Article:
Munday, J (2014) Using primary sources to produce a microhistory of translation and translators: theoretical and methodological concerns. Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication, 20 (1). pp. 64-80. ISSN 1355-6509

https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2014.899094

Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators

Theoretical and Methodological Concerns

JEREMY MUNDAY
University of Leeds, UK

Abstract. In descriptive studies, where the source and target texts are the main primary sources ("primary text products"), "extra-textual" sources are looked at with "circumspection" (Toury 1995:65). However, in historical research methodologies they are central. This article examines the use and value of archives, manuscripts and, especially, translator papers, post-hoc accounts and interviews in producing a history of translation and translators. Rather than informing a 'traditional' Rankean history of facts and major personalities, the article underlines the potential value of such material in creating a 'microhistory' (Ginzburg 1976/1980), reclaiming the details of the everyday lives and working processes of sometimes little-known or forgotten translators and contextualizing them to construct a social and cultural history of translation and translators. Sometimes these sources are housed in collections where translation may not be very visible, which creates problems of location. Examples are given from the autobiography of A. Birse and research on the working papers of Sam Hileman, Andrew Hurley, Bernard Miall and Margaret Sayers Peden.

Keywords. Archives, Manuscripts, Methodology, Microhistory, Personal papers, Primary sources, Social history.

My interest is in the study of the history of translators through their personal papers, manuscripts and related archives and other testimony.[1] Such primary sources, central to the historian's research since the emergence of German empirical historicism in the nineteenth century (van Ranke 1834/2009, Beiser 2011:254), are under-utilized in translation studies research, yet they are an indispensable resource for the investigation of the conditions, working practices and identity of translators and for the study of their interaction with other participants in the translation process.[2] Translation studies scholars need to be aware of the applications, and limitations, of methods employed by historians, social scientists and literary theorists but be prepared to tailor them in a way that can address the needs of the discipline.

This article will discuss different types of primary resources and some methodological questions concerning their use. It will draw on research I have conducted on the Archive of British Publishing and Printing (at the University of Reading, UK), the Translator archives (University of East Anglia, UK), the Penguin Classics archive (University of Bristol, UK), the Latin American Special Collections (Princeton University Library, US) and various translators' papers at the Harry Ransom Center (University of Texas at Austin, US).[3] In what

[1] Though most of the material discussed here relates to literary translation, I use the term 'translators' generically to mean translators and interpreters.

[2] See, for example, Venuti's use of archive material in his detailed studies of the work of Paul Blackburn (2008:194-232) and of the production process of the Don Camillo books at Pelligrini and Cudahy publishers (1998:136-52).

[3] I gratefully acknowledge funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Council, Friends of Princeton University Library and the University of Leeds, without which this research would not have been possible. I also acknowledge the valuable comments and suggestions made by the editor and the anonymous reviewers, which helped to improve this article.

follows, I will argue for the value of a social and cultural history that seeks to excavate and recover details of lives past and to record those of current translators in order to constitute what I term a 'microhistory' of translation and translators. In this, I draw on the method of microhistory, or microstoria, pioneered by Giovanni Levi (1992) and Carlo Ginzburg (1976/1980, 1993), and apply it in a translation context in order to better understand how the detailed analysis of the everyday experience of individuals can shed light on the bigger picture of the history of translation in specific socio-historical and cultural contexts.

1. Primary sources and descriptive translation studies

Although this special issue of The Translator attempts to go beyond textual analysis in historical research on translation, it is important to make the obvious point that the source and target texts on which the analysis is based are of course themselves key primary sources, which I shall term "primary text product" (Toury 1995:65). They are the basic raw material of descriptive translation studies (DTS) and crucial for uncovering the various norms at work in specific instances of translation, but they are also the most readily available sources; a DTS study that, in the absence of pre-textual material (i.e. drafts) or extra-textual material (e.g. interviews or paratextual commentary), limits itself to the primary text product remains rooted in an analysis of that product and dependent on the analyst's more or less subjective deduction of the process which underpinned it. This is despite the empirical framework provided by Toury (1995) with his three-fold methodology of situating the target text within the target culture system, undertaking textual analysis and making generalizations from the findings.

More sophisticated studies may involve the analysis, where they exist, of multiple translations of a single source text in their socio-historical context of production and may delve into less accessible sources of information, including drafts, production files and interviews with translators and editors. To take a single illustrative example of many, Linder's (2004) case study of the operation of censorship under the Franco regime in Spain (1939-1975) compares three different Spanish translations of Raymond Chandler's hard-boiled detective novel The Big Sleep (1939), published in 1949, 1958 and 1972. He identifies the expurgation of sexual references and homosexual language and then suggests reasons why this may have occurred: either the translators did not understand the source text or, more likely, they self-censored those elements felt to be in conflict with the dominant ideology, including references to homosexuality, which was illegal in Spain at the time. A descriptive study based on the primary text products alone can go no further than this: it is extra-textual material that is crucial in distinguishing whether such shifts in the text occurred because of state censorship or self-censorship by the translator. The methodology employed by Linder is essentially simple (2004:9):

> In order to establish what was government-censored, researchers must consult the censorship files for each edition, which contain the readers' reports and the proofs specifying what was censored. In order to establish what was self-censored, the published texts must then be contrasted with the original.

The regime's censorship files referred to here are held in the General Archive of the Administration in Alcalá de Henares near Madrid. In addition to reports from the official readers (who were very often staunch Catholics), the files typically contain a typewritten copy of the translation, proofs and a list of prior authorizations and rejections of the book in question. In his analysis, Linder uses material from various stages of the translation process to answer different questions: the readers' reports inform an overall institutional assessment as to whether to publish or not (importation of an early Argentine translation was refused on the grounds of its alleged pornography, for example); the typewritten copy is annotated by

the censor to indicate passages to be removed (those which offended the norms of the time); the proofs show the corrections implemented by the editor, and then the published texts themselves can be compared to see whether any further changes were introduced to the marketed product. In this way, some of the hidden processes of translation are revealed, although Linder acknowledges that research into self censorship is hindered because "the existence and availability of the testimony and materials of translators and editors is inconsistent" (ibid.:162). One might say that in most cases it is not available at all, which explains why many descriptive studies remain on the level of the published text alone.

