

Goethe's glosses to translation

Dinda L. Gorlée

Van Alkemadeaan 806

NL 2597 BC The Hague, The Netherlands

e-mail: gorlee@xs4all.nl; <http://gorlee.home.xs4all.nl/>

Abstract. The logical and illogical unity of translation with a triadic approach was mediated by Peirce's three-way semiotics of sign, object, and interpretant. Semio-translation creates a dynamic network of Peircean interpretants, which deal with artificial but alive signs progressively growing from undetermined ("bad") versions to higher determined ("good") translations. The three-way forms of translation were mentioned by Goethe. He imitated the old Persian poetry of Hafiz (14th Century) to compose his German paraphrase of *West-östlicher Divan* (1814–1819). To justify the liberties of his own translation/paraphrase, Goethe furnished notes in *Noten und Abhandlungen* and *Paralipomena* (1818–1819). Through his critical glosses, he explained information, adaptation, and reproduction of the foreign culture and literature (old Persian written in Arabic script) to become transplanted into the "equivalent" in German 19th Century verse. As critical patron of translation and cultural agent, Goethe's *Divan* notes are a parody mixing Orient and Occident. He built a (lack of) likeness, pointing in the pseudo-semiosis of translation to first and second degenerate types of object and sign.

1. Friendship

When I find myself recollecting some instances of meeting Juri Lotman, I vividly remember the turmoil between East and West, making us captive of the political history and alienizing all personal contact. Lotman's effective appeal to my invitation to become, together with Thomas A. Sebeok, key speakers of the First Congress of the Norwegian Association of Semiotics in Bergen (1989), became a semiotic extravaganza, unforgettable for all present. Translation was a crucial issue, but it seemed to work between semiotic friends. Sebeok addressed Lotman "mostly in German, with snatches of French, interspersed by his shaky English and my faltering Russian" (Sebeok 2001: 167). During one of the events of the congress, Lotman whispered to me in French, as I

guess, that translation was on the program in the semiotic school in Tartu. I thought that the brief remark was a smart anecdote, but I had misunderstood Lotman's cryptic words, alas!

The semiotic approach to translation – *semiotranslation* – had for many years been my lonely adventure. To write the methodology of Charles S. Peirce's semiotics in a doctoral dissertation was against the opinion of my university superiors, so I worked on the enterprise alone. Later, under the inspiration of Sebeok, Peircean translation had turned into my "mono-mania". In October 1999, if I remember well, I met for the first time Peeter Torop during the 7th International Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies in Dresden. Immediately, we became friends, although we had in the beginning no real language in common, but needed to communicate through half-words, body movements, and gestures. We have stayed honest friends until today (and hopefully tomorrow). My words of friendship are a simple yet affectionate statement but, in a time of professional wilderness, I fully realize that having a real friend overcomes our active busyness to trust in the truth and luxury of the language of friendship.

Lotman's hidden and secret words were realized in the friendship between Peeter and myself. A friendship between two semiotic translation theoreticians exists in our case to challenge the "old" rules of linguistic translatology into producing a new semiotic theory about the plural and manifold activity of making sense of a source text into a target text. Translatology – translating (process) and translation (product) – starts from the original, Romantic unity of the ego breathing his or her individual fashion of translation traversing the fixed and normative unity of language-and-grammar, but the perspective has now changed into the revolutionary advance of the plurality of the translator's signatures. Translating (process) and translation (product) create a living and radical form of Roman Jakobson's transmutation, inside and outside the source text, producing new target reactions of the "chaotic" symbiosis of language-and-culture.

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832), the Romantic poet-dramatist-novelist-philosopher and scientist (anatomy, botany) of German culture, came close to defining the modern version of translatology. In his days, he saw translation – including annotation, retranslation, and even lexicography – of a literary work in the German language as a means of performing a vital service for particularly classical literature. Goethe introduced the concept of world literature, building and mediating the cultural and political identity of the

German princedoms into one national home (Venuti 1998: 77–78). However, at *informal* kinds of *causeries* with his younger secretary Johann Peter Eckermann (1792–1854)¹ – indeed, early forms of “interviews” occurring in

¹ This footnote is an *informal* excursus to punctuate *formally* the acute angle to understand the two ways of Goethe’s work in *formal and informal* writings, as argued here separately and in mediation. Semiotically, both reflect *knowledge* and *metaknowledge*, unfolding in the formation of reasoning in Peirce’s three categories: argumentative deduction, experimental induction, and hypothetical abduction reflect the two concepts of formality and informality, that are not separate but interactive in whole and parts. The *formal* mind is the pure cognition of *semiosis* (logical Thirdness, with nuances of Secondness and Firstness) and the *informal* mind is the *degenerate pseudo-semiosis* (real or fictional Secondness, with nuances of Firstness and Thirdness). In literary genres, Peirce’s categories represent description, narration, and dissertation. *Formal* works are the flow of text-oriented thought-signs, to have essentially one interpretation, whereas *informal* works embody culture-oriented “factors – the bodily states and external conditions – and these interrupt logical thought and fact” (Esposito 1980: 112). The *informal* stories are the picaresque variety of narrative genres. The flow of episodes, plots, anecdotes, and other impressionistic and causal narrations can embrace many meanings, even ambiguous and contradictory senses.

In Lotman’s cultural semiosis, the “constant flux” (1990: 151) of *knowledge* and *metaknowledge* throws light on the dialogic interaction of different human *semiospheres* (1990: 125ff.). The structural boundaries of *formal* cultural (moral, ethical, ideological) space may be crossed by all kinds of *informal* human (self-)expressions reflecting various cultures. In literary language, the crosswise dialog between formal and informal codes demonstrates how and when human cultures (and subcultures) move away from domestic codes to shift to adopting new and strange codes. Lotman exchanges the *formal* “stereotype-images” into the *informal* image of what is described as “the unknown Dostoevsky” or “Goethe as he really was” to give a “true understanding” of literary personalities and their works (1990: 137). See also *metaknowledge* in the encyclopedic information of Sebeok (1986: 1: 529–534) and Greimas (1982: 188–190, 192).

Goethe’s *formal* attitude about literary translation will focus on his creative translation of his *West-östlicher Divan*. His *informal* view will be argued about his own self-explanatory notes, explaining the complexities of his *German* translation of the *Arabic* verse.

In this article, Goethe’s *informal* attitude about literary translation will be discussed: firstly, in the editor’s “table-talk literature” (1946: viii) of Goethe’s *Conversations* with Eckermann, and secondly, Goethe’s self-explanatory notes, explaining the German translation of his *Divan* verse. The latter, the *Divan* and the notes, shows the difference between Lotman’s terms of “*central and peripheral spheres of culture*” (1990: 162). The *Divan* is “the central sphere of culture ... constructed on the principle of an integrated structural whole, like a sentence”, whereas the notes are “the peripheral sphere ... organized like a cumulative chain organized by the simple joining of structurally

Goethe's study of the Weimar *Palais*, during dinner, in the library, in the garden, or taking walks together – Goethe interpreted as “translator” of his own experiences, the similarity between botanical form, shape, or pattern to:

[...] a green plant shooting up from its root, thrusting forth strong green leaves from the sturdy stem, and at last terminating in a flower. The flower is unexpected and startling, but come it must – nay, the whole foliage has existed only for the sake of that flower [...]. This is the ideal – this is the flower. The green foliage of the extremely real introduction is only there for the sake of this ideal, and only worth anything on account of it. For what is the real in itself? We take delight in it when it is represented with truth – nay, it may give us a clearer knowledge of certain things; but the proper gain to our higher nature lies alone in the ideal, which proceeds from the heart of the poet. (Eckermann 1946: 155; see 327)

Goethe's footnotes to the phenomenon of translation explained the organic form of translation, attaining the long-cultivated ambition to blossom and fruit. Anticipating the idea of intersemiotic translation, Goethe's approach seemed in some ways to anticipate *biosemiotics*. Indeed, the wilderness of the thistle path – shooting up from the wild rhizomes, thrusting forth thorny weeds with sharp spines and prickly margins – comes alive in the nomadic wanderings into the translator's semiosis or pseudo-semiosis (Kull, Torop 2003, Gorfée 2004a). As a warning against the business of “a thousand hindrances” of translation, Goethe's proverb said, “one must not expect grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles [...]” (Eckermann 1946: 385, 199). After his botanical analogy, Goethe added in spirited inspiration: “The like has often happened to me in life; and such cases lead to a belief in a higher influence, in something daemonic, which we adore without trying to explain further” (Eckermann 1946: 385). Friendship, I guess.

