ABSTRACT

This article aims to contribute to the understanding of Bob Dylan’s work in its international dimension, in the context of the discipline of Translation Studies. It examines the translation of Dylan’s memoir *Chronicles, Volume I* (2004) into Spanish (*Crónicas, volumen I*, published in Spain and translated by Miquel Izquierdo, 2005). Questions asked include: What is the target audience of the Spanish translation, and who will read it? Is the English-Spanish pairing in this case conducive to use of concepts developed by Translation Studies such as foreignisation/domestication, or does it subvert those concepts? What are the particular translation cruxes and difficulties in Dylan’s text, especially for a Hispanophone readership?; and, finally: How much in the text of *Chronicles* is ultimately untranslatable?

I

This article offers an analysis of the translation of Bob Dylan’s memoir *Chronicles, Volume I* into Spanish, in its own right and also in the context of the evolving discipline of Translation Studies. The specific choice of the Spanish translation as object of study reflects both the status of Spanish as major international language and possible rival to English, and Dylan’s long-standing popularity in the Spanish-speaking world.

*Chronicles, Volume I* (hereinafter *Chronicles*), published in 2004, is the second substantial prose work of Dylan’s career (the first being the experimental novel *Tarantula*, from 1966), and was presented to the world as the first volume of a trilogy of memoirs (at the time of writing the second and third had yet to materialise). *Chronicles* was an immediate success in both critical and commercial terms, reaching No 2 on the *New York Times* non-fiction best-seller list and being shortlisted in the US for the National Book Critics Circle Award. It has

---

1 In the Autobiography/Biography section. For favourable critical reactions to the book from established Dylan scholars, see Gray (2006), 136-138 and Scobie (2006), *passim*. Scobie asked rhetorically: “What influence has
been translated into, apart from Spanish, the following languages: Bulgarian, Catalan, Chinese (twice, in China and Taiwan), Croatian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese (twice, in Brazil and Portugal), Russian, Serbian, Slovene and Swedish (making 23 languages apart from English, and 25 translations)\(^2\). The Spanish version, *Crónicas*, *volumen I* (hereinafter *Crónicas*), translated by Miquel Izquierdo, was published in Barcelona, Spain, by Global Rhythm Press, in 2005 (the Catalan translation, by Toni Cardona, was issued by the same publisher, also in 2005). The present essay is, obviously, concerned with the Spanish version only, but some reference will be made to the recently published discussion by the book’s Italian translator, Alessandro Carrera, of his own version (Carrera 2009)\(^3\).

II

As far as previous translations of Dylan into Spanish are concerned, *Tarantula* has, a shade surprisingly perhaps, been rendered into that language no less than four times, once in Argentina and thrice in Spain. For the lyrics, the process of translation began with the two-volume set *Escríritos, Canciones y Dibujos*, in versions by Carlos Álvarez and published by Editorial R. Aguilera/Ediciones Castilla (Madrid) in 1975. This was an officially authorised, bilingual Spanish/English volume, rendering all of Dylan’s 1973 volume *Writings and Drawings*, prose texts included, plus the subsequent lyrics up to *Blood on the Tracks*. A slimmed-down version of the Álvarez translations (reduced to the songs from the main albums) was later issued by Editorial Fundamentos (Madrid) in two volumes - again bilingual - entitled *Canciones 1* and *Canciones 2* and published in 1984 and 1985 respectively. For more than two decades there was no further authorised lyrics translation. The gap was filled in 1999 by the volume *Del Huracán a las Tierras Altas: Escritos y canciones 1975-1997*, covering the period from *Desire* to *Time out of Mind*, translated by Antonio Iriarte and Francisco García and published in Valencia by Masked Tortilla Productions. This translation received authorisation from Dylan’s copyright administrators, but at the cost of two somewhat stringent conditions: no English parallel text, and a severely restricted print-run (it appeared as a limited edition of 250 copies). It was a rather more professional volume than the Álvarez effort, but the conditions imposed deprived it a priori of two of the earlier translation’s practical advantages, namely bilingual format and ready availability\(^4\). The picture has since been updated with the appearance in 2007 of the officially sanctioned (bilingual and annotated) Spanish translation of *Lyrics 1962-2001* – published as *Letras 1962-2001* by (again) Global Rhythm, jointly with Alfaguara of Madrid, and (again) (co-)translated by Miquel Izquierdo, in collaboration with Juan Moreno. It may be noted that all these versions of Dylan’s lyrics have appeared in Spain: there does not appear to be any lyrics translation originating in Latin America (nor, to date, has there been systematic translation of the lyrics into Catalan).

Before entering on a detailed discussion of the translation in question, it is necessary to situate the two texts, *Chronicles* and *Crónicas*, as, respectively, an English-language original and a translation intended for a Spanish-speaking readership. To start with the original, it

---

2 The appearance of *Volume One* had upon our attempts to enjoy, follow, analyse, or account for Dylan’s art and career?*’ (Scobie, 1) - the implied answer being, of course: incalculable!

3 My thanks to Arie de Reus for providing information on the book’s translation history.

4 Carrera has also translated *Lyrics 1962-2001* and (with Santo Pettinato) *Tarantula* into Italian: for details, see Carrera (2009), 104.

4 For a detailed examination of this translation, see my review (Rollason 2000).
should be sufficiently obvious that *Chronicles* is in the first place a product of the culture (however defined) of the United States, alongside the British one of the two linguistically and cultural dominant subsets of an English-speaking world that is itself larger than the sum of those two countries; that a British reader, as also one from Australia, South Africa, etc, will not perceive certain American constructions or colloquialisms as immediately “natural” or “accessible”, and the book will thus exert a certain strangeness effect even within Anglophone culture; and that the “American culture” which produced *Chronicles* is itself far from being homogeneous, recalling the enormously complex ethnic make-up of US society and, indeed, Bob Dylan’s own non-WASP, Ukrainian-Jewish origins. Furthermore, this book will be read by readers of English who are not native speakers – by users of English as a second language in, say, India or Singapore, and (Dylan here perhaps constituting a special case) by Dylan fans worldwide who are not native or second-language speakers of English but have grown up listening to their idol’s songs in English and may prefer to read his memoir in the original rather than in their own language.

In the case of the recipient culture (or cultures), it is important to stress that any notion of a homogeneous “Spanish”, “Hispanic” or “Hispanophone” readership is a false simplification. The present translation is published in Barcelona and intended for a market located in the first place in Spain. Appearing under a Spanish imprint, it is also exportable to up to eighteen Latin American republics plus, potentially, the Hispanic communities in the US, as well as expatriate Hispanophone communities in Europe and elsewhere. However, it should already be clear that the very terms “Spain” and “Hispanic” give rise to discontinuities that complicate the definition of the cultures of both origin and destination.

