

## **The Treatment of Intertextuality in Translation Studies: A case study with the 2009 English translation of Simone de Beauvoir's *Le Deuxième Sexe***

Marlène Bichet

University of Salford, UK / Université de Franche-Comté, FRANCE

### **ABSTRACT**

The present paper explores the way intertextuality is dealt with in the latest English translation of Simone de Beauvoir's *Le Deuxième Sexe* (1949). Intertextuality was described by Genette as a 'piège à traducteurs' (1982: 295-6), or as "a trap for translators", because it can go unnoticed, and, therefore, runs the risk of not being translated, particularly when more than two languages are present in a text. In de Beauvoir's *magnum opus*, intertextuality is paramount and highly multilingual. Moreover, the plurality of voices and languages present reinforces de Beauvoir's argument on Existentialism, which has had a radical impact, especially in the field of philosophical ethics and gender studies. In light of this work's iconic status and Genette's comment on intertextuality in translation, analysing how this intertextual plurality has been rendered in *The Second Sex* (2009) is of crucial importance. In this paper, I analyse the translators' strategies and the risks of taking an inconsistent approach to translating philosophy. I also highlight the significance of how particular translation strategies can contribute to burying connections between critical theories.

**KEYWORDS:** intertextuality, philosophy, polyphony, feminist thought

### **Introduction**

One of Simone de Beauvoir's most influential works, *Le Deuxième Sexe* (1949), encompasses reflections on a variety of disciplines, ranging from biology to psychology, to history, and literature. It is a philosophical treatise analysing women through the lens of Existentialism. The importance of de Beauvoir's "voice" in *Le Deuxième Sexe* makes it critical to analyse intertextuality in this cornerstone work, with a focus on citations, direct or indirect, as the

*Marlène Bichet, The Treatment of Intertextuality in Translation Studies: A case study with the 2009 English translation of Simone de Beauvoir's Le Deuxième Sexe, 1 – 30.*

citations give the reader an insight into de Beauvoir's own positions, and citations are used by the author to emphasize her own arguments.

In her work first published in French, de Beauvoir cites a variety of sources (including philosophers, psychologists, authors, sociologists, such as Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Wilhelm Stekel, Virginia Woolf and Claude Lévi-Strauss, to name but a few) and texts, from scientific reports to literary extracts and personal diaries, so as to broaden the scope of her study, while giving more authority to her findings. In *Le Deuxième Sexe*, the plurality of voices serves a number of purposes, and works to convince the reader to "see" lived experience as knowledge. Indeed, de Beauvoir's work concerns itself with phenomenology, a branch of philosophy which "studies conscious experience as experienced from the subjective or first-person point of view." In addition, as phenomenology is concerned with experiences helping philosophical enquiry which ultimately contributes to knowledge, de Beauvoir disturbs the notion of what constitutes knowledge itself by reporting on women's testimonies. This was a subversive act on de Beauvoir's part because of the epistemological lens through which philosophy and knowledge was viewed at the time, as explained by Gary and Pearsal: "traditional philosophy — the philosophical canon— has been shaped by men who have taken their experiences, values, ideals, and views of the world as the standard for all human beings" (Gary and Pearsall 1996: 1). At the time of publication, de Beauvoir's drawing on women's experiences in *Le Deuxième Sexe* thus constituted – and still constitutes - a landmark in European language philosophy and feminist thought. As explained by de Beauvoir scholar Ursula Tidd (2004), "de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* has continued to shape debates and thinking about gender. Key feminist thinkers of recent decades, such as Luce Irigaray and Judith Butler, have acknowledged their intellectual debt to her work, even as they developed their own work on gender in quite different directions" (Tidd 2004: loc.190). Indeed, *The Second Sex* has even been labelled the 'feminist bible', and thus is established as a primary text and frame of reference in many feminist canons.

De Beauvoir's drawing on women's experiences also entails an engagement with a plurality of voices as a mode of intertextuality: that is an expression of inter-relationship between texts and writers of other texts. De Beauvoir quoting and discussing other philosophers' theories enabled her to reinforce her own contribution to Existentialism, a key philosophical discourse at her time

of writing, by giving original examples and adding her own voice to its often charged discussions and debates. Indeed, *The Second Sex* illustrates how de Beauvoir's own Existentialist theories; for instance, relating to her views on freedom were less absolute than other Existentialist philosophers' such as Jean-Paul Sartre by her demonstrating in her treatise how women's concrete situation limits their freedom. Intertextuality, as situated, nonetheless gives strength to de Beauvoir's treatise because its mode of engagement echoes many women's voices and thus resonates with many women readers in different times and places. However, this mode of writing presents a challenge for French-English translators for many reasons and not only because of structural differences between French and English languages. The premises of intertextuality in de Beauvoir's specific cultural and intellectual contexts are sometimes difficult to pinpoint for anyone not experiencing knowledge as she did at that time.

In recognition of the importance and difficulties of translating de Beauvoir's intertextual references in her seminal work in French, I analyse in this paper how issues of intertextuality have been dealt with in the most recent English translation (2009) of *Le Deuxième Sexe*. The first English translation of this work was published in 1953 by US publishing house Knopf, who commissioned a zoology professor, H.M. Parshley to translate it. Critical issues with this 1953 translation have been well documented in many scholarly works (Moi 2002; Fallaise 1998; Simons 1983). First, Parshley was not specialised in translation or philosophy; and second, the publishing house wished to reduce production costs and increase commercial profits via widening the work's prospective readership. For this reason, the publisher's priority was making the work of philosophy appear as accessible as possible to US readerships. Indeed, the book's editor-in-chief stated that "it is essential to do everything possible to lighten the burden of the American reader" (Strauss quoted in Bogic 2011:162). For this reason, the original French book was considerably abridged in this 1953 US English translation. The many truncations in this first version in effect creating a 'simplified' (yet quite confusing) version of de Beauvoir's treatise were sound reason for scholars (Moi 2002 et al) to call for a new French-English translation, which was eventually released in 2009. It is the 2009 French-English translation of *Le Deuxième Sexe* which is the focus of my paper.

This is not to say that the 2009 version was received more warmly by de Beauvoir scholars than the 1953 version. According to Toril Moi (2010), the latest version of *The Second Sex* reads as very literal for English language readers. The two translators Borde and Chevallier opted for a close rendering of the original French vocabulary, syntax, and tense usage, with the aim to ‘say what Simone de Beauvoir said as close to the way she said it’ (Translators’ Note, loc. 295). However, according to Moi (2010), the result cannot be read or “seen” closely by the English language readers, particularly in relation to terminology for gender, tenses, and syntax. Moi’s review triggered a dispute between scholars and publishing agents, which revealed significant differences in how translation is perceived, what translation strategies were chosen. A recurrent theme in Moi’s review (2010) was the strategies used to translate de Beauvoir’s engagements with intertextuality: a theme which in many ways inspired me to write this paper. From this point of departure, I aim to explore the following question: namely, is a translator to literally translate quotations from a source text as written, or, instead, offer previously translated renderings of those quotations from which the source text also took them? This question is particularly salient in the context of the 2009 edition of *The Second Sex*. For as de Beauvoir scholars strongly critiqued the 2009 translations for taking the former option, so the translators and publishers responded to the critiques equally strongly, as shown below:

As for Bachofen’s term ‘mother right’, Beauvoir chose matriarcat or droit maternel, and ‘matriarchy’ or ‘maternal right’ are the words we used in English: we are not translating Bachofen but Beauvoir (Borde and Malovany-Chevallier, in response to Toril Moi’s article in the *London Review of Books* (Moi 2010)).

