

ROLAND BARTHES IN BRAZIL, BY TRANSLATIONS¹

Laura Taddei Brandini (ORCID: 0000-0001-9041-8723)
State University of Londrina (Brazil)

Roland Barthes has never been to Brazil. Although he had been invited by Leyla Perrone-Moisés to give lectures at Brazilian Universities and had discussed the details of such agreement in letters (Perrone-Moisés 2012), the trip has never happened. However, through the translations of his works, Barthes has been part of the Brazilian intellectual circles since 1970, when *Criticism and Truth* (1966) and a selection of *Critical Essays* (1964) were translated by Leyla Perrone-Moisés and published under the title of *Criticism and Truth*. Since then, the Barthesian presence in Brazil has been frequent, although heterogeneous: the choice of an author’s works reflects specific needs within the Brazilian cultural context, which changes according to the intellectual history of the country. This paper aims to connect the Barthesian critical thought and the translational activity. It also aims to present data on the history of translations of Barthes in Brazil, correlating it to the Brazilian literary system.

Barthes never translated any of his books. He was not a language expert² and never showed any interest in things related to translation, as he himself explains in a fragment about his mother tongue, in *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes* (1975): “(...) little taste for foreign literatures, constant pessimism regarding translation, affliction towards translators’ questions, and the fact that they seem to frequently ignore what I think is the literal meaning of a word: the connotation” (BARTHES 2003: 132). The

¹ A first version of this article was published in Brazil under the title “Roland Barthes no Brasil via traduções” in the journal *Cadernos de tradução*, v. 2, n. 34 (2014), pp. 120-141.

² While acknowledging a certain taste for languages other than French, for example, the Japanese, whose structure represented the otherness to him (BARTHES 2003: 132).



writer was certainly talking about the strictest meaning of translation, that purely utilitarian, that disrespects the polysemy and is, then, a reduction of the source-text.

In spite of this negative opinion, in some of his reflections about literary criticism, Barthes expressed opinions that approached certain modern concepts of translation. In “What is criticism?”, a renowned 1963 paper published on *Times Literary Supplement* and, in France, in *Critical Essays*, Barthes defines literary criticism as a metalanguage, in the following terms: “the criticism is a speech about a speech; it is a second language or a metalanguage (as logical people would say), that is exerted on a first language (or object-language)” (BARTHES 1970: 160). Furthermore, Barthes questions the idea that criticism has a final word over the work itself –the same can be said about traditional critics at that time–, quoting *In search of lost time*, by Proust:

Its role [criticism] is solely to elaborate a language itself, whose coherence, whose logic, in short, whose *systematics* can collect, or better yet, to “integrate” (in the mathematical sense of the word) the greatest possible quantity of Proustian language, exactly as a logical equation tests the validity of reasoning without taking sides as to the “truth” of the arguments it mobilizes (BARTHES 1972: 258).

In other words, the criticism should consist in a second language that “integrates” the language of the literary work, like a joiner when he puts together two pieces of furniture, thus, making the necessary adjustments. The critic, then, “adjusts” “the language provided by its era (existentialism, marxism, psychoanalysis) to the language, or the formal system of logical embarrassments elaborated by the author himself, according to his own epoch” (BARTHES 1972: 260). Barthes sees the critical activity as the elaboration of a language on its full meaning, the one of literary writing or, in a Barthesian concept, writing: tied to a critical present that still keeps a tight relationship with the language of



the literary work; this one, tied to its age but never limited to itself, because of its many meanings.³

Such comprehension of criticism may be approached by Haroldo de Campos’s theory of translation. In *A operação do texto* [The operation of the text], the concrete poet and translator remembers his first steps translating Maiakóvski. In spite of his scarce knowledge of Russian at that time, he shows how he achieved success because

there was also the specific problem of poetry translation, that, in my point of view, is a genre that could be categorized as creation itself. Translating poetry is creating, at the risk of sterilization and petrification, which is a worse alternative than betrayal (*apud* SCHNAIDERMAN 2003a: 61, freely translated).

