

ESSAY

Xenitia, the Nation, and Intralingual Translation

KAREN VAN DYCK

Όπου και να ταξιδέψω η Ελλάδα με πληγώνει
 (“Wherever I go Greece wounds me”)
 —George Seferis, aboard the *Aulis* waiting to sail from
 Piraeus, summer 1936¹

Ζωή—ένα τραύμα στην ανυπαρξία
 (“Life—a wound in inexistence”)
 —Yannis Ritsos, from a concentration camp on the island
 of Leros, summer 1968

George Seferis’s 1936 poem *Με τον τρόπο του Γ. Σ.* (“*Me ton tropo tou G. S.*”; “*In the Style of G. S.*”) can be read as figuring two different kinds of translation.² The very title involves interlingual translation as defined by Roman Jakobson, “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language” (233), since it implicitly moves between Greek and French: “*Me ton tropo tou*” translates the conventional phrase “à la manière de,” reflecting Seferis’s recurrent translation of European poetries as he attempted to develop his own style (hence the self-conscious inclusion of his initials; Seferis himself identified the interlingualism [*Poimata* 429–30]). As the poem unfolds, however, a different kind of translation emerges, intralingual, which Jakobson defines as “rewording” or “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language” (233).³ Intralingual translation can be glimpsed in the first verse paragraph, where Seferis uses his life in the twentieth century to translate scenes from Greek antiquity: he imagines himself moving in a Greek landscape that is at once ancient and contemporary, mythological and commercial, containing *θησαυρούς των Ατρείδων* (“treasures of the Atreus kings”; “*Me ton tropo*” 99) as well as *το ξενοδοχείο της Ωραίας Ελένης του*

KAREN VAN DYCK is the Kimon A. Doukas Chair of Modern Greek Language and Literature in the classics department at Columbia University. Her books include the study *Kassandra and the Censors: Greek Poetry since 1967* (Cornell UP, 1998), the anthology *Austerity Measures: The New Greek Poetry* (Penguin Books, 2016), and the translation of Margarita Liberaki’s novel *Three Summers* (New York Review Books, 2019).

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Modern Language Association of America

PMLA 138.3 (2023), doi:10.1632/S0030812923000421

551

Μενελάου (“the hotel ‘Pretty Helen of Menelaos’”), where Achilles-like he wears το πουκάμισο του Κενταύρου (“the Centaur’s shirt”), listens to the pastoral σουραύλι (“flute”) and to Κασσάνδρα (“Kassandra”) που λάλησε (“[when she] crowed”), and is shot in the hand by μια σαΐτα τιναγμένη ξαφνικά / από τα πέρατα μιας νιότης βασιλεμένης (“an arrow suddenly let loose / from the sunset youth of a Byzantine kingdom now past”). (The Greek word for “setting” [βασιλεμένης; *vasilemenis*] also means “royal” and recalls the purple-red robes of Byzantine emperors.) By the end of the poem, Ancient, Byzantine, and Modern Greek actually become one and the same language through an intralingualism enacted by a quotation from Aeschylus’s *Agamemnon*, ὀρώμεν ἀνθούν πέλαγος Αἰγαῖον νεκροῖς (“we see the ancient Aegean blossom with the dead”; 100). Seferis sees no need for a translation, although later editors provide it (Seferis, *Poimata* 430). A context of linguistic and cultural continuity is created in which the Ancient Greek line shares its object νεκροῖς (*nekrois*; “corpses” or “the dead”) with the repeated Modern Greek subject εκείνοι (*ekeinoi*; “those”) in the next two lines: εκείνοι που θέλησαν να πιάσουν το μεγάλο καράβι με το κολύμπι / εκείνοι που βαρέθηκαν να περιμένουν τα καράβια που δεν μπορούν να κινήσουν (“[those Modern Greek] swimmers who tried to catch the Great Ship / those who tired of waiting for ships that never moved”; 100–01).

The presence of both kinds of translation in Seferis’s poem can be seen as a response to the predicament of Greek culture in the 1930s. While serving as the Greek consul to Albania, Seferis had become acutely aware of the political stasis that prompted the military dictatorship of Ioannis Metaxas, a situation depicted in the poem as the windless impasse aboard the *Aulis* with the captain μαρμαρωμένος μες στ’ ἄσπρα και στα χρυσά (“marble-still, in white and gold”; 101). Translation can offer a poetic form of compensation, both collective and personal, although not without exposing difficult conditions that are densely expressed in the line that opens the poem: Ὅπου και να ταξιδέψω η Ελλάδα με πληγώνει (“Wherever I go Greece wounds me”; 99). On the

one hand, this line glances at the movement of interlingual translation through which a minor literature like Modern Greek seeks to appropriate the prestige and resources of major foreign literatures like French and English to develop its traditions and practices—translation that “wounds” with the awareness of Greek limitations. On the other hand, the line glances at the movement of intralingual translation through which a minor literature like Modern Greek asserts an unbroken continuity with the ancient form of the language and therefore with its prestige and resources—translation that “wounds” with the awareness of Greek belatedness but simultaneously overcomes it.⁴ In Seferis’s poem, intralingualism comes to displace or occlude interlingualism by insisting that Ancient and Modern Greek are one and the same language. Yet the agony of this resolution never seems to have left Seferis: he formulates it again intralingually in the last line when he admits, Το καράβι που ταξιδεύει το λένε ΑΓ ΩΝΙΑ 937 (“They call the ship that moves AG ONIA 937”; 101), a name whose broken capital letters recall ancient Greek inscriptions as well as Byzantine saints. AG is the abbreviation for Ἅγια (*Aghia*; “Saint”), and ships to this day bear saints’ names on their prows. Over the course of the poem, to translate “in the style of G. S.” means to replace interlingualism with intralingualism, imitation with integration, a style that best helps the poet deal with the pain of exile, what Greeks call ξενιτιά (*xenitia*), and that shows Greece, a nation of exiles, a way to imagine itself as whole again.

Translation is a central issue for exiles who have been uprooted from their homes, “constantly being unsettled, and unsettling others” (Said, *Representations* 53), since they are caught up in changing relationships to at least two languages, the languages of the place from which they feel separated and those of the place where they live out their feeling of separation.⁵ Writing in and translating into the originary language become ways of connecting to the homeland and continuing to participate in the imaginary construction of the nation (B. Anderson). In Greece, as more generally on the edges of Europe and the Balkans, definitions of exile and attempts to distinguish exile from other forms

of migrant displacement are particularly vexed issues and are always caught up with the question of translation.⁶ Centuries of war and occupation have created a syncretic palimpsest of cultures and languages where identity and self-definition are hotly contested. As a result, fights over a translation or a place-name often matter as much as territory. The issue of which contemporary Macedonia is the Macedonia of Alexander the Great is only the most recent example of these cultural political struggles (Christopoulos and Karpozilos). Hence, preserving the Greek language and asserting its continuous relation to Ancient Greek can become a national imperative. The primary meaning of the Greek word for exile, ἐξορία (*exoria*), links these concerns with place and language in revealing ways since it means both “outside the boundary markers” and “beyond definition.” The word points to a confusion and co-implication of geographic and linguistic borders, as well as their status as imaginary constructs. Whereas the English term *exile* means primarily banishment to a foreign country and refers to external exile (“Exile”), in Greek *exoria* refers as often to internal as to external exile (Babiniotis). What counts as outside and inside is hard to disaggregate. Four hundred years of Ottoman rule and then, in the twentieth century, periods of French, German, British, Italian, and less explicitly American domination have meant that Greeks often experience exile in or close to their own country. *Xenitia* can apply to a bride leaving her family and native village to be married into a family in the next village, to a rural laborer looking for a job in the big city, and to refugees and political prisoners, whether they are held inside or outside Greece. References to *exoria* and *xenitia* in folk songs and literature bear out the range of applications to these different experiences and the conflation of what is in or out and ultimately of what is or is not Greek. For Greeks, exile is shot through not only with national consciousness, ideological struggles, regional rivalries, and identity crises, but also with language politics.

