poetics or the author’s style) (Baker 2000: 258). I would argue that there can also be a third factor influencing the target text composition: the target language. In some cases, certain aspects of the source text can only be translated into the target language in a particular way because of grammatical conventions or the constructions of idioms. Parks summarises his views thus: “[t]he translation is a normalizing grid against which the deviations of the original can be read” (Parks 2007: 56). This is especially true in the case of Bachmann’s writing.

Leonardi’s book *Gender and Ideology in Translation: Do Women and Men Translate Differently* (2007) is one of only a few publications on the subject of linguistic differences in translation in relation to the translator’s gender, which means that her methodology was very informative in the planning stages of this thesis. She compares Stuart Hood’s English translations of a novel by the Italian feminist author Dacia Maraini and of a novel by Pier Paolo Pasolini with Frances Frenaye’s English translations of a different novel by Dacia Maraini and of a novel by Carlo Levi (for more details see Chapter 1). However, my methodology will not follow Leonardi’s analytical model of a “critical contrastive text linguistic approach” (Leonardi 2007: 25) to any great extent because, while this thesis is intended to contribute to the field that her book has already opened up, our aims are different. While Leonardi set out to “contribute to the construction of a new model of analysis of ideology and gender in translation to be used for future research in the field of translation studies” and to “test [her] hypothesis through the comparison of source texts and target texts” (Leonardi 2007: 19), my investigation is a case study of Bachmann’s writing in translation with a particular focus on gender. Our emphasis is different: Leonardi has developed a framework for target text evaluation and then tested it, whereas my categories for comparison were the result of source text and target text analysis.

Analysing the translators’ strategies and the resulting differences between source text and target text will give us more information regarding the source text’s structure and open up more avenues of interpretation. The differences between
source and target text in Malina’s case can be classified according to the following categories:

(1) Ambiguity, Puns and Wordplay

Empson defines ambiguity as a “verbal nuance […] which gives room for alternative reactions to the same piece of language” (Empson 1977: 1); similarly, Boase-Beier describes it as “structures in a text which have multiple meaning” and notes its role in cognitive stylistics of expressing occasionally contradictory thoughts (Boase-Beier 2006: 83). Because it can have several meanings at the same time, early writers saw ambiguity as a stylistic fault which the translator had to resolve (Boase-Beier 2006: 84), but a translator who favours a cognitive stylistic approach to translation would attempt to let the target text reader access the state of mind expressed through the ambiguity in the source text (Boase-Beier 2006: 85).

Bachmann often uses words that can have several meanings in German, and as a result the context of these words can be interpreted in different ways. One example of this is her use of ‘Farbe’ in the third nightmare (Bachmann 1995: 183-185; Boehm 1990: 114-115), which can mean ‘paint’ or ‘colour’, and is translated by Boehm as ‘paint’. Transferring just one of these connotations to the target text affects the network of meanings in the text: the use of ambiguity allows the author to convey several meanings at the same time and causes the reader, who works harder at understanding the text, to gain more enjoyment as the result of discovering these networks. Ambiguity “[marks] a point of interaction for the reader” (Boase-Beier 2006: 85), and eliminating it deprives the reader of an opportunity to engage with the text. The translation of Bachmann’s ambiguities will be discussed in section 3.3.

Wordplay is defined by Dirk Delabastita in the following way: “structural features of the language(s) used are exploited in order to bring about a communicatively significant confrontation of two (or more) linguistic structures with more or less similar forms and more or less different meanings” (Delabastita 1996: 128; original emphasis). Bachmann’s invention “Wintermorde” [literally: winter murders; translated as “winter fashion executions”] (Bachmann 1995: 219), for example, is an instance of
paronymic wordplay: it is similar to, but not the same as, the word ‘Wintermode’ on which it is based (see Epstein 2012: 168-169 for an overview of different types of wordplay). Wordplay is difficult to translate, and the translator’s choices have far-reaching consequences for the target text reader’s understanding of the text.

(2) Images and metaphors

Metaphor is “the use of one expression to refer to a different concept in a way which is still regarded as meaningful” (Stockwell 2002: 105). Views on the nature and function of metaphors have varied: Aristotle, for example, regarded them as purely ornamental (Stockwell 2002: 106). Since linguistic theories have begun to benefit from the findings of cognitive science, the discipline of cognitive stylistics has explored metaphor as a linguistic and psychological phenomenon. Bachmann often constructs elaborate and striking images, particularly in Malina’s middle chapter which consists of a series of 35 nightmares endured by the central character Ich. Most of these nightmares are intensely vivid and greatly challenge and involve the reader through a high concentration of stylistic devices. This link between style and content, of course, poses many difficulties for the translator. The extent to which Boehm transfers Bachmann’s imagery will be explored in section 3.4.

(3) Transitivity

Transitivity is a useful framework for looking at processes and participants: who does what, and in which manner. According to Toolan (1998: 77), the English language categorises the world into the four processes of doings (material processes), thinkings (mental), sayings (verbal), and characterisings (relational) (Toolan 1998: 76). Each process involves several participants, and who fills each role is significant. This makes transitivity a useful tool for the analysis of ideology as expressed in a text. If one classifies Malina as a feminist novel (see sections 1.1 and 2.6.2 for discussion of this question), as I do, the interaction and power balance between characters is likely to form an important part of the reader’s interpretation. If one character is outlined, for example, as weaker and less active in the target text, this character’s interactions with other characters will probably be interpreted differently in
terms of power by the target text reader compared with the source text reader. While the stories of *Simultan* have not been taken on by the German feminist movement to the same extent as *Malina*, some differences between the characters’ relationships in source and target text can be found and, along with *Malina*, will be discussed in section 3.6.1.

(4) **Iconicity**

An icon is a sign “which resembles in its form the object to which it refers” (Wales 2001: 193), and iconicity is “the stylistic phenomenon in which the language used physically resembles what it represents, rather than doing so in a purely arbitrary way” (Boase-Beier 2011: 11). Bachmann is well-known for her complex style. I shall argue that this way of writing is iconic in Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts in several ways: in the short story ‘Simultan’ ['Word for Word’], the disjointed narrative can be seen as an iconic representation of the protagonist Nadja’s identity crisis. Iconicity also occurs when a text makes a reader do what it describes: in *Malina* and the *Franza* fragment, including the ‘Vorrede’, the complex text occasionally makes it difficult for the reader to discern the grammatical subjects and objects, or verbs’ referents. This means that these texts are not easy to read and often require the reader to read lines several times in order to gain full understanding. This is iconic of Bachmann’s view that vigilance, with regard to language in particular, was necessary after the Second World War.

I selected these categories for my comparison of source and target texts because most of the clear differences between them pertain to these specific stylistic features. The musical, philosophical, and emotional nature of some of Bachmann’s writing is discussed where this is relevant to my explanation of Bachmann’s and the translators’ use of stylistic devices. In the following sections, I shall analyse numerous examples to illustrate and further explain points (1) to (4) above. The first line of each example is always taken from the source text, the second line in italics is a gloss representing the literal meaning of each German word in English, the third line is the target text version, and on occasion I have provided a fourth line to illustrate an alternative translation which considers characters’ inferred gender.
differences and stylistic details which I deemed important for the interpretation of the
text and to which I could find no reference in the target text.

In some instances, I refer to Malina’s French, Italian, and Spanish
translations in order to ascertain whether the English translation of certain stylistic
features was necessitated by the constraints of the English language, and whether the
other translators’ choices show similarities with the English translations.
3.2 Overview of *Malina*

*Malina* consists of three chapters: ‘Glücklich mit Ivan’ [Happy with Ivan], ‘Der dritte Mann’ [The Third Man] and ‘Von letzten Dingen’ [Last Things]. ‘Der dritte Mann’ is a reference to the 1949 film noir of the same title directed by Carol Reed, whose screenplay was written by Graham Greene (van Praag 1982: 115). One of the film’s protagonists, Harry Lime, escapes through the sewer system several times (van Praag 1982: 116), which, it can be argued, is a murky world hidden from view that can be equated with the subconscious which Ich explores in the middle chapter of *Malina*.

*Malina* was the first novel translated by Boehm. He was selected by the publisher, Holmes and Meier, based on a blind selection of sample translations (Boehm: personal correspondence).

All examples from *Malina* analysed in this chapter are included in Appendix I, together with the French, Italian and Spanish translations, while additional examples, which add further weight to the conclusions drawn but can be categorised in the same way, are included in Appendix IV. As *Malina* constitutes the main focus of this thesis, the examples outnumber those from *Franza* and *Simultan*. These two works are referred to in order to provide a supplemental contrast and to show other translators’ approaches to Bachmann’s work.
3.3 Ambiguity, Puns and Wordplay in Malina

Bachmann uses ambiguity to great effect in her writing. Boase-Beier notes that “[p]oems possibly rely on ambiguity more than other literary texts” (Boase-Beier 2011: 171), perhaps because they convey so much in only a few words, and it is possible that Bachmann’s occupation with poetry throughout most of her life influenced her prose style to such an extent that ambiguity became a central stylistic feature of the ‘Todesarten’ texts. Malina contains several instances of ambiguous words, puns and word-play. A particularly striking example of Bachmann’s use of ambiguity occurs in the first chapter when Ich goes swimming with Ivan and seems to be very emotional on the way home:

(1)

GLÜCKLICH, GLÜCKLICH, es heißt glücklich,
\( \text{happy} \) \( \text{happy} \) \( \text{it} \) \( \text{is-called} \) \( \text{happy} \)
es muss glücklich heißen
\( \text{it} \) \( \text{must} \) \( \text{happy} \) \( \text{to-be-called} \)

(Bachmann 1995: 58)

HAPPY, HAPPY, it’s called happy, it has to be called happy (Boehm 1990: 34)
Hap, happy, it happens to be called happy

Le bonheur, le bonheur, c’est bien le titre, il ne peut pas y en avoir d’autre
(Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 48)

Felice, felice, è felicità, deve essere felicità (Manucci 2003: 55)

FELIZ, FELIZ, se llama feliz, así debe llamarse (Bardelli 2003: 55)
Then we could visit these new walls every day and be so happy we would leap for joy, for this is happiness, we are happy. (Boehm 1990: 35)

Nous pourrions ainsi longer tous les jours ces nouveaux murs pour y épancher notre joie et notre bonheur, car c’est le mot, nous sommes heureux. (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 49)

Ogni giorno allora potremmo andare lungo queste nuove mura e schiantare dalla gioia, dalla felicità, perché è felicità, siamo felici. (Manucci 2003: 56)

Cada día podríamos bordear esos nuevos muros derramando alegría y felicidad, pues la palabra es, feliz, somos felices. (Bardelli 2003: 57)

An important term used by Bachmann is Sprachenerneuerung [literally: language renewal]. It is the subject of several of her poems and her Frankfurt Poetics Lectures. To put it simply, Bachmann felt that it was necessary after the Second World War to find a new language as the old language had contributed to the development of a situation that allowed the rise of fascism. Hapkmeyer notes “Sprachenerneuerung bedeutet bei der Bachmann, die gegebene Sprache neu zu erfahren und neu zu verstehen” [language renewal in Bachmann’s work means experiencing and
understanding language in a new manner] (Hapkemeyer 1982: 14). This is what Ich is able to do thanks to Ivan: between pages 58 and 60, ‘glücklich’ [happy] is used 17 times, whereas in the target text between pages 34 and 35, ‘happy’ is used 18 times because Boehm translates ‘Glücksmauer’ as ‘Happy Wall’, and ‘uns ausschütten vor Freude und Glück’ as ‘be so happy we would leap for joy’ (see (2) above), but then chooses ‘for this is happiness’ as a translation of ‘denn es heißt glücklich’, substituting a noun for an adjective and describing the emotion rather than Ich’s state. Although he does not translate every single instance of ‘glücklich’ as ‘happy’, source and target text readers are probably equally likely to notice the obvious significance of this word here.

However, the contrast between the words used by Bachmann and Boehm could make the source text reader aware of a possible double meaning of ‘glücklich’. Bachmann mentions both ‘Freude’ [joy/happiness] and ‘Glück’ [happiness; luck], whereas Boehm uses ‘joy’ and ‘happy/happiness’: joy and happiness are mostly synonymous whereas ‘Glück’ can denote both fortune and happiness, and its meaning thus markedly differs from that of ‘Freude’. Perhaps Ich, or Bachmann, is passing comment on the nature of happiness. Bachmann’s use of happiness and luck here could imply that happiness is fleeting and only occurs by random chance. This complexity becomes apparent especially when one reads both texts at the same time and notices that Boehm does not approximate this wordplay: the target text makes no reference to luck or the nature of happiness. It would be difficult to bring across the same ambiguity in English, and as a result of Boehm’s translation, a nuance of the source text is not transferred to the target text. This is also the case in the French, Italian and Spanish translations, which leads me to suspect that the link between good fortune and happiness is uniquely German.

It would be possible to achieve an effect similar to the source text’s by using the archaic English word ‘hap’, which means ‘chance’, ‘fortune’ or ‘luck’ when used as a noun, or “to come about by ‘hap’ or chance” (Oxford English Dictionary online n.d.: n.p.) when used as a verb. As it is also the root of ‘happy’, the dual meaning of ‘happiness’ and ‘luck’ is neatly encompassed in one English term. While a reader with no particular interest in or awareness of etymology might not be aware of the etymology of ‘happy’, translating the source text as shown in line four of example (2) above is likely to draw her/his attention to Bachmann’s reflection on the nature of happiness.
Once the reader has become alerted to this double meaning, s/he might re-evaluate the previous instances of ‘glücklich’ because when a word is used so many times, it is likely that its meaning undergoes subtle changes. In example (1) above, it is not clear what the subject of the phrase ‘es heißt glücklich’ [it’s called happy] is. It seems as though Ich is deliberating the true meaning of happiness: perhaps ‘es’ refers to the word itself and Ich is finding examples for its use in her life, or perhaps she is trying to convince herself that she is happy. She explores a new relationship between reality and the language used to describe it. According to Hapkemeyer, the narrator is learning to trust language again and uses ‘glücklich’ so many times that she becomes certain that this word is the only possible way to describe what she feels (Hapkemeyer 1982: 11). The French and Spanish translators have evidently noticed that Bachmann is pondering the link between the feeling and the term for it as they explicitly refer to “le mot” (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 49) and “la palabra” (Bardelli 2003: 57) [both: the word] in Ich’s evaluation of happiness.

Boase-Beier (2013: 199) has noticed a tendency in Boehm’s translation (with Michael Hulse) of Herta Müller’s novel Heute wär ich mir lieber nicht begegnet (1997; translated as The Appointment, 2001). Of course this does not mean that his tendency towards disambiguation is a result of his gender, it is more likely in the case of the examples presented here and of the compounds in Müller’s novel that the German language allows room for ambiguity that is simply not possible in English.

Because Ich’s relationship with Ivan seems to be based primarily on her subservience and his derision of her efforts, this scene causes the source text reader to wonder further about the nature of their relationship. This is unlikely to be the case to the same extent for the target text reader because Boehm’s translation omits references to luck or the ambiguous nature of ‘glücklich’, partly necessitated by the English language. Boase-Beier notes that “[a]mbiguity […] is a powerful tool to engage the reader” (2011: 171), and if the ambiguity is weaker or eliminated in the target text, its reader is likely to experience less pronounced cognitive effects. While processing a complex text, a reader may gain new insights or experience emotions (Boase-Beier 2011: 171), and if these effects are diminished, there is a smaller pay-off for the target text reader’s efforts. Another consequence of the translation of this passage is that Bachmann’s writing might seem more gushing and emotional to the target text reader, whereas the source text seems to be carefully crafted and rather philosophical. Thus if the target text reader is aware of a potential assessment of
Bachmann as an overemotional and supposedly inexperienced prose writer, Boehm’s translation of this passage does nothing to redress this perception. In my view, the target text reader would benefit from a footnote to explain the double meaning of ‘Glück’.

There is a particular concentration of wordplay in Malina’s middle chapter. Nightmare three (Bachmann 1995: 183-185; Boehm 1990: 114-115) is one example of this, but as this part of the book will be examined more closely in section 3.4 with regard to the translation of Bachmann’s striking use of imagery and stylistic devices, only a brief overview will be given here. In this nightmare, Ich finds herself in a scene akin to a horror film, surrounded by objects so intensely colourful that they seem to be oozing colour:

(3)
Autos rollen herum, von Farben triefend
cars roll around of colours/paint dripping
(Bachmann 1995: 183)

Cars are rolling around, dripping paint (Boehm 1990: 114)
Cars are rolling around, oozing colour

(4)
die Farben, leuchtend, knallig, rasend, beckleckern mich
the colours glaring, explosive, raving, spatter me
(Bachmann 1995: 183)

the colours, glaring, explosive, raving, spatter me (Boehm 1990: 115)
the colours, luminous, glaring, raving, spatter me

The German word ‘Farbe’ used by Bachmann can mean ‘paint’ as well as ‘colour’, and perhaps Boehm shows he is aware of this by translating it as ‘paint’ in the first instance and ‘colours’ in the second. However, because he translates ‘triefend’ as ‘dripping’, the target text reader might think that the temperature is so high that the paint on the cars is melting, whereas in the source text it is clear that Ich’s senses are
playing tricks on her. None of the other translators convey this ambiguity as although French, Italian and Spanish have different terms for paint and colour, all translators here opt for the literal translation of paint rather than colour. Boehm thus shows awareness of the ambiguity of the German here not demonstrated by the other translators.

The imagery of nightmare four (Bachmann 1995: 184-185; Boehm 1990: 115-116) is analysed in section 3.4, but it also contains the following instance of wordplay: Following Ich’s sudden descent into hell, she exclaims

(5) Befreien Sie mich von dieser Stunde!
free you me from this hour/lesson

(Liberate me from this hour! (Boehm 1990: 116)

Example (5) can be classified in several different ways: it includes wordplay and contributes to Ich’s characterisation, and it is both of these factors as well as Bachmann’s use of them here which led to its inclusion in this section; just as the source text reader begins to get an overview of what is happening to Ich, Bachmann devises a seeming digression. In the source text, this sentence, together with the preceding one “Bitte befreien Sie mich!” [Please set me free!], works as a pun: ‘befreien’ means ‘to set free/liberate’, but ‘von der Stunde befreit sein’ means ‘to be excused from the lesson’. Because there is no English word that means both ‘lesson’ and ‘hour’, the target text reader might find it surprising when Ich speaks with the voice of her school days whereas for the source text reader it is a progression from the previous sentences. A footnote seems to be the only way to make the target text reader aware of this pun. As a result of Boehm’s translation, the target text seems more disjointed, whereas the source text is a carefully woven web of references and allusions.39 As in nightmare three about the colours, it could be said that the source text reader would see Ich as childlike and overwhelmed. The focus on Ich as a child

---

39 It is a possible allusion to John 12:27: “Jetzt ist meine Seele betrübt. Und was soll ich sagen? Vater, hilf mir aus dieser Stunde?” (Lutheran Bible) [“Now my soul is troubled. What shall I say: Father, save me from this hour?” (New Jerusalem Bible)].
suggests problems in the child-parent relationship; this is important, and discussed later in this chapter. In both cases this effect is not re-created in the translation, thus the target text characterisation of Ich differs from the source text, and the target text is less complex as a result of Boehm’s translation of Bachmann’s ambiguity.

Nightmare 22 (Bachmann 1995: 219; Boehm 1990: 137) contains some puzzling wordplay:

(6)

Die neuen Wintermorde sind angekommen, sie werden
the new winter-murders have arrived they are

schon in den wichtigsten Mordhäusern vorgeführt
already in the most-important murder-houses shown

(Bachmann 1995: 219)

The winter fashion executions showing the latest designs are on display in all the important fashion houses. (Boehm 1990: 137)

Alternative: The new winter fashion à la meurtre has arrived, it is already being shown at the most important maisons de mort.

La nouvelle mort d’hiver est arrivée, on la présente dans les meilleures boutiques de mort. (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 177)

I nuovi delitti invernali sono arrivati, vengono già presentati dale più importanti case di morte. (Manucci 2003: 185)

Han llegado las nuevas muertes invernales, ya se están presentando en las más importantes casas de muerte. (Bardelli 2003: 211)

In the source text, fashion is equated with death through the substitution of the compounds ‘Wintermode’ [winter fashion] with ‘Wintermorde’ [winter murders], and ‘Modehäusern’ [fashion houses] with ‘Mordhäusern’ [murder houses], and a few lines earlier through the replacement of ‘Sommermode’ [literally: summer fashion;
Boehm: summer fashion exhibition] with ‘Sommermorde’ [literally: summer murders; Boehm: summer fashion executions] (Bachmann 1995: 219; Boehm 1990: 137): this makes the reader wonder about a possible link between clothes and the murder of women, and when Ich later freezes to death dressed in a bridal gown, it can lead to speculation about the link between marriage and the murder of women, or at least the effect of marriage on women. The pun ensures that murder/death is foregrounded in this passage, and through the repetition the foregrounding effect is augmented. ‘Mordhäuser’ [murder houses] is simply translated as ‘fashion houses’ [Modehäuser] by Boehm.

“Compounds are by nature syntactically simple but semantically complex: the missing relationship between the parts of a compound always has to be supplied by the reader” (Boase-Beier 2013: 199). This complexity makes compounds difficult to translate into English because the translator has to “convey the unspoken” (ibid.). A new meaning is created through the combination of two words which is different from the meaning of each of these words. Bachmann’s compounds compel the reader to reach her/his own conclusions regarding Ich’s relationship with the young Bardos, and a potentially feminist view Bachmann might express here. In an article on Herta Müller’s compounds in translation, Boase-Beier (ibid.) states that “their compressed form suggests silence and fragmentation”. Müller’s characters are silenced by the Romanian secret police and thus appear in a context which differs slightly from that of Bachmann’s characters: Bachmann was conscious of her society’s need to re-evaluate language after large parts of it were silenced by the National Socialists, and the main characters of the ‘Todesarten’ are women who are silenced by patriarchal oppression. Nevertheless, Boase-Beier’s point still applies: Bachmann’s characters think and speak in fragmented language because they are still attempting to piece together their identities.

As a result of Boehm’s translation, the imagery of death and murder is less clear in the target text because ‘fashion executions’ might not be strong enough. I struggled to find a way of expressing the same idea in English; however, Bachmann frequently uses Italian, French, Hungarian and English terms in Malina as well as in her other writing, such as the short story ‘Simultan’ ['Word for Word’], and Boehm and the other translators maintain this in the target texts, so doing the same in this instance might provide an acceptable solution. As many famous fashion designers are French and the language seems generally to be used as the language of fashion, I
decided that the terms ‘à la mode’ [fashionable; in fashion] and ‘maison de mode’ [fashion house] might be an option because of the alliteration and assonance of ‘mode’ [fashion] and ‘mort’ [death]. To follow the source text example, ‘mode’ could be substituted with ‘meurtre’ [murder] as well as ‘mort’ [death]. In fact, the solution created by the French translators does precisely this. They play on the similar sound of ‘mode’ and ‘mort’: “La nouvelle mort d’hiver est arrivée, on la présente dans les meilleures boutiques de mort” (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 177). The Italian and Spanish translators also recreate this pun. Boehm’s translation is thus the only one which does not make a reference to ‘murder houses’, whereas the other translators judged the link created by this compound to be significant. The non-English translations prompt the question whether English allows less wordplay of this type. While English literature has a rich tradition of wordplay, as exemplified by ‘The Jabberwocky’, for instance, it is based on sound, whereas Bachmann’s wordplay arises from the meaning of the words. Compound formation in German presents a further opportunity for humour.

Boase-Beier notes that of all possible combinations (e.g. noun-noun, verb-noun, adjective-noun),40 “[c]omounds with two nominal elements are probably the most frequently-occurring in English” (Boase-Beier 1987: 66); further, a recent study found that two-word compounds are more common in English than in German (Berg, Helmer, Neubauer and Lohmann 2012: 290). It would have been theoretically possible for Boehm to translate the compound ‘Mordhäuser’ in example (6) as ‘murder houses’ and explain the source text’s wordplay in a footnote without running the risk of alienating the target text reader with unusual syntax. This, in fact, is the solution chosen by Ramona Trufin, the Romanian translator of Malina (Trufin 2010: n.p.). Although Boehm’s translation of the first compound as ‘winter fashion executions’ is not explicit enough to do justice to Bachmann’s politically motivated wordplay, it would have been adequate if it had been supported by a stronger translation of the second compound which would have served to foreground the link between fashion and murder.

In the source text, it is possible to find a web of further references to the theme of ice, murder and fashion, but most of these are not available to the target text

40 For a full list of all possibilities for compound formation in English and how common they are, see Boase-Beier 1987: 66ff.
reader’s interpretation: ‘Braut-Modelle’ [bridal models] in the manner of car models, e.g. ‘the 2011 model’, could potentially mean that the audience will see several types of people murdered, and Ich will be a murdered bride, but as it is translated as ‘bridal gowns’, the target text reader would not come to this conclusion. ‘Eisschleier’ is translated as ‘frozen veils’, and the fact that Bachmann uses ‘Eis-’ eight times suggests that she did so on purpose and did not mean a traditional veil which is frozen. The father’s plan seems to be to shower Ich and young Bardos in cold water until they are literally frozen. Therefore it is likely that Ich will not wear a traditional veil that would freeze because of the cold, but rather a veil consisting of frozen water, so by the time she is wearing a veil she will already be dead.

It is helpful to bear in mind Bond’s analysis (1991) of fire imagery in Bachmann’s writing: fire is a conceptual metaphor of passion and is used in this way in some of Bachmann’s writing. Her poem ‘Lieder auf der Flucht’ [Songs in Flight] (in Anrufung des großen Bären) most clearly links fire and sexuality (Bond 1991: 243). Fire and passion are also linked by a key phrase in Malina, a quotation from a sonnet by the Italian poet Gaspara Stampa (1523-1554): “vivere ardendo e non sentire il male” [to live in fire and not to feel the pain]. Ice, the opposite of fire, can be seen to conquer passion. There is no passion for Ich who will be covered in a veil of ice. The target text reader might not be able to construct this contrast with Bachmann’s use of fire imagery, and as a result misses out on the possible feminist point that in a male-dominated society women are not permitted an autonomous sexuality. Delabastita expresses the following view:

translators of wordplay can be pushed to extremes and forced to show their cards. What is their understanding of the original text? What are the layers of meaning and the textual devices they regard as most central? What is the translators’ poetics? What is their concept of translation and does it perhaps have cracks or internal conflicts, showing in the inconsistent treatment of puns? The translation of wordplay can even document the translator’s politics insofar as wordplay often has a subversive quality about it, for example by smuggling in taboo meanings (bawdy wordplay) or by dislocating established discourses and truths […]. (Delabastita 1997: 11)
Boehm’s translation of this nightmare gives us a small insight into his mind: the fact that the target text neither makes reference to ‘Mordhäuser’ nor allows the reader to interpret ‘Braut-Modelle’ to be a part of the same pun suggests several possibilities according to Delabastita’s points above.

- Boehm did not understand Bachmann’s pun
- He did not see a link between ‘Wintermorde’, ‘Mordhäuser’, ‘Braut-Modelle’ and Ich’s death
- He did not think the pun would play a role in the reader’s interpretation of the text
- He did not think puns were a central textual device in Malina
- He thought some stylistic devices were less important than the story itself
- He found no possible way of creating a similar pun in English
- He was not aware of a possible feminist interpretation of the pun

The seven points above vary in severity, and it is impossible to say with certainty which, if any, of them are accurate. It seems certain that Boehm was aware of Bachmann’s pun because his translation sounds unusual in English. However, while Boehm’s translations of Bachmann’s puns are less thought-provoking, the image of Ich in the ice palace also appears less threatening, and as a result the target text reader is less likely than the source text reader to infer a possible feminist message regarding fashion and marriage.

There is a further instance of wordplay in one of Ich’s conversations with Malina: she tells him about having written the words “Todesarten” and “Todesraten” (Bachmann 1995: 304) on two different sheets of paper. These were translated by Boehm as “death styles” and “death stales” (Boehm 1990: 190). Readers of Malina at the time of its first publication would probably have been aware that ‘Todesarten’ was the title she envisaged for the cycle of three novels, and that this is what the pun referred to. Target text readers are left in the dark unless they possess detailed knowledge of Bachmann’s work as Mark Anderson’s afterword does not give any information regarding the ‘Todesarten’. As readers after 1990 (the year of the English translation’s publication), they also read the novel in a very different context. Target text readers would be able to ponder the significance of the word ‘death styles’ in the context of the novel, but they would not be able to relate this pun to the
complex ideas of the ‘Todesarten’ as they were not exposed to Bachmann’s pervasive presence in the press and did not have repeated opportunities to attend Bachmann’s public readings and speeches. It seems that a footnote is essential here. Boehm seems to have judged sound to be the most important feature of this pun as ‘styles’ and ‘stales’ sound similar. However, while ‘death stales’ does not have any meaning, ‘Todesraten’ means death rates, and might thus be a reference to the number of women who lose their lives in the same manner as Ich, or, because ‘Raten’ means ‘instalments’, that Ich’s death occurs gradually.

The French translation in this instance is particularly clever: ‘Todesarten’ becomes ‘genres de mort’, which has the same meaning, while ‘Todesraten’ becomes ‘gens de mort’ [literally: death-people] (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 244). The similar sound of ‘genres’ and ‘gens’ suggests that the French translators also judged sound to be an important aspect of the pun, but their solution also links death and people just as the source text does. The Italian translation, clearly also mindful of the sound, chooses an entirely different solution: ‘cause di morte’ [causes of death] becomes ‘cause d’amore’ [causes of love] (Manucci 2003: 254), which imposes a positive interpretative opportunity that is not possible in the source text, and could in fact affect the reader’s awareness of Ich’s precarious situation. The Italian translator thus, like Boehm, chose to prioritise sound over sense in the translation of this pun. Bachmann does not tend to use auditory wordplay, whereas the sense is crucial in her writing.

It is clear that the translation of Bachmann’s puns, ambiguity and wordplay is not easy. However, it is surprising that Boehm did not resort to the use of footnotes in some of these instances: he uses a footnote to explain Bachmann’s pun ‘MelaNIE’ (‘Melanie’ is a character’s name, and ‘nie’ also means ‘never’ in German) (Boehm 1990: 122) and is therefore clearly not opposed to their use in translations of prose works. The target text reader would benefit from paratextual explanations of elements of Bachmann’s language which cannot be recreated in English as s/he would gain a greater understanding of the text and possibly appreciate Bachmann more as a skilled writer. It is possible that the publisher of the English translation, Holmes and Meier, did not approve the use of further footnotes in order to avoid the translation being thought of as an overly academic text, but allowed it in this case.

41 The Romanian translation also contains a footnote at this point (Trufin 2010: n.p.).
because of the typographical difference here which would have alerted the reader to the wordplay. The Romanian translator of *Malina*, Ramona Trufin, used footnotes to explain both the fashion-murder and the MelaNIE wordplay (Trufin 2010: n.p.).
3.4 Imagery in the Nightmares

Bachmann’s use of imagery is particularly striking in Malina’s middle chapter. In a series of 35 nightmares, Ich is tortured by the Father in numerous ways and suffers strange events in her quest to discover his identity. In general, the precision with which the source text’s imagery is constructed comes across less strongly in the target text. The same is true for Bachmann’s use of language. The author herself stated in a 1971 interview (the year of Malina’s publication) “[f]ür mich spielt das eine große Rolle beim Schreiben, dass alles ineinander verschränkt ist” [when I write it is very important to me that everything is interlinked] (interview on 9 April 1971, cited in Koschel and Weidenbaum 1983: 96), and indeed the language used in Malina seems to have been very deliberately used to create a puzzle for the reader. This is less obvious in the target text, and there are also instances of mistranslation that lead the reader to have an entirely different impression of events.

The third nightmare (Bachmann 1995: 183-185; Boehm 1990: 114-115), which contains the ambiguous word ‘Farbe’ [colour] analysed in section 3.3 above, has a great impact on the source text reader because of its construction and Bachmann’s use of stylistic features. This passage uses vivid imagery of colours and sounds that leads the source text reader to be immersed in the surreal world in which Ich finds herself.

The situation is described in terms of extremes and excess: as ‘schaurig’ [gruesome], Ich is ‘wahnsinnig’ [crazy], the cars are dripping paint or colour, there are ‘grinsende Larven’ [smirking larvae]. ‘Wahnsinning’ could be a wordplay around the meaning of ‘wahn/Wahn’ and ‘Sinne’ [senses]: the adjective ‘wahn’ means ‘empty’ and is the root of ‘wahnsinnig’ [mad/crazy], but the noun ‘Wahn’ can mean ‘madness’ and ‘delusion’. Therefore, it seems that Ich has either gone mad, as she implies in the first sentence, or that she is ‘Wahn-sinnig’, i.e. that her senses have gone mad and she experiences everything with more intensity: colours seem brighter than they would usually be, sounds are amplified, things move more quickly. Cars are so colourful that it is as if they ooze colour everywhere they go. Larvae are not simply smiling, they grin, which makes them seem slightly deranged, sinister and threatening. The adjectives used in the first few lines evoke the image of a chamber of horrors, as does the rest of the paragraph:
Cars are rolling around, dripping paint, people pop up (Boehm 1990: 114)
Cars are rolling around, oozing colour, people emerge

des gens surgissent (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 149)

appaiono uomini (Manucci 2003: 157)

seres humanos que emergen (Bardelli 2003: 177)

Everything in the source text seems to be drowning in colour, as implied by the long onomatopoeic [i:] sound in ‘triefen’; people ‘tauchen auf’ [pop up], which can simply mean that they appear, but the fact that ‘tauchen’ means ‘to dive’ and ‘auftauchen’ means ‘to resurface’ lets the reader imagine that people have been submerged in the colour and then resurface. The French and Spanish translators’ choices indicate that they interpreted the German passage in this way, whereas the Italian translator refers only to men and uses a more general term to describe their sudden appearance. Later, the image of wetness is picked up again through the word ‘Farbgüsse’ [downpour of colors], but this image is eliminated in the translation as colour would not be wet. In the target text, the effects are noticeable through subtly different stylistic details: cars are ‘dripping paint’ and ‘people pop up’. The repeated [p] sound supports the image of dripping paint, but dripping paint is less overwhelming than oozing colour and downpours of colour. Boehm could have chosen to use ‘oozing paint’ instead for the onomatopoeic quality of the long [u:] sound which is similar to the [i:] in ‘triefend’.

The colours are ‘leuchtend, knallig, rasend’ [luminous, glaring, raving] – it all seems overwhelming, noisy and busy. In the target text, this is translated as ‘glaring,
explosive, raving’, but ‘knallig’ in the context of colours means ‘very bright’. Perhaps Boehm translated it as ‘explosive’ presumably because ‘Knall’ means ‘bang’ in English, i.e. the sound which is caused by an explosion. He could have used ‘loud’, ‘dazzling’ or ‘screaming’ instead of ‘explosive’ – these words have the same almost audible quality as ‘knallig’ and would have created a more similar image.

He translated ‘zerstieben’ as ‘turn to dust’, but it actually means ‘to scatter’. It is difficult to say whether this was an error or intentional, or if Boehm perhaps saw a connection between ‘zerstieben’ and the word ‘Staub’ [dust]. ‘Stieben’ is an unusual word in German: etymologically related to the Old High German ‘stioban’ and the Middle High German ‘stieben’, it means ‘sich schnell bewegen, fliegen’ [to move quickly, to fly] and is the root of ‘Staub’ [dust] (Duden 1963: 679). It is related to ‘stäuben’ [to agitate dust], which is now more commonly used in the form of ‘bestäuben’ [to pollinate]. The Duden etymological dictionary records that although German speakers commonly think that the root of ‘stauben’ [to produce dust] is ‘Staub’ [dust], it is actually ‘stieben’ (Duden 1963: 671). Perhaps Bachmann’s word-choice is a play on the ambiguity caused by the etymology of ‘zerstieben’. It means ‘to scatter’, but carries within it a reference to ‘turning to dust’, which suggests death, and through this is linked with the black toes. It is possible that Boehm was not aware of the meaning of ‘zerstieben’ when he read it in the source text, and, probably being aware that ‘zer-’ is a prefix, looked for words beginning with ‘st-’ in the dictionary, found ‘stauben’ and consequently settled on his translation.

If it is the case that Boehm did not know the meaning of ‘zerstieben’, he nevertheless attempted to translate it in a way that seemed logical rather than choosing to omit this part of the sentence. This would mean that he recognised its function as a sudden conclusion to the long sentence: dust is dry, whereas paint is wet, therefore he seems to have recognised that the image constructed by Bachmann contrasts opposites. If he was aware of the meaning of ‘zerstieben’ and the difference in his translation was intentional, this would constitute a deliberate intervention in the meaning of the text.

So the image created in the English translation differs slightly from that in the source text: in the source text machines run into Ich and then scatter in all directions, whereas in the target text, they turn to dust. The introduction of ‘dust’ into this image
of bright colours also leads to a less direct contrast when Ich’s feet turn black\textsuperscript{42} as one would usually imagine dust to be grey. The reader of the translation might imagine a colourful and noisy scene with dripping paint and a sudden dust cloud, followed by sky-coloured balloon-fingers and toes, and then black toes. The source text reader imagines a scene of runny colour oozing everywhere, machines charging at Ich and suddenly dispersing again, sky-coloured fingers and toes, and black toes.

The French, Italian and Spanish translators, however, all came to the same conclusion with regard to the meaning of ‘zerstieben’: it is translated as “ils éclatent” (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 149), “si disperdono” (Manucci 2003: 157), and “se dispersan” (Bardelli 2003: 177), which all carry the same connotation of scattering in different directions. The meaning of Bachmann’s (now) unusual wording was thus only obscure to Boehm. As Boehm also translates from Polish and spent a number of years living in Poland, it is possible that this is the language in which he is more comfortable. His knowledge of German is clearly excellent at a literal level, but more obscure connotations only become habitual to speakers with prolonged exposure to the language.

The entire description of Ich’s ‘gruesomely assembled’ world is one long sentence of 145 words that takes up most of a paragraph. This is preserved in the translation through a sentence of 159 words. The way Bachmann has structured this passage seems very deliberate: the description of events is just one fast, breathless-seeming sentence; it ends when Ich’s toes turn black (the opposite of all the colour described previously), and she states ‘ich kann nicht mehr weitergehen’ [I can’t go on any more], and therefore works in an iconic way too. The paragraph ends here, the next line consists only of the word ‘Sire!’\textsuperscript{42}, after which the next short paragraph begins with ‘Mein Vater’ [My father]. The structure is the same in the target text, in fact the sentence contains a few more words. ‘Weitergehen’, ‘Sire’ and ‘mein’ all contain an [ai] sound, and could therefore be seen as an iconic representation of Ich’s compliance with the father’s instruction ‘Geh weiter, geh nur weiter!’ [Go on, just go ahead!]\textsuperscript{42}: the sound is repeated twice, and then twice more in the father’s ‘weiter’, perhaps representing her steps. This effect is preserved in the target text through the

\textsuperscript{42} Frei Gerlach notes a link with Günter Eich’s poem ‘Betrachtet die Fingerspitzen’ here which contains the lines “Betrachtet die Fingerspitzen. Wenn sie sich Schwarz färben, / ist es zu spat” [Regard the fingertips. When/if they turn black, / it is too late] which Bachmann mentioned in one of her Frankfurt Lectures (Frei Gerlach 1998: 258).
[at] sound in ‘I’, ‘Sire’ and ‘My’, but the sound is not repeated two more times like it is in the source text. It is not clear whether Boehm noticed Bachmann’s sound repetition here as ‘Sire’ is an English word anyway, and ‘I’ and ‘My’ are the only possible translations of ‘Ich’ and ‘Mein’, therefore the sound repetition in the target text could merely be a happy coincidence.

In a similar fashion, Bachmann’s repetition of the [a] sound in ‘dann’ [then], ‘platzen’ [burst], ‘alle’ [all] und ‘falle’ [fall], as well as the repetition of ‘falle’ just before the previous example could also be seen as iconic, echoing Ich’s descent. Again, this effect is partly maintained in the target text through the assonance of ‘all’ and ‘fall’, but this could also merely be coincidental because of the fact that ‘all’ and ‘fall’ are the only logical choice for the translator.

Thus Boehm partly preserves the iconicity in this nightmare, but his reduction of possible interpretations means that the text produces a far less striking image for the target text reader, and this in turn might cause her/him to think of Bachmann solely as a writer of highly emotional scenes rather than as one who expertly manipulates language in order to create a complex web of signifiers. This observation is also true in the case of the next example, taken from nightmare four (Bachmann 1995: 184-185; Boehm 1990: 115-116). In a scene reminiscent of Dante, Ich first seems to go to a hell made of ice, and then of flames:

(8)

\begin{align*}
\text{Ich} & \quad \text{komme} & \quad \text{ins} & \quad \text{erste} & \quad \text{matschige} & \quad \text{Eis}, \\
I & \quad \text{come} & \quad \text{into-the} & \quad \text{first} & \quad \text{slushy} & \quad \text{ice} \\
\text{bevor} & \quad \text{ich} & \quad \text{ins} & \quad \text{ewige} & \quad \text{Eis} & \quad \text{komme} \quad (184) \\
\text{before} & \quad \text{I} & \quad \text{into-the} & \quad \text{eternal} & \quad \text{ice} & \quad \text{come}
\end{align*}

I reach some slushy ice before arriving at the permanent ice (115)

I get to the slushy ice before I arrive at the eternal ice

j’atteins les premières neiges à demi fondues avant d’en venir aux neiges éternelles (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 150)
arrivo a un primo ghiaccio fangoso, prima di giungere nel ghiaccio eterno
(Manucci 2003: 158)

llego hasta un primer hielo cenagoso, antes de llegar al hielo eterno (Bardelli
2003: 178)

In the ninth circle of hell (Canto 32-34) in Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, traitors are frozen in an icy lake called ‘Cocytus’; the theme of ice is central to five of the nightmares Ich experiences in the middle chapter, and the intertextual aspects of this are explored in section 3.3.2. The source text reader might equate the ice in the fourth nightmare (see example (8) above) with hell because of the mention of ‘ewige[s] Eis’ [eternal ice]. This is supported by Ich’s exclamation a few lines later “Ein Buch über die Hölle!” [A book about hell!] as well as Bachmann’s use of ‘komme’, which brings to mind the phrase ‘in die Hölle kommen’ [to go to hell]. She could have described the same event by using, for example, ‘ich erreiche das erste...’ [I reach...], therefore ‘komme’ seems to have been used deliberately. However, while ‘to go to hell’ or ‘to be sent to hell’ are the English equivalent of ‘in die Hölle kommen’, the first implies that Ich decides where she goes and the latter implies that someone else makes her go there, neither of which are implied by the source text. The reader of the translation would not be able to construct the same image in her/his mind, an effect which is further exacerbated by Boehm’s use of ‘some slushy ice’ and ‘permanent ice’: ‘ins’ is a contraction of ‘in’ [in(to)] and ‘das’ [the], and thus Bachmann uses the definite article here, which makes it appear as though Ich had been expecting to see the ice and knows what it indicates. The vagueness of ‘some’ in the translation leads to the idea that Ich might simply have come across some bad terrain. In order to preserve some of the source text’s connotations, Boehm could have used ‘eternal ice’ to bring to mind an association with ‘eternal damnation’ instead. This is what the French, Italian and Spanish translators have done: they all opt for the more biblical image of eternal ice.