The concept of transcreation is central in the poetics of de Campos⁴ translation, and gathers the ideas of creation and language transposition, main features of literary writing and translation, respectively. For him, translating a literary work means recreating it, or transcreating it, creating a new work from the transposition of the original language to another one:

All of this must be transcreated by the translator, exceeding the limits of his language, defamiliarizing the lexicon, recompensing the loss, here, with an inventive intromission there, the forced infra-translation with a felicitous hypertranslation, until it maddens and deprives the language of the ultimate Hubris (luciferous offence, semiological transgression?), that is, transforming the original into the translation of its translation. (DE CAMPOS 2003b: 179)

³ The plurality of senses of the literary text is strongly claimed by Barthes as an argument against the “only truth” of the work held by the old French criticism in the twentieth century. Cf. “The two criticisms”, “What is criticism?” and *Criticism and Truth* (BARTHES 1970).

⁴ Haroldo de Campos based his theory in poetry translation. However, there is nothing to prevent it from being understood in a broader sense, as a theory of literary translation, the way in which I interpret it.

When an original work becomes “the translation of its translation”, the hierarchy between the work itself and its translation breaks down, then prevailing the precedence relation, without implying an order of values. It is also a break down in paradigms –the supremacy of literary work about the critical text– as proposed by Barthes. Campos, an enthusiastic Barthes’ reader since the 1960’s, based on the Max Bense’s and Ezra Pound’s theories, establishes a connection between translation and criticism: in this very decade, the concrete poets, intending to strategically prepare the Brazilian literary system to its poems, then revolutionary, devoted themselves to a huge translational activity, naturally choosing foreign works that would corroborate their convictions and contribute to the development of their reflections about literature: “By doing this, they have presented just the didacticism of the theory and of the Poundian practice of translation and his ideas about the role of criticism –and criticism *via* translation– as ‘nutriment of creator impulse’” (DE CAMPOS 1992: 42).

Although Barthes isn’t cited in the fragment above –Ezra Pound, another great language thinker, is cited instead–, the comprehension of criticism as food for the literary creation is approached from the definition of criticism as writing, of criticism as text. However, in *Criticism and Truth*, about the definition of criticism, Barthes affirms: “When a critic takes from the bird and from the Mallarmean box a common ‘meaning’ of go and come, virtually, he is not designating the last truth of the image, but a new image, it itself hanging. The criticism is not translation, but a periphrasis.” (BARTHES 1970: 226). In this fragment, Barthes rejects the comparison between criticism and translation, referring to translation as a final and only transposition of a word or expression into another linguistic system, which reveals a limited conception of the translational activity. Translation can, and sometimes, ought to be periphrasis, so it implies interpretation, a personal reading, as Jakobson explained in *Linguistics aspects of translation*:



The intralingual translation of a word uses either another, more or less synonymous, word or resorts to a circumlocution [...].

Likewise, on the level of intralingual translation, there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units, while messages may serve as adequate interpretations of foreign code-units or messages [...].

More frequently, however, translation from one language into another, substitutes messages in one of the languages, not for separate code-units, but for entire messages in some other language. Such a translation is a reported speech; the translator recodes and transmits a message received from another source. Thus, translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes. (JAKOBSON 2000: 114)

So, despite the opposing speech, Barthes, in his theory and practice of criticism, approaches Campos’s concept: his comprehension of the criticism as a creation activity enables the three concepts –literary text, criticism and translation– to work together as one.

In an explicit way, it is Tania Carvalhal who makes the bridge between Barthes and translation, in her essay “*Tradução e recepção na prática comparatista*” [Translation and reception in the comparatist practice], by citing a fragment of *S/Z* (1970):

On the one hand, there is what is possible to write; and, on the other hand, what is no longer possible to write: that which is within the practice of the writer and what comes from it: what texts would I agree to write (rewrite), desire, forcefully casting them into this world of mine?

Taking up and transforming the final words of the author, we would say: “what texts would I agree to translate, forcefully casting them into this world of mine? (CARVALHAL 2003: 247, free translation)

For Carvalhal, both the verbs “to write” and “to translate” are included into two inseparable movements: the creation, or recreation, or transcreation, a work developed within language, moved by the author’s or translator’s desire; and his/her dissemination.



