



**\*Daniela Hăisan**

Faculty of Letters and Communication Sciences,  
Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava,  
13 Universității Street, 720229 Suceava, Romania  
e-mail: danielahaisan@litere.usv.ro

(PERI)TEXTUALITY AND A SKYSCRAPER OF FOOTNOTES:  
ALPHONSE DAUDET'S *LA DOULOU* AS TRANSLATED BY JULIAN BARNES

I want translations with copious footnotes,  
footnotes reaching up like skyscrapers  
to the top of this or that page  
so as to leave only the gleam of one textual line  
between commentary and eternity.  
(Vladimir Nabokov, 1995: 512)

Abstract

Drawing loosely on text linguistics, Gérard Genette's classic works on paratextuality, as well as a number of fairly recent concerns in Translation Studies (e.g. paratranslation, translator's habitus, translator's visibility), the present article deals with a collection of notes by Alphonse Daudet published posthumously (1930) as *La Doulou*, and particularly with its best-known English version, *In the Land of Pain*, signed by Julian Barnes (2002). The translator counterbalances the inherent deficiencies of Daudet's fragmentary text by making the most of paratextual patronage (he writes an introduction, two afterwords and 64 footnotes in order to turn Daudet's notes into a proper book).

Keywords: (para)translation, (peri)textuality, footnotes, translator's voice / visibility, compensation

Julian Barnes's rendition of Alphonse Daudet's *La Doulou* into English is a classic example of what happens when, in Didier S n cal's words (1997), *les grands traduisent les grands*: the outcome is rarely, if ever, a misstep. Quite the opposite, the (more often than not affinity-based) relationship between an author and an author-turned-translator has always been a surefire formula for (editorial) success. The greater the affinity between the two writers, the more rewarding the resulting translation, history has taught us (see Baudelaire's Poe, simply one case among others). In point of fact, this (often asynchronous and asymmetrical) fondness seems to be most productive when extreme:

The translator works better when he and the author are *simpatico*, said my friend, and by this he meant not just "agreeable" or "congenial", meanings which this Italian word is often used to signify, but also "possessing an underlying sympathy." The translator should not merely get

---

\*Daniela Hăisan is Lecturer in Linguistics and English Language at Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania. In 2010 she defended her doctoral dissertation on Poe's fiction translated into Romanian. Her research interests include English morphology, terminology, cultural translation and discourse analysis.

along with the author, not merely find him likeable; there should also be an identity between them. (Venuti, 1995: 273)

Anyone remotely familiar with Daudet's and Barnes's works will hardly be taken aback by the latter's choice of text which falls outside his mainstream literature. The two share quite a number of idiosyncrasies as prose-writers (*i.e.* the self-conscious linguistic style, the wittiness, the playfulness, the mordant irony etc.). Furthermore, Barnes's reputation for being a "chameleon"<sup>1</sup> has constantly been endorsed and heightened not only by his ever-changing technique but also by a considerable amount of (near-)literary "experiments" (ranging from periodical short fiction to miscellaneous nonfiction, narrative journalism, culinary memoir etc.). With both his parents teachers of French and a good old-fashioned Francophile environment offered to him as a child, translating Daudet makes perfect sense in the build-up of his (translator's) *habitus*<sup>2</sup>.

### The Source-Text

*La Doulou* is not a book in the classical sense but merely a collection of notes<sup>3</sup> written over the course of over a decade, while Daudet suffered increasing pain and debility from the ravages of *tabes dorsalis* in its tertiary and terminal stage. The disease taking its toll upon Daudet in more ways than one (stabbing pains, erosion of the spine, progressive loss of mobility, insomnia, amnesia, confusion, morphine-addiction, concern for how his illness affected his family, most barbaric but utterly useless medical treatments etc.), he at first found refuge in taking these notes only to discover that his skills as a writer as well as his very ability to hold a pen had sharply deteriorated. Yet, in spite of this, *La Doulou* radiates with humanity; Daudet's humour, philosophy and sportiveness, while not intact, all transfer into this idiosyncratic swan song. The title itself, the Provençal for *douleur* [pain]<sup>4</sup>, with its mellifluous quality, is at variance with the text:

The word [*doulou*] seems to sing with the crickets and to smell of lavender, it completely de-dramatizes the topic. The word also carries Daudet back to his childhood and innocence, a "regression" which gives to some notes a deep sense of nostalgia. (Dieguez & Bogousslavsky, 2005: 40)

Daudet started the notebook in 1885 and stopped writing about three years before his death. He died aged 57, on the 16<sup>th</sup> of December 1897. What was eventually published as *La Doulou* in 1930 by his widow, Julia Allard, consists of about fifty riveting pages of notes on his symptoms and sufferings, his fears and reflections, his fellow-sufferers and palliative medication. After lying dormant, much like Daudet's disease, for many years, *La Doulou* was brought to light again due to Julian Barnes's translation. Ever since, it has been reconsidered as a "classic in the literary annals of human suffering" (a Vintage Classics recurring text), a "raw picture of pain", a "most valuable document" (Dieguez & Bogousslavsky, *op. cit.*).

### Textuality

This particular text-type, as practised by Daudet in *La Doulou*, which is neither autobiography proper, nor casual, diary-like fiction, poses some delicate problems of textuality. Take, for instance,

<sup>1</sup> Literally "chameleon of British letters" (Moseley, 1997: 1).