Michelle Sommers argues that de Beauvoir herself paraphrases Byron and wonders whether it is reasonable that Moi “is now suggesting that the translators should have rewritten or improved on Beauvoir (the very charge she levelled against Parshley)?” (Sommers, *ibid.*)

So here we have a visceral debate on an iconic philosophical and feminist text. This debate focused not only on the nature of de Beauvoir’s modes of intertextuality, but also on how her modes of intertextuality should be translated. Clearly, in contexts of Translation Studies, the strategies used by the 2009 translators have theoretical precedents, termed as ‘foreignization’, the

maintaining of “foreign” elements from the original source text in the target text. Decades before the 2009 publication of *The Second Sex*, Antoine Berman (1984) for example had argued the importance of the foreign (*l'étranger*) (Berman 1984) in the translated text, as a way to recognise the Otherness of the source text. As pointed out by Schleiermacher, foreignization results in a translation which ‘move[s] the reader toward the author’ (Schleiermacher in Lefevere 1977: 78), not author towards the reader. In more recent contexts of Translation Studies, the most famous proponent of this strategy is Lawrence Venuti, for whom foreignization ‘challenges the dominant aesthetics’ (Venuti 1995: 18-22) and, therefore, should predominate within global contexts of translation, as will be discussed in the present study.

As a point of departure in my analysis of intertextuality, I first demonstrate the importance of citations in de Beauvoir’s book, which leads to my discussion of the notion of intertextuality. This discussion in effect calls for a study of the link between intertextuality and translation. I then analyse comparatively examples of intertextual references from *Le Deuxième Sexe* to determine how the plurality of voices has been rendered, or at times curtailed. I conclude my analysis by evaluating the extent that the “slippages” in the latest translation risk misrepresenting the original meaning of de Beauvoir’s work.

### **The importance of citations in *Le Deuxième Sexe***

The plurality of voices in *Le Deuxième Sexe* invites an engagement with Bakhtin’s *polyphony* (Bakhtin 1984: 18) on two counts: one, when examining the French source text, and, two, when analysing its French-English translation. Reading de Beauvoir’s use of citations through the lens of polyphony sheds light on the multiplicity of translation issues at play for this work in French-English translation, and namely the strategies adopted by translators. Indeed, Bakhtin’s concept of ‘double-voice’ and poly-phony highlights the division between the monologic and the dialogic, a concept which has been appropriated by feminist literary theorists, such as Patricia Yaeger (1984). According to her, patriarchy is characterised by its monologism: in other words, its exclusion of women’s alternative discourse:

As linguistic and social patterns continue to reinforce one another, language may indeed change to remain the same. Clearly, what we have come to call “patriarchal” discourse is a particular variant of this general linguistic tendency (Yaeger 1984: 957).

But de Beauvoir aims to reclaim this alternative discourse in *Le Deuxième Sexe*, by including many accounts and testimonies in her treatise, thus presenting a polyphony of women’s voices to be analysed within the Existentialist framework of that era for the first time. Citations are key in de Beauvoir’s *magnum opus*, as part of her modes (and politics) of intertextuality. To help contextualise my analysis of the text, I define as well as present the way Translation Studies deals with intertextuality, when philosophical and feminist texts are translated.

### **A brief definition of intertextuality**

Intertextuality refers to the connections between texts, and to the very existence of texts within a given text (such as Aimé Césaire’s play, *A Tempest* (1969) being an adaptation of *The Tempest* by William Shakespeare). Such references in a text call for a different level of reading, because the reader is presented with different narratives, and is thus not only hearing the voice of the author but the voices of other texts and authors consciously or unconsciously echoing throughout the text. In the words of Rama Kundu (2008) ‘no literary text can be studied in isolation; instead texts are connected with an endless repertoire of other texts and in endless ways’ (Kundu 2008: 1). Julia Kristeva, who coined the term ‘intertextualité’ (*intertextuality*) in the late 1960s, goes as far as claiming that no ‘original’ text exists: ‘any text is the absorption and transformation of another’ (Kristeva 1980: 66). A decade later, Michael Riffaterre states that the intertext is ‘one or more texts which the reader must know in order to understand a work of literature in terms of its overall significance’ (Riffaterre 1990: 56). Riffaterre’s comment implies that the reader must possess sufficient knowledge to fully comprehend a text, which reminds us of the necessity for the reader (and translator-as-reader) to be able to detect the presence of those hypotexts. Hypotexts, in the contexts of this paper, means an earlier text which serves as the source of a later piece of literature, or hypertext.

One view of intertextuality would be that it is a mode of rewriting: texts are not only connected to one another, but every new text calls for and refers in some way to previous texts. So, instead

of creating something from zero, this intertextuality frames the text so that a writer is always rewriting anew (Kundu *ibid.* 4). Therein lies an interesting link to Feminist Translation Studies, which views translation as an act of rewriting (Luise von Flotow 1997 and Sherry Simon 1996). It is important to note at this point that although *Le Deuxième Sexe* is considered as a feminist landmark in English, French and other language cultural spheres, the translation strategies chosen by its different French- English translators were not claimed or directly inspired by feminist translation strategies per se - although the translators Borde and Malovany-Chevallier consider and identify themselves as committed and politically active feminists.

Intertextuality can be used for a variety of reasons, and takes many forms, such as direct or indirect quotations, but also simply through references to previous texts. In relation to Translation Studies as a discipline overall, intertextuality is an ever-present element when translating texts: within contexts of translation studies, texts between source and target are assumed as inter-connected by the act of translation and within feminist translation studies, all writing is configured as rewriting. However configured theoretically, the act of translation is nonetheless a special kind of rewriting. Intertextuality thus presents many questions and issues of relevance to Translation Studies. The subtlety of references to other texts is undoubtedly what led Genette (1982) to describe intertextuality as ‘*piège à traducteurs*’ (*trap for translators*) (1982: 295-6). For this intertextuality conveyed in translation needs to render the links between different texts and the source text in a way which resonates between both source and target text. Identifying intertextuality is challenging enough; translating it may not always be possible or even practicable, as the multiple levels of reading require the target reader to be aware of references expected of the source reader, beyond her/his knowledge in terms of temporality as well as language and culture, as references often stem from contemporary and older texts alike.

From this point, the readership needs to be borne in mind when translating a text which mediates modes of intertextuality. Indeed, according to Wolfgang Iser (1976), the interaction between the text’s structures and the reader’s own emotional and cognitive structures results in an experience which gives meaning to the text. In this way, the reader is also contained in the text’s structures, making him/her an *implied reader* (Iser 1976:49-51), the implications of which are twofold for the translator: the translator needs to picture the reader and their expectations, and the translator

has to identify the source text's structures and convey them in the translation, so as to produce the same effect in the target text.