The translations, thrown “as a power” in a literary system, interfere with its operation, introducing new concepts or ratifying current ideas. About this phenomenon, Itamar Even-Zohar developed fruitful reflections conceiving his Literary Polysystem Theory. For this author, translations cannot be seen outside a cultural system, as he explains:

My argument is that translated works do correlate in at least two ways: (a) in the way their source texts are selected by the target literature, the principles of selection never being uncorrelated with the home co-systems of the target literature (to put it in the most cautious way); and (b) in the way they adopt specific norms, behaviours, and policies -in short, in their use of the literary repertoire- which results from their relations with the other home co-systems. (EVEN-ZOHAR 2000: 192-193)

This dynamic conception between translations and literary systems is useful in reading the reception of Barthes' works in Brazil through his translations. On one hand, the linguistic studies in vogue in the 1960's and 1970's, nurtured by the consolidation of the academic institutions, made people search for concepts in the outside bibliography, then, almost inexistent in the country. In this context, Cultrix and Perspectiva, publishers from São Paulo, stood out due to the huge number of titles published in the cited area, most of them, translations of foreign works, particularly French and American. The translated books -including Barthes' and many selections containing papers by the author- were chosen according to the local needs, in accordance with the item “a” of Even-Zohar's argumentation.

On the other hand, the theories and conceptions that were brought to Brazil by these translations raised questions and ways of facing problems common to the reality of other countries, most of the times, resulting in a conflict between cultures: ideas long matured within a diversified and ancient academic context, like the ones in Europe, suddenly docked on the sheepish Brazilian intellectual environment. This difference of perception happened, for instance, with *Writing Degree Zero* (1953), first of Barthes'



books, which initial reception was very negative in Brazil and positive in France. Barthes was read by the Brazilian critics in the 50's as an intellectual young man worried about creating a game with words, rather than to effectively contributing to the construction of a literary idea, being then totally uninteresting to the eyes of critics that were still trying to establish the theoretical basis for the construction of a national literature (MILLIET 1953). In other words, the translations provide the upcoming system with a new set of questions and own their meanings, not available to the original system. This is likely to generate controversy and incomprehension within the upcoming system, as Even-Zohar describes in the item “b” of the cited fragment.

From the history of translations of Barthes' works in Brazil, I highlight two moments: the decades of 1970's and 2000's. In the 70's, and echoing the intense debates from the 60's about *nouvelle critique* and structuralism, the interest for linguistics was intensified, particularly by the authors who, through linguistics, theorized about various topics. Consequently, the flow of publications about linguistics, that already existed, increased substantially, feeding the intellectual fever of the moment.

This diagnosis is given by Vilson Brunel Mellen in the review *Linguistics and poetics*, by Daniel Delas and Jacques Filliolet (translation by Carlos Felipe Moisés, São Paulo, Cultrix, 1976), entitled “Uma definição provisória de poesia” [A provisional definition of poetry] and published in the cultural supplement of the newspaper *O Estado de S. Paulo*, in 1977. His text starts with the following finding:

The interest aroused by linguistics in these last years is the main responsible for editorial events like this one: less than two years before its release in France, the Brazilian community is confronted with this *Linguistics and Poetics*, in a well done translation. (MELLEN 1977: 13)

And he sentences, explaining what seems to be a consequence of the abundance of linguistic studies: “A general vision of the work may favour the impression that it is a book like several



others that have been appearing lately –that intends to ‘improvise’ about something, shielded by a title that brings a magic word: Linguistics” (ib.). However, for the author, contrarily to what seems to be a first impression, *Linguistics and poetics* seems useful as it shows the great modern linguistic tendencies, offering to the reader a general outlook, capable of locating them in a forest of theories and conceptions. Inside this frame, Barthes’ name arises, as well as other intellectuals such as Benveniste, Derrida, Chomsky, Greimas, Eco, Hjelmslev, Martinet, Sapir, Kristeva, Jakobson, Lévi-Strauss, Saussure, etc.

