

- **TRADUÇÃO**

# FROM ANTHROPO-PHAGY TO TEXTO-PHAGY

**Michaela Wolf\***

*Abstract:* This paper sees translation as a practice which creatively produces new meanings, and discusses several translation models like the *belles infidèles*, Pope's translations of Homer and Brazilian cannibalization against this view of translation. The parameters of analysis are the receptor's expectations as well as the implications of the divergency between dominant and dominated cultures, mainly in relation to Roland Barthes' textual theory. It will be shown that the various translation strategies discussed in the paper have different "significance" in both the First and Third World context.

*Keywords:* Post-structuralism; cannibalism; translation history; Roland Barthes

*It is extremely simple – he said – the cannibal does not eat his adversaries, his parents, his children, because they taste good ... but with the flesh he also eats the visible and secret forces of the victim. He becomes the grave of his parents, brothers and enemies – the silent earth. He grows in this earth like a tree, whose roots go down to the deaths. He nourishes himself ... This is not a crime, but a cycle. It is our destination.<sup>1</sup>*

(Jahnn, 1948, p.13)

## INTRODUCTION

In translation, questioning the "original" means challenging established ideas of what translation may be. Today, it has been recognized that even the simplest and most unpretentious translation bears the characteristics of its creation, i.e. the history, the time, the circumstances, and the aims of the persons involved in the

\* Professora assistente, Institut für Translationswissenschaft, Universitaet Graz, Austria.

<sup>1</sup> My translation.

translation. Translation is inevitably an act of interpretation: the source-text, the so-called “original”, exists only in an act of reading which is the result of one standpoint and of the situation in which this standpoint was created. Translating is therefore not an activity exercised independently of the reader and her or his reading practice or reading experience. As Rosemary Arrojo illustrates in her analysis of Jorge Luis Borges’ *Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote*,<sup>2</sup> a text – like for example Cervantes’ *Don Quijote* – cannot be “repeated”, because the single components of the original text cannot preserve their original meaning independently of the context and its interpretations. One and the same words are imbued with a certain meaning when they are related to Menard’s context and another meaning when they are related to Cervantes’ context. Menard wants to recover the “original” meaning of Cervantes’ text, but he only succeeds in reproducing his words (Arrojo, 1992, p.20). In this view, the translation is no longer an activity which evokes the intended meaning of the “original”, but produces its own meanings which turn out to be embedded in different categories of culture, time and space.

This post-structuralist view of text, which sees each reading as a creative activity and therefore de-mystifies the “original” as well as the author as superior authority, will be the basis for my discussion of translation strategies which question the “original” in the translation process. In the second part, these translation strategies will be discussed against the background of Roland Barthes’ textual theory, which argues that a writer never produces a solid or unified “reality” or “truth”, but that “the modern scriptor is born simultaneously with the text ... and every text is eternally written *here and now*” (Barthes, 1991, p.171, author’s emphasis).

### “TUPY OR NOT TUPY”

Cannibalism as a cultural phenomenon has recently been the object of interdisciplinary studies, mainly with reference to its European context. The term derived from the “Caribs”, an Indian tribe who settled in the northern part of South America as well as on the Antilles, and who were said, according to some European conquerors, to practice ritual anthropophagy. The Cuban essayist Roberto Fernandez Retamar (1973) shows very clearly the shift of the term “cannibalist” in European cultural practice. It was William Shakespeare who in 1611 published *The Tempest*, whose main character is Calibán, a deformation of “canibal”. Calibán is identified with colonialism, with the wild person to be colonized. But when Michel de Montaigne, who apparently served as the main source for Shakespeare’s play, still maintained “qu’il n’y a rien de barbare et de sauvage en cette nation, à ce qu’on m’en a rapporté, sinon que chacun appelle barbarie ce qui n’est pas de son usage” (Montaigne, 1965, p.205), Shakespeare, for his part, would describe Calibán as a savage and deformed slave, indispensable for

2 In Borges’ novel, Pierre Menard, a fictive person, wants to reproduce Don Quijote by repeating the whole text. Pierre Menard seeks totality: total interpretation, total control over the text, total identification with its author. In doing so, he not

only wants to regain the totality of the text, but also the totality of the context in which it was written: “No quería componer otro Quijote ... sino el Quijote” (Borges, 1990, p.52). For further details see Arrojo (1992, p.11-24).

the colonizer's existence in the New World.<sup>3</sup> Today, cannibalism is associated with the equivalent of "disorder", which is threatening to society in general (Röckelein, 1996, p.13). As such being evidently a taboo, the term is in itself ambivalent and carries asymmetrical meanings. It symbolizes the devouring of a menacing, threatening adversary, his destruction and annihilation, as well as the in-corpora-tion of the other, the taking-possession of the other, the appropriation of the other's power.