Nightmare six (Bachmann 1995: 187; Boehm 1990: 117) contains further examples of Bachmann’s complex use of language and the problems this can cause for the translator. In this passage, Bachmann uses many onomatopoeic words; the repetition of sounds is very evocative and adds to the image created here: ‘wimmert’
[whimpers], ‘fauchen’ [hiss], ‘knistert’ [crackles], ‘gurgelnd’ [gurgles]. Boehm has chosen words whose sounds are similarly noticeable, therefore one can assume that he found Bachmann’s description important. The environment in which Ich finds herself is ‘finster’ [dark], there is a ‘tief-tiefgefrorener See’ [deep-frozen lake], an ‘Insel weit draußen im Wasser’ [island far away in the water], a ‘Sonneninsel’ [island of the sun] which is ‘verdüstert’ [gloomy], the oleanders are ‘umgesunken’ [keeled over], the volcano ‘hat Eiskristalle angesetzt’ [has brought forth crystals of ice] and is ‘erfroren’ [frozen]. Amidst all this, Ich appears to be adrift in the water clutching a telephone through which she is speaking to the father.

Again, it is a scene reminiscent of a horror film which partly achieves its oppressive effect on the reader through the direct contrast between opposites: in the source text, the island of the sun is ‘verdüstert’. ‘Düster’ is a colloquial term meaning ‘dark’ or ‘gloomy’; the ‘ver-’ prefix can imply an agent (i.e. the father), although it does not necessarily do so; it also implies the process of the island becoming ‘düster’. Bachmann could have simply used ‘düster’ or ‘dunkel’ [dark] here, therefore the prefix must be taken into account when analysing this passage. ‘Verdüsterung’ can be used to describe a depressed state of mind. ‘Gloomy’ works in a similar way in that it can also be used to describe a state of mind, but no agent is implied. However, Boehm has changed the description slightly by translating it as ‘I see how gloomy the island of the sun really is’: the addition of ‘really’ can give the reader the impression that the island has been gloomy for a long time and Ich had not noticed it before this point, whereas the source text also makes it possible to imagine that it has not always been gloomy, but suddenly became so during the course of Ich’s telephone call. In reading the source text, it is possible to imagine that the father is so powerful that he can exert an influence over Ich’s environment (and possibly put her there in the first place), making it cold, dark and threatening, whereas in the translation this effect is slightly weaker. However, it is still possible to come to the same conclusion based on the content of this passage alone.

Another example of Bachmann’s use of directly contrasting images is ‘der Vulkan hat Eiskristalle angesetzt’ [the volcano has brought forth crystals of ice]. In the source text, one would imagine a volcano covered in ice crystals, whereas the target text seems to suggest a volcano spewing ice crystals. While Boehm’s choice is an accurate translation (‘ansetzen’ can mean ‘hervorbringen’ [to bring forth]; Duden online), the way in which Bachmann uses ‘ansetzen’ here means ‘to be covered in’,
as for example ‘Rost ansetzen’ [to be covered in rust]. As a result, the image is not quite the same for readers of the source and target text, but the words used in the translation actually support the general feeling of a situation in which everything is turned on its head and as a result has a threatening effect. The image of the volcano covered in ice has similarities with the symbolism in nightmare 22 (Bachmann 1995: 219; Boehm 1990: 137) as explained by example (6) in section 3.3 above: the ice veil is a metaphor of fire/passion being destroyed by ice, and here even the volcano, i.e. the fire, is conquered by ice. Again, ice destroys fire.

In nightmare 15 (Bachmann 1995: 201; Boehm 1990: 126) the reader learns about the link between Ivan and the Stranger⁴³:

(9)

\begin{align*}
\text{in } & \text{seinem } [\ldots] \text{ siderischen Mantel, in } \text{dem ich} \\
\text{in } & \text{his sidereal coat in which I} \\
\text{ihn } & \text{vor einigen} \text{tausend Jahren gesehen habe (202)} \\
\text{him } & \text{ago several thousand years seen have}
\end{align*}

in his starry mantle […] in which I saw him a thousand years ago. (126)

in his starry cloak, in which I saw him several thousand years ago

The source text means that Ich saw the Stranger several thousand years ago, a clear reference to the legend from the first chapter which was set two thousand years before the present day of Ich, Ivan and Malina. This allusion and the continuity of Ich’s history with Ivan is therefore far less clear in the translation, and although the references to the legend are obvious through the context, this part is the key. Boehm might have thought that it was not important to distinguish between one thousand years and several thousand years as both are simply a long time. But he has made it more difficult for the target text reader to put all the puzzle pieces of Bachmann’s story together.

⁴³ There is also another possible reference to Paul Celan here: Ich sees Türkenbund [Turk’s-cap lilies] in this nightmare, a rare flower which grows in the Alps and is mentioned five times in his only prose work ‘Gespräch im Gebirg’ (1959) (Weigel 2003: 416).
3.5 The Depiction of Characters

3.5.1 Power and Agency in Malina

In my analysis of Ingeborg Bachmann’s 1971 novel Malina, I set out from the hypothesis that it is a feminist text (in the sense that Bachmann highlights the unequal situation of women and men, and its effects on women’s psyche; for further details, see sections 1.6.1. and 4.3.1) which deploys specific stylistic devices in order to make its meaning clear, and that Philip Boehm, the translator of Malina, is likely to change the reader’s understanding of the text. This assumption is based on Bachmann’s statement “[d]ass männliche Rationalität die weibliche Identität tötet, ist ein in vielen Variationen gespieltes Thema in den Todesarten” [the fact that masculine rationality murders the feminine identity is a theme which is played out in many variations in the Todesarten] (Vanhaegendoren 2006: 141): when a book with this central tenet is translated by a man, it makes sense to investigate whether any of the text’s elements or its distinct style are altered by the translator, particularly when the translation is composed several decades after the source text.

Furthermore, as Malina raises central issues of the relationship between women and men and as a result took on great importance in the German feminist movement, it is, in my view, imperative to analyse its translation and reception in the light of another influential text of a comparable nature: Simone de Beauvoir’s Le Deuxième Sexe (1949) and its much-criticised translation The Second Sex (1953) by Howard Parshley. Philosophical aspects of the book were de-emphasised (von Flotow 2011: 153) in favour of scientific content: the publishers thought the book was a “modern-day sex manual for women” (Bair 1990: 432 in von Flotow 2011: 153). It is estimated that Parshley cut approximately 15 percent of de Beauvoir’s text (Moi 2002: 1008), and Toril Moi suggests that despite not having any training in philosophy he was chosen as the translator because he was an expert on sexuality (ibid.: 1030). Parshley’s decision to leave out every reference to socialist feminism (ibid.: 1008) would not be surprising if he interpreted the work as one about the biological nature of women. However, Moi notes in a later article that Random House, the publisher of the translation, was in fact responsible for these cuts (Moi 2010: 3). Parshley’s intervention in the text resulted in a much-shortened text whose
solid grounding in philosophy and the history of the women’s movement became unavailable to the target text readers.

Moi (2002: 1022) found that because of Parshley’s omissions, de Beauvoir’s work has frequently been thought of as incoherent, inconsistent, and even careless. This is a great loss for the English-speaking world, and it is important to ascertain whether Malina or any other ‘Todesarten’ texts have undergone a similar editing process because target text readers who are unaware of Bachmann’s capability in philosophy and her eclectic literary interests are likely to form a less favourable impression of her than the source text readers, and would miss out on the contribution her philosophical reflections can make to feminism in the English-speaking world. A new translation of Le Deuxieme Sexe by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier (2009) has been published and has received criticism mostly for the fact that neither of the translators is an expert in literary translation or philosophy. It will not be discussed here because Parshley’s translation is the only one relevant to my argument. Boehm was tasked with the translation of Malina following his submission of a sample translation (personal communication, 2 June 2015), and this means that the publisher considered his skills as a translator sufficient.

When analysing a text in which feminism and the interactions of female and male characters potentially play a crucial role, it makes sense to look at how power is represented in the source and target text, especially because Malina can be interpreted as a philosophical reflection on women’s speechlessness (see Albrecht and Göttsche 2002: 141). Bachmann mentioned in an interview that she was influenced by Wittgenstein’s assertion in Tractatus 5.6 “Die Grenzen meiner Sprache sind die Grenzen meiner Welt” (Koschel and Weidenbaum 1983: 83) [the limits of my language are the limits of my world]. The Bachmann scholar Hapkemeyer makes the following observation:

Sprachlosigkeit ist gleichbedeutend mit Wehrlosigkeit. Zur-Sprache-Kommen dagegen bedeutet in Ingeborg Bachmanns späten Texten, Einsicht in die eigene Lage zu erlangen und die Persönlichkeitsentfaltung einzuleiten.

(Hapkemeyer 1982: 29)
Speechlessness is the same as defencelessness. Becoming able to speak, on the other hand, stands for gaining insight into one’s own situation and commencing self-development in Ingeborg Bachmann’s late writing.

This is exemplified in nightmare eight (Bachmann 1995: 189-192; Boehm 1990: 118-120), in which the father’s accomplices destroy Ich’s library: while this is clearly a reference to the Nazi’s book burnings, the books represent Ich’s way out of her speechlessness, and their destruction means that her powerlessness has become permanent (see Hapkemeyer 1982: 27).

Ich [I] is the only female main character who makes an appearance in all of the chapters; the other women – her sister Eleonore, her mother, her secretary, the cleaner and the father’s mistress Melanie – only make minor appearances. In contrast, the novel contains three main male characters: the first chapter is dominated by Ivan, the second chapter outlines the atrocities of the Father, and the third chapter tells the reader about Malina. The first chapter also contains the ‘Legend’ of the Princess of Kagran, a fairytale of eight pages which chronicles how the Princess is rescued by a Stranger. It later becomes clear that the ‘Legend’ describes an imagined first meeting of Ich and Ivan in 2000 BC. The ‘Legend’ alludes to traditional fairytales, as do several other pieces of Bachmann’s work: the first line of her poem ‘Von einem Land, einem Fluss und den Seen’ [Of a Land, a River and Lakes] alludes to the Grimm brothers’ fairytale ‘Von einem, der auszog, das Fürchten zu lernen’ [The Story of the Youth Who Went Forth to Learn What Fear Was]; ‘Rosenrot’ in the second stanza of the poem ‘Curriculum Vitae’ is an allusion to a character from the Grimms’ fairytale ‘Schneeweißchen und Rosenrot’ [Snow White and Rose Red]; ‘Sterntaler’ in stanza three of ‘Die blaue Stunde’ [The Blue Hour] is the main character in a fairytale of the same name [The Star Money] (Filkins 2006: 630). The following section will examine in which way Bachmann uses fairytales and Gothic

---

44 The legend contains many references to Paul Celan’s work. This fact, together with the description of the stranger in nightmare 15 in the middle chapter (Bachmann 1995: 201-205; Boehm 1990: 126-127) and the mention of Cz., Celan’s cipher for his hometown Czernowitz (see Weigel 2003: 412), in an early draft of Malina can lead readers to equate the stranger with Paul Celan. Bachmann sent the legend to her publisher after she had already sent the rest of the manuscript (Kohn-Waechter 1992: 52), which leads Weigel to interpret it as a reaction to Celan’s death in 1970 (Weigel 2003: 412).
novel elements in the ‘Legend’ in order to question women’s lack of opportunity to gain autonomy, as well as how her use of transitivity supports this.
3.5.2 Fairytales and Transitivity: Representation of the Princess of Kagran

Bachmann frequently alludes to fairytales in her ‘Todesarten’ texts. The way in which she does this is particularly interesting in the ‘Legend’ of the Princess of Kagran in Malina. The following paragraphs analyse how Bachmann uses images and quotations from fairytales in the ‘Legend’ of the Princess of Kagran to question perceptions of women in European society in the 20th century, and to imagine more positive roles for them. In addition, this analysis will clarify how these allusions link the ‘Legend’ with the rest of Malina through the subject matter of women and power, and how using elements of the Gothic novel helps Bachmann to achieve this. This will be followed by an analysis of transitivity in the descriptions of the Princess in the ‘Legend’.

The ‘Legend’ contains images from different Grimms’ fairytales, and several instances of the narrator’s insistence that the Princess was “eine wirkliche Prinzessin” (Bachmann 1995: 62) [a true princess; Boehm 1990: 37] function as an allusion to Hans Christian Andersen’s 1835 fairytale ‘The Princess on the Pea’.45 The allusions in Bachmann’s work “to fairytale characters and relationships are subtle and fragmentary” (Achberger 1985: 215): she did not re-write the tales collected and written by the Brothers Grimm, Hans Christian Andersen and Charles Perrault although this was a popular practice among politically conscious writers after the war, and especially in the 1960s. Many left-wing German writers were uncomfortable with the values taught to children by classical fairytales, and wrote modern tales which included references to contemporary political thought (Zipes 2006: 61; see Chapter 4 in Zipes 2006 for an overview of politicised fairytales in post-1945 Germany). Bachmann’s approach is different: she borrows images and well-known phrases as well as aspects of storylines and character traits from various fairytales in order to enrich her own writing and to allow the reader additional interpretations.

Bachmann tells the reader early on that fairytales will play a role in Malina: the beginning of the first chapter contains the line “O alter Duft aus Märchenzeit” (Bachmann 1995: 12) [O ancient scent from far-off days; Boehm 1990: 4] from

---

45 The Danish original refers to her as “en rigtig prinsesse” (Andersen n.d.: n.p.), which has been translated as “a real princess” by Crone Frank and Frank (2005: 61).
Arnold Schönberg’s opera *Pierrot Lunaire*, and this continues at the end of the third chapter with “All meinen Unmut geb ich preis, und träum hinaus in sel’ge Weiten” (Bachmann 1995: 337) [Now all my sorrows I dispel, and dream beyond the fair horizon”, Boehm 1990: 212]. Through its placement the citation provides a frame for the novel and serves as a reference to both the golden past of fairytales (‘Märchen’ means fairytale in German) and the dream of a brighter future, both of which serve as an escape from the harsh reality of the present (Achberger 1985: 218).

While dreams play a role in *Malina* solely in the form of nightmares of a traumatic past, the fairytale allusions are used in the ‘Legend’ as a device to recall a positive past and to express hope for a better future. Women are often subjugated or portrayed in an unflattering light in the canon of classic fairytales, and Bachmann uses fairytale allusions in addition to the already plentiful intertextual references in her work in order to question the fate women in post-war society are likely to suffer. Bachmann’s allusions to fairytales in *Malina* and her other prose works display three characteristics: they concern the destruction of women, they express a utopian ideal of women’s existence, and they occasionally do this through role reversal so that e.g. a female character in Bachmann’s texts possesses the traits of a male fairytale figure.

In *Franza*, Bachmann uses the ‘Bluebeard’ tale as a metaphor for the destruction of women’s lives in marriage: Franza’s treatment by her husband “represents the paradigmatic annihilation of the feminine Other in the name of reason, objectivity, and science” (Achberger 1985: 214). This analysis parallels possible interpretations of *Malina*: if one assumes Ich and Malina to represent the emotional and the rational facets of the same person, then Ich’s disappearance at the end of the novel suggests that masculine rationality has murdered feminine consciousness.

Bachmann was clearly aware that the Grimms’ tales, although they were socially relevant when they were collected and edited, “placed great emphasis on passivity, industry, and self-sacrifice for girls and on activity, competition, and accumulation of wealth for boys” (Zipes 2006: 61). Many children’s books in the UK still fit this description today, and it is not surprising, considering her progressive concerns, that Bachmann was taken on as a leading light by the early German feminist movement. The importance of literature must not be underestimated: Jack Zipes notes that reading plays a role in socialisation processes through the conscious and unconscious understanding of signs, symbols and letters (Zipes 2006: 68).
Some of the female characters of Bachmann’s prose texts are quasi-utopian allusions to various fairytale characters: Undine from the story ‘Undine geht’, Wanda from the story ‘Ein Wildermuth’ and Mara from ‘Ein Schritt nach Gomorrha’, and even the young Franza, show traits of this positive female ideal (Schmid-Bortenschlager 1985: 41). Schmid-Bortenschlager also classifies the Princess of Kagran as belonging to this category of characters. Achberger, an expert on many aspects of Bachmann’s writing, shares this assessment: references to fairytales “serve as a corrective or utopian counterpoint to the narrative […]; they offer glimpses of a timeless, mystical realm where real limits are suspended while fantastic possibilities are entertained” (Achberger 1985: 211). Thus using the fairytale genre allows Bachmann to explore the role of women through the character of the Princess of Kagran in a way not permitted by other genres as limitations which exist in the real world can be ignored. It can also be argued that Bachmann’s choice of the fairytale genre is iconic: she evokes a past era by using an ancient storytelling tradition.

However, Bachmann does not borrow elements from fairytales in a straightforward way. She exploits the familiarity which most European readers would probably feel with this genre when the allusions trigger their recognition and the expectation of a plot to which they are accustomed, but at the same time she also subverts the genre in order to make a feminist point regarding the misfortunes of women. Achberger describes myths, folktales and fairytales as having passed through the prism of patriarchy and gynophobia so that in the present day canon female characters are largely either defined by their relation to male characters (e.g. Eve and the Virgin Mary in the Bible47), destroyed when they are powerful (e.g. witches and wicked step-mothers), or they are passive young maidens who marry a prince (Achberger 1985: 212). Bachmann’s work contains these common fairytale motifs and subverts them.

As there are not many classic fairytale images which do not objectify women, Bachmann appropriates male roles for some of her female characters (especially Bluebeard in the story ‘Ein Schritt nach Gomorrha’ – see Achberger 1985 for a full analysis). This is one of her strategies in the ‘Legend’ and will be more fully

---

46 These stories have been published as ‘Undine goes’, ‘A Wildermuth’ and ‘A Step towards Gomorrah’ in Michael Bullock’s translation of the short story collection Das Dreißigste Jahr (The Thirtieth Year, 1987).

47 Some Bible scholars might disagree with this assessment.
analysed below. Bachmann alludes to fairytales in a way which allows her to suggest “female authenticity and responsible selfhood” (Achberger 1985: 212-213): for example, the references in the ‘Legend’ to women with golden hair suggest hope for a time in which women will be celebrated rather than subjugated. According to Achberger, the central message of the ‘Legend’ is that the present is only a temporary state of oppression with “better times both behind and before us” (Achberger 1985: 216). She concludes that Bachmann offers glimpses of “woman qua woman”, rather than as an absence in male-defined culture (Achberger 1985: 219). Bachmann does this by alluding to images from various sources, usually from fairytales or biblical in nature, and rejecting or subverting those which define women’s existence in relation to men.

Bachmann reverses the function of classic fairytales: whereas, for example, Grimms’ fairytales sought to lead girls towards the virtuous path, the ‘Legend’ alerts women to the dangers of waiting for a man’s approval or permission to act. The plot development of the ‘Legend’ echoes the pattern of many fairytales, as analysed by Zipes (2006: 70). At first, there is usually a struggle for power which results in the requirement for the (male) protagonist to leave home or family: the Princess has to flee from the conquering kings. This is followed by a task that has to be solved, and a struggle for survival. According to Zipes, this part of the plot usually involves the question “what must one do to use one’s powers rightly to be accepted in society or re-create society in keeping with the norms of the status quo?”, and the protagonist “always leaves home to reconstitute home” (Zipes 2006: 70). Similarly, Bachmann’s ‘Legend’ is clearly an attempt to incite her readers to ask these questions about the Princess, and thus of themselves and their position in the world.

The reader is not given much information about the Princess’s original situation, apart from the fact that she was powerful until she had to flee. If one follows Zipes’ assessment of the common fairytale plot, the ‘Legend’ charts the Princess’s endeavour to regain her power. However, instead of being concerned with power in terms of politics and land, the power which the Princess seeks to reclaim could be seen in terms of autonomy, as this is usually the goal of the protagonist’s trials and tribulations in Grimms’ tales (Zipes 2006: 70). This view of the development which the Princess undergoes is borne out by the analysis of transitivity in the legend. Thus the Princess takes on the role usually fulfilled by male heroes in fairytales.
However, by learning to be passive, obedient, patient and silent, she also faces challenges that are typically the remit of female fairytale characters (Zipes 2006: 70). These demands are placed on the Princess by the Stranger, and just as in classic fairytales, conforming to patriarchal rule is the path to happiness. This idea is confirmed by Eugen Weber’s observation that “in a lot of folktales, enduring in silence is one of the most common tests a heroine […] has to pass” (Weber 1981: 110), and Ruth Bottigheimer notes that silence in Grimms’ fairytales is usually female (Bottigheimer 1987: 75). In Grimms’ tales, gratification is postponed until skills, power and wealth are acquired (Zipes 2006: 70); gratification for the Princess of Kagran means reunification with the Stranger, and this will be delayed until 2000 years later in the time of Ich and Ivan as a reward for her skill of obeying patriarchal rules.

The common fairytale hero’s goal of autonomy can be linked with the importance of silence: Bottigheimer (1987: 74) notes the etymology of the German word ‘mündig’ [of legal majority] which shares an Old High German root with ‘Mund’ [mouth]. The power of speech can thus be equated with agency (see also section 3.5 for an overview of Ich’s speechlessness). Evidently, the Princess does not achieve the final goal of gaining autonomy as she dies, as does Ich, and both are superseded by their masculine rational counterpoint. Thus Bachmann’s bleak message seems to be that there is no reward for women who struggle in order to attain patriarchal approval, only metaphorical, spiritual or actual death. Bachmann’s Princess combines the structure of the journey that male fairytale characters undertake with the aim towards which female characters are expected to work. Her conclusion seems to be that by trying to attain typically feminine traits such as silence and obedience, one becomes unable to reach the proper goal of one’s journey, i.e. autonomy.

While death seems to be the inevitable outcome of women’s struggles to conform in Bachmann’s texts, it can also be interpreted as an escape from the male realm (Achberger 1985: 219). The second Pierrot Lunaire quotation references dreams and “sel’ge Welten”: the adjective ‘selig’, in addition to its religious connotations, can refer to death (Duden online). In addition to the main part of the ‘Legend’, Malina contains seven very brief interruptions that seem to represent drafts
of the ‘Legend’ on which Ich is working. One of these contains the phrase “wir werden tot sein und atmen”\(^{48}\) (Bachmann 1995: 144) [we will be dead and still breathe; Boehm 1990: 90] and also makes reference to going into the desert. If one understands this as an allusion to Moses’ exodus, then death in *Malina* seems to represent an escape from oppression. Bachmann’s message is thus not entirely negative. However, she does not suggest what shape women’s possible future might take. It is likely that this would have been one of her aims for *Franza* or *Requiem for Fanny Goldmann*, as she anticipated these novels to be the continuation of her exploration of women’s destruction.

Analysing transitivity in the descriptions of the Princess confirms that the ‘Legend’ is a story about her quest for autonomy. Linguistically, the legend of the Princess of Kagran provides several examples that illustrate how the representation of power can differ between source text and target text. As a result of the translator’s choices, the characterisation of the Princess and the Stranger is different in the target text, and the relationship between them is presented differently in terms of power. I shall analyse the differences between source text and target text in terms of transitivity as this is a useful framework for the analysis of actions.

Michael Halliday’s definition of transitivity encompasses processes (verbal groups), participants (nominal groups) and circumstances (adverbial groups or prepositional phrases) (Halliday 1985: 101). Writers have a choice between active and passive constructions, and while both can express the same meaning, passive constructions make it possible to hide the agent performing the action. As is often the case where an element of choice is involved, it is thus possible to look for traces of ideology in the text: “[t]he extent to which a character is the passive ‘victim’ of circumstance, or is actively in control of the environment, making decisions and taking action, is one of the concerns of feminist stylistics” (Mills 1995: 144). Sara Mills analyses transitivity by counting the ratios of different types of processes in the descriptions of characters’ actions; she distinguishes between mental processes, e.g. feelings (either internalised or externalised processes), and material processes, i.e. actions. Material processes can be event processes or action processes, the latter of which can be either intention processes or supervision processes (see Mills 1995:

\(^{48}\) “Wir waren tot und konnten atmen” is the last line of Celan’s poem ‘Erinnerung an Frankreich’.
Roger Fowler’s explanation of transitivity is more nuanced: among others, he also includes what he terms “pseudo-agentive structures” (Fowler 1996: 222) in his definition (e.g. “the door slammed”, Fowler 1996: 222).

By analysing who performs actions and who is a passive recipient of others’ actions, it is possible to discern an author’s or a character’s world-view (Fowler 1996: 220). Boase-Beier (2006 and 2011) further develops Fowler’s notion of world-view and mind style: “when we read a text what we are reading is not just words and meaning in the sense of representation, but also a particular mental state embodied in the text” (Boase-Beier 2011: 86).

The following examples demonstrate how the characterisation of the Princess is different in source text and target text.

(10)

Ihre Gefolgsleute beredeten und baten sie, zurückzubleiben (62)

*her retainers discussed- and asked her to-stay-back with

Her retainers conferred among themselves and begged her to stay back (36)

Her retainers pressed her and pleaded with her to stay

The German rendering really means ‘ihre Gefolgsleute beredeten *sie* und baten sie, zurückzubleiben’, but in order to avoid the repetition of ‘*sie*’, it can be omitted in the first instance as the meaning will remain clear because ‘bereden’ is a transitive verb rather than an intransitive or a reflexive verb, and the Princess is thus its only possible object. Boehm does not appear to be aware of this fact in his translation: in the source text, the Princess’s retainers talk to *her*, whereas in the target text, they talk to *each other*. The French, Italian and Spanish translations express the same circumstances as the source text, which suggests that there is not necessarily an issue with Bachmann’s phrasing here. The Princess is the object of two verbs in the original, whereas in the English translation she is the object of only one verb. As a result, the Princess’s presence in this sentence is reduced: she is not involved in the discussion concerning her plans. The next example is more complex:
Because the princess was a true princess, she preferred death to allowing herself to be made the bride of an old king (Boehm 1990: 37)

Because the princess was a real princess, she preferred death to being given in matrimony to an old king

Here, the Princess is first described as an active agent in the source text: she would rather choose death, whereas the target text expresses this situation as a mental state, i.e. a mere preference for death. This is reversed in the second half of the sentence which expresses the hypothetical situation the Princess is trying to avoid: she appears to be a commodity in the source text, as ‘zuführen’ can not only mean ‘to introduce’, but also ‘to convey’ or ‘to deliver’, so the reader has to decide how s/he imagines the Princess in her context, whether she would simply be introduced to a potential husband, or whether she would be transported against her will. In the source text the Princess is the grammatical object and thus her character is in a passive position, whereas the target text construction puts the Princess in the active mode, i.e. she is the agent. The source text construction of this sentence suggests that the Princess is trying to escape a situation in which she would be passive, and in doing so she becomes an agent. In the translation this impression is very different: the sense of the Princess as object remains to a smaller extent: she would still ‘be made’ the bride, but at the same time the use of ‘allowing herself’ seems to indicate that the Princess has some decision-making power in this course of action, which is not the case in the source text. Furthermore, in the source text it is clear that the Princess would rather commit suicide, whereas in the target text she simply prefers death, so she could
potentially prefer to have a fatal accident or to be murdered. The choice between death and marriage also seems more hypothetical in the target text, whereas in the source text the reader gets the impression that suicide is a concrete plan if the Princess is forced into marriage. The French translation opts for the same solution as Boehm and describes the Princess as preferring death. The Italian translation does the same as the source text and mentions the Princess’s wish to “darsi la morte” [give herself death] (Manucci 2003: 58). The Spanish translation is a combination of these two approaches: the Princess “prefería darse muerte” [prefers to give herself death] (Bardelli 2003: 59). The Italian translation is the only one to pick up on the nuance of the Princess’s agency in the source text.

(12)

Die Prinzessin verlor die Herrschaft (62)

the princess lost the authority/lordship/sovereignty

The princess lost her dominions (Boehm 1990: 37)

The princess lost her power

This example demonstrates how the characterisation of the Princess in the source text and target text differs. One would not usually expect a princess to be involved in the governance of a country, yet this seems to be how Bachmann envisaged the Princess: her Princess appears to be the supreme ruler of Kagran. ‘Herrschaft’ can mean several things: lordship, sovereignty, regime, control, and it includes the masculine title ‘Herr’. The Middle High German word ‘hērschaft’ can also signify dignity or honourableness: its root ‘hēr’ meant august, distinguished, and even holy (Duden online). In the source text, the Princess seems to be left powerless and without a people to govern. ‘Dominions’ seems to capture only the most literal aspect of the complex German term: the land that the Princess used to own. The Italian and Spanish translations refer to the Princess’s power, whereas the French translators opt for “couronne” [crown] (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 51), which can refer to the Princess’s sovereignty as well as the possessions that come with it. It is more difficult for the French reader to interpret this passage as being about the Princess’s power in general as ‘couronne’ has a specific meaning.
The English target text reader receives a different image of the Princess’s standing before and after the arrival of the Hussars and might therefore imagine Bachmann’s Princess more like a traditional princess who has no active involvement in the unfolding of her future. This point is underlined further by the following two examples taken from a later point in the legend.

(13)
Sie geriet in einen einzigen Morast (64)
she happened into a single/bad morass

She entered a huge morass (Boehm 1990: 38)
She found herself in a huge swamp

(14)
betört von dem Reich aus
bewitched by the kingdom of
Einsamkeit, einem verschlossenen verwunschenen Reich,
solitude a closed-off cursed kingdom
in das sie geraten war. (66)
into which she happened had

bedazzled by this forlorn, bewitched kingdom of solitude she had entered. (39)
beguiled by the empire of solitude, a closed-off, bewitched empire in which she had found herself

In both these examples, Boehm has translated ‘in etwas geraten’ with ‘to enter’, and as a result the Princess’s actions seem more determined and purposeful in the target text, whereas the source text portrays her as passive. ‘Geraten’ is used in many phrases, e.g. ‘auf Abwege geraten’ [to go astray] or ‘in die Falle geraten’ [to fall into the trap], in order to describe behaviour which is not intentional. In the source text, the Princess happens upon the morass and the bewitched kingdom, she seems to be at the mercy of her horse and the elements and suddenly finds herself in a threatening environment without meaning to have gone there, whereas in the target text she seems more aware of where she is going and therefore seems to have more choice. In
both of these cases, the French, Italian and Spanish translations, while they all vary the expression used rather than repeating it as the German does, also express a view of the Princess’s actions as accidental. While the Princess is the subject in all versions, the source text could be called a “pseudo-agentive structure” (Fowler 1996: 222), as the Princess, while grammatically active, is not actually an agent here. However, this is not the case in the English target text.

Descriptions of the Princess’s emotions tend to be toned down in the target text, as demonstrated by the following two examples. The gloss is omitted in example (15) in order to allow a clear presentation; my suggested alternative translation clarifies the meaning of the German section.

(15)

*trotzdem war es nicht die dahindonnernde Wasserflut, vor der sie Furcht überkam, sondern es waren Angst und Verwunderung in ihr und eine niegekannte Unruhe, die von den Weiden ausging.* (66)

nonetheless she did not fear the roaring waters; she was more awed and anguished, and the willows imparted an uneasiness she had never felt before. (Boehm 1990: 39)

nonetheless it was not the roaring flood that made her overcome with fear, but it was the fear and uneasiness within her and an unfamiliar restlessness originating from the willows.

(16)

Sie erschrak bis in ihr tiefstes Herz. (68)

*she startled down- in her deepest heart to*

She was terrified at heart (Boehm 1990: 40)
Her blood ran cold

At this point it becomes clear that the ‘legend’ is written in the style of a Gothic novel: the environment is described as mysterious and hostile with the power to act
upon the Princess (see Fowler 1977: 107-108). In examples (15) and (16) above, the Princess witnesses forces of nature or frightening events which cause her to feel sudden strong emotions. In example (15) she is not frightened of the water, but rather she is frightened because of the uneasiness the willows cause her to feel. This does not come across in the rather clumsy English translation where she is portrayed instead as ‘awed and anguished’, not frightened at all. Boehm seems to have struggled with this sentence as evidenced by his perplexing translation. While the German is not without complication here, all other translators bring across the same nuance of the Princess’s fear of the terror within herself and of the unrest emanating from the willows.

It is helpful to know at this point that this extract is from a two-page passage which is based on Algernon Blackwood’s story ‘The Willows’ (1907), in which the willows are taken over by extraterrestrial beings which change people’s identities (see Kunze 1985 for a thorough analysis of the parallels between Blackwood’s story and Bachmann’s legend). Although Bachmann makes no reference to the reason why the willows cause the Princess to feel uneasy, being aware of the legend’s origin might help to explain why the Princess has reason to be frightened. Perceiving the Gothic novel elements as a sort of response to the fairytale allusions also helps to explain this.

The German Romantics dissolved reader expectations through their transformation of familiar motifs into mysterious landscapes which led readers to question the former secure worlds of fairy tales as well as their immediate surroundings (Zipes 2006: 108). This is also the way in which Bachmann constructed the ‘Legend’, and it appears that the reason for her combination of fairytale and Gothic novel was her wish to lead her readers to question the world around them. The mysterious landscape, especially the brook, also occurs in classic Grimms’ fairytales, and it usually signifies danger for male characters (Bottigheimer 1987: 29 and 34). In fairytales, women often have power over nature, and this frequently occurs in relation to trees especially (see Bottigheimer 1987: 45 and 170); this is reversed in the ‘Legend’: the willows exert a strange power over the Princess. Bachmann uses a defamiliarising style in the legend: usually we would expect plants and the environment to be passive, but here they function as an agent metonym (Toolan 1998: 94-95). The willows and water often take on the subject position in the
sentence and thus give the reader a sense of a world in which the Princess has no control, but is at the mercy of nature.

In addition, the description of the environment can be understood as a reference to the underworld: a long journey, often across a body of water, is necessary to reach the underworld in Greek mythology, and this is also true of Bachmann’s ‘Legend’. If one follows this line of interpretation, the Stranger in his black cloak would be the guide to the underworld. Furthermore, the reader learns that the Princess’s tears will later turn to jewels. This may be a reference to the Norse legend of Freya who cries tears of gold in search of her husband.

Bachmann’s reference to the ‘Princess on the Pea’ makes her readers question common perceptions of women. Andersen’s princess differs markedly from female characters in the Grimms’ fairytales, and it is thus likely that Bachmann contrasted them intentionally. Andersen’s princess has to endure adverse weather conditions, as does Bachmann’s Princess, and she has to cope with a physical test of her nature, unlike, for example, Cinderella, who only has to try on a shoe. It can be said that Andersen’s tale is itself subversive: a real princess would probably not arrive at a castle on her own in a storm in the middle of the night. In contrast to the classic German fairytales, the Danish storytelling tradition values initiative as a positive feminine attribute and does not expect submission of its heroines (Bottigheimer 1987: 169). This seems to be true of the Princess on the Pea, and the fact that Bachmann described the Princess of Kagran with a phrase directly borrowed from this tale suggests that she wanted the reader to see a connection between these two princesses.

It can thus be said that Bachmann combines aspects of Grimms’ fairytales and Andersen’s Princess on the Pea with the style of a Gothic novel in order to offer the glimpses of “woman qua woman” hypothesised by Achberger (1985: 219). The ‘Legend’ raises the issues that are explored in Malina and the other ‘Todesarten’ texts and thus provides a microcosm of Bachmann’s views regarding the situation of women.

The legend of the Princess of Kagran presents a distinctive mind style (Fowler 1996: 227) that is changed in the target text. Bachmann foregrounds the roaring waters by placing them at the beginning of the sentence rather than choosing a more conventional word order, and the Princess’s feelings are also foregrounded because they, together with the waters, are the grammatical subjects of the sentence.
The target text construction puts the Princess and the willows in the subject position. As a result, the Princess seems less affected by her environment in the target text, and the environment also appears less vivid and threatening.

In example (16), the intensity of the Princess’s fear is reduced in the target text: the source text described a process, whereas the target text describes a state. In the source text, the Princess seems to become afraid very suddenly: ‘bis in ihr tiefstes Herz’ means that she is shaken to the core, whereas the target text reader is likely to assume that she is generally afraid, but not to any great extent. Upon its first publication, Malina was described by German critics as too feminine, weak and confusing, and Bachmann was derided as overemotional (see Albrecht and Götsche 2002 for a brief overview). Perhaps Boehm was influenced by these opinions and as a result consciously or unconsciously changed the features of Bachmann’s language that he deemed redundant or exaggerated. This hypothesis is borne out to some extent by the analysis of Malina’s middle chapter: here, too, Boehm lessens the emotional outbursts of Ich in her conversations with Malina. This will be more fully explored in section 3.5.3.

In addition to the characterisation of the Princess, the Stranger also appears markedly different in source text and target text. This is particularly striking when one examines how the Stranger’s actions are described, as demonstrated by the two following examples.

(17)
Er legte zwei Finger auf seinen Mund,
he put two fingers on his mouth
das erriet sie, er hieß sie schweigen,
that guessed she he instructed her to-be-silent
er bedeutete ihr, ihm zu folgen, und
he motioned to-her him to follow and
schlug seinen schwarzen Mantel um sie (63-64)
threw his black coat around her

He put two fingers to his mouth, she guessed this to mean she should be silent, he gave her a sign to follow and threw his black mantle around her (37)
He put two fingers on his lips, that much she could guess, he motioned for her to be quiet, he gave her a sign to follow him and threw his black cloak around her (18)
Er [...] schlug den Mantel über sie und sich. (68)
he threw the coat over her and himself

He [...] covered them both with his cloak. (40)
He threw his cloak around her and himself

In both of these examples, the Stranger appears more in charge in the source text than he does in the target text. In the source text he appears as an agent, but this is omitted in the target text as a result of a potential translation error. In (17), the source text can confuse the reader with the interjection ‘das erriet sie’, as it is not immediately clear whether the Princess guessed that the Stranger put two fingers on his mouth or that he wanted her to be silent. However, this problem can be solved when one remembers that it is so dark that the Princess cannot see the Stranger (“er verbarg sein Gesicht in der Nacht, aber obwohl sie ihn nicht sehen konnte […]”; 63) [he kept his face hidden in the night, but although she could not see him […]]; 37], therefore it is likely to mean that the Princess assumes that the Stranger has put his fingers on his mouth; furthermore, if the Princess guessed that the Stranger wanted her to be quiet, it would be more grammatically correct to say ‘sie erriet, dass er sie schweigen hieß’ [she guessed that he told her to be silent]. Thus in the source text the Stranger gives the Princess instructions, whereas in the target text his agency has been reduced and the Princess’s has been increased.

In addition, ‘sie’ can mean ‘they’ as well as ‘she’, so in the source text, the Stranger might throw his cloak around the Princess, or around himself and the Princess, whereas in the translation it is just the Princess. Boehm’s translation means that its reader interprets the Stranger’s instructions as less commanding than the source text reader would. Thus at this point in the source text the Stranger seems very authoritative and the Princess has no choice but to acquiesce to his demands, whereas in the target text he seems to give her gentle signs whose meaning she has to guess.
Example (18) further shows that the Stranger is generally more decisive in the source text: in (17) Boehm translated ‘schlug seinen schwarzen Mantel um sie’ as ‘threw his black mantle around her’, so it is surprising that he opted for an alternative translation in (18). It is possible that he was trying to avoid repetition, but these examples are separated by two pages in the book, and Bachmann chose the verb ‘schlagen’ in both instances, so its use might be significant. ‘Schlagen’ can mean ‘to hit/beat’, but it is also used in many phrases, for example ‘sich etwas aus dem Kopf schlagen’ [to put something out of one’s mind], ‘die Uhr schlägt’ [the clock strikes], ‘Brücken schlagen’ [to build bridges], or ‘die Wellen schlagen’ [the waves crash].

The source text reader would imagine a short and quick movement here, whereas ‘to cover’ seems to indicate a slower and gentler movement. Thus how the Stranger’s actions are described in the target text differs a surprising amount from the source text, and this in turn leads to a different portrayal of the relationship between him and the Princess, as the following example shows.

(19)

Sie sagte es mit den Augen.  

She said it with the eyes

Doch er wandte sich ab und  

but he turned himself away and

verschwand in der Nacht.  

disappeared in the night (64)

She spoke with her eyes. Then he turned and disappeared into the night. (Boehm 1990: 38)

She spoke with her eyes. But he turned away and disappeared into the night.

The source text reader gets the impression here that the Stranger does not listen to what the Princess signifies with her eyes, but instead turns away coldly and leaves. In the target text this sequence seems less abrupt and the target text reader would therefore assume that the Stranger receives the Princess’s message. A few lines earlier, the reader learns that the Princess “hatte […] ihr Herz verloren” (64) [had fallen in love; 38], and one would imagine the message that the Princess tries to convey with her eyes to be of a romantic nature. Despite coming to the Princess’s
aid, the Stranger seems cold and distant (and very mysterious) throughout most of the legend, hiding his face and only communicating with gestures until the last two pages. The example above presents a culmination of this distance between the Princess and the Stranger – she has fallen in love, but he turns away. In the translation this progression is lost, and as a result, its reader might interpret the Princess to be less alone as the Stranger could potentially return at any moment. When he does eventually rescue the Princess again, it is a surprise for the source text reader.

This analysis of Boehm’s translation of the legend has shown that transitivity appears altered in the target text. The portrayal of the Princess as an agent in some cases or object in others is not consistent with the source text. While the content of source and target text is the same, with the exception of the sections explained in example (15) and (17) above, transitivity analysis has shown that the characters’ agency and power balance is in fact different. When one compares how the Princess is portrayed in the source and target texts, references to her status are weakened in the target text (example (10) and (12)), and where Bachmann describes her in passive terms, she is more actively involved in the target text (example (11), (13) and (14)). Furthermore, the mind style represented in the target text differs from that of the source text: the Princess’s emotions are diminished in the target text compared to the source text (example (15) and (16)). Conversely, the Stranger appears less strong in the target text (example (17) and (18)). As a result of this inverted depiction of the Princess and the Stranger, the distance between them in terms of power becomes less in the target text, and thus the effect which their disparate power and agency might have on the source text reader’s interpretation is lost.

The reason why this difference in transitivity matters for the reader’s understanding of the text is that Bachmann can be seen to express a feminist view through the development which the Princess undergoes: Bond interprets the ‘Legend’ as a version of the ‘knight in shining armour’ plot. He acknowledges that this kind of story is “used to justify the organisation of power and sexual difference in our culture [and] may both reflect and perpetuate patriarchal structures” (Bond 1991: 244), but he also references Sichtermann’s analysis of this kind of story as “a dramatisation of the girl’s awakening desire, symbolised by the violent and powerful figure of the knight on horseback” (Bond 1991: 244). In this vein, he reads the ‘Legend’ as the Princess’s attempt to preserve her sexual autonomy which is threatened by the
conquering kings. Unlike in traditional fairytales there is no ‘happily ever after’ in Bachmann’s ‘Legend’, and when the Princess dies, it becomes clear that the male Stranger’s reluctance to allow the Princess’s autonomous female sexuality has led to her destruction. It is thus possible to read the source text version of the ‘Legend’ as a metaphor of awakening female sexuality, and this means that a changed power balance between the Princess and the Stranger, as well as a less clear development of the Princess’s character, makes it more difficult, if not impossible, for the target text reader to reach the same interpretation.

As mentioned above, Bachmann made unacknowledged borrowings from other texts, and the most extreme of these is her replication of Algernon Blackwood’s story ‘The Willows’. Because this practice appears to be a straightforward case of plagiarism, the following paragraphs explain my position. Bachmann stated in an interview that she used phrases that she wished she had written herself: “es gibt für mich keine Zitate, sondern die wenigen Stellen in der Literatur, die mich immer aufgeregt haben, die sind für mich das Leben” [for me there are no quotations, but rather the few passages in literature that have always excited me, they are life for me] (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 69), and further, “ich zitiere nicht Flaubert, sondern es ist ein Satz, den ich gern selbst geschrieben hätte” [I do not cite Flaubert, but it is a phrase that I would have liked to have written myself] (ibid.: 71).