Modern Greek poets offer notable instances of translation deployed to manage the trauma (το τραύμα; *to travma*), literally “the wound,” of *xenitia*. Two experiences in particular marked the “Generation of the Thirties,” the main cultural producers in Greece from the 1930s through the 1960s,

including artists, composers, and novelists but most famously poets such as Seferis (1900–71), Yannis Ritsos (1909–90), and Odysseas Elytis (1911–96). The first experience was the 1923 Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey, in which Greeks living in Asia Minor who were Christian were exchanged for Turks living in Greece who were Muslim; the second experience extended from the late 1930s onward, when anyone accused of communist sympathies was purged from Greece and relocated to island internment camps or to the Eastern bloc. Although based on very different criteria, in one case religious, in the other political, both experiences involved the conflation of internal and external exile and the uncanny sense of not being home at home. The Population Exchange was based on the assumption of a stable, coherent cultural identity whereby Christian Greeks, many of them Turkish speakers, would feel welcome and at home in Greece after living for generations in Asia Minor. Similarly, the separation of nationalism and communism by Greek authoritarian regimes, most notably that of Metaxas (1936–41) and the Regime of the Colonels (1967–74), meant that communist ἐξόριστοι (*exoristoi*; “exiles”) inside as well as outside Greece were imagined as one culturally homogeneous group that posed an ideological threat to the nation, always unwelcome, never at home. This layering of exilic and near-exilic experiences helps explain why Greek poets often merge different forms of exile. Seferis, forced as a child to leave Asia Minor, feels he undergoes a similar experience as a diplomat in the Greek foreign service, while Ritsos, imprisoned and banished to Greek islands for his political views, repeats the experience of living with other comrades outside Greece as a Communist Party emissary to Soviet-aligned countries in the Balkans. The lives, poems, and translations of these two poets are exemplary in how they frame and manage feelings of *xenitia*, each with his own conception of what it means to be a national poet in a literature currently deemed minor. But it is translation, that second-order signifying practice by which one negotiates one’s relation to the other (Venuti, “Translation” 30), that most dramatically reveals the connection between exile, nation, and language.

Seferis and Ritsos, one a Nobel laureate (1963), the other a Lenin Peace Prize winner (1977), occupy opposite ends of the political spectrum and disagree on what should be translated into Greek—what particular mix of ancient, European, or Balkan languages and traditions, as well as how this mix might be achieved, whether by an individual translator or by a collaborative group. Yet both view Greek poetry as a national institution and Demotic as the language of the people. And both view translation as a way to connect to the culture and nation from which they feel cut off. In a telling move, furthermore, both often imagine interlingual difference between two or more languages as intralingual sameness within one language. For Seferis, reinforcing his membership in the Greek nation entails conjuring up a language and a people that have a continuous tradition dating back to antiquity. In his view, the transformation into Modern Greek of archaic but more prestigious stages in the development of the national language—Ancient (Homeric, Attic) and Biblical (Koine) Greek—constitutes an intralingual process, “ours once more” (Herzfeld). For Ritsos, in contrast, the nation is paradoxically transnational insofar as orthodoxy, both communist in politics and Eastern Orthodox in religion, allows people with different languages to cross borders and coexist in a transnational collective. Ritsos sees himself reinforcing his membership in the Greek nation by recognizing the similarity between Greek and other Balkan languages, which are “already ours,” politically, religiously, and poetically, and therefore can easily be turned into Greek. Whether defined on the basis of temporal continuity (Seferis) or spatial contiguity (Ritsos), the claim of intralingualism masks what is actually interlingual translation so as to make up for the poet-translator’s feeling of separation by imagining a national language that either continues a valuable cultural past or serves as a transnational vehicle for unifying minor literatures. A comparison of Seferis’s translations of Ancient and Biblical Greek literature with Ritsos’s translations of Romanian, Czech, and Slovakian poetry, all produced outside Greece and all imagined as somehow intralingual, foregrounds the ideological underpinnings of their practices.

Seferis and the Ancients

According to the philhellene novelist Henry Miller, exile is the source of Seferis’s genius—his love for his country, “a result of patient discovery following years of absence abroad” (qtd. in Keeley 362). The key experience for Seferis was being uprooted from Skala, the seaside town near Smyrna where he spent much of his childhood (Beaton 15–18). In 1914 he and his family left for Athens, and then in 1923 they were officially ousted in the Population Exchange. Although Seferis experienced a host of different kinds of displacement during his lifetime—as political refugee, student, consul, ambassador, poet laureate, visitor abroad—all these experiences repeated for him his childhood sense of loss when he and his family were forced to leave Asia Minor. In Seferis’s mind, this experience came to underlie his years in the Balkans and Middle East during his career in the Greek foreign service. Certainly, the most difficult posting was his first in 1936 as consul in Korça (or, in Greek, Koritsa), Albania, where he sent off for publication “In the Style of G. S.” (Beaton 150). His poems, letters, and journal entries from this year complain incessantly about the lack of civilization, the poverty, and the languages he found incomprehensible (Albanian, Romanian, and Turkish), unlike the languages in which he had grown up at home and studied (Greek, French, and English). He took refuge in the French of the lycée and the literati, but his true comfort was translating Homer, Aeschylus, and Plato from Ancient Greek and imagining them as already in Modern Greek. It is not only that he chooses to translate ancient texts about exile, but that his translations were exilic, structured in a way that imagined source and translating languages as closer and more similar than they were.

Also particularly hard were the years 1952 to 1955, which Seferis spent in Beirut as ambassador to Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Iraq. Here he translated the Song of Songs into Modern Greek from the Koine of the Septuagint, another translation he considered intralingual. His hope was that translation would give him a better understanding of this land, his first impressions of which were $\pi\omicron$

σκληρές, πιο γυμνές, πιο φτωχίες (“harder, more naked, poorer”; *Asma* 7; trans. in Güthenke 359) than those he had from reading the biblical text written there thousands of years ago. But the choice of a Koine source text had the specifically Greek aim of addressing the πνευματικά υπαναπτυκτός (“spiritually undeveloped”) aspect of the σημερινός ελληνικός κόσμος (“modern day Greek kosmos”; 7; 363) by making available a text that was η κληρονομιά του κι η παράδοσή του (“its heritage and its tradition”; 8; 363). During this period he also produced translations from Euripides’s *Bacchae*, a play about exile written in exile, in which Seferis noted that the playwright βρήκε μια φρέσκια έμπνευση στη Μακεδονία, αφού παράτησε τη στέγνια της Αθήνας (“found fresh inspiration in Macedonia after abandoning dry Athens”; *Metagraphes* 292n1), as if he too were searching for something hopeful to come of this life of ξενιτιά ανυπόφορη (“unbearable exile”; *Poimata* 368). In the Middle East, he repeatedly turned to intralingual translation as a means of connecting to a Greece worthy of connection, possessing a rich past. In 1955, on a trip to Patmos, he stayed near the monastery where John wrote Revelation and completed his own version μιας στιγμής (“in one flash”; *Apokalypsi* 9), as if “being home” for this short stay fulfilled the distance-shrinking promise of intralingual translation: he was suddenly actually there.

Seferis never stopped doing interlingual translations. In addition to his student years in Paris (1918–25), when he brought over the poetry of his beloved French and English poets like Paul Valéry and T. S. Eliot (see Seferis, *T. S. Eliot*), he also produced an interlingual translation of the poem “Mythology” by Lawrence Durrell when he was serving in Egypt with the Greek government in exile from 1941 to 1943 (Beaton 202). It would seem that because his government service put him “in Greece,” even though he was based in Egypt, and because the languages were his (Greek, French, and English), his feeling of *xenitia* was less intense. Interlingual translation suited Seferis when his locale was not too foreign. Intralingual translation he reserved for times spent in the midst of languages

and cultures he did not know, such as in the Balkans and the Middle East.

In the titles to collections of his translations, as well as in his prologues, Seferis makes an effort to distinguish clearly between the two kinds of translation by creating his own terms, αντιγραφές (*antigraphes*) for διαγλωσσική (*diaglossiki*; “interlingual”) and μεταγραφές (*metagraphes*) for ενδογλωσσική (*endoglossiki*; “intralingual”). *Antigraphes*, literally “antiwritings” or “instead-of writings,” were modern Greek copies of the source texts that he describes as similar to an artist’s copy of a master’s painting:

όταν μεταφράζουμε από μια ξένη γλώσσα που ξέρουμε λίγο ή πολύ, σε μια γλώσσα—τη δική μας—που μας είναι έμφυτη και την αγαπούμε περισσότερο, κάνουμε κάτι, μου φαίνεται, σαν εκείνους τους ανθρώπους που βλέπουμε στα μουσεία, προσηλωμένους με πολλή προσοχή, ν’ α ν τ ι γ ρ ά φ ο υ ν, είτε για ν’ ασκηθούν είτε γιατί κάποιος τους το παράγγειλε, πίνακες διαφόρων ζωγράφων.