To illustrate that point, let us examine an instance of where this effect has not occurred in contexts of French and English translation. One example which comes to mind is Delphine Chartier's analysis (2006) of French translations of Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966), a novel which subtly refers to Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* (1847). The author retells the story of the first Mrs Rochester, and, in so doing, denounces imperialism and patriarchy, in a way that demands that the subversive aspect of her book be unpacked (Chartier 2006: 170). The French translators of the work, as explained by Chartier, seem to find difficulty in conveying those allusions, particularly as the hints present in *Wide Sargasso Sea* are extremely subtle, such as the use of two recurring adjectives: *infamous* and *lunatic*. The French translation thus falls flat when it renders the former as 'infâme' or 'abjecte' and the latter as 'la démente', because it refers to a specific medical condition which is not suitable in this context (Chartier *ibid.* 177). The translation strategy chosen here is that of the *calque* (i.e. 'infamous' is literally rendered as 'infâme', thus staying close to the original text), which buries the connection to Brontë's novel. Another approach which can be chosen is that of adaptation, a strategy which acknowledges the impossibility of conveying the same references as the source text, while still trying to recreate adequately some sort of similar effect on the reader. Indeed, according to Geneviève Roux-Faucard, translating citations is especially complex because the translator must give the citation's meaning and its effect, as the latter justifies using a citation, as opposed to a reference. The author suggests that only a free recreation could succeed, or, if failing to do so, resorting to an explanatory footnote can be an alternative strategy (Roux-Faucard: 2006). So here it seems a literal rendering is not always viable.

Drawing from this point, I contend that expressing the message (and the source text's intertextuality) should be favoured over literal rendering of the source text's linguistic or syntactical elements. As stated by Susan Bassnett (2014):

The closer the translation [comes] to trying to recreate *linguistic* and *formal* structures of the original, the further removed it [becomes] in terms of function (Bassnett 2014: 101, emphasis in original).

Another central point is the use of paratext to highlight and signal intertextuality to the reader. By paratexts, I refer to what surrounds and extends the text (Genette 1987). By paying attention to footnotes, prefaces or description on a book's cover, we see how paratexts are beneficial sites of a translated work in which to pinpoint the references to other texts within the translation.

Framing translation this way, we can see that not only are there echoes between texts within a given source text, but also parallels between source and target texts. Consequently, the plurality of voices intensifies, in that writers, authors (mentioned in references to other texts within the text), and translators are all present at different levels. Their voices blending with one another thus give the text (and the translation) much more depth. Sudha Shastri (2001) explains why this intertextuality is so compelling, and how a multiplicity of hypotexts gives a different experience to the reader as follows:

When the text is uni-generic (as most texts are), the reader stands every chance of losing himself to the text. However, two genres, when placed next to each other, or within each other, create a fissure in the spatial configuration of the larger text. [...] *A host of smaller texts such as the letter, the footnote, and the epigraph, when embedded in a larger genre or juxtaposed alongside it, also work to a similar result. These smaller texts become highly effective devices in carving intertextual identity.* (Shastri 2001: 101, my emphasis)

I fully cite the above quotation – although it is not referring to French-English translation – as it is reminiscent of devices which de Beauvoir uses when she deliberately includes numerous texts within her treatise, therefore drawing the reader's attention to the plurality of voices alongside her own. This form of intertextuality is used for a variety of reasons, as I now elucidate.

## **Intertextuality's different guises**

The functions of intertextuality vary depending on the author's wish to 'quote', 'draw on', 'differentiate oneself from', 'parody', or even 'subvert' previous texts (Baxandall 1985: 58-9). In *Le Deuxième Sexe* (1949), de Beauvoir seems to use all above listed possibilities, as she repeatedly resorts to citations to justify and reinforce her argument. For example, she uses direct quotations, such as testimonies, to show women's resentment towards their dreary destinies (*LDS I: 183*), which is a politically subversive practice, legitimizing women's lived experience as knowledge. De Beauvoir also cites derogatory comments made about women, often with the aim of ridiculing and parodying their author, as the following example illustrates where de Beauvoir cites Claude Mauriac:

*Nous écoutons sur un ton (sic!) d'indifférence polie...la plus brillante d'entre elles, sachant bien que son esprit reflète de façon plus ou moins éclatante des idées qui viennent de nous. (LDS I: 28)*

*We listen in a tone (sic!) of polite indifference...to the brightest of them, well aware that her wits reflect, in a more or less gifted way, ideas which come from us. (my translation)*

Following on from which, de Beauvoir comments:

*Ce ne sont évidemment pas les idées de M. C. Mauriac en personne que son interlocutrice reflète, étant donné qu'on ne lui en connaît aucune [...] (LDS ibid.)*

*Needless to say, it is not Mr C. Mauriac's own ideas that his female interlocutor reflects, as he is known not to have any [...] (my translation)*

The above examples from *Le Deuxième Sexe* illustrate how de Beauvoir reinforces her feminist argument through the use of citations, to parody and subvert their meaning in their original contexts. In these two instances, intertextuality emerges as a powerful tool through which an author's commitment is highlighted and enhanced, and resonates with the reader in her/his own epistemological contexts. For de Beauvoir, she uses this tool to show her commitment to feminist

philosophy, perilous in status when she wrote her book. In these critical and unstable intellectual contexts, it is important to note her move as making linkage between intertextuality and gender: the notion of plurality of voices recalls the cruciality for women's voices to be heard amid patriarchal discourse. I illustrate this point with an analysis of citations in de Beauvoir's text.

### **The treatment of citations in *The Second Sex* (2009)**

I now examine the way in which intertextuality has been rendered in the 2009 English translation of *The Second Sex*. In her work, de Beauvoir quotes sources written in her French mother tongue. She also quotes from German philosophical writings as well as English texts, to name but two foreign languages in the French source text. De Beauvoir's recurrent use of intertextuality presents a possible dilemma for the translators: they can opt to translate the citations used in the French text into English themselves, or to rely on previous translations of the cited texts into English, from the source language in which they were first published. In the following analysis, I have chosen examples emblematic of how different categories of intertextuality have been dealt with in French-English translation. These examples also show that, in the French source text, de Beauvoir drew on English or other languages. It is important to appreciate that such a multitude of texts in *Le Deuxième Sexe* presents the translators with many challenges, all the more so due to their multilingual aspect.

Let us first consider the problem of non-English texts used in *Le Deuxième Sexe*, i.e. French sources, or sources from languages other than English which have been translated into French (such as German philosophical texts from which de Beauvoir quotes). These citations can be rendered by the two translators (Borde and Malovany-Chevallier) themselves, or they could opt to use existing English translations. In my view, the second option is the most satisfactory option, because it enables readers (and particularly readers familiar with English-language philosophical treatises) to make connections between the sources and de Beauvoir's treatise more easily. Moreover, this second option can work to prevent the concealment of those links. It is thus important to examine how Borde and Malovany-Chevallier treat extracts from French texts (such as quotations from Lévi-Strauss and Sartre) and see if they translate them directly, or whether they use previous translations. By analysing these two approaches, I also determine

whether their strategy is consistent, or whether they interchange one approach with the other. This analysis will thus lead me to illustrate how Borde and Malovany-Chevallier signal and explain some of de Beauvoir's more obscure or specialised references and quotations in their translation's paratexts, such as through their preface, as well as in footnotes.