Linguistics, then, was a craze in Brazil. Being attractive both to the ones that already knew it from previous decades, equipping them with material for debate and reflection, and to the ones that were initiating in the subject. Promoting such interest and benefitting from it, some publishing houses stood out in that time, as Leônidas Hegenberg says in his paper “Na área da linguística” [In the field of linguistics], also published in the cultural supplement of the newspaper *O Estado de S. Paulo*, in 1977. In this text, the author claims that “Two publishing houses have been devoted, with great effort, in the last years, to publishing works about linguistics; Vozes, from Petrópolis, and Cultrix, from São Paulo” (HEGENBERG 1977: 7). This last one published *Course in general linguistics*, by Saussure, translated by Antonio Chelini, José Paulo Paes and Izidoro Blikstein, in 1970. Hegenberg explains that the good sales results opened doors and other publishing houses could invest in the translation and publishing of books about linguistics, because “The number of publishing houses and books is a clear evidence that the subject has been catching on” (ib.). Hegenberg cites the publication *Elements of semiology*, by Barthes, in 1971, as one of the biggest works already available to Brazilian people, thanks to Cultrix.

The number of linguistic studies that appeared in literary discussions in the 70’s favoured the dissemination of Barthes’ works. His books started to be translated and published throughout the decade, consisting of one of the peaks of translations of his works in Brazil. Among his published books, were the ones



that better met the necessities of linguistics applied to literary texts. Published books: *Criticism and Truth* followed by a selection of *Critical Essays* (1970), *Writing Degree Zero* (1971), *Elements of Semiology* (1971), *Structural Analysis of Narrative* (1971), *Mythologies* (1972), *New Critical Essays*, followed by *Writing Degree Zero* (1974), *The Pleasure of the Text* (1977), *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes* (1977), *Fashion System* (1979), *What is Literature* (interview with Barthes) (1979) and *Lesson* (1978).

In addition to the clear predominance of the publishing houses Perspectiva (two translations) and Cultrix (five translations) in publishing Barthes' books in that decade, I also stress the fundamental role of Leyla Perrone-Moisés, translator of Barthes' first work in Brazil, *Criticism and Truth* and the selection of *Critical Essays*, as well as *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes* and *Lesson*. Her pioneering work spreading Barthes' ideas was disseminated in the following years, both on newspapers and in colleges with the publishing houses, even after the 70's.

Available in Portuguese, accessible due to the Brazilian translations, easily found in bookstores, the French writer caught on in Brazil back then and, from an unknown author, wrongly labelled, Barthes became ubiquitous in texts about literature and other emergent arts, such as cinema, photography and studies about communication in general.

In the first decade of the 21st century, I identify a new moment in which Barthes' works were largely translated. Many of his concepts were recognized by post-modernity (considered here as dating from the 80's), which revitalized his works published from *The Pleasure of the Text* on. However, in that moment, the Barthesian works were released by many different publishing houses, many of them delaying their publication, such as *Michelet* and *Empire of signs*, that waited 37 years to be published. The inconstancy in the reedition of the works already published and the long time taken to translate unpublished works in Brazil resulted in a lesser accessibility of Barthes' works for the next 20 years, sometimes restricted to expensive Portuguese editions from the



70's. In the meantime, the demand for his books was boosted by studies called postmodern.

Once again, a demand of the literary system raised the presence of Barthes in the Brazilian editorial market: Martins Fontes Publishing House released the Roland Barthes Collection in 2000 organized by Leyla Perrone-Moisés. So, again, the trajectory of this great intellectual mixes with Barthes' story, publishing his works for the Brazilian public. Until today, the following books were added to the collection: *Writing Degree Zero* followed by *New Critical Essays* (2000), *The Semiotic Challenge* (2001), *How to Live Together - Romanesque Simulations of some everyday spaces. Courses and Seminars at Collège de France 1976-1977* (2003), *The Neutral - Lecture Course at the Collège de France 1977-1978* (2003), *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments* (2003), *The Grain of Voice - Interviews (1962-1980)* (2004), *The Rustle of Language* (2004), *Incidents* (2004), *Inéditos, I: Teoria* [Unpublished I: Theory] (2004), *Inéditos, II: Crítica* [Unpublished II: Criticism] (2004), *Inéditos, III: Imagem e Moda* [Unpublished III: Image and Fashion] (2005), *Inéditos, IV: Política* [Unpublished IV: Politics] (2005), *The Preparation of the Novel: Lecture Course at the Collège de France, 1978-1980* (2005), *Sade, Fourier, Loyola* (2005), *Empire of Signs* (2007), *Escritos sobre o Teatro* [Writings on Theatre] (2007), *On Racine* (2008), *The Fashion System* (2009), *Mourning Diary. October 29, 1977 - September 15 1979* (2011), *Travels in China* (2012).