In descriptive studies, as Toury explains (1995:65), extra-textual material refers to

> semi-theoretical or critical formulations, such as prescriptive 'theories' of translation, statements made by translators, editors, publishers, and other persons involved in or connected with the activity, critical appraisals of individual translations, or the activity of a translator or 'school' of translators, and so forth.

For Toury, who seeks to distinguish between that which he considers to be scientifically reliable objective 'evidence' (the primary text product) and that which is subjective and thus unreliable, extra-textual sources are "partial and biased, and should therefore be treated with every possible circumspection; all the more so since – emanating as they do from interested parties – they are likely to lean toward propaganda and persuasion" (ibid.). This is true to the extent that all such testimony mediates events through a more or less subjective prism. No event is recounted in an identical manner by two different actors, which is clearly a substantial problem for a branch of the discipline that seeks to construct a scientific or empirical base, as some DTS does. However, for microhistorical research into translation practice, based on an individual reading and interpretation of primary sources, such material is essential. Post-hoc accounts may reveal details of motivations that are irretrievable from more 'objective' textual analysis; interviews allow the researcher to probe matters that a subject may not otherwise think relevant; and other extra-textual material, such as archives, manuscripts and translator working papers, provides equally rich sources that are less overtly mediated. While requiring careful evaluation, such sources offer valuable testimony and more direct access to the working practices of the translator and can give crucial insights into both historical circumstance and translation. But it all depends on the type of history we wish to tell.

2. Which type of history?

This is far from being a facile point. It is central to the usefulness of the sources we will discuss here, inherently linked to the questions we wish to investigate and to the type of history we are constructing. The discipline of history itself has evolved critically over time. Burke (1991/2001:3-6) succinctly contrasts traditional, 'Rankean' history, concerned with 'facts' and first-hand accounts, with the 'new' history of social historians who are interested in the lives of 'ordinary' people or specific groups, such as women, who had tended to be marginalized in traditional history. We might add translators to such marginalized groups (Delisle and Woodsworth 2012: xiii-xiv). The contrasts Burke draws may be represented as in Table 1.

Traditional history	'New' history
Politics	Total history
Narrative of events	Analysis of social structures
Great men	History from below – ordinary people
Documents	Oral, visual and statistical evidence
Attitudes and thoughts of protagonists	Variety of social and cultural questions
Objective presentation of facts	A variety of (subjective) voices
By professional historians	Interdisciplinary, including community historians

Table 1. Contrast of traditional and 'new' history, following Burke (1991/2001:3-6)

The 'new', 'social' history, initially inspired by British Marxists and the French Annales School, is concerned with revealing the previously hidden lives and viewpoints of the silent majority. This is the "history from below" of Jim Sharpe's seminal essay, a history that involves "rescuing the past experiences of the bulk of the population from almost total neglect by historians" (Sharpe 1991/2001:27). Gone is the focus on the 'great men' of politics and world affairs and in comes the focus on 'ordinary' people as a group. Initially this was done through the quantitative analysis of records and a range of other qualitative empirical methods.

More recently, as a new "cultural history from below" has emerged (Burke 2008, Lyons 2010), individual recollections have acquired more importance, through interviews and the analysis of personal writings. This has also been central in 'microhistory', a method which shares some similarities with 'history from below' and with the German method of Alltagsgeschichte (everyday history), in that it focuses on those whose voices are generally unheard, but uses very small-scale qualitative analysis in order to understand the day-to-day experience and choices of those people (Magnússon 2006). Such concentration of scale, and on the lives of individuals, brings focus to what might be a fuzzy trend at the macrohistorical level. A seminal example is Ginzburg's The Cheese and the Worms (1976/1980), a book-length study of a sixteenth-century miller from Friuli in what is now north-eastern Italy, who was condemned and executed by the Inquisition. The advantage of such a method, about an otherwise unknown individual who would at most be a footnote in a larger account of the period (Ginzburg 1993:21), is that "it is on this reduced scale, and probably only on this scale, that we can understand, without deterministic reduction, the relationships between systems of belief, of values and representations on one side, and social affiliations on another" (Chartier 1982:32, in Ginzburg 1993:22). From the perspective of literary theory and literary history, notably the new historicism of the 1980s onwards, such relationships serve to uncover the power relations at work in the production of the literary text through the representation of its discourses. The focus on the small-scale is mirrored by new historicism's subversion of the grand epic and concentration on "the encounter with the singular, the specific, and the individual" (Gallagher and Greenblatt 2000: 6).

For research into living subjects, interviews, when conducted in order to preserve some element of the past, may be considered as oral history, defined by Lynn Abrams in her Oral History Theory as both a research methodology (of interviewing and recording) and a product (the recording or transcription which is available for analysis): "Oral history is a practice, a method of research. It is the act of recording the speech of people with something interesting to say and then analysing their memories of the past" (Abrams 2010:1). It has to do with the 'reconstructive' or 'recovery' form of new social and cultural history, which seeks to preserve "individual and generational experience of social change" (Roper 1996:346), and it links to the concept of testimony to be discussed in the following section.

First of all, though, we need to acknowledge the value and limitations of primary materials. For this, we might turn to the experience of historians and others, but there is no consensus. From the archivist's standpoint, Grigg (1991:229) notes that while "historians have generally agreed that the primary source is the core concept of historical method, [there

is] some lack of attention to how evidence and actuality are related". There is even sometimes a blurring between primary and secondary sources; newspaper reports, for example, are often used as a primary source by historians but they are no more than a representation of an event. Microhistorians such as Levi (1992), Magnússon (2006) and Boldiszár Simon (2009) openly acknowledge the subjectivity of a narrative that seeks to capture the "lived experience" of an individual and to persuade the reader of this interpretation in a process that itself generates new perspectives. Such considerations are central to the new historicism too: Gallagher and Greenblatt (2000:17-18) posit an approach based on a discussion of representations (rather than art), on the role of the human subject, on "unexpected discursive contexts" of literary works and on discourse analysis, before rejecting such structures in favour of being "passionately engaged" with the individual materials. On the other hand, oral testimony is rejected by some historians because of the mediation of memory, which they see as inherently unreliable. Mediation is a crucial factor in post-hoc accounts and interviews too, and the following sections will deal first with these, which I term "overtly mediated testimonies", before proceeding to the less overtly mediated archives, manuscripts and papers.