*Chronicles* has been translated in Spain by a Spanish translator (albeit with a Catalan first name, Miquel), and, while the aim is no doubt to deploy a Spanish that is equally comprehensible to Latin American readers in the framework of international standard Spanish, it is evident that idioms and colloquialisms are likely to be rendered by their equivalents as used in Spain, and thus may not appear as particularly “familiar” or “ours” to a reader in Buenos Aires or Bogotá (it should be stressed nonetheless that, unlike in the case of Portuguese, there is only one Spanish-language version of *Chronicles* – in other words, the differences between variants of Spanish are not so great as to make a version translated in Spain in any way unreadable or unsaleable in Mexico, Chile or wherever). Even so, and even considering the peninsular readership alone, the very concepts of “Spain” and “Spanish” emerge as problematic: Spain has not one but four official languages - Spanish, Catalan, Galician and the non-Romance Basque - and many inhabitants of some of what are called the “nations and regions of the Spanish state” view the terms “España” and “el español” as politically incorrect and insist on using “el Estado español” (“the Spanish state”) and “el castellano” (Castilian). This linguistic pluralism or particularism affects the translation

---

5 For present purposes, the main case in point is Catalan (since *Chronicles* has been translated into that language). Catalan, a Romance language as old as Spanish, is the co-official language with Spanish in three regions of Spain (Catalonia, the Balearic Islands and – under the name Valencian – the Valencia region). It is also spoken in the French region of Languedoc-Roussillon, in Andorra (of which mini-state it is the sole official language), and in the locality of Alghero in Sardinia (Italy). Catalan was banned under General Franco in the aftermath of the Spanish Civil War. In today’s Catalonia, it is in numerous contexts considered more important
market in Spain, especially in Catalonia, where the Spanish version of a foreign-language book often has to compete with the Catalan version, and it is not uncommon for both language versions to appear simultaneously. In the case of Crónicas, indeed, the Catalan translation (Cròniques, Volum 1, translated by Toni Cardona, Barcelona: Global Rhythm Press, 2005) – interestingly enough, issued by the same publisher as the Spanish version – appeared at much the same time. In a further twist, a Catalan (or Basque or Galician) who reads Crónicas will be reading it not as a first-language but a second-language speaker of Spanish. In Latin American countries too, indigenous languages such as Quechua in Peru also constitute some readers of a Spanish translation as second-language readers. Matters are further complicated by the existence of a Hispanophone readership in the United States, a country which directly incorporates a part of Latin America in the form of Puerto Rico, and is home to a large (and growing) Hispanic population of Mexican, Cuban and other origins. US Hispanics who choose to read Dylan’s memoir in Spanish rather than English will be reading a version in their language of origin of a product of the larger culture which surrounds them – an American culture which, given their minority/migrant status but also allowing for varying degrees of integration, is simultaneously ‘home’ and ‘not-home’, familiar and alien. All this should remind us that translation is never a neutral or transparent act.

Despite these complexities, a factor that also needs to be stressed is Bob Dylan’s objective and undoubted long-term popularity across the Spanish-speaking world. The depth and durability of the singer-songwriter’s reception in Hispanophone circles is attested by multiple elements: his repeated concert tours in Spain and Hispano-America (he has played Mexico, Argentina, Uruguay and Chile), numerous cover versions of his songs in Spanish (and in other languages used in Spain including Catalan, Galician and Asturian), avowed confessions of influence from Hispanophone musicians, favourable press coverage over decades, Dylan books in Spanish (original and translated), Spanish-language fanzines, and, indeed, university seminars on his work (in the last few years, in Peru, Bolivia and Spain). Less-trodden roads also link Dylan to the Hispanic world in unexpected ways: “Blowin’ in the Wind”, transformed with all but unrecognisable lyrics into the Catholic hymn “Sabemos que vendrás” (“We know you will come”), has become a regular presence in the liturgy of Latin American congregations in Mexico, Bolivia and elsewhere. Something of this Hispano-Dylan reality has been charted, for Spain, in Francisco García’s book of 2000, Bob Dylan en España: Mapas de carretera para el alma6 and, for the Hispanic world as a whole, in my own article, published in Oral Tradition in 2007, “‘Sólo Soy Un Guatarrista’: Bob Dylan in the Spanish-Speaking World—Influences, Parallels, Reception, and Translation”.6 Crónicas itself was extremely well received on publication in 2005 by the national press in Spain8, which multiplied favourable reviews; the book was also mentioned in the citation for the prestigious Prince of Asturias Prize for the Arts, awarded to Dylan in Spain in 20079.

---

7 Oral Tradition has been an online-only journal since 2007. A longer version of my study is available online under the title “Guitars and Tarantulas: The Spanish-Speaking World and the Work of Bob Dylan” (Rollason 2007b).
8 See Manrique (2005), Fresán (2005), Krmpotic (2005). For a Peruvian review (also very favourable) of the original English-language Chronicles, see Klingenberger (2004).
9 For this prize and event, see Rollason (2007a).
detailed analysis of the translation of Dylan’s memoir will inevitably be coloured by this awareness of the degree to which Dylan’s work has permeated Hispanophone culture.

The nature of *Chronicles* as text requires comment, since a successful translation strategy will necessarily be predicated on the characteristics of the source text, among them genre, style and intertextuality. Dylan’s book is not exactly a conventional autobiography, and – following Michael Gray\(^{10}\) - I have preferred throughout this essay to call it a memoir instead. *Chronicles* refuses to conform to two of the expected features of an autobiography, namely linearity and completeness. Its narrative describes a non-chronological circle, starting in 1961-62 (chapters 1 and 2), jumping to 1970 (chapter 3) and 1989 (chapter 4) and then returning to 1961-62 for the final chapter (starting at an earlier time-point than chapter 1). The most celebrated events in Dylan’s career are almost all left out, and the two albums whose making is described in detail – *New Morning* in chapter 3 and *Oh Mercy* in chapter 4 – are neither of them among his best-known works. The future volumes 2 and 3, if they materialise, may be expected to follow a similar pattern (Dylan has talked of volume 2 including chapters on the celebrated *Blonde and Blonde* album from 1966 and 1990’s much more obscure *Under the Red Sky*), and a complete three-volume *Chronicles* would be likely to resemble a mosaic or a jigsaw, not a straight line from A to Z. In addition and as critics have pointed out in detail\(^{11}\), the dividing-line between fact and fiction in Dylan’s narrative is problematic, and while many details may be approximately or genuinely true it does not follow that they photographically reproduce what “actually” happened. Stylistically, *Chronicles* may be described as a hybrid of oral and written, informal and formal registers that will inevitably challenge the translator (the book’s Italian renderer, Alessandro Carrera, speaks of “the strangeness of Dylan’s prose” and of how he “writes the way he sings”, characterising him as “an ‘oral’ writer”\(^{12}\). Dylan’s book has its evident stylistic models: there is a visible influence from the “hard-boiled” style made famous by Raymond Chandler (short sentences, lack of ornamental adjectives, paucity of connectives)\(^{13}\), and behind the young Dylan’s laconically recalled observation of New York places and characters there is, surely, an even younger voice, that of J.D. Salinger’s Holden Caulfield\(^{14}\). In addition, *Chronicles* is a book liberally strewn with intertextual references, to Dylan’s own songs of course but also to an enormous range of works by others, literary, musical and more. Beyond this and as with the recent albums “Love and Theft” (which draws on Japanese writer Junichi Saga) and *Modern Times* (which quotes Ovid and Confederate poet Henry Timrod), Dylan’s book has been discovered – thanks notably to the indefatigable Scott Warmuth\(^{15}\) - to contain a substantial number of embedded quotations from other works - transformed by context yet close-to-call in their resemblance - ranging from a shelf of novels by Jack London through a

---

\(^{10}\) See Gray (2006), 137 : “it clearly isn’t an autobiography but that lesser and more reasonably partial thing, a memoir, and never claims to be more”.