2. Semiotranslation

The conventional view of translation is the *dual* (or *dyadic*) *approach* that has tended to predominate the whole of translation studies. This comprehensive theory of translation studies was used as a systematic guideline and, semio-

independent texts” (Lotman 1990: 162). Lotman adds that “This organization best corresponds to the function of these texts: of the first to be a structural model of the world and of the second to be a special archive of anomalies” (Lotman 1990: 162).

tically, was based on the twofold concepts of Ferdinand de Saussure's language theory – signifier and signified, *langue* and *parole*, denotation and connotation, matter and form, sound and meaning, as well as synchrony and diachrony. The semiologically oriented language theory was in agreement with Saussure's system of contrastive terms, while the dual dichotomies produced, for example, Hjelmslev's expression and content, form and substance, and Jakobson's code and message, selection and combination, metaphor and metonymy, whole and details. However, Sebeok's inner and outer, vocal and nonvocal, verbal and nonverbal, linguistic and nonlinguistic signs and sign systems, as well as Lotman's primary and secondary modelling systems, internal and external communication, closed and open cultures, cultural center and periphery, tended not towards Saussure's contrastive oppositions, but reflect a continuum, echoing a relational structure of evolutionary progress. They grasp aspects of dynamic modes of expression, as found in Peirce's *threefold (or triadic) doctrine of semiotic signs*.

Within the threefold categories, the two-step model of translation studies of the linguistic (or multilingual) relation between the production and the producer, or the producing activity and reproductive activity, loses the primary importance. So does the ideal of perfect *equivalence* produced in the target language stand for the "same" place in the source language. The "old" model of classical equivalence has produced the paradigm of evaluating in the lines of the argument a yes/no response. The dual explanation judges translation according to the dual dichotomies of language: translation studies and translation practice, translation process and translation product, translatability and untranslatability, prescriptive (normative) and descriptive translation, co-textual and contextual translations, as well as source-oriented and target-oriented translations, faithful and free translation, linguistic and artistic translation, naturalizing and alienating translation, exotization and acculturation of translations, historization and actualization (assimilation) of translations, accuracy and receptibility of translations, and many others emanating from semiological (structuralist) approaches to translation studies (Greimas 1982: 351–352).

Semiotranslation is the "new" methodology, characterized as Peirce's doctrine of detecting and analyzing signs as a "progressive" thinking method, different from Saussure. Hijacked by Peirce, as my situation was, away from the camp of Saussure, the outlook of translation studies and the translation of meaning was based on the division and subdivision of the framework of Peirce's logical terms. The semiotic sign or representamen, object, and

interpretant, divided into various threeway elements, correspond to Peirce's categories of Firstness, Secondness, Thirdness. The threeway elements are not separate but interact with each other in semiosis, when possible. Translators, as human interpreters, work with *pseudo-semiosis* or Peirce's *degenerate semiosis* (Gorlée 1990; see fn. 1), as argued here. *Semiotranslation* channels a dynamic network of Peircean interpretant-signs, considered as artificial "sign-things" which are still alive, and thus progressively growing in time. A translation is a (re)creative work by a translator (or various translators), going through successive moods, aspects, and phases of the never-ending acts of translation. Simplifying the complex tasks of the translator, the vague and impromptu translations, made by so-called "bad" translators bringing in unintegrated and illogical impressions, could under the fortunate circumstances of "good" translators grow to become clear translations, giving higher determined and logical features – or performing any interpretant-messages whatsoever between "good" and "bad" (Gorlée 2004a: 167, 2004b) in what can be called *inter-mediate types*.

Peirce's mental activity of threeway subdivisions had the cultural flavor of detecting all kinds of signs and nonsigns, analyzing both linguistic and non-linguistic (graphical, acoustic, optical, and other) messages (see Sebeok 1985) interplaying with each other in the outer and inner speech expressed in the sensation, emotion, and attention of the new media. Between Saussure – in agreement with Nida's formal and dynamic equivalence (1964) – but tending toward Peirce, Jakobson's three types of translation (1959) gave widening significances to the traditional concept of translation, defined as: (1) Intra-lingual translation or *rewording* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language, (2) Interlingual translation or *translation proper* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language, and (3) Intersemiotic translation or *transmutation* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems. (Jakobson 1959: 233)

Jakobson's threefold division of translations gives the translational concept new and extralinguistic horizons beyond merely the accurate "rewording" and less accurate "translation proper" to the free and unbounded "transmutation" (Gorlée 1994: 156ff.). The wider phenomenon, including an "unconventional" repertoire of extensive forms of translations, was either supported or rejected, by purely linguistic translation theoreticians, as being non-empirical and "radical". Jakobson's *On linguistic aspects of translation* (1959) is now included in *The Translation Studies Reader* (Venuti 2004: 138–143), but in this recent

manual of translation studies, semiotics is not (yet) mentioned as a methodology of translation studies.²

The criticism of semiology (in the French tradition: structuralism) and its symbiosis with translation studies may be summarized in the following three points: (1) the linguistic imperialism, in which a linguistic model can be applied to nonlinguistic objects in a metaphorical replacement, without doing justice to the nature of the nonlinguistic objects, (2) semiology is basically the study of signifiers, and does not ask *what* signs mean but *how* they mean, the object that refers to the sign; meaning becomes wholly a sign-internal affair, while Peirce's interpretant-sign falls outside the sign and is not studied and not described, and finally (3) binarism, the division into *a priori* dual oppositions is presented as the instrument for exhaustive analysis, claiming to lead to objective, scientific conclusions; without analyzing the meaningful aspects of language and culture, time and space of the dynamic idea-potentiality of the sign in the human mind, that is identified and translated into the interpretant-sign (see Savan 1987–1988: 15–72).

Peirce's semiotics argues that any scientific inquiry is best conceived as a dynamic truth-searching process, that is goal-directed (teleological) but with no fixed results, no fixed methods, no fixed redefinitions, and no fixed agents. All results, methods, and agents are temporary habits, which are repeatable and nonrepeatable patterns of behavior. The same is also true for interpretative translation – or *semiotranslation*. Peirce's idea dramatically changes the whole traditional approach, that as argued concentrates heavily on the basically unverifiable dichotomies labeled as a dogmatic form of dual expression. *Semiotranslation* offers answers of an evolutionary and sceptical nature about the possibility (or impossibility) of translatability and untranslatability, equivalence and fidelity/infidelity, the function and role of the intelligence, will, and emotion of the translator's fallibilistic mind, translation and retranslation, the fate of the source text, the destiny of the target text, and other semiotic questions.

Sebeok's encouragement deepened my interest in Peirce's semiotics, but it dawned on me that Jakobson's organic concept of translation adhered a unified whole in Lotman's semiotic theory of culture. The natural inclination to visualize translation from Peirce's logics was capitalized in Lotman's universe

² Jakobson's cardinal functions of language can be pairwise attached or matched to the triad of Peirce's categories, though they are not identical to them and their correlation is interactive and may vary upwards and downwards with the communicational instances and textual network (Gorlée 2008).

of translation that joined language and culture into what I call the concept of *linguiculture* (Anderson and Gorlée 2011).³ The expansive system of *semiotranslation* includes culture and becomes *linguiculture*, grown and developed in Peeter Torop's concept of *total translation* (in 1995, in Russian, with following publications), celebrated in the seminar *Culture in Mediation: Total Translation, Complementary Perspectives* (2010) in his honor. Torop's *linguiculture* and his *semiotranslation* are actively involved in reaching the ultimate goal of Jakobson's intersemiotic translation transferred to the forms and shapes of interartistic and interorganic transmutation.

Returning to humanist Goethe, long ago he visualized intersemiotics in the conversational approach to Eckermann, stating that:

The plant goes from knot to knot, closing at last with the flower and the seed. In the animal kingdom it is the same. The caterpillar and the tape-worm go from knot to knot, and at last form heads. With the higher animals and man, the vertebral bones grow one upon another, and terminate with the head, in which the powers are concentrated [...]. Thus does a nation bring forth its heroes, who stand at the head like demigods to protect and save [...] many last longer, but the greater part have their places supplied by others and are forgotten by posterity. (Eckermann 1946: 292)

Goethe, with his brother-in-arms Friedrich von Schiller (1759–1805), belong to the *Geniezeit*, expressing the strong belief in the progress of individual work to turn into cultural and scientific heroes – an opinion that was relevant in the epoch of the progress of the industrial revolution. Goethe mentioned the practical and theoretical evolutionism of literature, mineralogy, and meteorology.