3. Post-hoc accounts and interviews: Overtly mediated testimonies

Crucial testimony about both the process of translation and the conditions under which it takes place is provided in post-hoc accounts by the individuals concerned, in the form of memoirs or autobiographies or interviews in which they consciously reflect on the event. Such material provides a potentially rich source for both the historian and the translation studies scholar. Take the example of Memoirs of an Interpreter (1967) by Churchill's wartime Russian language interpreter, Major A. H. Birse, who had grown up bilingually as the son of a Scottish businessman living in Russia. Historians might well use this account as the eye-witness testimony of behind-closed-doors negotiations between wartime leaders: Churchill's meeting with Stalin in Moscow in August 1942 is recounted in detail (pp. 99-104), along with the Tehran conference (November-December 1943) and the Yalta conference (February 1945). The course of the first meeting ranges from what Birse terms "sombre" questions about when Britain and her allies were going to open a second front in France to "more congenial subjects" such as the defence of the Caucasus, the landings in North Africa and the transportation via sea of materials to the Soviet Union. It also gives an insight into the emotions and thinking of the leaders, as perceived by the interpreter's recording of the interlocutors' manner. Prior to the meeting, Churchill asks Birse for his opinion of economic and social change under the Soviets; in the room itself, Stalin at first "hardly ever looked up", then "a look of approval seemed to emerge", "he had permitted himself the occasional smile", and then he proceeded to a "bit of leg-pulling". Birse (ibid.:103) provides very specific information about Stalin, such as his detailed knowledge of the Napoleonic wars, which Stalin uses as an analogy of the contemporary situation, and the books that are visible in his simple bedroom (Marxist literature, historical works and some books in Georgian, but no Russian classics).

We also see key information about the organization and conduct of the interpreting work, found in the small details that typically escape indexing. Thus, Birse only heard that he was to replace the original interpreter on the afternoon before the evening meeting in Moscow. He was told by a Churchill aide (ibid.:98) that "[Churchill] would want me to be exact in translation" and then, during and after the meeting by Churchill himself (ibid.:101, 104) that he had "got him across" very well and that Churchill was impressed by his speed of interpreting. The exact method of working is also described (ibid.:100-101):

> I had a scribbling pad with me, with two or three sharpened pencils which I always carried in my pocket, and I set these out in front of me, ready to begin. Churchill

> spoke slowly and clearly, and I found no difficulty either in writing my notes or in putting them across in Russian […] [U]ntil I had become accustomed to [Stalin's] voice, I found it difficult to follow what he said, on account of his low voice and unfamiliar Georgian accent.

Difficulty of comprehension was not a major stumbling block since it was Stalin's interpreter Pavlov who interpreted into English while Birse did the same into Russian. Birse describes this as "the correct method", ensuring a "closer reproduction of the speaker's remarks, for each of us respectively was better acquainted with the voice we were listening to, our chief's way of thinking, and to some extent his intentions" (ibid.:113-14). In his chapter on "the business of interpreting", we find further comments from Birse as to what interpreting entails (ibid.:114):

> There was another advantage of putting our 'home' language into the other. Sometimes the speaker might be purposely vague or irrelevant, in order to gain time or watch his opponent's reaction. It was up to the interpreter to realize … that this was by-play and to proceed in the normal way …. The first duty was loyalty to one's chief, and we were obliged to sink all individual feelings and cling to the exact reproduction of what was being said.

This loyalty to the chief included interpersonal interventions by the interpreter, warning against the strength of an offered vodka, for instance, which Churchill then declined (ibid.:103). However, such statements may be slightly self-serving. Many of Birse's observations seem designed to reinforce the image he wishes to convey of himself as an accurate interpreter and dutiful military officer and may or may not be an accurate representation of the actual instance of interpreting.

The very act of note-taking in the meetings was also consciously used as a form of record-keeping even when the leaders were talking informally, meaning that Birse played a dual role as interpreter and as recorder (ibid.:103):

> From time to time I succeeded in pencilling a few notes, for I felt that some record would be required not only of the earlier official interview, but also of this informal, often disconnected, and yet highly important conversation.

This mingling of roles also comes across clearly in the work of Birse's American counterpart, Charles Bohlen, who produced official minutes of such meetings (Bohlen 1973). After the Teheran conference in December 1943, an important disagreement of fact between the Allies was even resolved at the highest level by consulting Bohlen's minutes and Birse's notes.[4]

Another form of testimony consists of interviews, which are not normally controlled by the subject. There is a relatively long tradition of transcribed interviews with translators, notably in publications such as Translation Review of the Center for Translation Studies in Dallas, Texas.[5] The first issue of Translation Review appeared in 1978 and included a

[4] The disagreement concerned the number of Italian ships that were to be handed over to the Soviet Union after the signing of the Armistice of Cassibile in September 1943. The Soviets were requesting one third of the Italian fleet. In their meeting, Churchill had asked his Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, to confirm what had previously been agreed. Both Bohlen and Birse had recorded Eden's reply as: "one battleship, one cruiser, eight destroyers and four submarines". United States Department of State (1943) Foreign relations of the United States diplomatic papers, The Conferences at Cairo and Tehran, 1943, p. 852; available at http://digicoll.library.wisc.edu/cgi-bin/FRUS/FRUS-idx?type=goto&id=FRUS.FRUS1943CairoTehran&page=862&isize=text (last accessed 5 December 2013).

[5] An archive of interviews is available online at http://translation.utdallas.edu/resources/interviews.html (last accessed 5 December 2013).

Thomas Hoeksema interview with Gregory Rabassa in a series entitled 'The Translator's Voice', which was introduced as follows (Hoeksema 1978:5):

> This article on Gregory Rabassa initiates a regular feature in Translation Review which will focus on the role of the literary translator. Each issue will contain an extensive examination and evaluation of a prominent literary translator. The series is designed primarily to emphasize the translator as creative writer, and to call attention to the growing acknowledgement of the literary translator as a skilled artist. "The Translator's Voice" will be a forum for the translator's views on the art and process of translation.

In some ways, albeit on a smaller scale, this resembles what, in a political or historical context, Selton (1996) terms "élite interviews" with major figures. Rabassa enjoys a very privileged status within the translation community as one of the highest-profile anglophone literary translators of the twentieth century and his words are therefore weightier than those of less experienced translators and, indeed, than those of the interviewer.