(*Antigraphes* 7)

When we translate from a foreign language that we know, more or less, into a language—our own—that is innate to us and that we love more, we do something, it seems to me, similar to the people that we see in museums, who are concentrated with great zeal, *copying*—either to train themselves or at someone’s behest—paintings by various painters.

(trans. in Stergiopoulou, “Between the Lines” 380)

He calls his intralingual translations from Ancient and Koine Greek *metagraphes*, literally “after writings.” He describes them as rewordings or “transliterations” of the source texts in Modern Greek, understood as the same language as the archaic varieties:

από καιρό συλλογίζομαι πως όταν μεταφράζω ελληνικά κείμενα στη σημερινή γλώσσα μας, και όταν μεταφράζω ξένες γλώσσες, κάνω δύο διαφορετικές δουλειές. Μου χρειάζονται λοιπόν δύο διαφορετικές λέξεις για να δηλώσω αυτή τη διαφορά. Ώσπου να βρεθεί κάποια περισσότερο ικανοποιητική, υιοθέτησα την λέξη «μεταγραφή» για τον μεταγλωττισμό των αρχαίων κειμένων.

(*Asma* 65)

For a long while I have thought that when I translate Greek texts into our language of today and when I translate foreign texts, I do two different tasks. I therefore need two different words to show this. Until something more satisfactory is found, I have adopted the word *metagraphe* for the transliteration of ancient texts.

Seferis regarded the linguistic similarities that made the *metagraphes* possible as βιολογικά γνωρίσματα της λαλιάς μας (“biological attributes of our tongue”; qtd. in Yiatromanolakis, “Metafrastiki” 229). For him they were inborn, like family resemblances, and therefore irrefutable.

Metagraphes for Seferis seek to create the intralingual effect of a continuous tradition from antiquity to the present by using the same alphabet and orthography, as well as the same rhythm and sound, as the archaic Greek texts that were his sources. The effect of sameness is reinforced by a tendency to favor archaism in his lexical and syntactical choices (see Güttenke 344). Frequently, however, these strategies also expose linguistic differences that point to discontinuities in the languages. Thus, as he indicates in his prologue to his translation of the Book of Revelation, to show the continuity of the language he gives the Koine Greek verb ποιμανεῖ (*poimanei*; “to shepherd”) as the Modern Greek verb θα . . . ποιμάνει (*tha . . . poimanei*; *Apokalypsi* 13, 38, 152). Although the spelling appears to be the same, maintaining the future tense necessitates the addition of θα as well as an accent shift from the ultimate to the penultimate syllable. Seferis insists on the sameness of the source and translating languages here, but in reality the morphology and rhythm of the word have changed.

Seferis seems to have been acutely aware of such linguistic shifts. When he explains his translation process in the Book of Revelation, he states, Προσπάθησα να μείνω όσο μπορούσα πιο κοντά στο παλαιό κείμενο κρατώντας, αν μου το συγχωρούσε η γλώσσα μας, τη δομή και τις λέξεις του πρωτοτύπου (“I tried to stay as close as I could to the older text, keeping the form and the words of the original where our language was forgiving enough”; *Apokalypsi* 12–13). The word “forgiving” glances at the irreducible difference between the

Koine of the biblical text and Modern Greek: Seferis’s verbal choices were “forgiving” because they avoided the offense to intelligibility and felicity that too much archaizing might cause to the modern “form” of the language. He struggled to maintain the appearance of sameness through words with ancient roots because often the sameness was undermined: he was forced to revise orthography, accents, noun endings, and verb constructions. To make the deferential judgment, then, that “what changes, in Seferis’s view, is not the language per se, but the form” (Stergiopoulou, “Between the Lines” 379–80) does not go far enough: “form” is a constitutive feature of any language, essential enough to distinguish it from other languages. The changes that Seferis was forced to make when translating the Book of Revelation show that he was denying the fact that two languages are involved, each with its own structural differences, and that therefore his translation should be described not as intralingual, occurring within one and the same language, but as interlingual, occurring between two languages.

The linguistic differences are even more striking in his translations of Ancient Greek texts, since Homeric and Attic Greek have even fewer structural resemblances to Modern Greek than Biblical Koine. In Seferis’s version of *Odyssey* 4.450, for instance, the Modern Greek words show Seferis typically trying to match the Homeric Greek: for the Ancient Greek subject ὁ Γέρον (ο *Geron*; “the Old Man”), he chooses the Modern Greek ο Γέρος (ο *Geros*), and for the Ancient Greek object φώκος (*fokas*; “seals”), he chooses the Modern Greek φώκιες (*fokies*; *Metagraphes* 12–13). Yet the juxtapositions disclose, once again, that Seferis’s choices are really not intralingual renderings, because of morphological differences: the two nouns have developed different endings in Modern Greek. For the compound nouns and epithets that Homer uses, the notion of intralingual translation is stretched even further to cover neologism. In his translation of the *Odyssey* 4.456, Seferis translates the Homeric λέων γένετ’ ἠυγένειος (*leon genet’ eugeneios*; “he becomes a bearded [or hairy] lion”) as γίνεται μακρόμαλλο λιοντάρι (*ginetai makromallo liontari*; “he became a long-haired lion”; 12–13), creating

correspondences on the basis of similar roots for “becomes” and “lion.” He could have found a corresponding word with the same root for “bearded” in Modern Greek (γένει; *geni*; cf. Maronitis, *Odysseia* 4.457), but instead he invented a different compound, μακρόμαλλο (*makromallo*; “long-haired”), which did not already exist in any form of the language, in order to emphasize resonances with the Ancient Greek for “Golden Fleece” (χρυσόμαλλον δέρας; *chrysomallon deras*) as well as with the Modern Greek for proponents of Demotic, “the hairy ones” (μαλλιάροι; *maliari*). Here Seferis’s insistence on linguistic sameness as the basis of his intralingualism strains under the pressure of his own poetic innovation.

In translating an excerpt from Heraclitus, another writer in exile whom Seferis began translating during his year in Albania, he characteristically attempted to match the rhythm of the Ancient Greek prose. Thus, for Heraclitus’s verb ἐξευρήσουσιν (*exeuresusin*; “they will find”), he chooses the longer verbal ending θα τον βρούνε (*vroune*; “they will find it”) rather than βρουν (*vroun*) so that the rhythm would be maintained (*Metagraphes* 56–57; cf. Yiatromanolakis, “Metafrastiki” 270). Yet he is in fact forcing a disjunction in sound and in number of syllables. In the same passage, Seferis takes an alternative approach to continuity by choosing a Modern Greek word that matches Heraclitus’s Ancient Greek in root, but the result entails a radical change in meaning. He translates δίκη (*dike*; “arbiter of trials”), the name given to the goddess and cosmic force of law, as δικαιοσύνη (*dikaiosisini*; “justice”), inscribing a later moral sense that is found in Plato and Aristotle and is also the modern meaning of the word (Gagarin). The replacement of Heraclitus’s term *dike* with the later term *dikaiosisini* shows how continuity with ancient Greek culture in Seferis’s translation is always constructed.

The examples so far have stressed Seferis’s effort to ground his claim of intralingual translation on linguistic sameness, an effort to develop correspondences or identities between his Modern Greek versions and both Ancient and Koine source texts. But recurrently he abandons this pursuit and resorts to paraphrastic translations that are in effect

adaptations, not so much rewording the archaic Greek as introducing significant departures from it. Often the shift from translation to adaptation occurs with the same source text. Consider his version of *Odyssey* 4.450–61, where several linguistic differences—rhythmic, morphological, and lexical—have already been noted. Here is the Homeric passage:

ἔνδιος δ' ὁ γέρων ἦλθ' ἐξ ἁλός, εὔρε δὲ φώκας
 ζατρεφέας, πάσας δ' ἄρ' ἐπόχετο, λέκτο δ' ἀριθμόν:
 ἐν δ' ἡμέας πρώτους λέγε κήτεσιν, οὐδέ τι θυμῷ
 ᾧσθη δόλον εἶναι: ἔπειτα δὲ λέκτο καὶ αὐτός.
 ἡμεῖς δὲ ἰάχοντες ἐπεσσύμεθ', ἀμφὶ δὲ χεῖρας
 βάλλομεν: οὐδ' ὁ γέρων δολίης ἐπελήθετο τέχνης,
 ἄλλ' ἦ τοι πρώτιστα λέων γένετ' ἠυγένειος,
 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα δρόκων καὶ πάρδαλις ἠδὲ μέγας σῦς:
 γίγνετο δ' ὕγρον ὕδωρ καὶ δένδρεον ὑψιπέτηλον:
 ἡμεῖς δ' ἄστεμφέως ἔχομεν τετληότι θυμῷ.
 ἄλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἀνιάζ' ὁ γέρων ὀλοφώια εἰδώς,
 καὶ τότε δὴ μ' ἐπέεσσιν ἀνειρόμενος προσέειπε. . . .
 (Homer 4.450–61)

[A]t noon the old man of the sea came up too, and when he had found his fat seals he went over them and counted them. We were among the first he counted, and he never suspected any guile, but laid himself down to sleep as soon as he had done counting. Then we rushed upon him with a shout and seized him; on which he began at once with his old tricks, and changed himself first into a lion with a great mane; then all of a sudden he became a dragon, a leopard, a wild boar; the next moment he was running water, and then again directly he was a tree, but we stuck to him and never lost hold, till at last the cunning old creature became distressed, and said. . . .