I start with exploring how Borde and Malovany-Chevallier deal with the foreign hypotexts which are present in *Le Deuxième Sexe* and thus appear in French. If a translator directly translates the citation quoted by de Beauvoir into English, s/he risks a relay translation: i.e. when a text in one language is used as intermediary between the source text and the target text (which is rendered in yet another language). It means, in our case, that a foreign text is rendered into French, and the latter is translated into English, thus adding an extra layer or barrier for the target reader. The risk of such a strategy is the possibility of distorting further the source text and its meaning. Before examining the rendition of English source texts "back" into English from de Beauvoir's "source" French text, I will first examine the way German texts quoted by de Beauvoir are treated by Borde and Malovany-Chevallier. I focus on those texts because de Beauvoir draws so extensively on German philosophy to support and highlight the political positionality of her own work. In the following section, I examine the 2009 French-English translation of some quotations from Hegel and Nietzsche in *Le Deuxième Sexe*.

### **The treatment of quotations stemming from German in *The Second Sex***

De Beauvoir draws extensively on Hegel throughout her treatise. As the fundamental influence of Hegel is key de Beauvoir's own philosophical framework, this suggests that, whatever translation approach is used, consistency would be important when referring to Hegel's terminology, so as to avoid misrepresentation of Hegel's – and de Beauvoir's – thought. Borde and Malovany-Chevallier, however, opt for a form of relay translation, as illustrated in the rendition of the following quotation from *The Second Sex* in which de Beauvoir says that she cites Hegel directly:

L'autre [conscience] est la conscience dépendante pour laquelle la réalité essentielle est la vie animale, c'est-à-dire l'être donné par une entité autre. (*LDS I: 116*)

The other [consciousness] is the dependent consciousness for which essential reality is animal life, that is, life given by another entity. (*TSS* loc.1652)

We can see from the above extract that Borde and Malovany-Chevallier are translating the French source text very closely —keeping the same lexicon and sentence structure. In view of what we know of the intertextual aspects of the French version, we could infer a departure from the German original text. Although this is telling of de Beauvoir’s own reading influencing her rendering of the German text, such a close rendition of de Beauvoirrisks burying the French version’s overt connection to Hegel. Adding another layer to this discussion, we find that de Beauvoir is not quoting Hegel directly at all, but Alexandre Kojève’s study on Hegel instead:

L’autre est la Conscience dépendante, pour laquelle la réalité-essentielle est la vie-animale, c’est-à-dire l’être-donné pour une entité-autre. Celle-là est le *Maître*, celle-ci — l’*Esclave*. (Kojève 1947: 22)

The other is dependent Consciousness, for which the essential-reality is animal-life, i.e., given-being for an other-entity. The former is the *Master*, the latter — the *Slave*. (Kojève 1980: 16)

Borde and Malovany-Chevallier do not identify the quotation from Kojève, but instead translate Kojève’s terminology literally from the French text. Despite this overlap between Hegel and Kojève, the translators still state that the citation comes from Hegel (as de Beauvoir introduces it). So as well as not referring to Hegelian concepts prevalent in English-language philosophy, both literal translation and footnote run a high risk of concealing connections between the two philosophers made by de Beauvoir in her 1949 French text.

I explain this compelling instance in detail because it reminds us of a critical issue in recurrent debate in the field of Translation Studies: the remit of the translator’s role as well as issues of translator location and positionality towards the author. As Christiane Nord terms this relationality within frameworks of loyalty. She states, “loyalty commits the translator bilaterally to the source and the target side” (Nord, 1997). Borde and Malovany-Chevallier are thus confronted with the difficulty of a source text’s intertextuality as an inter-layering of different

*Marlène Bichet, The Treatment of Intertextuality in Translation Studies: A case study with the 2009 English translation of Simone de Beauvoir’s Le Deuxième Sexe, 1 – 30.*

authorial loyalties, as well as making incorrect citations, approximate references and paraphrasing. Awareness of de Beauvoir's influences and readings through studying her works, biographies and scholarly commentaries on her, any translation strategy used would need to qualify how it identifies and engages with the actual sources used by de Beauvoir herself and, thus, to find appropriate existing English translations of those sources. The above example shows that, in this instance, this crucial engagement has not happened.

That said however, Borde and Malovany-Chevallier did consult and use existing English translations of some German works drawn on by de Beauvoir in other instances as demonstrated in the following quotation from Hegel's *The Philosophy of Nature*:

The genus is therefore present in the individual as a straining against the inadequacy of its single actuality, as the urge to obtain its self-feeling in the other of its genus, to integrate itself through union with it and through this mediation to close the genus with itself and bring it into existence —*copulation*. (TSS loc.688)

The above translation comes from J.N. Findlay and A.V. Miler's translation published in 1979 and is listed in Borde and Malovany-Chevallier's selected sources. This example is particularly noteworthy alongside Toril Moi's comments (2010), before Borde and Malovany-Chevallier's translation was edited. Moi states:

At one point, Beauvoir discusses Hegel's analysis of sex. In the new translation, a brief quotation from *The Philosophy of Nature* ends with the puzzling claim: 'This is mates coupling.' *Mates coupling?* What does Hegel mean? It turns out that in Beauvoir's French version, Hegel says, 'C'est l'accouplement'; A.V. Miller's translation of *The Philosophy of Nature* uses the obvious term, 'copulation'. (Moi 2010)

Here we then find how commentary on translation results in a change of strategy. As a result of Moi's point, the translators modified their translation and made recourse to the English translation as advised by Moi. This critical intervention was not mentioned in their Translators' Note, nor in footnotes of the 2009 work. However, alongside their translation of the Kojève

quotation, such a strategy was not applied consistently. Although space allows reference to three examples only, we can surmise from them that Borde and Malovany-Chevallier's version indicates a somewhat jarring mixture of strategies used: at times directly translating quotations as they appear in French only, instead of making reference to previous English translations of the German works cited by de Beauvoir; and on the other, making recourse to scholars of specialised knowledge (as advocated by the Interpretive Theory of Translation) to avoid mistranslation or unfortunate calques, such as *mates coupling*.