<sup>2</sup> *Habitus* can be defined as a habit-forming force (as intimated by Aristotle, Aquinas, Panofsky, Bourdieu, Gouanvic etc.) derived from and shaped by history / society / family / education / profession, which accounts for virtually any given translator's decisions / choices / idiosyncrasies / even automatisms / ultimately style. Translational *habitus* is thus important insofar as it influences a translator's practice by determining his translational choices. (Häisan, 2016: 61-62)

<sup>3</sup> "Notes seem an appropriate form in which to deal with one's dying." says Barnes in the Introduction to the English edition of Daudet's book (2016, p. xiv).

<sup>4</sup> (Literal) translations between brackets are my own.

de Beaugrande & Dressler's seminal work *Introduction to Text Linguistics* (1981: 3), where a text is defined as "a communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality" (cohesion; coherence; intentionality; acceptability; informativity; situationality; intertextuality). Within the ambit of text linguistics at least, which states that if any of the above standards is not considered to have been satisfied, the text will not be communicative (therefore non-communicative texts are treated as non-texts), *La Doulou* is one inch away from being dismissed as a non-text. Its fragmentariness unpreventably affects coherence; sometimes cohesion, too. Intentionality is yet another sensitive and restrictive matter, for Daudet, the "text producer", was writing first and foremost for himself.

The text is additionally unbelievably elliptic on a number of levels: since it was written "to self", given events or people are sometimes only hinted at, with only half a reference, cryptic abbreviations and initials are aplenty. Semantic, pragmatic, and, above all, syntactic ellipsis – this is *La Doulou*'s trademark. This does not necessarily mean "bad writing". Lexical cohesion, among others, is fairly well represented through lexical chains; although seemingly repetitive, the text gradually builds informativity in a perfectly coherent theme-rheme succession underlying plot-progression. As a matter of fact, the overall style of this collection of notes has been termed "of a superlative order", which is "probably unique for a plain notebook" (Critchley, 1969, q. in Dieguez & Bogousslavsky, *ibidem*), whereas the narrative is regarded as fairly coherent:

Of course, the *immediate* purpose of taking these notes was cathartic, a way to try coping with unimaginable conditions of living. But it is apparent that Daudet wanted to construct a consistent narrative out of these notes, in his usual autofictional approach. (Dieguez & Bogousslavsky, *ibidem*)

The challenges in translating Daudet's notebook obviously do not spring exclusively from this issue related to textuality, although the above-named standards are of direct relevance to translation studies. The fact that *La Doulou* is ultimately an old text entails a lot of cultural or medical terms, *realia*, intertexts that need to be clarified for the contemporary reader. It is therefore not as much the text as it is the paratext that the readers will find immensely rewarding, as Julian Barnes's translation, with extensive annotations, introduction and afterwords, provides vital clues for them to grasp a good number of implicit aspects related to Daudet, his life, his career, the society he lived in, the books he wrote or read a.s.o.

*In the Land of Pain*, the English (or rather, American) version which first appeared in 2002 (Knopf, New York) and has regularly been reprinted ever since, is not only translated but also edited by Julian Barnes. The slender yet dense volume is the epitome of a very commendable trend in (Socio-)Translation Studies, namely the *translator's visibility* or *agency* or *voice*.<sup>5</sup> Barnes makes himself highly visible / audible in this bold editorial enterprise, covering all the aspects of agency possible:

*Textual agency* would refer to the translator's voice in the text, to her / his footprints, so to speak, be they deliberate manipulations, stylistic preferences or habits (Baker, 2000; Gullin, 2002; Pekkanen, 2007) or functionalist-oriented adaptation or anything in between. *Paratextual agency* consists of the translator's role in inserting and adding notes and prefaces, and *extratextual agency* of the selection of books to be translated, the use of different editions and intermediary translations, and to the role of translators in "speaking out", publicizing their translations, explaining their methods and strategies, and the like. (Paloposki, 2009: 191)

Our analysis, based on the 2016 edition of *In the Land of Pain*, shows Julian Barnes as a moderate textual agent. A keen decoder of implicatures, a fervent researcher of lost meanings, he more often than not sticks to the text while displaying his impeccable knowledge of French and a piece of his fine craftsmanship as a writer. What at the same time strikes the reader is a paradoxical propensity towards explicitation, which should hardly be a surprise given the fragmentary, elliptical nature of the source

---

<sup>5</sup> Translator's *voice* is preferred by Hermans (1996, 2006), Schiavi (1996), O'Sullivan (2003); *profile* by Assis Rosa (2008); *thumbprint* by Baker (2000); *point of view* or *style* or *presence* by Bosseaux (2007) or Munday (2008); *visibility* by Venuti (1995); *agency* by Paloposki (2009) etc.

text. Moreover, the few instances of clarification identified are extremely subtle. He, for instance, makes use of *despite* in order to fully expose the concession in *les yeux ouverts sans voir*:

Pauvres oiseaux de nuit, battant les murs, les yeux ouverts sans voir... / Poor night-birds, beating against the walls, blind *despite* their open eyes. (italics mine)

Elliptic conditionals, gerunds and past participles are sometimes reshaped and standardised:

Morphine prise auparavant, sommeil très bon. [lit. morphine taken beforehand, very good sleep] / If I've taken morphine beforehand, I sleep very well.