However, I would not use the term ‘plagiarism’ to refer to Bachmann’s practice of using others’ sentences. The reason for my position is the cognitive poetic concept of textual deixis and its role in the ‘Legend’. According to Stockwell (2002: 41), deixis is “[t]he capacity that language has for anchoring meaning to a context’, and it is “central to the idea of the embodiment of perception”. Texts have a deictic centre that consists of the speaker (in the ‘Legend’, the reader is encouraged to view events from the Princess’s perspective), time of utterance (2000 years ago), and place (near the Danube). Deictic projection is our ability to see things as literary characters do (Stockwell 2002: 43). At the outset, the reader takes on the Princess’s viewpoint and experiences her escape and subsequent rescue by the Stranger together with her. This deictic shift (Stockwell 2002: 46) means that s/he orients her-/himself within the constructed world of the ‘Legend’.

There are different types of deixis, and textual deixis is the one most applicable here. Textual deixis consists of “expressions that foreground the textuality of the text; […] reference to the text itself or the act of production” (Stockwell 2002: 46). The
passage in the ‘Legend’ that is taken from ‘The Willows’ has a distinct style and thus
draws attention to itself. At the end of the ‘Legend’, the Princess tells the Stranger that
they will see each other again in front of a window with flowers. Windows did not exist
2000 years ago, and this point thus co-references the plot of Malina by making the link
with Ivan and Ich’s relationship. Both of these constitute textual deixis (see Stockwell
2002: 46): the textuality of the text is foregrounded and the reader becomes aware of
the artifice of the ‘Legend’. While the reader initially sees events unfold from the
Princess’s perspective, at this point the deictic centre shifts back to Ich, who is in the
process of writing the ‘Legend’. In addition to this, it is also possible for the reader to
take back her/his own viewpoint when s/he becomes aware of the constructed nature of
the text: the deictic centre is shifted back to real life. Bachmann makes no claims for
the authenticity of the ‘Legend’. Indeed, the references to its textuality make it
impossible for the reader to become fully immersed in the plot. Instead, the reader is
couraged, in my view, to analyse the text and attempt to decode its message. Deictic
patterns in the ‘Legend’ serve to distance the reader from the text so that it has to be
read in conjunction with the novel in which it is included.
3.5.3 Ich: The Representation of Emotions

When one analyses Ich’s characterisation, there are several instances of surprising translation choices on Boehm’s part. In the source text (Bachmann 1995: 204), the following words are uttered by Ich in the conversation with Malina following nightmare 15 in which the man representing Ivan/the Stranger dies. They are omitted in the English translation.

\[
\text{(20)} \quad \text{denn ich verliere den Verstand, es kommt für mich, ich verliere den Verstand, ich bin ohne Trost, ich werde wahnsinnig (204)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Suggested translation: for I am losing my mind, I’m overcome, I am losing my mind, I can’t be helped, I’m going insane} \\
\text{The conversation is possibly the most dramatic one of the novel and this section seems to be the culmination of a lengthy expression of Ich’s grief, so it is surprising that Boehm chose to leave it out. On the subject of omission, Ritva Leppihalme notes that “[a] translator may, for example, choose omission responsibly, after rejecting all alternative strategies, or irresponsibly, to save him/herself the trouble of looking up something s/he does not know” (Leppihalme 1997: 25). The latter is unlikely to be the case here as the words in this section are taken from a register with which Boehm is likely to be familiar.}
\end{align*}
\]

It is possible that Leppihalme’s first reason applies to Boehm’s translation here: perhaps Boehm judged this section to be superfluous or redundant for the target text reader’s understanding, or perhaps he was influenced by critiques of Bachmann’s writing. In addition to these reasons it is also possible that the omission was not intended by Boehm: perhaps he was under pressure to complete his translation and lost his place in the text he was working from without subsequently
noticing that he had left out two lines, or perhaps the publisher insisted on a specific word count for the translation so that some words had to be cut. It is impossible to assign a reason for Boehm’s omission with any certainty, but it is certainly interesting that it is the most intense point of Ich’s emotional outburst that is left out, rather than any less dramatic lines. Comparing Boehm’s omission to the French, Italian and Spanish translations adds further interest:

- car je perds la raison, cela m’envahit, je suis inconsolable, je deviens folle (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008:165)
- perché perdo la testa, sono sopraffatta, perdo la testa, non ho un conforto, impazzisco (Manucci 2003: 174)
- porque estoy perdiendo la razón, algo me invade, estoy perdiendo la razón, mi desconcierto es total, me estoy volviendo loca (Bardelli 2003: 198)

The French translation omits the repetition of ‘Ich verliere den Verstand’, which suggests a small degree of editing or, again, accidental omission. The Spanish translation reduces the parallelism of four of the five phrases which begin with ‘Ich’ in German. As Spanish grammar does not require personal pronouns to be used, this necessarily obscured some of the repetition, but the sentence shifts between the first person, third person, possessive, and a reflexive construction. Spanish grammatical conventions necessitate these changes in order to convey the sense of the German text, but the translation nevertheless diffuses the intensity of Ich’s voice. The Italian translation, which is subject to the same grammatical conventions with regard to the use of personal pronouns as the Spanish translation and is also incidentally the only one composed by a woman, recreates both the parallel phrasing and the grammatical first-person perspective and thus matches the effect of the source text. While the differences here do not allow strong conclusions to be drawn with regard to the effect of the translator’s gender on stylistic choices, it must nevertheless be noted that this is also a rare point at which the French, Italian and Spanish translations diverge: in the majority of examples included in Appendix I and IV, they present the same solutions. It is possible, however, to understand the divergences between the translations and Boehm’s omission as evidence that this passage indeed presents a
great challenge for the translators. This in turn leads me to conclude that it represents a crucial development in the source text.

The following two examples contribute to the characterisation of Ich, who now appears more emotional in the target text.

(21)
Lass dich ganz fallen (204)
*let yourself completely fall*

Let yourself collapse (128)
Just relax

(22)
Ich fahre zusammen (210)
*I flinch/start together*

I collapse (132)
I start

The verb ‘sich fallen lassen’ would be more accurately translated as ‘to relax’, which is the meaning opted for by the French, Italian and Spanish translators, so (21) is a mistranslation. As a result, ‘Let yourself collapse’ as a translation of ‘Lass dich ganz fallen’ actually makes Ich appear less in control of her emotions than she seems in the source text, despite the omission in the target text a few lines earlier. It also means that the translation makes less sense: if Ich collapses, it is very surprising that she starts “breathing a little more regularly”, as one would expect the opposite to happen. Thus the target text is less coherent than the source text. Because Ich collapses again in nightmare 19 (example (22)), she will come across as far more fragile than she does in the original: starting when she notices the Father watching her from the doorway is a reaction which would probably make sense to most readers, and Ich would therefore not be perceived as particularly unstable.

As the emotion in the English target text is generally less intense and the threat to Ich appears less imminent, the mind style of the source text is not fully recreated. The mind style of *Malina* is created by Bachmann’s use of figurative
language and ambiguities, but grammatical constructions further support the sense of chaos and let the reader experience Ich’s mental state. The following paragraphs draw parallels between Boehm’s interventions in Malina and another of his translations. Eine Frau in Berlin (Anonyma 2003; here 2008) is the diary kept by an anonymous Berlin woman in her thirties between 20 April and 15 June 1945. Her notes detail the everyday life and struggles of the inhabitants of her apartment building and her street, as well as the decline of Nazi Germany and the advance of the Russian army. The reader is introduced to a Berlin under siege in a series of striking descriptions expressed mostly in rushed, short sentences. The word order in the source text serves to evoke the eeriness of a Berlin seemingly deserted by those hitherto in charge. The narrator seems to exist in a hyper-alert state as she details her environment. As the building’s inhabitants are shown to be aware of the Russian army’s progress towards their street and regularly pass unkempt tired-looking German soldiers, their sense of impending doom results in constant assessments of threat levels and unusual occurrences. The constant bombing of Berlin during this time also required vigilance as inhabitants had to make their way to the air raid shelter at a moment’s notice at any time of the day and night.

The source text’s style brings across the gradual depersonalisation of the street’s inhabitants. In the first diary entries, which introduce the reader to the narrator’s circumstances, ‘I’ and ‘me’ are only used occasionally. Rather than describing herself or her feelings, the narrator focuses on her environment:

Man atmet Geschützlärm ein. Das Ohr ertaubt, es hört nur noch die Abschüsse schwerster Kaliber. (Anonyma 2008: 9)

We breathe the din; our ears are deafened to all but the heaviest guns.
(Boehm 2005: 1)

As the English impersonal ‘one’ belongs to a more formal register than the German ‘man’, and as the source text is informal to a large extent, Boehm is forced to use ‘we’. However, by translating ‘Das Ohr’ as ‘our ears’, he further counteracts the impersonal nature of the source text.

Boehm’s translation, together with Michael Hulse, of Herta Müller’s Heute wär ich mir lieber icht begegnet (1997), The Appointment (2001), shows parallels...
with this approach. The novel examines life under a totalitarian regime. Curiously, the narrator's ear is involved again:

Mir scheint sie rauscht, wenn es nicht die hartblättrigen Pappeln sind (Müller 1997: 7)

It does seem to rustle, at least to my ear, unless these are the stiff leaves of the poplars I’m hearing (Boehm and Hulse 2001: 2)

The narrator, referring to an approaching tram, changes from direct thought to free indirect thought (see Boase-Beier 2013: 197). The German text leaves open the possibility that this is one occasion of many on which the narrator needs to convince herself that her own perception is wrong, whereas the translation explicitly refers only to her hearing and is thus more literal. Under a totalitarian regime, people’s perceptions are sometimes at odds with what they are allowed to think, and the source text lets the reader make this link.

In Eine Frau, descriptions of conventions and behaviours that read almost like clinical observations in the source text are changed in the translation:

Draußen dickes Gebrumm, anschwellend. Der Tüchertick tritt in Tätigkeit.

(Anonyma 2008: 18)

A sudden spike in the constant drone outside sets off our mania, and we all wrap our cloths around our mouths and noses. (Boehm 2005: 10)

“Der Tüchertick” [literally: the cloth-quirk/-spleen] refers to the narrator’s earlier explanation that each shelter had developed its unique quasi-superstitious method for warding off death and injury during a bombing raid: in her cellar, everyone thinks that wrapping a cloth around their face will keep them safe. In the source text, the narrator seems to be outside of the situation: she is observing the behaviour without clarifying whether she is taking part in it. What this sentence means is that people are scared, but this is left for the reader to decode. In the target text, she is included in the action, which is more explicitly described.

As Eine Frau in Berlin is presented as a diary, there are frequent markers of dates and times. In addition, some passages contain additional markers of time:
“Zwischendurch” [“Now and then”], “Plötzlich” [“all of a sudden”], “Irgendwann” [omitted] (9) [Boehm 2005: 1]. In the source text, these markers occur at the beginning of sentences and thus ensure that the reader follows the narrator’s thought process. She wrote this diary in short sections when there were new developments to report. Sometimes this is made clear in the text, but it is also possible that she noted down her thoughts as they occurred to her, so that, for example, ‘plötzlich’ [suddenly] is the manner in which she remembered spring (“plötzlich fiel einem der Frühling ein” [suddenly, one remembered spring]), which prompted her to write this thought down, rather than solely a description. Indeed, this phrase further exemplifies the narrator’s depersonalisation: she is not telling us that she remembered spring, but rather that one remembered spring, but as demonstrated above, we can assume this to be her thought. By generalising, the narrator also seems to assume that everyone had the same thoughts.

Boehm’s intervention in his translation of Eine Frau also shows similarities with his editing of Bachmann’s punctuation. The first sentence of Malina (shown as example 21) in Appendix IV) is rather long and appears in English as five sentences. While the German reader is immediately overwhelmed by Ich’s chaotic disordered world, the English-language reader’s impression is much more orderly. Throughout the novel, Boehm exerts a disciplining influence. In Eine Frau, his involvement manifests itself in the opposite way, but has the same effect on the text’s mind style. The source text is written in short, abrupt sentences that add further emphasis to the unemotional nature of the narrator’s account. She suffers from dissociation. Furthermore, as she explains that she jotted down her notes in short bursts whenever an opportunity arose, shorter sentences are a logical consequence of this time pressure. Boehm inserts conjunctions such as “then”, “since”, and “however” (Boehm 2005: 4-5), for example, that render the target text more fluent. Often, these are utilised to link phrases that are separate sentences in the source text, so that the initial passage which describes the narrator’s street and circumstances on Friday 20 April from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. (Anonyma 2008: 9-14) consists of 157 sentences, whereas the translation (Boehm 2005: 1-6) consists of 146. The result of these changes is that the target text is more coherent.

Of course, the fact that the diary begins on 20 April is significant: this was Hitler’s date of birth, which in Nazi Germany had to be acknowledged by the
population. The narrator and her neighbours do not do so in this year, and the absence of the German rulers is alluded to:

Durch die brandschwarzen Ruinen der Siedlung weht in Schwaden Fliederduft aus herrenlosen Gärten. (Anonyma 2008: 9)

Clouds of lilac perfume drift over from untended gardens and waft through the charred ruins of apartment houses. (Boehm 2005: 1)

The allotments are ‘herrenlos’, without a master, possibly because the vast majority of men were at the front, and the women were occupied with the bare necessities of life, such as obtaining enough food to survive. Boehm’s translation of this as ‘untended’ is semantically correct, as the German means that the gardens were not looked after. However, in my view, ‘herrenlos’ is a reference to the situation of Germany during the last weeks of the war: it is evident from the book that Berlin’s and Germany’s leaders had lost control and were largely absent. The state of the newly in bloom allotments can be seen as an allegory: without the Nazis, Berlin had the chance to become pleasant again eventually. Furthermore, whereas the source text foregrounds the burnt ruins through their position in the sentence, Boehm begins with the lilac scent. The fact that the German sentence begins with a preposition means its word order is unusual and thus marked. This is not a pleasant environment, but rather one of threat and destruction. ‘Schwaden’ suggests the oppressive nature of the lilac scent, but ‘clouds’ neutralises it.

The narrator’s descriptions of her environment are pervaded by a theme of lack and absence: in addition to the “herrenlosen” allotments, the gutter is “spatzenleer” [sparrow-less] (9). Boehm translates this compound as “there’s not a single sparrow nesting in the gutters of our roof” (Boehm 2005: 1). The source text does not make reference to nesting, so that it is equally possible to interpret this sentence as a reference to the absence of birdsong. This makes sense as the narrator earlier mentioned “unheimlich[e] Lautlosigkeit” [“eerie silence”; Boehm 2005: 1] (9). If even the birds have deserted Berlin this spring, it is indeed a bleak place.

With regard to the mind style of the source text, it is clear that the narrator’s circumstances are close to unbearable, and that she deals with this by neutrally observing her situation and emotions from a position outside of herself. Boehm
repeatedly counteracts this depersonalisation by introducing a first-person perspective. The impersonal formulations in the source text thus give insight into the narrator’s mental state, but the translation does not allow this to the same extent. Boehm’s translation reduces the abject horror that is omnipresent in German. His choices are puzzling considering that he stated in a 2014 interview with English Pen that “Voice is what always interests me the most” (Boehm 2014: n.p.). Voice is not exactly the same as mind style, but the voice of the narrator of *A Woman in Berlin* is nevertheless changed in English. There are thus parallels between Boehm’s approaches to the translation of *Malina, Eine Frau in Berlin*, and *Heute wär ich mir lieber nicht begegnet*. 
3.5.4 The ‘Father’

The ‘Father’ in *Malina* is not Ich’s actual father, but rather a symbolic figure (see Albrecht and Gött sche 2002: 137 and Krylova 2007). This figure can be interpreted in multiple ways: he can be seen to represent society’s oppression of women, as well as the Nazis’ reign of terror. In addition, Melanie refers to him as “mein großer Bär” (Bachmann 1995: 220) [bear (literally: my big bear); Boehm 1990: 138], a possible reference to the fact that in ancient religions the bear was a symbol of the divine being (van Praag 1982: 116); thus he can also be seen to represent God. In the middle chapter the Father commits different atrocities against Ich in a series of 35 nightmares: Ich dies in a gas chamber, she breaks her neck, freezes to death, is electrocuted and drowns. In all of the nightmares the Father appears as a malevolent omnipotent being. Nightmare three (Bachmann 1995: 183-185; Boehm 1990: 114-115) makes his possible role as a sort of evil God particularly clear with the following examples:

(23)

Mein Vater kommt aus den schweren Farbgüssen nieder (183)

*my father comes from the heavy colour- down gush*

My father descends from the heavy downpour (115)

(24)

Gott ist eine Vorstellung (188)

*God is a show/performance/ imagination*

God is a show (118)

It is not clear in example (23) whether the colours represent the father, whether he is equally as affected by them as Ich or if he causes them. ‘Niederkommen’ seems a strange choice of word here, and therefore might hold some significance. It is an archaic term which means ‘to give birth’; for example, ‘eine Frau kommt nieder’ means ‘a woman gives birth’. ‘Nieder’ [down] can also be a synonym for ‘herunter’
and ‘herunterkommen’ can mean ‘to descend’ as well as ‘to become degenerate’. There are a few Bachmann scholars who think that she experienced incest and used Malina as a way of making this known (see, for example, Horn 1995, Dennemarck-Jäger 2008, Schlich 2009). If example (23) is an allusion to the father’s becoming degenerate, it could be a reference to incest. However, most researchers dispute this biographical speculation because it does not contribute much to the understanding of the novel’s complex structure (see Albrecht and Götsche 2002: 137). Nevertheless, in the target text the Father appears more God-like than he immediately does in the source text: he ‘descends from the heavy downpour’, an image and a choice of words which reminds one of the phrase ‘to descend from the heavens’.

The image of the Father as God is picked up again a few pages later in nightmare six (Bachmann 1995: 187-188; Boehm 1990: 117-118). ‘Vorstellung’ in example (24) can mean ‘imagination’ as well as ‘performance/show’. Perhaps the Father plays God: he seems able to exert control over the weather and he seemingly alters Ich’s environment from afar. ‘God’ is a performance the Father puts on. At the same time, the double meaning of ‘Vorstellung’ could signify that God is what people imagine him to be: he is not one thing, he is a person’s ‘Vorstellung’ [imagination]. In the translation, ‘God is a show’ brings across the idea that the Father behaves in a God-like manner; he ‘puts on a show’. But whereas God is benevolent, the father is portrayed as evil. Boehm’s choice brings across most of the nuances of the original, so that the target text reader is able to come to similar conclusions regarding the Father’s status, but his translation does not suggest imagination, so any comment Bachmann might have been passing regarding organised religion or Christianity is lost.

In nightmare 14 (Bachmann 1995: 199-200; Boehm 1990: 125), the representation of the Father’s power in source and target text is reversed:

(25)
Mein Vater ist mit mir [… ] schwimmen gegangen (199)

my father is with me swimming gone

My father has come swimming with me […]. (125)
My father has gone swimming with me
The target text gives the reader the impression that Ich has decided to go swimming and the Father joins her, whereas the source text could be interpreted as the Father taking Ich against her will, and thus has connotations of drowning. ‘Mit jemandem mitkommen’ [to come with someone] would have been an option for Bachmann here, so it can be presumed that she chose the verb ‘mit jemandem mitgehen’ [to go with someone] for a reason. The translation means that the father is portrayed as less evil or powerful in the target text. Indeed, the French, Italian and Spanish translators interpreted the source text as I did.

(26)
Ich habe sogar die Erlaubnis, auf die Straße zu gehen (210)

I even have permission to walk on the street (131)

‘Auf die Straße gehen’ can mean ‘to go outside’ rather than ‘to walk on the street’; Boehm has translated this in a very literal way. As a result, the father seems less oppressive in the target text as the implication in the source text is that sometimes he does not let Ich go outside, which is more oppressive than not being allowed to walk on the street as opposed to the pavement. The other translators pick up on the idea of Ich being allowed to go outside rather than to merely walk on the street. “Descendre dans la rue” (Jaccottet and de Oliveira 2008: 170), “venir fuori” (Manucci 2003: 178) and “salir a la calle” (Bardelli 2003: 203) all mean ‘to go outside’, and as a result preserve the image of the father as oppressive.

(27)
Eine Frau mit einem verbundenen Gesicht (131)

a woman with a bandaged face
A woman with a veiled face
A woman with a bandaged face

‘Verbunden’ means ‘bandaged’. One could imagine a woman wearing some sort of veil or scarf, as is suggested also by the French translation, but as the reader already knows about the father’s violence, the source text reader is likely to wonder whether this woman is another victim of the father, whereas in the target text this is not possible. The Italian and Spanish translations refer to a woman’s bandaged face.

Like the Stranger in the legend, the father is on the whole portrayed as less menacing and powerful in the English target text.
3.6 Overview of Franza

While Malina was published as a complete novel during Bachmann’s lifetime (1971), Franza presents a more complex case. Bachmann scholars have different views on which texts can be classified as part of the planned novel cycle ‘Todesarten’, and the manner in which they should be presented. This is further complicated by the fact that much of Bachmann’s writing, which could potentially clarify the matter, is contained in the part of her estate that is sealed until 2025. Albrecht and Göttscbe’s 1995 Todesarten-Projekt determines that text fragments from the early 1950s (known as the ‘Eugen-Roman’ [Eugen novel]) form part of the ‘Todesarten’ because their themes and characters show clear links with those of Franza and Malina, and small sections from these texts were included in the intended Franza manuscript by Bachmann. Koschel, Weidenbaum and Münster edited all of Bachmann’s writings (published and unpublished), and published them as Werke (1978). Their aim was to make Bachmann’s texts accessible to the public as quickly as possible, and scholars have expressed doubts with regard to their presentation of the manuscript fragments (see Reitani 2009: 22-23). Weigel (1999) does not support their decision to present the novel manuscripts in chronological order in this four-volume anthology, stating that Bachmann only conceived of the ‘Todesarten’ in 1967 (Weigel 1999: 513), and earlier texts therefore should not be presented in a way which suggests a linear and intentional continuum. She suggests that it makes more sense to arrange Bachmann’s writings according to their status as published, edited, or completed so that texts published during the author’s lifetime are presented first while texts edited and ready to be published as well as more fragmentary passages are included as supplementary material. This is the method chosen by Albrecht and Göttscbe for their ‘Todesarten’-Projekt.

The Franza fragment was first published in Werke (eds. Koschel and Weidenbaum 1978) as ‘Der Fall Franza’ [The Franza Case]. Albrecht and Göttscbe discovered during their research for the ‘Todesarten’-Projekt (1995) that after much deliberation Bachmann settled on ‘Das Buch Franza’ as her final choice for the title of this part of the ‘Todesarten’ (see ‘Nachwort’ by Albrecht and Göttscbe in Bachmann 2008: 248 for a detailed history of the title). A translation by Tess Lewis was commissioned for publication in 1994 with the title ‘The Franza Case’, but was not published (see section 2.8). As Filkins’ translation was published several years
after Albrecht and Göttche’s ‘Todesarten’-Projekt, it was possible for him to benefit from their findings (see Filkins 1999: xxi). The Italian translator also benefited from Albrecht and Göttche’s research: the translation by Magda Olivetti was initially published as Il Caso Franza in 1988, based on the Werke edition, but re-published with the involvement of Germanist Luigi Reitani as Il Libro Franza in 2009. The new translation includes a detailed introduction by Reitani which positions Franza in the context of Bachmann’s life and work, and also provides drafts of Bachmann’s Zurich lecture, her Wüstenbuch (an early draft of what would become Franza), and drafts of prefaces to Franza. The Zurich lecture precedes the other materials and the draft chapters, but it is explicitly marked as a speech.

In this regard, the Italian translation differs noticeably from the English translation: Olivetti and Reitani’s translation presents the text in the same manner as Albrecht and Göttche’s ‘reader-friendly’ edition (2008): the main text is clearly separated from the paralipomena, and readers benefit from some additional information, as well as footnotes, without being overwhelmed. The Italian translation thus manages to be both scholarly and accessible. Filkins foregoes the option of letting English-speaking readers play detective. The translators state their different intentions explicitly, however: Reitani (2009: 26) notes that the new Italian edition “vuole sottolineare il carattere incompiuto e frammentario del romanzo” [wants to underline the incomplete and fragmentary character of the novel], whereas Filkins (1999: xxii) acknowledges that his translation is “less fragmentary in its shape and feel”.

The French translation by Miguel Couffon (1985) exhibits similarities with the English translation: the published text appears as a coherent novel. Although gaps in the text are marked with ellipses, paralipomena are not included in this translation. The translator and publisher avoided any complications relating to the novel’s title by simply calling it Franza. The cover shows ‘L’œil du faucon Horus’, part of the ‘Steile of Lady Taperet’, wooden funerary furniture made in Thebes in the year 1000BC (Louvre online n.d.: n.p.). It is thus very fitting for the Egyptian context of Franza, and also noticeable differs from other publishers’ insistence on using a photograph of Bachmann. The foreword was written by Georges-Arthur Goldschmidt, a German-born French author and translator, who has translated, among others, the works of Nietzsche, Benjamin, and Goethe. He notes
(Goldschmidt 1985: 1) that the translator has successfully cut the long sentences of Bachmann’s text.

Bachmann’s main phase of writing *Franza* took place between 1965 and 1967 (Filkins 1999: xxi), and she initially set out to compose a novel called ‘Todesarten’, as evident from letters exchanged with her editors. At some point she decided that this would become the title of a cycle of three novels, of which the text she was writing (which would become *Franza*) should form the third part. In 1967 this novel was set aside and Bachmann wrote *Malina*, which she intended to provide the first part of the ‘Todesarten’. Filkins notes that “*Franza* develops many of the narrative techniques that would later serve Bachmann in *Malina*” (Filkins 1999: xi), and the same can be said about *Simultan* (*Three Paths to the Lake*) (see also section 1.1).

Albrecht and Göttzsche published a more reader-friendly version of the 1995 ‘Todesarten’-Projekt in 2004 (here 2008), presumably so that non-academic readers could also benefit from their findings and classification of Bachmann’s manuscripts without having to navigate numerous drafts and commentaries. Filkins based his translation of *Franza* on the texts presented in *Werke* (1978), as well as the texts provided in Albrecht and Göttzsche’s edition, and he also included Bachmann’s ‘Vorrede’ [introduction], which is included in the *Werke* version of *Franza*, as he judged it to be of fundamental importance to the reader’s understanding of the ‘Todesarten’ (Filkins 1999: xxi). Albrecht and Göttzsche included this text in the supplementary material section as it was a speech given by Bachmann in 1966 (‘Züricher Vorlesung’ [Zurich lecture]; Bachmann 2008: 198-201), and they did not interpret it as part of the main manuscript.

Filkins chose to entitle his translation ‘The Book of Franza’, a title he found more appropriate for the novel’s biblical setting than the “menacing notion” of ‘The Franza Case’ (Filkins 1999: xxi). Filkins’ *Franza* translation was published in a double edition together with the separate novel fragment ‘Requiem for Fanny Goldmann’ (first published 1999). According to Filkins’ ‘Translator’s Note’ (Filkins 1999: xxii), he used sections from both the *Werke* (Koschel et al. 1978) and the

---

49 The *Werke* version of the ‘Vorrede’ is the same as the third version included in the Text Stage III section of Albrecht and Göttzsche’s 2004 (here 2008) *Franza* edition (Bachmann 2008: 200-201), with the exception of lines 2 to 5, which are not included in the *Werke* version (no explanation provided by the editors) or Filkins’ translation.
‘Todesarten’-Projekt (Albrecht and Göttsc... Before presenting the edited version, Bachmann had read the ‘Vorrede’ [introduction] (Textstufe III) and ‘Heimkehr nach Galicien’ [Return to Galicic], which were presented, entitled ‘Todesarten’ (Bachmann 2008), by Bachmann in her ‘Züricher Vorlesung’ [Zurich Lecture] on 9 January 1966. In this speech Bachmann presented her plan for the ‘Todesarten’ project to the public for the first time. Friedberg’s translation of this fragment is included under the title ‘Manners of Death’ in a volume that also contains her translations of seven short stories and 14 poems by Bachmann (Friedberg 2005). The purpose of Friedberg’s collection of translated texts is not clear: they are poems, short stories and a short speech, and there is no common theme to unify the texts.

Albrecht and Göttsc... edition gives valuable insights into the way in which Bachmann’s work on the manuscript progressed: their ‘Todesarten’-Projekt shows that the first chapter ‘Heimkehr nach Galicic’ and the third chapter ‘Ägyptische Finsternis’ [Egyptian Darkness] were presented by Bachmann at readings in March 1966 and then edited further in preparation for publication, whereas the second chapter ‘Jordanische Zeit’ [Jordanian Time] was composed after the readings and reached a much less refined stage than the other two chapters (Albrecht and Göttsc... 2008: 249).

Albrecht and Göttsc... have classified the genesis of Franza as five stages of text production. I shall give only a very brief overview here in order to allow an understanding of how the fragments translated by Friedberg and Filkins differ in terms of editing and conception of the novel (for a detailed analysis of all Franza texts from Bachmann’s estate, see Albrecht and Göttsc... 1995 volume 2: 393-466).

**Textstufe II [Text Stage II]**: January to March 1966; Bachmann’s ‘Züricher Vorlesung’ and an early draft of the ‘Vorrede’ are thought to have been written during this time (Albrecht and Götsche 1995: 406). Bachmann extends and refines the two chapters and presents them in Zürich, Hamburg, Hanover, Berlin and Lübeck; she decides the order of the chapters and after the public readings begins to write texts that will later form parts of the chapter ‘Jordanische Zeit’ (Albrecht and Götsche 1995: 395). This seems to have been the most intense phase of Bachmann’s work on *Franza*.

**Textstufe III [Text Stage III]**: comprises all texts later included in ‘Heimkehr nach Galicien’ and ‘Ägyptische Finsternis’ which were written between January and March 1966 (Albrecht and Götsche 1995: 415) as well as several different versions of ‘Vorrede’ [Introduction] which are thought to have been intended as introductions for Bachmann’s public readings in March 1966, but were not used for this purpose. The ‘Vorreden’ were composed in parallel with the novel rather than just before the readings and therefore give an insight into developments during the writing of the novel, such as the intended number of chapters (Albrecht and Götsche 1995: 417). At this stage Bachmann had planned for ‘Ägyptische Finsternis’ to follow ‘Heimkehr nach Galicien’ (Albrecht and Götsche 1995: 426).

**Textstufe IV [Text Stage IV]**: comprises the ‘Hauptfassung’ [main version] of ‘Heimkehr nach Galicien’ and ‘Ägyptische Finsternis’. The existence of versions edited by people other than Bachmann herself suggests that these chapters were quite far advanced. The chapter ‘Jordanische Zeit’ remains in a state which is comparable to Textstufe III of the other two chapters in terms of revisions, but in contrast to the intended structure of the novel at Textstufe
III, Textstufe IV marks the point at which Bachmann decided to make ‘Jordanische Zeit’ the middle chapter (Albrecht and Göttzsche 1995: 426). Here, ‘Textstufe’ has to be understood as a term denoting refinement as well as the configuration of the novel.


Filkins and Friedberg base their translations on different drafts of the *Franza* fragment: Filkins translated the version which is published in the ‘reader-friendly’ edition of *Franza* (here Bachmann 2008) as the “Hauptfassung” [main version], Bachmann’s most recent draft, which was intended by Albrecht and Göttzsche as the ‘Lesetext’ [main text] (Albrecht and Göttzsche 2008: 249). Friedberg translated the version that is included in Albrecht and Göttzsche’s edition (Bachmann 2008) as part of Textstufe II (i.e. an earlier draft than the ‘Hauptfassung’ [main version]). The section of Albrecht and Göttzsche’s book containing Textstufe II is dedicated to fragments from Bachmann’s drafts which Albrecht and Göttzsche included as “zusätzliches Studienmaterial” [additional study material] (Albrecht and Göttzsche 2008: 249).

While it is surprising that Friedberg based her translation on a text fragment which was intended as a final version by neither Bachmann nor Albrecht and Göttzsche, a possible explanation is that instead of translating the most recent drafts of Bachmann’s ‘Vorrede’ and ‘Heimkehr nach Galicien’ like Filkins did, Friedberg’s aim seems to have been to translate the texts which Bachmann presented to an audience under the title ‘Todesarten’. Perhaps Friedberg felt that the ‘Todesarten’ concept formed such an important part of Bachmann’s oeuvre that it had to be included in her collection of poetry and prose translations in some way. Bachmann’s ‘Züricher Vorlesung’ [Zurich Lecture] can be seen to form a cohesive text (it was written as a speech and is therefore structured as a stand-alone text), which is not necessarily the case for the other fragments, and it is also comparably short, making it the ideal candidate for inclusion in a volume of short translated texts.

However, Friedberg’s and Filkins’ translations cannot be compared directly, as their source texts are different. Because Friedberg’s translation is not very
extensive, I shall refer to it only when this provides additional insight into the analysis of Filkins’ choices.

Leppihalme notes that “[t]he work of the competent and responsible translator involves the application of translation strategies to translation problems” (Leppihalme 1997: 24) and that “the translator may not always be conscious of using strategies” (Leppihalme 1997: 25). According to Toury, there are textual sources (i.e. the translated texts themselves) and extratextual sources (e.g. statements made by translators) for the reconstruction of translation strategies (Toury 1995: 65). In his ‘translator’s note’ (no capitals in original), an extratextual source which allows us an insight into his strategy, Filkins cites readability, narrative voice and faithfulness to what he assumes to be Bachmann’s intent as his main concerns during the translation of *The Book of Franza* and *Requiem for Fanny Goldman*, and to this end rearranges sections included in the German version edited by Albrecht and Göttscbe (Bachmann 2008), leaves out background narratives and splits up Bachmann’s long sentences and paragraphs (see Filkins 1999: xxi-xxv).

Toury (1995: 56) distinguishes between “adequate” and “acceptable” translation: adequate translation takes place when a translator subjects her-/himselves to the source text and the norms realised by it; the target text will tend to subscribe to the norms of source language and culture. This strategy can lead to incompatibilities with target norms and practices. When a translator subjects her-/himselves to the norms active in the target culture, there will be shifts from the source text. This approach determines a translation’s acceptability (Toury 1995: 57). Filkins’ concern is with the position of the target text in the target culture. In a way, the question as to exactly which text stage of the source text provided the basis of his translation is not very important, as Filkins’ structure differs from all of the possible source texts to such a great extent that his target text seems hardly like a translation of Bachmann’s *Franza* at all. Thus it is clear that, in Toury’s terms, Filkins is concerned with acceptability rather than adequacy. When I attempted to make contact with Filkins via email in order to find out his reasoning for his strategy, no response was received. Of the translators whose work is discussed in this thesis, he is in a unique position: as an academic, he is able to benefit from theoretical knowledge in his practical work, and indeed he refers to several scholarly sources on Bachmann’s work in his ‘translator’s note’.
3.7 Textual Analysis of *Franza*

In addition to the unstable nature of the source text, *Franza* poses stylistic challenges for the translator that are comparable to those of *Malina*. Franza Jordan, similarly to Ich, experiences a high degree of psychological distress.

Filkins’ version of the chapter ‘Jordanische Zeit’ is abridged. Most noticeably, he omits a section which details a heated argument between Franza and Leo Jordan (Bachmann 2004: 66-69) in which Leo’s abusive nature and Franza’s fear become clear. Also omitted is a short paragraph which explains that Jordan forces Franza to bathe three times daily (Bachmann 2004: 64). Both of these sections are included in the Italian translation. A further rather puzzling omission is the passage which details Franza’s relationship with Ödön Csobaldi and the events that led to her first meeting with Leo Jordan. The passage, included in Italian, but omitted in English and French, is fully-formed and coherent in German; the insight into Franz’s life before her marriage allowed by this section usefully contrasts with her personality in the rest of the novel fragment. It is only through this passage that the reader understands the fundamental effect of Jordan’s treatment on her psyche.

From my comparison of the number of sentences and paragraphs in each chapter of *Franza* it is evident that Filkins changed the structure of the text quite significantly: the first chapter contains 427 sentences in 43 paragraphs in German, but in English consists of 667 sentences in 119 paragraphs. This is an increase of around a third in the number of sentences and paragraphs. The second chapter consists of 492 sentences in 99 paragraphs in German, and of 518 sentences in 78 paragraphs in English. While this does not appear to be a significant difference, we must bear in mind that the content of this chapter is abridged in the target text and these numbers are therefore not conclusive. The third chapter of *Franza* consists of 965 sentences in 151 paragraphs in German, and of 1264 sentences in 228 paragraphs in English. This is again an increase of around a third in the number of both sentences and paragraphs. These numbers show considerable intervention on Filkins’ part. Furthermore, compared to the source text, his paragraphs are of much more even length. The length of paragraphs in the source text is erratic. However, Franza’s behaviour and thoughts are erratic, and so it makes sense for the text’s style to echo this.
The examples included in Appendix V suggest that ambiguities evident in the source text are simplified in the translation. This is partly necessitated by grammatical conventions and not necessarily the result of the translator’s gender.
3.8 Political Iconicity

Bachmann’s writing is complex, and sometimes it is difficult to make sense of it: most of her sentences are very long and include subordinate, relative, dependent and adjective clauses and appositives. In addition, the viewpoint presented also changes frequently, to such an extent that a single sentence often contains direct speech (without speech marks), indirect speech and free indirect thought. This way of writing is iconic in Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts in several ways: in the short story ‘Simultan’ [‘Word for Word’], the disjointed narrative can be seen as an iconic representation of the protagonist Nadja’s identity crisis. In Malina and the Franz fragment, including the ‘Vorrede’, the complex text occasionally makes it difficult for the reader to discern the grammatical subjects and objects, or verbs’ referents. This means that these texts are not easy to read and often require the reader to read lines several times in order to gain full understanding. This is iconic of Bachmann’s view that vigilance was necessary after the Second World War. In the Franz ‘Vorrede’ she explains her views:

[E]s hat mich sehr beschäftigt, wo das Quantum Verbrechen, der latente Mord geblieben ist, seit ich begreifen musste, dass 1945 kein Datum war, was wir so gern glauben möchten, um uns beruhigt schlafen zu legen. (Bachmann 2008: 155)

[E]ver since I was forced to realise that, contrary to what we might like to believe, 1945 was not a date that gave us reason to suddenly sleep soundly at night, I have wondered where the quantum criminal activity, the latent murder, has remained. (Friedberg 2005: 285)

Bachmann believed that atrocities did not cease at the end of the war, but were still being committed in a different way because society turned a blind eye. The translator, novelist and feminist Willa Muir (known primarily as one of the translators, together with her husband Edwin, of Kafka’s novels) expressed a similar view in her 1968 memoir Belonging when she linked a “militant patriarchal feeling” (Muir 1968: 136) in Britain with the advent of the Second World War (Woods 2011: 61). After the Second World War, people were eager to return to normal life, but
Bachmann seems to have held the view that it would have led to a safer situation if a systematic eradication of violence had been carried out. Denazification took place in Germany after the war, but not in Austria (Perloff 1996: 163), in order to prosecute those who had held positions of authority in the NSDAP [National Socialist German Workers’ Party] and to re-educate the German people, but Bachmann’s ‘Vorrede’ suggests that she perceived as dangerous not only National Socialism, but also some people’s capacity or impulse to commit acts of violence. In accordance with this idea, her texts do not allow the reader to move effortlessly from one line to the next. This is particularly evident when one compares her texts with their translations: Boehm, Filkins and Friedberg’s translations differ greatly from their respective source texts in some instances where the sentence structure requires particular patience from the reader. The sentence analysed in this chapter as example (22) in section 3.5.2 is one of these instances: in his translation of the Princess of Kagran legend, Boehm seems to have misinterpreted a complex sentence containing both the subordinating conjunction ‘trotzdem’ [still; nevertheless] and the coordinating conjunction ‘sondern’ [but rather; instead], and the meaning of the translation thus differs from the source text.

A key sentence that most clearly explains Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ theory is less clear in Friedberg’s translation:

Die Todesarten wollen die Fortsetzung sein, in einer Gesellschaft, die sich die Hände in Unschuld wäscht und nur keine Möglichkeit hat, Blut fließen zu lassen, zu foltern, zu vergasen. (Bachmann 2008: 155; my emphasis)

These manners of death would be the extension of a society that washes its hands clean of culpability and simply has no outlet for bloodletting, torture and gassing. (Friedberg 2005: 286; my emphasis)

Friedberg has substituted the preposition ‘in’ with ‘of’ and consequently changed the meaning of this sentence to such an extent that Bachmann’s explanation is different in the target text. The manners of death would not be the extension of society. Rather, the manners of death considered in Bachmann’s texts would be the continuation of the murder and cruelty mentioned in the previous sentence for which
a society, which forgets about the events of the Second World War too rapidly, provides no outlet. Bachmann seemed to be of the opinion that the impulse to commit violence and murder remained after the end of the war, but it was no longer demanded or sanctioned by the state, and thus took an alternative course, i.e. within relationships between men and women.

Filkins, too, seems to have struggled with unusual sentence formation in the source text:

Denn es ist das Innen, in dem alle Dramen stattfinden, kraft der Dimension, die wir oder imaginierte Personen diesem Leidenmachen und Erleiden verschaffen können. (Bachmann 2008: 201)

For it is this interior in which all dramas take place, in the power of a dimension in which we or imagined characters can grasp the nature of pain and suffering. (Filkins 1999: 4)

The word ‘kraft’ here does not mean power: the fact that it is not spelled with a capital letter as is usual for German nouns is not a printing error because it is a preposition in the genitive case. This means that it the dimension that we allow pain and suffering to take on causes the drama to occur interiorly.

Bachmann’s political ideas are often expressed in grammatically complex sentences that appear to pose a challenge for translators, as demonstrated by the errors discussed above.
3.9 Overview of Simultan

Bachmann’s volume is titled *Simultan* after the first story of the collection, whereas *Three Paths to the Lake* takes its title from the final story. The French, Italian and Spanish translations echo the title of the English translation. The collection contains five stories that centre on a female character who is experiencing some form of difficulty. The five women are presented as ordinary people through rapid switches between narration, direct and indirect speech, direct and indirect thought. To the critics, the collection appeared to present merely trivial “Frauengeschichten” [women’s stories] that did not live up to the standards set by Bachmann in her poetry, doctoral thesis, and Frankfurt lectures (Anderson 1989: vii). However, the nuances with which Bachmann presents the women’s insecurities and inability to find a voice mean that these are highly complex stories.

Although the reader gains insight into the characters’ thoughts and feelings, this does not encourage identification because of their unsympathetic flaws. The passivity of Beatrix in ‘Probleme, Probleme’ [‘Problems Problems’], who sleeps most of the time with the exception of a weekly visit to a beauty salon, for example, shows her inability to cope with life, but her refusal to engage with the people around her renders her entirely unlikeable. Miranda in ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ [‘Eyes to Wonder’] resists confrontation with society by refusing to wear glasses despite her severe myopia, a condition presented as the expression of psychological processes through Bachmann’s dedication of the story to Georg Groddek, who described psychosomatic symptoms in a 1918 lecture (Albrecht and Göttscbe 2002: 164). The incessant barking which Frau Jordan hears in ‘Das Gebell’ [‘The Barking’] constitutes her protest at her son’s simultaneous neglect and attempts to exert control over her life. Franza from the *Franza* fragment is her daughter-in-law. She increasingly takes on the older woman’s role of victim, and the story thus poses questions with regard to the role of women in the family throughout different eras of bourgeois society.