Postmodernity, a new theoretical-reflexive order that guides literary studies, resets the French writer. From its theories and works subjectivity has emerged and this new conceptual paradigm raised Barthes to the condition of a postmodern guru because of the same subjectivity that promoted his works since *The Pleasure of the Text*. Also, the republications and new translations of his works in Brazil fed the Barthesian metamorphosis, acknowledged by literary critics and Brazilian cultural journalists.

This new image construction got a significant boost in 2003, when *Writing Degree Zero* turned fifty years old. The occasion was celebrated in France with the release of Barthes' complete works and with the successful multimedia exhibition dedicated to



the author in Paris. Echoing such events, Luiz Zanin Oricchio writes in *O Estado de S. Paulo* “Saudades de Barthes e reabertura do ‘caso’ Céline” [Missing Barthes and reopening of the Céline ‘case’], paper also dedicated to the author of *Journey to the End of the Night* (1932). About Barthes, Oricchio acknowledges that the new publications of the already known books, added to a good number of new works in the collection, up to this point disseminated in a panoply of journals, engendered a review of the author’s works. Reproducing the opinion of Jean-Paul Enthoven, to *Le Point*, source of information for the Brazilian author, he considers:

[...] some of the more structuralist works, like *Fashion System*, *Mythologies*, and *S/Z* may not hold up over time. But works such as *A Lover’s Discourse: Fragments*, *The Empire of Signs*, and *The Pleasure of the Text* are incomparable and maintain their freshness of meaning and innovation. Furthermore, they show Barthes as he wished to be: not a teacher but rather a sort of guide, a friendly type of professor-artist, who excelled at awakening talents. Ultimately, somebody who derived great pleasure from thinking and transmitted that pleasure to those who heard and read him. To sum up, as he himself defined the subject with which he laboured. (ENTHOVEN 2003: D4)

Oricchio’s agreement with Enthoven’s point of view is manifested by the reproduction, without any reservation, of the division of Barthes’ works into two groups: some of his books, notably marked by the structuralism, did not age as well as the ones from the 70s, which are more personal.

This brief summary of the different moments of the reception of Barthes’s work sheds light on the writer who is no longer seen as “structuralist”, an image from the 60’s, reinforced in the 70’s in Brazil by the translations, and still alive. At the same time, it shows him as a “poststructuralist” intellectual and, therefore, shall play a new kind of influence: in general, especially in the 2000’s, the French author came to embody the postmodern ideals, either because of his personalist *écriture* or by the detachment from theories that he helped to establish, in a constant



combativeness against the *doxa* and all kinds of authoritarianism, which was metamorphosed into an attitude of defence of minorities.

Barthes' change of paths was faithfully portrayed by Gilles Lapouge, who, alongside Leyla Perrone-Moisés, was a promoter of the writer's work in Brazil. In a cover article for the issue *Caderno 2/ Cultura* of the newspaper *O Estado de S. Paulo* from February 2, in 2003, the author pronounces in the title “O Melhor Barthes ficou fora da sala de aula” [The best of Barthes was kept outside the classroom], expressing his preference for the postmodern writings to the detriment of the structuralist ones, at that time already incorporated at the universities. The short text that introduces the article summarizes this appreciation: “Exhibition in Paris honours the teacher, the amateur plastic artist and the pretentious theorist, but what remains, in these 20 years of his death, is the vibrant personality, his touch of humanity and the supreme style” (LAPOUGE 2003, D1).