In translation as practiced and theorized in post-colonial societies, new ways have been sought to shake off their Eurocentric inheritance. In Brazil, for instance, the metaphor of cannibalism in translation involves a changed idea of the value of the original with reference to its reception in the target culture. As a consequence, cannibalism in the Brazilian context signifies a practice of incorporating a dominant culture into one's own by which the incorporated society turns out to be no longer dominant. Oswald de Andrade's well known "Manifesto Antropófago" elaborated the programme of a free society based on the devouring of the cultural values of Western (colonizing) societies (Andrade, 1928). The *movimento antropófago* constituted a response to the dilemma of many (mainly Latin American) intellectuals whose education was European and who wanted to free themselves from the bonds of European hegemony. Their weapons were corrosive humour, irreverence, parody and sarcasm. "Tupy or not Tupy, that is the question", is Oswald de Andrade's version of Hamlet's dilemma (see Johnson, 1987, p.51).

About 40 years later, Augusto and Haroldo de Campos took up this cannibalistic theory and proposed it as a model of translation (A. de Campos, 1988; H. de Campos, 1981). This model follows target-specific purposes with the result of producing another/a different literature enriched by the "original" one but yet transformed. The devouring-metaphor does not stand for ignoring or failing to consider the other in the text, but for absorbing and recreating it, bearing autochthonous elements. It involves the acceptance of foreign nourishment, but at the same time denies imitation and influence in the traditional sense. In particular, Haroldo de Campos sees cannibalism as "polemics" (from Greek pólemos, war, fight): The cannibal only ate the enemies he regarded efficient and extracted from them their protein and their marrow in order to strengthen and renew his own forces (H. de Campos, 1987, p.103).<sup>4</sup> As a result of the cannibalistic process, the traditional hierarchy between original and translation is toppled, and the author and the translator emerge side by side, without erasing any identity.<sup>5</sup> To explain this process with Else Vieira's words:

3 See also Eric Cheyfitz's excellent interpretation of Shakespeare's *Caliban* (Cheyfitz, 1991).

4 The element of appropriation in H. de Campos translation model is also discussed by Braga-Pinto as one of his four types of translation which are practiced in the context of hegemony and subordination. According to Braga-Pinto, re-appropriation is a translation "in which the minor language is able to translate the dominant language (which can occur according to various degrees of assimilation)". This re-appropriation may also work as a strategy of resistance: "Since the language that is in the position to translate is, in this case, always in a subordinate position, its appropriative force tends not to

eliminate the foreignness of the other language. It rather accentuates the difference that is always at work in any process of translation" (Braga-Pinto, 1995, p.35). See also Moreno (2001).

5 Of course Oswald de Andrade's programme and the strategies of cultural representations by his fellow writers are (and will remain) an utopian vision. Nevertheless, the cannibalistic attitude continues to be seen in the work of writers such as Darcy Ribeiro, and others. A detailed analysis see in Johnson (1987, p.55-6). A severe critique of the anthropophagic cultural model was pronounced by Roberto Schwarz, see in McGuirk (1995, p.160-1).

*Cannibalism [is a] way of describing a relation not grounded on binary power oppositions (superior/inferior) but on the notion of continuation and becoming, a becoming that operates at the threshold of fusion and distinction, permanence and transcendence, dependence collateral with autonomy: not a dichotomy, but a duality... (Vieira, 1995, p.150)*

As a form of resistance, cannibalism becomes a metaphor for a certain behaviour towards cultural and economic dominance and also of a “translation philosophy” which gained great importance in post-modern translation theory.<sup>6</sup>

A translation method similar to the cannibalistic one, involving a radical re-writing of the “original” text, was a dominant feature of some European translation theories and practices a few centuries ago. In what follows I will discuss some of these historical approaches and analyse the differences in the production of meaning in the various cultures involved. The main focus will be on translation methods practiced in France and England in the 17th and 18th centuries.