³ *Linguiculture* is coined from “language” and “culture” to suggest their direct connection at a cognitive-intentional-intuitive level beyond that of the mere word, sentence, or discourse. *Linguiculture*, as language-*cum*-culture, follows an earlier term, *languaculture* (Agar 1994a, 1994b), according to Agar himself an “awkward term” (1994b: 60) meaning language-*and*-culture. *Languaculture* is used by Agar to argue his anthropological fieldwork (1994b: 93, 109ff. 128, 132, 137, 253f.), discussing the patterns of linguo-cultural expressions, happening in personal (low-content) or collectivistic (high-content) messages (Agar 1994a: 222). *Linguiculture* broadens *languaculture* to other areas and directions, different from Agar with a semiotic approach (Agar 1994b: 47f.). In the linguistic etymology of the binomial construction, the first unit must be affixed to the second: instead of Agar's Latin root, half-translated into French, “*lengua*” into “*langua*” (*languaculture*), the proposed “*lingui-*” in the transposition *linguiculture*, derived from Latin “*lingua*” with final affix *-i* attached after the root, will capture the speech units together with the attached cultural clues.

logy (Eckermann 1946: 292–294), but as we see, his genre of *semiotranslation* bears fruit from one to another language and stands for the continuity in the future.

3. Truchement

During the *Sturm und Drang* (*Storm and Stress*) years of Goethe's youth, Friedrich Schleiermacher's (1768–1834) (Störig 1963: 38–70; trans. Lefevere 1977: 66–89 retrans. by Susan Pernofski in Venuti 2004: 43–63) *dual or dyadic idea of translation* of Greek and Latin literature was the standard definition for translators and critics of translations. Schleiermacher took a distance from *informal* “newspaper articles and ordinary travel literature” where he argued that translation is “little more than a mechanical task” (Venuti 2004: 44f.) and concentrated on the *formal* peculiarities of “old” literature. The new world with strange words and obscure sentences, rhymed in antique hexameter had to be transmogrified to a version of German, the native tongue, adorned with classical insights to imitate a “true” approximation of the classical authors and the sacred writings. The translator needed to be a philologist, a poet, and a classical or theological scholar, to respond to the complexities of the profession. The alternative attitudes of the translator were characterized by Schleiermacher as *Verfremdung* – imitating the source language, creating a foreignness of the German translation – or *Verdeutschung* – approximating the target language and producing a germanization of the translation. In Schleiermacher's (and Goethe's) day, only a tiny elite of the readers had access to the knowledge of foreign languages, in the sense that real *paraphrases or imitations* can lead to misconceptions and misunderstandings. Schleiermacher stressed that language is a creative game and “no one has his language mechanically attached to him from the outside as if by straps” (trans. qtd. in Venuti 2004: 56f.). Translation is for translators not so claustrophobic as it seems a bootstrapping operation (Merrell 1995: 98).

Goethe's priorities started indeed from the work of classical authors (Homer, Euripides, Sophocles, Plato, Cicero), the sacred writings (Old and New Testaments), and traditional epics (*Nibelungenlied*). Since Goethe was the multilingual humanist of the old Western secular culture, he broadened the landscape to the socio-literary discussion of more modern or contemporary writers, such as Alighieri Dante, Jean-Baptiste Molière, William Shakespeare, Lord George Byron, and Walter Scott. Goethe had a classical mind, but his

unique genius and his global significance were universal and transdisciplinary. He was strongly attentive to old and new developments in music, theatre, opera, architecture, Serbian songs, Chinese novels into what he called the global ideal of the “higher world-literature” (Eckermann 1946: 263). Goethe knew French, English, Italian, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, and had translated works by Denis Diderot, François Voltaire, Benvenuto Cellini, Lord Byron, and others. Translation was Goethe’s special concern; he had been a translator himself and was fully aware of the troubles with the critical translation of literary works.⁴ Together with the brothers August Wilhelm and Friedrich von Schlegel (1767–1845, 1772–1829), who broadened the significant areas of translation to Indian literature, Goethe introduced Oriental literature to Western readers.

Goethe’s spiritual revolt out of his artistic and political life was writing *Faust*, his masterwork, in which the final volume II was completed in the last years of his life, during his conversations with Eckermann. In a quasi-autobiographical history, Goethe told the words and actions of a heroic man of enlightenment struggling between God and Mephistopheles. Bemused with magical dreams and wild passions for charming or even fatal women – recalling the Cartesian duality of mind and body – Faust sought energy and redemption through love, study, and good works. Before *Faust*, Goethe’s first escape was his pilgrimage from bourgeois *civilization* to the “otherness” of the cultures of Oriental life, that was in Germany otherwise regarded than the British and French explorations of the East (Said 2003). In Goethe’s Germany, the Orient was an imaginative and unknown world of mysteries, with the alien customs of a Muslim continent and speaking Arabic, the language of the cryptic but sacred Islam.

Goethe was transmogrified into a Western Orientalist – although a *salon* Orientalist, since he never traveled to the East to study Arabic *in situ*. He composed the German translation of the Persian ghasal lyric of Hafiz⁵ (14th century), written in Arabic script. In the years of Goethe’s translation of Hafiz,

⁴ In Goethe’s informal *Conversations* with Eckermann (1946), an intralingual translation of the actual conversations, the phenomenon of interlingual translation is repeated and discussed many times: specifically (1946: 65, 78, 160, 163ff, 199, 309, 320, 341, 385, 395, 396, 400, 410) and references to Goethe’s intersemiotic translation (1946: 135f, 303, 320).

⁵ Hafiz (original name: Shams ud-din Mohammad) (c.1325–1390) was a Persian poet (Shiraz, now Iran) of the *ghazals* or odes. Belonged to the order of dervishes and was a member of the mystical Sufi sect. Hafiz has been the subject of an enormous and still growing scholarship of Oriental studies, but will here only be indicated in some details.

the study of Orientalism changed his Western scale of art into a paradise of Oriental art (Said 2003). The basic elements are not the familiar Western “*Skulptur und Bild, sondern Ornament und Kalligraph*” (sculpture and image but rather ornament and calligraphy, my trans.) (Solbrig 1973: 84). The mystical understanding of the recitation of the *Quran*, the metaphors of a beautiful rose with hundred leaves, and the nightingale’s song had to be symbolized, fictionalized, and to a certain degree allegorized (Solbrig 1973: 96). The rhetorical symbolisms of Hafiz’ mystical trance, drunk on the wine of the beloved sultana, were translated into Goethe’s own sensual desire worded in his love poetry.⁶

Goethe mediated not in person, but in *fine arts* between East and West. His German *West-östlicher Divan* was no ordinary translation but he composed a retranslation and reversion, or better a:

Truchement [which] derives nicely from the Arabic *turjaman*, meaning “interpreter”, “intermediary”, or “spokesman”. On the one hand, Orientalism acquired the Orient as literally and as widely as possible; on the other, it domesticated this knowledge to the West, filtering it through regulatory codes, classifications, specimen cases, periodical reviews, dictionaries, grammars, commentaries, editions, translations, all of which together formed a simulacrum of the Orient and reproduced it materially in the West, for the West. (Said 2003: 166; see Paker 1998: 571)

Goethe’s *West-östlicher Divan* (tr. *West-Eastern Divan*) (1814–1819)⁷ is the *formal paraphrase* of the Oriental narratives of Hafiz.⁸ However, Goethe was

⁶ See Thubron (2009). Sufi poetry was religious and didactic verse, but is at times full of mystical satire with parodies and travesties. The criticism of the complexity of Islam society can turn into a flirt “with public obloquy and social danger, as if to prove that their love of God was wholly disinterested, uninfluenced by, indeed, contemptuous of, the social approval sought by the outwardly pious. Wine, forbidden to Muslims, becomes the emblem of divinity: homoeroticism (forbidden in theory, though not always in practice) is a recurring theme, where the divine is manifested in the beauty of beardless boys” (Ruthven 1997: 65–66).

⁷ For the German original of the *West-östlicher Divan* including *Noten und Abhandlungen* and *Paralipomena* (Goethe 1952, published in East Germany) and without *Paralipomena* (Goethe 1958, published in West Germany). For *Noten und Abhandlungen*, see Störig (1963: 35–37). For the English translation of *West-östlicher Divan*, see Goethe (1998), of *Noten und Abhandlungen*, see Lefevere (1977: 35–37), retranslated by Sharon Sloan in Venuti (2004: 64–66). The English translation of *Paralipomena* (Goethe 1952) is my own.