\(^{11}\) See, for instance, Clinton Heylin (2005), quoted in Gray (2006), 137.

\(^{12}\) Carrera (2009), 100, 102, 85.

\(^{13}\) On this point, we may also note a recent stylistic comparison of Dylan with another ‘hard-boiled’ exponent, Damon Runyon (Whitehouse 2010).

\(^{14}\) Carrera suggests the Salinger comparison, and also posits stylistic analogies with Ernest Hemingway, Jack Kerouac and Saul Bellow (Carrera 101-102).

\(^{15}\) Cf. Scott Warmuth’s contribution to this volume (SPECIFY)
guidebook to New Orleans and historical works on the US Civil War. The very title too, has intertextual implications, going so far as to evoke biblical authority, since 1 Chronicles and 2 Chronicles are books of the Old Testament. All in all, the nature of the source text is such as to make it likely to pose, from the beginning, any number of potential headaches for its translator into any language.

Nonetheless, in strictly physical and material terms, if we place the two hardbacks Chronicles and Crónicas side by side we will note immediately that the translation is offered and marketed as the absolute double of the original. Crónicas has a dust jacket identical on both sides to that of Chronicles and a word-for-word translation (in no way localised) of the blurb. The font and font size are the same, and if the page count differs (Crónicas ends at page 300 and Chronicles at page 293), that is only because the original fails to paginate the front matter, which in the Spanish version receives page numbers, the former thus beginning at page 3 and the latter at page 11. Crónicas has no introduction, no Translator’s Note and no glossary: a mere two translator’s footnotes (if I have counted correctly) constitute the sole, minor variation on the original. There is surely a conception of translation behind all this: comparison of the two volumes suggests a notion on the translator’s part that the aim of a translation is to resemble the original as much as possible.

III

It will now be useful to examine certain contemporary tendencies in the academic study of translation, which we may then go on to juxtapose, explicitly or implicitly under our critical microscope, with what might actually be happening in this particular translation. Translation Studies as a fully-fledged academic discipline, complete with undergraduate and graduate courses, manuals, chairs and conferences, is a relatively new subject area which came into being only around 1980, but has developed fast over its three decades of existence – in parallel with other “new” disciplines such as postcolonial studies and postcolonial studies, which in some ways it resembles. Translation as an activity had, of course, nonetheless been subject to conceptual interrogation by writers and academics in earlier times, and we may here go back briefly to some of the predecessors of today’s academic trends in the field.

One of the great thinkers of the twentieth century, Walter Benjamin - a name cited with reverence in Translation Studies circles even though he produced only a sliver of reflections on the subject, essentially in two essays – argued philosophically in favour of an ontological equality of source and translated texts. For Benjamin, translation is a matter not of similarity or identity (translated text copies source text) but of affinity in difference (translated text and source text are two objects that are separate yet akin and equal in value). In his early, esoteric text “On Language as Such and on the Language of Man” (1916), he affirms: “Translation attains its full meaning in the realisation that every evolved language … can be considered as a translation of all the others”, perceiving translation as a succession not of similarities but of transformations, and thus pointing towards a vision of source and translated text as equal.

---

16 Warmuth states variously: “Dylan has hidden many puzzles, jokes, secret messages, secondary meanings, and bizarre subtexts in his book” (2010a, 71); “The masterstroke in Chronicles: Volume One is that Dylan incorporated an initially visible second book beneath its surface” (83); “I’ve discussed Dylan’s use of the words of others with a number of people and they all agree that Dylan is indeed up to something” (2010b).

17 Benjamin (1979), 117.
on the level of being. In the better-known essay “The Task of the Translator” (1923)\(^{18}\), he further develops this insight, arguing against the notion of a translation as a mere simulacrum of the original: “a translation, instead of resembling the meaning of the original, must lovingly and in detail incorporate the original’s mode of signification, thus making both the original and the translation recognizable as fragments of a greater language”\(^{19}\) – a position which points towards a concept of translation as a form of dialogue.

The issue of the relationship between source and translated texts is closely bound up with an antithesis which, though no new invention, today receives much attention in Translation Studies, namely that between the domestic and the foreign. Benjamin’s comments here are significant. In “The Task of the Translator”, he approvingly quotes an earlier commentator, Rudolf Pannwitz, who, writing in 1917, said: “Our translations, even the best ones, proceed from a wrong premise. They want to turn Hindi, Greek, English into German instead of turning German into Greek, Hindi, English. (…) The basic error of the translator is that he preserves the state in which his own language happens to be instead of allowing his language to be profoundly affected by the foreign tongue. (…) [Rather], he must expand and deepen his language by means of the foreign language”\(^{20}\).

This Benjamin-Pannwitz position looks both forwards and backwards, to the theories of Friedrich Schleiermacher in the early nineteenth century and Lawrence Venuti in our own day. In his influential essay of 1813, “On the Different Methods of Translating”, Schleiermacher argued that in translation strategy “there are only two possibilities. Either the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the writer toward him”\(^{21}\). He preferred the former option - i.e. the translator highlights the otherness of the translated text, by “striving to adhere so closely to the foreign text as his own language allows”. For Schleiermacher, if this method obliges the reader to make more effort and may yield translations that appear “harsh and stiff”\(^{22}\), it is certainly superior to the other, less demanding approach. The latter, aiming at “lightness and naturalness of style”\(^{23}\) and seeking to “spare its reader all exertion and toil”\(^{24}\), smooths over the alien features of the foreign-language text, insouciantly omits or replaces whole passages, and risks occluding the differences between what we would now call source and target languages (and, we should add, the cultures behind them).

Schleiermacher’s notion of the “two methods” has been taken up by a whole school of latter-day translation theorists who have named them, respectively, foreignisation (typically seen, as George Orwell, would put it, as four-legs-good) and domestication (seen as, again in

\(^{18}\) This essay was originally published as a preface to Benjamin’s own translation of poems by Baudelaire (Tableaux parisiens), and is therefore not purely theoretical in scope, seeking also to justify its author’s own translation practice.

\(^{19}\) Benjamin (1973), 78.