For the political historian, "[i]nterviews are almost always an inferior source of information to documents written at the time" (Selton 1996:353) since there are doubts over their reliability and the subjects might intentionally or unintentionally falsify their account, pre-empting the historian with their own version of events. Nevertheless, interviews can fill gaps until written evidence becomes available. Selton lists three other important benefits of an interview (ibid.:358-59): it gives the subject's perspective on events and people; it helps interpret documents; an interviewee may produce new material or offer other assistance to the interviewer. When we consider the particular case of interviews with translators, the main benefit consists of the opportunity to question them about their own background, translation career, the specifics of translation decisions, the context in which a translation took place, and so on. In Hoeksema's Rabassa interview, for instance, we learn details of Rabassa's relationship and working arrangements with authors that are crucial for understanding the creative process and are simply unobtainable elsewhere. We learn, for example, that his contact with Lezama Lima during the translation of the Cuban's novel Paradiso relied on a complex system of couriering assisted by the Paris-based Argentine writer Julio Cortázar. Rabassa also describes his translation method and work schedule (in Hoeksema 1978:12):

> More to give myself a break in routine than anything else (although it enables me to ship chunks of translation off to the author periodically), I will stop after twenty or thirty pages of manuscript text and go back over it for the re-write. Here I work more slowly and check out words I could not find in the dictionary and find a smooth solution for the rough passages I have left in the raw. More often than not this is the final draft.

Of course, the information provided will need to be evaluated carefully (Toury's "circumspection"). Rabassa's account of his working process in some ways resembles a retrospective think-aloud protocol but at a greater distance from the moment of production. This would explain the broad-brush descriptions because accurate recall of detailed translation decisions some years after the event is scarcely feasible.[6] In addition, if we consider the context of the interviewer's intervention, the 'Translator's Voice' series acknowledges its interested aim of boosting the creative status of the literary translator. This

[6] Compare the findings from more recent experimental research, which, though in a very different context, show that the greater the gap between the production of the translation and the interview, the less reliable the information provided (Hansen 2006, Gopferich 2009).

means that this type of interview is bound to construct a positive representation of literary translators' work as part of its own dialogue with a sympathetic readership.

4. Archives, manuscripts and personal papers

Less overtly mediated testimony may be found when direct access is available to a range of more formal extra-textual primary sources: archives, manuscripts and personal papers. I shall consider all three in the rest of this article but focus mainly on the third.

Some of the richest **archives** for translation research are those of publishers of translation, where files may contain correspondence between editor, translator and author charting the genesis and evolution of a project. Amongst the numerous examples are those studies which have used such archives to investigate Fascism in pre-war Europe (e.g. Nottola 2010, Rubino 2010, Rundle 2010). Billiani (2007) makes exhaustive use of the Einaudi archive in Turin and of the Mondadori archive in Milan to explain editorial practice in post-war Italy, notably the selection of texts and translation strategies employed by those publishing houses in their poetry translation programmes.

But whether these materials are on clay tablet, on paper or in digital form, the archive itself is a "locus of power" (Claus and Marriott 2012:386). Firstly, because the choice of what is to be retained in an official archive is subject to the decision making of curators and other professionals, who wield considerable institutional power (ibid.:388, drawing on Foucault 1969/2002). The fact that a written record appears in an institutional archive (such as a University, local or national library or other official building) immediately grants it an elevated status above other testimonies. Inclusion within that controlled setting is by itself significant (Mbembe 2002:20):

> Archives are the product of a process which converts a certain number of documents into items judged to be worthy of preserving and keeping in a public place, where they can be consulted according to well established procedures and regulations.

The converse, rejection, is also meaningful: records and documents that are not included are thereby denied status and are discarded as "debris" (ibid.). In the context of a contested political environment such as apartheid South Africa, for example, such excluded material was related to the disenfranchised ethnic groups that comprised the majority of the population. This "figuring of the archive" (Hamilton et al. 2002:7), with gaps and modifications that give an unbalanced view of history and in which the prevailing outlook is that of the white governments, has meant that it has not been possible to conduct quantitative social and historical research on those peoples. Therefore, basing an account purely on the official archives would be tantamount to accepting the view of the powerful.

When it comes to the study of translation, until recently exclusion seems to have been the norm. Traces of the translator are generally hard to find in many collections and require some excavation. In the absence of a central catalogue of archives searchable by keyword or theme, it is often difficult to locate collections that are relevant for translation studies research. Some libraries do openly specialize in translators' papers, notably the Lilly Library, Indiana University Bloomington.[7] Others, such as the renowned Harry Ransom Center for the Humanities, University of Austin, Texas, have spectacularly rich holdings – for example, the papers of Ezra Pound, Charles Kenneth Scott-Moncrieff (the first translator into English of Proust), Stuart Gilbert (translator of Camus and Sartre), Lysander Kemp (translator of Octavio Paz), Ronald Christ (translator of Latin American writing) and Andrew Hurley (translator of Borges) – but do not list 'translation' as one of their twenty-nine subject

[7] See http://www.indiana.edu/~liblilly/lilly/mss/subject/translations.html (last accessed 5 December 2013).

categories.[8] Instead, the interested researcher has to look in 'Latin American literature', 'Literature: French', 'Literature: international', and so on.

Even when material is available, there are gatekeepers who control access. This can be problematic in the case of well-known literary figures whose work is closely controlled by an estate or other third party. A recent example is the 2500 metre-long archive of the renowned Carmen Balcells literary agency which was founded in Barcelona in 1956 and represented the major figures of the Latin American Boom (Cortázar, Fuentes, García Márquez, Vargas Llosa) as well as Spanish authors. Having sold the archive to the Spanish Ministry of Culture in 2010 for 3 million Euros, Balcells then requested it to be closed to researchers after the press reported on controversial comments contained in the archived correspondence of the authors in her care as well as details of contract negotiations (Constanla 2011).

Manuscripts are unpublished documents, either handwritten ('mss') or typewritten ('ms'). These include drafts and, in the case of historical or literary research, occasionally bring to light previously unknown texts or works that had been considered lost. As Claus and Marriott note (2012:389), this is due to the "arbitrary nature of the archiving process" where survival is the result of "chance". Not all drafts are kept; indeed, most are discarded. However, just as literary drafts are rich sources for the investigation of the genesis of a literary text, so are drafts of the translation crucial for revealing some of the translator's decision-making. Multiple drafts, often with hand-written corrections at different stages of production, and related correspondence between translator, author and editor, provide explicit evidence about decisions and their motivation at different stages and shed light on the cognitive translation processes at work. Detailed text and process analysis may be applied to such material to identify the changes made at different stages and those points in a text that are particularly problematic or 'critical'. For instance, close analysis and classification of David Bellos's revisions of his draft translations of the novels of the experimental French writer Georges Perec show a move from literal translation to lexical revision and restructuring; amendments in the later drafts and proofing stages are much less frequent and typically concern the correction of punctuation and specific lexical choices (Munday 2012: Chapter 4, Munday 2013).