Let us now analyse the following extract where de Beauvoir quotes Nietzsche:

La matière inorganique est le sein maternel. Être délivré de la vie, c'est redevenir vrai, c'est se parachever. Celui qui comprendrait cela considérerait comme une fête de retourner à la poussière insensible. (*LDS I: 250*)

Inorganic matter is the mother's breast. Being delivered from life means becoming real again, completing oneself. Anyone who understands that would consider returning to unfeeling dust as a holiday. (*TSS loc. 3463*)

Before commenting on the above passage, it is worth mentioning a study by Spyros Papapetros (2012: 146) which reveals that de Beauvoir's words probably stem from Charles Andler's notorious biography of Nietzsche (1920), which was also requoted by Georges Bataille (1937). As Papapetros (2012) points out, the German *Mutterschoß* is commonly translated in English as (*mother's*) *womb* (ibid). The latter term is also used Keith Ansell Pearson's *A Companion to Nietzsche* (2006: 240) and is the accepted English translation of *Mutterschoß* in Nietzsche's works. A consultation of a German-French dictionary shows the same German word can be translated as *sein maternel* (*maternal breast*) in French. Therefore, there is a departure in the first instance between the German term and its English and French translations, which can lead to possible misunderstandings in the extract quoted above. Indeed, Borde and Malovany-Chevallier once again directly translate de Beauvoir's quotation, not de Beauvoir's citation of Nietzsche, thus concealing the connection to Nietzsche and muting his presence in the text: using 'mother's breast' instead of 'womb.' This in effect contributes to masking Nietzsche's presence as the

French translation de Beauvoir quotes is faithful to Nietzsche's terminology. Consequently, English readers do not clearly see how de Beauvoir's work and Nietzsche's are connected.

Two other distortions in the last sentence of this passage also lead to confusion. The first is the choice of 'holiday' to render the French 'fête', which distorts Nietzsche's word, the word *Fest*. In this instance, the English term *celebration* could convey the connotation of *Fest* (*fête*) in the context in which de Beauvoir cites from Nietzsche. The second instance is the mistranslation of the French word *insensible*, which carries connotations of lifelessness as well as lack of feeling. In this light, the English adjective 'unfeeling' appears somewhat weak alongside the French text seeking to explicitly convey the idea of death. My contrastive analysis of the shift of intertextuality in this passage alongside the mistranslations of *fête* and *insensible* indicates that the English rendering of the above quotation is clumsy and once again buries the connection to Nietzsche. As well as curtailing de Beauvoir's argument, the distortion of *Mutterschoss* in the 2009 English translation reminds us that an awareness of language differences in regard to borrowed philosophical terms is compelling and crucial.

### **The treatment of French quotations in *The Second Sex* (2009)**

After analysing the treatment of German texts quoted by de Beauvoir, I now examine how French quotations are dealt with in *The Second Sex* (2009). I first consider excerpts from Claude Lévi-Strauss's works, and then examples from Sartre's work. Both authors, Lévi-Strauss and Sartre, are worth singling out for analysis, as their different fields of expertise (anthropology and philosophy) were also areas in which de Beauvoir specialised. Both authors have significance for de Beauvoir, as she draws on Sartre's and Lévi-Strauss's theories in *Le Deuxième Sexe* (1949).

#### *Quotations from Lévi-Strauss*

Claude Lévi-Strauss was a renowned anthropologist and contemporary of de Beauvoir. De Beauvoir read his work *Les Structures Élémentaires de la Parenté* (adapted from his thesis) before its official publication in 1949. The impact of his anthropological study of social mores and rules in relation to marriage and family, is very clear in de Beauvoir's treatise: it helped her to increase her knowledge of anthropology, while honing her own reflections on its

epistemological implications in terms of knowledge, experience and gender. She directly quotes extracts from Lévi-Strauss' work in *Le Deuxième Sexe*, as the following examples show:

“L'autorité publique ou simplement sociale appartient toujours aux hommes” affirme Lévi-Strauss au terme de son étude sur les sociétés primitives. (*LDS I: 124*)

“Political authority, or simply social authority, always belongs to men,” Lévi-Strauss affirms at the end of his study of primitive societies. (*TSS loc.1745*)

And:

“Le lien de réciprocité qui fonde le mariage n'est pas établi entre des hommes et des femmes, mais entre des hommes au moyen de femmes qui en sont seulement la principale occasion”, dit Lévi-Strauss. (*LSD I: 125*)

“The relationship of reciprocity which is the basis of marriage is not established between men and women, but between men by means of women, who are merely the occasion of this relationship,” said Lévi-Strauss. (*TSS loc.1754*)

In both cases, Borde and Malovany-Chevallier use J. Harle Bell, R. Needham and J.R. von Sturmer's translation (1969: 177 and 116). This flags up the link between de Beauvoir and her contemporary scholar, and thus develops the continuum between Lévi-Strauss's study and de Beauvoir's. However, despite the judicious usage of English versions of *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, there is an interesting contrast between the way Borde and Malovany-Chevallier introduce Lévi-Strauss's statement in the first and the second sentence: they first use the present tense, and then the past tense ('affirms', 'said'). In the French source text, de Beauvoir uses the present tense ('affirme') followed by ("dit"), which creates a linguistic ambiguity and slippage because the verb form *dit* is used for both the present tense and the preterite past tense in French. On the previous page, de Beauvoir uses the present tense consistently. For a French reader's perspective, we can assume that de Beauvoir is still using the present to report Lévi-Strauss's words, as a contemporary of hers. The potential tense slippage from the French word "dit" might explain why the two translators decided to shift from one tense to another. However, as de Beauvoir uses the present tense one page before, Borde and

Malovany-Chevallier's rendering feels ungainly and inconsistent. It reads as if there is no awareness of the connection of one page to the next. Such a sense of disconnect between two pages, reflected in the French language and divergence in tense usage imparts an impression of jarring registers, even more so, as it is not an isolated example. Such tense issues can be seen in *The Second Sex's* History section. On one hand, this reflection appears to reflect little of great significance. However, as inconsistency in tense usage is not a writing style for which de Beauvoir is known in French, this issue is important. For in (and due to the) English translation, de Beauvoir risks being perceived as writing in a style which is ambiguous and inconsistent by other readerships who cannot read her in French. In view of her book's iconic status and critical influence, (false) rendering of de Beauvoir's writing style, in my view, is no small matter.

### *Quotations from Sartre*

When developing her own philosophical theory, de Beauvoir draws on the frameworks of Existentialism (LDS I: 33) and on Sartre's work. So although one might expect to find direct references to Sartre's work in *Le Deuxième Sexe*, de Beauvoir often paraphrases and uses Sartre's ideas without directly quoting his words. As explained by Christine Daigle and Jacob Golomb (2009), de Beauvoir's technique of paraphrasing can be explained by the strong personal and political links between the two philosophers, and their habit of sharing their ideas with each other. Nonetheless, de Beauvoir does point the reader to some specific works by Sartre, so let us see an example of a direct quotation from *L'Être et le Néant* (1943), and how this quotation is translated from French into English:

Le masochisme comme le sadisme est assumption de culpabilité. Je suis coupable, en effet, du seul fait que je suis objet. (LDS II: 185)

Masochism, like sadism, is the assumption of guilt. I am guilty due to the very fact that I am an object. (TSS loc. 8414)

The English rendering is taken from Hazel Barnes's translation (Sartre 1956: 378), and Barnes's version is listed in Borde and Malovany-Chevallier's "Selected Sources". In this case, we can surmise that the translators have, in this instance, relied on earlier English versions.