The protagonists of the first and the last story, unlike the others, are women who travel extensively: Nadja in ‘Simultan’ [‘Word for Word’] is a successful simultaneous interpreter, while Elisabeth in ‘Drei Wege zum See’ [‘Three Paths to the Lake’] is a news photographer. Both of these women use several languages, and their inability to feel at home and articulate their thoughts in their own language
becomes clear. While Nadja’s ability to speak several languages fluently eventually stops her from being able to articulate her own thoughts, Elisabeth’s history becomes tangled up with the three paths she follows to reach the Wörther See. Bachmann thematises the psychological consequences of a capitalist society in which real connections between people become problematic (see Albrecht and Göttche 2002: 167). The five stories show how the women arrived in situations in which they are isolated and speechless.

Occasional references are made to the French translation by Hélène Belletto (1982; here 2006) and the Italian translation by Ippolito Pizzetti (1980; here 2012). The examples from Simultan analysed in Chapter 3 are included in Appendix III, and Appendix V shows a detailed analysis of one page of ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’.
3.10 Extended Metaphor in ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ and its Translation ‘Eyes to Wonder’

The stories in the Simultan collection are thematically and stylistically linked with Malina and the novel fragments (Albrecht and Götsche 2002: 160), and detail women’s struggles as the result of being expected to conform to certain roles (Schmid-Bortenschlager 1985: 45). The subject of the story ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ ['Eyes to Wonder'] is a woman named Miranda who is severely myopic but refuses to wear glasses. She is in a relationship with Josef, who eventually leaves her for her friend Anastasia. Unsurprisingly, the metaphor of eyes and ways of seeing things pervades the story: in some instances, eye- and vision-related words seem to be used almost as a joke to make the reader laugh, whereas in others, they are used more seriously as an invitation to contemplate Miranda’s life and death. Mary Fran Gilbert transfers the vast majority of these references, so that the target text reader has access to the same metaphor networks as the source text reader. Nevertheless, the target text deviates from the source text at certain points, and the possible reasons and effects will be explored below.

The references to eyes and vision included in the text by Bachmann serve to amuse the reader at the same time as they make her/him wonder whether they are ironic. Miranda supposedly “merkt sowieso augenblicklich” (78) [notices at the blink of an eye; 76] when Josef’s mood changes, she fell in love “[a]uf den ersten Blick” (78) [at first sight 76], which makes the reader wonder whether she really is very perceptive or instead rather too convinced of her own sensibilities. Miranda is contrasted with her friend Anastasia whose vision is better:

(1)

ich sehe doch anständig (79)

I see indeed decently

my vision is decent (78)
(2) Sie [Stasi] hat alles deutlich gesehen (89)
she has everything clearly seen

She saw it all very clearly. (88)

(3) Anastasia ist eben doch sehr klug
Anastasia is after-all indeed very clever

Anastasia is a very intelligent woman gifted with keen insight. (88)

(4) Aber das ist doch sonnenklar (90)
but that is rather as-clear-as-the-sun

But that’s clear as glass (ETW 89)

The sentence in example (1) can have a double meaning: Anastasia has ‘decent’ vision, or she sees in a ‘decent’ manner, i.e. she either does not need glasses or, if she does, she does not refuse to wear them, and thus she conforms to social norms, unlike Miranda. ‘Decent’ is an unusual word to use to describe someone’s vision, so it might make the target text reader consider its significance: it seems to describe Anastasia’s personality rather than her vision, i.e. she conforms to social norms. Examples (2), (3) and (4) further cement the reader’s impression of Anastasia as Miranda’s polar opposite, an interpretation which is also made possible by the translation. In example (4), Gilbert has translated ‘sonnenklar’ as ‘clear as glass’, which still includes a reference to the fact that Anastasia can see clearly, but it also includes a reference to glass which is not in the original. The metaphor of glass, which will be more fully explored below, recurs throughout the story, and it is possible that this addition in the translation might confuse the reader. On the other
hand, it also suggests that Gilbert has noticed the significance of the glass theme and that she chose this translation as a result.

Example (3) links vision with positive character traits by juxtaposing “Scharfblick” [insight], which includes a reference to vision, with intelligence. This encourages the reader to wonder about the contrast between Miranda and Anastasia and, by extension, whether it is possible to read the story of Miranda’s short-sightedness as a metaphor. It seems that Anastasia with her sharp-sightedness represents rationality, which is usually the preserve of the masculine world in Bachmann’s texts, whereas Miranda, who is described in terms of feelings and perceptions, represents the feminine realm of the senses. In Malina, for example, Ich and Malina are often interpreted as two facets of the same person (Jurgensen 1983: 34) who encompasses the emotional and passionate (Ich) and the rational and intellectual (Malina) (Dollenmayer 1997: 103). Of course Ich is survived (and possibly murdered) by Malina at the end of the novel, and in ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ this plot is paralleled when Anastasia survives and Miranda does not.

Another theme of ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ is that of people’s appearances and faces: Miranda thinks about Josef’s “gelblich verfärbte Zähne” (77) [yellow-stained teeth (76)] or the “Faltenfelder um seine Augen” (78) [network of lines etched around his eyes (76)], as well as her ignorance of other women’s “Haare auf der Oberlippe” [moustaches] and “Poren, Unebenheiten, Pickel” (85) [pores or rough skin, […] pimples (84)]; she is affected by other people’s “unträumbare Visagen” (79) [nightmarish faces (77)], and at the end of the story receives a blow to the face from a glass door. The French word ‘visage’ [face] is etymologically related to the Latin word ‘videre’ [to see] (Duden online), thus it combines the story’s themes of faces and seeing. Bachmann makes use of another term rooted in French to continue the face theme:

(5)

Josef schaut wieder in die Zeitung,

Josef looks again into the newspaper

Miranda auf das Dach vis-à-vis. (80)

Miranda at the roof face-to-face

Josef looks back at his newspaper, Miranda at the roof across the street. (78)
Josef looks back at the newspaper, Miranda sat facing/vis-à-vis the roof across the street.

As a preposition, ‘vis-à-vis’ in French and German means ‘opposite’; ‘vis’ is the root of ‘visage’ in French. Most readers would probably expect to find ‘gegenüber’ [opposite; across] here as it is a widely used word, thus ‘vis-à-vis’ is an unexpected choice. It is possible that Bachmann used it as part of her Austrian idiom, but nevertheless it contributes to the reader’s assessment of face-related words as potentially significant: the fact that there are several mentions of words denoting face makes the reader consider the face’s significance in relation to vision, insight and sensing rather than seeing.

‘Vis-à-vis’ can be used to mean ‘opposite’ in English (Oxford English Dictionary online), but perhaps it is so unusual that the translator thought ‘across’ would be more easily understood. This means that both foreign terms which refer to the face are eliminated from the translation. The fact that Bachmann uses non-German words for the face seems significant. She also uses the words “Trottoir” [pavement] (80), “Billett” [ticket] and “Kondukteur” (82) [conductor], terms which do not belong to the standard German variety. However, these are commonly used in Austrian German and, according to Anderson’s introduction, Bachmann at one point intended to call the story collection ‘Women from Vienna’ (Anderson 1989: x), so perhaps she used Austrian words, in addition to street names, for aspects of everyday life in order to situate the story in Vienna. This means that ‘Visage’ and ‘vis-à-vis’ hold a distinctive position in this story. When she does not wear her glasses, Miranda is unable to see other people’s faces; they are unfamiliar, or foreign, to her. A possible interpretation is that the French terms illustrate this situation through language. The target text reader does not have the opportunity to embark on this line of interpretation because Gilbert only uses standard English terms.

In order to understand the face metaphor it is necessary to explore another of the story’s themes: the theme of ways of looking at things and appearance gains another facet when Miranda looks at herself in two different mirrors. First she looks into the “Rasierspiegel” [shaving mirror], then the “milden Biedermeierspiegel” (85) [more lenient Biedermeier mirror (84)], until she finds her appearance acceptable. The narrator notes:
The English and Italian translations recreate the link between what Mianda sees and her deception through their choice of words. The French translation allows the reader to think of ‘trompe l’œil’ [literally: deceive the eye], an art technique that involves optical illusions. At this point it becomes clear that the theme of the story is not just vision in general, but it is more nuanced. A shaving mirror has a magnifying effect, whereas a Biedermeier mirror would have been made in the Biedermeier period between 1815 and 1848. If one assumes the story to be set in Bachmann’s Vienna, i.e. in the 1960s or 1970s, the mirror would produce a distorted image because old mirrors often do. ‘Täuschen’ means ‘to deceive’, as in the target text, but ‘Täuschung’, the noun form, can also mean ‘illusion’. Neither of her two mirrors presents Miranda as she really is, she only sees an optical illusion. The story contains other references to ways of seeing: metaphors of art (photography, drawing, painting) and the weather (“nebelhafte Welt”, “Sonnenaufgang, der den Dunstvorhang zerreißt” (81) [nebulous world; sunrise of sorts […] for the veil of haze is torn open; 79]).

One might wonder why Bachmann specifically chose the Biedermeier reference here. This period came to an end as the 1848 revolutions began, and a few decades before Bismarck’s rise to power in Prussia. Bismarck initiated German unification, a process which both required and resulted in an increase of German nationalism. This eventually led to the Second World War, so perhaps the Biedermeier period represents a golden era before Europe underwent political upheaval and atrocities were committed.

In addition, this passage constitutes an ironic reference to the Lacanian idea of the mirror stage, in my opinion. The mirror stage in Lacanian theory marks the
acquisition of subjectivity (Weedon 1997: 16). In the pre-Oedipal phase, the infant is unable to distinguish between its own body and the external world, and experiences a feeling of fragmentation. When it recognises itself in a mirror, it identifies itself as a unified being (ibid.). Following Lacan’s idea, one would therefore expect Miranda to understand herself and her position in the world in relation to other people. However, Bachmann’s reference to deceit means that the opposite is the case.

The title ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ [literally: You Happy Eyes] includes the word ‘glücklich’ again (see example (3) in section 3.1), and its significance is explained early on in the story – Miranda prefers not to see things too clearly in order to protect herself, thus her eyes are ‘happy’ or ‘lucky’ because they remain unaffected by everything cruel, unjust or unpleasant:

(7)

Es kann aber vorkommen, dass Miranda ihre kranken optischen Systeme als ein ‘Geschenk des Himmels’ empfindet. [...] Denn es erstaunt sie, wie die anderen Menschen das jeden Tag aushalten, was sie sehen und mit ansehen müssen. Oder leiden die anderen nicht so sehr darunter, weil sie kein andres System haben, die Welt zu sehen? Es könnte das normale Sehen […] die Leute ja ganz abstumpfen […]. (77)

But there are times when Miranda views her defective optical systems as a ‘gift from heaven’. [...] She is astonished at how other people can stand it day after day, seeing what they see and have to witness. Or do the others suffer less from it because they have no other system for viewing the world? Perhaps normal vision […] completely dulled people’s senses […]. (76)

The use of the word ‘empfindet’ [perceives; feels] here seems significant, especially when one considers the fact that it was translated as ‘views’ by Gilbert. It seems almost as though ‘views’ in the target text might have been used in order to amuse the reader because Miranda cannot ‘view’ much most of the time. As ‘empfindet’ initially seems to be used to connote opinion here, it is synonymous with ‘views’, but the fact that Bachmann did not use a number of alternatives (e.g. ‘sehen’ [to view], ‘für etwas halten’ [to consider/believe something to be something’]) suggests that she
chose ‘empfinden’ deliberately to enhance the description of a woman who cannot see very well. Visually impaired people often rely on other senses, and for that reason they would ‘empfinden’ [feel] rather than ‘view’. ‘Empfinden’ seems an unremarkable word at first and, in my opinion, its significance is more likely to be noticed in direct contrast with the unexpected use of ‘view’ in the translation. The French and Italian translations here circumvent the wordplay:

Mais il arrive que Miranda ressente la maladie de son système optique un “don du ciel”. (Belletto 2006: 99)

Può anche capitare tuttavia che Miranda consideri il suo sistema ottico malato cone “un dono del cielo”. (Pizzetti 2012: 89)

The reference to disease is preserved in both of these translations. As a result of Gilbert’s choice to use “defective optical systems” as a translation of “krank[e] optische Systeme”, the target text is not linked with a central concept of Bachmann’s work. While ‘defective’ accurately represents the meaning, it seems to belong to a more technical and scientific register and does not have connotations of disease and pathology which might be essential for the reader’s interpretation of this story and the character Miranda. The term ‘krank’ [ill, diseased, sick] is usually used in a particular way by Bachmann: Georgette Fleischer notes that in her 1953 essay on Wittgenstein ‘Sagbares und Unsagbares’ Bachmann describes philosophical problems as illnesses which need to be cured (Fleischer 2000: 322); she also makes reference to a 1971 interview in which Bachmann summarises Malina as a story of ‘die Krankheit unserer Zeit’ [the illness of our time] (Fleischer 2000: 323). In Malina, Ich tells Malina the following:

[a]ine einzige Frau muss schon mit zuviel Merkwürdigkeiten fertig werden, und das hat ihr vorher niemand gesagt, auf welche Krankheitserscheinungen sie sich einstellen muss. (Bachmann 1995: 283)

a single woman has to come to terms with too many peculiarities as it is, and no one ever told her what type of diseases she should insure herself against. (Boehm 1990: 177)
Weigel throws light on what Bachmann saw as the ‘illness of our time’: as part of her *Franza* drafts, Bachmann was working on an analogy linking victims of colonisation, violent relationships and the National Socialist ‘final solution’ (Weigel 1999: 500). When Franza is very unwell during her journey through the desert, her symptoms are compared with the ‘Spätschäden’ [late sequelae] exhibited by concentration camp survivors. From December 1963 to August 1965 the Auschwitz Trial took place in Frankfurt (Pendas 2006: 1), which drew Bachmann’s interest to the medical experiments performed in the camps. She read several books on this subject while working on *Franza* in 1965/6, and for a while used the provisional title ‘Medizin der Unmenschlichkeit’ [literally: medical science of inhumanity] to echo ‘Medizin ohne Menschlichkeit’ [medical science without humanity], the title of the final report on medical experiments written as part of the Nuremberg Trials (Weigel 1999: 501). It is also interesting to consider a possible link between Josef’s name and Josef Mengele, the Auschwitz physician who performed experiments on concentration camp victims. Thus it seems that Bachmann saw women as so traumatised that they exhibit symptoms usually suffered by concentration camp survivors. It seems important to include the following here:

To compare the Nazis’ oppression of Jews to a domineering husband can be seen as trivializing the most terrible event of modern history. And yet it is clear that this was by no means Bachmann’s intention. She was hardly insensitive to the enormity of the Holocaust. (Franklin 2000: 40)

Section 2.3 examines Bachmann’s idea of fascism within relationships in the context of Adorno’s statement regarding the writing of poetry after Auschwitz (Adorno 1992: 34). If one bears in mind Bachmann’s use of the term ‘krank’, Miranda is clearly not just suffering from poor eyesight, but rather it represents something else, perhaps her powers of perception in general, or her critical faculties. It could also mean the suffering caused to Miranda by Josef. A theme which recurs throughout Bachmann’s poetry and prose is that of unrequited love and how it destroys women:
the male figures can only love according to a system of convention in which the women can only be dissatisfied, and the pattern [...] shows that women who refuse to conform to this system will be killed by it. (Bond 1991: 250)

D.G. Bond’s article links fire imagery in Bachmann’s poems ‘Erklär mir Liebe’ and ‘Mein Vogel’ and her radio play Der gute Gott von Manhattan with the ‘knight in shining armour’ theme in the Princess of Kagran legend to hypothesise that women’s desire and autonomy is seen as a danger to the established order by the patriarchy and therefore must be suppressed. In Bachmann’s writings “[t]he male order is the order which maintains and is maintained by the fire which must be destroyed and destroys” (Bond 1991: 252). ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ contains a short reference to fire when it is mentioned that there are many “Brandspuren” (Bachmann 2008: 83) [scorch marks (Gilbert 1989: 82)] in Miranda’s flat because of her poor vision when smoking or cooking. Unrequited love is clearly also one of the themes of this story as Josef begins a relationship with Miranda’s friend Anastasia, and Miranda dies when she is hit by a glass door after their engagement is announced. Thus Miranda’s refusal to wear glasses appears to be linked to Bachmann’s idea of ‘the illness of our time’, women’s destruction by a patriarchal system. Perhaps this refusal to conform to the norms of society (i.e. to wear glasses when one suffers poor vision) is an expression of Miranda’s autonomy. However, this type of behaviour is usually punished in Bachmann’s texts, so glass, the very thing Miranda tries to avoid, is responsible for her death. Glass or windows are mentioned ten times in both source and target text. If one understands them to be a metaphor for ways of seeing, then the story charts Miranda’s attempt to forge her own view of the world and ends when society’s perspective is forced on her, resulting in her death.
3.11 Conclusion

This chapter offers a new perspective on the benefits of comparing source and target texts. Bachmann’s writing in her ‘Todesarten’ texts is complex and poses numerous challenges for the translator: the texts’ style is indivisibly linked with their content. The way Bachmann uses language has multiple effects: it creates emotions in the reader which the text describes, it confronts the reader with puzzles which have to be solved in order to make sense of the text, and it hints at political views.

Analysis of the source texts and target texts has found significant differences in terms of ambiguity, wordplay, metaphors, iconicity and transitivity. With the exception of the short story collection *Three Paths to the Lake*, which was translated by Mary Fran Gilbert, the only female translator of a substantial amount of writing in this case study, the target texts demonstrate a tendency on the translators’ part to simplify the text for the English language reader. Filkins is the only translator of whom we know he did so intentionally because he states this aim in his translator’s note.

Boehm’s translation in many instances fails to bring across aspects of the source text that greatly enhance the reader’s understanding and enjoyment, as well as her/his perception of Bachmann as a writer. While *Malina* in German is a complex text with philosophical and feminist undertones, its target text appears rather like a more conventional novel. *Malina* contains several instances of wordplay that encourage the reader to stop in order to consider their significance in the context of the novel. The ‘winter murders’ and ‘summer murders’ wordplay has feminist undertones, while the ‘Todesarten – Todesraten’ wordplay alludes to Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ cycle. Wordplay is a way of effecting the reader’s active engagement with the text. Boehm’s translation choices clearly show that he noticed the wordplay in the source text, but he fails to bring across any of the aspects of the source text’s wordplay.

A possible explanation for the stylistic variations between the source and target texts in Boehm’s case is the difference between Bachmann’s and Boehm’s backgrounds: Boehm has translated 20th century German prose works by authors such as Peter Schneider, Christoph Hein, and Herta Müller, as well as Franz Kafka’s *Letters to Milena*, the Bertolt Brecht play *In the Jungle of the City*, and the Polish novel *Death in Danzig* by Stefan Chwin. Bachmann wrote poetry throughout most of
her life. While it is not clear why she chose to publish only two collections of poems, it is now known that she continued to write poetry, and it can be argued that her prose is written in a poetic manner. I agree with Marjorie Perloff’s use of the term “poem-fictions” (1996: 147) to describe Bachmann’s prose. Support for my position can also be found in stylistic approaches to language use: Boase-Beier defines poetic language as language which is characterised by stylistic features such as metaphor, ambiguity, and others (Boase-Beier 2002: 6); she further notes that “[p]oetry essentially conveys not information but a state of mind, and it does this by achieving poetic effects which allow the reader access to the state of mind in question” (Boase-Beier 2004: 94). Malina, and to some extent all of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts, is concerned exclusively with state of mind: in fact, the novel’s plot is Ich’s state of mind.

In addition, Bachmann’s philosophical studies, greatly influenced by Wittgenstein, Heidegger and Musil, as well as her views of language as a political instrument, are likely to have found expression in her prose writing. Boehm does not have a background in philosophy, and while this should not preclude him from translating a book with a philosophical subject matter, one is reminded of how Parshley’s translation led to the obscuring of de Beauvoir’s links to philosophy (Simons 1983: 563). A crucial aspect of Boehm’s work as a translator which must not be forgotten when analysing his work, however, is the time pressure he is likely to have experienced. As Boehm is clearly a very experienced translator, this is a possible explanation for occasional puzzling omissions and the loss of ambiguity such as demonstrated in example (5) in section 3.3: Boehm might simply not have been able to dedicate more time to resolving the challenges which Bachmann’s writing poses for the translator. Indeed, Boehm referenced constant time pressure in his correspondence (see Appendix VIII).

Filkins’ attempts to simplify Bachmann’s style leads to a great loss for the target text reader. Bachmann’s language is poetic because in the ‘Todesarten’ texts her style conveys the content, and is inextricably linked with it. Boase-Beier states “one might argue [poetry] should convey as little as possible in order to make the...

50 Bachmann’s siblings published her previously unpublished poetry as Ich weiß keine bessere Welt (2000), and this edition, together with all of Bachmann’s previously published poems, was translated by Peter Filkins as Darkness Spoken: The Collected Poems of Ingeborg Bachmann (2006).
reader ‘work’. It is not essential that poetry be clear; many writers and critics have favoured the view that it should be obscure” (Boase-Beier 1987: 33). Similarly, it is not essential that Bachmann’s prose be clear.

Filkins’ efforts to shorten Bachmann’s sentences in translation do the text no favours: “[g]enuine oddities or excesses of grammar are almost invariably intentional and authorially motivated” (Toolan 1998: 11). Bachmann’s long sentences and paragraphs, especially in Malina and Franza, lend a sense of momentum and breathlessness to the text, and in some places allow the reader multiple interpretations. Thus it is safe to assume that their length is not the result of any lack of skill as a writer on Bachmann’s part as her early critics assumed, but rather they serve the purpose of slowing the reader’s understanding of the text. My conclusion with regard to Bachmann’s iconic use of complex phrases is presented in section 5.3.

Three Paths to the Lake, translated by Mary Fran Gilbert, remains a notable exception as Bachmann’s elaborate extended metaphors (for example, the ‘glass’ metaphor in ‘Eyes to Wonder’, analysed in section 3.5) are preserved in the target text and thus allow its reader to interpret the story on many different levels. It is possible that the brevity of these stories makes it easier for the translator to recognise these networks of words.

Leppihalme notes that “an alluding author and an appreciative reader can be said to form an in-group, with the reader flattered at being included” (Leppihalme 1997: 49). Solving the problems posed by a complex text, while requiring effort from the reader, leads to a positive experience. If the complexity of the text is diminished and the challenge for the reader thus reduced, her/his engagement with and enjoyment of the text would therefore also be lessened.

The results of this analysis with a view to the influence which the translator’s gender has on the text s/he produces are not very clear-cut because none of Bachmann’s prose texts have been translated by more than one translator. An exception is the brief passage from Franza translated by Friedberg in addition to Filkins, but as their translations are based on different stages of the manuscript, their source texts have to be seen as different texts.

Analysis of translations of Bachmann’s texts into other languages would allow insight into whether source and target text differences are necessitated by the source text, the target language or individual translators. Malina has been translated into Romanian by Ramona Trufin. Words and Phrases in Hungarian, Slovenian,
French, Italian, English, Latin and Greek are printed in italics and translated into Romanian in footnotes. One known difference between the English translation and the Romanian translation is that, according to an article by the translator, the Romanian target text contains more footnotes which help the reader to understand Bachmann’s wordplay when this is difficult to convey in the same way in Romanian. It is not clear, however, whether this willingness to make ready use of footnotes should be attributed to the translator herself, to the publisher’s editorial policies, or to target culture conventions, and, unfortunately, attempts to contact the translator have remained unanswered.

The fact that transitivity structures differ between the source and target text of Malina, especially in the ‘Legend’ of the Princess of Kagran suggests that this is one area in which possible ideological leanings of the translator can be discerned. Leonardi (2006) found that the male translator of Dacia Maraini’s novel omitted the grammatical agent on several occasions and translated passive structures in the source text as active in the target text. As passive formulations are more common in English than in Italian (Leonardi 2006: 171), this change does not seem to have been necessitated by target language conventions. However, Leonardi noticed that the female translator of a different novel by Dacia Maraini also omitted the agent in many cases, and in addition had a tendency to turn active into passive, which shifts the reader’s attention from subject to object and provides the target text reader with the translator’s rather than the narrator’s view. Perhaps it is not only the translator’s gender that influences the translation, but also, to some extent, the author’s gender.

While no proof has been found that women and men write in distinctly different ways, it is possible that a translator would have subconscious attitudes to a woman-authored text, or be influenced by text-external factors such as reviews, the book cover or academic interpretations of the target text. It is not clear whether the differences in transitivity in the case of Bachmann were an intentional decision on the part of Boehm: perhaps he judged the content of Malina’s to be a more important aspect. In a novel, the content might be seen to be more important than the style (unlike in poetry whose style conveys the content), and considering that he was under time pressure (see above), Boehm might only have been able to focus on the content so that target text readers at least have the opportunity to follow the ‘action’. However, much of the plot in Malina takes place in Ich’s mind, thus the mind style conveyed to the reader is as important as Ich’s misfortunes. Bachmann was trying to
demonstrate the suffering experienced by women in a patriarchal society. This suffering, while it is partly expressed through physical symptoms in *Franza*, is expressed in the characters’ mind style in *Malina*. As both Leonardi’s and my analysis have found differences in transitivity, however, further study of this area seems necessary. The next chapter examines the translations of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts in the context of the Anglo-American literary polysystem as well as feminism and feminist criticism in this part of the world.
Chapter 4: Feminist Criticism, German Literature and Ingeborg Bachmann in the Anglo-American Literary Polysystem

Building on the overview given in Chapter 2 of the reception of the ‘Todesarten’ texts in German-speaking countries before and after the development of feminist criticism, as well as Chapter 3’s analysis of the source and target texts, this chapter gives an overview of the reception of the target texts in the context of the history of women’s writing in English in order to locate the translations of Ingeborg Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts among the various strands and developments of this field. I demonstrate that the contrast between the position of German-language translated literature in the Anglo-American literary “polysystem” (Even-Zohar 199b: 45) and the way in which Bachmann’s success in German was anchored in the position she fulfilled in the German-language polysystem made it difficult for the translations to be successful. Bachmann’s case serves as a useful illustration of the interaction between these two systems.
4.1 Bachmann’s Anglo-American Reception

In the previous chapter, significant differences between the source texts and their translations by Philip Boehm and Peter Filkins were found with regard to ambiguity, puns and wordplay, images and metaphors, transitivity, and iconicity. Instances of wordplay with a potentially feminist content in *Malina* are not transferred (see section 3.3); elaborate images often linked with other passages are weakened in the translation (see section 3.4); power and agency differences between characters, especially the Princess of Kagran and the Stranger in the ‘Legend’, are less pronounced in the translation. The result of the translator’s choices is that the target text has a less clear structure and thus does not display the same subversion of the gendered roles of common fairy-tale plots as the source text (see section 3.6.1).

The effect of Boehm’s interference in the text means that source and target text readers arrive at different perceptions of emotion in the text. While the source text gives rise to emotions in the reader, such as a sense of threat and chaos in the middle chapter of *Malina* as well as the ‘Legend of the Princess of Kagran’, the fact that its style echoes and adds to the plot nevertheless gives the impression of a text that has been carefully crafted. The greatly reduced degree to which this close relationship between style and content is maintained in the target text means that its readers are unable to include a sense of the author’s control in their construction of the “extra-fictional voice” (Stockwell 2002: 42) to the same extent as the source text reader. The translation is therefore more likely to lead readers to interpret emotions described in and evoked by the text as a deficit rather than as an integral part of the text and Bachmann’s philosophical viewpoint.

The inclusion by Filkins of Bachmann’s Büchnerpreis [Büchner prize] speech in *Franza* would be seen as justified by many modern translation theorists as developments in this field over the course of the past two decades have increasingly acknowledged and advocated for the translator’s creative involvement in the creation of a new text (see, for example, Bassnett and Bush 2006 or Loffredo and Perteghella 2006). Nevertheless, Filkins’ intervention means that the English-language reader of *Franza* is not able to gain an insight into the novel Bachmann had envisaged, according to her notes and drafts, without referring to secondary material. Mary Fran Gilbert’s translations of the *Simultan* stories remained faithful to the source texts’
structure and stylistic elements to a greater extent so that their reader is given the opportunity to understand the characters in a similar manner to the source text reader.

This chapter compares the reception of the translations in the English-speaking world with the German-language reception of Bachmann’s texts presented in Chapter 2 in order to demonstrate the ways in which they differ as well as the extent to which Bachmann is portrayed as a different type of author by both. The following sections will explore the translations’ role in the UK and USA in the context of the women’s movement and developments in feminist literature and criticism. As part of this analysis, critics’ reactions to the publication of the translations are compared to the critical reception of Bachmann’s work in German-speaking countries.
4.2 Women’s Writing and Feminist Criticism in English-speaking Countries

It is important to know the ways in which Bachmann was constructed as a significant European writer by critics who did not share her cultural background. As the English translations were published many years after the source texts and after Bachmann’s death, these reviews were composed in a situation that differs greatly from that of the German reviews. While the German critics to some extent had a personal involvement in Bachmann’s success or failure as a writer since many of them knew her personally and had been instrumental in the immense popularity achieved by her poetry, this aspect does not play a role for the reviewers of the translations. Comparison of the reception of source and target texts seems crucial, given that the insight into the male translators’ approaches to Bachmann’s texts gained as the result of the stylistic analysis presented in Chapter 3 suggests that they were influenced by pre-1984 criticism of Bachmann to a greater extent than by the post-1984 feminist criticism of her work.  

The theories, criticism and literature examined in this chapter are part of second-wave feminism. While first-wave feminism is usually understood to refer to the suffragette movement (see Chapter 1, section 1.1), second-wave feminism began in the 1960s (see Chapter 2, section 2.2). Second-wave feminism is defined by Jane Pilcher and Imelda Whelehan (2004: 144) as the “feminist collective political activism and militancy which emerged in the late 1960s”. Second-wave feminism was characterised by a focus on the female body as a site of oppression (Shulamith Firestone’s *The Dialectic of Sex* (1970), for example, examines the role of women’s capacity to give birth), its representation, as well as the significance of biological difference (ibid.).

Woman-centred criticism approaches women’s difference from men in the following three ways (Weedon 1997: 12-17):

---

51 As stated in section 1.5, 1984 is understood as the beginning of feminist critics’ interest in Bachmann’s work as this is when Sigrid Weigel’s influential *Text+Kritik* volume was published. This book contains the first analyses of the feminist significance of Bachmann’s writings (see, for example, Weigel’s (1984c) article ‘Die andere Ingeborg Bachmann’ [The other Ingeborg Bachmann] in this volume).

52 They determine first-wave feminism to have developed between the mid-19th century and the 1920s (Pilcher and Whelehan 2004: 52), and its key concerns were women’s rights to vote and own property (ibid. 144).
1) Biological: women and men are perceived as different because their bodies are different; essential natural womanhood is seen as a source of strength and should be reflected in their writing. Subjectivity is preferred to rationality. Mary Daly’s work, for example, relies on the assumption of a shared femaleness that can be celebrated.

2) Psychoanalytic: Feminist critics influenced by Lacan have reinterpreted aspects of psychoanalytic theory (for example Kate Millet’s *Sexual Politics* (1969) and Juliet Mitchell’s *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (1974)) because it promises explanations of gender differences not tied to biology. Julia Kristeva, Luce Irigaray and Hélène Cixous belong to this group.

3) Social and historical: cultural explanations of women’s difference; construction of female traditions (for example, Gilbert and Gubar’s *The Mad Woman in the Attic* (1979)). This category of criticism places great emphasis on women’s experience (as mentioned in section 4.1) and tends to avoid any thorough consideration of how language constructs rather than reflects the meaning that we give to our experience.

These three approaches developed in parallel. The following paragraphs demonstrate that there are multiple perspectives within feminism, and the movement has undergone many developments as a result of scientific advances and political and societal changes. Feminist criticism is a diverse and multi-disciplinary school of thought that does not have a singular political or theoretical perspective. Elaine Showalter (1985: 4) lists psychology, psychoanalysis, history, anthropology, linguistics, Marxism, and deconstruction as well as general literary theory as its influences, and these have all provided useful analytical tools for feminist scholars. Feminist criticism is described by Showalter (1987: 31) as “a community of women with a shared set of concerns but with a complex and resourceful variety of methodological practices and theoretical affiliations”. Feminist criticism thus does

---

53 One could argue that men can be feminist critics too, if one subscribes to a view of feminism as a shared political aim. Early feminists and feminist critics seemed to focus on the idea of feminism as shared experience (see Barrett 1982), and this view would exclude the possibility of male feminist critics. Scholars Stephen Heath and John Stoltenberg (cited in Thomas 2007: 187) recognise the difficulty in combining masculinity, which they see as linked to domination and power, with feminism.
not subscribe to one single theory, but instead is unified by its concerns, which encompass three areas: the representation of sexual difference in literature, the influence of feminine and masculine values on literary genres, and the ways in which women have been excluded from literature, criticism and theory (see Showalter 1985: 3). In this thesis, I have been addressing all of these aspects. The text analysis in Chapter 3 demonstrates the different translation strategies of Philip Boehm, Peter Filkins and Mary Fran Gilbert. As part of this analysis, hypotheses regarding the translators’ values are presented that take into account the possible influence of their gender. Chapter 2 presents trends in reviews of Bachmann’s work that effected an initially peripheral position of her prose texts.

While my theoretical approach is grounded in second-wave feminism as mentioned above, my analysis of Bachmann’s reception builds on Western feminist theories, and in this chapter specifically those from the US, UK and Western Europe. This is because the English translations of the ‘Todesarten’ texts were carried out by North American translators. In general, Anglo-American feminisms are not treated separately in this thesis because they are historically closely linked and because the translators are American. Furthermore, publishing tends to be Anglo-American now in the sense that books published in the US are available in the UK and vice versa. German feminism is discussed in Chapter 2. Second-wave feminist activism first began in North America (Pilcher and Whelehan: 145), and the first influential feminist literary critics worked there. North-American feminism originates in political activism: in the 19th century, feminists such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton worked towards the abolition of slavery (Moi 1985: 21). Second-wave feminism in North America arose from the civil rights movement and women active in protests against the war in Vietnam (ibid.).

North-American feminist criticism began with the realisation that the representation of women as either “angels or monsters” (Showalter 1985: 5) was a misogynist practice and could be linked to the mistreatment of women in society. In the United States, feminist literary criticism was initiated in the early 1970s by academic women who had taken part in feminist activism in the 1960s (Showalter 1985: 5). According to Showalter (ibid.), many activists had an interest in literature, but when they found disparity between their own ambitions and the representations of fictional women’s roles, feminist criticism allowed them to combine their work and lives.
This is why early feminist criticism deviates noticeably from established academic writing conventions by combining personal testimonies and an emotional style, such as a more informal register, with politics and theoretical approaches. Critics who composed their texts in this way were, for instance, Adrienne Rich (especially in her 1980 essay ‘When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Revision’) and Rachel Blau du Plessis (in ‘For the Etruscans’; 1980). Nancy Miller termed this type of writing ‘Personal Criticism’ (see Anderson 2007: 138). Critics often highlighted women’s emotional style as a negative trait (see Annan’s and Boyer’s comments in section 4.2.1), perhaps because emotions appear to be a deviation from the rational norm. To involve emotions in one’s writing suggests losing control and it is seen as out of place in theoretical discourse; this practice is highlighted by Mary Daly. She notes in the introduction to her influential book *Gyn/Ecology* (1984: xv) that her work was not seen as sufficiently academic for promotion to a professorship, despite the fact that she had published numerous articles and several books that had been widely cited.

Emotional writing can mean two different things: writing that expresses emotion, or writing that evokes emotions in the reader. These two possibilities intersect in style because fiction uses “involvement strategies” (Burke 2011: 120) in order to affect the reader’s state of mind. These strategies can involve the use of the first-person pronoun, such as that of Bachmann in *Malina*, as well as detail and imagery (Burke 2011: 121). According to Mieke Bal’s (1997: 47-8) explanation, use of the first person and the present tense means that a personal “language situation” is created that results in intimacy between a speaker or writer and the reader. This is the case in *Malina* as the novel is written from the perspective of its central character Ich. “Language as emotion” encompasses mental process verbs, grading (intensifiers, comparison, quantifiers, mood, modality, negation), repetition, figurativeness, punctuation, interjections, diminutives and augmentatives, inversion, exclamation, syntactic markedness, emphatic particles, vagueness and evaluative adjectives (Bednarek 2008: 11). *Malina*, especially the representation of Ich’s thoughts, achieves its effects through most of these. Most immediately noticeable is the lack of punctuation, which immediately confronts the reader with Ich’s chaotic world, but this is not maintained in the translation, whose additional punctuation gives the text a more obviously linear and calm nature.
Bachmann frequently uses intensifiers, such as “den größten Schrecken” (Bachmann 1995: 249) [my greatest fear; Boehm 1990: 156], “unglaublicher Betrug” (Bachmann 1995: 270) [an unbelievable lie; Boehm 1990: 169], or “überhaupt keine Gefühle” (Bachmann 1995: 286) [no feelings at all; Boehm 1990: 179]. Ich’s speech and thoughts are often a jumble of interjections. Ich also frequently poses multiple questions, for example “ist das natürlich oder normal? Bin ich eine Frau oder etwas Dimorphes? Bin ich nicht ganz eine Frau, was bin ich überhaupt?” (Bachmann 1995: 292) [is that natural or normal? Am I a woman or something dimorphic? Am I not entirely female – what am I, anyway? Boehm 1990: 183]. According to Katie Wales (2001: 328), juxtaposed questions can lead to heightened emotion. As Ich’s function as Malina’s counterpart is becoming increasingly clear to her here, it makes sense that the style of this passage supports the dramatic turn of events. The language in Malina both expresses emotion and evokes it in the reader.

In addition to the stylistic devices listed by Monika Bednarek, Bachmann also uses another strategy in order to evoke emotions in the reader. Peter Barry (2009: 87) defines postmodern fiction as works that mix literary genres (among other aspects). Bachmann does not only mix literary genres such as prose, poetry and drama, she also uses musical mood markers in Ich’s dialogues with Malina, such as crescendo, lamentadosi, moderato, sotto voce, tempo giusto, più mosso, molto mosso, forte, abbandonandosi, tutto il clavicembalo, diminuendo, vivacissimamente, agitato, allegro, pensieroso, appassionato a con molto sentimento (Bachmann 1995: 305-331; Boehm 1990: 191-208). Here these notations serve to make clear Ich’s emotions and to let the reader share them. She alternates between an agitated and a calm state, and her heightened emotion is emphasised by the absurdity of some of the Italian terms.

The more dramatic musical markers occur when Ich engages in a power struggle with Malina and when she discusses her identity. “Tutto il clavicembalo” (Bachmann 1995: 328; Boehm 1990: 206) [literally: the entire harpsichord] is used when Ich exclaims “Ach! Ich bin eine Andere, du willst sagen, ich werde noch eine ganz andere sein!” [Oh! I’m somebody else, you’re trying to say that I’ll become someone completely different!], and thus conveys the drama of her struggle with Malina by leading the reader to imagine the way in which Ich’s speech might resemble the sound of a harpsichord being played at its full capacity, or perhaps a dramatic filmic scene accompanied by a loud harpsichord score, but also sounds ludicrous as a result of its overstatement. Achberger (1995: 10) links this
phenomenon to Brecht’s ‘alienation effect’ whose “incongruity shatters the coherence of the narrative”. Ich’s identity and the fact that she is Malina’s alter ego (or he hers) is one of the central issues of the novel, and Ich’s realisation of her situation is a pivotal point. Bachmann referred to her writing as ‘composition’ and had expressed the idea of writing the final section of *Malina* in the manner of a musical score (Achberger 1995: 6). Achberger (ibid.) views this as Bachmann’s attempt to transcend the limits of language. Using musical markers in this way functions as an almost multi-modal way of evoking emotion in the reader.

Burke (2011: 211) emphasises that “meaning is equal to conceptualisation”, both of which rely on emotion. Cognitive linguists who have written on emotion and cognition (Kövecses 2000; Wierzbicka 1999; Lakoff and Turner 1989; Burke 2011) have come to the conclusion that the conceptualisation of emotion is influenced both by biology and experiences. The extent to which the translators are able to conceptualise the emotions evoked by the texts’ involvement strategies, and consequently their ability to construct meaning, therefore varies according to their biology and experiences. Research linking neurobiology and style is still in its infancy and it is thus difficult to draw definitive conclusions.

The reviews of the translations do not emphasise Bachmann’s or her characters’ perceived struggle to control her own or their emotions to the same extent as the German reviews. It is possible that in the case of *Malina* this is the result of the different role played by emotional aspects in the target text (see above). Taylor (2007: 760), in a review of Filkins’ poetry translations, even notes the emotional nature of Bachmann’s previously unpublished poems as a positive trait: “[i]n any event, the oft-desperate poetic outcries of both her spontaneous and more polished drafts […] are impressive in their directness and emotional power”. This review stands in stark contrast to the German critics’ assessment.

It is also surprising that Filkins preserved the emotional nature of the poetic drafts as this is not the case in his translation of *Franza*. His attempt to impose a structure on the text further increases this effect: if a lack of punctuation contributes to the degree to which a text expresses and evokes emotions, the introduction of additional full-stops, commas, and even semi-colons (used only extremely rarely by Bachmann) must result in a less affective text. Considering that Albrecht (2004: 92) references a resurgence in misogynist attitudes towards female authors in the late 1980s, it is possible that Boehm’s and Filkins’ elimination of many of the feminist
aspects of the texts is the result of this trend. There is a link between feminism and emotion in writing: Moi (1985: 160) notes the perception that “masculine rationality [...] has always privileged reason, order, unity and lucidity, and [...] it has done so by silencing and excluding the irrationality, chaos and fragmentation that has come to represent femininity”. She warns of the risk of constructing an opposition between masculine and feminine values. This opposition is also what Bachmann thematises through the characterisation of Ich and Malina.

The idea of hysteria further links emotion and feminism. Hysteria was initially thought of as part of women’s temperament and associated with women’s “lability and capriciousness” (Showalter 1993: 286). In addition, a gendered understanding of the body developed in the 18th century; for example, the nervous system began to be seen as feminine, whereas the musculature was thought of as masculine (Showalter 1993: 93). This conceptualisation of the body posits emotion as a feminine trait. Vieda (cited in Showalter 1993: 293) sees a connection between the popularity of misogynist literature in the 17th century and the increasing use of hysteria as a diagnostic category from this point onwards. It seems logical to seek a parallel in 20th-century literature: if, as Albrecht states (see above), misogynist attitudes towards women became more prevalent in the late 1980s, it is likely that debates at this time would have utilised long-established tropes such as that of women as over-emotional. If Bachmann’s male translators were affected, even subconsciously, by this kind of discourse, this would explain their choices.

The denigration of women’s emotions when they attempt to break out from restrictions imposed on them has a long history originating from the anti-suffragist rhetoric of the 1880s (Showalter 1993: 306). Feminists in the 20th century sought to explore the mistreatment of women at the hands of psychoanalysts, as exemplified by Showalter’s (1993) concern with the matter. Hélène Cixous (1987: 47) asked, “What woman isn’t Dora?”, and the case of Bachmann’s male translators’ treatment of her texts suggests that Bachmann’s extra-fictional voice has suffered a similar fate. Just as Sigmund Freud saw it as his responsibility to reorganise his hysterical subjects’ fragmented and discontinuous narrative into a coherent whole (Showalter 1993: 318), Filkins assembles Bachmann’s fragments into a unified novel, while Boehm attempts to make her writing more rational. Sprengnether (2007: 235) recognises the
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54 Dora was a Viennese woman studied by Freud.
hierarchical nature of this type of analysis: “[t]he woman babbles; her physician interprets. […] He knows her better than she knows herself”. Interpretation is of course a fundamental part of the translator’s work. But Bachmann’s male translators ‘improved’ her texts according to values not commonly espoused by feminist writers of Bachmann’s era, such as logical progression. Bachmann achieves coherence, but this is a less obvious kind of coherence that can only be fully appreciated through stylistic analysis and contextualisation with Bachmann’s theoretical writings (as demonstrated by the analysis of ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ ['Eyes to Wonder'] in Chapter 3).