⁸ The *Oxford English Dictionary* refers that the Persian word “*divan*”, untranslated into German and English, was “[o]riginally, in early use, a brochure, or fascicle of written leaves or sheets, hence a collection of poems” (OED 1989: 4: 882).

acquainted with Hafiz through the German translation of *Divan* (1812), written by the Austrian diplomat and Orientalist Joseph *Freiherr* von Hammer-Purgstall (1774–1856). As Goethe explained in his *Divan* (1952: 183–185, 1958: 302–304), he had from 1814 read von Hammer-Purgstall's recent translation of Hafiz' *ghazals*. This reading aroused so vividly his deeper emotions, that he felt encouraged and stimulated into making his own retranslation. Indeed, Oriental studies was in Goethe's days a pioneer project, so that Hammer's translation in German was a bold experiment in Oriental scholarship.⁹ Hammer-Purgstall had sent his translated book to Goethe, with the artistic dedication "*Dem Zaubermeister das Werkzeug*" ("a tool for the magician", my trans.) (Solbrig 1973: 13, 37). Hammer's translation was basically an interlinear version, a word-for-word *imitation* retaining the Arabic words and their different meanings (polysemy) for the learned audience of Orientalists. Yet in Goethe's vision, Hammer's philological translation became a dynamic exhortation to develop further into elegant poetry for Western man and woman.

Hammer's poetic simplicity was compared by Henri Broms to a forgotten treasure of "rough diamonds", although in his beautiful metaphor Broms recognized that "their roughness is no fault, it is, rather, as if these original, simple rhythms might give a clearer sight of Hafiz' world than many later interpretations" (1968: 46–47). Eastern and Western man and woman do not use the same structures and their minds use different logics (Broms 1990). Goethe was a visionary poet and his duty was to animate Hafiz' lyrical poems for the "popular" elixir of Western life (Eckermann 1946: 271). He read Hammer's poetically rough translation as a tool to mix his meanings in the retranslation. There was in those days no affair of plagiarism, claiming responsibility for Goethe's copying or stealing Hammer's words or ideas. Indeed, Goethe highly appreciated Hammer's translation – "*mit Achtung und Anerkennung*" ("with esteem and recognition", my trans.) (Solbrig 1973: 16), "*höchster Lob*" ("highest praise", my trans.) (Lentz 1958: 21) – and *vice versa*. He consulted Hammer-Purgstall's treatise again and again to solve many of his translational problems. At the same time, Goethe never wrote about the lack of artistic value of the alien words and ambiguities used by Hammer-Purgstall, that, as it seemed to Goethe, were "created" for his poetic verse (Lentz 1958: 24).

⁹ Joseph Hammer-Purgstall was a multilingual scholar. Beyond his native language, German, he knew Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Greek, Latin, Spanish, Italian, French, English, Hebrew, and Russian (Solbrig 1973: 45).

Goethe had been deeply interested in Zoroastrianism, Mohammad's *Quran*, and Bedouin poetry. Yet his thoughts must have remembered when he was a boy and heard the Oriental storytelling of the beautiful and captivating princess Sheherazade, whose marvelous fantasies of Oriental wealth, food and drink, and sex were to pleasure her husband, the king of Samarkand. The original stories of the popular (but unfinished) collection, *Thousand and One Nights* or *Arabian Nights* (Mommsen 1981: ix–xxiii, 101–118, 290–295), had been written in Arabic, but were translated to French in 12 volumes of Abbé Antoine Galland's *Les mille et une nuits* (1704–1717) and then retranslated from French into other European languages, including German (Mommsen 1981: xv).

The popular Arabian tales, and the variants and imitations of this Western pilgrimage, had nothing to do with the impoverished life of Eastern men and women confined to the desert and held in low repute by the Muslim code of the Islamic Middle East (Said 2003: 64f., 193ff.). From the *informal* coffee-house pleasure to the *formal* amusement of Goethe's genius, as man of Western taste, he turned, with his intimate narration and wealth of local color, the *Divan* into a dramatic imagery between reality and romance, a travesty in which romance was stronger than reality. Despite the religious war of Christendom and Islam, Goethe felt free in the poetic retranslation to identify himself with his prophetic "twin brother" Hafiz. He also took the liberty to disguise Marianne von Willemer (1784–1860), his mistress, to play the role of poetess Suleika (Nicoletti 2002: 349-376).

Goethe followed the poetic verse of Hafiz' *ghazals* (from Arabic "spinning"), that were Sufi-inspired poems of varying length and made up of a number of 4 to 14 couplets, all upon the same rhyme, playing together a pattern of variations on the main theme. The rhyme is repeated throughout the poem, but the off lines are unrhymed (aa, ab, ac, etc.). In the final couplet, the poet signs his name. The continuity of *ghazals* is, for Western eyes, rhapsodic and incoherent. To give the hidden meaning a sense, Goethe had expanded the couplet into a stanza up to 30 lines and made the *ghazal* a logical unity. In terms of style, he did not use the style of "old" quasi-Oriental writing, the historicizing or retrospective approach, *en vogue* in the Western world to approximate the Oriental world-picture to the West. Goethe abandoned his earlier two-step model of either exoticizing or naturalizing translation and tried to give the translated cycle of the poetic verse and essays a new, modernized, and actual expression in the German *Divan*.

The target-oriented *truchement* meant that the translator Goethe had to a certain degree modified linguistically and culturally the source text to suit his reality, taste, and critical standards, attributing modern ideas, persons, things, etc. to the target readership (Gorlée 1997: 162). Taking some scientific distance from Hammer-Purgstall's philological translation, Goethe wrote with what sounded like the suddenly liberated translator of bridging socio-cultural differences (Fink 1982). Despite the traditional models, Goethe was free and followed his own lyric-prosaic "*Spielformen*" (Scholz 1990), that is playful forms of abductive literature, including the free mixture of foreign and native elements. As a globalized botanist, Goethe offered "something like a rhizomatic model" of "the desert and the oasis [...] rather than forest and field" (Deleuze, Guattari 1987: 18; see Gorlée 2004a). Goethe's *Divan* collection is not Hammer's monolog but a role-playing dialog, or even trialog.

4. (Meta)statements

In Goethe's *Divan* cycle, the *formal* story went hand in hand with the *informal* asides: the *Noten und Abhandlungen* (tr. *Notes and Essays*) and then *Paralipomena* (1818–1819). In both marginal glosses¹⁰, Goethe coped with the *doubles entendres* of the *Divan's* rewording, paraphrasing, amplifying, re-interpreting, condensing, parodying, and commenting of the revision and (re)-translation. The comments, redactions, adjuncts, phrases, paragraphs, fragments, and at times even misplacings and misunderstandings are published to better understand the techniques, plots, motifs, and types of the German *Divan*. Goethe's *informal* marginalia reflected his own *metastatements* – Merrell's "counterstatements, counterpropositions, counterarguments, and countertexts" (1982: 132) – about the analytical differences with respect to the *statements* of creative translation (Popovič 1975: 12–13; see fn. 1).

One of the last glosses features Goethe's new opinion: the *threefold model of translation*. Goethe's concept of translation manifests the information, and reproduction, and adaptation of the real and fictitious specificity of Western "orientalized" translations from Oriental literary works. In a selection of the paragraphs of the *Notes*, Goethe stated that:

¹⁰ A gloss (from Greek *glossa* "tongue", "language") – used in the title as keyword of the article – is an intellectual or naive explanation, by means of a marginal note of a previous text; sometimes used of the foreign or obscure word that requires explanation.

There are three kinds of translation. The first acquaints us with the foreign countries on our own terms; a plain prose translation is best in this purpose. Prose in and of itself serves as the best introduction: it completely neutralizes the formal characteristics of any sort of poetic art and reduces even the most exuberant waves of poetic enthusiasm to still water. The plain prose translation surprises us with foreign splendors in the midst of our national domestic sensibility; in our everyday lives, and without our realizing what is happening to us – by lending our lives a nobler air – it genuinely uplifts us. Luther's Bible translation will produce this kind of effect with each reading.

Much would have gained, for instance, if the *Nibelungen* had been set in good, solid prose at the outset, and labeled as popular literature. Then the brutal, dark, solemn, and strange sense of chivalry would still have spoken to us in its full power. Whether this would still be feasible or even advisable now is best decided by those who have more rigorously dedicated themselves to these matters of antiquity.

A second epoch follows, in which the translator endeavors to transport himself into the foreign situation but actually only appropriates the foreign idea and represents it as his own. I would like to call such an epoch *parodistic*, in the purest sense of that word. It is most often men of wit who feel drawn to the parodistic. The French make use of this style in the translation of all poetic works: Delille's translations provide hundreds of examples.¹¹ In the same way that the French adapt foreign words to their pronunciation, they adapt feelings, thoughts, even objects; for every foreign fruit there must be a substitute grown in their own soil.