Personal papers are "the physical survivals of a life" (Raspin 1996:219). In historical research, such material is central, especially where the historian's method is to reconstruct a context via one or more individuals' experience in the past. In the case of a politician, "[personal] papers may contain correspondence with family, personal friends and political colleagues, minutes, notes on informal meetings, drafts of policy papers, formal correspondence, and official papers retained from periods of office" (ibid.). Similar contents are to be found in literary papers, except that the drafts are of novels, plays and poetry, the political colleagues are other writers and perhaps translators, and official papers might be absent. Sometimes, of course, the author may have played several private and public roles: in Princeton University library, the papers of Carlos Fuentes (1928-2012) and Mario Vargas Llosa (1936-) contain abundant material from their periods as Mexican Ambassador to Paris (1975-77) and Peruvian presidential candidate (1990) respectively; similarly, the papers of Charles E. Bolen, held at the Library of Congress, Washington, centre on his work as a diplomat but also contain information relating to his role as personal interpreter for President Roosevelt in meetings with Stalin (see above).

These examples illustrate that material on translation and translators is often housed in the collections of others (novelists, diplomats, publishing companies, etc.); hence it requires some detective work to locate it. It is also acknowledged by historians that the methodology for the study of personal papers is underdeveloped compared to that used in the study of administrative records in archives: "Few professional methodologies and standards for acquisition, appraisal, arrangement and description have been explicitly developed to support

[8] See http://www.hrc.utexas.edu/collections/guide/ (last accessed 5 December 2013).

the requirements of personal papers, although these are not specifically excluded" (Williams 2008:62). Yet, as Williams goes on to assert (ibid.:67), personal papers are an important archival genre:

> While the records of public bodies and organizations contribute primarily to knowledge about infrastructures, contexts and frameworks of business, society and politics, papers of individuals enable biographical, prosoprographical [social history], occupational and genealogical study at a personal and collective level.

Their importance for the detailed history of translation and translators is evident (see the microhistory discussed in Section 7 below). Even though personal papers are normally "a by-product of activity or a means of carrying it out" (Raspin 1996:219), they give an unrivalled insight into the working conditions and state of mind (Grigg 1991:230) of the originator of the papers and the social activity in which he or she is engaged. At times, this is only gleaned by the translation historian's digging out what might seem minor details of a working life. But, as Raspin warns (ibid.:220), "it is very unlikely that [papers] will give a complete picture of the originator's activities". Not everything is written down and, even when it is, it may consist of fragments; correspondence may lack a reply or an enclosure (particularly vexing when that enclosure is a translator's curriculum vitae or contract); details of an individual's early life are likely to be scant. Papers themselves are subject to editing by the originator, which means that a range of sources needs to be consulted in order to corroborate or complete an account. However, these papers are also likely to be less guarded than official records or interviews.

5. Provenance and order

Provenance and original order are very important archival principles as they may give information about the context of a document or letter and about the classification used by the author. Archivists recommend that they should be preserved as far as possible, although Grigg (1991:232, n14) notes that "[i]t is possible to protect provenance without original order, and provenance continues to be more universally respected. It can also happen that materials arrive in the archives with provenance intact but with no discernible functional order". Closely related to this is the form of cataloguing adopted by the archivist, especially if a detailed finding aid is prepared to facilitate retrieval. For example, the finding aids of the Carlos Fuentes and Mario Vargas Llosa personal and working papers at Princeton show that the deposits are divided according to the following categories:

> Mario Vargas Llosa: notebooks, works, correspondence, papers by others, printed and recorded material, political archive, additional papers.[9]

> Carlos Fuentes: notebooks, writings, drawings and cartoons, correspondence, documents, photographs, audiocassettes and videocassettes, papers of others, scrapbooks, clippings and printed material, additional material.[10]

Translation is therefore not at the first level of classification. In the Vargas Llosa collection, the most relevant material is likely to be found in 'correspondence' (with named translators) and 'papers by others', the latter containing drafts and proofs of translations. For Fuentes, the draft translations are in a sub-classification of 'writings: translations', and further sub-divided between 'fiction' and 'non-fiction', which demonstrates a greater prominence for translation

[9] http://findingaids.princeton.edu/collections/C0641 (last accessed 5 December 2013).
[10] http://findingaids.princeton.edu/collections/C0790 (last accessed 5 December 2013).

in his collection. But, again, the material may not be comprehensive. The folders of correspondence received by Fuentes from translators such as Sam Hileman, Margaret Sayers Peden and his French translator, Céline Zins, may contain the letters received by Fuentes but not necessarily all the letters sent by him, although he was meticulous and most are retained in carbon copy. Similarly, the availability of draft translations varies wildly across collections. In publishers' archives (for example, the Penguin Archive, the British Publishers archive in Reading and the Alfred Knopf archive in Austin) they tend to be rare, but they feature prominently in the papers of Vargas Llosa and Fuentes. It might be conjectured that such high-profile authors are more aware of the potential importance of this material or are keener to keep a record of the production process, useful in the event of any dispute over detail. So, for instance, the various papers relating to the translation of Fuentes' novella Gringo viejo occupy two whole boxes.[11] They contain the following, as detailed by the finding aid:

- Drafts of English translation of Gringo viejo by Margaret Sayers Peden, TMs [typed manuscripts], 15 pp., and TMs (Xerox), 174 pp., dated 1984 February and 1984 April With corrections by translator and author;
- English translation of Gringo viejo by Margaret Sayers Peden and the author, TMs (Xerox) with typed manuscript additions, 189 pp., 1984 June 2 TLsS [typed letters signed] from translator to author, dated 1984 June 19 and 1984 July 12;
- English translation by Margaret Sayers Peden and the author, TMs (Xerox) with extensive typed manuscript additions, 189 pp, 1984;
- English translation by Margaret Sayers Peden and the author. Copy-edited manuscript, TMs (Xerox) with corrections in several hands, pp. numbered 1-230, 1985;
- English translation by Margaret Sayers Peden and the author. Draft, chapter titled "Arroyo—New," TMs (Xerox) with corrections in unknown hand, pp. numbered 144-237; TMs (Xerox), 3 pp., undated;
- Galleys marked with author's corrections, pp. numbered 1-102, c. July 1985;
- Master galleys with corrections, pp. numbered 1-102, c. July 1985;
- Master page proofs with corrections, pp. numbered 1-102, c. August 1985.