\(^{21}\) Schleiermacher (2004), 49.

\(^{22}\) Schleiermacher, 53.

\(^{23}\) Schleiermacher, 54.

\(^{24}\) Schleiermacher, 55.
Orwell’s terminology, two-legs-bad). The high priest here is the American translator and translation scholar Lawrence Venuti, who is famously fierce in his opposition to what Schleiermacher termed “lightness and naturalness” and Venuti himself calls “fluency”. Venuti has expounded his positions in his book *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*, first published in 1995 (an expanded second edition appeared in 2008) and in a series of shorter pieces. His book has all but achieved received gospel status on what might be called the “Translation Studies left”, though it should be noted that, despite its subtitle (and its author’s oft-repeated anti-imperialist political stance), it deals entirely with the nature and history of translation (from a range of mostly major European languages, ancient and modern) into English.

Venuti starts out in *The Translator’s Invisibility* from the surely rather harsh, but no doubt suitably radical-sounding position that all translation is an act of ethnocentric violence. He denounces “the violence that resides in the very purpose and activity of translation ... always configured in hierarchies of domination and marginality”, viewing translation as “the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text with a text that is intelligible to the translating-language reader”\(^\text{25}\) To counter this endemic tendency, he argues that a translation should not read as if it were an original (the translation thus appearing ‘fluent’ and the translator ‘invisible’), but should wear its translatedness on its sleeve, thus making its translator and his or her activity 'visible'. His essay of 2000, “Neoclassicism and Enlightenment”, historically contextualises his position as regards translation into English, arguing that the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries “witnessed the decisive emergence of fluency as the most prevalent strategy” (with Alexander Pope’s Homer as the supreme example). Translators’ “overriding project”, he states, “was to make the foreign recognisably, even splendidly English”: “Translation strategies were rarely wedded to a programme for preserving the foreignness of the foreign text. On the contrary, they were guided primarily by domestic values that were assuming cultural dominance”\(^\text{26}\). Elsewhere, in a text of 2004, Venuti defines his bipolar terms as follows: “Fluency masks a domestication of the foreign text that is appropriative and potentially imperialistic ... It can be countered by “foreignising” translation that registers the irreducible differences of the foreign text”.\(^\text{27}\) He believes that domestication remains the dominant mode today, at least in Anglophone cultures, despite the efforts of a minority - to whom Venuti himself has offered consistent ideological support - to advance the rival cause of foreignisation. Venuti’s ideas and terminology have become fashionable to the point of orthodoxy in Translation Studies circles: the influence of his book and its concepts of domestication/foreignisation are comparable to those of Edward Said’s *Orientalism* in postcolonial studies or Jean-François Lyotard’s *La condition postmoderne* and his concept of "grand narratives" in postmodern studies: certainly, few in Translation Studies today would dare praise a translation as "fluent"!

Venuti’s aim - to denaturalise translation and ensure it does not become a mere act of textual appropriation – may be seen as in itself laudable, as a means of seeking that equality between

\(^{25}\) Venuti (2008), 14.
\(^{26}\) Venuti (2000), 55.
\(^{27}\) Venuti (2004), 334.
original and translation to which Benjamin aspired. It may be asked, however, whether his binary antithesis is actually necessary (Venuti himself contends that in fact the antithesis is not a “binary opposition” but an encoding of “ethical attitudes”\(^{28}\), but one may still counter-argue that binariness is written into a terminology that opposes “home” and “abroad”). Inevitably, in reality there will be a continuum; any translation in practice will combine one and the other strategy, in the interests of intelligibility and, indeed, of selling the book and finding and keeping readers. At the same time, though, a given translator, in the context of a given translation, will no doubt prefer to use one or other of Schleiermacher’s “two methods” more frequently than the other – or, alternatively (a possibility not considered by Venuti) to privilege neither, seeking and striking, rather, a deft balance between author and reader.

Allowing the antithesis formed by the \textit{two methods} to be legitimate, one may question the usefulness of the terminology used by Venuti and others to describe it, and ask whether \textit{domestication} and \textit{foreignisation} are really appropriate labels in a rapidly globalising context like that of the present. To speak of the \textit{domestic} and the \textit{foreign} appears, to say the least, problematic, at all events for today’s global languages such as English or Spanish, even if they may be acceptable referring to the Augustan England described by Venuti. “Domestic”, derived from Latin “domus” (home), implies that a given language has a single “home”, which is certainly not the case with Spanish or English today; while to speak of the “foreign” presupposes that the national and the alien, “us” and “them”, always diverge along language lines. In the twenty-first century, a novel translated into English will be read not only by native speakers but by non-Anglophone purchasers in, say, Holland or Denmark. Nor do native speakers form a single community that can be called “home”. Argentinian readers complain about incomprehensible Mexicanisms in translations imported from Mexico; an English-language original, too, can encounter communication barriers when crossing the Atlantic. Conversely, what happens if both source and target cultures are partly internationalised, as is surely the case with English and Spanish? Do Shakespeare and Cervantes, Turner and Picasso, belong solely and entirely to their English and Spanish cultures of origin, or are they also part of a more universal “greater Western” culture, and if so, how “foreign” is a reference to Hamlet to a Hispanic reader or one to Don Quixote to an Anglophone reader? Venuti, however, seems congenitally wedded to a crude binary of "home" and "abroad": even in a recent essay, “Translation, Empiricism, Ethics” (2010), he continues to invoke an essentialised \textit{foreignness} (“a foreigner's speech”; “foreign languages, texts and cultures”); thus participating in his lexical choices in the reductivist them-and-us mentality typical of the Anglophone cultures he claims to oppose\(^{29}\).

Given the multiplicity of real situations which the opposition \textit{domestic/foreign} seems inadequate to cover, it may now be desirable to seek an alternative terminology. The \textit{domestic/foreign} binary is no longer immune to being questioned even in Anglophone Translation Studies circles. Thus, Verena Conley (2010), while not openly criticising Venuti as such, adverts that “global languages … are no longer simply national” and that there are

\(^{28}\) Venuti (2008), 19.