[...] Because we cannot linger for very long in either a perfect or an imperfect state but must, after all, undergo one transformation after another, we experienced the third epoch of translation, which is the final and highest of the three. In such periods, the goal of the translation is to achieve perfect identity with the original, so that the one does not exist instead of the other but in the other's place.

This kind met with the most resistance in its early stages, because the translator identifies so strongly with the original that he more or less gives up the uniqueness of his own nation, creating this third kind of text for which the taste of the masses has to be developed.

At first the public was not at all satisfied with Voss¹² (who will never be fully appreciated) until gradually the public's ear accustomed itself to this new kind of translation and became comfortable with it. Now anyone who assesses the extent of what has happened, what versatility has come to the Germans, what rhythmical and metrical advantages are available to the spirited, talented beginner, how Ariosto and Tasso, Shakespeare and Calderon have been brought to us two and three times over as Germanized foreigners, may hope that literary history will openly acknowledge who was the first to choose this path in spite of so many and varied obstacles.

¹¹ Abbé Jacques Delille (1738–1813) translated Virgil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid* into German.

¹² Johann Heinrich Voss (1751–1826) translated Homer into German hexameters.

For the most part, the works of von Hammer indicate a similar treatment of oriental masterpieces; he suggests that the translation approximate as closely as possible the external form of the original work.

[...] Now would be the proper time for a new translation of the third type that would not only correspond to the various dialects, rhythms, meters, and prosaic idioms in the original but would also, in a pleasant and familiar manner, renew the poem in all of its distinctiveness for us. [...]

The reason why we also call the third epoch the final one can be explained in a few words. A translation that attempts to identify itself with the original ultimately comes close to an interlinear version and greatly facilitates our understanding of the original. We are led, yes, compelled as it were, back to the source text: the circle, within which the approximation of the foreign and the familiar, the known and the unknown constantly move, is finally complete. (Venuti 2004: 64–66; original Goethe 1952: 2: 186–189, 1958: 5: 304–307)¹³

As discussed by Venuti (2005: 801), Goethe's first phase concerns the radical domestication of the target language (*Verdeutschung*), making the reader forget that the text really is a translation of a previous work. The source text has "disappeared" and the translation is a totally Germanized version. The second phase is a duality of domestication and foreignizing (*Verfremdung*). The translation loses the closeness to the source text and becomes an alienated world formulated and reformulated in a somewhat biased translation between source and target texts. The reader of *franglais* and other mixtures of languages is aware that the translator has mediated between both texts and becomes puzzled. The third phase is a manipulation to accord with some ideology, prejudice, dogma, or belief. The source text has been modified, even mutilated, peripherally, or almost beyond recognition. Indeed, such manipulation, away from the source center, may happen (fn. 1), and be accepted, welcomed, or simply ignored in the target culture, due to the linguistic and cultural distance between the codes involved, the temporal and/or spatial distance between the text-to-be-translated and the translated text, and/or for other reasons, be they social, political, religious, institutional, commercial, and so on.

¹³ The 1952 edition offered a non-philological edition of Goethe's unchanged "original" style in old-German, without rectifying capitalization, punctuation, parentheses, grammatical misconstructions, and so forth (Goethe 1952). The 1958 is a standard edited edition. For discussion of Goethe's *Notes*, see chronologically Pannwitz (1917: 240–243), Lentz (1958), Radó (1982), Wertheim (1983), Steiner (1975: 256–260), and Nicoletti (2002).

Goethe offered an alternative to Schleiermacher's dual approach of translation to a third "move" (Robinson 1998: 98) from the historical context of German culture to the nostalgia of exotic life and the erotic love of the Orient, as delicately restructured by himself. The orientalised metempsychosis of two fictional cultures had challenged Goethe's new vision in the *informal* glosses to translation: was the Arabic *Divan* retranslated into German language more than a nomadic enthusiasm for Oriental religion and culture? Was Goethe's triadic mention of translation a linguistic-anthropological symbol mixing Orient and Occident? Was Goethe, the greatest cosmopolitan of his days, in terms of sheer erudition and mastery of the Eastern material, a cross-cultural critic of East and West?

The *Paralipomena* are *metacomments* of his own *comments*. They work as Goethe's catalogue-type information for his own use and are merely unmediated fragments, plagued by spelling mistakes and grammatical errors (see fn. 13). Without their later unedited publication (in Goethe 1952), the simplicity of Goethe's *metadata* would have been lost and "forgotten".¹⁴ The whole text is as follows:

Three kinds

1, To reconcile foreign productions and the fatherland.

2, Further attempt against the foreign to achieve a middle situation.

3, final attempt to make translation and original identical

of all three the Germans can indeed show examples of exemplary pieces.

more than approaching the foreign situation we should certainly note,

to cheer loudly on the works of von Hammer, directing us on this way.

even warmly welcoming the hexameter and pentameter from the first concept of translation.

The strangeness of the transfigurations into Greek and Latin of the excellent Jones,¹⁵ recalls the foreign country, customs, and taste, meaning that the study of the content totally destroys the originality of the poems.

¹⁴ The plural *Paralipomena* (from Greek *paraleipein* "to leave aside", "to omit") signify "forgotten" postscripts, supplements, or reflections of a previous book or fragment. Goethe's *Paralipomena* has hardly been discussed.

¹⁵ Sir William Jones (1746–1794), an English polyglot with knowledge of twenty-eight languages, was an eminent Oriental and Sanskrit scholar. Jones was interested in Hafiz and translated the sacred texts of Eastern religions. He pronounced the genealogical connection of Sanskrit with Greek and Latin, and the languages of Europe.

The grotesque enterprise of Mr. [any name] to rework Firdusi¹⁶ in the sense of alienating it from the Orient without bringing it close to the West.

A prose translation should be far better than one transformed into an alien unsuitable rhythm.

Von Hammer translation, retaining line by line of the original, is on its own correct, perhaps can Mr. [any name] decide now to accept these intents and purposes, to accomplish for himself and the bookseller in charge of the printing a flourishing business.

The translator will not harvest any thanks and the publisher no profit. (My trans. from Goethe 1952: 3: 130–131)

The chaotic *Paralipomena* naturally uses a different style of writing than the ordered paragraphs of the *Notes*. The *informal* tone reflects the emotional voice of Goethe's personal words, but his dry and business-like actions speak louder. The pitch of *Paralipomena* lay in the postscript: how to cook Goethe's *West-Eastern Divan* into a success story. Goethe focused on the production's costs: to win the spectacular bestseller the business went at the expense of his associates (including the translator).

East and West mingle in bizarre juxtaposition, but they do not mix in Goethe's labyrinth of fragments. Guided by the spatiotemporal distance to Hafiz, Goethe mediates semiotically in cultural differences of morals and scholarship as a human and spiritual alternative. His agenda of the *Notes* reflects a psychological and anthropological understanding of Eastern ideas, concepts, meaning, and nuance. The public interest of cross-cultural scholarship is translated into the free association of poetry. The results are striking, including a new vision of translation. At the same time, Goethe's hidden agenda arises in the bottom line of *Paralipomena* to determine the effectiveness of the agreement. The "negotiation" of bridging cultures and national experiences becomes on dark spots an over-confidence, changing into a purely commercial affair – an unhappy return to bourgeois *civilization*.

¹⁶ Firdusi (transliterated as Firdausi, Ferdowsi, or Firdowski) (932–1020) was the Persian poet who wrote the Iranian national epic, the *Shahnamah*.

5. Semiotic Mediation

Goethe's caravan of sign translation – from information and reproduction until adaptation – makes the target text become more and more visible in Peirce's interpretants, and the source text more and more invisible. Goethe's various "epochs" – Peirce's Secondness indicating the spatiotemporal object under the force of *haecceity* (MS 909: 18 = CP: 1.405, 1890–1891) – were transported to signify the whole sign of the trajectory of translation. Semiotic signs play the role of a mediator between thought and reality, so that the "bringing together" of translation is grounded not on genuine Thirdness, but rather on the "middle, medium, means, or mediation" of the original sign (Parmentier 1985: 42 and *passim*) to produce *mediate interpretants*.