*Marlène Bichet, The Treatment of Intertextuality in Translation Studies: A case study with the 2009 English translation of Simone de Beauvoir's Le Deuxième Sexe, 1 – 30.*

However, they have not invariably done so, as the following example shows:

À moitié victimes, à moitié complices, comme tout le monde. (*LDS*, epigraph before Tome 2)

Half victim, half accomplice, like everyone. (*TSS* loc. 5792)

Here, the two translators directly translate de Beauvoir's quotation, although the existing English translation of *Dirty Hands* differs slightly: 'Half victim, half accomplice, like everyone *else*'.

Here we can also wonder whether the alteration in the English translation distorts the philosophical message because the addition of 'else' implies the idea of an other: and *the Other* is a significant concept in Existentialism. With the citation being oft-quoted in its first English translation, such as Sartre's 'L'enfer c'est les autres' (1944), there is a risk in using a literal translation without reference to previously translated versions of Sartre's work. Indeed, as these sentences are significant and widely known, they have strong intertextual resonance in English language discourses. In this light, we see that alterations to already existing and influential translations of iconic or canonical texts of Sartre can distort the source text's political message, which opens up interesting questions on the role of loyalty of the translators in the case of the 2009 translation: should the translators stay loyal to their readings of de Beauvoir's text as they perceive her work in French, or should their loyalty lie with translators of the past whose work nonetheless resonates with target readers reading de Beauvoir's work in the present?

In the case of Borde and Malovany-Chevallier's rendering of "À moitié victimes, à moitié complices, comme tout le monde" as "Half victim, half accomplice, like everyone", it seems that they have chosen their reading of de Beauvoir's work as it reads now in French. In my view, burying intertextual connections undermines the English translation because it weakens the synergies between de Beauvoir's work and that of other authors, particularly Sartre.

### **The treatment of English source texts in *The Second Sex* (2009)**

When de Beauvoir quotes (in French) from English we might expect to see the translators directly citing the source English text itself, instead of “back-translating” the French into English. Let us see one instance of an English source in *Le Deuxième Sexe* in the 2009 English version. It refers to an English charm quoted by de Beauvoir:

Salut, Terre, mère des hommes, sois fertile dans l’embrassement du Dieu et remplis-toi de fruits à l’usage de l’homme. (*LDS I: 121*)

Hail, Earth, mother of all men, may you be fertile in the arms of God and filled with fruits for the use of man. (*TSS loc.1924*)

We see here that Borde and Malovany-Chevallier keep close to the French sentence, maintaining a similar lexicon (*fertile, fruits*) and the structure closely follows that of the French. However, in the source reference mentioned by de Beauvoir, was part of a spell used to increase soil’s abundance, easily sourced in the following reference:

All hail, Earth, mother of men!  
Be fruitful in God’s embracing arm,  
Filled with food for the needs of men. (*Grendon 1909: 177*)

The version above is one of the variants of that charm, as the following other versions show:

Hail, Earth, mother of all;  
Be abundant in God’s embrace,  
Filled with food for our folk’s need. (*Anglo-Saxon Metrical Charms listed by New Northvegr Center*)

Hail to thee, Earth, mother of men,  
Be fruitful in God’s embrace,  
Filled with food for the use of men. (*Hood 1998*)

When comparing Borde and Malovany-Chevallier's version to the ones above, they are clearly translating de Beauvoir's words rather than the original English source texts. I surmise this due to their use of the words *fruits* and *fertile*, as well as rendering of 'à l'usage de l'homme' as 'for the use of man'. It is important to note that de Beauvoir in French does not explicitly present her sources in the above example, and she merely states that she is quoting 'un vieux charme anglo-saxon' (an old Anglo-Saxon charm). So, in this sense, it can be difficult to identify the source text from de Beauvoir's mode of reference in French itself. However, the English source is readily available (as shown by the English versions I have just cited). In my view, Borde and Malovany-Chevallier could have at least made a reference to the English language sources in a footnote to contextualise de Beauvoir's own translated words in a way which offers multiple layers of meaning of de Beauvoir's understanding of "old Anglo-Saxon charm" to English readers, albeit different how she offers this "charm" to her readers in French.

Let us now study another example where de Beauvoir cites an English text, with an excerpt from Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* quoted in *The Second Sex*:

Thus restless I my wretched way must make  
And on the ground, which is my mother's gate,  
I knock with my staff early, aye, and late  
And cry: O my dear mother, let me in! (TSS loc.3467)

This is the same version found in *The Canterbury Tales* (Chaucer 2009: 159-60), so here we can notice that Borde and Malovany-Chevallier return to the original source, thus more accurately presenting the intertextuality of de Beauvoir's work to the English-speaking target reader. Moving on to other English extracts, let us look at quotations written by women whose voice de Beauvoir wants her readers to hear (in French). The following quotation by the Duchess of Newcastle is used to illustrate the consternation some women feel about their destiny:

Les femmes vivent comme des blattes ou des chouettes, elles meurent comme des vers.  
(Duchess of Newcastle quoted in *LDS I*: 183)

Women live like cockroaches or owls, they die like worms. (TSS loc.2578)

The quotation above is a literal translation of de Beauvoir's words, rather than the original text. The actual words by Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, can be found in Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own* (1929), an essay which greatly inspired de Beauvoir:

Women live like Bats or Owls, labour like Beasts, and die like Worms. (Cavendish quoted in Woolf 2014: 62)

We notice here that de Beauvoir did not quote it in full. It is likely that she partially took it from *A Room of One's Own*. In this light, we can question what strategy Borde and Malovany-Chevallier opted for in their translation, especially as there is another interesting point to mention, namely that de Beauvoir's version is a mistranslation of Margaret Cavendish's poem:

Women live like *Bats* or Owls, labour like Beasts, and die like Worms. (Cavendish quoted in Woolf 2014: 62, my emphasis)

Les femmes vivent comme des *blattes* ou des chouettes, elles meurent comme des vers. (Duchess of Newcastle quoted in *LDS I*: 183, my emphasis)

The English noun *bat* has been rendered as *blatte* (cockroach), and, although there is a similar sound effect to the two nouns, their meaning differs greatly. In all likelihood, de Beauvoir read the poem in Woolf's *A Room of One's Own* in English, as the essay was published in 1929 and was only translated into French in 1951. Although de Beauvoir read and spoke English, it is reasonable to think that she might have mistranslated or quoted this text from memory thus shortening the original text. What we see in the two translators' engagements is a constant change in strategy: at times resorting to previous translations, and, as in the above instance, not always using English source texts either. If the two translators had turned to the original poem, they would have noticed the error or misreading on de Beauvoir's part. If they had reproduced the original English text, they would have emphasized the *Second Sex's* intertextuality, thus making connections between feminist works (Cavendish — Woolf — de Beauvoir) more obvious. If they had made a footnote reference to de Beauvoir's misreading, a similar effect could have been achieved. Considering that Cavendish's statement is a well-known example of

feminist thinking (Russ 1983: 107), I contend that quoting the English source perhaps could be more pertinent than directly translating de Beauvoir's French quotation with a footnote. The former approach is however at times followed by Borde and Malovany-Chevallier, as shown by our next example:

Hélas! une femme qui prend la plume  
Est considérée comme une créature si présomptueuse  
Qu'elle n'a aucun moyen de racheter son crime! (*LDS I*: 183)