\(^{29}\) Venuti (2010), 75, 80; my italics.
circumstances when “the opposition between host and foreigner ... no longer quite holds”\textsuperscript{30}. The most valuable insights, however, appear to be coming from Asia. Work currently being done in Taiwan questions the universal validity of Venuti’s concepts and argues they need rescuing from Anglocentrism. Hsin-hsin Tu (2010) takes the view that Venuti’s positions “should not be seen as a paradigm because of a very simple fact: Venuti is speaking within the center of the culturally and linguistically dominant”, and counter-argues: “Domestication has a different meaning for the two sides. For the dominant cultures, it is a way to erase the foreign and smooth out the translated works; for the non-dominant cultures, on the contrary, it is a way to absorb the foreign and accommodate themselves to it” (by “non-dominant” she appears to mean all cultures but Anglophone culture). She thus questions the automatic applicability of Venuti’s binary to texts translated into languages other than English, on the grounds that “the situation of English-speaking culture doesn’t always apply to other cultures” – a “self-evident fact” that, according to the Taiwanese scholar, “tends to be overshadowed by the desire to flow with the current tide of globalization”\textsuperscript{31}. From another Asian perspective, the growing contribution being made to Translation Studies from India has a potentially significant role to play, enriched as it is by India’s own centuries-old tradition of translation between the country’s many languages, employing parameters often very different from those of the west. The translation scholar G.J.V. Prasad (2010) sees translation as “the addition of souls from both languages, a creative coming together, a commingling that gives rise to a completely individual text” – indeed, as “a reverberation, a commentary, a piece of new writing ... a reincarnation”\textsuperscript{32}. On similar lines, the poet-translator Anuraag Sharma (2008), introducing his own translations of Australian poets into Hindi, affirms that “the art of translation is a ... yogic ‘kriya’ [action] which involves the transmigration of one’s soul into the body of the original poet / author”\textsuperscript{33}, and that “translation is an arch – a covenant like a rainbow”\textsuperscript{34}. Such images of commingling and transmigration may be counterposed to Venuti’s concept of translation as violence. They point to a possible meeting-point with Benjamin’s notion of source and target texts as ontologically equal, and suggest a way forward for models of translation conceived in terms not of irrevocably skewed power-relations but of dialogue between texts and cultures. Indeed, I would suggest – and have done so in detail in an article published in India in 2010, “Beyond the Domestic and the Foreign: Translation as Dialogue” - an alternative terminology of the naturalising and the dialogic\textsuperscript{35}. Naturalising translation would be that which avoids risks and efforts for its readers, minimising the differences between their own world and that of the translated texts; dialogic translation, by contrast, would rejoice in the surprises and complexities of open intercultural meeting in a globalised world\textsuperscript{36}. What may now prove interesting is how the detailed comparison of Chronicles and Crónicas, of Dylan’s original text and its simulacrum

\textsuperscript{30} Conlry (2010), 21.
\textsuperscript{31} Tu (2010), Internet reference.
\textsuperscript{32} Prasad (2010), 12.
\textsuperscript{33} Sharma (2008), 7.
\textsuperscript{34} Sharma, 8.
\textsuperscript{35} Rollason (2010).
\textsuperscript{36} I am here comforted by the MLA-approved observations of Sandra Bermann (2010), who evokes “the dialogue intrinsic to the language of translation” (86).
in Spanish, relates to all or any of the various translational positions, established or evolving, which I have attempted to sketch.

IV

The first thing to say is that, according to traditional (non-Venutian?) expectations of translational quality, Miquel Izquierdo has done an excellent job: few errors or omissions, racy American idioms rendered by their Spanish equivalents, due sensitivity to American cultural particulars. The second thing is that whether Crónicas can usefully be evaluated in terms of Venuti’s theories, or whether it throws up, rather, aspects of the translation process which might cast doubt on those same theories, is a matter that can only be teased out by detailed analysis. The comments on the translation that follow will endeavour to take account of both perspectives, though how many actual readers of Crónicas are likely to be Translation Studies professionals or acolytes of Lawrence Venuti is anyone’s guess.

To kick off with manifest mistranslations, and while it is not my intention to draw up a punitive error sheet, this is an aspect of evident importance, and some at least of the more obvious howlers require attention. Thus, “female impersonator” is misrendered as “una imitadora” (a woman who impersonates, rather than a man who impersonates a woman - 18 ES, 10 EN); “moonshine” is translated literally as “la luz de la luna” rather than recognised in its colloquial sense of “bootleg whisky” (52 ES, 44 EN); “the quick earth” becomes “la tierra veloz” (115 ES, 107 EN), the translator not having realised that “quick” here appears not in the usual sense of “rapid” but in the archaic sense of “living”; “blank verse” (a form which does not exist in Spanish-language poetry) is translated as “verso libre”, as if Shakespeare wrote like Whitman (120 ES, 112 EN); “football” appears as “fútbol” (soccer) when the context obviously points to American football (“fútbol americano” - 137 ES, 129 EN) - though later (240 ES, 232 EN), the translator gets it right; the reference to Daniel Lanois “working out of New Orleans” (i.e. using the city as his base) becomes “trabajaba en las afueras de Nueva Orleans” (“working on the outskirts of New Orleans” – 183 ES, 176 EN); the “demon lovers” of Anglo-American folksong (the devil disguised as a lover) become “adoradores del diablo” (“devil-worshippers” – 244 ES, 236 EN); and, in a very rare musical misprision, the R&B singer Bobby Blue Bland becomes “la Bobby Blue Band” (267 ES, 260 EN)!

The last-named is an error of fact; otherwise, these errors arise variously from misunderstanding of idiom, failure to recognise set collocations, and lack of contextual awareness. However, the actual rarity of such errors in the translation does conversely point to Izquierdo’s advanced knowledge of English and his general ability to avoid such traps. The “demon lovers” mistake is particularly interesting, as it derives at one and the same time from a misrecognised collocation and a lack of familiarity with Dylan’s roots. In fact, “The Demon Lover” is an alternate title for the traditional ballad “House Carpenter”, as performed by Dylan on The Bootleg Series vols. 1-3 - which collection also includes a version of the bootlegger’s song “Moonshiner”, a listen to which might have spared the translator another of

37 From here on, parenthetical references in the text will be to the page numbers of Crónicas (ES) and Chronicles (EN).
his errors. Obviously, Izquierdo is not familiar with Dylan’s Demon Lover, Clinton Heylin’s detailed study of “House Carpenter” and its presence in Dylan’s oeuvre (Heylin 1999).

Where the translation suffers from omissions, the motivation appears generally to be cultural, the translator no doubt wishing to spare his readers excessive overload from American culture. Thus, quintessentially American phrases like “Ivy League” (14 EN) or “Jim Crow” (18 EN) are simply dropped; equally, some references to figures from Anglophone culture – e.g. that to the hypnotist Svengali, created by the British writer George du Maurier in his novel Trilby, but in Crónicas robed of his name and metamorphosed into “el chamán” (the shaman – 251 ES, 245 EN) - are airbrushed out, presumably as too obscure for Hispanophone readers. In such cases, Venuti would no doubt charge Izquierdo with domesticating Dylan’s text for his readership, manipulatively masking its essential foreignness.