Goethe's and Jakobson's three types of translation are the same in grammatical number, but differ on "such distinctions as objective and subjective, outward and inward, true and false, good and bad [...]" (MS 304: 39, 1903). From a more external viewpoint, Goethe valued the three degrees of possible equivalence between source and target texts, whereas Jakobson's intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic translations took the lack of equivalence for granted as the standard "equivalence in difference" (1959: 233). From an internal viewpoint, Goethe's *truchement* disguised translation in a liberated mode of a subjective translation, while Jakobson judged externally the distance between source and target language. Then Jakobson broadened their mutual translatability outside "ordinary language" (1959: 234) to translate the cultural (inter)relations (unmarked and marked forms and functions) into the target version (Mertz 1985: 13–16). Jakobson stated that the bilingual and bicultural dilemma of implying *linguiculture* defied all efforts of translatability, representing the "Gordian knot by proclaiming the dogma of untranslatability" (1959: 234). *Semiotranslation* can untie the intricate knot, cutting through untranslatability to claim Jakobson's degrees of a relative translatability – not arriving at Goethe's genial work, but an effort to solve the complexities.

Translation is freedom with a bold (re)action of the translator to reach his or her signature of the "same" meaning. The sign action is *semiotic mediation*, acting under the forces of reality and thought. In translation, Firstness – sign – and Secondness – object – are linked to connect to the "medium" of Thirdness (CP: 1.337, 1909). Peirce wrote that:

As a *medium*, the Sign is essentially in a triadic relation, to its Object which determines it, and to its Interpretant which it determines. In its relation to the Object, the Sign is *passive*; that is to say, its correspondence to the object is brought about by an effect upon the Sign, the Object remaining unaffected. On the other hand, in its relation to the Interpretant the Sign is *active*, determining the Interpretant without being itself thereby affected.

But at this point certain distinctions are called for. That which is communicated from the Object through the Sign to the Interpretant is a Form; that is to say, it is nothing like an existent, but is a power, is the fact that something would happen under certain conditions. This Form is *really* embodied in the object, meaning that the conditional relation which constitutes the form is *true* of the Form as it is in the Object. In the Sign it is embodied only in a *representative* sense, meaning that whether by virtue of some real modification of the Sign, or otherwise, the Sign becomes endowed with the power of communicating it to an interpretant. It may be in the interpretant directly, as it is in the Object, or it may be in the Interpretant dynamically, as [the] behavior of the Interpretant [...] (MS 793: 2–5 = (in different version) EP: 2: 544, 1906)

Thirdness in translation is no purely intellectual interaction of First and Second into Third, but becomes a fantasy of a Second in relation to a First, without a real Third. Peirce wrote that:

A man gives a brooch to his wife. The merely mechanical part of the act consists in his laying the brooch down while uttering certain sounds, and her taking it up. There is no genuine triplicity here; but there is no giving, either. The giving consists in his agreeing that a certain intellectual principle shall govern the relations of the brooch to his wife. (CP: 2.86, 1902)

The jewel of Goethe's creative and recreative work *West-östlicher Divan* actively involves the knowledge of Hafiz and von Hammer-Purgstall, but the "mere congeries of dual characters" (MS 901: 13 = CP: 1.371, 1885) are brought in such a way that the synthesis (Thirdness) lies on Goethe's way of translation, and particularly on himself as the translating poet.

In a literary work, the triadicty is dissolved into the "true duality" (MS 909: 11 = CP: 1.366, 1890–1891) of sign and object to embody the German interpretants in verse of Hafiz' Arabic *Divan*. Goethe's "alienated" treasure-box reflects his will and effort of mediation, based not alone on knowledge of foreign languages, but on his artistic genius and aesthetic life. Peirce returned to an Oriental tinge, when he continued as followed about semiosis and mediation:

The merchant in the *Arabian Nights* threw away a datestone which struck the eye of a Jinnee. This was purely mechanical, and there was no genuine triplicity. The throwing and the striking were independent of one another. But had he aimed at the Jinnee's eye, there would have been more than merely throwing away the stone. There would have been genuine triplicity, the stone being not merely thrown, but thrown at the eye. Here, *intention*, the mind's action, would have come in. Intellectual triplicity, or Mediation, is my third category. (CP: 2.86, 1902)¹⁷

In the understanding of Goethe's *Divan* and the "spontaneous" discovery of applying a triadic translation, the "good", "bad", and "intermediate" sign-events of translation modify and mediate the literary form of the accidental interpretants, made by pure chance and effort (CP: 1.337, 1909). Goethe's *intermediate (re)translation* reflects not genuine semiosis – the "perfect" sign of Thirdness – but offers "imperfect" signs. Pseudo-semiosis is represented in the translation composed by human interpreters. The "quasi-minds" (MS 793: 2, 1906 = EP: 2: 544, 1906) create new but biased quasi-translations, on the ground of quasi-signs made by the quasi-thought of a quasi-mind (Gorlée 2004b).¹⁸ Quasi-translations bring forth not the intellectual mind, but rather some unanalyzable, unpredictable, unsystemic, and controversial qualities of the feeling and mind of the interpreter-translator, manifesting instead of the high-level mental semiosis the lower-level idea of Goethe's wicked travesty of the real facts.

Quasi- or pseudo-Thirdness is called "Betweenness or Mediation in its simplest and most rudimentary form" (CP: 5.104, 1903). This *degenerate sign relation* brings together and takes apart – semiotically, deconstructs and

¹⁷ The passage of *Arabian Nights* about accidental Thirds is repeated in Peirce's episode: "How did I slay thy son?" asked the merchant, and the jinnee replied, 'When thou threwest away the date-stone, it smote my son, who was passing at the time, on the breast, and he died forthright.' Here there were two independent facts, first that the merchant threw away the date-stone, and second that the date-stone struck and killed the jinnee's son. Had it been aimed at him, the case would have been different; for then there would have been a relation of aiming which would have connected together the aimer, the thing aimed, and the object aimed at, in one fact. What monstrous injustice and inhumanity on the part of that jinnee to hold that poor merchant responsible for such an accident!" (MS 909: 12 = CP: 1.365, 1890–1891) and mentioned again in "the date-stone, which hit the Jinnee in the eye" (CP: 1.345, 1903).

¹⁸ Quasi-signs, see Gorlée (2004b: 66f., 87, 129f., 137, 148); quasi-thought, see Gorlée (2004b: 145, 203ff., 206ff., 214, 217ff.); quasi-mind, see Gorlée (2004b: 66f., 87, 129f., 137, 148).

constructs – Goethe's glosses on the plurality of translation (CP: 2.89ff, 1902). The deterioration of the triadic relation into a dyadic or *degenerate semiosis* can define the varieties of *intermediate types*. The thought-off content of Goethe's *Notes* is regulated by the duality of *first degenerate signs*, but the ramified lines of the *Paralipomena* agree with *second degenerate signs* (Parmentier 1985: 39f.).¹⁹ In *first or singly degenerate signs*, the interpretant points directly to its object, but does not interact with the sign. For Peirce, the interpretant “forcibly directs [...] to a particular object, and there it stops” (CP: 1.361, 1885) without giving a specific reaction. The reaction is degenerate Secondness with a nuance of Firstness and Thirdness. In *second or doubly degenerate signs*, the interpretant relates to the sign and the object in separate sign-events, to make its own sense representing the interpreter's personal meaning. The degenerate Firstness with a nuance of Secondness and Thirdness gives “a pure dream – not any particular existence, and yet not general” (CP: 3.362, 1885).

Goethe was steadily accustomed to bilingual and bicultural identities in the “radically new sort of element” (CP: 1.471, 1896) of his project, connecting and disconnecting Hafiz and von Hammer-Purgstall within his German *Divan*. He thus practiced in the definitions of the *Notes* a scientific *proposition*,²⁰ identifying related and otherwise unrelated things about the types of translations in his experience. Peirce's proposition was a singly degenerate arrangement, made “in a living effort to make its interpreter believe it true” (MS 646: 16, 1910). Goethe asserted that the dyadic connection of active sign and passive object (CP: 1.471, 1896) was known as Schleiermacher's duality of *paraphrases* and *imitations*. Yet Goethe's “triad brings a third sort of element, the expression of thought, or reasoning, consisting of a colligation of two propositions, not mere dyadic propositions, however, but general beliefs; and these two propositions are connected by a common term and tend to produce a third belief” (CP: 1.515, c.1896). Goethe wanted to affect the readers by the freedom of his third agent, *adaptation* – a germane but extraneous element to the interactive duality. In a proposition, Peirce stated that:

¹⁹ See Buczyńska-Garewicz (1979, 1983), Gorrée (1990), and Merrell (1995). Peirce's formal concept of degeneracy and its informal examples were specifically explained in his later years, from 1885 and ending in 1909; see Peirce's informal letter to Victoria Lady Welby (1837–1912) with a glossary of intermediate types (PW: 194, 1905).

²⁰ “Proposition” is one of Peirce's favourite terms, omnipresent in his writings about language, interpretation, utterance, and meaning.