(Butler 54)

Seferis pares down the Homeric text, starting with the opening: he entirely deletes lines 451 to 453, which present a fairly detailed account of how Odysseus and his men try to capture the god Proteus.

Ἦρθε το μεσημέρι, κι ο Γέρος βγήκε από τη
 θάλασσα, βρήκε τις φώκιες.
 Τον αδράξαμε· δε λησμόνησε καμιά μηχανή·
 γίνεται μακρόμαλλο λιοντάρι

έπειτα δράκοντας και πάρδαλη
 υπέρογκο γουρούνι
 τρεχάμενο νερό
 δέντρο στ' αψηλά φουντωμένο.
 Τα χέρια μας τον έσφιγγαν.
 Σαν έσωσε τα μάγια και δεν άντεχε άλλο
 μου λέει και με ρωτά. . . . (Metaphrasis 13)

Midday came, and the Old Man emerged from the
 sea, found the seals.
 We caught hold of him; he did not forget his trickery;
 He became a long-haired lion
 Then dragon and leopard
 Huge pig
 Running water
 Tree, foliage fully blown.
 Our hands were clasping him tight.
 As if he spared his magic and could not endure any
 more
 He speaks to me and asks me. . . .

Seferis's version relies on archaism to signify the similarities between the time of the *Odyssey* and his own time, mixing words from different periods of Greek, Early Modern (αδράξαμε [*adraksame*; "we caught hold of"]) as well as Ancient (μηχανή [*mechane*; "trickery"]). At the same time, he departs widely from the rhythm of the Homeric lines, abandoning dactylic hexameter for free verse that parses out Proteus's shifting shapes, endowing the Modern Greek with a hard-edged imagism.⁷ Not only does Seferis impose a modernist poetics on the passage, but he inscribes a distinctive interpretation: insofar as the deletion suppresses a depiction of the god trapped by humans and the line breaks in his free verse stress the radical difference of each of Proteus's shapes, the translation winds up heightening his superhuman power of self-transformation. The god, although he initially appears as an "old man," is more formidable in Seferis's treatment, which is determined by factors that cannot precisely be called Homeric.

Seferis's *metaphrases* contain several cases that are even more conspicuous in resisting any notion of intralingualism. The questions they raise, however, have to do not so much with his translation strategies as with the nature of the source text and

his translation process. His assertion that he translated the Song of Songs from the Septuagint, the Koine version of the Hebrew Bible produced from the third century BCE to the first century CE, is contradicted by the fact that he began the translation interlingually in Egypt from the Gideon Bible in English (Beaton 210–11), and when he sought to fashion this project as an intralingual version, he consulted both the Hebrew text and a French translation (Yiatromanolakis, "Metafrastiki" 277; Loulakaki-Moore 212).⁸ Seferis also translated an excerpt from *The Golden Ass*, a Latin prose fiction by the North African philosopher Apuleius, who was educated in Athens, set his narrative in Greece, and apparently adapted it from a Greek source text that has "oriental" origins (G. Anderson 198–210). Another Latin text appears among the fragments of Heraclitus that Seferis translates, although this source has been judged inauthentic, not written by the Ionian philosopher but cobbled together by the medieval theologian Albertus Magnus from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and an Aristotelian commentator, Michael of Ephesus (O'Meara). In each case, the archaic Greek to which Seferis claims to have established a continuity is either not present or heavily mediated by other languages and cultures, and certainly the common alphabet on which his argument depends is impossible. To insist on intralingualism in the face of such evidence requires the assumption of an instrumental model of translation that understands it as reproducing or transferring an invariant contained in the source text, an invariant form or meaning (see Venuti, *Contra Instrumentalism*). Here the invariant is an archaic Greek essence that remains timeless and unchanging so as to be communicated transparently through Seferis's Modern Greek translations.

The questions that proliferate around Seferis's claim of intralingualism point to how strongly he was invested in it, and indeed it served various functions for him. These functions start with the immediate occasions where he developed and practiced intralingual translation—namely, those periods of foreign service in which he experienced painful *xenitia* that recalled the loss of a home in childhood.

At times, the links between deracination and translation could be direct, even if implicit. In diary entries written when he was in Albania, the phrase he uses for Proteus (“the Old Man”) in his translation of the Homeric passage is applied to the Athens-based undersecretary at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to whom he made numerous requests for furloughs and transfers that went unheard (Beaton 146, 265). During this period, he also wrote a poem titled Ο Γέρος (“O Geros”; “The Old Man”), in which this figure becomes a deathly presence who, while lacking a φυλή (“race”) and προγόνος (“ancestors”; “O Geros” 102; “Old Man” 54), powerfully προστάζει τους ίσκιους των ανθρώπων (“commands the shades of men”; 103; 55). Homesickness seems to have motivated Seferis’s decision to translate a Homeric passage in which a god possesses powers that enable him to escape human constraints. Seferis’s longing to return to Athens, his distaste for the foreign location, and his dissatisfaction with his government position all enter into the translation, and the claim of intralingualism once again becomes a way of managing these frustrations.

That longing, especially in its tacit elevation of Greek culture, meant that his translations were also performing cultural and political functions that had nationalism as their base. In translating, Seferis explores different ways of integrating other languages and styles into his own poetry, enabling him to participate in a pan-European modernism, but they were distressing for the poet (Seferis, *Antigraphes* 7–8; Connolly) because they constantly called attention to Greece’s belatedness and his awareness of writing in a minor language: το πρωτότυπο . . . μας δείχνει πως βρισκόμαστε πάντα χαμηλότερα από το σωστό, πως ακόμη κι αν πάμε ψηλότερα πάλι χαμηλότερα θα είμαστε (“the original [in the other language] . . . reveals to us that we are always lower than we should be, that even if we go higher, we will still be lower”; Seferis qtd. in Yiatromanolakis, “Metafrastiki” 232). The intralingual project compensates for this minority status and fosters a competitive attitude toward major languages like French and English by establishing—in Seferis’s view—a continuity with the

kudos of Ancient Greek. Not only is Greek a language that includes ancient and biblical texts, but it supports the hope that it might once again become a hegemonic language, a lingua franca. This temporal irredentism underpins Seferis’s antipathy—shared by many speakers of Modern Greek—for the Erasmic pronunciation of Ancient Greek, where diphthongs are pronounced as two separate sounds instead of one on the assumption that Greek is not something that “goes on living,” but instead “a dead language” (Seferis, “Art of Poetry”). Seferis’s *metagraphic* translation practice aimed to give his readers translations that were inspired από το πρωτότυπο αλλά ταυτόχρονα να αναπτύσσεται, ισοδύναμα και αυτόνομα προς αυτό (“by the source text but at the same time developed equal to and autonomous from it”; Yiatromanolakis, “Metafrastiki” 282), a modern kind of writing ισότιμη και ισοδύναμη με τον αρχαίο λόγο (“as worthy and as powerful as the ancient”; Yiatromanolakis, “Metagraphes” 308; see also Maronitis, “Intralinguistic Inequality” 882). The differing functions that Seferis assigned to the two kinds of translation led to different publishing formats: his *Antigraphes*, the interlingual translations, were published monolingually, only the Modern Greek without the French and English texts, so as to minimize or even suppress his dependence on other European literatures, especially those written in major languages, whereas his *Metagraphes*, the intralingual translations, were published with the Ancient and Koine Greek texts facing the Modern Greek versions, so as to foreground the identity between the different forms of Greek and invite favorable comparison, the sense that they are all written in one and the same language. This even involved changing the source texts: he capitalized Ο Γέρος (“the Old Man”) not only in his translation but also in the en face Homeric Greek. Ultimately, he was cultivating a vernacular nationalism, whereby the value that derived from the continuity between Ancient, Koine, and Modern Greek assuaged his exilic experience by constructing and validating a national Greek literature and endowing the national poet, “wherever” he went, with the power to speak for the nation.