### “BELLE” OR “INFIDÈLE”?

A striking example of the violation of traditional translation practices is the often cited period of the *belles infidèles*, when French writers and translators did not hesitate to subordinate foreign literatures to their own canon (see Van Hoof, 1991, p.50). Translations thus had to correspond to the class-based “bon goût” whose language was fixed and codified in Louis XIV’s classicistic France, which was shaped, inter alia, by the foundation of the Académie Française, by the flourishing of Port-Royal, by numerous literary salons and by the quarrel between the *Anciens* and the *Modernes*. As it is well-known, the term *belles infidèles* was coined to describe the translations of Nicolas Perrot d’Ablancourt, which followed the effort to participate in the creation of a beautiful piece of prose in order to please the audience: the key word was therefore “divertir”, not “ennuyer”. As a consequence, translation came to be more and more recognized as a literary art and served as a means to render the French language perfection.

Critics were not long in coming. D’Ablancourt found his fiercest adversaries on the occasion of the quarrel between *Anciens* and *Modernes*, namely in the person of Anne Dacier, whose Homer translations placed her on the side of the *Anciens*. The decline of the *Anciens* in a way contributed *nolens-volens* to the decline of the *belles infidèles*. In fact, the end of the golden age of the *belles infidèles* must be seen on a larger scale, too. One might hypothesize that with the upcoming of national consciousness in Europe the French cultural “goût” was seriously questioned and the influence of French classical studies diminished. Rationalism in its certainty of self-evident propositions obviously required a translation strategy that no longer needed either the adornment of the original nor

<sup>6</sup> The question, to which extent the de Campos brothers themselves claimed to create a canon, becoming dominant figures in Brazilian literature, has not yet been tackled

exhaustively, but seems important regarding the question of “acceptability” dealt with in chapter 4.

translation as a manifestation of the own “bon goût”, but its representatives were keen on creating something themselves (van Hoof, 1991, p.58).

### **“HOMERICAL” VERSUS “UNHOMERICAL” TRANSLATIONS**

Alexander Pope, the “maître du Parnasse anglais” (Van Hoof, 1991, p.146), became particularly famous for his Homer translations, which were widely discussed not only by contemporary critics. When Pope published his translation of the *Odyssey* in 1725, he was on his way to becoming known as the creator of the most distinguished English translations of Homer, and his translations were lauded and admired throughout the century. Pope’s immense popularity, however, did not spare him from severe critics: he was attacked as “unhomerical”, and certainly many passages sound more like Pope and generally like an 18th-century Englishman, than like an ancient Greek (Robinson, 1997, p.192).

Pope justified and explained his translation practice in his remarks on translation which are mainly contained in the often published and quoted prefaces to his translations. He confesses in his own words to be “utterly incapable of doing justice to Homer” (Pope, 1715 in Robinson, 1997, p.194) and pleads in favour of rendering Homer’s simplicity by taking, when translating, particular care of the moral sentences and proverbial speeches which are responsible for the “venerable, oracular” character of Homer’s verses. Pope also discusses specific problems he had with his Homer translations and concentrates on the epithets and the repetitions. In his opinion, many of Homer’s epithets cannot be translated literally into English without destroying the purity of the English language. Repetitions, on the other hand, are obviously regarded by Pope as a defect and preserved only if he regards them necessary and acceptable, otherwise they have to be reduced or to be paraphrased. It thus seems that there is not so much of revolutionary translation strategies in Pope’s Homer. What was it, then, what made fellow translators and literary critics call his translations “not homerical”? In which way did Pope break with contemporary and historical translation traditions? In his collection *Lives of the English Poets*, Samuel Johnson also published Pope’s biography. Johnson focuses his discussion on Pope’s translations on two aspects: the significance of his Homer translation for the English language (“His version may be said to have tuned the English tongue, for since its appearance no writer, however deficient in other powers, has wanted melody”, Johnson, 1779, in Robinson, 1997, p.206) and on Pope’s understanding of time and space with regard to the original and the translation: “In estimating this translation consideration must be had of ... the change which two thousand years have made in the modes of life and the habits of thought” (ibidem). Johnson defends Pope’s concern to recognize and accept the distance which exists in translation between language, time, behaviour, and way of thinking, and in doing so he stresses the necessity to translate for a certain public. Under these circumstances, according to Johnson, it would be no problem “to colour the images and point the sentiments of his author” (ibidem).