In other cases, the translator has, rather than omitting, opted for an only approximate rendition of an American cultural specificity, most likely because no exact equivalent exists in Hispanic cultures. Thus, “chain gang workers” become the less specific “presidiarios” (“prison inmates” – 75 ES, 68 EN); President Andrew Jackson’s nickname “Old Hickory” is rendered as “savia americana” (literally, American sap – 205 ES, 198 EN); “backwoodsman” becomes “pueblerino” (“small-town dweller” – 206 ES, 198 EN), eliding the pioneer/frontier connotations of the American term. When Dylan stays temporarily at a fraternity in Minneapolis, the Spanish term chosen (“club estudiantil”, i.e. “student club” – 243 ES, 235 EN) fail to convey the full sense of that very American concept (connoting both association and accommodation); and, since there is nonetheless an approximate Spanish equivalent, “colegio mayor” (in Spain, a student residence that also serves cultural functions), this is a case where a translator’s note would have helped. Again, where the song “What Was It You Wanted?” is described as sounding, at the Lanois sessions, “like a gumbo”, the translation, “como un potaje” (like a stew – 219 ES, 211 EN) lacks “gumbo”’s trademark Louisiana stamp. In none of these cases, however, should the translator, who can reasonably plead translational impossibility, be charged with deliberately occluding Dylan’s Americanness.

Conversely to the omissions, the translation is also studded with occasional additions, whose purpose is obviously (also in the absence of translator’s notes) to make some of the American cultural allusions more comprehensible to the Hispanophone reader. Thus, more information is provided than in the original in cases such as Pretty Boy Floyd (defined as a bank-robber outlaw – 47 ES, 39 EN), West Point (specified as a military academy – 50 ES, 42 EN), the San Bernardino Angels baseball team (here the Spanish-speaking reader gets more information than a British reader innocent of baseball probably would glean from the original – 86 ES, 79 EN), or the Twin Cities (i.e. Minneapolis and St Paul - 249 ES, 241 EN). Glosses of this nature obviously increase the translation’s accessibility to its readers, and surely in such cases Venuti could not reasonably object to the translator spelling out the details of the original’s foreignness?

An area where the translator, perhaps confusingly, alternates between hispanicising the text and not doing so is the onomastic one of the titles of works: Dylan cites large numbers of
book, song, theatre play and film titles, and in *Crónicas* some are translated while others are left alone. For instance, the title of Eugene O’Neill’s play *Long Day’s Journey into Night* is translated (174 ES, 167 EN), as is that of Jack Kerouac’s novel *On the Road* (243 ES, 235 EN); by contrast, there is no attempt to hispanicise the title of Archibald McLeish’s play *Scratch*, which plays an important part in chapter 4. Johnny Cash’s song title “I Walk the Line” remains in English, although when Dylan quotes a line from it, it appears in Spanish (224 ES, 217 EN). Dylan’s own song and album titles, be it noted, appear always in English. Particularly relevant here is the long sequence in chapter 2 (43-50, 53-54 ES; 35-41, 45-46 EN) where Dylan runs through the books in Ray Gooch and Chloe Kiel’s enormous library in their New York apartment, where we are asked to believe (with an implicit nod, it may be, to Poe and Borges) that Dylan stumbled on large swathes of his literary education. In this section, Izquierdo chooses to render all the titles in Spanish – thus referring to, for instance, Machiavelli’s *Il Principe / The Prince* as *El príncipe* (44 ES, 36 EN), Rousseau’s *Le Contrat social / The Social Contract* as *El contrato social* (45 ES, 36 EN), Faulkner’s *The Sound and The Fury* as *El ruido y la furia* (45 ES, 37 EN), or Freud’s *Jenseits des Lustprinzip / Beyond the Pleasure Principle* as *Más allá del principio del placer* (46 ES, 37 EN). Such hispanicisation appears justifiable if we consider that these books belong to an transnational Western heritage and are available in Spanish translation, and an actual majority are not original English titles anyway. In general across *Crónicas*, the translator’s rule of thumb appears to be that, Dylan’s own song titles apart, titles of works that are reasonably likely to be already known to the target reader should be hispanicised, while those which are not should stay in English.

Meanwhile, on a related aspect – the translation of actual song texts or extracts – we may note what can only be described as a translational loss, in certain cases where fragments of song texts, his own or others’, quoted by Dylan are translated but rhyme and rhythm disappear. Thus, when Dylan quotes a pair of lines from the traditional song “Frankie and Albert” (as covered by him on *Good As I Been to You*): “Frankie was a good girl. Everybody knows. Paid a hundred dollars for Albert’s new suit of clothes”, Izquierdo offers the non-rhyming: “Frankie era una buena chica. Todo el mundo lo sabe. Pagó cien dólares por el nuevo traje de Albert’ (284 ES, 276 EN). At moments like this, readers are likely to suddenly remember that they are reading a translation.

This aspect in fact raises a major translation crux in *Chronicles* – i.e. how to render one of the book’s most problematic elements, namely what might be called the dummy lyrics from *Oh Mercy* which appear at intervals in Dylan’s account of the recording sessions for that album with Daniel Lanois (173-181 ES, 165-174 EN). Dylan offers what he claims are alternate lyrics later discarded, for five of the album’s songs, at the rate of one extra stanza each for: “Political World”, “What Good Am I?” “Disease of Conceit”, “What Was It You Wanted?” and “Everything is Broken”. These “extra lyrics”, as Dylan calls them - or “versos de sobra” (leftover verses) in Izquierdo’s translation (175 ES, 168 EN) - are a less innocent presence than they might appear: first, they are to be found on no known outtake from the sessions, official (the *Tell-Tale Signs* compilation has an alternate version of “Everything is Broken”)
or non-official\textsuperscript{38}; and second, they are by any standards downright bad – inferior to any stanzas included in the released songs, in which they would, to put it mildly, not have been at home. Izquierdo chooses to translate these lyrics literally, eschewing rhyme and rhythm, and thus their consummate badness does not fully come across (for “What Good Am I?” there is also an omission, the words “If I’m right in the thick of it and I don’t know why” [168 EN] not being translated). As an example, we may take “Disease of Conceit” - English: “There’s a whole lot of people dreaming tonight about the disease of conceit, a whole lot of people screaming tonight about the disease of conceit. I’ll hump ya and I’ll dump ya and I’ll blow your house down. I’ll slice into your cake before you leave town. Pick a number – take a seat, with the disease of conceit”; Spanish: “Hay gran cantidad de gente soñando esta noche en el mal de la vanidad. Hay gran cantidad de gente gritando esta noche en el mal de la vanidad. Te levantaré, te dejaré caer y derribaré tu casa. Cortaré un trozo de tu tarta antes de abandonar la ciudad. Agarra número y siéntate víctima del mal de la vanidad” (179 ES, 171 EN). The fairy-tale (“big bad wolf”) reference in “blow your house down” disappears, as does the aggressive colloquialism of “slice into your cake”. My own take on this whole sequence is that those lyrics never existed – Dylan improvised them while writing the chapter – and that he is in reality playing games with that section of Dylan fandom which is obsessed with out-takes and alternative lyrics. Indeed, he may even be satirising those who believe his later work to be inferior by deliberately plugging bad “later lyrics”. Such nuances, however, do not immediately emerge from the translation, and may, indeed, be a limit-case of \textit{Chronicles’} translatability.