Ritsos and the Balkans

The claim of intralingualism manages other exilic experiences for poets of this generation. If Seferis's translations from Ancient Greek show the dominant form of the intralingual imaginary in Greece, Ritsos's Balkan anthologies provide us with another form that reveals how internationalism can be yoked to the imagined community of a nation that embraces the West or the East.

Ritsos's years in exile fall into two main periods, and in each of them he produced substantial bodies of translations that saw print soon after. During the first period, between 1948 and 1952, he was incarcerated in internment camps for leftists on the islands of Limnos, Makronisos, and Aghios Efstratios (commonly known as Ai Stratis). After his release, he published his first book-length translations, including the work of the Turkish poet Nazim Hikmet (1953) and the Russian poet Alexander Blok's *The Twelve* (1957). The second period, between 1956 and 1960, encompassed visits to the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc countries such as Romania and Czechoslovakia at the invitation of writers' unions and with the support of the Greek Communist Party. In the wake of these trips, he published anthologies of translations from Romanian (1961) and from Czech and Slovakian (1966), as well as book-length selections from the work of Attila József (1963), Vladimir Mayakovsky (1964), and Ilya Ehrenburg (1966). In 1967, immediately after the coup that brought the colonels to power, Ritsos was again arrested as a leftist, imprisoned on the islands of Yiaros and Leros, and subsequently banished to Samos, off the Turkish coast, where he lived under house arrest. Many of his books were burned, including these anthologies. Ritsos spent much of his life outside Greece and therefore outside life: a one-line poem written in Leros reads in its entirety, Ζωή—ένα τραύμα στην ανυπαρξία ("Zoe—ena trauma stin aniparksia"; "Life—a wound in inexistence"). The time spent in sanatoriums for tuberculosis and in psychiatric wards tending his father and sister were additional periods spent cut off from society (Savvas 14).

Ritsos uses varying terms to describe his work as a translator, implicitly drawing a distinction

similar to that between interlingual and intralingual translation, although his definitions, even when the same term is at issue, are quite different and often imprecise. The title pages of his translations always carry the term απόδοση (*apodosi*; "version," "rendition," or "performance"), suggesting not strict translation but interlingual adaptation, comparable to the practice of imitation that was deployed by such anglophone poets as John Dryden and Robert Lowell (Venuti, "Poet's Version"). Yet when Ritsos annotates the version of Mayakovsky he produced from Russian with the writer and translator Aris Alexandrou, he uses μεταγλώττιση (*metaglottisi*; Mayakovsky 179), and when he describes his collaboration with Greek speakers of Czech for his anthology, he uses μεταγραφή (*meta-graphe*; Ritsos, *Anthologia Tsekon* 375), both of which refer to transliteration. Insofar as transliteration renders a letter in one alphabet into a corresponding letter in another alphabet, the process can be said to occur within the same language: what changes in a transliteration is an alphabet, not a language. Thus, a project to which Ritsos applied the terms μεταγλώττιση and μεταγραφή can be regarded, in effect, as an intralingual translation, similar to those by Seferis. This point is reinforced by Ritsos's pride that many of the letters in the Cyrillic alphabet derive from the Greek alphabet, again something Seferis stressed (*Apokalypsi* 17). When Ritsos translated from a language like Russian, he considered even the alphabets of the languages to be similar. At a fundamental level, Ritsos saw Russian and Greek, among other Eastern European languages, as the same language. His beautiful calligraphic handwriting, which is often reproduced in collections of his poetry, translations, and letters, confirms this connection. It is ecclesiastical, like the manuscript hand of Eastern Orthodox monks. If Seferis forced the idea of sameness with regard to ancient Greece, Ritsos did so with regard to Central Europe and the Balkans.

His idea of intralingualism is rooted in his conception of poetry. In the introduction to his Romanian anthology, he observes that poets πλαστογραφούν . . . την εθνική και ατομική τους ιδιομορφία, υπακούοντας . . . στην θέληση τους

για μια . . . υπογράμμιση της ενότητας . . . κ' επεκτείνοντας με αίσθημα, συνείδηση και γνώση τα όρια της αδελφοσύνης μας ("overcome ethnic and individual differences . . . in order to underscore unity . . . expanding the borders of brotherhood through feeling, understanding, and knowledge"; *Anthologia Roumanikis* 8). He develops this notion of transcending "individual differences" when he describes his first encounter with the work of Romanian poets like Tudor Arghezi and Mihai Beniuc: Εκεί ακριβώς αναγνώρισα . . . μια αναλογία αναμονής και ομολογίας ("That was the moment I recognized . . . an analogy of expectation and confession"; 7). Ritsos's resonant choice of words points to a similarity between Romanian and Greek poetic traditions: he echoes the *ανα* (*ana*) of *αναλογία* (*analogia*; "analogy") in the word *αναμονής* (*anamonis*; "expectation") and the *λογία* (*logia*) of *αναλογία* (*analogia*) in the word *ομολογίας* (*omologias*; "confession," literally "to say the same thing"). He subsequently lists cultural similarities: τους ιστορικούς μας και γεωγραφικούς δεσμούς και τις κοινές μας αναμνήσεις . . . αναλογίες της δημοτικής παράδοσης – αναλογίες στη ποίηση, στη μουσική, στο χορό, που, λίγο αργότερα, τις διαπίστωσα σε δύο ταξίδια μου στη Ρουμανία ("our historical and geographic ties and our common memories . . . analogies in the folk tradition, in poetry, music, and dance, which I discovered during my two trips to Romania"; 7).

Ritsos's claim of cultural sameness already seems wishful. Yet it was supported by the nature of his translation process. Whether Ritsos was imprisoned or traveling abroad, he tended to translate collaboratively, revising close renderings in French and Greek, the two languages he knew fluently, produced by colleagues who had access to the other languages. He offers a glimpse of the process in his notes to his anthology of Czech and Slovakian poetry:

Για να ευκολύνει λοιπόν τη μεταφραστική μου προσπάθεια, η Ένωση Τσέχων και Σλοβάκων Συγγραφέων, δημιούργησε ένα ολόκληρο επιτελείο από γάλλους τσεχομαθείς, τσέχους γαλλομαθείς και έλληνες τσεχομαθείς, που μου

ετοίμασαν πιστές κατά το δυνατόν, κατά λέξη μεταγραφές των ποιημάτων στα γαλλικά και στα ελληνικά, με σχόλια, παρενθέσεις, ενδείξεις για ρυθμούς, μέτρα, ομοιοκαταληξίες, για κάποιες ασάφειες και συνταχτικές ανωμαλίες. Σ' αυτό το υλικό στηρίχτηκε κατ' αρχήν η δική μου εργασία, συγκρίνοντας τις γαλλικές και ελληνικές μεταφράσεις, διασταυρώνοντας αντιλήψεις και συχνά δύο διαφορετικές εκδοχές των ίδιων στίχων, επιλέγοντας, τείνοντας προς μίαν εξακρίβωση πέρα απ' τις καταγραμμένες μεταφράσεις – μίαν άλλη εξακρίβωση στηριγμένη κάποτε στη ποιητική, λεγόμενη, διαίσθηση και στην όποια τεχνική μου εμπειρία. (*Anthologia Tsekon* 375; cf. Keslova)

To make my translation efforts easier, the Union of Czech and Slovakian Writers created a whole staff of French Czech speakers, Czech French speakers, and Greek Czech speakers who prepared faithful and, to the extent possible, word-for-word transliterations [*μεταγραφές*; *metagraphes*] of the poems in French and in Greek, with notes, parentheses, indications concerning rhythm, meter, rhyme, and some ambiguities and syntactic irregularities. My own work relied first on this material, comparing French and Greek translations, seeing where the translators' perceptions matched, often drawing on two different versions of the same lines, selecting from them, tending toward solutions that lay beyond literal translations—solutions that at times relied on so-called poetic intuition and on my own experience and craft as a poet.