In the classification 'Novels and other works', further boxes[12] hold Fuentes' early versions of the text, which he began to write in English in the 1960s, as well as the emerging Spanish version, along with notebooks and materials about the real-life character Ambrose Bierce, on whom the story is based. Together with the correspondence from translator Margaret Sayers Peden,[13] this allows a detailed picture to be reconstructed of the evolution of the novel and subsequent film adaptation. It is also possible to corroborate the picture by cross-reference to correspondence in Peden's own papers in Austin, thus strengthening the rigour of the analysis and affording the opportunity to fill in any missing information.[14] Triangulation of findings is also possible where public and private declarations exist, for example by comparing what Gregory Rabassa says in his correspondence to Vargas Llosa with his own writings and interviews about the translation process (e.g. Rabassa 2005).

6. Hybrid archives

[11] The Old Gringo; 1984-1985, Boxes 71 and 72; Carlos Fuentes Papers, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
[12] Gringo viejo and English version The Old Gringo; 1964-1985, Boxes 13 and 14.
[13] Peden, Margaret Sayers; undated; Carlos Fuentes Papers, Box 120, Folder 5.
[14] The different locations again highlight the fact that much material is available in collections that are not primarily focused on translation.

Of course, developments in modern communication have already meant that the form and nature of such primary historical material is changing (Craven 2008:1). Raspin (1996:220) was concerned that the use of the telephone would mean that "much important business … is very sparsely recorded". This trend was bucked with the advent of email, already seen as a potential transformation of record-making by Derrida, in his Archive Fever (1996). Initially, emails tended to be printed out and filed with other correspondence – this is the case, for example, with correspondence in the Andrew Hurley archive in Austin, Texas, leading up to the publication of his translation of Borges's Collected Fictions in 1998. This has led to the creation of what are termed 'hybrid' archives, which comprise a mix of hard copy and digital holdings and make new demands on archivists. While such hybrids were initially focused on collections of academic abstracts and articles and PhD theses, they are now increasingly common in literary collections. For example, in recent years the British Library has acquired the literary records of Harold Pinter and Wendy Cope, amongst others. The Pinter collection includes email folders downloaded from his Outlook application and the Cope papers contain more than 40,000 emails (Owen 2011). Given that, as Owen says, literary records also contain manuscripts in the form of a word processor file, it is quite conceivable that future collections of author and translator 'papers' will predominantly, or even completely, comprise digital communication and even be available online (Foss 2011). The worldwide web has also increased the reach of translator declarations, whether these be formal interviews with Gregory Rabassa and Edith Grossman (PEN America 2006), podcasts of translation readings (Poetry Translation Centre) or translator blogs. Digitalization of such material was one aim of a major project proposal put together in 2013 by the Universities of Leeds and Glasgow, together with the British Library and in conjunction with the Translators Association and the British Centre for Literary Translation, Norwich. This would comprise translator working papers and correspondence and interviews with translators, publishers, agents and other actors involved in the process and would aim to provide a resource for future cultural and social historians of translation.

7. For a microhistory of translation

My contention is that translator papers especially, but also interviews and other testimony, are most useful in studies adopting the method of microhistory, which engages with historical anthropology and analyzes small cultural communities (Claus and Marriott 2012:284). Microhistory, as we saw in Section 2 above, "is essentially based on the reduction of the scale of observation, on a microscopic analysis and an intensive study of the documentary material" (Levi 1992:95); for Szijártó (2002:209), it has four advantages over quantitative macro-social history:

- it appeals to a wider public than the professional expert;
- it is "realistic";
- it conveys personal experience; and
- it links the individual case study with the general socio-historical context.

Of these, the last two appear to me to be the most vital. If we are interested in finding out about the working and living conditions of a particular translator and relating this to a translation community, then accessing and expressing the minutiae of the toils and tribulations of everyday life is important (Ginzberg 1993, Magnússon 2006). I will briefly describe two examples from the archives and papers I have examined: Bernard Miall, whose

correspondence can be found in the Allen & Unwin archive in Reading, UK,[15] and Sam Hileman, whose correspondence appears among the Carlos Fuentes papers in Princeton.

Miall (1876-1953) was a prolific translator from French who corresponded with his editors and the publisher every two or three days for the 39 years of their collaboration. An extremely detailed picture can be gained of the conditions in which Miall worked and eked out a living. On the very trivial level this includes details about his daily routine (translating during the day and writing reader's reports in the evening) and his preference for handwriting his translations rather than using his "very old Remington which saw thirty years' service in a business house, but is fairly serviceable still if humoured and repaired" (21 June 1918).[16] Other details reveal the plight of a poverty-stricken freelance translator, not helped by constant serious illnesses and "mental worry" which sometimes confined him to bed. In the era before the National Health Service, this did not mean he could stop work: "A week ago … I was literally faced with starvation. … I have been working in spite of a serious illness as I had somehow to double my former income", he wrote on 21 January 1917. Thirty years later, in the austere conditions that followed the Second World War, a similar scenario repeated itself: "I write and type, with cracked and benumbed fingers, in a temperature of 44 Fahrenheit [6.7°C]" (14 February 1947).[17]

Szijártó's third advantage of microhistory is that "it can convey the lived experience to readers directly on the micro-level of everyday life" (2002:210). This is certainly the case with Miall, from his first letter (12 September 1914)[18] in which he claims that he is able to translate from French, German and Italian and indicates his desire to translate and disseminate the work of Belgian poet and playwright Maurice Maeterlinck (1862-1949). For a while, he also had an agent, the ubiquitious James Pinker of London, he translated for other publishing companies (20 September 1914) and undertook some "propaganda work" for government departments. The reality is that literary translation alone was never sufficient to sustain him: "[I]n a year I have translated nine volumes and not a page of literature", he wrote on 28 August 1916. Yet Miall's skills in translation criticism were highly regarded: apart from his myriad reader reports, he says he completely revised the manuscript of an inadequate translation of Freud's Interpretation of Dreams, which appeared with Fisher Unwin under the name of the original translator, Dr A.A. Brill, in 1913 (Miall to Unwin, 1 September 1947).[19]

