If This Be Treason Translation and its Dyscontents, A Memoir by Gregory Rabassa

Review by Anne Milano Appel

Gregory Rabasa's long-awaited memoir varieties of perifdy and treason implied in industore/inditore, with Rabasa himself as the (self-)accused as well as judge-andjury. The hearing is replete with personal confessions, such as how Rabasa 'backed

into translation," the fact that he himself has tried to "teach what 's unteachable," and his ultimate dissatisfaction with any translation he has done. Along the way he reprises unanswerables, such as the facelessness imposed on the translator (an invisibility that we have come to cherish as "ideal"), the treachery of words (can a stone ever be a 'pierre' or a 'pieme' a stone?), and the fact that translation is about value judgment and personal choice with the translator as just one of the many readers of the work. If there is one thing Rabassa dedares with utter certainty it is that translation is an art, not

a craft, "because you can teach a craft but you cannot teach an art."

To those in translation circles, Gregory Rabassa needs no introduction. Now in his eighties, he is a giant who translated the masters of Latin American magic realism. Having translated over 50 works by such luminarises as Gabriel Garcia Märquez, Julio Cortianz, and Mario Yargas Llosa, his accomplishments are uncontexted.

The case studies that Rabassa includes

reconal 'regrettilly o wacked others, implition of the sector of the s

If This Be Treason: Translation and Its Dyscontents, A Marrolit; by Gregory Robusts, T89 pages, New Directions Publiching Corporation, 2005, T804: 0811216195.

are, by his own admission, a kind of "rap sheet" of his experiences with his authors, and will resonate with any translator. His testimony that his relationship with these writers was personal in some cases, while "regretifully only through their work" in others, implies a strong preference for

author-translator interaction. I identified with this, as I did with his approach of following the text to see where it leads: an exercise of "controlled schizephrenia" requiring skills at "mutability"

The verdict (also the title of the books final section) in the end is that there are no certain answers and "translation is but another version of the truth." It is the "Not Proven" verdict of Scots Jav, consistent with the ambivalencies implicit in translation. And so Rabassás translator is left in limbo, where many of us live and work, neither guilty of treason nor free of doubts. Can Rabassás exait so stid to

reflect a certain universality? Yes, judging by my own encounters with translation. I, too, relish intraaction with my authors, and like Rabassa I never read a book in its entirety before translating X, preferring to follow the text to saw where X leads. I admit to a certain degree of "controlled schtzophrenia" and an not adverse to "mutability". Am I ever guilty of treason? Am I ever truly satisfied with a translation? The vendict remains "Not Proven" 4