As we can see, Pope had practiced a target-oriented translation method which overtly enters in conflict with traditional practices; criticisms like “Pope’s translation - or better, Pope’s parody” (Novalis, 1796 in Robinson, 1997, p.218) or “Pope did not understand that metaphysical phrases of modern language ... are completely inappropriate to Homer” (de Cueto, 1878 in Santoyo, 1987, p.175, my translation) seem to confirm Pope’s modern view of translating which is supposed to do justice to a reading public who expects more than the literal transfer of Homer’s words and who appreciates Pope’s creative contributions to English versification.

#### IS CANNIBALISM “ACCEPTABLE”?

The three translation strategies discussed here (cannibalism, *belles infidèles*, Pope’s “modernization” of Homer) seem to have one feature in common: they stand for target-oriented, (to different degrees) interventionist translation strategies which represent a more or less radical re-writing of the “original” text. This, however, can only be seen as an external similarity. The circumstances of these interventions differ from epoch to epoch, but – as will be shown – a clear distinction can be made between the translation methods practiced in France and England and those in Brazil. For the discussion of the “acceptability” of these approaches we will try to establish various parameters such as the question of “primary” versus “secondary” texts, the implications of the divergency between asymmetrical cultures in forms of power, and, as a result, the political and cultural implications of the adoption of these approaches to translation.

#### “PRIMARY” VERSUS “SECONDARY” TEXTS

According to Theo Hermans (1985, p.11), “primary” or innovative texts challenge the prevailing system of literary and socio-cultural norms and give them a new direction by introducing a new model, while “secondary” or conservative texts move within the existing literary and social systems, constantly adapting to them and re-enforcing them. If a text (in our case text as translation) is not “acceptable” in Toury’s sense, because it diverges from the prevalent canon, but is nevertheless adopted in the target culture - as was temporarily the case with Pope’s translations - it could be argued that it is a “primary model” which occupies a position in the target culture which so far has not been taken: “[T]ranslations always come into being within a certain cultural environment and are designed to meet certain needs of, and/or occupy certain ‘slots’ in it” (Toury, 1995, p.12). Such “primary models” in many cases are also the so-called “masterpieces” of national literatures, which at the moment of their first publication exceeded contemporary literary norms and did not refer to a specific public, but suffered continuous canonization until they became “secondary models”.

With regard to Pope, the role of translation and of the translator in the process between “primary” and “secondary models” was recognized and

emphasized by intellectuals like Madame de Staël as early as 1816. Her concern to induce people to become aware of their own culture through an appeal to the culture of others make her argue that it is through the influence of translation that a national literature can learn and develop new forms:

*The English, whose language allows for inversion, and whose versification is subject to laws that are far less severe than in French, could have enriched their language by translations both precise and natural; but their great authors did not undertake this labor of translation. Pope, the only one who did, made the Iliad and the Odyssey into two beautiful poems... (Staël, 1816 in Kadish & Massardier-Kenney, 1994, p.164)*

Staël thus, in a – then – very modern way, perceives translation as a means to move away from obsolete literary conventions and to rejuvenate a nation's own writing.

To a certain extent this is also true of the *belles infidèles*. The mastery of Pope's translations obviously lasted about a century and not only had an important influence on English versification, but also questioned contemporary literary canons. At this point the question arises, whether the *belles infidèles* – even though questioning existing literary practices – had a rather “ephemeral” character as a literary movement, as they increasingly grew out of the necessity to follow the obviously class-based *bon goût*, with the intention of “improving” the original text “afin qu'on puisse [la]<sup>7</sup> lire avec plus de plaisir” (Méziriac, 1635, in Balard, 1995, p.164).

What about the cannibalistic method of translation discussed above? Can we also talk about a “primary” or “innovative” model when the reception of the anthropophagous text is in question? I would argue that the anthropophagous text undoubtedly occupies certain “slots” in its cultural environment, to say it with Toury's words (Toury, 1995, p.12): it stands for the (cannibalistic) translators' and writers' concern to challenge the prevailing cultural system of literary norms and tries to topple the overwhelming influence of European thoughts. This cultural system is bound up in economic and political domination structures which have lasted for centuries, with their origin in colonialism and perpetuated through the assumption of power through local élites and neo-colonial (and post-colonial) power structures. This brings us to the second parameter in the discussion of the acceptability of our target-oriented translation methods.