Bien pensé à cet homme-là en écrivant *L'Évangéliste*... [thought a lot about this man, writing *L'Évangéliste*] / I had him very much in mind when I wrote *L'Évangéliste*...

But ellipsis is not forever lost, for Barnes often makes use of what Hervey and Higgins call *compensation in place* – the loss of a particular effect found at a given place in the source text compensated for by creating a corresponding effect at an earlier or a later place in the target text (Hervey & Higgins, 2002: 47):

Certains Exotiques ont l'air de grosses mouches noires. [certain exotic (patients) look like some big black flies] / Some exotic patients, like big black flies.

Depuis déjà longtemps, depuis le bromure, je n'avais pas eu recours à la morphine. [no ellipsis] / Haven't had recourse to morphine for a long time, not since I've been taking bromide.

Un moment humilié de me voir un simple baromètre, engainé de verre, gradué. [no ellipsis] / Am briefly humiliated by thinking of myself as a mere barometer, glassed-in and marked-off. [here, too, Barnes compensates for the rhyme in *engainé, gradué* by means of the symmetrical compounds *glassed-in* and *marked-off*]

Elsewhere, the translator takes charge of *maquillage* and *lourdes plaques* [lit. heavy plates], which need elucidation:

Le maquillage par lourdes plaques du chloral. / Effect of chloral on the skin: thick patches like make-up.

*La vie du mal*, too opaque in the given context, becomes, in translation: “Pain has a life of its own.” The rather vague *petite voiture* [lit. small car] is, in Julian Barnes's accurate translation, “invalid carriage”, while *les “Dames seules”* are very conveniently “the Women On Their Own”. Whatever else he does in terms of *clarification* – duly included by Antoine Berman (1985) among the “deforming tendencies” inherent, after all, in the very act of translation – is always in the name of good English rather than that of overt domestication.

Clarification also often entails syntactic reordering, as in the following examples:

La sensation mythologique, l'insensibilisation et le durcissement du torse étroit dans une gaine de bois ou de pierre, et le malade, à mesure que la paralysie monte, se changeant peu à peu en arbre, en rocher, comme une nymphe des métamorphoses. / I feel like some creature from mythology, whose torso is locked up in a box of wood or stone, gradually turning numb and then solid. As the paralysis spreads upwards, the sick man changes into a tree or a rock, like some nymph from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

Tous les tiraillements de ficelles de l'homme-orchestre agitant ses instruments. [...] L'homme-orchestre de la douleur, c'est moi. / I feel like a one-man band, tugging on all his strings and playing all his instruments at once. [...] This is me: the one-man band of pain.

While it is true that translators should never attempt to “fix” the source text, what Barnes does with Daudet's text is scarcely reprehensible; it is rather liable to inclusion by many a translation theorist among the so-called “universals of translation”.

Lexical cohesion is handled with great accuracy and synonymy is always strictly followed on a one-to-one basis (e.g. *douleur* is always rendered by “pain”; *souffrance* and *souffrir* by “suffering”; *sosie* by a more nuanced “doppelganger” etc.).

There are, assuredly, also a few debatable choices Barnes made in his translation of Daudet’s text. The effortless way he dispenses with the multiple (geometrical, botanical, narcotic etc.) senses of *fleur de vie* (*le sommeil à fleur de vie* / “on the edge of life”) is one of them. Another is that of translating, and not transferring the Italian *Il Crociato*, while elsewhere, for flavour’s sake, he sticks to the French *vivandière* and *silhouette*:

*Il Crociato*. Oui, c’était cela, cette nuit. Le supplice de la Croix, torsion des mains, des pieds, des genoux, les nerfs tendus, tirillés à éclater. / Crucifixion. That’s what it was like the other night. The torment of the Cross: violent wrenching of the hands, feet, knees; nerves stretched and pulled to breaking point.

Soigné à la fin par une vivandière qui le terrifiait. / Cared for at the end by a vivandière who terrified him.

...longue figure de Robinson Crusoe... / ...a gangling Robinson Crusoe silhouette...

Translating *nervosisme* (nervous disorder, specifically neurasthenia) as “neuropathy” (disease or dysfunction of one or more peripheral nerves, typically causing numbness or weakness) is also a questionable choice, as is “brains are racked all the time”, used to render *tout le temps à chercher*:

Elle est bien comique cette station pour anémiés. On ne se rappelle pas un nom; tout le temps à chercher; grands trous dans la conversation. À dix pour trouver le mot *industriel*. / This resort for anaemics has its funny side. No one remembers anyone’s name; brains are racked all the time; there are great holes in the conversation. It took ten of us to come up with the word *industrial*. [one may also wonder whether Daudet meant to describe *anaemics* or *amnesiacs*]

Neologisms like “hypocondriac” for *malade imaginaire*, “plutocrat” for *riche*, and “solipsistic” for *ne parle que pour moi*, are just a few examples meant to dispel any shadow of doubt about Barnes’s overall approach of Daudet’s text as well as the type of reader he addresses.