Alas! a woman that attempts  
the pen,  
Such an intruder on the rights  
of men,  
Such a presumptuous creature  
is esteemed,  
The fault by no virtue can be  
redeemed. (*TSS loc.2571*)

We can note that the English translation is longer than the French quotation, and that it maintains the poem's rhymes as Borde and Malovany-Chevallier are in fact quoting the original poem here. They explain the divergence of this citation from de Beauvoir's own citation of this poem by including a footnote to explain that de Beauvoir shortened and paraphrased the original (*TSS loc.2668*). The translators also correcting the misspelling in the French *Le Deuxième Sexe* as de Beauvoir misspelled the author's name, writing Winhilsea instead of Winchilsea, I cite the above example in detail as it presents a good use of specialised knowledge on the part of the translators, combined with translators' own dedication to the English source text. The consequence of such loyalty is to make the connections between de Beauvoir's text and the hypotexts she quotes (in this case, Winchilsea's poem) thus highlighting *Le Deuxième Sexe*'s intertextuality in more than one context. Moreover, by adding a note to explain how the original quotation has been altered by de Beauvoir, Borde and Malovany-Chevallier also ascertain their presence and intervention, so that their own voice as translators can be heard too, reminding the reader that s/he is studying

a translated text. Such a strategy of translator visibility is reminiscent of Barbara Godard's views on transparency (1990), namely, that the (woman) translator needs to be present, to be visible in the translation (Godard in Bassnett and Lefevere 1990: 90-91). This stance is defended by Lawrence Venuti (2004) in contexts of US publishing of translated texts. Even this intervention however, is distinguished by inconsistency: the translators' own correction of de Beauvoir's misspelling is not stated clearly however. I contend that the translators should have made known their alteration, using, for instance, "sic" to signal their amendment, and hence, continue their intervention as (woman) translators - as they do in other aspects of this citation.

I draw now on examples from *The Second Sex* where Borde and Malovany-Chevallier felt compelled to interrupt the reading with supplementary notes. The following extract refers to a certain Mme de Ciray:

Chez une femme, Mme de Ciray, on voit poindre timidement un féminisme économique.  
(LDS I: 187)

Economic feminism timidly makes its appearance through a woman, Mme de Ciray. (TSS loc.2640)

Added to the English version, however, is an extra footnote which reads as follows:

*Emilie du Châtelet and Voltaire lived and worked in the Château de Cirey from 1734 to 1749, giving rise to some speculation about the possibility of a misspelling or an erroneous transcription from the original manuscript of the name Ciray. But there is no conclusive evidence of this.*" (Translators' Note loc.2672)

In the 2009 English version, we see that the translators claim that the woman in question cannot be identified, which leads them to think that de Beauvoir mistook her name, or misspelled it. This additional piece of information appears to verify that de Beauvoir's report is accurate. As seen earlier, the two translators have not always located and quoted English translations. Neither have they drawn on original source texts of momentous hypotexts and their iconic or established English translations, as illustrated by my analysis of de Beauvoir's references to the work of Hegel, Nietzsche, Sartre, or Cavendish. Moreover, when it comes to footnotes used to explain obscure intertextuality (i.e. arcane hypotexts), Borde and Malovany-Chevallier exhibit wariness

towards Latin phrases. We see that in the case of phrases left in Latin by de Beauvoir, they often translate them into English, at times even correcting them. Let us see two such examples:

*Uxor non est proprie socia sed speratur fore (LDS I: 170; TSS loc.2396)*

The wife is not exactly a partner, but it is hoped she will become one (Translators' Note loc.2654)

The above instance in Latin is a legal adage, which de Beauvoir did not deem necessary to translate. Borde and Malovany-Chevallier however added a note to render the Latin phrase in English. They even give some more indications about the following phrase:

*Post coitum homo animal triste (TSS loc.3759)*

stating that it was most likely:

*Post coitum omne animal triste (All animals are sad after sex)*

(Translators' Note loc.4425)

The example above asserts the translators' presence and voice, as they indicate a mistake present in the source text. At the same time, their presence could be read as domesticating interference with de Beauvoir's voice, as she rendered the text in Latin to leave readers with a trace of the foreign expression through Latin. The latter presents us with an example of where a translator chooses how to render a deliberate usage of a third foreign language in the source text into the target language. The choice to keep the "foreign trace" or to "domesticate" a target text depends on the effect that third language produces on the source text. If the source readers are not supposed to understand the foreign language, then arguably the phrase can be left as it is in the target text. When the source readers are expected to understand the foreign language, then the translator could make a case to translate the latter into the target text. Borde and Malovany-Chevallier opting for that choice in English infers they presumed their 2009 target readerships would not be familiar with Latin, and so opt for what appears to be an example of domestication. Although not in line with their intention not to interfere with the source text, I contend that this strategy nonetheless facilitates the understanding and reception of de Beauvoir's text while

reminding the English target reader that s/he is reading a translation. This is important to know because they can, therefore, be more attentive to the translators' footnotes which make the translation more accessible to them, but also because it tells them that they are not reading de Beauvoir's own words, but a rendering from Borde and Malovany-Chevallier.

## **Conclusion**

As stated at the beginning of this paper, Toril Moi's review critiqued the treatment of citations in the 2009 French-English translation of *The Second Sex*. My analysis of the above examples confirms that Borde and Malovany-Chevallier were not always consistent in their use of sources or strategies: at times translating hypotexts themselves; at other times, using existing translations, in the case of English citations. When the translators switch approaches with works by the same author (i.e. Hegel), confusion can arise for the target reader, in that the hypotext can become distorted or that connections between de Beauvoir's argument and the hypotexts she uses can become concealed. My analysis shows that Borde and Malovany-Chevallier nonetheless considered some of Moi's remarks, and thus made recourse to previous English translations. My question for further debate is: why the inconsistency of approach?

Although a relatively small case study of a 2009 work comprising nearly 800 pages, my analysis of these examples of intertextuality supports my own contention that more interdisciplinarity between Translation Studies as a praxis (as well as a theory) and de Beauvoir specialists at least is fundamental. Firstly my case study illustrates the need for a translator to gather background or contextual knowledge when undertaking a translation covering a specialist field of knowledge, epistemology or thought. Secondly, the examples studied above show the very real difficulties facing any translator to calibrate her/his presence and anonymity (or invisibility, Venuti 1995) in the translated work. The two translators claim not to 'jeopardise the author's integrity' (Borde and Malovany-Chevallier 2011: 275, my translation). At the same time, the 2009 work is abundant in explanatory notes and footnotes correcting some of de Beauvoir's quotations, yet invisibly making changes in other instances. This inconsistency of approach confirms that a perspective of translator objectivity is illusory and thus is open to ongoing debate.