#### TRANSFER QUESTIONS BETWEEN “ASYMMETRICAL” CULTURES

The questioning of the “original” in the cannibalistic translation method cannot only be interpreted as the attempt to represent an autonomous and creative cultural practice, but also stands for a metaphor which implies the questioning of cultural domination in a wider sense. What counts here

---

7 “la” refers here to “la traduction”.



is that beyond cultural factors, other criteria such as the economic or social and definitely the political situation of – in this case – Brazil play an eminent role in the forefield of the formation of cannibalistic texts as “primary models”. I would like to go as far as to say that the adoption of the cannibalistic translation method is a sort of “act of liberation” for Brazilian intellectuals, which is performed in order to get rid of cultural domination still heavily marked by colonialist features.

It could be argued that such an “act of liberation” is also true in the case of the *belles infidèles*: did not the representatives of this translation method liberate themselves from the overwhelming influence of the Anciens (as opposed to the *Modernes*)? However, it should not be forgotten that the (cultural) power relation in the Brazilian context is far more unequal than in the comparative historical situation in England and France. Both Pope and the translators of the *belles infidèles* worked in favour of an increasingly dominant culture, and it cannot be claimed that as translators and writers they operated on the margin of their contemporary society. Thus, they did not adopt their translation method as a demonstration of resistance against prevailing cultural practices, but through its adoption they contributed – each to a different extent – to the creation of a dominant literary canon. This can be seen, for instance, in the somewhat rough simplicity of Homer’s culture which Alexander Pope smoothly suited to the taste of his sophisticated English audience. Another example can be seen in the use of repetitions: as already mentioned, Pope seems to have regarded Homer’s repetitions as a defect and not as a characteristic of Homer’s supposed oral tradition, and in most cases omitted or paraphrased them. In such an oral tradition, repetitions are important rhetorical figures. As a consequence, the terms of production in the case of Homer radically differed from Pope’s: Pope obviously did not know about the oral tradition of the *Ilias* and the *Odyssey*, and it seems that his concern was rather to “embellish” the style in order to correspond to the taste of his reading public. In any case, there is some evidence that Pope did not take into account cultural knowledge in the *Ilias* or the *Odyssey*,<sup>8</sup> but tried to operate in form and content within the literary framework of his period.

In Brazil, translators like the de Campos brothers consciously adopt and theoretically discuss cannibalistic translation strategies in order to demonstrate independence from dominant structures characterized by neo-colonialism and authoritarian thought of Brazilian elites. This does not mean that the roles of dominant and dominated culture are simply reversed: the cannibalistic translation practiced in the Brazilian context does not aim at pleasing the reading audience as was advocated by the sophisticated French salons. It rather means that through the adoption of the cannibalistic translation a contribution is done to the formation of an autonomous cultural identity whose main features are reflections on relations of dependency and on the possibility to elaborate writing strategies which are supposed to topple the traditional hierarchy between “original” – which stands for the colonial heritage – and translation.

---

<sup>8</sup> See the examples listed in Arnold (1861, in López García, 1996, p.215-17, 269-70).

## THE “FLESH TO BE DIGESTED”

Independent of acceptability, all of the discussed translation practices represent a creative activity which contributes to abandoning the respective traditional practices which are focused on the source text, although they follow different aims when applying a target-text oriented translation practice, as has been shown. The translation process in all three cases is undoubtedly based on a different understanding of text than that of previous translation methods. Pope and d’Ablancourt, as well as the de Campos brothers, relativizing – to various extents – the very concept of original production, question the “flesh to be digested”, that is the “original” text. By way of conclusion I would therefore like to discuss the various degrees of this “de-mystification” of the original as well as the role of the author involved in this process.