### Peritextuality

As previously suggested, the lacunar nature of Daudet’s text requires a deeper paratextual involvement on the part of the translator / editor. Nowhere is the paratext – which, according to Genette, is meant to “ensure the text’s presence in the world, its ‘reception’ and consumption in the form of a book” (1997: 1) – put to better use than in the case of a fragmentary text such as this. An interface between reader and text, a “threshold”, a zone not only of transition but also of transaction, a “privileged place of pragmatics” and a “strategy” (Genette, *op. cit.*, 2), the paratext illustrates the paradoxical circumstance of authority in any book, translated or not:

[P]aratexts, those no man’s lands more often than not disregarded as literature, create new layers of meaning around the text, which are anything but innocent. (Lopes, 2012: 131)

Genette’s primary interest might have been in the *authorial* rather than the *allographic paratext* which he “closely tied to the humanist practice of publishing and translating the classic texts of the Middle Ages and classical antiquity” (Genette, *ibidem*, 263). Nonetheless, ever since the 1980s, when Peter Newmark, among others, stated that “a translated novel without a translator’s preface ought to be a thing of the past” (1983: 17), a new interest emerged into what came to be called *paratranslation*<sup>6</sup>. In

<sup>6</sup> The key concept of the Vigo School, promoted, among others, by José Yuste Frías (“[I]f, as Genette (1987) maintained, there can be no text without paratext, neither can there be translation without corresponding paratranslation. The prime objective of the creation of the concept of paratranslation is to remind ourselves and

the light of Barnes's extensive use of the paratext (henceforth *peritext*<sup>7</sup>) in his edition of *In the Land of Pain*, we propose a reading of it not as instances of failure or of indebtedness but as the "apparent locus of authorship in a translated text". (Lopes, *ibidem*, 132)

*In the Land of Pain* definitely sets new standards in translation and editing as it makes up for most of the inherent deficiencies of a fragmentary text by reconfiguring its textuality within the peritext. Julian Barnes pushes the limits of paratextual agency as he allows a new, highly substantial peritextual body to grow out of the "original" text. The result of this mutualistic symbiosis is an invasive peritext whose size is comparable to that of the text itself: an introduction, two afterwords and 64 footnotes (20 of which being half-page long).

As a paratranslator, Julian Barnes writes with his well-known "originality and verve" (Moseley, *ibidem*, 165). An embodiment of the *highbrow translator* as delineated by Alexandra Lopes (*op. cit.*)<sup>8</sup> – he is very much concerned with the contemporary reader's reduced encyclopedic knowledge of nineteenth-century Europe and lack of erudition, in general. Eminently aware of what constitutes Daudet's singularity, Barnes feels free to put this uniqueness across while also making the book his own. The thorough work he does both as a translator and an editor seems to bluntly contradict, for the moment, Ezra Pound's prophecy, that "[i]n the long run the translator is in all probability impotent to do *all* of the work of the linguistically lazy reader" (Pound, 2000: 92).

Taking on the more structural role of editor, Barnes writes an unconventional preface-like Introduction (pp. v-xv in the 2016 Vintage Classics edition we analysed) whose role is partly explanatory, partly informative-descriptive<sup>9</sup>. Generally speaking,

Translators' prefaces are posited [...] as spaces of individuality, which, much like the interiors of a house, offer countless design possibilities, to the point that translators, unaccustomed to such largesse, are often tempted to reduce the range of options to two basic floor plans: a) a confession booth; b) a bunker. (Feltrin-Morris, 2016: 39)

But Julian Barnes goes against the flow: his introduction is neither an implicit admission of guilt for failure to provide "equivalence" with an unmatched original text, as suggested by Feltrin-Morris, nor a defense of his translatorial choices. His introduction is simply not about translation at all; it is about Daudet, his disease and the notebook he entitled *La Doulou*.

Based on an extensive analysis of a large corpus of translator's prefaces, Ellen McRae found that they serve (one or more of) the following purposes:

(1) foregrounding differences of cultures and languages, (2) promoting understanding of the source culture, (3) promoting understanding of the translator's role and intervention, (4) helping critics assess the quality of the translation and (5) being useful as process documentation. (McRae, 2012: 80-81)

Again, it is safe to say Barnes does very little or none of the above. What he does instead is reintroduce, revitalise Daudet's image with as many details as he can find.

stress the essential role performed by paratextual elements in translation, that is, their participation, together with text, in the construction of meaning of the published work." (Yuste Frías, 2012: 118) and utterly decried by Christiane Nord in *Paratranslation – A New Paradigm or a Re-invented Wheel?* (2012).

<sup>7</sup> For Genette, *paratext* further consists of two categories: *peritext* and *epitext*. The former refers to the elements such as front cover, titles, authorial names, dedication, forewords, introduction etc. (Genette, 1997: 24), whereas the latter refers to more distant elements located outside the book, such as interviews, conversations, letters and diaries etc. (*ibid*, 24). Although *paratext* and *peritext* are sometimes used interchangeably, in the present paper we are solely concerned with the peritextual side, as previously defined, of *In the Land of Pain*.

<sup>8</sup> The other types she describes in *Under the Sign of Janus: Reflections on Authorship as Liminality in Translated Literature* (2012) are: *the translator as encyclopedia*, *the irreverent translator*, *the translator as enthusiast* (a blend of youthful enthusiasm and lack of experience), *the translator as priest* or *reverential translator* (underconfident in his / her own ability to translate the revered piece of art).