Attitudes to emotions in the Western world have always oscillated between negative and positive (Bednarek 2008: 2). Although Bednarek does not discuss style and emotion from a feminist perspective, she notes that irrational and uncontrollable emotions are seen as negative whereas order and rationality is seen as positive (ibid.: 3). The link between control and emotion is encoded in the metaphor EMOTION IS FORCE (Kövecses 2000: 17), and this “master metaphor” affects the way we think about emotion (ibid: xiv). It seems that German-language critics in the 1970s were especially negatively disposed towards emotion in literature, and the reason for this could be political. Burke (2011: 134) explains that “[p]lain style in ancient times was not meant to move or please”. Perhaps post-war critics who thought literature after the war should re-educate readers saw no place for emotive language in literature. A critic in the New York Times (Dougherty 2005: n.p.) describes German literary critics as “the doctrinaire guardians of solemnity in books”, and Reich-Ranicki specifically as “the stodgy dean of critics”. This assessment suggests that German-language critics did indeed have preferences regarding style.

I assume that the translators of the ‘Todesarten’ had read evaluations of Bachmann’s skill as a writer before they embarked on the translations. This is most likely to be true in the case of Filkins as he has had a long-standing interest in Bachmann’s work as demonstrated by the fact that he translated all of her poems over a number of years in addition to Franza. Any reviews the translators read would have become part of their cognitive context. According to Burke (2011: 141), “[p]redictions, anticipations and expectations are all real and primary in working memory prior to textual engagement” (original emphasis). This means that the translators’ predictions, anticipations and expectations with regard to the type of text they were about to read played a role before their interpretative process began. The
memory to which Burke refers here encompasses previously read literary texts and the emotions they evoke. Any criticism of Bachmann read by the translators would also be part of this memory, as Manguel (1996: 19) states, “[...] each new reading builds upon whatever the reader has read before”. Burke (ibid.) further notes that working memory systems “operate during perception”, so the influence of the translators’ prior reading cannot be separated from their interpretation of the text.

The above statements by Burke also apply to Mary Fran Gilbert. However, there is a further factor that potentially influenced the translators’ different approaches and interpretations: that of the speed at which they read the text. An experiment carried out by Gerald Cupchick and Janos László (1994; cited in Burke 2011: 165) found that compared to male participants’ behaviour, women were more responsive to involvement by the text (see the discussion of Bachmann’s ‘involvement strategies’ earlier in this section) and slowed down more often when they judged a text to provide insight into their own life. The study examined subject involvement, objective detachment, and responses to action and to a character’s experience, and found that the pace of reading slowed when a text was judged to be “rich in meaning about life” (Burke 2011: 165). Bachmann’s texts are certainly rich in meaning about life, but one has to look closely to find it.

As Cupchick and László’s study only involved twenty female and twenty male readers’ responses to short story extracts, its results are not generally conclusive. However, it nevertheless suggests that on occasion, women and men respond to texts differently. It is impossible to prove whether this link between reading speed and engagement determined Boehm’s, Filkins’ and Gilbert’s approach to Bachmann’s texts. The translator is a reader of the source text, and the translation is a manifestation of that reading (see, for example, Scott 2006; see discussion of this in section 1.1). Karen Leeder (2004: 153) puts it thus: “a translator might best be thought of as a reader par excellence and translation as a privileged first and closest reading” (original emphasis). The processes of reading and translation cannot be separated.

Female readers were found to be more responsive to involvement strategies (Burke 2011: 165). If Gilbert read the text more slowly, possibly because she perceived a relevance to her own life, as argued below, she would have been able to notice more of its nuances, because reading more slowly is surely more conducive to
a thorough stylistic analysis of the text. The stylistic analysis then also influences the target text that she composes. Conversely, if Boehm and Filkins did not feel that Bachmann’s texts held a great amount of significance for them, they would have read them faster and, as a result, been more likely to make errors, omissions or misinterpretations. Boase-Beier (2006: 42-43) mentions Riffaterre’s idea of “converging stylistic patterns” in a text, the point at which the reader experiences processing difficulties. She concludes that as a result of this difficulty, the reader looks for significance. Because of the small extent to which Filkins and Boehm recreate these points of convergence, I think it is worth considering whether they approached the text in an oppositional manner. They did not recreate significant aspects of Bachmann’s style (e.g. her use of punctuation) and thus took on the role of editors.

Women’s writing in the sense of writing for women or by women had existed in different forms for several centuries by the time second-wave feminism began. For example, women’s fiction in North America in the 1850s encompassed books that were not intended as literature, but instead were aimed at women with traditional interests. An example of this is Fanny Fern’s novel *Rose Clark* (1856). These women-authored popular fiction books responded to readers’ interests and also created new ones while canonical literature was kept as a men’s preserve (Kolodny 1985: 48). As part of the early phase of feminist criticism in the 1960s and 1970s, critics began to rediscover the history of women writers whose writing was linked thematically and historically. Patricia Meyer Spacks (1975), Elaine Showalter (1975), and Susan Gubar and Sandra Gilbert (1979) attempted to establish a lost history of 18th to 20th century women’s writing whose themes, images and plots are the result of women’s experiences in a male-dominated culture.

Many views expressed by feminist literary theorists writing in the 1970s now appear rather essentialist in the sense that they arose from an understanding of gender as fixed and binary, and it took until the 1990s for these to be gradually questioned and extended. It has been argued that what is often called ‘essentialist’ in feminist criticism goes back to Aristotle. This is, for example, the view expressed by Janicki (2003: 274), who notes Aristotle’s statement that “all things have their essences”. Essentialist views of women and men are based on the notion that a person’s biological sex determines their gender, as well as all aspects of their personality and their expressive faculties. This view leads to the assumption that, for example,
women and men are suited for different professions or that they write in a noticeably different style. These essentialist conceptions of gender began to be questioned by poststructuralists such as Derrida and Barthes in the twentieth century, and also by some second-wave feminists.

Diana Fuss defines essentialism as “a belief in the real, true essence of things, the invariable and fixed properties which define the ‘whatness’ of a given entity” (Fuss 1989: xi). True essence is “that which is most irreducible, unchanging, and therefore constitutive of a given person or thing” (Fuss 1989: 2). Pilcher and Whelehan (2004: 41) note the references to biological differences in essentialist pronouncements. Women and men are thus defined according to what is assumed to be natural. Fuss goes on to define essentialism as used in feminist theory as “the idea that men and women […] are identified as such on the basis of transhistorical, eternal, immutable essences” (ibid.). This view suggests that women possess innate and permanent qualities that men do not share. Some second-wave feminists objected to the way in which women’s biological realities were used in order to limit their full and equal involvement in society. However, other feminists’ ideas were also characterised by essentialist views; for example Mary Daly’s work, as already discussed (see point 1) above). Essentialism can thus be used in different ways. Although one might assume that the suggestion that all women are unified by a single factor is rather positive as it might be a source of strength and a sense of community, this way of thinking was problematic for women of colour (Pilcher and Whelehan 2004: 42) as it arose from the circumstances of white middle-class feminists.

Constructionism, on the other hand, understands categories such as ‘woman’ or ‘man’ as the “effects of complicated discursive practices” (Fuss 1989: 2). Simone de Beauvoir’s famous statement that one is not born but rather becomes a woman (de Beauvoir 1973: 301) is based on the existentialist idea that existence precedes essence, but it is also constructionist, as is Judith Butler’s work, because it states that gender consists of repeated performances that create an illusion of naturalness (Butler 1990: 137). My own view falls between essentialism and constructionism. It seems unhelpful to assume that women and men write and translate in distinctly different styles. However, I do not think that gender as a category should be eliminated from literary and linguistic analysis. Overtly feminist or woman-centred texts such as Bachmann’s explore issues to which a female translator might be more
sensitive because she is likely to have experienced situations in which her own gender was made relevant, and these experiences will form part of her cognitive context. This means that she is then more likely to fully understand the source text and to interpret passages in which gender is particularly relevant as important. My view is supported by Leonardi’s findings that the female translator whose work she analysed as part of her study “seems to pick both the referential and the emotional meaning” (2007: 303). She hypothesises that she “is closer to the ‘woman’s condition’ than a man could ever be” (ibid.). Chapter 5 discusses the role of the translators’ gender in more detail.

Gender is now generally understood as situation-dependent and individual, but as this is a radical departure from a binary system, early feminist literary theory, while it constitutes a vital and fundamental development step, seems distant from the way gender is treated in literature now. The link between female authors and femininity is not as straightforward as it may have appeared at the beginning of second-wave feminism. Of course there are experiences that are only possible for women to undergo, such as those arising from biological processes, including menstruation, pregnancy and childbirth. The Sexual Offences Act 1956 defined rape as an act that can only be committed against a woman (Crown Prosecution Service a: n.p.), but it was repealed by the Sexual Offences Act 2003 which replaces ‘woman’ with ‘person’ (Crown Prosecution Service b: n.p.). As English law takes a long time to change, it is likely to reflect attitudes that have been prevalent for some time rather than work as an instrument that drives change in society.

Furthermore, although there have been several studies of women’s and men’s brains, the extent to which they might work differently remains unclear as studies are often interpreted in a biased manner. For example, a recent study on ‘Sex differences in the structural connectome of the human brain’ found “fundamental sex differences

55 The few transgender men who have given birth blur this distinction very slightly, although at this point one could probably not say that they experience pregnancy and birth in a ‘masculine’ way rather than in the same way women experience it. Pregnant men are likely to encounter discrimination and uninvited attention, but so are pregnant women. Furthermore, some scholars (for example, Sara Ruddick 1989; Emily Jeremiah 2006) define mothering as a collection of practices that can be carried out by women and men. This is linked to Butler’s (1993) understanding of gender as performance; mothering is also performed rather than a fixed state. ‘Motherhood’ can be understood as the societal institution, as suggested by Adrienne Rich in Of Woman Born. Motherhood as Experience and Institution (1976).

56 However, the extent to which this point is true also varies between different areas of law.
in the structural architecture of the human brain” (Ingalhalikar et al. 2013: 826) and its authors state that these differences complement the findings of behavioural and functional studies. While the study report itself gives a neutral explanation of the findings, newspaper, magazine and online articles published at the time by, for instance, *The Telegraph* (Gray 2013: n.p.), *Forbes* (DiSalvo 2013: n.p.) and BBC News tended towards absolute statements regarding women’s propensity for multitasking and men’s predisposition for activities that require coordination.

While studies such as this one can investigate physical differences between women and men, it is only possible to hypothesise regarding a correlation with behaviour. One must also not forget the potential effect of socialisation. For example, if girls receive positive feedback for showing empathy, or boys are implicitly rewarded for carrying out physical tasks, it seems logical to assume that they would improve their abilities through repetition, and this, in turn, might affect brain development. It is thus difficult to say precisely what the particularly ‘feminine’ aspects of women’s lives are. Femininity is usually associated with moral distinction and characterised by “sensitivity, understanding, love, sociability, concreteness, closeness” (Weigel 1984a: 84). But this essentialist view of women as emotional and concerned with the fostering of interpersonal relationships is often used to relegate them to an inferior status in society.

Fuss (1989: 114) contrasts the Aristotelian view that experience allows us access to knowledge with Althusser’s view that ideology also plays a role in the understanding of experience as truth, and notes that ‘female experience’ is not unified, knowable, universal or stable. The perspective of early second-wave feminist literary theorists largely follows the Aristotelian view, although this was not necessarily done consciously by all. They are thus not wrong in their approach per se, but it is helpful to understand its origins and limitations. Bachmann, according to McMurtry (2012: 2), extrapolated from personal difficulties in order to question a “wider state of cultural emergency”, the psychological struggles of women in general as well as German and Austrian post-war society. She was not concerned with experiences as such, but rather the impact of mistreatment on women’s psyche and the way in which this interacts with certain philosophical approaches. An example of this is the story ‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ [‘Eyes to Wonder’] and its response to Georg Groddek’s ideas regarding psychosomatic illnesses (see section 3.5). Bachmann, as noted in Chapter 1, studied philosophy at doctoral level and continued
her work in philosophy in her Frankfurt Poetics Lectures as well as several essays presented on the radio.

The essentialism of early feminist criticism began to be superseded by other interests in the 1980s. According to Showalter (1985: 7), at this point lesbian criticism, which understood the connection between women as a source of creativity and strength, became separate from feminist criticism (see, for example, Gonda 2007). Some feminist critics, who until this point had focused on women’s oppression by the patriarchy and women’s exclusion from literature, now turned towards mother-daughter relationships. Examples of these texts are Luce Irigaray’s essay ‘And One Doesn’t Stir Without the other’ (1979), Nancy Chodorow’s ‘Family Structure and Feminine Personality’ (1974), Jane Flax’s ‘The Conflict between Nurturance and Autonomy in Mother-Daughter Relationships’ (1978), and Julia Kristeva’s ‘Stabat Mater’ (first published as ‘Hérétique de l’amour’ in 1977; English version 1985). Critics’ interest in mother-daughter relationships occurred in parallel with the publication of literary texts on the same subject, such as Nancy Friday’s My Mother/My Self: A Daughter’s Search for Identity (1977) and Marie Cardinal’s The Words to Say It (Published as Les Mots pour le Dire in 1975; English translation 1984).

Showalter notes the differences between North American and European feminist criticism (1985: 8). While, according to her, American universities provided women’s studies courses, these were rarer in the UK, and as a result feminism progressed mostly in the fields of journalism, publishing, and radical politics. British feminism was interlinked with issues of social class and thus Marxist ideology for historical reasons (Showalter 1985: 8).57 One aspect of this is the shared interest of feminists and Marxists in “the transformative potential of emancipatory politics” (Bryson 2004: 14) in the 1960s and ‘70s, and some feminists turned to Marxism because they considered capitalism to be interlinked with patriarchy (see Hartmann 1997: 98). French feminism, on the other hand, is rooted in the theories of Lacan and Derrida, and thus approached women’s experiences from the symbolic function of language and its ability to define, represent or repress “the feminine” (Showalter 1985: 9). The French approach thus differs greatly from North American feminist

57 Shulamith Firestone, a North American feminist, also examines women’s role in society in terms of a Marxist understanding of reproduction as work in The Dialectic of Sex (1971).
critics’ interests, and its potential to achieve tangible differences in society was questioned (Showalter 1985: 9). My own approach is rooted in Anglo-American and German feminism. While it is possible to explore Bachmann’s work from a psychoanalytic perspective in order to elucidate, for example, Ich’s relationship with the ‘father’ in the middle chapter of Malina, only brief reference is made to Lacan’s mirror stage in section 3.5 as a thorough analysis of the ‘Todesarten’ from this perspective is beyond the scope of this thesis. As demonstrated in section 2.6.2, Bachmann’s prose has much in common with German-language feminist literature of the 1970s, and because of the author’s rootedness in European traditions, as well as the shared aims of Anglo-American and German feminism, these provide the most appropriate framework for the analysis presented here.

Feminist translation strategies were first developed by Luise von Flotow (1996) and Sherry Simon (1997) in the context of Canadian feminist women’s writing. Canada presents a fruitful environment for new power-related theories because of the political tension that arises as the result of its two official languages (English and French). Feminist translation strategies are explained in detail in Section 1.3.1. They are based on feminist translators’ approaches to overtly feminist and overtly sexist texts. However, they are a product of their time, which is evident in their approach to gender as a binary system. In addition, while feminist translation strategies perhaps appeared radical at the time, particularly the practice of ‘hijacking’, a more nuanced approach is needed to understand what happens in the translations of Bachmann’s texts. Neither Bachmann nor her translators openly stated an aim to represent women’s interests. However, the ‘Todesarten’ texts can be read as feminist writing despite this. Mary Fran Gilbert’s short story translations in Three Paths to the Lake also resemble other overtly feminist texts published at the same time, in that they all centre around a female character and the respective character’s relationship with herself, the world around her, or specific other people. These themes and their employment in women-authored fiction are examined in section 2.6.2.
4.3.1 The Reception of Bachmann and the ‘Todesarten’ in the Anglo-American Literary Polysystem

The reception of Bachmann’s texts in English-speaking countries was necessarily going to differ from that in Germany and Austria for several reasons. Polysystem theory, which examines the workings of literatures as interlinked systems, is an appropriate framework for explaining the difference between source and target texts. When translated texts enter the polysystem of literature in the target culture, their position with regard to centre and periphery is neutralised (Even-Zohar 1990b: 46). Texts in the centre of the literary polysystem are those that have reached a large audience and are canonised, whereas those at the periphery represent niche interests. In Bachmann’s case, the status her writing enjoys in the German-speaking territories might be of less importance to the target text reader than the fact that s/he is reading her work in translation, and translated literature is often met with specific expectations, as I shall demonstrate in the following paragraphs.

Polysystem theory relies on the idea “that semiotic phenomena, i.e., sign-governed human patterns of communication (such as culture, language, literature, society), could more adequately be understood and studied if regarded as systems rather than conglomerates of disparate elements” (Even-Zohar 1990a: 9). This perspective presents a view of literature as interlinked. In such a system, translated literature, for example, is not isolated and subject to its own distinct norms, but rather is affected and affects the norms of other types of literature. Literature as a “dynamic system” (ibid.: 10) is “a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap” (ibid.: 11). According to Itamar Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory (1990a: 20), writers acquire positions in the literary system not solely through their texts as their public can follow them when writers move from the centre to the periphery of the system while certain texts remain in the centre. The centre in this conception of the literary system means canonised works.

While the writer’s position in the canon may continue to be accepted, new ways of writing could be rejected (ibid.). In my view, this is what happened to Bachmann. Her poetry became part of the German canon soon after publication. One indication of this is its acceptance, signalled by the prize awarded by the Gruppe 47, by a group of established writers. In her prose, especially Malina and the Franz
fragment, Bachmann presents the “model for making new texts” (ibid.) discussed by Even-Zohar and thus radically departs from accepted literary forms.

Applying Even-Zohar’s terms (1990: 16), Malina initially assumed a position at the periphery of the German literary polysystem. The critics’ evaluations suggest that this was because the novel did not conform to the norms prevalent at that time. Bachmann’s poetry, on the other hand, became canonical because its subject matter was political at a time when well-known authors and philosophers (such as Adorno; see section 2.3) emphasised the importance of political literature. One of Bachmann’s most vehement critics, Marcel Reich-Ranicki, quite literally presented himself as the arbiter of the canon of German literature by publishing Der Kanon [The Canon] (2002-2006), a multi-volume collection of the texts he judged to be the most important in German-language literature.

*Der Kanon* encompasses 20 volumes of novels (2002), ten volumes of stories (2003), eight volumes of drama (2004), seven volumes of poetry (2005), and five volumes of essays (2006). The twenty novels were written by 16 men and one woman (Anna Seghers); the 180 novellas, short stories and fables were written by 81 men and nine women; the 43 plays were written by 23 men; and the 1370 poems were written by 218 men and 33 women. 14 of Bachmann’s poems are included in the poetry collection. A compilation of texts such as this is necessarily going to be subjective. While it is credible that there were few significant women authors in the time of, for example, Middle High German poetry, on the whole, it is unsurprising but nevertheless disappointing that so few female writers are represented. The fact that *Der Kanon* was published three decades after Bachmann’s death suggests that literary critics are likely to have been even less inclusive of women during her lifetime.

Valerie Henitiuk (1999: 471) notes that subsuming a text written by a woman into the general literary canon means that the author will be read as a man (see section 1.3.1). The ‘Todesarten’ are not subsumed into the general literary canon as indicated by their absence in Reich-Renicki’s *Der Kanon*. In addition, German criticism of *Malina* and the short stories suggests that Bachmann is read as a woman. Reviews of Bachmann’s public appearances after the publication of her poetry collections leave room for ambiguity: one could say that Bachmann was read as a woman and that is why reviews from this time emphasised her appearance and quiet voice. However, it is also possible to say that she was read as a man, and her public
appearance presented a contrast to the figure subconsciously expected by critics. Support for the latter view can be found in Braun’s (2013: 238; see section 2.3) discovery that Herta Müller’s physical appearance is often discussed by critics. Müller won the 2009 Literature Nobel Prize and must therefore be seen as part of the canon of established literature. I am therefore inclined to agree with Henitiuk.

With regard to Der Kanon, it is interesting that a project of this scale would be overseen by just one critic (although it is likely that he had significant editorial support from the publishers involved) because collaboration with other critics would surely have led to a more representative selection. The fact that Reich-Ranicki is the only critic whose name is associated with this project demonstrates his status in the German-language literary world, and it also suggests that German literary criticism is rather personal.

There does not seem to be an equivalent figure to Reich-Ranicki in the Anglo-American literary polysystem, and the German system appears to function in a different way. For example, Reich-Ranicki was in charge of ‘Das Literarische Quartett’ [The Literary Quartet], a talkshow that centred around the discussion of literature, on German television channel ZDF [approximate British equivalent: BBC2] from 1988 to 2001 (The Economist 2013: n.p.) that served to make literary criticism more accessible and entertaining for the general population. There has been no equivalent programme of this nature on mainstream British or American television to my knowledge. Literary criticism in the UK and US seems to be influenced by publications rather than people. For example, readers might rely on the London Review of Books, the Times Literary Supplement or the New York Review of Books (see Day 2014: n.p.) because of their reputation. The way in which literature is treated in the Anglo-American polysystem thus differs in some respects from the German-language system, and it was more difficult for Bachmann’s work to find a position to occupy within it.

Bachmann personified a specific role in post-war Germany and Austria (i.e. that of a new beginning, as discussed in section 2.1) and because the subject of her poetry, though often veiled, was war and its aftermath. The British and American post-war history differs greatly from the political developments in Germany and Austria; the greatest difference results from the fact that Germany caused the war and was responsible for the persecution and death of millions of people, whereas Britain and the USA won the war and did not have to examine their roles critically to the
same extent.\textsuperscript{58} German society required re-education and a new beginning, and this was not the case in English-speaking countries. The United Kingdom and North America thus did not have to face a situation which required a re-evaluation of recent events or drastic re-education of society, which is a contributing factor to the smaller resonance that Bachmann’s writing found in those countries, in my view. This argument is presented in more detail in section 2.2.

It seems reasonable to speculate that English-speaking readers with an interest in the nuances of post-war German and Austrian society would also be highly educated. For example, to develop such an interest, such readers would either have learned German or studied European history at post-16 level in order for their interest to be piqued. Furthermore, books on this subject are unlikely to be sold at airports or be included in bestseller lists, so that readers would have to seek them out. This factor would further restrict the potential audience of the translations.

In addition, the Anglo-American reviews of Bachmann’s work show a less pronounced difference in their reception of Bachmann’s poetry and prose. One of the possible reasons for the German critics’ initial dislike of her prose was that they approached the author in a paternalistic manner: the older male critics had helped the young female writer to find success in the 1950s, and her literary change of direction could have struck them as an attempt to embark on a path which was not publicly sanctioned. In addition, several of these critics belonged to the same circles as Bachmann. Reich-Ranicki, for example, belonged to the Gruppe 47 for some time (\textit{The Economist} 2013: n.p.; see also section 1.2.1) Her relationship with German-speaking critics was thus more personal. Although some reviews of Bachmann’s German publications were published in English during her lifetime (see, for example, Friebert 1966), in the case of British and American critics, temporal and spatial distance made a comparable relationship between author and critics impossible.

One must also not forget the position of translations from German in the target culture’s book market and publishers’ financial concerns. Hélène Buzelin (2007: 161) notes that literary translation generates “considerable symbolic capital” for the author, but is less likely to produce financial capital when the author is a

\textsuperscript{58} This is a rather simplistic explanation, of course, but is intended to serve merely as a brief comparison of the post-war situation and attitudes in the German-speaking territories, the UK and the US.
foreigner, not involved in promotion and unknown. All these factors apply to Bachmann. As the translations were published more than a decade after her death, she obviously could not participate in publicity events. All of Bachmann’s English translations were published in the US, possibly because British publishers were reluctant to publish them. In 1989, for example, just seven English translations of German prose texts were published in the UK (Sievers 2007: 41-44). This lack of interest in German-language writing continued: between the year 2000 and 2006, six English translations of German-language fiction were published annually in the United States (Allen 2007b: 26). The following paragraphs will focus on translations from German in the US. The statistics included here were taken from the website of the Börsenverein des Deutschen Buchhandels [stock exchange of the German book trade] unless noted otherwise.

In 2012, 10,862 translations into German were published; 7343 of these were translations from English. The total number of books published in Germany in 2012 was 91,100 (both Börsenverein des Deutschen Buchhandels 2013b: n.p.); translations thus accounted for 11.9% of all book publications. Translations from English into German in 2012 constituted 8% of the total German book output. In the same year the rights for 6855 translations were sold, 529 of these for English-language translations, and of these 156 were sold to US publishers (Börsenverein des Deutschen Buchhandels 2013a). Translations into English account for the second-biggest number of contracts with foreign publishers (Chinese is in first place). Non-fiction is the most popular genre of German-to-English translations (Börsenverein des Deutschen Buchhandels 2013b). The US book market is much larger than the German book market: the US book output in 2011 was 347,178 (German Book Office 2013: n.p.). The number of books for which translation rights are acquired from German publishers is not necessarily the same as the number of translations published each year, but the fact that contracts for 156 translations from German to English were agreed indicates that the number of German books published in the US and their share of the book market is much smaller than the number of English-language books in Germany.

One must bear in mind that Germany and the US (as well as the UK) have different publishing conventions and audience expectations. Reports and scholarly analyses reach different, and occasionally seemingly contradictory, conclusions with regard to the way in which publishers choose texts to be translated. Buzelin (2007:
states that translators are “useful allies” for publishers when they are involved
in the selection of books to be translated, which they often are. Lawrence Venuti
(1995: 312) expresses the same view twelve years earlier when he notes that because
few Anglo-American editors read other languages, they rely on translators’
recommendations.

However, these are both general impressions, and while Buzelin does not
specify the countries to which this view applies, Venuti’s assessment regards Anglo-
American publishing. Simona Škrabec (2007: 69) deduces from a number of
questionnaires answered by PEN centres in several countries that the most productive
way in which to promote German literature abroad is through personal contact rather
than pitching to publishers. This makes sense since finding a reliable translator is the
greatest concern of publishers, eclipsing sales and publicity issues (Literature across
Frontiers 2012: 13). Literature Across Frontiers (LAF), on the other hand, in an
examination of European publishers’ methods for choosing translations (2012: 9)
reports that publishers’ interest is most commonly piqued when they read a sample
translation or the book in its original language. Following a translator’s suggestion is
only in ninth place of thirteen factors that influence a publisher’s decision to publish
a specific translation in the statistics published by LAF (2012). These views thus
differ considerably.

One must bear in mind that Buzelin and Venuti wrote several years before
Škrabec and the LAF report, and while they express general impressions, the latter
two are based on the quantitative evaluation of questionnaires. Škrabec’s conclusion
also does not contradict LAF’s findings because it does not exclude the possibility
that once personal contact has been established with a publisher, s/he could read a
sample translation or the original text. It is also likely that publishers of different
types of literature have varying approaches to the selection of texts to be translated.
Those who founded publishing houses because of a personal interest in translation
(such as And Other Stories in the UK) or an interest in different kinds of poetry (such
as Arc Publications in the UK) are more likely to read foreign languages than those
who entered the publishing world from a business perspective.

Škrabec notes (2007: 71) that the end of the German Democratic Republic in
1989 also marked the end of post-war German writing. This type of literature had
been perceived as “academic, serious, and indigestible” (Škrabec 2007: 71), and thus
did not interest foreign publishers. She mentions Günter Grass as the most famous
example of this difficult literature, and because he was a member of the Gruppe 47 at the same time as Bachmann, it is likely that Bachmann’s writing would have been assessed in a similar manner by publishers. This effect is augmented when books are translated: Stuart Evers (2008: n.p.), in a blog post for the *Guardian*, notes that “the perception is that translated works are literary and difficult”. The market for Bachmann’s abstract work in translation thus seems very small.

Financial concerns are a central issue for publishers. Northwestern University Press, the publisher of *Franza* in Filkin’s translation, was seen as a leading university press for works in translation, but reduced its focus on translation for financial reasons, according to its director Donna Shear (cited in Kinzer 2003: n.p.). The idea that German literature is difficult also seems to be shared by translators. Edward Timms (2014: 211) notes that students are often advised by their teachers to divide German sentences when translating them into English in order to avoid sounding too ‘Germanic’. This is presumably also behind Boehm’s and Filkin’s decision to shorten Bachmann’s sentences.

Škrabec observes that the newer German writing that became popular in the US and UK showed American influences such as narrative storytelling (Škrabec 2007: 71). Damrosch and Škrabec thus tell us that North American readers (and therefore also publishers because publishers usually sell the kinds of books that readers want to read) like translated fiction whose content and style show similarities with English-language North American fiction. Charlotte Ryland (2010: 12), the editor of *New Books in German*, calls the British book market “tricky” with regard to its willingness to accept translated German literature. In fact, several of the reviews of German books published in the *New Books in German* magazine and on its website assess the book in terms of the similarities it shows with books originally written in English (see, for example, the review of Angelika Waldis’ novel *Aufräumen; New Books in German* Issue 35 2014: n.p.). Damrosch and Škrabec made their observations in 2003 and 2007 respectively. However, in my view it makes sense to assume that these attitudes to translated fiction were also prevalent, and possibly even more pronounced, during Bachmann’s lifetime because the Second World War led to a period of distrust regarding Germany, and North American
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59 The distrust of Germany is exemplified, for instance, by the existence of US Army bases in Germany for several decades following the end of the war.
readers are thus likely to have shown little interest in German books, known for their “intellectual heft” (Dougherty 2005: n.p.). Laurie Brown, senior vice president for marketing and sales at Harcourt Trade Publishers, summarises US readers’ approach to literature thus: “we’d rather read lines than read between the lines” (cited in Kinzer 2003: n.p.). Bachmann’s writing, as demonstrated in Chapter 3, cannot be understood or enjoyed without reading between the lines.

Damrosch notes that not many translations are published in the United States, and those that are usually conform to American ideas regarding their source culture and are not widely publicised (Damrosch 2003: 18). In the first respect, Damrosch’s observation conforms to Even-Zohar’s statement (1990b: 46) that “the principles of [source text] selection [are never] uncorrelatable with the home co-systems of the target literature”. It is thus evidently often the case that foreign texts published in translation show similarities with the texts produced in the target culture in some way. This is likely to be one of the reasons for the long delay of the English translation of the ‘Todesarten’.

In addition, the Anglo-American literary system is very rigid, and this means that translated literature within this system tends to assume a very peripheral position (Even-Zohar 1990b: 50). When this is the case, the translator has to compose the translation according to models already in existence in the target literary system, and as a result, there is “a greater discrepancy between the equivalence achieved and the adequacy postulated” (Even-Zohar 1990b: 51). ‘Adequacy’ and ‘acceptability’ of translated works are Gideon Toury’s terms (1995: 56-57). An adequate translation conforms to the source culture norms, whereas an acceptable translation conforms to the target system norms.

Filkins, in his translation of *Franza*, clearly composed his text according to conventional models of novels. The explanations of the text which Bachmann provided at public readings in 1966 are integrated into the foreword and thus become part of the fiction instead of remaining as secondary material. The choice to include parts of Bachmann’s speeches is acknowledged by Filkins in his ‘translator’s note’ (Filkins 1999: xxi). Filkins’ choice not to include parts of Bachmann’s manuscript in order to preserve a “sharper focus” and “narrative voice” (ibid: xxiii) means that his translation focuses on acceptability rather than adequacy.

“Cultures in transition tend to look outwards for innovative forces that can transform what is happening at home”, Susan Bassnett suggests (2007: iiiv). As stated
above, Germany was required to make amends after the Second World War to a greater extent than the UK and the US, and was therefore in a more acute state of transition. According to Bassnett’s view, Germany and its politically conscious citizens and writers were thus more willing to look outwards. Power relations between countries, of a political or cultural nature, also influence translation: “the flows of translation depend on the system of power relations between linguistic communities” (Sapiro 2010: 420). What is translated, and how many books are translated, as well as the number of books printed, thus also depends on countries’ alliances, as well as the extent of their influence on the world stage.

There are thus social, financial, historical, political, and stylistic factors that explain the difference of Bachmann’s reception in Germany and the English-speaking world, as well as those that result from the way in which the Anglo-American literary polysystem operates. The fact that Bachmann wrote at a time when Germany and Austria were viewed suspiciously is likely to be one reason for the delay between the original publications and the translations. The abstract nature of Bachmann’s writing as well as the perception of translations as difficult means that her English-speaking audience was always likely to be small and specialist. A translated writer’s popularity in the target culture could be enhanced through publicity campaigns involving, for example, exhibitions, television or radio programmes to contextualise the author and highlight their significance in the source culture, or other efforts. Because the ‘Todesarten’ translations were published by relatively small presses, it is unlikely that they had the financial means to organise or encourage any of these. The male translators’ elimination of precisely those aspects of her work that make it worth reading and provoke discussions about her social, political and literary context, in my view, contributed to the small success of the translations.
4.3.2 The Perception of Bachmann as a Writer

This section examines both the US and UK circumstances as the translations were carried out by North American translators, and published by North American publishers, but also available to British readers. As shown in Chapter 3, the translations of *Malina* and *Franza* lead readers to form an impression of Bachmann that differs from that presented in the German-language reviews, and this is reflected in the reviews. This section discusses the extent to which Bachmann is seen as a different writer in English.

While German-language reviews of Bachmann’s books were easily obtained, it was much more difficult to find English-language reviews of the ‘Todesarten’ translations. The fact that both *Malina* and *Franza/Fanny Goldmann* were still available in their first paperback edition in the US and the UK in early 2014 suggests that Bachmann is less commercially successful in English than she is in German: Suhrkamp was unable to provide sales figures because of company policy (Alexandra Richter: personal correspondence), as was Northwestern (Liz Hamilton: personal correspondence), but *Malina*’s Amazon sales page shows that the 24th edition has been available since 2011. According to Peggy Blamberg at Piper (personal correspondence), in its third edition *Simultan* sold 24,000 copies, and 23,000 in its 11th edition. *Franza* sold 4000 copies in its first edition, 5000 in its third edition, and 7000 in its fifth edition. Other sales figures were not provided, but these numbers nevertheless give an insight into the continuing popularity of Bachmann’s work in Germany. The smaller number of the *Franza* editions and sales are likely to be the result of its fragmentary character and the fact that it was published as a more academic book with several footnotes and editors’ comments in order to explain the order in which the various fragments were assembled.

It is interesting to assess the small amount of attention the English translations received in the UK in the context of “Orwell syndrome”, a term invented by Peter Bush which describes the conviction that foreign-language works are unlikely to present anything of a higher value than British-authored books (Bush 2004: 32). Bush (2004: 41) also notes the nationalist turn in the UK in the 1980s as a reason for the British public’s lack of interest in translations in general. Support for the view that the North American public shares this preference for its own writers’ work is expressed by Taylor (n.d.: n.p.), who states that “few novels are further
removed [than *Malina*] in style, narrative structure and philosophical scope from mainstream American fiction”. It is evident that his audience places importance on a work’s similarities to home-grown literature as he found it necessary specifically to draw readers’ attention to the novel’s dissimilarity to American fiction.

Reviews of Bachmann’s publications in the United States are characterised by three things: the fact that Bachmann was a woman, that she loved language, and that her writing is puzzling and complex in places. Some reviews construct Bachmann as an explicitly foreign author. In addition, the English-language reviews show some similarities with German reviews published in the 1970s. For example, Gabriele Annan (1992: n.p.) in the *New York Review of Books* unquestioningly references the supposed autobiographical nature of Bachmann’s novels and stories. In addition, Annan uses a food metaphor to explain how complex Bachmann’s writing is: “[r]ead [Malina] is like chewing one’s way through a packet of bouillon cubes that need to be diluted before they can be absorbed”. She arrives at this image after the realisation that *Malina* is a “philosopher-poet’s novel, too dense for fiction” (Annan 1992: n.p.). This view is echoed by Filkins (1991: n.p.) who describes *Malina* as “intense” and describes her work as serious literature: “Bachmann carries her readers to the very brink of meaning and expression in this courageous and important novel, which is equal to the best of Virginia Woolf and Samuel Beckett” (Filkins 1991: n.p.). His comparison of Bachmann’s writing to that of Virginia Woolf is echoed by Achberger’s comparison of the significance of these two writers in their own culture (1995: 1; see section 2.1).

It is unclear whether Filkins was already in the process of translating Bachmann’s poems, published as *Songs in flight* in 1994, or *Franza* or *Fanny Goldmann*, which were published in 1999. If he was, it was in his own interest to express a positive view of Bachmann’s work in general as this could potentially mean a greater readership for his own translations. However, if he was not, his longstanding interest in Bachmann suggests that he possessed in-depth knowledge and understanding of her work, so that his views are reliable.

A reviewer in *Library Journal* recommends *Malina* for “collections with holdings in European or women’s literature” (O’Pecko 1990: 112). From these brief quotations it is clear that these reviews are intended to achieve a greater audience for Bachmann’s writing in translation. She is introduced to English-speaking readers in terms of her similarities with famous British authors of canonical works and is thus
presented as part of European literature rather than German-language literature. This activates the review reader’s preconceptions and expectations regarding European literature as a collection of masterpieces and classics (see Damrosch 2003: 15) so that Bachmann’s work will be read in this context. Similarly, presenting her as a woman writer will have influenced potential readers’ expectations, too; they could have, for example, approached Bachmann’s work as ‘Trivialliteratur’ (see section 2.2) or popular women’s fiction (see section 4.1) as these genres are most readily available for categorising writing by women in both German-speaking countries and the US.

While one reviewer criticises the emotional nature of parts of Malina by writing “[t]here is too much lamentation, imprecation, and admonishment; and too often self-pity leaks into the tears of compassion for the world” (Annan 1992: n.p.), another conversely states that although Bachmann “[descends] into hysteria”, she balances this with “miraculous and deeply serious lucidity” (Boyers 2005: 93). Bad is down is a conceptual metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 16), and for this reason descent is interpreted as negative by most people. The use of the idea of descent into hysteria suggests that the reviewer and readers move from a neutral assessment of Bachmann to a negative one. Boyer’s phrasing here thus presents the emotional nature of the text as a negative feature. However, at the same time he also suggests that Bachmann is a serious writer.

Boyers (2005: 92) also expresses surprise that Bachmann did not reach a large American audience despite the “excellent” English translation, but does not present a possible reason for this. Filkins (1991: n.p.) describes Boehm’s translation as “capable”. While this seems like a positive adjective in general use, the fact that there are other more enthusiastic words Filkins could have used to evaluate Boehm’s translation, such as “lucid”, chosen by Franklin (2000: 41) in her review of Filkins’ own translation, indicates a negative view of the translation. A ‘capable’ translation suggests one that brings across a minimum of the source text’s features.

Shannon, in The Germanic Review, addresses the challenges of translating Bachmann’s poetry. He notes the esteem in which she was held in Austria and Germany, and refers to the fact that the first English translation of a volume of poetry was carried out by Mark Anderson, who also translated Thomas Bernhard. Referring to a famous male Austrian author can be seen as a device to lend credibility to Bachmann. Shannon expresses the view that neither Filkins nor Friedberg succeed in
bringing the double or triple meanings of Bachmann’s poetry across (Shannon 2007: 294). As discussed in Chapter 3, Boehm’s translation of *Malina* especially does not recreate the multiple meanings of Bachmann’s prose. It is possible that Bachmann in translation is not challenging or interesting enough for the reader because there are fewer messages to decode. At the same time, her subject matter is highly abstract, and this requires the reader to work. However, without a similar extent of language games, the target text reader does not experience the reward that would justify the effort of interpreting the text, to use a view taken from Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 261-262).  

Several reviews of Bachmann’s prose works cite Peter Filkins, the North-American translator of her collected poems, as an authority on her work. This appears to be an attempt to give Bachmann a frame of reference for the benefit of American readers of the reviews. No well-known German-language literary figures are used in order to lend Bachmann authority as presumably they would not carry the same weight outside Europe, or the reviewers themselves were unaware of them. Filkins was not the first American Bachmann translator; however, as his translations encompass all of Bachmann’s poems, including those not published during her lifetime, the scale of his work demonstrates to American readers that Bachmann is worth reading: if she had been an unknown poet who wrote mediocre poetry, it is unlikely that the entirety of her opus would have been made available to English-speaking readers. The references to Filkins’ translation in reviews of Bachmann’s prose works thus function as an assurance that she is already established in the North-American literary system. This view is confirmed by Beard and Garvey’s statement that reviews influence readers’ expectations of a translation (Beard and Garvey 2004: 4). The majority of English-language reviews would lead the reader to expect difficult texts, but also the rewards of high quality literature.

Although American reviews of the ‘Todesarten’ translations purport to evaluate one, and occasionally two, publications, in-text references to the specific
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60 The first Principle of Relevance is that “human cognition tends to be geared to the maximisation of relevance, […] cognitive resources tend to be allocated to the processing of the most relevant inputs available” (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 261).

61 However, both Marjorie Perloff and Sara Lennox are not convinced of the quality of Filkins’ poetry translations. Perloff (1996: 265) calls Filkins’ translations “unreliable” while Lennox (2007: 28) expresses the view that he displays insufficient knowledge of German and makes several “significant errors”.
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texts that prompted the review are usually brief as the reviews give a sweeping overview of Bachmann’s entire prose oeuvre. This is the case in Annan (1992), Taylor (n.d.), Boyers (2005), Franklin (2000) and the reviews in Publishers Weekly (1991 and 1999) and Review of Contemporary Fiction (2000). As Bachmann is less well-known in English-speaking countries, this is necessary because readers of these reviews are unlikely to have prior knowledge of her work. The translations are not evaluated in great detail. The reviews thus appear to have been written with the aim of introducing an English-language readership to Bachmann, and the publication of a new translation merely presents an occasion to write about Bachmann in a public forum. The fact that these reviews mostly express positive appraisals of her work suggests that the reviews constitute attempts to garner more attention for Bachmann’s work in the English-speaking world. An overview of her life story is always included and mentions the key reference points of, firstly, the Second World War, thereby allowing the reader to contextualise Bachmann historically and ideologically, and, secondly, her tragic death, adding a smidgeon of human interest and mystery.

Both German and English-language reviews construct Malina as mystery fiction in two ways. By referencing Ich’s possible murder, the reader is primed to approach the novel as an example of crime fiction; in addition to this, the reader is encouraged to find potential autobiographical elements in the novel as if the ‘real’ Bachmann was somehow hidden in her writing to be discovered by the most diligent detective. Both of these factors, in my opinion, serve to intrigue potential buyers of the novel. This latter way of reading Bachmann is promoted through reviewers’ frequent juxtaposition of Bachmann’s personal life with aspects of the novel such as the author’s fire-related death and frequent references to fire in the novel or her erratic style, Ich’s mental instability and speculations regarding the possibility that Bachmann intended to commit suicide. This focus on Bachmann as a phenomenon rather than on the novel itself is also exhibited by many German reviews. Hotz (1990: 156) notes that Malina could be read only as a Bachmann novel rather than as a novel in its own right because the discourse around its publication was concerned less with the novel itself than with the author and her image. This also partly applies to the effect of publication of Simultan: the book’s dust jacket and newspaper advertisements (e.g. in weekly newspaper Die Zeit [The Time] on 8 September 1972) bore the author’s pensive face and the announcement “Die neue Bachmann” [The
new Bachmann] (Hotz 1990: 157). The definite article ‘die’ refers to a grammatically feminine subject and thus does not denote the book. It could potentially refer to ‘publication’ as ‘Erscheinung’ and ‘Veröffentlichung’ are both feminine nouns whose relevance the reader could infer here, but in combination with Bachmann’s photo, the text is more likely to refer to the author herself, so that Simultan, too, will be read in the context of the author’s persona, history and previous work. This kind of advertising strategy is likely to make readers think that they will learn more about Bachmann as a person by reading her book. English-language readers are less likely to have recognised Bachmann in photographs and to be aware of the details of her personal life, so they probably would not have approached her texts keen to investigate.