The recourse to intermediate translations in Greek seems to have encouraged Ritsos's sense that he was working in the same language and therefore translating intralingually, and, while the interposition of French could be seen as introducing a foreign language, it, too, was more a matter of creating intralingual closeness since French, as Ritsos's other main language, one he published in when censorship prevented publishing in Greek, was very much his own.⁹ The length and arduousness of the collaborative process deepened any such contradictions, which, however, he glossed over with his belief that poetry transcended difference. When working on the Romanian anthology,

for instance, Ritsos spent five months with the poets he included, meeting them in long sessions that lasted into the night. As a result, he tells his Greek readers, he felt *μια τέτοια οικειότητα, τόση άνεση* (“such a familiarity, such ease”) that he could bring *την φωνή τους στη γλώσσα μας μ’ όλα τα αναπόφευκτα λάθη και τις αδυναμίες μου, μα και με την φιλία που μου γέννησε η τέχνη τους και η ανθρωπιά τους* (“their voice into our language—despite all the unavoidable mistakes and [my] limitations—with the friendship that their art and their humanity created in me”; *Anthologia Roumanikis* 9).

Ritsos’s translation practice, his specific verbal choices, also seem to have suppressed the questions concerning this idea of intralingualism. He sought to create, for example, what he perceived as an approximation of source-text meters. On the one hand, his translations of Romanian folk songs turned their alternating trochaic trimeter and tetrameter into the fifteen-syllable iambic line of Greek folk songs, *σχεδόν αθέλητα* (“almost unwittingly”)—in his words—*για να τον φέρω πιο κοντά στο αίσθημα του ελληνικού ρυθμού* (“so as to bring it closer to the feeling of the Greek rhythm”; *Anthologia Roumanikis* 8). On the other hand, during his visit to Romania, his translations of the *doină* (the predominant Romanian form of folk song) inspired his own poem, *Πέντε παραλλαγές σε μια ντόινα* (“Pente parallages se mia doina”; “Five Variations on a Doină”), which he cast in trochaic meter so that it *αντιστοιχούσε στο δικό τους αίσθημα ρυθμού* (“corresponded to the feeling of their rhythm”; 8). This effort to elide the difference between Romanian and Greek through intralingual rhythms reached a revealing extreme when it became a matter of word choice. In translating Tudor Arghezi’s poem “Cîntec Mut” (“Mute Song”) when he encountered a Turkish loanword, *şal* (“shawl”), not only did Ritsos choose a comparable Turkish loanword in Greek, *μποξά* (*boksa*; “shawl”), but he went further, inserting additional Turkish-derived Greek choices for Romanian words that lack a similar etymology. Thus, the Romanian *vizite* (“visits”) is translated with another Turkish loanword, *μουσαφιραίους* (*mousafiraious*; “guests”). Ritsos

evidently recognized a feature that Greek shared with Romanian because both languages had been imprinted by centuries of Ottoman rule. He incorporated other words and phrases exchanged between languages on the Balkan borders, like *δεκανίκι* (*dek-aniki*; “crutch” or “crosier”), a Macedonian army term as well as a church term for a bishop’s staff (Babiniotis). As with Seferis’s verbal choices from Ancient Greek, Ritsos’s choices from other Balkan languages are completely comprehensible in Modern Greek, although their histories reveal underlying ideological projects.

Here one can begin to see what sort of functions intralingualism served for Ritsos. His periods of *xenitia*, whether a result of imprisonment or Communist Party invitations, were no doubt assuaged by his prolific translation projects, which at times mirrored precisely how he felt. For his Romanian anthology, he not only chose to begin with folk songs, as so many Greek anthologies of poetry do (see Politis), but also picked those that could easily fit into the Greek category of songs about *xenitia*:

Αχ, ξένος είμαι, Κύριε, ξένος,
καθώς του κούκκου το νιογέννητο.
Όπου να πάω, καμιά σπλαχνιά.
Αι, ξένος είμαι, Κύριε, ξένος
ξένος σαν το πουλί κι απόξενος.
Όπου να πάω, ποτέ, καμιά σπλαχνιά.
Έι, Βασιλιά, Βασιλιά, εσύ
μη διώχνεις με πολύ μακριά.
Δεν έχω—δες—γονιούς να με ζητήσουνε.
Κ’ είναι μικρούλες οι αδερφάδες μου.
Ω, αυτές δεν ξέρουνε τα μονοπάτια μου.

(*Anthologia Roumanikis* 2–3)

Oh, I am a foreigner [xenos], Lord, a foreigner,
Like a newborn, unswaddled.
Wherever I go, no mercy.
Oh, I am a foreigner, Lord, a foreigner,
A foreigner like a bird, estranged.
Wherever I go, no mercy.
Oh, King, you, my King,
Don’t send me far away.
I have no parents—see—to look for me.
And my sisters are so young.
Oh, they won’t know the paths I take.

In asserting linguistic and cultural similarities with the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc, however, Ritsos was motivated simultaneously by the political commitment that led to his exile (his advocacy of communism) and by the common Eastern Orthodox religion that sustained traditions and languages under the Turks, seen in the mention of the crozier and the invocations to Κύριε (*Kirie*; “Lord”). His intralingual translations projected a hopeful vision of pan-Balkanism, in which minor languages and literatures that had historically suffered similar kinds of oppression recognized their shared identity and formed a collective that could advance their social and political interests. Yet Ritsos’s internationalism, stemming from his own feeling of being punished for his beliefs, could go only so far in shaking off its nationalistic basis. The collective he imagined was grounded in the Greek language of his translations, asserting a vernacular nationalism that often suppressed linguistic and cultural differences even as it hoped to transcend them.

The translations produced by Seferis and Ritsos, whether composed outside Greece or in island concentration camps, have not only different ideas of the nation but different temporal and affective horizons. Seferis’s projects are nostalgic, whereas Ritsos’s are utopian. They both, however, imagine a Greek language that is more homogeneous and unchanging than the histories of occupation and exile can plausibly support. Intralingual translation is the key to the effort to smooth over differences, whether one imagines earlier periods in the history of the language as more similar to the language of today or one thinks of other languages across the border as more similar to one’s own. To question the assumed conflation of difference, exposing the instrumentalist concept of translation that underlies intralingualism, is to begin to change the terms of literary analysis so that monolingualism and the nation are no longer the main analytic categories for thinking about literature as a social institution (Yildiz).

Given the global hierarchy that distributes literary capital so unevenly among languages, translation is a means of accumulating capital and

achieving legitimacy for minor literatures, of nation building (Casanova, “Consecration”). Modern Greek would seem to be a special case that warrants a qualification. Greek poet-translators have sought to partake of the cultural cachet that has accrued to French and English literatures over the past few centuries. But since Greek possesses “quite an important history and prestige” (410), a Greek poet-translator need not feel that a source text must come from a major literature to increase the cultural capital of Greek through translation. Modern Greek might be the vehicle and site of its own legitimation by serving as the translating language for its prestigious ancient canon or for various other minor literatures—but only if an intralingual imaginary is invoked.

Seferis and Ritsos reveal what is at stake in the claim of intralingual translation made by a writer in a minor language. Their immediate motivation, in view of the conditions under which they translated, may have been the sense that they were separated from their homeland and daily life in their ordinary tongue. Yet to manage their feeling of *xenitia*, they needed to imagine its sameness to Ancient Greek or to the languages of other communist cultures. They created an essential role for Modern Greek as a repository of literary resources, whether gloriously canonical or similarly oppressed, and in both cases the intralingual imaginary issued into vernacular nationalism that occluded the linguistic and cultural differences of their source materials, although with vastly different political implications.

The insistence that Greek poets placed on sameness, the sheer energy of their intralingual imaginary, resulted in a body of innovative translation projects that plumbed the national and transnational resources of Modern Greek. In his translations, Seferis experimented with different varieties of Greek as he sampled distinct moments in the history of the language, not so much establishing a homogeneous continuum as opening up suggestive disjunctions. Ritsos’s versions amalgamated the Balkan residue in Modern Greek, not so much establishing a likeness through contiguity as exposing a shared history of multiple languages in proximity. For both poet-translators, *xenitia* became a

topos and a *tropos*, a place and a style, for including more in the face of less and replacing the wound of inexistence with new forms of existence. The drive to translate intralingually, in the end, could not eradicate differences, but it could stage them in unaccustomed and remarkably provocative ways, thereby offering an alternative to the usual focus on interlingual translation as the main way of regulating borders.

NOTES

I want to thank Özlem Berk Albachten for inviting me to present the Greek case at the International Workshop on Intralingual Translation, Boğaziçi University (27–28 Nov. 2014), and also Brent Hayes Edwards and Konstantina Zanou at the Modern Greek University Seminar, Columbia University (25 Oct. 2018), and Dustin Stewart at the Heyman Fellows Seminar (12 Oct. 2021), as well as Lawrence Venuti, John Ma, and A. E. B. Coldiron for their comments on earlier drafts. I am grateful to Kostas Karpozilos for help locating the Ritsos materials, Isabella Livorni for her assistance with the bibliography, and my teachers Edmund Keeley and N. C. Germanacos, who first introduced me to the poetry of Seferis and Ritsos in their translations.