<sup>9</sup> See Rodica Dimitriu's classification of functions of translators' prefaces: (1) explanatory; (2) normative / prescriptive; (3) informative-descriptive. (Dimitriu, 2009: 195)

Alphonse Daudet (1840-97) is a substantially forgotten writer nowadays. Novelist, playwright, journalist, he is viewed as a sunny humorist and clear stylist, creator in *Lettres de mon moulin* and *Tartarin de Tarascon* of an agreeable if partial Provence. He is offered to students of French as a nursery slope or climbing wall: practise on this. But in his day he was not only highly successful (and very rich); he also ate at the top literary table. Dickens called him “my little brother in France”; Henry James, who translated Daudet’s novel *Port-Tarascon*, called him “a great little novelist”; Goncourt “*mon petit Daudet*”. [...] He was also kind, generous and sociable, a passionate observer and an unstoppable talker. (p. vi)

Barnes’s distinctive raillery turns the Preface into a heartfelt portrait of Daudet, if with sharp, uncompromising strokes:

If Daudet dined in the highest company, he was also a member of a less enviable nineteenth-century French club: that of literary syphilitics. Here again, he is somewhat overshadowed: the Big Three were Baudelaire, Flaubert and Maupassant. [...] He could at least claim that the syphilis he acquired, shortly after his arrival in Paris at the age of seventeen, came from a classier, indeed more literary, source than theirs. He caught it from a *lectrice de la cour*, a woman employed to read aloud at the Imperial Court. (p. vii)

His [Daudet’s] response, both personal and literary, to his condition was admirable. “Courage ... means not scaring others,” Larkin wrote. Numerous witnesses attest to Daudet’s exemplary behaviour. [...] “Suffering is nothing,” he murmured. “It’s all a matter of preventing those you love from suffering.” This is a difficult, correct (and nowadays unfashionable) position. (p. x)

The only reference incidental to translation is an explanation of a comparison with a knife-grinder Daudet uses in the text:

Daudet, when caught in a frenzied bout of locomotor ataxia, his leg hopelessly out of control, reminded himself of a knife-grinder. (The comparison may be lost on some modern readers: until a few decades ago itinerant knife-grinders would trundle the streets with circular stones mounted on wheeled carriers; to make his stone revolve at a speed sufficient to sharpen your knives and shears, the grinder would pump frantically up and down on a pedal.) (p. xiv)

On page 78, the reader unexpectedly comes across the following notice:

The text of *La Doulou* breaks off here. According to André Ebner, Daudet stopped taking notes for it about three years before his death. This is an approximation: one note – concerning the Daudet’s visit to Venice – can clearly be dated to eighteen months before his death.

There is absolutely no warning, no (typo)graphic(al) mark to signal this passage from Daudet’s narrative to the translator-editor’s intrusion. It is here that Barnes most visibly, wilfully and irreverently takes the book over and fully asserts his authority and co-authorship. He does so in order to provide an ending to a narrative so abruptly interrupted; he thus describes in detail Daudet’s final moments (including the abominable scene with the artificial respiration by the bizarre and briefly fashionable method of “rhythmical tractions of the tongue”, p. 81) and concludes this first afterword in the same fashion as he did the introduction, with facts related to the publication of *La Doulou* (“Mme Daudet [...] authorized the publication of *La Doulou* in 1930, and herself died in 1940, the centenary of Daudet’s birth.”, *ibidem*).

In yet another afterword, entitled *A Note on Syphilis* (pp. 82-87), Barnes enlarges further upon the subject already extensively discussed in the Introduction and some of the footnotes, and provides a brief historical outline of the disease, its main clinical features, the sensory, muscular, visceral, visual, motor problems associated with it, and a number of other aspects. He also finds the time for a concise lecture on mentalities (“...attitudes to the acquisition of syphilis were more complicated than we might imagine. For some it was a badge of manhood, proof of sexual bravado; there was even a belief that it brought enhanced creative and imaginative powers”, p. 85) and for occasional jokes on mercury-based and other outlandish treatments.

The last peritextual resort is the back cover of the book, where a lot of information is provided as an incentive for (further) reading. A quotation from *The New Yorker* (“These are [Daudet’s] notes from the underground. They include ... ruminations on fear and fraud, and sharp observations of the healthy. But much of the book – and the book’s force – lies in the patient’s flailing search for a language to match his suffering.”), a photo of Alphonse Daudet (around 1860, by Nadar), a longer text about how greatly admired Daudet was during his lifetime, and a modest, fleeting remark on the translation of the book (“Julian Barnes’s crystalline translation”) are the elements which add the finishing touches to a consummate paratranslation.