Some reviewers posit the idea that Bachmann’s work belongs to a type of literature which is rooted in its geographical and literary environment. Taylor (n.d.: n.p.), for example, seeks the reason for Malina’s lack of success in the United States in the fact that its style, structure and philosophical scope differ greatly from mainstream American fiction (although he does not state what he sees as mainstream American fiction). Similarly, Deneau (1988: 327) states that “[t]he praise which Bachmann has received in the German-speaking world suggests to me that there are still pronounced differences in taste on different sides of the Atlantic”. In an article on the ways in which texts position the reader Stockwell (2013: 269) highlights the fact that (presumably English-speaking) readers prefer texts with a clear plot and structure. Malina exhibits neither of these and as a result is likely to confound the expectations of its English-speaking readers.

Another characteristic of English-language reviews of Bachmann’s work is the emphasis on her Austrian heritage. She is on occasion constructed as a specifically Austrian writer; Malina, for example, is supposedly “as manylayered as a strudel”, while Ich’s language is described as having “a particular charm” thanks to its “Viennese inflection” (Annan 1992: n.p.). While the strudel comparison is likely to have been used for a humorous effect, these two examples nevertheless suggest a somewhat quaint and reductive view of Austria: even people who do not possess a great deal of knowledge about Austria would probably know of strudel and its origins and might imagine the creation of desserts as one of the country’s great achievements, disregarding its history or association with important philosophers.
It also suggests a lack of insight into Bachmann’s work: while Vienna, its people and the dialect play a role in her prose texts, Bachmann was critical of the Austria of strudel as this surely represents complacency and an insistence on old values. This is clear in several of her poems, especially ‘Früher Mittag’ [Early Noon] in which she contrasts references to old Austrian and German culture (e.g. Lieder) with the aftermath of the war. Taylor (n.d: n.p.) recognises that Bachmann’s “idiosyncratic style” is motivated by her attempt to use language in a way not contaminated by the Nazis and thus recognises her political motivation.
4.4 How did the English Reception Differ from the German Reception?

In some respects, English-language reviews of Bachmann’s works do not differ from those published in German in the early 1970s in that they point out Bachmann’s unusual style and the complexity of *Malina*. A reviewer of Michael Bullock’s translation of *The Thirtieth Year* misunderstands most of the stories of Bachmann’s first collection of prose texts and calls Bachmann’s writing “nearly unreadable”, “tedious”, “not memorable”. However, the fact that he points out that Bachmann “prefers male protagonists” (Deneau 1988: 326) suggests that he is not very familiar with the author’s work as he would know, if he had read *Simultan*, to which he briefly refers, that most of Bachmann’s other prose texts centre around a female protagonist.

On the whole, the English reviews contain fewer references to Gruppe 47 and other German and Austrian cultural institutions, presumably because target text readers’ unfamiliarity with them would be more likely to lead to confusion than to an appreciation of this contextualisation. The members of the Gruppe 47 were a part of the German-language literary polysystem and played a role in developing its norms. Reference to the group in reviews thus demonstrates the canonical status enjoyed by Bachmann as a poet. However, because the group has no influence on the Anglo-American literary system, reference to it is mostly superfluous. Bachmann thus did not enter the Anglo-American polysystem as part of a group of writers, but as a single author.

A reviewer calls the writing of *Three Paths to the Lake* “bold, experimental, even subversive” (Slocum Hinerfeld 1990: n.p.). While in this particular instance the translator’s responsibility for the specific achievements cited here is not mentioned, this review is also the only one I have been able to find that highlights the translator’s involvement in the production of the English-language text in general. Albeit briefly, the review praises Gilbert’s skill.

Simone de Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex* is mentioned in section 3.5 in the context of its male translator’s drastic intervention in the text. The book has another factor in common with Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’: von Flotow (2011: 152) notes that the American and Canadian reception of *The Second Sex* was more positive than its French reception. British and American reviews of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ do not display the personal attacks that marked the German reviews in the 1970s, so they
are generally more positive. A possible reason for this might be that volumes of her poetry and prose were all published in translation within two decades (1986-2006), and three of them within four years. While translations of selected poems were published in American and British journals or poetry anthologies as early as 1959 (Jerome Rothenberg’s translation of ‘Die gestundete Zeit’ [Mortgaged Time] and ‘Curriculum Vitae’ in New Young German Poets), the first book-length translation of Bachmann’s poetry was Mark Anderson’s In the Storm of Roses in 1986. Mary Fran Gilbert’s translation of Simultan followed only three years later, so that English-speaking readers were introduced to Bachmann’s work in a different way to German-language readers, who would have been aware of the ten-year gap between the second poetry collection and the first story collection Das dreißigste Jahr [The Thirtieth Year]. Showalter (1985: 6) notes that literary misogyny had become unacceptable by the mid-1980s, so it is also possible that the translations benefited from this with regard to how they were received by critics.
4.5 Are the Differences in Reception and Style the Result of Gender?

To some extent, this chapter should be seen as the counterpart to Chapter 2. While Chapter 2 discusses Ingeborg Bachmann’s evaluation as a person by German-language critics following the publication of Malina, Chapter 4 has demonstrated the multiple ways in which Bachmann’s Anglo-American reception was different. In addition to this, Chapter 4 also examines the style of emotion in Malina in the context of the criticism levelled at Bachmann, and the Anglo-American literary polysystem. The results of the stylistic comparison in Chapter 3 are intended to be seen in the context of these differences in reception.

I have carried out these comparisons because Bachmann was a woman whose writing has been predominantly translated by men. Her prose texts, especially Malina, in my view can be called proto-feminist because they exhibit traits, such as first-person narrative, autobiography, father-daughter relationships, separation, and illness, several years before German-language women writers turned their attention to them (see Chapter 2). At the same time, Bachmann’s treatment of these themes is more advanced and abstract than that of the writers whose texts were published after Malina. The silencing of women’s voices is another concern explored by Bachmann, and in fact central to the ‘Todesarten’. Translators have the power to silence aspects of a text by not translating them, or by reducing stylistic nuances such as extended metaphors. I argue in Chapter 3 that this is the case in the translations carried out by Peter Filkins and Philip Boehm.

In this chapter, it has been my intention to show that the political and literary context of Bachmann’s years of production created a unique set of circumstances for her reception in the German-speaking territories. Her English translations were published almost two decades later, and the developments that happened in the UK and US, particularly those resulting from the feminist movement, mean that the target texts were received by a system that was significantly different. Several factors relating to the Anglo-American literary polysystem mean that the reception of the target texts was always likely to be limited. These are publishing conventions in the US, the small extent to which translations are accepted by publishers and the market, attitudes to German-language cultural items, reader expectations of both translated and German literature as difficult, as well as the fact that Bachmann was not well-known.
New material from Bachmann’s estate is published every few years. Most recently this was *Herzzeit* (2008) [*Correspondence*; 2010], her correspondence with Paul Celan, and her *Kriegstagebuch* (2010) [*War Diary*; 2011]. Both of these were also published in English translation by Wieland Hoban and Michael Mitchell, respectively. As a result, Anglo-American audiences now have increasing access to information about Bachmann’s life. Bachmann’s texts are difficult to appreciate without contextual information. While the usefulness of this information is limited in stylistic analysis, understanding Bachmann’s political context can help to elucidate, for example, her idea of ‘die Krankheit unserer Zeit’ [the disease of our time]. Assembling the different aspects of Bachmann’s writing leads to a greater reward for the reader.

As the second-wave feminist movement experienced its most intense phase before the publication of the translations, and because of the different political climate, I have to conclude that Bachmann’s texts did not hit the same nerve with English-speaking audiences. She fulfilled a particular role in German literature (as discussed in section 4.2.1), and this position did not exist for her in English. While the German reviews construct Bachmann as a woman, the English reviews tend to present her as Austrian. As a number of feminist writers and critics had become well-known in the US and Canada by the time the translations were published, I hypothesise that an Austrian writer was more exotic than a female writer at this point, whereas in Germany and Austria of the early 1970s, women writers were still rare.

It would appear essentialist to assume that men and women translate in inherently different ways. The stylistic comparison has shown differences between Filkins’ and Boehm’s strategies on the one hand, and Gilbert’s on the other. The male translators’ choices show parallels with criticisms levelled at Bachmann’s writing by German critics. The reasons for these parallels are not clear at present, but there are several possibilities which can be explored in further research. Boehm and Filkins could have been influenced by a subconscious wish to ‘improve’ Bachmann’s writing; support for this hypothesis is present in Filkins’ ‘translator’s note’ [no capitals in original]. Bachmann in English appears less emotional in Filkins’ and Boehm’s translations. The ways in which these target texts differ from their source texts thus demonstrate the translators’ interventions. The differences between the source and target texts that I ascribe to the translators’ choices can be summarised as
‘less emotional’ and ‘more rational’, and as these correspond to ways in which women’s participation in society and literature has been limited as well as to the concerns of feminist critics, it was imperative to contrast source and target text style from a feminist perspective.

In Chapter 5, I consider the conclusions I have arrived at as the result of the comparison of source and target text reception and style in order to provide support for my hypothesis that male translators would intervene in the target text to a greater extent than the female translator, and that this is likely to be the result of the way in which German critics presented Bachmann. In addition, I draw conclusions regarding the appropriateness of a case study methodology, traditionally used in the social sciences, for this type of analysis.
Chapter 5: Transposing Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ into the 21st Century: How this Case Study Illustrates the Effect of Gender on Translation

In this thesis, I discuss the link between the male translators’ stylistic choices and the criticism of Bachmann’s prose expressed by German-language male literary critics after the publication of her novel *Malina* in 1971. The final chapter concludes that Bachmann’s male translators, Philip Boehm and Peter Filkins, reduce the aspects of *Malina* and *Franza* that could be seen as literary women’s language, and that Mary Fran Gilbert preserves these aspects to a greater extent in *Three Paths to the Lake*. In addition, I compare the advantages and disadvantages of a case study methodology that involves stylistic analysis for the investigation of the role of the author’s and translators’ gender in translation.
5.1 The Thesis Questions and Methodology

This thesis has contrasted the German (in Chapter 2) and Anglo-American (in Chapter 4) reception of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts and compared the style of the German and English texts (in Chapter 3). The aim of these comparisons, as stated in section 1.1, was to find answers to the following research questions, included here to remind the reader:

1) Can the source and target texts be seen as women’s writing? Is the voice in the source and target texts gendered? How can women’s writing and women’s language be defined? These questions were examined in the context of German-language writing in Chapter 2.

2) How do the two male translators, Philip Boehm and Peter Filkins, and one female translator, Mary Fran Gilbert, transform the style of the texts written by Ingeborg Bachmann? This was examined in Chapter 3.

3) What is the effect of Bachmann’s gender on the translations? The reception of the translations was examined in Chapter 4.

The findings of my analyses give rise to a fourth question:

4) Does the translators’ gender influence the ways in which they understand and translate the texts?

In the present chapter, I draw conclusions about the role of the translators’ genders in the translation of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts and thus answer the question posed in section 4.5. as to whether the translators’ genders provide an explanation for their different stylistic choices. It is important to remember that my approach does not assume that women and men are biologically predisposed to selecting different translation strategies. Moi (1985: 154) warns that examinations of sex differences in language start from an understanding of masculinity and femininity as “stable, unchanging essences, as meaningful presences between which the elusive difference is supposed to be located”. Furthermore, according to Judith Butler (1986: 35), we cannot refer meaningfully to “natural or unnatural gendered behaviour”. Many studies (for example, Lakoff 1975; Maltz and Borker 1982; Coates and Cameron
1988; Tannen 1993, 1994, 1995; Holmes and Meyerhoff 2003; Speer 2005) have attempted to pinpoint how women and men use language in order to locate specific differences. An analysis such as the one presented in this thesis might at first appear essentialist. While the differences found by sociolinguists in conversational behaviour motivated me to think about the role of the translator in terms of power, my approach to gender is different: I come to the conclusion that the translator’s gender is created by her/his cognitive context. This means that the construction of gender is situation-dependent and influenced by the translator’s world knowledge and previous reading.

There are multiple ways in which translations and translators’ choices can be analysed, both qualitative and quantitative. Case studies are predominantly used in the social sciences and are relatively unusual in literary studies; the most closely related field in which they have seen some limited use is applied linguistics (see, for example, Duff 2008). Corpus analysis (e.g. Saldanha 2003) initially appears to be a useful way reliably to determine differences in language used by women and men, but in my opinion this method can only be applied in limited circumstances as it is unlikely to provide detailed and wide-ranging conclusions that would result in practical application and meaningful impact. Corpus analysis is used to an increasing extent in stylistics and can give valuable insights into attitudes conveyed in texts through the analysis of correlations. However, Archer (2007: 256) reaches the conclusion that “human interpretation is still crucial” in the development and interpretation of corpus studies.

The question of whether women and men translate differently seems fundamental because translators control a text’s passage into another culture; they have the power to alter the text, and consequently the way in which it and its author are perceived by the target text audience. The first attempts to develop a methodology for the assessment of gender in translation were made at the beginning of the 21st century. Gabriela Saldanha’s focus (2003) on gendered linguistic features

---

62 One example of this was Matt Davies’ presentation at the 2013 conference of the Poetics and Linguistics Association. His analysis of semantic categories showed “othering strategies” (Davies 2014: 21) in the representation of trade union members in the British press. The key terms ‘militant’ and ‘militancy’ were used more frequently in discussions of manual labour union activists than in those of public sector workers, and Davies linked this with the phenomenon of ‘the demonisation of the working class’ highlighted by, for example, Owen Jones (2011; see Davies 2014 for a summary of some of these findings).
favoured a corpus linguistics approach, and because quantitative analysis is the norm in scientific research, it appears more immune to bias and falsification than qualitative methods.

Donald Freeman (1970: 3) stated that if analyses of frequency distributions of particular linguistic features of discourse were possible, “they would constitute no revealing insight into either natural language or style”. Computer-assisted methods of analysis have developed immensely since 1970, but the question of insight into style still stands. Michaela Mahlberg and Dan McIntyre (2011: 205), in an article intended to prove Freeman wrong, argue that “a qualitative approach [...] should be a crucial part of stylistic analysis”. Geoffrey Leech and Mick Short (2007: 2) note that it is difficult to perform an exhaustive stylistic analysis of all features of a prose text because of the length of the text. Mahlberg and McIntyre (2011: 206) present corpus analysis as a solution to this problem as this method can help in selecting passages for qualitative study. It therefore appears that a combination of corpus and qualitative analyses has many benefits.

However, the selection of passages for further investigation is a function that can also be fulfilled by the comparison of a text with its translation: the points at which source and target text diverge are usually instances of a high concentration of stylistic features (Boase-Beier 2011: 139) and therefore give insight into the text’s key message, or they constitute exploitation of the source language ‘loopholes’ (see Parks 2007: 55), and therefore also deeper meaning. The relevance of the convergence of stylistic features to the question of the translators’ gender is explained more fully in section 5.3. It is thus not only the case that stylistic awareness is of benefit to the composition and analysis of translations, but the involvement of translations can also aid the development of stylistic methods of text analysis. Furthermore, in my opinion, corpus analysis is not necessarily useful in all circumstances. It tends to focus on repetitive patterns (Nørgaard, Busse and Montoro 2010: 9), and although repetition is significant in the case of Ich’s use of ‘glücklich’ in Malina (examples (1) and (2) in section 3.3), this is not usually the most significant aspect of style in Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’. The ‘Todesarten’ communicate their message through a combination of politics, philosophy, metaphor, ambiguity, iconicity, and transitivity. While the ironic use of vision-related words in
‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ [‘Eyes to Wonder’] could potentially be noticed by analytic software such as WMMatrix, its full significance in the context of Bachmann’s ‘Krankheit unserer Zeit’ [disease of our time] and women’s suffering can only be reconstructed in person.

Support for my position can be found in Moi’s suggestion that conclusions regarding sex differences in language cannot be reached by analysing isolated fragments, such as single sentences, but that it is necessary to study a text’s “ideological, political and psychoanalytical articulations, its relations to society, with the psyche and – not least – with other texts” (1985: 155). This is what this case study does. In my view, studying linguistic patterns in isolation is unlikely to allow useful conclusions to be drawn as this approach often ignores the fact that the purpose of literary language is not solely communicative. Literary language has the potential to evoke feelings in the reader. Bachmann believed in “Kunst als Veränderndes” (“art as a force for change”; Achberger 1991: 8), the idea that literature should bring about social change. This productive aspect of literary language cannot be fully explored through corpus analysis alone. (See also my discussion of Mary Hiatt’s computer-based analysis of fiction and non-fiction in section 1.7.)

Hiroko Furukawa (2012) develops a methodology that involves quantitative analysis of sentence-final particles denoting femininity in a case study of selected Japanese translations of English-language novels. While the statistical analysis of the occurrence of particles expressing varying degrees of femininity clearly demonstrates the involvement of the translators, the qualitative approach in the form of the case study allows greater insight into the texts’ contexts and nuances and the historical context of women’s language in Japan. The existence of a variety of sentence-final particles lends itself to quantitative analysis and is not paralleled in German or English. Nevertheless, Furukawa’s theoretical background demonstrates the value of stylistic theories for the analysis of gender in translation. She notes (ibid.: 234) that it is imperative that translators pay attention to implied meanings in the source text, and this is also my conclusion. It is evident that stylistics provides a useful set of tools for the analysis of gendered language use in translation. As demonstrated in
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63 Louw (1993) successfully used WMMatrix to elucidate how irony is conveyed in David Lodge’s novel Small World.
Chapter 3, Mary Fran Gilbert appears more receptive to implied meanings in Bachmann’s texts than Philip Boehm and Peter Filkins.

Leonardi and Federici (2012: 185) identify a gap between theory and practice in feminist translation studies. Case studies let us identify trends in translators’ behaviour. While it is not advisable to extrapolate from individual case studies because of their individual nature and circumstances, an increasing number of case studies of gender in translation will eventually allow more general conclusions to be drawn. The conclusions of my stylistic analysis show parallels with Leonardi’s (2007) finding that transitivity is altered in translation. Furthermore, Furukawa advocates for the benefits of knowledge of stylistic theories (2012). I demonstrate in Chapter 3 that stylistic analysis is not only a useful way of approaching one text, but that this type of comparison allows insights into both source and target text that would otherwise have been unlikely to be reached. The strength of a case study lies in the fact that it can take into account many factors of the life of a text, such as the author’s environment and the reception of the texts themselves as well as translations in general. This approach gives a rounded picture of the multiple facets in which the author’s gender and the translator’s gender influence translation choices.

Stylistic analyses, because they involve looking for “patterns in the relationship between the translation and the original text” (Malmkjer 2004: 20), deal with specific features of a text and as a result seem more tangible. Stylistic analysis is definitely of benefit to feminist criticism:

The overriding task of an intellectually vigorous feminist criticism […] must be to school itself in rigorous methods for analyzing style and image and then without preconception or preconceived conclusions to apply those methodologies to individual works. Only then will we be able to train our students, and our colleagues, to read women writers properly, with greater appreciation for their individual aims and particular achievements. (Kolodny 1975: 87)

Kolodny’s reference to “preconception” and “preconceived conclusions” indicates the opinion that stylistic analysis is more neutral than other research methods. Kolodny wrote in 1975, and at that time a view of the researcher as neutral was common. However, it is now assumed that the person who carries out an analysis is
subject to biases and preconceptions that can influence the findings. Nevertheless, although Kolodny wrote almost 40 years ago, her view is still relevant. She seems to suggest that stylistic analysis is the key to a proper understanding of feminist literature, and this is borne out by my stylistic analysis of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts. The example of Bachmann’s reception demonstrates that Kolodny’s endorsement of stylistic analysis is right: Malina did not convince the critics because most of them failed to notice the significance of its style. There was thus no appreciation for Bachmann’s aims and achievements. If more attention had been paid to Bachmann’s political style, German and Austrian society could have benefited from her example of Holocaust remembrance, for example, as stylistic analysis allows access to Bachmann’s view of the role of fascism in society.
5.2 Women’s Language in Source and Target Texts

In order to answer question 4) about the influence of the translators’ gender, we need to think about the role of gender in the source texts. The answers to the questions listed under 1) are arrived at through the stylistic analysis of the source and target texts themselves, as well as comparison of their reviews. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to identify a universal ‘women’s language’. The term can be used to describe features that have been shown in empirical studies to be primarily used by women. As I did not carry out a quantitative study, it has not been my aim to count how many times women writers use certain types of words or expressions, but rather to consider the reader’s experience of the text. This thesis looks at texts composed in the second half of the 20th century in German, and my conclusion with regard to women’s language only applies to these circumstances. Sociolinguists have worked towards recognising gendered behaviour in conversations, and the aspect of their work that is useful for this thesis lies in their detailing of the production of power differences in communication.

My interpretation of language used by women in fiction is based on Judith Butler’s understanding of gender as performance. Writers construct texts, and their performance is their construction of the text. The reader’s interpretation of the text adds another facet to the performance of gender: it obviously cannot be determined by the author, even if it can perhaps be influenced, but the reader’s cognitive context has some bearing on which aspects of the author’s gender performance are interpreted as significant, or whether they are seen as significant at all.

The stylistic analysis of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ and the overview of feminist women’s writing of the 1970s bring me to the conclusion that Bachmann’s writing shares a common language with the writers who followed her. Content and style are interrelated, as demonstrated by stylisticians (e.g. Boase-Beier 2006; Boase-Beier 2011: 12). In the case of feminist writers, the radical departure from previous formal norms necessitates a different way of structuring texts, and this is achieved through the link between style and content. I suggest that what unites German-language feminist writing is its political motivation, its opposition to rationality, and its coherence in style. It does not display an immediately obvious logical order according to content, subject matter, or time. Its style and content are inextricably linked: it is not literature about certain topics that exhibits a certain style unrelated to
the subject matter of the text, but rather it is writing that makes its subject matter clear through its style. Texts that might appear disorganised at first sight are structured by extended metaphors and recurring ambiguities as well as the exploitation of transitivity structures.

Women’s language in Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts is characterised by a nexus of style, content, and politics. It is important to remember that ‘writer’ here does not refer to the actual physical person who interacts with the world, but rather the writer as inferred by the reader, the extra-fictional voice. The writer as a person performs gender in her/his own ways, but I am concerned with the textual manifestation of gender that is at least partly independent of this.

Following the analysis of numerous German-language reviews from the 1970s and early 1980s, it is clear that Bachmann’s gender was a constant subject of discussion. There are parallels between aspects of the texts criticised by reviewers and the male translators’ choices. The most striking of these is the perceived emotional nature of Malina. Several reviews referred to the novel as, for example, “neurotic” (Weber 1975: 17).

A crucial omission by Boehm in his translation of Malina, discussed in section 3.6.2, is revisited here in the light of question 4). Boehm omits the sentence that, in my interpretation, represents the pinnacle of Ich’s emotional outbursts: “denn ich verliere den Verstand, es kommt über mich, ich verliere den Verstand, ich bin ohne Trost, ich werde wahnsinnig” [for I am losing my mind, I am overcome, I am losing my mind, I have no consolation, I am going insane] (Bachmann 1995: 204). This is difficult to translate. The second phrase in particular, the only impersonal formulation, contributes to the distress portrayed as it suggests a wave of despair overcoming Ich. Translated literally, it means ‘it is overcoming me’, but there is no referent for ‘es/it’, which amplifies the impression of an ominous threat. This is also McMurtry’s view with regard to the use of ‘es’ in an untitled poetic draft (Bachmann 2000: 135): “the impersonal pronoun, ‘es’, serves as an elusive cipher for that which cannot be articulated directly” (McMurtry 2012: 40). ‘Ich bin ohne Trost’ is also difficult to translate into English because it means ‘I am without consolation’, which suggests a hopeless state of existence.64

64 ‘Trost’ is related to the English word ‘trust’, and in this sense ‘Augentrost’ [literally: eye-consolation], the name of a flower, is used by Celan in his poem ‘Todtnauberg’ (1970),
It is unclear why Boehm omitted this passage, but it certainly leaves a gap in the target text, and the parallel with the criticism of the novel suggests a wish to ‘improve’ Bachmann’s writing or a subconscious rejection of her style. It is impossible to say for certain exactly what caused the omission. In personal correspondence, Boehm stated that he was under pressure of time, and that he did not have the extent of editorial support that he would have found ideal, especially considering that *Malina* was “essentially [his] first [book]”. He also highlighted the importance of a bilingual editor.

Emotion and style are discussed in detail in section 4.2, where I also address textual involvement strategies (Burke 2011: 120). Involvement strategies affect the reader’s state of mind, and the terminology suggests that these strategies aid the reader’s engagement with the text. In my view, it is worth considering whether certain textual features, perhaps in combination with specific subject matter, lead to the reader’s rejection of the text and a refusal to engage with it. According to my analysis, Boehm does not appear to have engaged with the text very deeply. Further research is needed in order to understand the specific effects of involvement strategies on readers who are reluctant to engage with a text. This research would ascertain whether there are stylistic strategies exhibited by specific types of texts that are rejected by specific types of readers.

The German critics’ reaction is explained in Chapter 2 in the context of the political and social developments in Germany and Austria after the Second World War, and the particular role Bachmann occupied as their societies moved from right-wing ideology towards socialist leanings. It is unlikely that male authors would have been treated with a similarly paternalistic attitude.

Reception and text overlap in the paratext. The role of paratext, peritext and epitext is discussed in Chapter 2. These are not strictly speaking part of the text itself, but are treated in this thesis as the place where text and reception meet; they are a

written after his meeting with Heidegger in Todtnauberg. His poem ‘Herbst’ (published posthumously in 1986) also contains the word in the line “Doch Wimper und Lid vermissen den Augentrost”. According to Bambach (2013: 220), the flower holds significance for Celan with regard to his experiences in a Moldavian work-camp. Ich’s outburst seems to represent another instance of the writers’ ‘poetische Korrespondenzen’ [poetic correspondence] (Böschenstein and Weigel 1997; Weigel 2003: 410). There are many allusions to both Celan himself and his work in Bachmann’s poetry and prose.
liminal space (Genette 1997: 2). The paratext of the German editions of *Malina* presents the text as intrinsically connected with the author whose face appears on the cover of several editions. This is also how most of the initial reviews treated the novel: many reviewers seemed to understand Ich as a direct and autobiographical representation of Bachmann. The paratexts of *Malina* and *Franza*, discussed in section 2.8 and 2.9, include Anderson’s afterword and Boehm’s translator’s note in *Malina* and Filkins’ introduction in *Franza*. Revisited in the light of question 4), we can observe a difference between the paratexts of the works translated by male and female translators. Gilbert and Friedman are not given the opportunity to speak, whereas Anderson and Filkins are (see section 5.3). It would be interesting if a quantitative study of fore- and afterwords in books by male and female authors and translators were carried out to investigate if there are any differences with regard to who explains the text, and whose text is seen to require explanation. In addition, applying sociological methods of analysis of, for example, use of public spaces to the study of paratexts could potentially open up new avenues of evaluation by allowing a link between paratexts and power.

Evaluations of Bachmann’s prose from 1971 to 1984 were characterised by a concern with the following “loci of traditional author-centred criticism” (Burke’s term; 2004: 4) as explained in Chapter 2: her intentions for the ‘Todesarten’, her position as a literary authority prior to the publication of *Malina* in 1971, biographical details, accountability for her demeanour at public readings and during the Frankfurt Poetics lectures, the understanding of her oeuvre as disjointed, and interpretations of her work as autobiographical. I refer to cognitive poetic theories of the extra-fictional voice (Stockwell 2002) and the inferred author (e.g. Boase-Beier 2006) to show the limitations that these loci place on understandings of Bachmann’s work. The fact that Bachmann was a woman in my view considerably affected these evaluations. For example, logically, an author’s behaviour at readings should not play a role in assessments of her work because it is not significant for her writing skills.

The position of translations and German-language literature in the Anglo-American literary polysystem meant that the conditions of the reception of the ‘Todesarten’ translations differed greatly from the environment into which the source texts were introduced (see Chapter 4). The source text and target text receptions necessarily had to be different. The translations of Bachmann’s texts are presented in
reviews as European Literature or specifically Austrian literature. This is occasionally achieved through the use of metaphors, such as Annan’s (1992: n.p.) description of Bachmann’s writing as “as manylayered as a strudel”. Malina in English is evidently not received as women’s writing, but rather as foreign literature. The reason for this is either the fact that the translation has eliminated much of what I term ‘women’s language’ above, or the prioritising of the text’s foreignness over its content and political message.
5.3 How the Translators Transform the ‘Todesarten’ Style

To revisit question 2) above, it is clear that Filkins’ and Boehm’s approach to Bachmann’s style differs from Gilbert’s. This realisation is relevant for question 4) about the effect of the translators’ gender on their choices. Bachmann’s wordplay and ambiguity, imagery, use of transitivity, and iconicity play a crucial role with regard to structuring the texts and her formulation of her political ideas, and Boehm does not entirely recreate these in Malina. These stylistic devices are essential components of the source text because they create its internal cohesion and allow insights into Bachmann’s feminist ideas. Even her wordplay does not merely serve to amuse the reader, but makes a profound point about women’s oppression. Because of the reduction of stylistic detail, Malina in English is not the ground-breaking proto-feminist work it is in German. Filkins has reduced the complexity of Franza in order to make it easier to read. He does not seem to have realised that Bachmann’s seemingly chaotic narrative fulfils an iconic function (see section 3.8): the reader’s need to re-read sentences, in my opinion, represents both the requirement for vigilance in society after the Second World War and the need to return to previous certainties or to find new ones in order to allow the right kind of new beginning. Bachmann demands constant questioning and can be seen to express distrust of easy interpretations. In this sense, Bachmann’s style is political, but the target text reader is not given the opportunity to embark on this path of interpretation. This means that the essence of Bachmann’s poetic vision is obscured:


[For the writer, history is indispensable. One cannot write when one does not take into account all of the socio-historical interrelations that have led to our today.]

‘Heute’, today, occupies a specific place in Bachmann’s work. It is stated as the setting of Malina at the beginning of the novel. Following my stylistic analysis and
examination of Bachmann’s thoughts in the context of the 20th-century philosophy that influenced her, I argue that ‘today’ in the ‘Todesarten’ is a moment of crisis. Bachmann’s concept of ‘today’ can be equated with ‘Stunde Null’ [zero hour], the beginning from nothing after the end of the Second World War. Imre Kertész explains the requirement for this new beginning in his literature Nobel Prize acceptance speech:

What I discovered in Auschwitz is the human condition, the end point of a great adventure, where the European traveler arrived after his two-thousand-year-old moral and cultural history. (Cited in Franklin 2011: 122)

This viewpoint suggests that European history, literature, political thought, all aspects of culture and society over the course of the past two thousand years led to the Holocaust. The atrocities committed by Germans between 1933 and 1945 are presented as an inevitable outcome. This perspective is also central to Daniel Goldhagen’s 1996 book Hitler’s Willing Executioners. It is clear, in my assessment, that Bachmann shared this understanding of the Second World War because her writing is grappling with the forms that a new beginning might take.

Ich, Franza, and the women in the Simultan stories find themselves in unliveable circumstances. The post-war era in the German-speaking territories is seen as a fundamental crisis of humankind (see Pajević 2014a: 106, for example), and Bachmann attempts in her writing to locate the origin of this crisis. McMurtry (2012: 2) argues that Bachmann’s previously unpublished poetic drafts (Ich weiß keine bessere Welt) take her own suffering as a point of departure for social and cultural critique, and that she achieves this in the ‘Todesarten’. This is especially clearly exemplified in the poetic draft entitled ‘Nach vielen Jahren’, presented here together with my gloss and Peter Fikins’ translation (Filkins 2006: 432-435).

Nach vielen Jahren
after many years
nach viel erfahrenem Unrecht,
after much experienced injustice
beispiellosen Verbrechen rundum,
example-less crimes all-around
und Unrecht, vor dem nach Recht
and injustice before which after justice
schreien sinnlos wird.
to-scream senseless becomes

Nach vielen Jahren erst, alles
after many years only everything
gewußt, alles erfahren,
known everything experienced/learnt
alles bekannt, geordnet, gebucht,
everything known ordered taken-into-account
jetzt erst geh ich da, lieg ich da,
now only go I there lie I there
von Stromstößen geschüttelt,
by electric-shocks shaken
zitternd über das ganze Segeltuch
trembling across the whole sail-cloth
ganz Haut, nach keinem Ermessen,
all skin according to no calculation/estimation
in meinem Zelt Einsamkeit,
in my tent loneliness
heimgesucht von jeder Nadelspitze,
haunted by each needle-tip
jeder Würgspur, jedem Druckmal,
each strangulation-mark each pressure-mark
ganz ein Körper, auf dem die Geschichte
entirely a body on which the history
und nicht die eigene, ausgetragen wird,
and not the own-one staged becomes
mit zerrauftem Haar und Schreien, die
with dishevelled hair and screams that
am Bellevue die Polizei dem Krankenwagen
at the Bellevue the police to the ambulance
übergibt, auf Tragbahren geschnallt, im Regen,
hands over on stretchers buckled in the rain
von Spritzen betäubt, von Spritzen
by injections numbed by injections
ins Wachen geholt, ins Begreifen,
taken into the waking taken into the comprehending
was doch niemand begreift.
what though no-one comprehends

Wie soll einer allein soviel erleiden können,
how should one alone so-much to suffer be able to
soviele Deportationen, soviel Staub, sooft hinabgestoßen
so many deportations so much dust so often down pushed
sooft gehäutet, lebendig verbrannt, sooft
so often skinned alive burned so often
geschunden, erschossen, vergast, wie soll einer
mistrated shot gassed how should one
sich hinhalten in eine Raserei
her/himself expose bear the brunt to of a fury hurry
die ihm fremd ist und der heult über eine erschlagene Fliege.
that to her/him alien is and who wails about a swatted fly
Soll ich aufhören, da zu sein, damit dies aufhört.

should I stop there to be so-that this stops

Soll ich die Qual mir abkürzen, mit 50 Nembutal,

should I the torture to-me shorten with 50 Nembutal

soll ich, da ich niemand in die Hände falle,

should I as I no-one in(to) the hands fall

aus allen Händen fallen, die morden.

out-of all hands fall that murder

‘After many years’

(Peter Filkins)

After many years,

after having seen so much injustice,

now everywhere countless crimes

and injustice, about which it would be senseless to raise a hue and cry.

After many years, for the first time,

everything known, having seen everything,

everything familiar, orderly, set up,

now for the first time I go there, I lie there,

convulsed with electrical shocks,

trembling upon the entire sail cloth,

the entire skin, from end to end there in my tent of loneliness,

afflicted by every injection,

every trace of choking, every pressure mark,

the entire body, on which a history,

and not only mine, is inscribed,

with a bundle of rent hair and screams which the police hand over to the ambulance at Bellevue,

buckled to a stretcher in the rain,

numbed by injections, awakened by injections, made aware of what no one is aware of.

How can one bear so much by oneself,

so many deportations, so much dust, so often knocked down,

so often flayed, burned alive, so often tortured, shot, gassed, how should one handle oneself amid a rage

that seems strange to one who howls over a swatted fly.

Shall I cease living so that this stops?

Shall I end the agony with 50 Nembutal?

Shall I, since I fall into no one’s hands,

fall out of all hands, those that murder, too?
The poem alternates between a patient’s thoughts and experiences in a psychiatric hospital, as suggested by the electric shocks, and references to the Holocaust, suggested by “alles gewußt” [everything known] in lines 6/7 and made explicit though the mention of deportation and gassing. The reference to “die Geschichte / und nicht die eigene” [history, and not one’s own] links these two topics. Filkins uses the idea of a body on which history is inscribed, and this is a possible interpretation when one considers the marks described. However, in Bachmann’s poem, the impression is more of a body as a stage on which history takes place because ‘austragen’ can mean ‘to carry out’ and ‘to settle a dispute’. It can also mean ‘to carry a pregnancy to full term’, and veiled references to pregnancy occur in other poetic fragments, some of which obliquely suggest the termination of a pregnancy and feelings of loss. The wording is ambiguous here, because the grammatical construction at the end of the second stanza means that on the stretcher could be the screams (the disembodied patient) or history itself. This seems to suggest that just as the patient’s situation is unbearable, the horrors of recent history are beyond comprehension.

Foreshadowing Kertész’s (2001) idea that the Holocaust must not solely be seen as a problem involving Germany and the Jewish people (see section 2.3), Bachmann believed that the end of the war did not eradicate fascism. She traces the mistreatment of women in relationships in her stories because she saw a link between the mistreatment of women and the origins of fascism as well as the locus of its continuation. It is possible to argue that Bachmann saw the mistreatment of women as a metaphor for the repressions of fascism; however, in my opinion, it is also possible that she literally saw fascist practices in relationships because many of her poetic drafts and some of the letters she sent to Paul Celan reference psychological suffering caused to her by Celan’s and Frisch’s actions (also see my views on Bachmann’s feminism expressed in section 2.6.1).

For example, a letter to Celan drafted by Bachmann on 27 September 1961 which remained unsent refers to ominous deeds committed by him, which Bachmann states she wished she could ignore and for which no apology would suffice (Badiou et al. 2008: 152 and 156). The letter is the longest in the collection (eight pages) and

---

65 This part of the poem is also reminiscent of T.S. Eliot’s poem ‘The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock’ (1920) whose third line reads ‘Like a patient etherized upon a table’.
is the only one that explicitly spells out Bachmann’s understanding of the feelings they have for each other. The other letters only implicitly allude to these through repeated phrases that appear to have held special significance for Bachmann and Celan, such as “du weißt” [you know] (Bachmann; Badiou et al. 2008: 68), “du weißt, Ingeborg, Du weißt ja” [you know, Ingeborg, you really know] (Celan; ibid.: 86). This particular phrase is also included in the second chapter of Malina: it is uttered by Ich in nightmare 15 (Bachmann 1995: 201; Boehm 1990: 126) when she hears that the Stranger has lost his life (see also footnote 44 in section 3.6).

The letter draft is also the only occasion on which Bachmann insists on stating her perspective on the effects of the plagiarism accusation against Celan whereas most of her other letters focus almost exclusively on Celan’s difficulties. In my view, this letter draft shows parallels with the central idea of the ‘Todesarten’ that men’s mistreatment of women is linked to the Holocaust. Bachmann alludes to the suffering Celan had to endure during the war and its effects on his psyche, and contrasts his “Klagen” [complaints] (ibid.: 156) with his wife’s stoic resilience to, presumably, his poor treatment of her and to his affair with Bachmann. The letter draft makes it possible to understand Bachmann’s search for fascism within relationships as literal.

With regard to Peter Filkins’ stylistic choices in Franza, it is my opinion that he obscures the links between the chains of reasoning that connect fascism with women’s suffering. I conclude that Bachmann’s male translators do not preserve ‘women’s language’ as used in her ‘Todesarten’ texts to the same extent as the female translator. In section 1.3 I refer to Henitiuk’s concept of the “phallo-translator” (1999: 473). Henitiuk cites Edward Seidensticker as an example of this type of translator because he ensures through his introduction to his 1964 translation of the Kagerô nikki [The Kagerô Diary; tr. as The Gossamer Years] that his readers are less favourably disposed towards the quality of the writing. Filkins’ ‘translator’s note’ [no capital letters in original] can be understood in the same way: he frames Franza as problematic because of its incomplete state and Bachmann’s style, and even makes the reader aware of the necessity for the translator to take on “the additional roles of editor and critic” (Filkins 1999: xxii). Consequently, the reader is primed to expect little. Henitiuk further explains that phallocentric translators may only superficially translate the text because they are unaware of its deeper significance. This assessment applies to Boehm’s approach to Malina, as
demonstrated in Chapter 3. He does not recreate vital aspects of the style, and his translation can therefore be called superficial. According to Henitiuk’s criteria, Filkins and Boehm are both ‘phallo-translators’. In my opinion, the concept of the phallo-translator is useful. Henitiuk’s terminology refers to the Freudian and Lacanian idea of the phallus as a symbol of “male generative powers” (Tuana 1989b: 158). A phallo-translator therefore appears as one who is superior to the source text author and whose understanding of the text is authoritative. A translation generated by the phallo-translator represents an improvement of the original according to the standards imposed on it by the translator and/or publisher. In the future, it might be beneficial to amend the term in order to clarify, in accordance with insights gained in stylistics since 1999, that phallocentric translator behaviour does not necessarily constitute conscious and purposeful intervention on the part of the translator, and that female translators also have the potential to approach texts in a dismissive manner. However, the subject of the extent to which translators’ choices are influenced by subconscious processes still requires further research.

Stylistic comparison can enhance understanding of both source and target texts, and my views with regard to the insights that can be gained through this type of comparison are linked to Boase-Beier’s theory of the “eye of the poem” in translations (2011: 137-142), which in turn builds on Freeman’s idea of the eye of the poem (2005: 40) and Riffaterre’s idea of “convergence” (1959: 172). Freeman (2005: 40) describes the eye of the poem as the “central point on which the poem turns”. This is the point at which stylistic features converge and draw attention (Boase-Beier 2011: 139). Parks (1998: vii) observes that the point at which the source and target texts diverge allows the reader access to the vision implied by the author’s style. Boase-Beier (2011: 140) notes that these divergences occur where the source text exhibits convergences, and often appear to be two-thirds to three-quarters of the way through the poem (2011: 142).

Poems are usually structured differently from prose texts, and their physical appearance on the page guides the reader’s interpretative process. Poems also contain a higher density of stylistic features (Furniss and Bath 2007: 71) and thus make the reader work more with fewer words than prose texts. Nevertheless, I argue that the ideas of the convergence of features in the source text and the target text’s divergence from the source text at this point is useful for the analysis of prose texts. While Boase-Beier has suggested a point at which translations tend to diverge from
the original poem, no particular place has been identified in prose translations. We can only speculate that the divergence would occur towards the end of a text rather than at the beginning as the reader’s process of inferring a network of significant stylistic features that gives insight into the text would occur gradually.

The reader’s assessment of the stylistic features as significant might furthermore depend on the length of the text. This aspect of “translational stylistics” (Malmkjær 2003: 38) obviously requires further investigation on a scale larger than that permitted by the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless, the ideas of convergence and divergence should be borne in mind in analyses of Bachmann’s texts. As Bachmann was a poet and continued to write poetry in parallel to her prose texts, and because of the richness of stylistic features exhibited by the ‘Todesarten’, these texts lend themselves to methods of poetic interpretation more easily than other prose texts. Jürgen Lenerz notes that poetic language and standard language use the same grammatical system, but that poetic language deviates from the norms and principles that define standard language. These deviations are “simply extensions of the possible meaning of linguistic structures, due to a more liberal use of our conceptual system” (Lenerz 2002: 157; original emphasis). Poetic interpretation encompasses close reading in order to see how the language used gives rise to meaning (see Furniss and Bath 2007: 13-14). This view is also expressed by Filkins (1999: xxviii) when he notes that the “major strategy of the poetry is its use of ‘fragments’ welded into mosaic patterns by the silence they seek to break. In the prose fiction and drama, the same strategy occurs, so that the question of genre is largely irrelevant”.