1. Translations are mine unless noted. Transliterations are phonetic for the Modern Greek except when it is helpful to show the roots of words, such as *exoria* and *xenitia* rather than *eksoria* and *ksenitia*, or when there is a preferred way of spelling authors' names in English, i.e., George Seferis and Yannis Ritsos (see Mackridge x–xi). On my transliteration of Ancient Greek, see atticgreek.org/downloads/GreekTransliteration.pdf. I use the monotonic accent system for Modern Greek and the polytonic for Ancient and Biblical Greek.

2. For a more in-depth reading of this poem and my full translation, see Van Dyck, “1922–2022.”

3. For recent discussions of Jakobson's distinctions with a focus on intralingual translation, see Berk Albachten; Davis. On the Greek terms, see Dimitroulia et al.; Kayialis. And on intralingual translation in Greek literary and translation studies, see Greenwood; Kargiotis; Kourdis; Maronitis, “Intralingual Translation”; and Stergiopoulou, “Song of Songs.”

4. For a definition of minor literature as written in the context and wake of major languages, i.e., Kafka's Prague German, see Deleuze and Guattari. For the case of Leopardi's Italian French, see Casanova, “What Is a Dominant Language?” For a brief introduction to the Greek case, see Van Dyck, “Introduction,” and for an extended analysis, see Jusdanis. For studies on Seferis's poetry with respect to reinventing the past as a national poet, see Dimiroulis; Leontis.

5. Said's work on exile and the reverberations of his work in the anglophone world as well as in Greece have been most useful to me,

particularly his chapter “Intellectual Exiles: Expatriates and Marginals” (*Representations* 47–64; see also Said, “Pnevmatiki exoria”).

6. On the difficult, yet necessary, task of distinguishing exile from other forms of displacement, see Tölölyan. For comparative discussions of language and translation with regard to the diaspora and the migrant in Greek literature, see Van Dyck, “Language Question” and “Migration.”

7. On parsing free verse, see Longenbach, ch. 2.

8. On the interdependence of intralingual and interlingual translation, see Stergiopoulou, “Song of Songs.” Her discussion of how interlingual translation from French and Hebrew troubles linguistic nationalism in Seferis's intralingual translation, however, does not question whether translating from Biblical Greek to Modern Greek is intralingual.

9. French mediated Ritsos's access to Ancient Greek literature. In 1981, when working as a research assistant on Edmund Keeley's translation of Ritsos's dictatorship poems (*Exile*), I was tasked with locating the many mythological allusions. During a visit to the poet's Athens apartment, I asked if I might see his Ancient Greek books. Much to my surprise, he handed me a small French dictionary of Greek mythology. Inside I found the names of heroines like Marpessa for which I had spent hours poring over primary sources. For Ritsos, Greek mythology was in French! When the regime's censorship was in force, he published some of his collections in French (*Pierres* and *Le mur*) before the Greek editions appeared (*Petres* and *O toichos*).

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, Benedict R. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 2nd ed., Verso, 1991.
- Anderson, Graham. *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World*. Routledge, 1984.
- Babiniotis, Yiorgos D. Λεξικό της νεοελληνικής γλώσσας [*Lexiko tis neollinikis glossas*]. 2nd ed., Center for the Dictionary, 2002.
- Beaton, Roderick. *George Seferis: Waiting for the Angel: A Biography*. Yale UP, 2003.
- Berk Albachten, Özlem. “Intralingual Translation: Discussions within Translation Studies and the Case of Turkey.” *A Companion to Translation Studies*, 1st ed., edited by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, John Wiley and Sons, 2014, pp. 573–85.
- Blok, Alexander. Οι δώδεκα, απόδοση Ρίτσος Γιάννης, σχέδια και επιμέλεια Κολμούχος Τ. [*Oi dodeka, apodosi Ritsos Yannis, skedia kai epimeleia Kalmouhos T.*]. Translated by Yannis Ritsos, Kedros, 1957.
- Butler, Samuel, translator. *The Odyssey, Rendered into English Prose for the Use of Those Who Cannot Read the Original*. Fifield, 1900.
- Casanova, Pascale. “Consecration and Accumulation of Literary Capital: Translation as Unequal Exchange.” *The Translation Studies Reader*, 4th ed., edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2021, pp. 407–23.
- . “What Is a Dominant Language? Giacomo Leopardi: Theoretician of Linguistic Inequality.” Translated by Marlon Jones. *New Literary History*, vol. 44, no. 3, 2013, pp. 379–99.

- Christopoulos, Dimitris, and Kostis Karpozilos. 10 + 1 ερωτήσεις & απαντήσεις για το μακεδονικό [10 + 1 erotiseis & apandiseis gia to makedoniko]. Polis, 2018.
- Connolly, David. "The Least Satisfying Form of Writing: Seferis on Translation." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2002, pp. 29–46.
- Davis, Kathleen. "Intralingual Translation and the Making of a Language." *A Companion to Translation Studies*, 1st ed., edited by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, John Wiley and Sons, 2014, pp. 586–98.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Translated by Dana Polan, U of Minnesota P, 1986.
- Dimiroulis, Dimitris. Ο ποιητής ως έθνος: Αισθητική και ιδεολογία στον Γ. Σεφέρη [O poiitis os ethnos: Aisthiki kai ideologia ston G. Seferi], Athens, 1997.
- Dimitroulia, Titika, et al. Διεπιστημονικές προσεγγίσεις της μετάφρασης [Diepistimonikes prosengiseis tis metafrasis]. Kallipos, 2015.
- Ehrenburg, Ilya. Το δέντρο, πρόλογος και απόδοση Ρίτσος Γιάννης [To dentro, prologos kai apodosi Ritsos Yannis]. Edited and translated by Yannis Ritsos, Kedros, 1966.
- "Exile, N. (1)." *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, Mar. 2023, www.oed.com/view/Entry/66231.
- Gagarin, Michael. "Dike in Archaic Greek Thought." *Classical Philology*, vol. 69, no. 3, 1974, pp. 186–97.
- Greenwood, Emily. "The Greek Thucydides: Venizelos' Translation of Thucydides." *Thucydides and the Modern World: Reception, Reinterpretation and Influence from the Renaissance to the Present*, edited by Katherine Harloe and Neville Morley, Cambridge UP, 2012, pp. 157–77.
- Güthenke, Constanze. "Do Not Awaken Love until Ready': George Seferis' *Asma Asmaton* and the Translation of Intimacy." *Perspectives on the Song of Songs*, edited by Anselm C. Hagedorn, Walter de Gruyter, 2005, pp. 338–56.
- Herzfeld, Michael. *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology, and the Making of Modern Greece*. Pella, 1986.
- Hikmet, Nâzım. Ποιήματα [Poimata]. Translated by Yannis Ritsos, Kedros, 1953.
- Homer. Οδύσσεια [Odysseia]. *Perseus Digital Library*, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.01.0135.
- Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *On Translation*, edited by Reuben Brower, Harvard UP, 1959, pp. 232–39.
- József, Attila. Ποιήματα [Poimata]. Translated by Yannis Ritsos, Kedros, 1963.
- Jusdanis, Gregory. *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature*. U of Minnesota P, 1991.
- Kargiotis, Dimitris. Ιστορικότητα, ιδεολογία, ενδογλωσσική μετάφραση ["Istorikotita, ideologia, endoglossiki metafrasi"]. Γεωγραφίες της μετάφρασης [Geografies tis metafrasis], Kapa, 2017, pp. 15–59.
- Kayialis, Takis. Η μετάφραση της ποίησης στον μοντερνισμό: Κέντρο και περιφέρεια ["I metafrasi tis poiisis ston modernismo: Kendro kai periferia"]. 'Η γλώσσα της λογοτεχνίας και η γλώσσα της μετάφρασης [I glossa tis logotechnias kai i glossa tis metafrasis], Center for the Greek Language, 1998, www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/literature/studies/literature_translation/03_kagialis.html.
- Keeley, Edmund. "Corresponding with George Seferis, 1951–1971." *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, vol. 58, no. 3, 1997, pp. 359–426.
- Keslova, Tereza. "Yannis Ritsos and Czechoslovakia: Anthology of Czech and Slovak Poets." *Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2013, pp. 107–16.
- Kourdis, Evangelos. Ενδογλωσσική μετάφραση κατ' επιλογήν: Η περίπτωση του υποτιτλισμού διαλεκτικών συστημάτων της ελληνικής γλώσσας σε τηλεοπτικά διαφημιστικά μηνύματα ["Endoglossiki metafrasi kat epilogin: I periptosi tou upotitlismou dialektikon sustimaton tis ellinikis glossas se tileoptika diafimistika minimata"]. *The Tenth International Conference of Greek Linguistics*, edited by Zoe Gavriilidou et al., Democritus University of Thrace, 2012, pp. 870–80.
- Leontis, Artemis. *Topographies of Hellenism: Mapping the Homeland*. Cornell UP, 1995.
- Longenbach, James. *The Resistance to Poetry*. U of Chicago P, 2004.
- Loulakaki-Moore, Irene. *Seferis and Elytis as Translators*. Peter Lang, 2010.
- Mackridge, Peter. *Language and National Identity in Greece, 1766–1976*. Oxford UP, 2009.
- Maronitis, D. N. "Intralingual Translation: Genuine and False Dilemmas." Translated by Yorgos Agoustis. *Translation and the Classic: Identity as Change in the History of Culture*, edited by Alexandra Lianeri and Vanda Zajko, Oxford UP, 2008, pp. 367–85.
- . "Intralinguistic Inequality." "Strong" and "Weak" Languages in the European Union: *Aspects of Linguistic Hegemonism*, edited by A.-F. Christidis, vol. 2, Center for the Greek Language, 1999, pp. 879–82.
- . translator. 'Οδύσσεια [Odysseia]. Triantafyllidis Institute, 2009, www.greek-language.gr/digitalResources/ancient_greek/library/browse.html?text_id=133.
- Mayakovsky, Vladimir. Ποιήματα, πρόλογος και απόδοση Ρίτσος Γιάννης [Poimata, prologos kai apodosi Ritsos Yannis]. Translated by Yannis Ritsos, Kedros, 1964.
- O'Meara, Dominic J. "On the Source and Authenticity of Heraclitus Fragment 4 (DK)." *Museum Helveticum*, vol. 74, no. 1, 2017, pp. 1–5.
- Politis, Linos, editor. Ποιητική ανθολογία (πρώτος τόμος): Πριν από την άλωση [Poiitiki anthologia (protos tomos): Prin apo tin alosi]. Dodoni, 1998.
- Ritsos, Yannis, editor and translator. Ανθολογία Ρουμανικής ποίησης, πρόλογος και απόδοση Ρίτσος Γιάννης [Anthologia Roumanikis poiisis, prologos kai apodosi Ritsos Yannis]. Kedros, 1961.
- , editor and translator. Ανθολογία Τσέχων και Σλοβάκων ποιητών, απόδοση Ρίτσος Γιάννης [Anthologia Tsekon kai Slovakon poiiton, apodosi Ritsos Yannis]. Themelio, 1966.
- . *Exile and Return: Selected Poems, 1967–1974*. Translated by Edmund Keeley, Ecco, 1985.