#### Footnotes

Technically, a note (be it a footnote or an endnote) is “a statement of variable length (one word is enough) connected to a more or less definite segment of text and either placed opposite or keyed to this segment.” (Genette, *op. cit.*, 319). Functionally, notes are often regarded as a disparate segment of the peritext:

Footnotes, endnotes and postfaces share one common characteristic that distinguishes them dramatically from prefaces, for instance: they constitute a less prominent site. (Lopes, *op. cit.*, 131)

If prefaces are meant to “*get the book read* and to *get the book read properly*” (Genette, *ibidem*, 197), (foot)notes are expected to do the same (*i.e.* to captivate the reader, to ensure the completeness of the overall meaning etc.), while at the same time keeping a low profile, all the more so if they accessorize a translated text. Allographic footnotes have by tradition been the pariah of peritext. They are “the expected locus of intrusion (a different ‘voice’ interrupting and disrupting) and defeat (a contrite ‘voice’ appearing whenever unable to render the text adequately, *i.e.*, invisibly).” (Lopes, *ibidem*). For Dominique Aury, the footnote is the translator’s shame<sup>10</sup>. André Lefevère (1970), Grigore Vereş (1983), Clifford E. Landers (2001), Maïca Sanconie (2007) etc. see notes as cumbersome because they are allowed to break the flow, disrupt the intimacy between the reader and the text and destroy the mimetic effect:

In the absence of footnotes in the original, the translation that includes them is a warped reflection. Why? Because they destroy the *mimetic effect*, the attempt by (most) fiction writers to create the illusion that the reader is actually witnessing, if not experiencing, the events described. Footnotes break the flow, disturbing the continuity by drawing the eye, albeit briefly, away from the text to a piece of information that, however useful, is still a disrupter of the “willing suspension of disbelief”. (Landers, 2001: 93)

On the other hand, the equally numerous attempts at rehabilitating the footnote (see, for instance, Theo Hermans, 1996, or Lopes, 2012) have contributed to a new understanding of the peritext simply as a place where the translator’s voice emerges more clearly.

Footnotes are, I would like to suggest, the clearest manifestation of the Janus-like presence of the translator in the text: while acknowledging the past / origin of the text, the footnote and other paratextual material also assert the translator’s present reading / rendering while pointing to other (future?) possibilities of reading the text. (Lopes, *ibidem*, 130)

What Julian Barnes does with the 64 footnotes he attaches to Daudet’s text is, indeed, not only filling up the lacunae of the original text and of the reader’s knowledge, it is also fully asserting his voice as a translator and as an editor, it is creating a whole new text which is as much a metatext as it is a peri-/paratext. Most of these footnotes, which make up almost a third of the entire text, are conventional translator’s notes, providing explanations about this or that cultural aspect hinted at in the original

---

<sup>10</sup> In orig. “La note en bas de page est la honte du traducteur.” (a definition given in the preface to Georges Mounin’s book *Problèmes théoriques de la traduction* (1963)).



(note)book. What makes them out of the ordinary is their length (sometimes spanning over multiple pages) and their all-encompassing, panoptic character.

Thematically, most footnotes deal with:

- decoding names (toponyms or anthroponyms)
- decoding intertexts
- explaining (medical) terms / customs
- translating Greek / Latin / Italian / French expressions
- enlarging upon statements / events
- enlarging upon translation *per se*

Toponyms are lavishly adorned with relevant details within the space of many a footnote. We find out that *Champrosay*, for instance, is a “village south of Paris, on the edge of the Forêt de Sénart”, but also that “Daudet lived here initially in Delacroix’s former atelier. In 1887 he bought a large house with grounds running down to the Seine. [...] The Daudets also had a succession of apartments in Paris.” For *Erebus*, the translator surprisingly only gives the toponymic sense of the word (“A place of darkness between Earth and Hades.”), leaving aside its anthroponymic side, whereas the French text is somewhat ambiguous. *Lamalou* is geographically located, but also defined on account of its patron, one of Daudet’s doctors. The profusion of details related to a bronze statue of the latter might seem superfluous but they are all part of the thought-out architecture of the book:

*Lamalou*: A thermal station north of Béziers, in the spurs joining the Cévennes to the Montagne Noire. The waters, known since Roman times, were advised for rheumatic and nervous illnesses, especially tabes. [...] Charcot made the spa’s fortune sending many of his patients there. [...] Charcot may not have visited Lamalou, but the town knew how to salute a benefactor, erecting a Fontaine Charcot in 1903, ten years after the neurologist’s death. [...] In 1944 the Germans annoyingly removed his bronze bust from the top of the Fountain; it was eventually replaced by a stone replica in 1955.

J.-M. Charcot himself (1825-93) benefits from several footnotes which portray him as a pioneer neurologist, psychotherapist and classifier of nervous diseases, a brilliant teacher and clinician, a close collaborator of Freud’s, who translated his lectures into German. Famous for his ability to mime tics, spasms, rigidity, and other symptoms, Charcot was also known for his blunt speaking to patients and their families. At one point, the translator’s voice is louder and more intrusive than usual, Barnes taking the liberty of inserting his own comment upon Charcot’s coarseness: “If he was being tactful, he might announce bad news in Latin.”

Elsewhere, *Zézé*, a hypocorism, is made clear: it is Daudet’s younger son Lucien (1879-1946), painter, writer, a close friend of Proust, a society figure “overshadowed by his forceful brother.” Barnes’s vast commentaries are clearly never neutral, never innocent. When introducing Daudet’s wife, Julia, née Allard (1844-1940), the translator is incisive enough to call a spade a spade: “Goncourt’s first impression was that she was the artist of the household rather than her husband; he also judged her the best-read woman he had ever met.” Barnes’s proverbial irony can easily be spotted here and there (e.g. *Mlle de Lespinasse*: (1732-76), “salon hostess, friend of the Encyclopédistes, remembered for her desperate, Racinian love for the unworthy M. de Guibert...” or *Xavier Aubryet*: (1827-80), “journalist, editor, literary man-about-town, whose loquacity and taste for paradox enchanted some and infuriated others...”). It is also not unusual to find notes that are often quite moving:

Edmond de Goncourt and his brother Jules were so inseparable that in twenty-two years after the death of their mother they were only twice apart for as much as twenty-four hours; so inseparable that they wrote their joint diary in the first person.