When elements of the source text are missing in the target text, this suggests that they were difficult to translate or that the translator did not find them significant. The difficulty can lie in the rootedness of an expression in the source culture, so that it cannot easily be recreated in another language. The Sapir-Whorf-Hypothesis, which posits a link between language and experience, is relevant in this case. Although Sapir and Whorf were anthropologists rather than translation theorists, their work is of great relevance to translation scholars because it provides a useful framework for examining differences between a text and its translation. The Sapir-Whorf-Hypothesis encompasses linguistic determinism and linguistic relativity. The determinist perspective is that certain parts of the source text cannot be recreated in the target text as the worldview of which they form part is determined by the source language. The relativist view, which is more widely accepted today, is that the target
language may not be subject to the same distinction as the source language, but it
does not necessarily lack the same concepts and thus can encode the source text’s
message. Linguistic Relativity refers to the standpoint that language and thought are
interdependent.

My approach was not about a contrastive analysis of German and English, but
rather of the language used by women and men. Further research is needed in order
to reach definitive conclusions about the link between a translator’s gender and
her/his use of language. The results of my analysis presented in this thesis show that
Bachmann’s worldview was not recreated by the male translators whereas the female
translator appeared better able to do this. However, I have found no conclusive proof
that the differences between the source and target texts are the result of the
translators’ gender. Considering the translators’ cognitive context allows more
factors to be taken into account and is therefore a useful extension of examinations
that seek to relate language and thought. Approaching analyses of translators’
choices in this way broadens the field to include external factors such as life
experience and the social environment.

Following my comparison in the context of cognitive stylistics, it is my view
that Mary Fran Gilbert does not use different language per se; rather, she uses
language differently by preserving metaphor networks and related philosophical and
political ideas. She made these choices not necessarily because she has at her
disposal vocabulary, stylistic devices and grammatical structures that differ from
those that can be accessed by the male translators. To be more precise, I argue that
her cognitive context, which involves aspects of the experience of being a woman in
the 20th century, led her to understand the metaphor networks as interlinked with
Bachmann’s political ideas. The male translators might have been able to achieve a
similarly thorough understanding of Bachmann’s style if they had been able to
devote more time to stylistic analysis and research of Bachmann’s work and context.
Of course, this is rarely an option for professional translators under significant time
pressure, as noted by Boehm in correspondence.

An additional difficulty in the translation process is that an expression might
be part of a network of stylistic features that cannot be translated in its entirety and
consequently necessitates omission or compensation. The “loopholes” (Parks 2007:
59) of one language (explained in detail in section 3.2) also do not exist in the same
way in another language. This is especially relevant in the case of Bachmann’s use of
ambiguity, which represents her subversion of the German language as part of her *Sprachskepsis* [language scepticism] and language renewal (explained in sections 2.5 and 3.2).

*Sprachskepsis* in Bachmann’s work stands for a demand for a re-examination of language in the context of Germany’s recent history. Bachmann experienced an intense language crisis when she found herself unable to express her thoughts in a manner she deemed adequate during psychiatric treatment; this is thematised, for example, in the poetic draft ‘Meine Gedichte sind mir abhanden gekommen’ [my poems have escaped my grasp; translated by Filkins as ‘I’ve misplaced my poems’]. The experience allowed her a new perspective, and the speakers in her work “question former certainties and [...] call for change and renewal through language” (McMurtry 2012: 3). The poetic drafts, which link Bachmann’s personal crisis to the wider cultural crisis (see above), also thematise language in this context. The National Socialists encouraged particular uses of language to achieve their aims. For example, words formerly thought of as ‘foreign words’ became ‘enemy words’, and a new terminology, using vocabulary that previously held other meanings, had to be developed for new regulations and inhumane acts (see Fritzsche 1996: 41 and Hoffman 1996: 78). The German language had the potential to be used in this manner and therefore had to be used with caution after the war. Bachmann summarises this by saying “verdächtige die Worte, die Sprache” [be suspicious of words, of language] (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 25). In an essay composed in 1963, Bachmann discusses language in relation to history by considering what a European way of thinking might be:

> Denken, gewiß, auch historisch denken und vor allem utopisch denken, daß die Risse eines Tages wirklich aufspringen, dort wo sie aufspringen müssen und die Grenzverläufe sich zeigen müssen, als ideologische, wenn man so will, als Risse auch im Gebrauch von Sprache, die nicht nur den Schreibenden betreffen, aber den Schreibenden zuerst betreffen, weil...

---

66 The essay was written in German for the first volume of a magazine that was intended to be published simultaneously in French, Italian and German. It encompassed texts by writers such as Bachmann, Hans Magnus Enzensberger, Uwe Johnson, Günter Grass, Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italo Calvino, Roland Barthes and Maurice Blanchot. The magazine was eventually only published in Italian, as *Gulliver*, and Bachmann’s essay was translated as ‘Diario in Pubblico’ by Lia Secci (see ‘Anmerkungen’ in Bachmann 2011: 173-174).
er nicht mit einem nationalen Fertigprodukt ‘Sprache’ oder einem internationalen Wunschprodukt ‘Sprache’ umgehen kann und es gebrauchen kann, sondern, von ihr geprüft und sie prüfend, ein Abenteuer mit der Sprache hat, dessen Ausgang ungewiß ist. (Bachmann 2011: 65; original emphasis)

[Thinking, certainly also thinking in relation to history, and above all thinking in a utopian manner, that one day the rifts will spring open where they must spring open and the borderlines have to reveal themselves, as ideological in nature, if you like, as rifts also in the use of language that not only concern the writer, but concern the writer first of all, because he [sic] is unable to handle or make use of a national prefabricated product called ‘language’ or an international wished-for product called ‘language’, but instead, tested by language and testing it, embarks on an adventure with language whose outcome is uncertain.]

Bachmann’s thoughts about language may have arisen from her analysis of contemporary philosophy (see Perloff 1996: 165). Her doctoral dissertation on Heidegger also referenced Wittgenstein’s idea in the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* that poetic language can transcend the limits of ordinary language because it is not concerned with truth (Eberhardt 2002: 214). Her idea of ‘utopian language’ shows Musil’s influence, according to Eberhardt (ibid.). In the essay cited above, Bachmann argues against haste in the new formation of Europe whose proponents, in her view, treat it merely as an object of economic considerations. She expresses regret that the market has replaced individual cultural initiatives such as the introduction of thoughts from abroad through letter exchanges, travel and meetings. Bachmann emphasises the need for careful consideration, selectiveness, and responsibility with regard to the integration of other countries’ thoughts. Her first Frankfurt Poetics Lecture had discussed the lack of trust in the relation “zwischen Ich

---

67 Bachmann stated in a 1971 interview (in Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 82-83) that she did not think about Wittgenstein’s or others’ philosophies while she wrote; in her view, they articulated what was already on her mind.
und Sprache und Ding” [between I and language and object\(^68\)] with reference to Hofmannsthal’s ‘Chandos-letter’ (Eberhardt 2002: 215; see also section 2.5 for the relevance of the ‘Chandos-letter’). In the passage quoted above, she seems to suggest that writers continually have to examine the language they use. Bachmann looks unfavourably upon the idea of a national language as a unified concept, and presents a view of language as continuous development. Her poetry and prose illustrate this theoretical standpoint of Sprachskespsi.

In an interview (in Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 83-84) Bachmann further explains that writers cannot simply utilise ordinary language as they find it. Her view of language is complex, but it shares common ground with the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, although she did not formulate her views in these terms: she realised that language did not solely depict society, but could also be used to influence it (Eberhardt 2002: 215). In Bachmann’s view, this takes place through what she calls “Phrasen” [phrases] (ibid.), and this capacity of language to manipulate thought is what the “national[es] Fertigprodukt ‘Sprache’” [national prefabricated product] refers to. From Bachmann’s writing on this matter as well as the views she expressed in interviews, it is apparent that she considered writers to have the duty to subvert these ‘phrases’. She uses the term “zerschreiben” (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 84) to describe this process, which can be translated as ‘to write apart’ in the manner of ‘to take apart’ (the prefix ‘zer-’ suggests movement in opposite directions; ‘schreiben’ means ‘to write’).

This is also where music plays a role in Bachmann’s writing: she felt that music showed her “das Absolute […] das ich nicht erreicht sehe in der Sprache, also auch nicht in der Literatur” [the absolute, that in my view language, and therefore also literature, has not achieved] (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 85). *Pierrot Lunaire* in *Malina* is used in this way, and the musical mood markers in Ich’s conversations with Malina (discussed in section 4.2; see Appendix VII) play a similar role: music allows Bachmann an additional mode of expression and meaning. The mood markers lend an almost audible quality to the conversations’ varying levels of intensity without sole reliance on stylistic foregrounding. Additional

\(^68\) ‘Ding’ literally means ‘thing’; it is likely that Bachmann means that which Saussure calls the ‘signified’ (Saussure 1966: 66). The signified is the concept to which the signifier, the “sound-image”, relates (Scholes 1980: 204).
meaning in the case of the allusion to *Pierrot Lunaire* is achieved through the historical position of the piece: Schoenberg’s minimal orchestration (the orchestra consists of just seven instruments, occasionally performed by five musicians) stands in stark contrast to the opulence of, for example, Wagner’s orchestras. Wagner was revered by the National Socialists (Sheffi 2014: 36), whereas Schoenberg was one of the artists whose creations they deemed ‘entartete Kunst’ [degenerate art] (MacDonald 2008: 321). The allusion to Schoenberg’s music rather than to that of any other composer can therefore also be seen in the context of Bachmann’s politics. Furthermore, the melodrama is atonal, and atonality was a response to the crisis in musical language in the early twentieth century (Dunsby 1992: 8). Bachmann’s choice of *Pierrot Lunaire* also makes sense if one interprets *Malina* as a contemplation of the crisis of Ich, or of German society.

Bachmann ends the essay with the idea that real dialogue is only possible when one is open to other idioms. She uses translation as a metaphor for this idea (see Goßens 2002: 204), and this is also the subject of the story ‘Simultan’ about a multi-lingual interpreter. Trust in other idioms and careful consideration of one’s own use of language are necessary in order to achieve dialogue. The key terms whose importance Bachmann emphasises are “darstellen” and “ausdrücken” (Koschel and von Weidenbaum 1983: 91). These can be translated as, respectively, ‘to show’ and ‘to represent’. Because Bachmann uses ‘ausdrücken’ in explicit opposition to the expression of opinions, and because ‘darstellen’ includes an element of showing by doing, in my opinion Bachmann underlines the crucial role of style in her work. Although stylistics as a discipline was in its very early stages during Bachmann’s lifetime\(^{69}\) and furthermore has Anglo-American and Eastern-European roots, the views expressed by Bachmann with regard to the role of language in literature are now paralleled in current stylistics. Above (in this section) I note current perspectives on the differences between standard and poetic language and poetic interpretation; these parallel Bachmann’s view that writers must not simply utilise language, but rather should create new meaning through what their work does. Style conveys meaning, and the eradication of the source texts’ style in

\(^{69}\) The first influential conference on style took place at Indiana University in 1958, and its proceedings were published as *Style in Language*, edited by Thomas Sebeok, in 1960.
the translations by Boehm and Filkins obscures the aspect of the texts which constituted their actual content and rationale.

In answer to question 2) above, therefore, Bachmann’s male translators transform the texts drastically. While the fact that their translations of the ‘Todesarten’ do not recreate all of the originals’ nuances can be seen as a defect according to the above analysis, these differences between original and translation are of use to readers who are competent in both languages, and to translation theorists. Divergences between the source and target texts alert us to the fact that the source texts exhibit stylistic features that play a significant role in our interpretation of the text as a whole. A contrastive reading of source and target text thus allows a more comprehensive understanding of the source text. The differences between the texts also show the translators’ involvement: where the target texts differ noticeably from the source texts, this constitutes the translators’ intervention. This is examined in the following section in order to address question 4) raised at the end of Chapter 4 and at the beginning of this chapter.
5.4 “Jetzt quatscht sie wieder”: The Role of Gender in the Reception of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ Texts and their Translations

In answer to question 3) above, with regard to the effect of Bachmann’s gender on the translations, I argue in Chapters 2 and 4 that Bachmann was reviewed specifically as a woman, and that there are significant parallels between the German reception and the male translators’ choices. The quotation “Jetzt quatscht sie wieder” (cited in Achberger 1991: 16) can be translated as something like ‘now she’s nattering again’. This is how Bertolt Brecht is reported to have reacted to some of Bachmann’s poems. ‘Quatschen’ is a colloquial term that refers to a manner of talking which is usually attributed to women and denotes loquaciousness concerned with trivial matters (Duden online). Although Brecht respected the “critical thrust” (Achberger 1991: 10) of Bachmann’s writing, he did not approve of the parts of her poems that he deemed not to be socially critical and therefore personal in nature (see also Wolf 1982: 177). This evaluation of Bachmann’s poetry is not shared by many, not even the critics who disliked what they saw as overly personal prose fifteen years later, and as Brecht’s own poetry was highly political, he is likely to have had very specific expectations (see, for example, his 1930 volume Aus dem Lesebuch für Städtebewohner). I refer to Brecht’s view here in order to illustrate the different perspectives that can be brought to Bachmann’s work. While Brecht saw triviality in Bachmann’s poems, the members of Gruppe 47 by all accounts approved of them in their entirety, as suggested by the annual prize Bachmann was awarded in 1953. The Gruppe 47 later criticised the personal aspects of Bachmann’s prose (see Reich-Ranicki 1974 and 1989) whose significance was expounded by feminist critics in the 1980s.

Bachmann’s Anglo-American reception is less marked by explicit evaluations of the writer in terms of her gender, and gives the impression that critics were aware of her status as a poet in the German-speaking territories, but that the relevance of her work for the English-speaking world was not immediately apparent (see sections 4.3 and 4.4). It is impossible to say with certainty whether Boehm’s and Fillkins’ translation choices were influenced highly by misogynist criticism of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ since, as they do not explicitly refer to this type of review in their forewords, this process would have taken place on a subconscious level. However, as I have demonstrated in Chapters 3 and 4, there are parallels between the views
expressed by German critics and the choices made by the male translators, and it remains my view that there is a link between the two. It is also possible that Boehm and Filkins were affected by explicit and implicit norms and expectations with regard to writing in general as well as writing by women specifically. It would be interesting to find out if there are differences in the extent of emotion expressed in texts by women and men.

According to Sherry Simon’s view (1996: 7; as quoted in Chapter 1) of gender as a discursive construction, there is no innately masculine way of translating, and I have found no evidence to the contrary. However, to address question 4), the results of my stylistic analysis and the paratexts of the translations, in conjunction with Henitiuk’s concept of the phallo-translator (see above), lead me to conclude that Bachmann’s English translations function in a fundamentally different way to the source texts. Similarly to Suhrkamp, the publisher of all Italian translations of Bachmann’s work has a reputation of a high intellectual calibre. Adelphi has published translations of the works of most key European authors.70 Actes Sud and Editions du Seuil, the French publishers of Trois Sentiers vers le Lac, and Malina and Franza, respectively, have a comparable influence.71 Holmes and Meier, on the other hand, is a smaller North American company with a diverse, mostly non-fiction, list. It is unclear why Bachmann’s prose work was not published earlier or by a British publisher, but the small number of reviews shows that her influence in the English-speaking world has been minimal. The reviews acknowledge Bachmann’s status in the German-language territories, and her work has been studied extensively by English-speaking academics, but the Anglo-American literary sphere has not engaged with it.

Translators alter texts to the extent agreed with the publisher of the target text, and Filkins’ strategy makes sense as the translation of Franza takes on the appearance of a fully formed novel, which is presumably easier to sell than a fragmentary text. He appears to have modified Bachmann’s ideology as expressed through the construction of Franza consciously, according to his foreword. Boehm’s ‘Translator’s Note’ expresses good intentions as he states “I have attempted to

70 Adelphi’s authors include Friedrich Nietzsche, Georges Simenon, Vladimir Nabokov, Jack London, Elias Canetti, and Milan Kundera.
71 Actes Sud has published work by Paul Auster, Günter Grass, Nancy Huston, Siri Hustvedt, and others, while Editions du Seuil has published, for example, Roland Barthes, Jacques Lacan and Pierre Bourdieu, Paul Celan, and Jorge Luis Borges.
capture both the wordplay of the original as well as its unique rhythm” (Boehm 1990: vii), and he hence does not seem to have had a specific strategy aimed at reducing wordplay. He recognises Bachmann’s linguistic expression as “playful” (Boehm 1990: vii) and highlights “the novel’s innovative style” (ibid.). Bachmann’s style is indeed innovative, but I would not call her linguistic expression playful. ‘Playful’ suggests that wordplay has been used in order to be an intellectual exercise for the writer or to amuse the reader. Bachmann’s use of language is much more serious: she does not merely experiment with the configurations of the German language, but uses it purposefully to draw attention to double meanings, as in the case of ‘Todesraten’ (Bachmann 1995: 304), a pun on ‘Todesarten’, which can refer to a number of deaths [literally death rates] as well as Ich’s death occurring gradually (‘Raten’ also means instalments; see section 3.3). The ambiguities in Malina upon closer inspection always lead the reader to question life in general, as in the case of ‘glücklich’ (also in section 3.3) and the fleeting nature of happiness, or the post-war situation when everything, including one’s use of language, had to be re-examined in order to allow a new beginning. To call this ‘playful’ is to trivialise the political and philosophical content of Bachmann’s work, as well as her achievement in conveying complex concepts, such as women’s oppression, through style.

As he does not overtly state the aim of making Bachmann’s text easier to read, it is, in my estimation, likely that his changes were the result of time pressure and unconscious bias. The fact that Boehm has translated complex works of literature such as literature Nobel Prize-winner Herta Müller’s The Appointment (2001) and The Hunger Angel (2012) suggests that he is not ideologically opposed to translating literature by women, and that he is thought of by publishers as competent enough to do so. In fact, he has almost exclusively translated texts by women.

Mary Fran Gilbert’s translation does not include a foreword or introduction authored by her, only Mark Anderson’s introduction. Lilian Friedberg’s translation of various texts by Bachmann, discussed briefly in Chapter 3 (sections 3.1 and 3.7), does not contain paratextual material by her either. As a result, both female translators are less visible to the target text reader than the male translators. This could potentially be the result of personal choice or editorial policy, although it is very unlikely to be the latter: it is implausible that Green Integer, the publisher of Friedberg’s translations, would have opposed the inclusion of a translator’s note because Damion Searls’ translation of Bachmann’s Briefe an Felician [Letters to
Felician; 2004], also published by Green Integer, contains a translator’s note. His translation also includes an introduction by Isolde Moser, Ingeborg Bachmann’s sister, while Friedberg’s translation is introduced by Dagmar C.G. Lorenz. Michael Bullock’s translation of Das Dreißigste Jahr [The Thirtieth Year; 1995], published by Holmes and Meier, the publisher of Mary Fran Gilbert’s Three Paths to the Lake and Philip Boehm’s Malina, contains an introduction by Karen Achberger.

This invisibility of Bachmann’s female translators corresponds to Rude-Porubská’s realisation (2013: 265) that, in general, female translators are less visible than male translators. Kaisa Koiskinen (2000: 99) coined the term “paratextual visibility” to describe the extent to which the translator is visible in the extra-textual material. In the case of Bachmann’s translations, Gilbert and Friedberg have minimal paratextual visibility: Friedberg’s name appears on the book cover, while Gilbert’s is only included on the second title page. Boehm and Filkins have a much greater degree of paratextual visibility as their names appear on the covers, the texts contain some, albeit few, footnotes, and they are given the opportunity to express their views and contextualise Bachmann and her text in their translator’s note (Boehm) and introduction (Filkins). The inclusion of a translator’s name on the cover and extra-textual comments can vary according to a publisher’s editorial policy. However, readers who do not have a specific interest in the translation industry are unlikely to know this and would probably assume that Filkins and Boehm carry more prestige than Gilbert and Friedberg.

It could be argued that Filkins is an authority on Bachmann’s work because of his translations of her poetry. Indeed, this link becomes explicit as his introduction to Franza is titled ‘darkness spoken’ [no capital letters in original], and this was chosen as the title of his poetry translation, published seven years later. Friedberg’s PhD thesis, however, deals with the translation of Bachmann’s texts, and as she is likely to possess a great deal of insight into Bachmann’s texts and the challenges for the translator, it is, in my opinion, surprising and unfortunate that some of her knowledge was not made available to the readers of her collection.

Boehm, Filkins and Anderson are thus given the opportunity to speak, whereas Gilbert and Friedberg are not. To answer question 3) above, then, it is apparent, in my view, that the fact that Bachmann was a woman affected the selection of paratextual material. Boehm and Filkins, according to my textual analysis, appear to have deferred to the critics’ assessment of Bachmann and the
texts instead of locating the texts’ internal cohesion and relation to the author’s political views. The reason for this is unclear. The success of Bachmann’s poetry indicates that she was a skilled writer, and a change in genre does not necessarily mean that her prose texts would be inferior. Boehm’s and Filkins’ behaviour therefore, in my opinion, suggests a view of the critics as experts on Bachmann’s work. It would be useful, in further research, to examine the editor-translator dyad. Boehm highlighted the important role of editors (personal correspondence), and as they hold final responsibility for the composition of the translation, it would be beneficial to elucidate their influence on the text.
5.5 Are the Differences between the Source Text and Target Text the Result of the Translator’s Gender?

In Chapter 1, I stated my intention to ascertain whether the source texts and target texts can be seen as women’s writing in the sense that they exhibit characteristics that are hallmarks of women’s writing discussed in Chapters 2 and 4. Part of this question was also whether the voice in the source text is gendered and what happens to it in translation. My analysis found that the source texts’ style is gendered, while their reception was also gendered. The target texts composed by Boehm and Filkins are not gendered in the same way or to the same extent according to the definition developed in Chapter 2, and the differences between the source and target texts constitute their involvement. The fourth research question that arises (see section 5.1), whether the translators’ gender affects their choices, draws together the different strands of this thesis.

Discussions of the effects of a translator’s gender based on the way in which she/he translates can easily become essentialist in the sense that one might run the risk of assuming that women and men translate in different ways depending on innate characteristics. Fuss (1989: xii) argues that essentialism is not in itself a bad thing, but that it “can be deployed effectively in the service of both idealist and materialist, progressive and reactionary, mythologizing and resistive discourses”. The way in which essentialism is used determines the insights that can be reached. She notes that the debate regarding essentialism in feminist theory has set up a binary of essentialist versus constructionist perspectives (Fuss 1989: 1; see section 4.2). In my view, it is unlikely that there are particular ways in which women and men translate that are the result of their biology, and I have not found conclusive proof that the differences in the translators’ approaches discussed in this thesis are the result of their genders. However, I would argue that women and men experience society in different ways, and translators might therefore be more or less sensitive to specific issues in a text because of those sex-specific experiences.

Edward Said warns of the dangers of “stipulating, for instance, only women can understand feminine experience, only Jews can understand Jewish suffering, only formerly colonial subjects can understand colonial experience” (Said 1986: 55).

---

72 Of course, one must also bear in mind that sex and gender do not necessarily correspond.
However, this thesis is not concerned with women’s experiences in general, but rather with the extent to which the target text readers form the same impressions as the source text readers. The first systematic investigation into the role of the translator’s gender by Leonardi (2007; see Chapter 1) concluded that Stuart Hood deleted the agent several times in his translation of female Italian author Dacia Maraini’s text, and consequently replaced the source text author’s positioning with his own (Leonardi 2007: 171). Reading texts involves the construction of “text-worlds” (see Stockwell 2002: 137-143) that allow the reader to orient her/himself according to the perspectives presented in the text. Hood altered the target text reader’s frame of orientation.

Leonardi (2007: 271) found that alteration of transitivity structures “allows concealment especially in terms of power relations”, and my findings, presented in Chapter 3, parallel this discovery. However, Leonardi tends to focus on nominalisation and unrelated examples of switches between active and passive constructions. Although her examples provide a useful indication that transitivity plays a role in translation and that further study of similar cases might be beneficial, the link with the translator’s ideological positioning is not very strong. The reason why transitivity is important is that it represents the ideational function of language (Halliday 1978: 45). This function is “the content function of language, language as ‘about something’” (Halliday 1993: 27). It encodes experiences and phenomena, and “not only specifies the available options in meaning but also determines the nature of their structural realizations” (Halliday 1973: 39). What language does, that is, the effects it has on the reader and what it conveys, is thus related to its structure. A text’s transitivity grammar can construe a particular worldview (see Halliday and Matthiessen 2013: 283).

Alterations to the worldview expressed in a text are significant because the transitivity structures in Bachmann’s text support an interpretation of the ‘Legend’ as feminist. Because this is not the case in the translation, the worldview conveyed by it must be the translator’s, since it is not Bachmann’s or the Princess’s worldview. Hermans (1996: 27) states that “translated narrative discourse always contains a ‘second’ voice”, and he refers to this discursive presence as “the translator’s voice”. Although the translator’s textual presence is not a property of the text, such as style according to Koster (2002: 33), it can be detected through the comparison of source and target text. The instances in which they diverge to the extent that the target text
presents a different worldview therefore must constitute the translator’s voice and perspective.

My analysis of transitivity in the ‘Legend’ involves the tracing of patterns: the Princess’ autonomy varies, and it is not the extent of her agency at specific points, but rather her development, occasionally in relation to the Stranger, expressed through both content and style, that conveys a feminist viewpoint. My stylistic analysis shows that Boehm and Filkins did not recreate certain aspects of *Malina* and *Franza* whereas Mary Fran Gilbert recreated the same aspects of the stories in *Three Paths to the Lake*. The stories in *Simultan*, as mentioned in section 3.1, were taken from the over 1000 pages that Bachmann wrote in anticipation of the ‘Todesarten’. One can therefore assume that the stories display the same level of complexity as *Malina* and *Franza* and that, consequently, all texts posed the same level of difficulty for the translators.

In reading and translating a text, it is helpful to bear in mind both the author’s context and the reader’s. Barthes’ view (whose relevance to the role of the author is explained in Chapter 2) that the author limits the interpretative possibilities is important. Hotz (1990: 30) echoes this when she states that an author’s “image” guides the reader’s interpretation (see section 2.2). However, in my opinion, it is clear that readers do pay attention to portrayals of the author; if they did not, there would be no market for biographies or autobiographies of literary personalities.

In addition to noting the disadvantages of the involvement of the author in interpretations of their writing, it is, in my view, also important to explore the effect of the author’s image on the reader’s interpretation of the text. As is the case in this thesis, this exploration should encompass criticism, media portrayals, and paratextual information consisting of words and pictures. Fuss (1989: 116) notes that an individual’s lack of experience is often used to “de-authorize an individual from speaking”. I do not think that it would be helpful to suggest that only women should translate books written by women, and this thesis is not intended to result in a set of guidelines for publishers or translators in order to effect a limit to the opportunities for male translators to translate texts authored by women and vice versa. However, it is, in my opinion, imperative to pay attention to power relationships in translation.

Because reading is a cognitive process, it is important to consider the role of cognitive context. This is constructed as part of the interpretative process (see Boase-Beier 2011: 109 and 2006: 112) as “cognitive effect[s] […] involve changes to our
cognitive context” (Boase-Beier 2011: 109). Literary texts lead the reader to search for contexts, and this is how they achieve their effects. Boase-Beier (2006: 113) notes that stylistic devices “have both a universal basis and an individual context which is to some extent culturally bound”. The function and effect of some stylistic devices might depend on the reader’s cultural context, and I argue in section 4.2 that gender should be considered in this way. What matters in translation is the recreation of the cognitive state embodied in and evoked by the text as this allows the target text reader to experience the effects of the source text (see Boase-Beier 2006: 113).

Boase-Beier (2011: 152) notes that one of the purposes of reading poetry is the search for meaning. The discovery of a definite contained meaning is less important for the reader than the process of creating meaning. Chapter 3 shows that the cognitive state embodied in Malina is not wholly recreated in the translation, and the text’s poetic effects are consequently reduced. As noted above in section 5.3, Bachmann’s style in the ‘Todesarten’ is poetic, and for this reason, Boase-Beier’s point also applies here. Boehm’s and Filkins’ translations give the target text reader fewer possibilities to search for meaning than the source text reader has.

Although the arguments presented above focus on the stylistic curtailment of Boehm’s and Filkins’ translations, this thesis is not concerned with the quality of the translations per se as it is unlikely that there are absolute measures of quality in literary translation. Rather, I set out from the initial hypothesis that the translators’ gender plays a role in stylistic choices. ‘Gender’ here does not refer to an innate and stable quality inherent in the translators, but instead to something that is produced through discursive structures (see Lennox 2006: 259). According to Freeman (2005: 28), “meaning is [...] an ongoing, dynamic activity, constrained in its scope by the parameters of conceptualization and language”. Conceptualisation means the way we perceive the world. Men might have a different way of seeing the world, so the way in which they construct meaning might differ from how women do this. While one cannot generalise, it is nevertheless possible that some men’s worldview and consequent text interpretation differs markedly from those of some women. In the case of Boehm and Filkins, however, it is not possible to find out detailed information about their worldview. It is also unclear how one would reliably assess worldview. Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts are a special case for several reasons. First, they are polemic in so far as they are explicitly concerned with women’s inferior status and experiences of violence in society and consequently invite the
reader either to share this perspective or to take on an oppositional approach. Second, Bachmann as a writer presents a challenge because the parallels between her life and those of her characters occasionally make it difficult for critics to distinguish between the inferred author and the narrator or characters, so that these are often conflated in reviews.

Subconscious thought processes are likely to be influenced by societal norms. Fuss (1989: 124) points out that French feminist Luce Irigaray’s work was not translated into English as quickly as Derrida’s. Although she does not speculate about a possible cause, the fact that she mentions this in a book on feminist theories invites the assumption that a theorist’s or writer’s gender influences the extent to which their work is seen as important. It took 19 years for Malina to be translated into English; while Bachmann is likely to have been less influential and well-known in her country of origin than Derrida (and Irigaray), this is still a rather long time when one considers that The Tin Drum, the English translation of the novel Die Blechtrommel by her contemporary Günter Grass, was published in the same year as its source text (1959), as was Halftime, the translation of Martin Walser’s novel Halbzeit (1960). Grass and Walser of course were more prolific writers than Bachmann, but these novels were published at the beginning of their careers, so it would have been unclear at that time whether they would publish additional successful books. They, too, were members of Gruppe 47. It is thus surprising that Bachmann’s work was not translated sooner (Mark Anderson’s translation of a selection of her poetry was published in 1986, 30 years after Anrufung des Großen Bären and 33 years after Die gestundete Zeit). Mark and Rees-Jones (2000: xxii) state in the introduction to the collection Contemporary Women’s Poetry that “[c]urrently, within the field of contemporary poetry, women’s work tends to be far less prolifically interpreted, mediated, and analysed than that of men”. Bachmann’s case is not an anomaly and is in fact representative of trends in both German- and
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73 This is less clear-cut in the case of Franza: ‘Der Fall Franza’ was published in volume 3 of Werke [Works] in 1978, and Albrecht and Götsche’s alternative assembly of fragments ‘Das Buch Franza’ was published as part of the ‘Todesarten’-Projekt [The ‘Todesarten-Project] in 1995, so that Filkins’ translation in 1999 marks 21 years since the text was first made publicly accessible. The uncompleted state of the manuscript could potentially have played a role in preventing publishers and translators from seeing an obvious (financial) value of a translation.
English-speaking countries. However, the fact that either the translators or the publishers decided to publish the translations should be seen in a positive way.

As mentioned in section 4.5 above, one explanation regarding why elements of the source text are not transferred to the target text is that the translator judged them not to be significant. In the case of the Princess of Kagran’s retainers talking to her in the source text, but to each other in the target text, for example, it is possible that Philip Boehm as a male translator misunderstood the source text here. As he is less likely to have experienced the frequent repression of his participation in conversations, since sociolinguists such as Dale Spender established that conversations tend to be dominated by men (Sunderland 2006: 14), the Princess’s role in deciding her future might not have immediately appeared noteworthy to him. Of course, I am merely speculating.

According to Weedon (1997: 6), “[t]he sex of the author is almost always a decisive factor in the way in which male literary criticism evaluates writing”. The work done by translators encompasses to some extent the type of evaluation performed by critics, so I would argue that Weedon’s point can also apply to translators. Whether the translator’s gender is also potentially “procedurally consequential” (Schegloff 1997: 165), i.e. whether it has an influence on how s/he translates, is less certain. However, according to Moi (1985: 71), “gender is a relational entity” (emphasis in original), which means that gender is produced through discourse (see reference to Lennox above) and contact with others, or through contrasting discourses, or through the contrast between two characters. For example, the contrasting portrayal of the Princess of Kagran and the Stranger in the ‘Legend’ in Malina (see section 3.6.1) makes their power differences clear; it is because of this contrast that we think the differences in agency are an important part of the story.

Where writers are concerned, gender performance also includes extra-textual materials. Because of this, their performance is not entirely in their own control as publishers hold the deciding power. The reader, and therefore the translator, is also involved in the performance of the writer’s gender because s/he can choose to ignore these aspects of the text, or be conditioned to do so through life experiences, socialisation, previous reading, or situational circumstances. In the case of

---

274 See also section 1.1 for a discussion of feminist conversation analysis.
Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’, Philip Boehm and Peter Filkins do not re-create ‘women’s language’, whereas Mary Fran Gilbert does. Boehm reduces the coherence of the metaphor networks, ambiguities and transitivity structures of *Malina*. Filkins imposes order on a text whose style conveys its meaning. Gilbert preserves the metaphor networks that pervade entire stories and allows the target text reader access to Bachmann’s understanding of post-war society. The analysis presented in this thesis demonstrates that Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ are complex texts that pose many challenges for translators.

In addition, power aspects should be borne in mind during the analysis of translations. Filkins’ expression of his aim to make Bachmann’s text more readable suggests a wish to improve Bachmann’s writing. My analysis shows that the exertion of power in paratexts is indeed an issue in the case of translations of Bachmann’s ‘Todesarten’ texts. The translation of transitivity patterns seems to present a specific challenge, as does the combination of style, content and politics.

I have demonstrated that the fact that Bachmann was a woman significantly influenced the descriptions by German-language critics of the author herself, as well as their evaluations of her work. The focus on the extent to which Bachmann conformed to standards of femininity came at the expense of recognition of the crucial role of style in the ‘Todesarten’. Bachmann’s use of extended metaphors, iconicity and ambiguity means that her prose texts, and especially *Malina*, should be regarded as proto-feminist masterpieces whose contemplation of the post-war situation and society’s treatment of women were far ahead of their contemporaries. The reduction, or elimination in some cases, of the networks of stylistic features in Boehm’s and Filkins’ translations result in a weakening of the links between content, style and politics which are crucial to Bachmann’s texts.

These changes mean that the target texts composed by Boehm and Filkins are less challenging for the English-language reader. They alter what I term women’s language in *Malina* and *Franza*, and consequently conceal much of Bachmann’s proto-feminist message.

I conclude that, while I found differences between the source texts and Boehm’s and Filkins’ translations, it is difficult to ascribe these to their gender. The time in which Bachmann composed her texts is far removed from the time in which the translations were created. Gender is merely one of several factors that constitute the distance between Bachmann and the translators. Furthermore, if it were generally
accepted that translators do not merely filter the source text without leaving a trace, which is the expectation behind by the well-known metaphor of the translation as a window-pane (see Sayers Peden 1989: 13 or Venuti 1995: 1), but rather that they, like any writer, have their own way of thinking, then expectations with regard to the translator’s involvement in the text would change. To accept that translation is not transparent means also to expect that the target text will differ from the source text because of the translator’s involvement. Gender, religion, life experience and other factors would not matter when a translator is selected for a particular text because the role of the translator as an individual reader would be clear.

Avenues for potential further research lie in the effect of textual features on readers’ willingness to engage, as well as in the construction of paratextual material. Decisions about paratexts are more easily traceable and thus allow greater certainty with regard to changes made to the text and the presentation of authors in different literary systems. Why readers, including translators, read the ways they do, and how preferences for certain types of texts develop and evolve is an area that holds much potential for translation studies.
Appendices

Appendix I: Examples from *Malina* in German, English, French, Italian and Spanish

Section 3.3

(1)
GLÜCKLICH, GLÜCKLICH, es heißt glücklich, es muss glücklich heißen (58)

HAPPY, HAPPY, it’s called happy, it has to be called happy (34)

*Le bonheur, le bonheur*, c’est bien le titre, il ne peut pas y en avoir d’autre (48)

*Felice, felice*, è felicità, deve essere felicità (55)

*FELIZ, FELIZ*, se llama feliz, así debe llamarse (55)

(2)
Jeden Tag könnten wir dann an diese neuen Mauern gehen und uns ausschütten vor Freude und Glück, denn es heißt glücklich, wir sind glücklich. (60)

Then we could visit these new walls every day and be so happy we would leap for joy, for this is happiness, we are happy. (35)

Nous pourrions ainsi longer tous les jours ces nouveaux murs pour y épancher notre joie et notre bonheur, car c’est le mot, nous sommes heureux. (49)

Ogni giorno allora potremmo andare lungo queste nuove mura e schiantare dalla gioia, dalla felicità, perché è felicità, siamo felici. (56)

Cada día podríamos bordear esos nuevos muros derramando alegría y felicidad, pues la palabra es, feliz, somos felices. (57)
Autos rollen herum, von Farben triefend (183)

Cars are rolling around, dripping paint (114)

Des voitures dégoulinantes de peinture circulent en tous sens (149)

Le machine passano con fracasso, grondanti di colori (157)

Coches que circulan goteando colores (177)

die Farben, leuchtend, knallig, rasend, beckleckern mich (183)

the colours, glaring, explosive, raving, spatter me (115)

les peintures éclatantes, rutilantes, effrénées tachent mon visage (149)

i colori, smaglianti, vistosi, folli, mi imbrattano il viso (157)

los colores – brillantes, restallantes, frenéticos – me embadurnan (177)

Befreien Sie mich von dieser Stunde! (185)

Liberate me from this hour! (116)

Délivrez-moi de cette heure! (150)

Liberatemi da questa ora! (158)

¡Libérenme de esta hora! (179)
The winter fashion executions showing the latest designs are on display in all the important fashion houses. (137)

La nouvelle mort d’hiver est arrivée, on la présente dans les meilleures boutiques de mort. (177)

I nuovi delitti invernali sono arrivati, vengono già presentati dalle più importanti case di morte. (185)

Han llegado las nuevas muertes invernales, ya se están presentando en las más importantes casas de muerte. (211)

Section 3.4

Autos rollen herum, von Farben triefend, Menschen tauchen auf (183)

Cars are rolling around, dripping paint, people pop up (114)

des gens surgissent (149)

appaiono uomini (157) – Italian uses ‘men’ rather than ‘people’

seres humanos que emergen (177)

7a) ‘leuchtend, knallig, rasend’

‘glaring, explosive, raving’

éclatantes, rutilantes, effrénées (149)
l colori, smaglianti, vistosi, folli (157)

los colores – brillantes, restallantes, frenéticos – me embadurnan (177)

7b) ‘zerstieben’
‘turn to dust’
‘ils éclatent’
‘si disperdono’
‘se dispersan’ (177)

(8)
Ich komme ins erste matschige Eis, bevor ich ins ewige Eis komme (184)

I reach some slushy ice before arriving at the permanent ice (115)

j’atteins les premières neiges à demis fondues avant d’en venir aux neiges éternelles [150]

arrivo a un primo ghiaccio fangoso, prima di giungere nel ghiaccio eterno (158)

llego hasta un primer hielo cenagoso, antes de llegar al hielo eterno (178)

(9)
in seinem […] siderischen Mantel, in dem ich ihn vor einigen tausen Jahren gesehen habe (202)

in his starry mantle […], in which I saw him a thousand years ago. (126)

il porte ce manteau sidéral, plus noir que noir, celui que je lui avais vu voici quelques millénaires. (164)
nel suo cappotto siderale più nero del nero in cui l’ho visto qualche migliaio di anni fa. (172)

en su capa sideral más negra que la negrura, la misma en que lo vi hace ya varios milenios. (196)

Section 3.5.2

(10)
Ihre Gefolgsleute beredeten und baten sie, zurückzubleiben (62)

Her retainers conferred among themselves and begged her to stay back (36)

Les gens de sa suite la priaient instamment de rester en retrait (51)

I suoi fidi la persuadevano e la pregavano di restare (58)

La gente de su séquito trataba de persuadirla y le rogaba que no avanzara (59)

(11)
Weil die Prinzessin eine wirkliche Prinzessin war, wollte sie sich lieber den Tod geben, als sich einem alten König zuführen lassen (62)

Because the princess was a true princess, she preferred death to allowing herself to be made the bride of an old king (37)

Comme cette princesse était une vraie princesse, elle préférait mourir plutôt que de se voir donnée à un vieux roi (51)

Poiché la principessa era una vera principessa, preferiva darsi la morte piuttosto che essere consegnata a un vecchio re (58)
Como era una princesa de verdad, prefería darse muerte que dejarse entregar a un rey viejo (59)

(12)
Die Prinzessin verlor die Herrschaft (62)

The princess lost her dominions (37)

La princesse perdit sa couronne (51)

La principessa perse il potere (58)

La princesa perdió su poderío (59)

(13)
Sie geriet in einen einzigen Morast (64)

She entered a huge morass (38)

Elle se retrouva dans un grand marécage (53)

Arrivò in mezzo a una palude (60)

Se encontró en un único pantano poblado de raquiticas mimbreras (61)

(14)
betört von dem Reich aus Einsamkeit, einem verschlossenen verwunschenen Reich, in das sie geraten war. (66)

bedazzled by this forlorn, bewitched kingdom of solitude she had entered. (39)

envoûtée par ce royaume de solitude où elle s’était perdue, ce royaume enchanté enfermé. (54)
presa dall’incanto di quell regno di solitudine, un chiuso regno fatato, in cui era capitata. (61)

fascinada pore se reino de soledad, pore se reino hermético, encantado, en el que había caído. (62-63)

(15)
trotzdem war es nicht die dahindonnernde Wasserflut, vor der sie Furcht überkam, sondern es waren Angst und Verwunderung in ihr und eine niegekannte Unruhe, die von den Weiden ausging. (66)

nonetheless she did not fear the roaring waters; she was more awed and anguished, and the willows imparted an uneasiness she had never felt before. (39)

ce n’était pas le mugissement des flots qui l’effrayait; en elle, l’angoisse et l’égarement se mêlaient à une agitation inouïe qui venait des saules. (54)

tuttavia non era la piena scrosciante che le faceva paura, ma c’erano in lei terrore e meraviglia, e una mai provata inquietudine che esalava dai salici. (61)

pero no era el tonitruante flujo de agua lo que le asustaba, sino que en ella misma había miedo, perplejidad y un desasosiego hasta entonces desconocido, que provenía de las mimbreras (63)

(16)
Sie erschrak bis in ihr tiefstes Herz (68)

She was terrified at heart (40)

Elle trembla au plus profond de son cœur (55)

Lei si spaventò fino in fondo al cuore (63)
Se estremeció hasta lo más hondo de su ser (65)

(17)
Er legte zwei Finger auf seinen Mund, das errit sie, er hieß sie schweigen, er bedeutete ihr, ihm zu folgen, und schlug seinen Schwarzen Mantel um sie (63-64)

He put two fingers to his mouth, she guessed this to mean she should be silent, he gave her a sign to follow and threw his black mantle around her (37)

Il lui mit deux doigts sur la bouche, ce qu’elle comprit, lui signifa de se taire et de le suivre, l’enveloppa dans son manteau noir (52)

Lui si mise due dita sulla bocca, ella indovinò, le ordinava di tacere, le accennava di seguirlo, e l’avvolse nel suo mantello nero (59)

El se llevó dos dedos a la boca y ella adivinó que la invitaba a guardar silencio; luego le hizo señas de que lo siguiera y la envolvió en su capa negra (60)

(18)
Er […] schlug den Mantel über sie und sich. (68)

He […] covered them both with his cloak. (40)

Il (…) étendit son manteau sur eux deux. (55)

gettò il mantello su di lei e su di sé. (63)

extendió su capa sobre los dos. (64)
Sie sagte es mit den Augen. Doc her wandte sich ab und verschwand in der Nacht.