A special form of omission is \textit{omitted intertextuality}. The likes of Warmuth and Carrera, as we have seen, have identified a wide range of textual borrowings in \textit{Chronicles}, and these, however one judges them, simply cannot be reproduced in a translation and will inevitably be elided for the Spanish-speaking reader. More complex problems, arguably, are posed by another type of intertextuality, namely between the prose of \textit{Chronicles} and Dylan’s own song texts. Here and there across the book, a phrase or allusion, consciously or unconsciously, recalls one of his songs even if the song as such is not flagged in the text. In such cases, Izquierdo, who is after all also the co-translator of \textit{Lyrics}, could, had he been particularly ingenious, have translated such tell-tale phrases with their equivalents from actual Spanish versions of the song texts (though not all would recognise the allusions). Thus, where Dylan speaks of the “frostbitten North Country”, the Spanish text has “el norte glacial” (the glacial north – 17 ES, 9 EN), thus losing the chance to evoke the song titles “Girl of the North Country” and “North Country Blues”. “Girl of the North Country” is recalled again in the phrase “howling winds”, rendered literally as “aulladores vientos” (238 ES, 230 EN), and a group of celebrities are described as “all from the North Country”, translated as “todos norteños” (all from the North – 299 ES, 292 EN). In neither case is it likely that Hispanic readers will start hearing the song from \textit{The Freewheelin’ Bob Dylan} in their heads. In a New Orleans episode preceding the composition of “Man in the Long Black Coat”, the English text has, in the sentence “Their consciences, God help them, were vile and depraved”, a clear

\textsuperscript{38} This sequence also includes a list of alternate characters (rather than lines) for the song “Dignity”, recorded at the \textit{Oh Mercy} sessions but released only some years later. \textit{Tell-Tale Signs} features two outtakes of this song, both including alternate stanzas, but with no trace of any of the alleged characters named in \textit{Chronicles}. 
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reference to a line from the song (“He said every man’s conscience is vile and depraved”) - a link lost in the translation, which reads: “Que Dios les ayude: tenían conciencias ruines y depravadas” (215 ES, 207 EN). This phenomenon extends also to songs covered by Dylan: where the English text evokes “the martyred man of constant sorrow”, pointing back to “Man of Constant Sorrow”, as interpreted by Dylan on his debut album, the Spanish text has “un hombre martirizado y presa de un pesar constante” (“a man martyred and prey to a constant sorrow” a phrase from which it would be hard to extract a song title (228 ES, 220 EN) All told, this occasional but significant element in the English text is another aspect lost in translation.

Another aspect that could have proved controversial but in fact is not, that of lexical anglicisms. Popular music terminology is an area in which one might, a priori, expect the translator from English to resort to anglicisms again and again, if only to save effort. In fact, however, such resort is commendably rare in Izquierdo’s pages. One may note occasional untranslated items such as “manager” (104 ES, 97 EN) or “royalties” (131 ES, 123 EN), while, obviously, basic generic terms such as “jazz” and “blues” have to be rendered as such, the same applying to more specialised genre indicators like “rockabilly” and “funky” (both 189 ES, 182 EN; on the same page, “riffs” is, curiously, rendered by another English term, “licks”). “Overdubbing”, occurring twice in the context of the Oh Mercy sessions, elicits two differing responses from the translator, who first paraphrases it as “grabación sobre pistas ya grabadas” (literally, “recording over pre-recorded tracks” – 202 ES, 195 EN), but later resorts to an italicised non-translation (“el overdub” – 219 ES, 212 EN). All that can be said is that a less skilled translator would have grasped far more often for easy-way-out anglicisms.

An area that sorely tests the translator’s creativity, and where Izquierdo emerges with flying colours, is that of idioms - the challenge of finding convincing Spanish equivalents for Dylan’s numerous racy American colloquialisms. We should recall here that Izquierdo is a speaker of European Spanish, and his idiomatic choices will almost certainly reflect the Spanish of Spain, not of Latin America (thus, he uses terms like “nevera” for “refrigerator” (250 ES, 242 EN) and “gafas” for “glasses” (251 ES, 243 EN) where a Latin American would prefer “refrigerador” and “anteojos”). There will be cases, inevitably, where one of his idiomatic choices may not be immediately comprehensible to a Mexican or an Argentinian, as where he renders “bucks” by “pavos” (250 ES, 242 EN), a slang term (literally, “turkeys”) used in Spain to denote current coin (it once meant “pesetas” and can now stand for “euros”) but unfamiliar to Latin American ears. That said, Izquierdo has achieved a remarkable degree of success in finding suitable idiomatic equivalents.

Among the felicitous solutions that jump off the pages of Crónicas (many of them deriving from Izquierdo’s ear for idiom) we may note: “being preachy and one-dimensional” = “caer en el maniqueismo panfletario” (62 ES, 54 EN); “flashy” = “llamativo” (85 ES, 78 EN); “skittish” = “cursi” (86 ES, 78 EN); “slick” = “certero” (87 ES, 80 EN); “mumbo jumbo” = “mascarada” (117 ES, 109 EN); “the whole shebang” = “todo el tinglado” (117 ES, 109 EN); “capture that feeling” = “plasmar esa sensación” (175 ES, 168 EN); “I needed to let things

For the issue of anglicisms (in French and Spanish), see Rollason (2004).
straighten out” = “Necesitaba que las cosas volvieran a su cauce” (184 ES, 176 EN); “putting our heads together” = “cotejar nuestro ideario” (185 ES, 178 EN); “we could sure use some songs like those” = “canciones como aquellas nos vendrían de perlas” (203 ES, 195 EN); “one-horse towns” = “pueblos de mala muerte” (248 ES, 241 EN); “quit the scam” = “déjate de rollos” (279 ES, 271 EN); “I was so into it” = “a causa de mi ensimismamiento” (280 ES, 273 EN); “didn’t come off” = “no cuajó” (284 ES, 276 EN); “many got it wrong” = “muchos no lo pillaron” (300 ES, 293 EN).

In cases like these, what the translator has done is not to render literally, but enter into the spirit of the English language, sense the connotations of the (often highly colloquial) terms and phrases, and then go back into his own language to find a translation that has the corresponding (not necessarily equivalent) spirit. This process does nonetheless carry a risk of excess hispanicisation, or what Venuti would call domestication. In practice, any such charge would stick in only a few cases: for instance when Izquierdo renders ‘farmhands’ (248 ES, 240 EN), and later also the very (Southern) American “sharecroppers” (293 ES, 285 EN) as “braceros” (a term with connotations of rural social relations in Andalusia); or when “choirs going from house to house caroling” becomes “los coros de villancicos yendo de una casa a otra” (“villancicos” is a term used to describe songs sung at Christmas, but of a specifically Spanish nature, and can only approximate to “carols” – 292 ES, 284 EN). Such choices may over-hispanicise aspects of Dylan’s world, but they are few and far between.