The microhistory of another translator, Sam Hileman (1926-2001), can be partly pieced together from his correspondence with author Carlos Fuentes, held in the Fuentes papers in Princeton and in Hileman's own papers at UCLA, California, where he was editor of art books. The correspondence in the Fuentes collection dates from November 1960 to March 1967. The frequent exchanges centre on translation queries, on the literary quality of the works and the form of the translation. The power relations between author and translator are keenly felt in the discussion of the translation of Change of Skin (Hileman to Fuentes, 1 May 1966):[20]

> All through the first part you will notice ... many, many small cuts and changes, inversions, transpositions ... I have done all these to jeep up the tension, speed, and movement of the writing, to make it hold the reader by a tight grip. I think I have succeeded. But I have had to take liberties. This is not a "creative" translation in the

[15] I acknowledge the advice of Lawrence Venuti in directing my attention to the Archive of British Publishing and Printing, including specifically the Miall correspondence.
[16] The Archive of British Publishing and Printing, University of Reading, UK. Records of George Allen & Unwin Ltd, AU FSC 22/140.
[17] Allen & Unwin, FSC 312/8.
[18] Allen & Unwin, FSC 21/135.
[19] Allen & Unwin, FSC 312/8.
[20] Carlos Fuentes Papers, Box 108, Folder 13.

> sense our first work together was. But I admit that it is a selective, strongly edited translation.

Hileman's 'strong' editing is often rejected by Fuentes, who insists on retaining certain elements of the narrative structure but nevertheless congratulates him on the overall translation (18 July 1966). As well as this back-and-forth discussion of the translation, in which Hileman shows himself to be a very forceful translator ("I work in an entirely different spirit and for a different purpose", 11 March 1967), he is depressed by the constant hand-to-mouth existence (he does not have the money to post the latest batch as he apologises for his slow pace of five pages a day, 20 May 1966) and by what he perceives to be the inadequacy of the work ("a miserable business, at best always a failure, at worst a disaster", 26 May 1966).[21]

Without such micro-data, the details of Miall and Hileman's working conditions, of their state of mind and of their approach to translation would be lost. Only their published translations would remain. Unlike better-known, 'élite' translators (e.g. Garnett 1991, Rabassa 2005, Johnson-Davis 2006), they have no biographies or autobiographies and the bulk of their papers resides in the collections of others (Allen & Unwin and Carlos Fuentes). As historians of translation, we should aim to highlight these 'ordinary' lives, but the question arises as to their importance compared to others and to our role as historians. Do we consider these microhistories sufficient of themselves because the lives in question are of translators of prominent authors or because of the fascinating incidental details of these lives? Does the chance survival of their personal papers, thanks to the custodians of a publisher's archives, the enlightened choice of an archivist or the concentration on posterity of an author like Carlos Fuentes, distort the sample or is their condition generalizable? What about all the translators whose papers have disappeared? By comparing the Miall and Hileman papers with the papers of other translators we can build up a bigger picture of the working conditions of translators in this and other periods, but there are many who are not represented or who are underrepresented. Ginzburg (1993:21) himself warns us against believing that a microhistorical approach is inherently democratic: "in any society the conditions of access to the production of documentation are tied to a situation of power and thus create an inherent imbalance". This imbalance is to the detriment of translators of popular literature and those who earn their daily living translating technical and other texts that are more ephemeral than the 'great' works of literature and where the process and conditions are not recorded for posterity. The same goes for translation that occurs in those many cultures or contexts where the spoken word prevails over the written one and where no permanent records are kept. It beholds us to seek out and preserve such accounts and to relate them to the wider social and cultural conditions in which the individuals lived in order to enhance our understanding of the general history of translation. Although that relation of the micro to the macro is far from being unproblematic, it is by focusing on the "little facts" (Szijártó 2002:210) of everyday lives that a picture can be built up of the specific interaction between a translator and other individuals, groups, institutions and power structures, and of the exchange and operation of beliefs and the motivation of behaviour. On the larger scale, the new narratives we construe based on these 'little facts' have the potential to challenge dominant historical discourses of text production, which are in turn dominated by prominent literary figures and translators; but these new narratives of micro-history also conceal other biases in the selection and presentation of material, in the gaps in our knowledge and in forms of overtly mediated testimonies.

JEREMY MUNDAY
School of Modern Languages and Cultures, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK.

[21] All in Carlos Fuentes Papers, Box 108, Folder 13.

j.munday@leeds.ac.uk

References

Abrams, Lynn (2010) Oral History Theory, Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Beiser, Frederick (2011) The German Historicist Tradition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Billiani, Francesca (2007) 'Renewing a Literary Culture through Translation: Poetry in Post-war Italy', in Jeremy Munday (ed.) Translation as Intervention, London & New York: Continuum, 138-60.

Birse, Arthur Herbert (1967) Memoirs of an Interpreter, London: Michael Joseph.

Boldizsár Simon, Zoltan (2009) 'Method and Perspective', Journal of Microhistory. Available at http://web.archive.org/web/20110727083658/http://www.microhistory.org/pivot/entry.php?id=48 (last accessed 28 June 2013).

Borges, Jorge Luis (1998) Collected Fictions, translated by Andrew Hurley, New York: Penguin.

Burke, Peter (1991/2001) 'Overture to the New History: Its Past and Future', in Peter Burke (ed.) New Perspectives on Historical Writing, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1-24.

------ (2008) What is Cultural History?, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chartier, Roger (1982) 'Intellectual History or Social History: The French Trajectories', in Dominick LaCapra and Stephen L. Kaplan (eds) Modern European Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 13-46.

Claus, Peter and John Marriott (eds) (2012) History: An Introduction to Theory, Method and Practice, Harlow: Pearson.

Constenla, Tereixa (2011) 'Los papeles de Balcells: de cal y canto' [The Balcells Papers: Behind Closed Doors], El País, 21 November. Available at http://cultura.elpais.com/cultura/2011/11/21/actualidad/1321830003_850215.html (last accessed 5 December 2013).