[...] there are in the dyad two subjects of different character, though in special cases the difference may disappear. These two subjects are the *units* of the dyad. Each is *one*, though a dyadic one. Now the triad in like manner has not for its principal element merely a certain unanalyzable quality *sui generis*. It makes [to be sure] a certain feeling in us. (CP: 1.471, 1896)

Contrary to scientific method, “[...] it is to be understood that proposition, judgment, and belief are logically equivalent (though in other respects different)” (MS 789: 2, n.d.). Despite the doubts that “a proposition is nothing existent, but is a general model, type, or law according to which existents are shaped” (MS 280: 29, c.1905), Goethe took his responsibility of the propositional announcement, supporting the three types of translation as a general idea.

Peirce announced that “[i]n science, a diagram or analogue of the observed fact leads on to a further analogy” (MS 909: 12f. [see 42] = CP: 1.367, 1890–1891). The approximative approach of the “reactionally degenerate” (CP: 5.73, 1902) glosses of the *Notes* is again deconstructed in the doubly degenerate list of *Paralipomena*. The separate lines depend not really on intellectual performance (Thirdness), but sketch the design of the “qualitatively degenerate” (CP: 5.73, 1902) moods and tones of thought of Goethe’s own self. Goethe’s images of self-depiction in the edited version “address themselves to us, so that we fully apprehend them. But it is a *paralyzed reason* that does not acknowledge others that are not directed to us, and does not suppose still others of which we know *nothing* definitely” (MS 4: 49, 1904; my italics). Goethe’s “airy nothingness” (CP: 4.241, 1902) means that the sign of “Brute Actuality of things and facts” (Secondness) has weakened beyond the meaningful occurrence into the undetermined and vague quality of “suchness” (Firstness) (CP: 1.303, c.1894, CP: 1.326, c.1894, CP: 1.304, c.1905), independent from the object (Gorrée 2009). To illustrate the empty pages of “Translations” in *Paralipomena*, Peirce wrote something analogous, saying that:

Combine quality with quality after quality and what is the mode of being which such determinations approach indefinitely but altogether fail ever to attain? It is, as logicians have always taught, the *existence* of the individual. Individual existence whether of a thing or of a fact is the first mode of being that suchness fails to confer. (CP: 1.456, c.1896)

The mere Firstness is a “rough impression” (SS: 194, 1905) reflecting the “Sign’s Soul, which has its Being in its power of serving as intermediary between its Object and a Mind. Such, too, is a living consciousness, and such the life, the power of growth, of a plant” (CP: 6.455, 1908). Grasping the possibility of understanding the hidden idea of a “dark instinct of being a germ of thought” (CP: 5.71, 1902), the reader is brought “face to face with the very character signified” (NEM 4: 242, 1904), with the expressions and emotions of Goethe’s own self-portrait.

With “only a fragment or a completer sign” (NEM 4: 242, 1904) in Goethe’s *Paralipomena*, the last and final point of intermediate types has been argued in *bricolages* (Firstness) (Gorlée 2007: 224ff.). Translation started out as pure intellectual Thirdness, but was accurately and sharply weakened into mixed concepts of Secondness and Thirdness, mingling with Thirdness. Pseudo-translation is degenerate thought, mediated into a representation of the fact according to a possible idea. Goethe’s images of translation are not reasoned, but rely on experience and education. In the *Notes* and the *Paralipomena*, degenerate translation gave in Peirce’s perspective “just one un-separated image, not resembling a proposition in the smallest particular [...]; but it never told you so. Now in all imagination and perception there is such an operation by which thought springs up; and its only justification is that it subsequently turns out to be useful” (CP: 1.538, 1903) – like Goethe’s thing of beauty in *West-östlicher Divan*.

References

- Agar, Michael 1994a. The intercultural frame. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 18(2): 221–237.
- 1994b. *Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation*. New York: Morrow.
- Anderson, Myrdene; Gorlée, Dinda L. 2011. Duologue in the familiar and the strange: Translatability, translating, translation. In: Haworth, Karen; Hogue, Jason; Sbrocchi, Leonard G. (eds.), *Semiotics 2010: Proceedings of the Semiotic Society of America*. Ontario: Legas Publishing, 221–232.
- Broms, Henri 1968. *Two Studies in the Relations of Häfiz and the West*. (Studia Orientalia Edidit Societas Orientalis Fennica 39.) Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica (Diss. University of Helsinki).
- 1990. The Eastern man. *Semiotica* 82(3/4): 293–303.
- Buczyńska-Garewicz, Hanna 1979. The degenerate sign. *Semiosis* 13(5): 5–16.

- 1983. The degenerate sign. In: Borbé, Tasso (ed.), *Semiotics Unfolding: Proceedings of the Second Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies (IASS, Vienna 1979)*. (Approaches to Semiotics 68.) Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton, 43–50.
- Chambers, Robert 2010. *Parody: The Art that Plays with Art* (Studies in Literary Criticism & Theory 21.) New York, Frankfurt etc.: Peter Lang.
- CP = Peirce, Charles Sanders 1931–1958.
- Deleuze, Gilles; Guattari, Félix 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. (Massumi, Brian, trans.) Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press [French original: *Mille Plateaux: Capitalisme et Schizophrénie*. Paris: Minuit, 1980].
- Eckermann, Johann Peter 1946. *Conversations with Goethe*. (Moorhead, J. K., ed.; Oxenford, John, trans.) (Everyman's Library, 851). Repr. 1930 ed. London: J. M. Dutton & Sons. [German original: *Gespräche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens* (2 Vols. 1823–1827, 1828–1832). Leipzig: F. M. Brockhaus, 1836].
- EP = Peirce, Charles Sanders 1992–1998.
- Esposito, Joseph L. 1980. *Evolutionary Metaphysics: The Development of Peirce's Theory of Categories*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Fink, Karl J. 1982. Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan*: Orientalism restructured. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 14: 315–328.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von 1952. *West-östlicher Divan*. (Grumach, Ernst, ed.) (Werke Goethes, Vol. 2 *Noten und Abhandlungen*, Vol. 3 *Paralipomena*). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- 1958. *West-östlicher Divan. Noten und Abhandlungen zu besserem Verständnis des West-östlicher Divans*. (Burdach, Konrad, ed.) (Vol. 5 Welt-Goethe Ausgabe [Kippenberg, Anton; Petersen, Julius; Wahl, Hans, eds.]) Frankfurt am Main: Freies Deutsches Hochstift Goethe-Museum.
- 1963. Drei Stücke zum Thema vom Übersetzen. In: Störig, Hans Joachim (ed.), *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 34–37.
- 1998. *Poems of the West and East: West-Eastern Divan – West-östlicher Divan. Bi-lingual Edition of the Complete Poems*. (Mommssen, Katharina, ed.; Whaley, John, trans.) (Germanic Studies in America 68.) Bern, Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Goriée, Dinda L. 1990. Degeneracy: A reading of Peirce's writing. *Semiotica* 81(1/2): 71–92.
- 1994. *Semiotics and the Problem of Translation: With Special Reference to the Semiotics of Charles S. Peirce*. (Approaches to Translation Studies 12.) Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- 1997. Bridging the gap: A semiotician's view on translating the Greek classics. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 5(2): 153–169.
- 2004a. Horticultural roots of translational semiosis. In: Withalm, Gloria; Wallmannsberger, Josef (eds.), *Macht der Zeichen, Zeichen der Macht / Signs of Power, Power of Signs: Festschrift für Jeff Bernard / Essays in Honor of Jeff Bernard*. (TRANS-Studien zur Veränderung der Welt 3.) Vienna: INST Verlag, 164–187.
- 2004b. *On Translating Signs: Exploring Text and Semio-Translation*. (Approaches to Translation Studies, 24) Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- 2007. Broken signs: The architectonic translation of Peirce's fragments. *Semiotica* 163(1/4): 209–287.