Intertextuality is yet another aspect of *La Doulou* which merits elaboration and receives the translator-editor’s full attention. Oftentimes, Daudet alludes to his own writings (*Caoudal*, for instance, the sculptor in Daudet’s novel *Sappho* (1884), is so vividly and eloquently delineated in a footnote that readers might be tricked into believing they have not only read, but also studied the respective novel and possibly also written about it; *L’Évangéliste*, Daudet’s 1883 novel, “leisurely in manner but fierce

in theme”, is at length commented upon in a footnote which, again, is bound to make the readers search for the book in question on the spot). On other occasions, he invokes other more or less famous characters, such as *Joseph Prudhomme* (“a character invented by the writer and caricaturist Henri Monnier (1805-77) to tipify self-satisfied mediocrity and sonorous banality”).

A wide range of therapies, types of workout and medication (see *savate* – “a French version of kick-boxing, both a gymnastic exercise and a sport.”, or *acetanilide* – an analgesic and antipyretic) are carefully explained, sometimes with an abrupt change of tenor from one paragraph to another.

Daudet’s text might not be linguistically chequered but it does contain a few words in:

- Greek (*La Doulou*’s motto: Μαθήματα — Παθήματα / “Suffering is instructive.”)
- Latin (*Dictante dolore.* / “with pain dictating”, “pain dictates the words I now write”; and the note goes on, enlarging upon the subject: Ovid has “*dolor dictat*”; Silius Italicus has “*dolor verba aspera dictat.*”)
- Italian (*carcere durro*: hard, *i.e.* punitive, imprisonment, a term “especially associated with the incarceration of Risorgimento patriots.”; here, too, the footnote continues, this time with a speculation: “Daudet must have read Silvio Pellico’s *Le mie prigioni* – said to be the most popular Italian book of the nineteenth century – about his fifteen years of *carcere duro* under the Austrians.”)
- French (*brodequins en bois*, a form of torture, very explicitly depicted by Barnes; *lampe anglaise*: “English lamp, a version of the miner’s lamp, adapted for domestic use” etc.)

Based on alternative research, Barnes cannot help enlarging upon certain statements or events, without ever divagating exceedingly from the main threads of the discussion. Among the issues discussed at length, we mention, for instance, the death of Daudet’s father, Vincent, in 1875, a recurring dream Daudet used to have (in which he was boat whose keel caused him pain), or the Drumont-Meyer duel:

Daudet and the journalist Albert Duruy were the seconds of Edouard Drumont in his famous duel with Arthur Meyer on 24 April 1886. [...] The duel in those days often worked as a quick form of libel writ. Daudet, pugnacious by nature, had already fought two himself by this time; and even as an ataxic nearly fought two more. In 1888 he challenged the founder of *L’Événement*, which had published an article suggesting that Mme Daudet was scheming to inherit Goncourt’s estate. In 1891 he was himself challenged by the same Edouard Drumont, who had (correctly) recognized himself in *L’Obstacle*, Daudet’s play on the theme of hereditary insanity. Daudet admitted fault and proposed, given his physical deterioration, that they fight at Champrosay while sitting on chairs. Eventually signed a declaration that Drumont’s father had been the sanest man that ever lived, and the matter went no further.

Some of Barnes’s personal commentaries inserted in various footnotes provide a necessary comic relief, given the macabre topic of the original text and the excruciating details provided by many other footnotes (*e.g.* “Mme Daudet fell ill in late 1890, and believed she was dying. In the event, she survived another half-century.”; “Daudet was so myopic that he once talked for a quarter of an hour to a rug thrown over a chair, in the belief that it was Edmond de Goncourt.”).

As with the introduction and epilogues, very few notes deal with translation *per se*. Julian Barnes, the translator, is never insecure, never complains about the inevitable difficulties and losses of translating his text. We found two instances only of traductological concern. One of them discusses a pun-upon-words (“*guerre au couteau entre La Doulou-le-Haut et La Doulou-le-Bas*” / “*Upper Pain and Lower Pain* are at daggers drawn”) and the other the near-synonymy of two terms:

In *La Doulou* Daudet uses *ataxie* and *ataxique* (the latter as both adjective and noun) rather than the higher-medical *tabès* and *tabétique*; I have followed his usage. *Tabès* denotes the disease process in the nervous system, and *ataxia* its most visible outward consequence; Daudet allows the latter to include the former.