Venuti for example talks of “foreignization” as a technique of resistance (2004). This influential notion in translation studies is shown as complex and fraught with difficulties in contexts of intertextuality in translation. My analysis of examples of “foreignization” used in the 2009 version of *The Second Sex* demonstrates instances where “foreignization” of citations used in the source text can lead to distortion and mistranslation particularly where inter-lingual intertextuality makes up the layering of the source text. Indeed, staying “close” to the source text has repercussions on intertextuality itself, as following the source text may contribute to concealing *Le Deuxième Sexe*’s intertextuality. In the examples I have shown in this paper, such a strategy could in fact mediate a weakening in de Beauvoir’s argument and the rich connections to other disciplines and the language in which she so actively engaged. As I stated previously the plurality of voices is crucial to her argument, and reinforces her philosophical theory. Obscuring her treatise’s intertextuality thus, in my view, severely curtails her message.

Moreover, the case-study revealed another pertinent issue in translation strategies: consistency. By a strategy of inconsistency, Borde and Malovany-Chevallier risk increasing the confusion concerning their 2009 translation, which is, in turn, harmful to the reception of de Beauvoir’s work. This has critical implications not only for de Beauvoir herself, but also the considerable effort and dedication on their part to make her iconic text known to 2009 audiences, made up in part of readerships already familiar with her work and the problematic issues of the first 1953 English translation. In my view, a possible cumulative effect of inconsistency in the translators’ choices creates a register of faults, their frequency rendering the translation somehow stilted and ossified. In view of de Beauvoir’s own fluid style of writing in French and interaction with such a plurality of voices, this register of stiltedness alone risks distorting the original meaning of de Beauvoir’s work: an expression of becoming as fluidity, plurality and potentiality both for herself as a writer-philosopher and her multiple readerships.

This contrastive case-study is beneficial to the exploration of intertextuality because it reveals some of the difficulties brought about by intertextuality in the act of translating. Translation Studies and intertextuality are entwined insofar as the translator aims to convey the intertextual effect to his/her readerships, but also because translation analyses intertextuality differently.

Indeed, it allows us to study the intertextual layers of a text, as well as what it demands of its “*model reader*” (Eco: 1979).

## **Bibliography**

- Ansell Pearson, Keith (ed.). *A Companion to Nietzsche*. Blackwell Companions to Philosophy. Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Bair, Deirdre. *Simone de Beauvoir: A Biography*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. 4th edition. London/New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Bassnett, Susan and Lefevere, André (eds). *Translation, history, and culture*. London: Pinter, 1990.
- Baxandall, Michael. *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*. Yale University Press, 1985.
- Beauvoir, Simone (de). *Le Deuxième Sexe*. Paris: Gallimard, 1949/1976.
- Beauvoir, Simone (de). *The Second Sex*. translated by H.M. Parshley. New York: Knopf, 1953/1989.
- Beauvoir, Simone (de). *The Second Sex*. translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. New York: Vintage Books, 2010.
- Berman, Antoine. *L'Épreuve de l'étranger. Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1984.
- Bogic, Anna. “Why Philosophy Went Missing: Understanding the English Version of Simone de Beauvoir's *Le Deuxième Sexe*” in *Translating Women*. ed. Luise von Flotow. University of Ottawa Press, 2011.
- Borde, Constance and Malovany-Chevallier, Sheila. “Quelques réflexions sur la nouvelle traduction anglaise du Deuxième Sexe”. *L'Harmattan: l'Homme et la société* 179 (2011): 273- 77.
- Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. Wordsworth Editions. 1992.
- Césaire, Aimé. *A Tempest*. New York: Editions du Seuil. 1992.
- Chartier, Delphine. “De la perception de l'hypotexte à sa traduction, une histoire de lectures...” *Palimpsestes* 18 (2006): 165-179.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Canterbury Tales*. Prestwick House Literary Touchstone Classics, 2009.
- Marlène Bichet, *The Treatment of Intertextuality in Translation Studies: A case study with the 2009 English translation of Simone de Beauvoir's Le Deuxième Sexe*, 1 – 30.

- Chéron, Albert. *Etude sur l'adage "Uxor non est propria socia sed speratur fore"*. Paris: Rousseau, 1901.
- Daigle, Christine and Golomb, Jacob (eds). *Beauvoir and Sartre: The Riddle of Influence*. Indiana University Press, 2009.
- Eco, Umberto. *Lector in Fabula*. Grasset, 1979.
- Fallaize, Elizabeth. *Simone de Beauvoir: A Critical Reader*. London/New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Seuil, 1982.
- Genette, Gérard. *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil, 1987.
- Glazer, Sarah. "A Second Sex". Bookforum (Apr/May 2007).
- Godard, Barbara. "Translating (as) Women. Review of Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood: *Re-Belle et Infidèle*". *Essays on Canadian Writing* 55 (1995): 71-82.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *Faust, Part Two*. translated by David Luke. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Grendon, Felix. "The Anglo-Saxon Charms". *The Journal of American Folklore* 22, 84 (1909): 105-237.
- Hood, John. "Pagan Gods of the Anglo-Saxons". *CLIO, History Journal* (1998)
- Inwood, Michael. *A Hegel Dictionary*. Blackwell Publishing. Blackwell Reference Online. 01 November 2017.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *L'acte de lecture: théorie de l'effet esthétique*. Mardaga, 1976.
- Kojève, Alexandre. *Introduction à la lecture de Hegel*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947.
- Kojève, Alexandre. *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel*. translated by James H. Nichols. Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Kundu, Rama. *Intertext: A Study of the Dialogue Between Texts*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons, 2008.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Translated by J. Harle Bell, R. Needham and J.R. von Sturmer. London, 1969.
- Lotbinière-Harwood, Susanne (de). *Re-belle et infidèle: la traduction comme pratique de réécriture au féminin*. Montréal: Editions du Remue-ménage, 1991.
- Marlène Bichet, *The Treatment of Intertextuality in Translation Studies: A case study with the 2009 English translation of Simone de Beauvoir's Le Deuxième Sexe, 1 – 30.*

- Moi, Toril. "While We Wait: The English Translation of *The Second Sex*". *Signs* 27, 4 (2002): 1005-1035.
- Moi, Toril. "The Adulteress Wife". *London Review of Books* 32, 3 (2010): 3-6.
- Papapetros, Spyros. *On the Animation of the Inorganic: Art, Architecture, and the Extension of Life*. University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Rhys, Jean. *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Penguin Classics, 2000.
- Riffaterre, Michael. "Compulsory Reader Response: The Intertextual Drive", in Worton, M. and Still J. (eds). *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Manchester University Press, 1990.
- Roux-Faucard, Geneviève. "Intertextualité et traduction." *Meta* 511 (2006): 98–118.
- Russ, Joanna. *How to Suppress Women's Writing*. University of Texas Press, 1983.
- Salines in Salama-Carr, Myriam (ed.). *On Translating French Literature and Film II*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. Translated by Hazel Barnes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Dover Publications Inc., 2000.
- Shastri, Sudha. *Intertextuality and Victorian Studies*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman Ltd, 2001.
- Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation; Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London/New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Tidd, Ursula. *Simone de Beauvoir*. Routledge Critical Thinkers. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. New York: Harper Perennial Classics, 2014.
- Yaeger, Patricia S. "'Because a Fire Was in My Head': Eudora Welty and the Dialogic Imagination". *PMLA* 99, 5 (1984).
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Von Flotow, Luise. *Translation and Gender: translating in the "era of feminism"*. St Jerome Publishing, 1997.