In his essay “The Death of the Author”, Roland Barthes (1991) stands up against the traditional idealization of representing a (literary) text according to a system of stable, unchanging order and advocates the interpretation of literature as a process of re-reading and re-modelling. For Barthes, writing is “the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin” (ibidem, p.168); as a consequence, Barthes argues, “as soon as a fact is *narrated* no longer with a view to acting directly on reality but intransitively ... the author enters into his own death” (ibidem, author’s emphasis). According to Barthes, when viewed historically, capitalist ideology has attached great importance to the person of the author. He argues that it is necessary to substitute language itself for the person who until then had been supposed to be its owner. Therefore, for Barthes it is language which speaks, not the author, and to write is only to reach the point where language acts and performs: “Once the Author is removed, the claim to decipher a text becomes quite futile. To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text...” (ibidem, p.171). The reader-oriented theory he develops in this essay allows the reader to create meanings by opening up the text to an interminable play of codes. The reader is therefore free to link the text with systems of meaning while ignoring the author’s intentions, whatever they might have been. Barthes illustrates this process with the famous sentence: “The birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author” (ibidem, p.172).

In translation, this view of text production implies once again a revision of traditional translation strategies. When adopted to the different target-oriented approaches discussed above, Barthes’ textual theory gives way to a *provisional* production of a target text through translation which, respectively, can follow different aims: it has been shown that the cannibalistic translation strategy operates from motivations different to the *belles infidèles*, for instance. Nevertheless, in all those strategies and to a different degree, the translator becomes the temporary, provisional reader of the “original”. The purpose, however, is a different one in the several cases.

If once again we consider Theo Herman’s “primary (or innovatory) models and types” (Hermans, 1985, p.11) and their implications on national literatures as discussed above, it will be realized that Alexander

Pope's translation strategy as well as that of the *belles infidèles*, although creating new meaning at a first stage when questioning traditional standards of translation, can no longer be applied to Barthes' theory once the real goal of these strategies is revealed. It has been shown that Pope and the translators following the trend of the *belles infidèles* adopted their translation methods to serve the - obviously class-based - "bon goût", and to help to establish a determinate literary tendency. In doing so, at a later stage and once "accepted" in Toury's sense, they correspond to the establishment of a canonized literature which rather tends to create "stable meanings" even though the translated text - like any other text - is still open to readers' interpretations. But the freedom of Pope's or d'Ablancourt's target readers to open and close a text's signifying process is limited by a strong culture of reception to which those translation strategies are pertinent. Thus, a reader-oriented translation strategy does not necessarily mean to create and re-create meaning within a sort of continuum without questioning its provisional character.

The cannibalistic translation strategy, on the other hand, seems to correspond in a more comprehensive way to Barthes' textual approach. Haroldo and Augusto de Campos turn translation into a sort of "crossbreeding", thus challenging traditional dichotomies between "centre" and "periphery" or "original" and "translation". It is in this "re-mixing" of several cultural layers characterized by heavily unequal power relations that Barthes' (post)structural approach to text can be revealed. Barthes' writers can only mix already existing writings they draw from a "ready-formed dictionary":

*We know that a text is ... a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture. (Barthes 1991, p.170)*

These quotations, in the cannibalistic context, are re-assembled and re-arranged; they are "digested" in an explicit transparent process which allows difference and makes the writer's (translator's) intervention clearly visible.<sup>9</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The various interventionist translation strategies discussed in this paper have different significance in the European and the Brazilian context. Alexander Pope and the representatives of the *belles infidèles* adopt their strategies - by way of generalization - in order to abandon traditional ways of translation, following and - in doing so - strengthening a literature on its way to canonization. Translation as cannibalization, on the other hand, does not conjure away the "original", but devours it in

---

<sup>9</sup> See Arrojo (1997) on the contribution of translation as cannibalization to the formation of a more cogent discipline of translation studies.

order to create a cultural attitude nourished by foreign influences and enriched by autochthonous input which helps to dismantle the traditional asymmetrical power relations between the cultures involved.