- . *Le mur dans le miroir / Ismène*. Translated by Dominique Grandmont, Gallimard, 1973.
- . Πέτρες—Επαναλήψεις—Κιγκλιδόμα [Petres—Epanalipseis—Kigklidoma]. Kedros, 1972.
- . *Pierres, Répétitions, Barreaux*. Bilingual ed., translated by Chrysa Prokopaki, et al., preface by Louis Aragon, Gallimard, 1971.
- . Ο τοίχος μέσα στον καθρέφτη [O toichos mesa ston kathrefiti]. Kedros, 1974.
- . Ζωή—ένα τραύμα στην ανυπαρξία [“Zoe—ena trauma stin aniparksia”]. Ritsos, *Petres*, p. 39.
- Said, Edward W. Πνευματική εξορία: Εκπατρισμός και περιθωριοποίηση [“Pneumatiki exoria: Ekpatrismos ke perithoriopoiisi”]. Introduced by Haris Vlavianos and translated by Yiannis Papadimitriou. *Poiisi*, vol. 10, fall-winter 1997, pp. 67–90.
- . *Representations of the Intellectual*. Vintage Books, 1996.
- Savvas, Minas. Translator’s introduction. *Chronicle of Exile*, by Yannis Ritsos, foreword by Louis Aragon, Wire Press, 1977, pp. 13–19.
- Seferis, George. Αντιγραφές [Antigraphes]. Edited by G. P. Savvidis, Ikaros, 1978.
- . Η αποκάλυψη του Ιωάννη [I apokalypsi tou Ioanni]. Edited by G. P. Savvidis, Ikaros, 1975.
- . “The Art of Poetry No. 13.” Interview by Edmund Keeley. *The Paris Review*, no. 50, 1970, www.theparisreview.org/interviews/4112/the-art-of-poetry-no-13-george-seferis.
- . Άσμα ασμάτων [Asma asmaton]. Edited by G. P. Savvidis, Ikaros, 1979.
- . Μεταγραφές [Metagraphes]. Edited by Yiorgos Yiatromanolakis, Ikaros, 2000.
- . Με τον τρόπο του Γ. Σ. [“Me ton tropo tou G. S.”]. Seferis, *Poiimata*, pp. 99–101.
- . Ο Γέρος [“O Geros”]. Seferis, *Poiimata*, pp. 102–03.
- . “The Old Man.” *George Seferis: Collected Poems, Revised Edition*, translated, edited, and introduced by Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard, Princeton UP, 1995, pp. 54–55.
- . Ποιήματα [Poiimata]. Edited by Dimitris Daskalopoulos, Ikaros, 2014.
- . Τ. Σ. Έλιοτ: Η έρημη χώρα [T. S. Eliot: I erimi chora]. Edited by G. P. Savvidis, Ikaros, 1973.
- Stergiopoulou, Katerina. “Between the Lines: Seferis Anti-writing Pound’s Homer.” *Comparative Literature*, vol. 66, no. 4, 2014, pp. 375–98.
- . “The Song of Songs in the Rhythms of George Seferis.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2016, pp. 265–98.
- Tölölyan, Khachig. “A General Introduction to Exile.” *Les diasporas dans le monde contemporain: Un état des lieux*, edited by William Berthomière and Christine Chivallon, Éditions Karthala et MSHA, 2006, pp. 195–209.
- Van Dyck, Karen. “Introduction to Translation and Deterritorialization.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1990, pp. 169–71.
- . “The Language Question and the Diaspora.” *The Making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism, and the Uses of the Past (1797–1896)*, edited by Roderick Beaton and David Ricks, Ashgate Publishing, 2008, pp. 189–98.
- . “Migration, Translingualism, Translation.” *The Translation Studies Reader*, 4th ed., edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2021, pp. 466–85.
- . 1922–2022: Όπου και να ταξιδέψω η Ελλάδα με πληγώνει [“1922–2022: Opu kai na taksidepso i Ellada me pligonei”]. Translated by Alexandros Karavelos et al. Ποιητική [Poiitiki], vol. 32, fall-winter 2023, forthcoming.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *Contra Instrumentalism: A Translation Polemic*. U of Nebraska P, 2019.
- . “The Poet’s Version; or, An Ethics of Translation.” *Translation Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2011, pp. 230–47.
- . “Translation, Interpretation, Canon Formation.” *Translation and the Classic: Identity as Change in the History of Culture*, edited by Alexandra Lianeri and Vanda Zajko, Oxford UP, 2008, pp. 27–51.
- Yiatromanolakis, Yiorgos. Μεταφραστική θεωρία και πρακτική του Σεφέρη [“Metafrastiki theoria kai praktiki tou Seferi”]. Seferis, *Metagraphes*, pp. 227–82.
- . Οι Μεταγραφές [“Oi metagraphes”]. Seferis, *Metagraphes*, pp. 283–308.
- Yildiz, Yasemin. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. Fordham UP, 2012.

Abstract: Modern Greek poets often imagine interlingual translation as intralingual—that is, as rewording within the same language when two distinct languages are involved. George Seferis and Yannis Ritsos provide two cases, Seferis in translating Ancient Greek poetry and Ritsos in translating Romanian, Czech, and Slovakian poetry. For these poet-translators on opposite sides of the political spectrum, the claim of intralingualism responds to different experiences of exile: Seferis as a refugee from Asia Minor and then as an overseas diplomat, Ritsos as a political prisoner and then as a Communist Party emissary. Intralingual translation assuages *xenitia*, the pain of not being able to go home, but it also masks interlingual differences that serve other cultural and political functions, whether imagining a national language that continues a valuable cultural past or serving as a transnational vehicle for unifying minor cultures.