In any case, Chronicles itself at certain moments draws directly on the wellspring of Hispanic culture. Dylan recalls how in New York he felt himself a Columbus-like pioneer: “When I left home, I was like Columbus going off into the desolate Atlantic. I’d done that and I’d been to the ends of the earth – to the water’s edge – and now I was back in Spain, back where it all started, in the court of the Queen with a half-glazed expression on my face” (108 EN). Also from New York days, he evokes his art-gallery visits with Suze Rotolo, and his appreciation of painters including Velázquez, Goya and Picasso (269 EN), the latter’s “Guernica” also appearing as a point of reference for the arts (275 EN). Spanish and Latin American references also, of course, appear in Tarantula and the Dylan songbook: here in Chronicles, the Columbus or Picasso references show Dylan drawing on the Spanish components of a larger Western culture, on the same level as his citations of Shakespeare or Tennessee Williams. Indeed, the reader may legitimately ask just how “foreign” such shared references are to an educated Westerner, wherever born and raised, and thus, equally, how “foreign” the experience of reading and translating this book really is. If Spain is “where it all started”, is its reality as far from Dylan’s as Venuti’s “foreign/domestic” binary would have it? The “Guernica” reference occurs in the course of Dylan’s long account of how he was transfixed in New York by a performance of the famous song by Bertolt Brecht and Kurt Weill, “ Pirate Jenny” (272-276 EN). He quotes from the song, not in the German original but in English translation; the Spanish translator, whether he has taken his rendering through Dylan’s English or directly from the German, is here translating less a piece of the source Anglophone culture than something more complex, a culturally hybrid phenomenon. If Brecht and Picasso are as much part of Bob Dylan’s cultural make-up as Mark Twain or Hank Williams, is there really such a place as an unsullied, essentialist “home” at all, as the domestication/foreignisation opposition would have us believe? Indeed, does it make more sense to follow Salman Rushdie in his critique of the ending of The Wizard of Oz (Rushdie
1992) and its notion that “there’s no place like home”, and affirm with the expatriate author that in today’s world “there is no longer any such place as home”?

V

The opinion is often expressed that English has today irrevocably become the world’s hegemonic language for ever more international purposes – a position represented by, for instance, the linguist Tom McArthur, who, in The Oxford Guide to World English (2002), variously calls English “the universalising language of the human race”, “the world’s default mode”, or, again, a language in a category of its own, “a set with a membership of one”. If that position were true in all circumstances and without qualification, would Venuti find it necessary, for translations from English, to reverse his domestic/foreign ethical binary and actually praise a translation like Crónicas in the cases where it hispanicises the original, thus hypothetically embodying strategies of resistance against perceived Anglo-Saxon linguistic and cultural imperialism? Conversely, the effective absence of anglicisms from Crónicas would to many readers surely seem one of the strong points of this translation - especially in a field like popular music that is particularly vulnerable to them - and yet under Venuti’s dispensation, if the translation were spattered with anglicisms, would it appear foreignised and therefore apparently to be commended! The reality is complex and does not lend itself to oversimplified dichotomies of this kind. With Spanish we are dealing with a language, which, if not as powerful as English, is hardly an endangered species, being, far from it, (multi)culturally vibrant and taught and promoted as a major foreign language worldwide.

As the text of Chronicles itself shows, we are not talking about a one-way flow of influence. If the Anglophone world has influenced and influences the Hispanophone world economically and culturally, the reverse is also true, as witness the rising numbers of pupils leaning Spanish in British schools as numbers for French and German fall, the Spanish ownership of Britain’s airport infrastructures, the Mexican stake in the New York Times or the international success of Cuban music via the record and film Buena Vista Social Club. The Hispanic imprint is, as we have seen, present in the pages of Chronicles itself in the references to Columbus, Goya or Picasso. Beyond either culture in our host/target pair, Dylan’s memoir shows his work to be the product not only of deeply American influences white and black (Woody Guthrie or Robert Johnson), but also, through Ray and Chloe’s Borgesian library or the theatre of Brecht, to be the outcome of a wider “general Western” culture whose manifestations cannot simply be written off as “alien” to speakers of another European and world language like Spanish. If Chronicles, with its multiplication of influences and intertext, can be read as implying that art in today’s world is less a question of “high culture” versus “popular culture” than of culture full stop, perhaps the same can be said of the other binary of “national” versus “foreign” culture: here too, it might be argued, in Dylan’s and our world there is, simply, culture. From such a perspective, the analysis of Chronicles/Crónicas may suggest that Venuti’s domestication/foreignisation dichotomy is ultimately irrelevant to the particular object of study, as too would be any attempt to apply it in reverse.

40 Rushdie (1992), 57.
42 It is a curious thought that, had Crónicas been translated in Mexico rather than Spain, it would no doubt have contained more anglicisms and would thus have been objectively closer, both geographically and linguistically, to what Venuti would see as the “imperial” source culture of the United States, (in Mexican Spanish, as far as habitual or first-choice usage is concerned, a computer is not an “ordenador” as in Spain, but a “computadora”, to rent is not “alquilar” but “rentar”, and a boarding pass, at Madrid airport a “tarjeta de embarque”, is at Mexico City airport a “pase de abordar”, an obvious calque from English).
The Spanish version of Dylan’s memoir has managed - with remarkable success, for all its sprinkling of errors and omissions (many of which could have been compensated via notes or glossary) - to transplant the book’s linguistic and cultural Americanness to a Hispanic context. The Dylan who emerges from Crónicas for a Spanish-speaking readership is, thanks to the balance achieved by Izquierdo in avoiding both excess anglicisms and over-hispanicisation, a recognisable simulacrum of the real, English-speaking cultural icon (it is also true that few will read Chronicles in any language who are not in any case reasonably familiar with the complex cultural baggage underwritten by the name “Bob Dylan”). Not everything in Chronicles is translatable into Spanish, but by far the greater part is. The translator has not been able to render the hidden quotations and references, the “puzzles” identified by Warmuth, but that is intertext, not text: the gap could be partly filled in future years by the publication of scholarly, annotated editions, of original or translation or both. Nonetheless, This inevitably “missing” intertext shows up Chronicles as a limit case and an instance of where translation has to stop (even were the translator to comb the works of Jack London in Spanish and import the Dylan-London phrases as pre-existing in that language, virtually no Hispanophone readers would notice or get the point). Even so, the process of transplantation has drawn on the parallels, resemblances and mutual influences between two languages and cultural spheres that are also both part of a wider global culture in constant evolution. Finally, the objective evidence suggests that this translation in reality subverts certain of the concepts currently dominant in Translation Studies. The successful transmutation of Chronicles into Crónicas strongly points to the non-applicability of Venuti’s binaries to each and every act of translation, reinforcing by contrast an alternative position of translation as dialogue – dialogue between texts and cultures, between writer and translator and between translator and reader. This is a dialogue that takes place in an ever more interdependent world, where peoples and cultures interact and intermingle in growingly complex forms, and where “there’s no such place as home” – where indeed, to take a phrase out of Bob Dylan’s mouth, there’s no direction home.

**
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