- 2008. Jakobson and Peirce: Translational intersemiosis and symbiosis in opera. *Sign Systems Studies* 36(2): 341–374.
 - 2009. A sketch of Peirce's Firstness and its significance to art. *Sign Systems Studies* 37(1/2): 204–269.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien; Courtès, Joseph 1982. *Semiotics and Language: An Analytical Dictionary*. (Christ, Larry; Patte, Daniel; Lee, James; McMahon, Edward II; Phillips, Gary; Rengstorf, Michael, trans.) (Advances in Semiotics). Bloomington: Indiana University Press [French original: *Sémiotique: Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage*. Paris: Hachette, 1979].
- Jakobson, Roman 1959. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: Brower, Reuben A. (ed.), *On Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 232–239.
- Kull, Kalevi; Torop, Peeter 2003. Biotranslation: Translation between *Umwelten*. In: Petrilli, Susan (ed.), *Translation Translation*. (Approaches to Translation Studies 21.) Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 315–328 (1st ed. 2000).
- Lefevere, André 1977. *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Assen, Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.
- Lentz, Wolfgang 1958. *Goethes Noten und Abhandlungen zum West-östlichen Divan*. Hamburg: Verlag J. J. Augustin.
- Lotman, Juri M. 1990. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. (Shukman, Ann, trans.; Eco, Umberto, intro.) London, New York: I. B. Tauris.
- Merrell, Floyd 1982. *Semiotic Foundations: Steps Toward an Epistemology of Written Texts*. (Advances in Semiotics.) Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- 1995. *Semiosis in the Postmodern Age*. Purdue: Purdue University Press.
- Mertz, Elizabeth 1985. Beyond symbolic anthropology: Introducing semiotic mediation. In: Mertz, Elizabeth; Parmentier, Richard J. (eds.), *Semiotic Mediation: Sociocultural and Psychological Perspectives*. (Language, Thought, and Culture: Advances in the Study of Cognition.) Orlando etc.: Academic Press, 1–19.
- Mommsen, Katharina 1981. *Goethe und 1001 Nacht*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp [1st ed. 1960, without introduction].
- MS = Peirce, Charles Sanders (Manuscripts).
- Nicoletti, Antonella 2002. *Übersetzung als Auslegung in Goethes West-östlichem Divan im Kontext frühromantischer Übersetzungstheorien und Hermeneutik*. (Basler Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur 18.) Tübingen, Basel: Francke (Diss. University of Basel).
- Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Oxford English Dictionary, The* 1989. (Simpson, J.A.; Weiner, E.S.C., eds.) 2nd ed. 20 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [In-text references are to OED 1989, followed by volume number and page numbers]
- Paker, Salih 1998. Turkish tradition. In: Baker, Mona (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London, New York: Routledge, 571–580.
- Pannwitz, Rudolf 1917. *Die Krisis der Europäischen Kultur*. (Rudolf Pannwitz Werke, Vol. 2–4, Book 1.) Nürnberg: Verlag Hans Carl.

- Parmentier, Richard J. 1985. Sign's place *in medias res*: Peirce's concept of semiotic mediation. In: Mertz, Elizabeth; Parmentier, Richard J. (eds.), *Semiotic Mediation: Sociocultural and Psychological Perspectives*. (Language, Thought, and Culture: Advances in the Study of Cognition.) Orlando, etc.: Academic Press, 23–48.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders 1931–1958. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. (Hartshorne, Charles; Weiss, Paul; Burks, Arthur W., eds.) 8 vols. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. [In-text references are to CP: volume number, paragraph number, year]
- 1992–1998. *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings*. (Houser, Nathan; Kloesel, Christian, eds.) 2 vols. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press. [In-text references are to EP: volume number: page number, year]
 - 1976. *The New Elements of Mathematics by Charles S. Peirce*. (Eisele, Carolyn, ed.) 4 vols. The Hague, Paris: Mouton; Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press. [In-text references are to NEM: volume number, paragraph number, year]
 - 1997. *Semiotics and Signifys: The Correspondence Between Charles S. Peirce and Victoria Lady Welby*. (Hardwick, Charles S., ed.) Bloomington, London: Indiana University Press. [In-text references are to SS: page number, year]
 - (Unpublished manuscripts). Peirce Edition Project. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University. [In-text references are to MS followed by page number, year]
- Popovič, Anton 1975. *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Edmonton: University of Alberta, Dept. of Comparative Literature.
- Radó, György 1982. Goethe und die Übersetzung. *Babel* 28(4): 198–232.
- Robinson, Douglas 1998. Hermeneutic motion. In: Baker, Mona (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London, New York: Routledge, 97–99.
- Ruthven, Malise 1997. *Islam: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Said, Edward 2003. *Orientalism*. Reprint. London: Penguin (1st ed. 1978, without preface).
- Savan, David 1987–1988. *An Introduction to C. S. Peirce's Full System of Semeiotic*. (Monograph Series of the Toronto Semiotic Circle 1.) Toronto: Toronto Semiotic Circle.
- Scholz, Horst-Günther 1990. *Spielformen in Goethes Alterdichtung*. 4 vols. Frankfurt am Main: H.-A. Herchen Verlag.
- Sebeok, Thomas A. 1985. Zoosemiotic components of human communication. In: Innis, Robert E. (ed.), *Semiotics: An Introductory Anthology*. (Advances in Semiotics.) Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 294–324 [Rev. ed. 1974 and 1977].
- (gen. ed.) 1986. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics*. (Approaches to Semiotics 73.) 3 vols. Berlin etc.: Mouton de Gruyter.
 - 2001. The Estonian connection. In: Sebeok, Thomas A., *Global Semiotics*. (Advances in Semiotics.) Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 160–171.
- Solbrig, Ingeborg H. 1973. *Hammer-Purgstall und Goethe: "Dem Zaubermeister das Werkzeug"*. (Stanford German Studies 1.) Bern, Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Herbert Lang.
- Steiner, George 1975. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Störig, Hans Joachim (ed.) 1963. *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

- Thubron, Colin 2009. Madame's Butterfly Brothel. *The New York Book Review* 56(10): 24–27 [Review of Bernstein, Richard (2009). *The East, the West, and Sex: A History of Erotic Encounters*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009].
- Torop, Peeter 1995. *Total'nyj perevod*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Venuti, Lawrence 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London, New York: Routledge.
- (ed.) 2004. *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd ed. London, New York: Routledge.
 - 2005. Translation, history, narrative. *META* 50(3): 800–816.
- Wertheim, Ursula 1983. *Von Tasso zu Hafis. Probleme von Lyrik und Prosa des "West-östlichen Divans"*. Berlin, Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag.

Комментарии Гете по поводу перевода

При объяснении логической и алогической общности триадического метода перевода в статье опирались на пирсовскую семиотическую модель—триаду знак, объект и интерпретант. С помощью семиоперевода создается динамическая сеть пирсовских интерпретантов, в которой искусственные, но развивающиеся знаки прогрессируют от неопределенного («плохого») перевода ко все более определенному («хорошему») переводу. Три типа перевода выделял и Гете. В произведении «Западно-восточный диван» (*West-östlicher Divan*, 1814–1819) он подражает персидскому поэту 14 века. Использование свободного перевода/парфразирования Гете оправдывал в своих работах «Заметки и очерки о «Западно-восточном Диване»» (*Noten und Abhandlungen*) и *Paralipomena* (1818–1819). С помощью критических комментариев он объясняет передачу, адаптацию и репродуцирование информации, представленной в чужой культуре и литературе (на староперсидском языке арабским шрифтом) способом, позволившим ее трансляцию в «эквивалентный» стихотворный немецкий язык 19 века. Будучи критическим представителем перевода и культурного посредничества, Гете представляет свои комментарии к «Западно-восточному дивану» как пародию, соединяющую Запад и Восток. Гете создал (не)похожесть, указывая в ходе псевдосемиозиса на первый и второй дегенерированный тип объекта и знака.

Goethe kommentaarid tõlkimise kohta

Triaadilise tõlkemeetodi loogilise ja ebaloogilise ühtsuse vahendamisel tugineti Peirce'i kolmetisele, märgiks, objektiks ja interpretandiks jagunevale semiootilisele mudelile. Semiotõlkega luuakse Peirce'i interpretantide dünaamiline võrgustik, milles kunstlikud, kuid arenevad märgid progresseeruvad määratlematust ("halbast") versioonist järjest määratletuma ("hea") tõlke poole. Kolme tõlketüüpi eristas ka Goethe. Teoses *West-östlicher Divan* (1814–1819) imiteerib ta Pärsia poeedi Hafizi (14. saj) töid. Kasutatud vaba tõlget / parafraaseerimist õigustas Goethe oma töödes *Noten und Abhandlungen* ja *Paralipomena* (1818–1819). Kriitiliste kommentaaride abil selgitab ta võõras kultuuris ja kirjanduses (araabia tähestikus esitatud vana-pärsia keeles) esineva informatsiooni edastamist, adapteerimist ja reprodutseerimist viisil, mis võimaldaks selle transleerimist

“ekvivalentssesse” 19. sajandi saksa värsikeelde. Tõlkimise ja kultuurivahendamise kriitilise eestkostjana esitab Goethe oma teost *West-östlicher Divan* käsitlevate kommentaaride näol ida- ja õhtumaid ühendava paroodia. Goethe vormis sarnasuse (puudumise), viidates tõlke pseudo-semioosis objekti ja märgi esimesele ja teisele degenerereerunud tüübile.