## Conclusion

Julian Barnes’s version of Alphonse Daudet’s text shows him as a full-fledged, meticulous translator and an assertive, persuasive editor. This translator / editor duality is also apparent in the way he

handles textuality as compared to peritextuality: as a textual agent, he keeps a safe distance from any imaginable extreme, whereas as a peritextual agent, he takes hold of the text, contaminates it with his own vision and style and ultimately makes it his own. As objectionable as this might seem at first sight, especially coming from an established, world-renowned author like himself, he needed to do so. To rehabilitate Daudet and revive his reputation, to rehabilitate translators and revive their reputation, he had to rely on the marginal and usually unassuming footnotes, for

[t]he “skyscraper of footnotes” stands [...] as the most visible monument to the new (and often ultimate) authorship / authority of a text in a given culture — that of the translator. (Lopes, *ibidem*, 132)

#### Works Cited

- Berman, A. 2000. “Translation and the Trials of the Foreign.” In: Venuti, L. (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 284–297.
- Bystrova-McIntyre, T. 2012. *Cohesion in Translation: A Corpus Study of Human-Translated, Machine-Translated, and Non-Translated Texts (Russian Into English)*. A dissertation submitted to Kent State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. <https://core.ac.uk/display/47011101>. Retrieved on August 15<sup>th</sup> 2017.
- De Beaugrande, R & Dressler, W. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London & New York: Longman.
- Daudet, A. 2016. *In the Land of Pain*, edited and translated by Julian Barnes. New York: Vintage Classics, Vintage Books, Penguin Random House.
- Daudet, A. 2002. *La Doulou*. Paris: Mille et une nuit.
- Dieguez, S; Bogousslavsky, J. 2005. “The One-Man Band of Pain. Alphonse Daudet and His Painful Experience of Tabes Dorsal.” In: Bogousslavsky, J.; Boller, F. (eds.), *Neurological Disorders in Famous Artists Part I* [Frontiers of Neurology and Neuroscience, volume 19]. Basel: Karger, pp. 17-45.
- Dimitriu, R. 2009. “Translators’ Prefaces as Documentary Sources for Translation Studies.” In: *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, vol. 17, №3, pp. 193-206.
- Genette, G. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Harris, P. 2005. *At the Interface Between Reader and Text: Devices in Children’s Picturebooks that Mediate Reader Expectations and Interpretations*, paper presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Parmatta, <https://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/.../har05606.pdf>. Retrieved on October 23<sup>rd</sup> 2017.
- Hatim, B.; Munday, J. 2004. *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Hăisan, D. 2016. *On Writers as Translators / Sur les écrivains-traducteurs*. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință.
- Henry, J. 2000. “De l’érudition à l’échec: la note du traducteur.” In: *Meta*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 228-240.
- Hermans, Th. 1996. “The Translator’s Voice in Translated Narrative.” In: *Target*, vol. 8:1, pp. 23-48.
- Hervey, S.; Higgins, I. 1992. *Thinking Translation: A Course in Translation Method, French-English*. New York: Routledge.
- Landers, C. E. 2001. *Literary Translation. A Practical Guide*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lane, Ph. 2007. *Periferia textului*. Iași: Institutul European.
- Lefevere, A. 1970. “The Translation of Literature. An Approach.” In: *Babel*, XVI, 2.
- Lopes, A. 2012. “Under the Sign of Janus: Reflections on Authorship as Liminality in Translated Literature.” In: *Anglo-Saxonica* no. 3 (Special Issue: New Directions in Translated Studies), pp.127-156.
- Feltrin-Morris, M. 2016. “Persuasive spaces: Translators’ prefaces to the *Divine Comedy*.” In: *Forum Italicum. Sage Journals*, Vol. 50(1), pp. 38–49.

- McRae, E. 2010. *The Role of Translators' Prefaces to Contemporary Literary Translations into English*, Dissertation Thesis, <http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>. Retrieved on October 2<sup>nd</sup> 2017.
- Moseley, M. 1997. *Understanding Julian Barnes*. South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.
- Mounin, G. 1963. *Problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Nabokov, V. 1955. "Problems in Translation: Onegin in English." In: *Partisan Review* 22, no. 4, pp. 496-512.
- Neubert, A.; Shreve, G. M. 1992. *Translation as Text*. Kent: Kent State University Press.
- Newmark, P. 1983. "Introductory Survey." In: Picken, C. (ed.), *The Translator's Handbook*. London: Asli.
- Paloposki, O. 2009. "Limits of Freedom: Agency, Choice and Constraints in the Work of the Translator." In: Milton, J.; Bandia, P. (eds.), *Agents of Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 189-208.
- Pound, E. 2000. "Guido's Relation." In: Venuti, L. (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 86-93.
- Sénécal, D. 1997. "Les grands traduisent les grands." In: *Lire*, Dossier "Faut-il tout retraduire?", pp. 41-43.
- Thornbury, S. 2005. *Beyond the Sentence. Introducing Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Tymockzo, M. 1999. "Post-colonial Writing and Literary Translation." In: Bassnett, S.; Trivedi, H. (eds.), *Post-Colonial Translation. Theory and Practice*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 19-40.
- Venuti, L. 2008 [1995]. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Vereş, G. 1983. *Opera lui Charles Dickens în România*. Bucureşti: Editura Minerva.
- Yuste Frías, J. 2012. "Paratextual Elements in Translation: Paratranslating Titles in Children's Literature." In: Gil-Bajardí, A.; Orero, P.; Rovira-Esteva, S. (eds.), *Translation Peripheries. Paratextual Elements in Translation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 117-134.
- Yuste Frías, J. 2010. "Au seuil de la traduction : la paratraduction." In: Naaijken, T. (ed.), *Event or Incident. Événement ou Incident. On the Role of Translation in the Dynamics of Cultural Exchange. Du rôle des traductions dans les processus d'échanges culturels*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 287-316.