In his article, Lapouge revisited the intellectual journey of the writer and made a balance of his heritage. The result is expressed in the quote above: the praise of the postmodern writer and the condemnation of the structuralist theorist, seen as a “pretentious theorist”, undoubtedly due to the wide employment of the scientific jargon from the 60's. The passage of a “state” -the structuralism- to another -the free, personal and subjective- is narrated in a humorous way in the article:

Generations of students became dizzy in face of Barthes' studies of style and structure. Today, when one rereads those works, those tiresome lessons fall from our hands: a study like *Fashion System* is mortifying, lacking in any interest, and moreover poorly conceived on the level of theory.

But the true Barthes was very different [...].

Happily, it is this other Barthes - a Barthes that is free, joyful, playful and insolent, jovial and intrepid, passionately free of all theory, lover of the world and of people -that the exhibition chose to praise, not the Barthes embalmed in Marx, and, especially, in Saussure, or structuralist theory. (LAPOUGE 2003: D1)



Behind the master of the syntagms and paradigms, there is another Barthes, lighter and, why not, fun? This is the writer's image ambivalence in his *post-mortem*: the great structuralist theorist and postmodern libertarian, as Lapouge summarizes, pointing to a paradox: “We realize that this author, considered difficult, theoretical and abstract is, in reality, a man who is filled with concrete things, who speaks of things, and not ideas” (LAPOUGE 2003: D1). That is, a man of flesh and bones who can be close to his readers. Postmodern Barthes is no longer the “difficult theorist”, but the “sensitive author”.

The renewed interest in Barthes' ideas in the 2000's and the new influx of issues brought to the market by Martins Fontes infected other publishers that hold the publishing rights of the translations of some of his books to republish or even start publishing this “new source”. An example was the publication of *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes*, translated by Leyla Perrone-Moisés for the Cultrix publisher in 1977, and for the Estação Liberdade publisher in 2003. Or the reissues of *Camera Lucida* by Nova Fronteira (2000), *Mythologies* by Difel (2003 and 2009), *Structural Analysis of Narrative* by Vozes (2008), *The Pleasure of the Text* and *Criticism and Truth* followed by the collection of essays *Critical Essays* by Perspectiva (2008 and 2009, respectively).

The dynamics of the translations of Barthes' works set some of the images created of him, according to which the writer was read in Brazil: first, in the 70s, it was primarily the structuralist author that engaged Brazilian intellectuals, thanks to his reflections on language, based on the linguistic theories in vogue. *Elements of Semiology* and the essay *Structural Analysis of Narrative* became mandatory readings for the intellectual interested in any sort of language analysis, from literature to cinema, from fashion to advertising, from photography to the journalistic discourse. The Roland Barthes that appeared was the semiotician, leader of the French structuralism, analytical instrument, “jack of all trades”, theory of all research.



In the following twenty years, these writings seemed outdated and Barthes was not sought with such interest. But the postmodernity of the late 90s and early 2000s raised the writer as a whole, recognizing him as a precursor of libertarian models of literary construction: the aesthetics of the fragment and the body writing, which operates guided by the desire were, for example, celebrated as ways to break with the standard of academic writing, which was objective in principle and based on a purely rational logic.

Books like *The Pleasure of the Text*, *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes* and *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments* lifted Barthes to the category of the greatest subversive figure of the paradigms and inspired even nowadays the renewal of the academic essay, stimulating the insertion of subjectivity through the affirmation of the desire. In the last decade, in addition to the content of his works, his writings owe much -again- to the obstinate work of an intellectual, Leyla Perrone-Moisés. Without her work, perhaps the recognition of Roland Barthes could be late in Brazil. The translations and reissues of the works of Barthes that now are in the catalogues of Brazilian publishers give new life to his works so they can bear fruit far beyond France.

Bibliographical references

- BARTHES, Roland. (1970) *Crítica e verdade*. Tr. Leyla Perrone-Moisés. São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva.
- _____. (1972). *Critical Essays*. Tr. Richard Howard. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, pp. 255-260.
- _____. (2003) *Roland Barthes por Roland Barthes*. Tr. Leyla Perrone-Moisés. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade.
- CAMPOS, Haroldo de. (1992). “Da Tradução como criação e como crítica”. In: *Metalinguagem & outras metas*. Ensaios de teoria e crítica literária. São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, pp. 31-48.