She spoke with her eyes. Then he turned and disappeared into the night.

Elle le dit avec les yeux. Mais il se détourna et disparut dans la nuit.

La disse con gli occhi. Ma lui si volse e scomparve nella notte.

Se las dijo con los ojos. Pero él dio media vuelta y desapareció en la noche.

(20)

denn ich verliere den Verstand, es kommt über mich, ich verliere den Verstand, ich bin ohne Trost, ich werde wahnsinnig

omitted by Boehm

car je perds la raison, cela m’envahit, je suis inconsolable, je deviens follè

One phrase omitted

perché perdo la testa, sono sopraffatta, perdo la testa, non ho un conforto, impazzisco

porque estoy perdiendo la razón, algo me invade, estoy perdiendo la razón, mi desconseulo es total, me estoy volviendo loca

(21)

Lass dich ganz fallen

Let yourself collapse
laisse-toi aller complètement (165)

lasciati andare completamente (174)

déjate caer del todo (198)

(22)
Ich fahre zusammen (210)

I collapse (132)

Je sursaute (170)

Trasalisco (178)

Tiemblo (203)

(23)
Mein Vater kommt aus den schweren Farbgüssen nieder (183)

My father descends from the heavy downpour (115)

Mon père surgit des lourdes trainées de peinture (149)

Mio padre emerge dai pesanti getti di colore (157)

Mi padre emerge de los pesados chorros de color (178)

(24)
Gott ist eine Vorstellung (188)
God is a show (118)

Dieu est une représentation. (153)

Dio è una rappresentazione. (161)

Dios es una representación. (182)

(25)
Mein Vater ist mit mir […] schwimmen gegangen (199)

My father has come swimming with me [...]. (125)

Mon père est allé se baigner avec moi (161)

Mio padre è venuto con me a nuotare (170)

Mi padre ha ido a nadar conmigo (193)

(26)
Ich habe sogar die Erlaubnis, auf die Straße zu gehen (210)

I even have permission to walk on the street (131)

j’ai même la permission de descendre dans la rue (170)

Ma potrebbe venir fuori. (178)

tengo incluso permiso para salir a la calle (203)
Eine Frau mit einem verbundenen Gesicht (131)

A woman with a veiled face (131)

une femme au visage caché par un foulard (170)

una donna con il viso bendato (178)

una mujer con el rostro vendado (203)
Appendix II: Analysis of Franza

Number of sentences in each chapter of *Franza*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heimkehr nach Galicien</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanische Zeit</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Ägyptische Finsternis</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of paragraphs in each chapter of *Franza*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heimkehr nach Galicien</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanische Zeit</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Ägyptische Finsternis</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: Examples from Simultan in German, English, French and Italian

Section 3.10

(1)
ich sehe doch anständig (79)

my vision is decent (78)

Je vois clair. (102)

I miei occhi sono in regola. (91)

(2)
Sie [Stasi] hat alles deutlich gesehen (89)

She saw it all very clearly. (88)

Elle a tout vu distinctement. (115)

Ha visto tutto chiaramente. (101)

(3)
Anastasia ist eben doch sehr klug und hat viel Scharfblick (89)

Anastasia is a very intelligent woman gifted with keen insight. (88)

Anastasia est très astucieuse et elle a beaucoup de perspicacité. (115)

Anastasia è molto in gamba e ha uno sguardo acuto. (101)
(4)
Aber das ist doch sonnenklar (90)

But that’s clear as glass (ETW 89)

Mais c’est clair comme le jour. (116)

Ma si, è chiaro (102)

(5)
Josef schaut wieder in die Zeitung, Miranda auf das Dach vis-à-vis. (80)

Josef looks back at his newspaper, Miranda at the roof across the street. (78)

Josef regarde son journal, et Miranda le toit d’en face. (103)

Josef legge di nuovo il giornale, e Miranda guard ait tetto di fronte. (92)

(6)
und da täuscht sie sich auch (85)

she deceives herself here, too (84)

et là encore, elle se trompe (110)

e anche questa volta si illude (97)

(7)
Es kann aber vorkommen, dass Miranda ihre kranken optischen Systeme als ein ‘Geschenk des Himmels’ empfindet. [...] Denn es erstaunt sie, wie die anderen Menschen das jeden Tag aushalten, was sie sehen und mit ansehen müssen. Oder
leiden die anderen nicht so sehr darunter, weil sie kein andres System haben, die Welt zu sehen? Es könnte das normale Sehen […] die Leute ja ganz abstumpfen […]. (77)

But there are times when Miranda views her defective optical systems as a ‘gift from heaven’. […] She is astonished at how other people can stand it day after day, seeing what they see and have to witness. Or do the others suffer less from it because they have no other system for viewing the world? Perhaps normal vision […] completely dulled people’s senses […]. (76)

Mais il arrive que Miranda ressente la maladie de son système optique un “don du ciel”. […] Ce qui l’étonne, c’est que chaque jour les autres supportent tout ce qu’ils voient, tout ce qu’ils sont obliges de voir. Serait-ce que les autres, n’ayant pas d’autre système pour voir le monde, n’en souffrent pas autant? Il se pourrait que la vision normale […] émousse la sensibilité des gens […]. (99-100)

Può anche capitare tuttavia che Miranda consideri il suo sistema ottico malato come “un dono del cielo”. […] Perché Miranda si stupisce come gli altri uomini riescano a sopportare quotidianamente le cose che vedono e che sono costretti a vedere. O magari gli altri non soffrono come lei perché non possiedono alcun altro sistema per vedere il mondo? Potrebbe anche darsi che la vista normale […] ottundesse i sensi della gente […]. (89-90)
Appendix IV: Further examples from *Malina* in German, English, French, Italian and Spanish

(1) “...durch dieses Heute kann ich nur...” (8)

“This today sends me flying” (2)

ce jour, je ne peux que le traverser en toute hate (6)

questo Oggi lo posso passare solo con una tremenda angoscia e una fretta pazzesca (12)

solo puedo atravesar este ‘Hoy’ angustiadísima y a toda prisa (7)

(2) “vernichten muesste man es sofort, was ueber Heute geschrieben wird” (8)

“Today should be destroyed immediately” (2)

ce qu’on écrit sur le jour même, on devrait le détruire aussitôt (6)

si dovrebbe distruggere subito quello che viene scritto sull’Oggi (12)

habría que destruir en seguida lo que se escribe sobre el ‘hoy’ (7)

(3) “beklommen” (12)

“anxious” (4)

Il m’arrive encore d’être saisie (9) [I am sometimes seized]

osservo angosciata la magnolia (15-16)

observo, angustiada, las primeras inflorescencias del magnolio (10)

(4) “es war einmal an dieser Stelle” (14)

“there was something there once” (5)
il y avait là (11)
una volta li c’era… (17)
algo hubo alguna vez de todas formas (12)

(5)
“Es ist mir nur erspart worden, oder ich habe es mir aufgespart…” (14)
“I was only spared – or perhaps I spared myself - …” (5)

Mais je n’ai pas eu à le croiser trop tôt, ou c’est moi qui m’en suis dispensée. (11)

Mi è stato risparmiato soltanto, o io me lo sono risparmiato (17)
me fue, simplemente, ahorrado, o bien yo me lo reserve para más tarde (12)

(6)
“Jahre später ist es mir mit ihm noch einmal so ergangen” (15)

“Years later the same thing happened” (6)

Des années après, la scène s’est reproduite (11)

Qualche anno dopo mi capitò la stessa cosa (18)
Años más tarde volvió a ocurrírme lo mismo (13)

(7)
“Noch stört es dich. Noch. Es stört dich aber eine andre Erinnerung.” (24)

“It still upsets you. Still. But you’re upset about a different recollection.” (11)

cela te gêne encore. Encore. Mais c’est un autre souvenir qui te gêne. (19)

Ancora ti turba. Ancora. Ma è un altro ricordo che ti turba. (25)

aún te sigue perturbando aquello. Pero es otro recuerdo el que te molesta. (22)
(8)
Und den See […] säumen die Friedhöfe (181)

The lake […] is hemmed by cemeteries (113)

Et le lac est ceint de nombreux cimetières. (147)

E orlano il lago, che non si vede, i molti cimiteri. (156)

gran número de cementerios orillan sus invisibles aguas. (176)

(9)
Mein Vater […] zieht seine Hand von meiner Schulter zurück (181)

My father […] takes his hand off my shoulder (113)

Mon père (…) retire sa main de mon épaule (147)

Mio padre (…) ritrae la mano dalla mia spalla (156)

mi padre retira su mano de mi hombro (176)

(10)
Mein Vater hat mich eingeschlossen […] eine Tür muss es geben, eine einzige Tür, damit ich ins Freie kann (182)

My father has imprisoned me […] there must be a door, one single door leading outside (114)

Mon père m’y a enfermée (…) il doit bien y en avoir une (porte), ne serait-ce qu’une, qui me permettrait de sortir (148)

Mio padre mi ha chiuso dentro (…) ci deve essere una porta, una porta sola, in modo che io possa uscire all’aperto (156)

Mi padre me ha encerrado en [el aposento] […] tiene que haber alguna puerta, una sola puerta que me permita salir (176)

(11)
Man wehrt sich nicht im Gas […] Man wehrt sich hier nicht. (182)

There’s no defense against gas […] Here there is no defense. (114)

Contre le gaz, on ne se defend pas. […] On ne peut pas se défendre ici. (148)
Non ci si difende dal gas. (156) omission of 4 sentences in Italian.

Contra el gas no hay forma de defenderse. [...] Aquí nadie se defiende. (177)

(12)
Ich hätte dich nicht verraten, ich hätte es niemand gesagt. (182)

I wouldn’t have told anyone, I wouldn’t have betrayed you. (114)

Je ne t’aurais pas trahi, je ne l’aurais dit à personne. (148)

omitted in Italian

yo no te hubiera traicionado, no se lo hubiera dicho a nadie. (177)

(13)
ein blauer riesiger Klecks fährt mir in den Mund (184)

a huge blue splotch runs into my mouth (115)

une immense tache bleue m’entre dans la bouche (150)

una enorme macchia blu mi entra in bocca (158)

una gigantesca mancha azul se me instala en la boca (178)

(14)
a) ‘Meine Mutter fegt die zetretenen Blumen, das bißchen Unrat, weg, stumm, um das Haus rein zu halten.’ (189)

To keep the house clean my mother sweeps away the trampled flowers in silence, the little bit of filth. (118)

Ma mère balaye les fleurs écrasées, ces quelques saletés, sans mot dire, pour nettoyer la maison. (153-154)

omitted in Italian

Mi madre barrel as flores pisoteadas, un montoncito de basura, muda, para mantener la casa limpia. (183)
b) meine Mutter rückt immer weiter zurück auf dem Wagen, **stumm**. (192)

*my mother keeps moving farther back inside the wagon, *silently*. (120)

*ma mère se rencogne de plus en plus au fond du chariot, muette* (156)

*mia madre si ritrae sempre di più nel carro, muta.* (164)

*mi madre se retira cada vez más al fondo del coche, muda.* (186)

c) ‘Meine Mutter sitzt aufrecht und **stumm** neben mir.’ (193)

*Next to me my mother is sitting upright and *silent*. (121)*

*Ma mère est assise près de moi, toute droite et muette* (157)

*Mia madre siede dritta e muta accanto a me* (165)

*Mi madre está sentada a mi lado, rígida y muda.* (187)

(15)

*ich finde das Glas mit dem Mineralwasser, Güssinger, ich trinke, am Verdursten, dieses Glas Wasser.* (200)

*I find the glass with the mineral water, Güssinger, ready to die of thirst I drink this glass of water.* (125)

*(je) trouve le verre d’eau minérale et le bois, assoiffée.* (162) – *name omitted*

*trovo il bicchiere dell’acqua minerale, bevo, assetata, quell bicchiere d’acqua.* (170) – *name omitted*

*encuentro el vaso de agua mineral, ‘Guessinger’, bebo, muerta de sed, ese vaso de agua.* (193-194)

(16)

*In einer anderen Ecke liegt die Frau, sanft und duldsam, von der sein Kind ist* (202)

*His wife is lying in another corner, gentle and patient* (127)
Dans un autre coin est couché la femme douce et patiente dont il a eu cet enfant (164)

In un altro angolo è distesa la donna, mite e paziente, da cui ha avuto quel bambino (172)

En otro rincón está echada la mujer, dulce y paciente, con la que tuvo aquel niño (196)

Ich lege mich auf den Boden, stehe sofort wieder auf (204)

I lie down on the floor, but am on my feet again at once (128)

Je me couche par terre et me relève tout de suite (165)

Mi distendo sul pavimento, mi rialzo subito (173)

Me tumbo en el suelo y vuelvo a incorporarme en el acto (197)

Sag ihm, sag ihm, bitte sag ihm! Sag ihm nichts. (206)

Tell him, tell him, please tell him! Don’t tell him anything! (128)

Dis-lui, dis-lui, s’il te plait, dis-lui! Ne lui dis rien. (166)

Digli, digli, digli per favore! Non dirgli niente. (175)

Dile, por favor, dile… no le digas nada. (199)

Es sei nicht günstig für mich (210)

It’s not good for me (131)

ça ne m’arrange pas (170)

non è opportune per me. (178)

no sería bueno para mí (203)
Ich: Dann erklär dir, warum hier schon wieder ein alter Zettel auftaucht. [...] du darfst nur auf das eine Wort, das darübergeschrieben ist, schauen.

Malina: Todesarten.


Death Styles.
Death Stales’. (190)

Genres de mort.
Gens de mort. (244)

Cause di morte.
Cause d’amore. (254)

Tipos de muerte.
Tiros de muerte. (292)

Nur die Zeitangabe mußte ich mir lange überlegen, denn es ist mir fast unmöglich, ‘heute’ zu sagen, obwohl man jeden Tag ‘heute’ sagt, ja, sagen muß, aber wenn mir etwa Leute mitteilen, was sie heute vorhaben – um von morgen ganz zu schweigen –, bekomme ich nicht, wie man oft meint, einen abwesenden Blick, sondern einen sehr aufmerksamen, vor Verlegenheit, so hoffnungslos ist meine Beziehung zu ‘heute’, denn durch dieses Heute kann ich nur in höchster Angst und fliegender Eile kommen und davon schreiben, oder nur sagen, in dieser höchsten Angst, was sich da zuträgt, denn vernichten müßte man es sofort, was über Heute geschrieben wird, wie man die wirklichen Briefe zerreißt, zerknüllt, nicht beendet, nicht abschickt, weil sie von heute sind und weil sie in keinem Heute mehr ankommen werden. (8)

But I had to think long and hard about the Time, since ‘today’ is an impossible word for me, even though I hear it daily; you can’t escape it. When people start telling me what they have planned for today – not to mention tomorrow – I get confused. My relationship with ‘today’ is so bad that many people often mistake extreme attentiveness for an absent-minded gaze. This Today sends me flying into an anxious haste, so that I can only write about it, or at best report whatever’s going on. Actually, anything written about Today should be destroyed immediately, just like all real letters are crumpled or torn up, unfinished and unmailed, all because they were written, but cannot arrive, Today. (2)
Seule l’indication du temps est issue d’une longue réflexion: il m’est presque impossible de dire ‘aujourd’hui’, comme on le fait tous les jours, ou plutôt comme il le faudrait; moi, quand les gens me font part de leurs projets pour le jour même, sans parler de ceux qu’ils ont pour le lendemain, je ne prends pas, comme on le croit souvent, un regard absent: l’embarras me donne un regard très attentive, tant mes rapports avec cet ‘aujourd’hui’ sont désespérés; ce jour, je ne peux que le traverser en toute hâte, dans la plus grande angoisse, écrire dessus ou dire simplement ce qui s’y passé, vu toute mon angoisse, car ce qu’on écrit sur le jour meme, on devrait le détruire aussitôt, comme on déchire et froisse les letter réelles en les laissant inachevées, non expédiées parce que, étant d’aujourd’hui, il n’y a plus d’aujourd’hui où elles puissent arriver. (6)

Solo sulla data ho dovuto riflettere a lungo, perché è quasi impossibile per me dire ‘oggi’, sebbene ogni giorno si dica, anzi, si debba dire ‘oggi’, ma qualcuno mi comunica quel che si propone di fare oggi – per non dire domani – non assumo, come di solito dicono, uno sguardo assente, ma uno molto attento, per l’imbarazzo, tanto è privo di speranza il mio rapporto con l’’oggi’, perché questo Oggi lo posso passare solo con una tremenda angoscia e una fretta pazzesca, e scrivere, o solo dire, in questa tremenda angoscia, ciò che success, perché si dovrebbe distruggere subito quello che viene scritto sull’Oggi, come si strappano, si spiegazzano, non si finiscono, non si spediscono le lettere vere, perché sono di oggi e perché non arriveranno più in nessun Oggi. (12)

Sólo la indicación temporal me ha hecho pensar un buen rato, pues me resulta casi imposible decir ‘hoy’ aunque la gente diga o, mejor aún, tenga que decir ‘hoy’ cada día; pero si alguien me cuenta lo que se propone hacer hoy – por no hablar de mañana –, no adopto una mirada ausente, como a menudo se piensa, sino una muy atenta, de pura perplejidad, ¡tan faltas de esperanza son mis relaciones con el ‘hoy’!, pues sólo puedo atravesar este ‘Hoy’ angustiadísimo y a toda prisa y, en medio de esa angustia, escribir o contar simplemente lo que en él ocurra; pues habría que destruir en seguida lo que se escribe sobre el ‘hoy’, tal como se rompen, arrugan y no se terminan ni se envían las cartas verdaderas, porque siendo de hoy no podrán ya llegar a ningún otro Hoy. (6-7)
Appendix V: Further examples from *Franza* in German, English, French and Italian

(1) Jordan reibt sich an seinen Gegnern, entdeckte Franza nicht, daß er alle als Gegner sah. (55)

**Omitted in English and French.**

Jordan si scontra con i suoi avversari – non si rendeva conto, Franza, che tutti erano avversari per lui? (240)

(2) Das war diese furchtbare Abreise in Genua, würde er sich noch oft sagen, und er irrte sich, denn er wies später diesen Stunden nicht einen besonderen Platz an in der Erinnerung. (55)

Then came this awful departure in Genoa, he could imagine himself saying, though he was wrong: Later these hours would hold no special place in his memory. (61)

Ce fut cet épouvantable départ de Gênes, se redirait-il souvent, et il se trompait car plus tard ces heures n’occupèrent pas de place particulière dans sa mémoire. (75)

Quella fu la terribile partenza da Genova, avrebbe spesso detto tra sé, ma si sbagliava, poiché nel ricordo, in seguito, a quelle ore non assegnò una particolare importanza. (240)

Changed perspective: in the ST, Leo Jordan does not allow the hours to take on significance in his memories, whereas in the TT, it is the memories that do not occupy a special place. He is more powerful in the ST.

(3) Es kann doch nicht jeder Augenblick so schrecklich gewesen sein […] Weil es damals nicht so schrecklich war (55)

Every single moment cannot have been so awful then […] But it’s because it wasn’t that bad then (61)

Chaque instant n’a quand même pas dû être affreux […] Parce qu’à l’époque ce n’était pas si terrible. (75)

Non è possibile che ogni attimo sia stato così spaventoso […] Ma perché allora non era così spaventoso (240)

There is no ‘but’ in the ST. Translator as editor: introduction of conjunctions to make text more fluent.
(4) 
[...] du könntest an keinen denken, ohne an jeder Stelle der Vergangenheit zu schreien oder zittern anzufangen. (55)

[...] you’re unable to think of any part of the past without screaming or beginning to tremble. (61)

tu dises ne pouvoir t’en rappeler aucun, nit e situer nulle part dans le passé, sans te mettre à crier ou à trembler. (75)

[...] non puoi pensare a uno solo di quegli istanti senza metterti a tremare o a urlare su ogni frammento del passato (240)

5) 
Graust dir vor mir (55)

You’re shuddering because of me (61)

Je te fais horreur? (75)

Ti faccio ribrezzo? (241)

(6) 
Was andere Mädchen auch woollen, ich muß wohl getrieben gewesen sein, ins letzte Zimmer zu schauen, die Blaubartehe, auf das letzte Zimmer neugierig (56)

What other girls long for I had to work hard at, namely, to look into the last room, the marriage with Bluebeard, ever curious about the last room (62)

Quoi que veuillent d’autres filles, pour ma part j’ai dû être incitée à regarder dans la dernière chamber, l’instinct de l’Amnados, le mariage avec Barbe-Bleu, curieuse de voir cette dernière chamber (77)

Proprio quello che cercano anche alter ragazze, devo essere stata spinta dall’impulso di guardare dentro l’ultima stanza, l’impulso di Amnados, il matrimonio di Barbaablù, la curiosità per l’ultima stanza (241)

The ST suggests that Franza thinks of herself as self-destructive: ‘(von etwas) getrieben sein’ indicates that she was almost possessed by the wish to find out what would happen if she married Jordan. The English TT suggests that she had to force herself, which is the opposite meaning. In addition, ‘namely’ serves to structure the passage. The Italian TT retains the image of Franza as compelled to find out, but also explicates the Bluebeard reference.

(7) 
dieser hilflose Satz mit dem ich plötzlich auf mir bestehen wollte (58)
this helpless sentence with which I suddenly wanted to stand up for myself (65)
Passage omitted in French

quella frase goffa, con cui improvvisamente intendevo farmi valere (244)

The English and Italian TT are similar here in that they reference Franza’s wish to recognise her own value/agency. The ST additionally includes the possibility of inferring a reference to Franza’s fight against the gradual erasure of her personality: she needs to insist on the fact that she exists in her own right as Jordan treats her as a collection of symptoms.

(8)
Er hat mir meine Güter genommen. Mein Lachen, meine Zärtlichkeit, mein Freuenkönnen, mein Mitleiden, Helfenkönnen, meine Animalität, mein Strahlen. (76)

He stole all of my goodness. My laughter, my tenderness, my capacity for joy, my compassion, my ability to help, my animal nature, my shining rays. (80)

Il m’a pris mes biens. Mon rire, ma tendresse, ma disposition à faire plaisir, à aider, ma compassion, mon animalité, mon rayonnement (91)

Lui mi ha sottratto i miei beni. Il mio sorriso, la mia tenerezza, la mia capacità di gioire, di compatire, di aiutare, la mia animalità, la mia radiosità. (278)

The English TT accentuates the ambiguity of the ST: while ‘Güter’ means ‘goods’ (as in possessions), the list that follows indicates that it is here also used to mean ‘Güte’ [benevolence] and all things ‘gut’ [good] more generally. The ST thus allows the reader to see that Franza’s humanity is her most prized possession. The English TT does not draw a parallel between ‘goodness’ and ‘goods’, whereas in the Italian TT this is possible because ‘bene’ means ‘good’ and ‘beni’ means ‘goods’. Furthermore, the translation of ‘Strahlen’ as ‘shining rays’ is extremely puzzling.

(9)
Omission in English and French TTs of passage detailing Franza’s relationship with Ödön and her first meeting with Jordan (78-88 in German ST): this passage makes it clear that Franza is not easy to understand; although she seems happy with Ödön, she has grown tired of him and is intrigued by Jordan. She is clearly vulnerable when she first meets him. This passage in the ST adds further complexity to both Franza’s and Jordan’s characters and their relationship. Furthermore, there is an extended allusion to Schoenberg’s Pierrot Lunaire (as in Malina) in the ST, which is an interesting parallel between the two novels.

(10)
Badeortversprechung, die Lügen gestraft wurde von ein paar kläglichen Häusern. (95)

The promise of a seaside spa, the lie revealed by a couple of pitiful houses. (95)
Promesse de station balnéaire, démentie par quelques maisons minables. (101)
Stazione balneare, c’era scritto, promessa sbugiardata da un paio di case miserabili.
(306)

The ST formulation is slightly complex because of the compound, but the TT brings across the meaning and tone.

(11)
Ja, die Farbwerke Hoechst und Bayer. (98)
Yes, dear old Behring and all its good advice. (98)

Eh oui, les laboratoires Hoechst et Bayer (104)
Già, le industrie chimiche Hoechst e Bayer, disse Franza. (308)

The ST mentions Behring, Hoechst and Bayer in this passage detailing medical advice. The TT only keeps one of the company names and adds an interjection to clarify that the preceding list constitutes medical advice.

(12)
eine der älteren Hütten, die dort versuchten, ein Stück Siedlung gegen ein paar weitre hundert Kilometer Niemandsland und den Sandangriff zu halten. (99)

one of the older huts thrown up as an attempt at maintaining a settlement in the face of a hundred kilometers of no-man’s-land and the onslaught of the sand. (99)

une des baraques plus anciennes qui tentaient de maintenir un morceau de terre habitée contre quelques centaines de kilomètres de no man’s land et contre l’attaque du sable. (105)

uno dei vecchi capanni che li tentavano di opporre una parvenza di insediamento alla terra di nessuno – alter centinaia di chilometri più a sud – e all’aggressione della sabbia. (309)

The ST and the Italian TT portray the huts as quasi-agents, which supports the opposition between desert and civilisation which affects Franza in this chapter. The English TT makes it clear that the huts were built by people.

(13)
sie legte sich neben ihn in den Strand und salbte sich und ihn mit Ölen und Spray. (100)
She lay beside him in the sand and rubbed oil and spray on herself and him. (101)

Elle s’allonga à côté de lui sur le sable et s’enduisit, et lui en meme temps, d’huiles et d’aérosol. (108)
si sdraiò accanto a Martin sulla sabbia e si mise a ungere se stessa e lui con oli e spray. (311)

The ST uses ‘salben’ [to anoint], which has religious connotations. The use of ‘Ölen’ [oils] rather than ‘Öl’ [oil] supports the religious nature of Franza’s actions. These connotations are missing in the TT. The Italian TT uses the plural, but avoids the religious term.

(14)
er las lieber die Zeitungen, aus denen Assuan und immer wieder Assuan und der Hochdamm hervorbrachen. (103)

he much preferred to read the newspapers that kept mentioning Aswan and always Aswan and the huge dam. (104)

il préférait lire les journaux où s’étalaient Assouan et toujours Assouan et le Haut Barrage (111-112)

preferì leggere i giornali, dove campeggiava Assuan e ancora Assuan e la Grande Diga. (314)

The ST uses irony here: the use of ‘hervorbrachen’ in the context of the controversial Aswan dam can be interpreted as intentional. The dam and its effects are thematised in Franza. The English TT uses a more simple and literal translation, whereas the Italian retains a weaker effect through the use of ‘campeggiare’.

(15)
Ich habe gewußt, wie tot ich sein werde. (104)

I have seen how I will die. (105)

J’ai su comment je serai, morte, dit’elle. Dans la boue, je l’ai su. (113)

Ho capito fino a che punto sarò morta. (315)

The meaning of ST and TT is different: the ST refers to death as though it occurs by degrees, whereas in the TT Franza refers to the manner in which she thinks she is going to die.

(16)
Die Phosphatgesellschaft kann Gott nicht verhindern. (115)

The phosphate mines cannot stop the appearance of God. (119)

La société des phosphates ne peut empêcher Dieu. (128)
La compagnia dei fosfati non può ostacolare Dio. (328)

The meaning of the ST is ambiguous: God cannot prevent the phosphate company, or the company cannot eradicate God. Franza occasionally ponders the role of God. The English TT necessarily has to choose one meaning as the ST’s ambiguity is inherent in its German grammatical construction.

(17)
er merkte nicht, daß sie vor lauter Sterben zu sterben anfing. (135)

He […] hadn’t noticed at all that she was beginning to die from having experienced a genuine death. (141)

Il ne remarquait pas qu’à force de mourir elle était en train de mourir. (154)

non si accorgeva che lei, a forza di morire, cominciava a morire. (355)

The phrasing is unusual in both ST and TT. However, the ST allows the possibility in seeing a reference here to Franza’s life in Vienna, which could be described in terms of Bachmann’s idea of ‘die Krankheit unserer Zeit’. Franza’s marriage to Jordan constituted gradual death because of his treatment of her. In addition, through her work on the sequelae of concentration camp victims she witnessed death. The TT refers to one death and thus makes it more difficult to see these connections.
Appendix VI: Further examples from Simultan in German, English, French, and Italian

(1)
Weil ich zufällig. Ja, zufällig, einmal muß ich immerhin zum Friseur. (41)

Yes, it just so happens I have to go to the beauty parlor every once in a while. (37)

Parce que par hasard je… Oui, par hasard, de toute façon il faut que j’aile che le coiffeur. (51)

Davvero, è un caso, una volta tanto devo pur andare dal parrucchiere. (49)

Fragmented sentences here are less fragmented in English – fewer sentences (but not many).

(2)
Es war ihr ein Rätsel (43)

It puzzled her (39)

C’était pour elle un mystère (54)

Un vero mistero (51)

Vagueness of German grammar is recreated in the English TT – not clear in ST or TT what is puzzling Beatrix. The French TT emphasises Beatrix’s oddness. The Italian TT does not add to the impression that life in general is a mystery for Beatrix.

(3)
es mußte wieder einmal überlegt werden, was zuerst geschehen sollte. (43)

first things first, she needed to decide what should happen next. (39)

Il fallait se demander par quoi commencer. (53)

bisognava pensare a quali cose andavano fatte prima e quali dopo. (51)

The ST uses an impersonal formulation that contributes to Beatrix’s characterisation, whereas the English TT uses the first person. However, “first things first” hints at Beatrix’s phlegmatic nature. The French and Italian TTs do not bring across how tedious Beatrix finds decisions.
he never noticed the deception since she deceived him so unintentionally in every respect (46)

‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ also contains a reference to deceit which is ambiguous because of its reference to optical illusions. There is no ambiguity here, and the English translation achieves the same effect as the ST, as does the French TT. ‘Ingannare’ refers to deceit with malicious intentions, so the Italian TT makes Beatrix’s actions appear more purposeful.

she had to magnify the importance of these things (47)

The ST uses the impersonal construction, for which the first person singular is an acceptable equivalent in the English TT. The English TT does not contain a reference to ‘erscheinen lassen’, i.e. Beatrix’ intent to manipulate Erich. The Italian TT also uses the impersonal phrasing, as does the French TT. Beatrix is thinking about her role in Erich’s life here. It is rather minimal, and she is unwilling to take action in any area of her life throughout the story, so details of her passive nature are important.

She for one would never allow herself to be exploited (49)

The repetition of the pronoun would sound unusual in English, so the interjection here adds the same emphasis. The French TT is not marked here. The repetition works in Italian, and as pronouns are generally not used as the verb ending denotes who the verb refers to, it adds emphasis here.
Was sie auch keinem anderen Mann eingestanden hätte, warum sie vielleicht auch keinen wollte, war einfach, daß sie nur gerne beim Friseur saß, daß René für sie der einzige Platz auf der Welt war, wo sie sich wohlfühlte, und dafür verzichtete sie fast auf alles.

A thing she would never confess to any other man, perhaps the very reason she didn’t want one: it was simply that she was only happy when sitting in the beauty parlor, that René’s was the only place in the world she felt at home. For René’s she sacrificed almost everything.

elle n’aurait pas non plus avoué à un autre homme, et peut-être était-ce pour cela qu’elle ne voulait pas d’autre homme, c’est qu’elle n’avait d’autre plaisir que ses séances chez le coiffeur, que René était pour elle le seul endroit au monde où elle se sentit bien, et pour cela elle renonçait à presque tout.

che del resto non l’avrebbe confessato a nessun altro uomo, e anzi era forse questa la ragione per cui di uomini non ne voleva, era una cosa molto semplice, che a lei piaceva soltanto stare dal parucchiere, che René era l’unico posto al mondo dove si trovava bene e per andare da lui rinunciava a quasi tutto il resto.

The English TT adds a colon here and divides the text into two sentences. Furthermore, it indicates that Beatrix sacrifices almost everything for the beauty parlour, whereas the ST makes it clear that she makes sacrifices for the comfort and contentedness her presence at the beauty parlour enables her to feel.

people should finally stop coming and expecting that she follow her cousin Elisabeth’s example, who had mastered and doctored and slaved herself to death.

che nessuno, per carità, venisse più a chiederle di seguire l’esempio di sua cugina Elisabeth; quella figlia modello aveva studiato, si era laureata e sfacchinava come una matta.

The English TT is quite creative here and recreates the ST’s wordplay. The French TT is not very playful, but Beatrix’s disdain oh fer cousin’s work is clear. While the Italian TT’s use of ‘sfacchinare’ is a direct equivalent of ‘sich abrackern’ in meaning and register, ‘laurearsi’ is the standard term for the completion of a degree and thus does not indicate the sarcasm of the ST.
Beatrix ging das zwar nicht ein, denn was mußte die ‘einfach’ sein (61)

That didn’t make much sense to Beatrix: how ‘simple’ could a woman like that be (59)

Cela ne produisit aucun effet sur Beatrix, car en quoi avait’elle besoin d’être ‘simple’ (79)

A Beatrix la cosa non andava giù, perché mai avrebbe dovuto essere ‘semplice’ (71)

The English TT again adds a colon and does not quite bring across the fact that Beatrix misses the nuance in the beautician’s statement to her. ‘Ging das zwar nicht ein’ is unusual phrasing and in my view emphasises that Beatrix exists in her own universe. The French TT presents a changed perspective as it describes Beatrix from the outside. The Italian TT is more similar to the ST.

Franziska beherrschte sich und unterrückte ein Lachen, es war sicher die größte Kühnheit, zu der sich die alte Frau aufgerafft hatte seit Jahren (102)

Franziska controlled herself and suppressed a laugh, it was surely the most daring revelation the old woman had roused herself to in years (101)

Franziska se domina et réprima un rire, c’était assurément la plus grande audace de la vieille femme, depuis des années elle avait rassemblé ses forces (130)

Franziska fece uno sforzo per controllarsi e non mettersi a ridere, certamente da molti anni la vecchia signora non si permetteva un’espressione così audace (117)

As Franziska (Franza) has to suppress most of her feelings and natural reactions throughout this story and The Book of Franza, this passage is crucial as it contrasts her repression with the Mrs Jordan’s behaviour, which becomes increasingly outrageous. The Italian TT is the only one that combines both parts of the first phrase; the use of two words indicating repression is key in the ST and the English and French TTs.

Der dornenreiche, leidvolle Aufstieg eines genialen Arztes war schon Franziskas Religion zu der Zeit (103)

The brilliant doctor’s rise to fame along the thorny path of suffering had already become Franziska’s religion at that time (102)

Cette douloureuse ascension semée d’épines d’un médecin genial était déjà à cette époque la religion de Franziska (132)
A quel tempo la sofferta e spinosa ascesa di un medico di genio era per Franziska qualcosa di sacro (119).

Obvious religious language; Franza’s admiration of her husband is ironic in the context of the story. The English TT is the only translation not to equate the doctor’s rise to Jesus’ ascension.

(12)
Bei ihrem nächsten Besuch wußte Franziska nicht, wie sie es anstellen sollte, aus der altem Frau, die auf der Hut war, etwas herauszufragen, was sie wissen mußte. (111)

At her next visit Franziska didn’t know how to persuade the old woman, who was always on the alert, to give her answers she needed to know. (109)

Lors de sa visite suivante, Franziska ne savait pas comment faire pour tirer de la vieille femme qui était sur ses gardes ce qu’elle avait besoin de savoir. (141)

Alla sua successive visita Franziska non sapeva come fare per riuscire a tirar fuori dalla vecchia signora, sempre così guardinga, quello che lei assolutamente voleva sapere. (126)

The ST evidently presents problems for all of the translators here as the TTs vary considerably. The French and Italian TTs hint at Franziska’s inability to effect change, break out of her role or encourage her mother-in-law to do the same through the clumsy-sounding phrasing of ‘comment faire pour/come fare per’. ‘Auf der Hut’ is translated literally in all cases.
Appendix VII: Examples of Text Analysis

Malina p.328-334

Malina: Du wirst kaum beteiligt sein, nicht mehr hier.
Ich: (abbandonando) Warum nicht hier? Nein, ich verstehe dich nicht! Aber dann verstehe ich gar nichts mehr… Ich müßte mich ja selber beseitigen!
Malina: Weil du dir nur nützen kannst, indem du dir schadest. Das ist der Anfang und das Ende aller Kämpfe. […]
Ich: (tutto il clavicembalo) Ach! Ich bin eine Andere, du willst sagen, ich werde noch eine ganz Andere sein!
Malina: […] Ein Ich handelt. Du aber wirst nicht mehr handeln.
Ich: (diminuendo) Ich habe doch nie gern gehandelt.

[…]

Malina sieht herein zu mir. Du bist noch wach?
Ich bin zufällig wach, ich muß über etwas nachdenken, es ist furchtbar.
Malina sagt: So, und warum ist es furchtbar?
Ich: (con fuoco) Es ist furchtbar, es ist die Furchtbarkeit noch gar nicht enthalten in einem Wort, es ist zu furchtbar.
Malina: Ist das alles, was dich wachhält? (Töte ihn! töte ihn!)
Ich: (sotto voce) Ja, es ist alles.
Malina: Und was wirst du tun?
Ich: (forte, forte, fortissimo) Nichts.

Ich’s mood is brought across through musical mood markers, highlighted in red.
This mood marker was clearly invented by Bachmann. It is dramatic and emphasises a crucial moment in Ich’s realisation of her situation.
Ich alternates between agitation and calmer states which is clearly shown through the mood markers.
These words all have multiple possible meanings: Ich and Malina contrast ‘to act (against s.o.)’ with ‘to trade’ and ‘to negotiate’ as well as ‘to compromise’, ‘to be treated’ and ‘to be the subject of negotiation’. The meanings allow interpretation of the first instances as denoting Ich’s agency which progresses to passivity in the later instances.
This passage of the 3rd chapter shifts between narrative and dialogue. As exemplified here, it is often difficult to distinguish between Ich’s thoughts and speech. The absence of speech marks increases the ambiguity.
’Con fuoco’ is used three times in the final section of chapter 3. It means ‘with fire’ and highlights the relevance of Italian poet Gaspara Stampa’s phrase "vivere ardendo e non sentire il male" [to live in fire and not to feel the pain], which is quoted in Malina, as Ich’s existence is threatened here. Fire imagery recurs throughout Bachmann’s work.
The contrast between the mood markers here and “Nichts” is unexpected and further emphasises Ich’s desperation.
Bestimmt würde Miranda Josef nicht weniger lieben, wenn sie seine gelblich verfärbten Zähne jedesmal bei einem Lachen sehen müßte. Sie weiß aus der Nähe, wie diese Zähne sind, aber sie denkt unbehaglich an eine Möglichkeit von ‘immerzu sehen’. Es würde ihr wahrscheinlich auch nichts ausmachen, an manchen Tagen, wenn er müde ist, durch Faltenfelder um seine Augen erschreckt zu werden. Trotzdem ist es ihr lieber, daß dieses genaue Sehen ihr erspart bleibt und ihr Gefühl dadurch nicht beeinträchtigt und geschwächt werden kann. Sie merkt sowieso augenblicklich – weil sie Mitteilungen auf andren Wellen empfängt –, ob Josef müde ist, warum er müde ist, ob er übemütig lacht oder ein Wehr. So scharf abgebildet wie andre braucht sie ihn nicht vor sich zu haben, sie mustert niemand, fotografiert Menschen nicht mit einem Brillenblick, sondern malt sie in ihrer eignen, von andren Eindrücken bestimmten Manier, und Josef endlich ist ihr wirklich gelungen, von Anfang an.

Mit Hilfe einer winzigen Korrektion – der durch die Zerreißungslinsen – mit einem auf die Nase gestülpten goldenen Brillengestell, kann Miranda in die Hölle sehen. Dieses Innen hat sie aufgehört, für sie an Schrecken zu verlieren. Darum sieht sie sich, immer auf der Hut, vorsichtig um in einem Restaurant, ob sie die Brille aufsetzt, um die Speisekarte zu lesen, oder auf der Straße, wenn sie ein Taxi herbeiwinken will, denn wenn sie nicht acht gibt, kommt in ihr Blickfeld, was sie nie mehr vergessen kann. Sie sieht ein verkrüppeltes Kind oder einen Zwerg oder eine Frau mit einem amputierten Arm, doch solche Figuren sind wirklich nur die grellsten, auffallendsten inmitten einer Anhäufung von ungültlichen, hämischen, verdammten Gesichtern, von Demütigungen oder Verbrechen beschriebenen Gesichtern, in träumabaren Visagen.

‘Ihr glücklichen Augen’ p. 78

Visage stems from the Latin word ‘visus’ and is related to ‘videre’ [to see] “Unträumbare Visagen” thus combines the two semantic fields which exist in tension in this passage.
Appendix VIII: Correspondence with the translators

The following questions were sent to all three translators

1) How did your translation come about - were you approached by the publisher or did you pursue publication because this was a project in which you had a particular interest?
2) Did you feel that you were translating a feminist writer?
3) Were you under pressure of time to complete your translation?
4) As far as you can recall, what was your impression of the ‘voice(s)’ central to the text?

Additional question sent to Philip Boehm

Was your publisher, Holmes & Meier, involved in determining the final composition of the translation to any extent? For example, whose decision was it to include the map of Vienna, the footnotes, glossary, and Mark Anderson’s afterword?

Additional questions sent to Peter Filkins

1) Was the publisher involved in determining the final composition of the translation to any extent?
2) What was your motivation for including the draft of a speech by Ingeborg Bachmann in the novel’s foreword?

Additional question sent to Mary Fran Gilbert

Whose choice was it to entitle the translation Three Paths to the Lake, and what was the reason for this?

Philip Boehm’s response

1) How did your translation come about - were you approached by the publisher or did you pursue publication because this was a project in which you had a particular interest?

I was asked to submit a sample, and the publisher selected mine in a blind reading. I don't know how many samples were solicited.

2) Did you feel that you were translating a feminist writer?

Malina is a richly complex text and while I'm sure I fell short of conveying some of its riches, I was quite aware of the novel's critical resonance as well as its significance within many contexts, including various feminist ones.

3) Were you under pressure of time to complete your translation?
Yes, as is generally the case.

4) As far as you can recall, what was your impression of the ‘voice(s)’ central to the text?

In hindsight I can see I missed things here and there, and of course I'm sure I would render some things differently today.

Incidentally one thing I've come to appreciate very much is having a strong editor, ideally a bilingual one (for that book, which was essentially my first, I was pretty much on my own). Perhaps editors are even more overlooked than translators.

5) Was your publisher, Holmes & Meier, involved in determining the final composition of the translation to any extent? For example, whose decision was it to include the map of Vienna, the footnotes, glossary, and Mark Anderson’s afterword?

Yes I worked with an editor at H&M [Holmes and Meier] (also consulted with Ingeborg Bachmann's brother, who was very gracious). Map and glossary were my suggestion, the publisher commissioned Mark Anderson to write the afterword.

Mary Fran Gilbert’s response

Mary Fran Gilbert responded to my message, but did not refer to the questions I sent. Similarly to Philip Boehm, she highlighted the time pressure she was experiencing as co-owner of a small translation agency.

No further response to my reply or the original questions was received.

Peter Filkins’ response

No response was received.
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