Craven, Louise (ed.) (2008) What are Archives? Cultural and Theoretical Perspectives: A Reader, Aldershot & Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Delisle, Jean and Judith Woodsworth (eds) (2012) Translators Through History, Second edition, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Foss, Rachel (2011) 'Collecting Translators' Papers', In Other Words 38: 30-32.

Foucault, Michel (1969/2002) The Archaeology of Knowledge, translated by A.M. Sheridan-Smith, London & New York: Routledge.

Gallagher, Catherine and Stephen Greenblatt (2000) Practicing New Historicism, Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Garnett, Richard (1991) Constance Garnett: A Heroic Life, London: Sinclair Stevenson.

Ginzburg, Carlo (1976/1980) The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-century Miller, translated by John Tedeschi and Anne C. Tedeschi, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

------ (1993) 'Microhistory: Two or Three Things that I know about It', translated by John Tedeschi and Anne C. Tedeschi, Critical Inquiry 20(1): 11-35.

Göpferich, Susanne and Riitta Jääskeläinen (2009) 'Process Research into the Development of Translation Competence: Where Are We and Where Do We Need to Go?', Across Languages and Cultures 10(2): 169-91.

Grigg, Susan (1991) 'Archival Practice and the Foundations of Historical Method', The Journal of American History 78(1): 228-39.

Hamilton, Carolyn, Verne Harris and Graeme Reid (2002) 'Introduction', in Carolyn Hamilton, Verne Harris, Jane Taylor, Michele Pickover, Graeme Reid and Razia Saleh (eds) Refiguring the Archive, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 7-18.

Hansen, Gyde (2006) 'Retrospection Methods in Translator Training and Translation Research', JosTrans 5: 2-41.
Hoeksema, Thomas (1978) 'The Translator's Voice: An Interview with Gregory Rabassa', Translation Review, 5-18.
Johnson-Davis, Denys (2006) Memories in Translation, Cairo: American University Press.
Levi, Giovanni (1991) 'On Microhistory', in Peter Burke (ed.) New Perspectives on Historical Writing, Cambridge: Polity Press, 93-113.
Linder, Daniel (2004) 'The Censorship of Sex: A Study of Raymond Chandler's The Big Sleep in Franco's Spain', TTR 17(1): 155-82.
Lyons, Michael (2010) 'A New History from Below? The Writing Culture of Ordinary People in Europe', History Australia 7(3). Available at http://journals.publishing.monash.edu/ojs/index.php/ha/article/view/ha100059 (last accessed 28 June 2013).
MacRaild, Duncan and Avram Taylor (2004) Social Theory and Social History, Houndmills: MacMillan.
Magnússon, Sigurdur Gylfi (2006) 'Social history – Cultural history – Alltagsgeschichte – Microhistory: In-between Methodologies and Conceptual Frameworks', Journal of Microhistory. Available at http://web.archive.org/web/20110727083357/http://www.microhistory.org/pivot/entry.php?id=20 (last accessed 28 June 2013).
Mbembe, Achille (2002) 'The Power of the Archive and Its Limits', in Carolyn Hamilton, Verne Harris, Jane Taylor, Michele Pickover, Graeme Reid and Razia Saleh (eds) Refiguring the Archive, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 19-26.
Munday, Jeremy (2012) Evaluation in Translation: Critical Points of Translator Decision-making, Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
------ (2013) 'The Role of Archival and Manuscript Research in the Investigation of Translator Decision-making', in Sharon O'Brien, Susanne Göpferich and Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow (eds) Special issue of Target 25(1): 127-40.
Nottola, Francesca (2010) 'The Einaudi Publishing House and Fascist Policy on Translations', in Christopher Rundle and Kate Sturge (eds) Translation Under Fascism, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 178-200.
Owen, Nick (2011) 'The Future of Literary Past: Archives Goes Digital as British Library Wins Wendy Cope Archive'. Available at http://www.culture24.org.uk/history+%26+heritage/literature+%26+music/art354896 (last accessed 28 June 2013).
Pearce-Moss, Richard (2005) A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology, Chicago: The Society of American Archivists. Available at http://www.archivists.org/glossary/index.asp (last accessed 5 December 2013).
PEN America (2006) 'Conversation: Gregory Rabassa, Edith Grossman, and Michael F. Moore'. Available at http://www.pen.org/book/conversation-gregory-rabassa-edith-grossman-and-michael-f-moore (last accessed 28 June 2013).
Poetry Translation Centre (n.d.) 'Publications and Podcasts'. Available at http://www.poetrytranslation.org/downloads (last accessed 28 June 2013).
Rabassa, Gregory (2005) If This Be Treason: Translation and Its Dyscontents, New York: New Directions.
Ranke, Leopold von (1834/2009) 'Preface to History of the Popes, their Church and State', in Adam Budd (ed.) The Modern Historiography Reader: Western Sources, London & New York: Routledge, 174-77.
Raspin, Angela (1996) 'Private Papers', in Brian Brivati, Julia Buxton and Anthony Seldon (eds) The Contemporary History Handbook, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 219-29.

Roper, Michael (1996) 'Oral History', in Brian Brivati, Julia Buxton and Anthony Seldon (eds) The Contemporary History Handbook, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 345-52.

Rubino, Mario (2010) 'Literary Exchange between Italy and Germany: German Literature in Italian Translation', in Christopher Rundle and Kate Sturge **(**eds) Translation Under Fascism, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 147-77.

Rundle, Christopher (2010) Publishing Translations in Fascist Italy, Oxford: Peter Lang.

Seldon, Anthony (1996) 'Elite Interviews', in Brian Brivati, Julia Buxton and Anthony Seldon (eds) The Contemporary History Handbook, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 353-65.

Sharpe, Jim (1991/2001) 'History from below', in Peter Burke (ed.) New Perspectives on Historical Writing, Cambridge: Polity Press, 25-42.

Szijártó, István (2002) 'Four Arguments for Microhistory', Rethinking History 6(2): 209-15.

Toury, Gideon (1995) Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence (1998) The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference, London & New York: Routledge.

------ (2008) *The Translator's Invisibility: A* History of Translation, Second edition, Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Williams, Caroline (2008) 'Personal Papers: Perceptions and Practices', in Louise Craven (ed.) What are Archives? Cultural and Theoretical Perspectives: A Reader, Aldershot & Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 53-70.