- CARVALHAL, Tania Franco. (2003). *O Próprio e o alheio. Ensaio de literatura comparada*. São Leopoldo (RS): Editora da Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos.
- EVEN-ZOHAR, Itamar. (2000). “The Position of translated literature within the literary polysystem”. In: VENUTI, Lawrence (org.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 192-197.
- HEGENBERG, Leônidas (August 28, 1977). “Na Área da Linguística”. *O Estado de S. Paulo*, Suplemento Cultural, São Paulo, p. 7.
- JAKOBSON, Roman. (2000). “Linguistics aspects of translation”. In: VENUTI, Lawrence (org.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, pp. 113-118.
- LAPOUGE, Gilles (February 2, 2003). “O Melhor Barthes ficou fora da sala de aula”. *O Estado de S. Paulo, Caderno 2/ Cultura*, São Paulo, p. D1.
- MELLEN, Vilson Brunel. (March 27, 1977). “Resenha de Linguística e Poética”. *O Estado de S. Paulo*, Suplemento Cultural, São Paulo, p. 13.
- MILLIET, Sérgio (November 17, 1953). “O Grau zero da escrita”. *O Estado de S. Paulo*, p. 6.
- PERRONE-MOISÉS, Leyla. (2012). *Com Roland Barthes*. São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes.
- SCHNAIDERMAN, Boris. (July-December, 2003a). “Haroldo de Campos e a transcrição da poesia russa moderna”. *Fragmentos*, nº 25 (Florianópolis), pp. 61-68.
- . (September-November, 2003b) “Haroldo de Campos, poesia russa moderna, transcrição” *Revista USP*, nº 59 (São Paulo), pp. 172-180.
- ORICCHIO, Luiz Zanin. (January 5, 2003). “Saudades de Barthes e reabertura do ‘caso’ Céline”. *O Estado de S. Paulo, Caderno 2/ Cultura*, “Revista das revistas”, São Paulo, p. D4.



ABSTRACT:

This article studies the reception to the work of Roland Barthes in Brazil through the translations of his books and essays. More specifically, and according to the Theory of Literary Polysystem, by Itamar Even-Zohar, it retraces the history of Barthes translations in its relations with the most important Brazilian intellectual scenarios for his work, the 70's and 2000's: at first, the works of the French writer that best met the desire of Brazilian intellectuals for theories came from linguistic studies, versatile enough to serve as an analytical basis for the reading of the most varied objects; in a second moment, interest in Barthes found in the canonization imposed by the postmodernity thought the justification for a review of his work. Both in the first and the second moments, the translations of Barthesian texts reflect different images of the French writer, built by Brazilian intellectuals, which show the characteristics of each of these historic cultural moments.

Keywords: Roland Barthes; Translation; Reception Studies; Images; Comparative Literature

RESUMEN:

ROLAND BARTHES EN BRASIL A TRAVÉS DE LAS TRADUCCIONES

Este artículo analiza la recepción de la obra de Roland Barthes en Brasil a través de las traducciones de sus libros y ensayos. Bajo la perspectiva de la Teoría literaria de los Polisistemas de Itamar Even-Zohar, este estudio reconstruye la historia de las traducciones de Barthes relacionándolas con los más importantes escenarios intelectuales brasileños para su obra, los años 70 del siglo XX y los años 2000. En este primer periodo se observa que fueron traducidas las obras del escritor francés que mejor corresponden a los anhelos de los intelectuales brasileiros por las teorías provenientes de los estudios lingüísticos, suficientemente versátiles para basar analíticamente la lectura de los más variados objetos.



“Transfer” XIII: 1-2 (2018), pp. 77-93. ISSN: 1886-554

Ya en el segundo periodo, el interés en la obra de Barthes se fundamenta en la canonización impuesta por la postmodernidad. Tanto en el primero como en el segundo momento, las traducciones de textos barthesianos reflejan diferentes imágenes del escritor francés, construidas por los intelectuales brasileños, que muestran las características de cada uno de esos momentos de la historia cultural del país de acogida.

Palabras clave: Roland Barthes; Traducción; Estudios de Recepción; Imágenes; Literatura Comparada.