## References

- ANDRADE, O. de. Manifesto Antropófago. *Revista de Antropofagia*, v.1, n.1, p.3-7, 1928.
- ARROJO, R. *Oficina de tradução. A teoria na prática*. São Paulo: Ática, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Asymmetrical Relations of Power and the Ethics of Translation. *TEXTconTEXT*, v.1, n.1 = NF 1, p.5-24, 1997.
- BALARD, M. *De Ciceron a Benjamin. Traducteurs, traductions, réflexions*. Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille, 1995.
- BARTHES, R. The Death of the Author. Translated by Stephen Heath. In: LODGE, D. (Ed.) *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*. London, New York: Longman, 1991. p.167-72. [1968].
- BORGES, J. L. *Ficciones*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1990. [1956].
- BRAGA-PINTO, C. Translating, Meaning and the Community of Languages. *Studies in the Humanities* v.22, n.1.2, p.33-49, 1995.
- CAMPOS, A. de. *Verso, reverso e controverso*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1988. [1978].
- CAMPOS, H. de. *Deus e o Diabo no Fausto de Goethe*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Über die anthropophagische Vernunft: Europa im Zeichen des Gefressenwerdens. In: MEYER-CLASON, C. (Ed.) *Lateinamerikaner über Europa*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1987. p.101-16.
- CHEYFITZ, E. *The Poetics of Imperialism. Translation and Colonization from 'The Tempest' to 'Tarzan'*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- HERMANS, T. Introduction. Translation Studies and a New Paradigm. In: \_\_\_\_\_. (Ed.) *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985. p.7-15.
- JAHNN, H. H. *Fluß ohne Ufer*. München: Weismann, 1948.
- JOHNSON, R. Tupy or not Tupy: Cannibalism and Nationalism in Contemporary Brazilian Literature and Culture. In: KING, J. (Ed.) *On Modern Latin American Fiction*. New York: The Noonday Press, 1987. p.41-59.
- KADISH, D., MASSARDIER-KENNEY, F. (Ed.) *Translating Slavery. Gender and Race in French Women's Writing, 1783-1823*. Kent, London: The Kent State University Press, 1994.
- LÓPEZ-GARCÍA, D. (Ed.) *Teorías de la traducción*. Antología de textos. Cuenca: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad e Castilla-La Mancha, 1996.
- McGUIRK, B. Post-, trans-, intra-: locating inequality. In: McGUIRK, B., MILLINGTON, M. I. (Ed.) *Inequality and Difference in Hispanic and Latin American Cultures*. Lewiston-Queenston-Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995. p.153-69.

- MONTAIGNE, M. de. *Les essais*. Édition conforme au texte de l'exemplaire de Bordeaux. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965.
- MORENO, S. Traduzir e devorar: o projeto de tradução de Augusto e Haroldo de Campos, a poética concretista e a questão da antropofagia. *Tradução e Comunicação*, v.10, p.129-38, 2001.
- RETAMAR, R. F. *Calibán. Apuntes sobre la cultura de nuestra América*. Buenos Aires: Editorial La Pleyade, 1973.
- ROBINSON, D. *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997.
- RÖCKELEIN, H. (Ed.) *Kannibalismus und europäische Kultur*. Tübingen: Edition Diskord, 1996.
- SANTOYO, J.-C. *Teoría y crítica de la traducción: antología*. Bellaterra: Escola Universitària de Traductors i Intèrprets. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 1987.
- TOURY, G. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.
- VAN HOOFF, H. *Histoire de la traduction en Occident*. France, Grande-Bretagne, Allemagne, Russie, Pays-Bas. Paris-Louvain-la Neuve: Duculot, 1991.
- VIEIRA, E. R. P. Towards a minor translation. In: McGUIRK, B., MILLINGTON, M. I. (Ed.) *Inequality and Difference in Hispanic and Latin American Cultures*. Lewiston-Queenston-Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995. p.141-52.

WOLF, M. Da antropo-fagia à texto-fagia. *Todas as Letras (São Paulo)*, n.5, p.117-128, 2003.

**Resumo:** *Este artigo focaliza a tradução como uma prática em que a criatividade produz novos sentidos, e discute alguns modelos de tradução como as belles infidèles, traduções de Pope da obra de Homero e a antropofagia brasileira em contraposição a essa concepção de tradução. Os parâmetros de análise são as expectativas do receptor, bem como as implicações da divergência entre culturas dominante e dominada, especialmente em relação à teoria do texto de Roland Barthes. Mostra-se como as inúmeras estratégias de tradução discutidas no artigo têm diferentes "significâncias" no contexto do Primeiro e do Terceiro mundos.*

**Palavras-chave:** *Pós-estruturalismo; antropofagia; história da tradução; Roland Barthes.*