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INTRODUCTION

VALERIE PELLATT

Over the latter half of the twentieth century, as translation scholars and practitioners realised the wealth, the complexity and the variety inherent in the rendering of text from one culture to another, translation studies have embraced ever more cross-disciplinary inquiry. We have gone beyond the bounds of purely linguistic and literary study, turning to cultural concerns, pragmatics, psychology, sociology and more. The fairly recent and growing interest in the role of paratext continues the spirit of innovation that characterises translation studies in the twenty-first century. Scholars are concerned with the cultural implications of paratext, its cultural significance and political, ideological and commercial power. As with any aspect of translation, paratextual material creates complex decision-making on the part of the translator, the editor and the publisher. In this volume, we explore the ways in which these agents render the paratextual elements of a variety of texts, ranging from the ideological manipulation of prefatorial material and book reviews, to the handling of crucial metadata which instructs translation software.

Paratext is the text that surrounds and supports the core text, like layers of packaging that initially protect and gradually reveal the essence of the packaged item. Much current research draws on and is inspired by the work of Genette. Genette was writing about literature: he did not tackle the complementary issues of paratext which is translated, or translation as paratext. Seminal studies such as those by Tahir-Gürcağlar (2002) and Watts (2012) have brought paratext of and in translation into sharper focus.

In this volume we regard paratext as any material additional to, appended to or external to the core text which has functions of explaining, defining, instructing, or supporting, adding background information, or the relevant opinions and attitudes of scholars, translators and reviewers. Paratext is not necessarily written or verbal material. As some of our contributors show, non-verbal material is a powerful shaper of reactions and attitudes.

The range of paratext is vast, encompassing authorial comment and external comment and explanatory material. Most of the contributors to
this volume use Genette’s analysis of paratext as a basis to enable the
study of translation and paratext. Genette notes that paratext varies greatly
from text to text, and that in the “media age” there has been a proliferation
of discourse around texts that was unknown in previous eras (1997: 3).
Twenty years on from Genette’s ground-breaking work, we can see that
paratext is more or less infinitely varied, and plays subtle roles that writers
may not even be aware of. In this volume we are mainly concerned with
paratext, attached to or inserted in the core text, and epitext, comment
which is external to the published volume.

The most visible categories of paratext include the footnote or endnote,
the preface and foreword, the introduction and the epilogue or afterword.
Less visible, but equally powerful types of paratext are the contents pages,
the index, titles and subtitles, chapter synopses, and blurb on dust jacket
and flap. In addition to these verbal paratexts, most publications contain a
degree of non-verbal paratext, which may be in the form of illustrations,
including photos, tables, charts and diagrams, dust jacket design and also
the scarcely visible, but highly influential visual presentation, including
fonts, paragraphing and layout. This sums up the range found in a
published book, and each of these elements influences the reader to a
greater or lesser degree. Works such as those by Harvey (2003) and
Powers (2001) have contributed to our understanding of the non-verbal
elements in publication. In some publications, the question arises: which
of the graphic and the text is the core text and which the paratext?

Paratext has “spatial, temporal, substantial, pragmatic and functional
characteristics” (Genette 1997: 4), all of which have a profound influence
on the reader. Genette lists four functions of paratext: designating or
identifying; description of the work (content and genre); connotative value;
temptation (ibid: 93). The first two on the list appear straightforward and
objective, but as is shown in the papers in this volume, even a title may not
be so innocent. Even the contents pages and index must inevitably be
highly selective, in the former case providing a very extreme, minimal
summary, and in the latter case providing a mention of items considered
important by the indexer. This very reduction in itself shapes the reader’s
approach to the core text. Of course, the functions of paratext may be
serious: the introduction and footnotes in a volume provide all-important
academic background information. Yet games and deceptions may also be
involved.

Peritextual items of “connotative value” are the preface, introduction,
footnotes etc, which overtly contribute meaning – not impartial denotative
meaning, but the connotative value placed on the text by the author or a
colleague or supporter. Preface and introduction purport to contribute
explanation and justification. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, they prime the reader, who will set about the first chapter with a set of expectations controlled or at least guided by the writer of the introduction. In the case of a translated work, the introduction or preface may shape the intercultural reading of the text very substantially. The final function in Genette’s list is related to the connotative value – all the priming work done in the introduction and the advertising work done in the blurb are designed to entice the reader.

Paratext primes, explains, contextualises, justifies and through beautification, tempts. Epitext, in the form of reviews, can serve these purposes, but may also serve to reject and refute the text and deter the reader. Authors, editors and publishers do not rely solely on the written word to achieve these effects. A large component of the paratext surrounding any text is non-verbal. Chief of these are dust jacket design and layout of the text. The dust jacket is a major temptation for any reader. In spite of, or perhaps because of the advent of e-books, paper books are still sought-after and read. They have become objects of beauty, designed for treasuring and inheriting. It is not uncommon to find a dust jacket which in no way reflects the content of the book but is simply sensational and sexy. Once inside the book, the reader is subject to the manipulation of the layout – attractive font, interesting motifs, and easy-on-the-eye spacing. A canny publisher will provide illustrations to enhance the priming begun by the verbal messages of the introduction. The non-verbal components of paratext are powerful tools in the presentation and manipulation employed by the translator or the commissioners of a translation.

A discussion of paratext in translation begs two questions: what are the functions and effects of the paratext of the source text, and to what extent are these functions and effects necessary, retained and of positive relevance in translation. The translator is first and foremost a reader, and interprets the text and transmits the translation thereof according to that interpretation. In this volume the contributors explore a number of significant examples of the translation of paratext, and translation as paratext, which may include deliberately added material such as explicitation and translator’s notes. As translators we create paratext the moment we put pen to paper, or fingers to keyboard. The transition of even the smallest fragment of source text to target text constitutes an explanation, a re-phrasing, a re-structuring. The zone of transition is between source and target language and between source and target culture. The zone of transaction is tripartite, between source writer, translator and target reader.
Three papers in the volume deal with overt political and ideological control of the core text by means of epitext and paratext. As found in well-known studies by O’Sullivan and Harvey (2003), and more recent studies by Frias (2012) and Gerber (2012), several of our contributors report the influential role of non-verbal paratext: cover designs, illustrations and layout. Two of the papers investigate the challenge of conveying the sounds of poetry in translation, and one deals with metatext as a technological tool. All our contributors reveal the complex, powerful influence that paratext has on translation and translated works.

Caroline Summers similarly discusses way in which paratext reveals political stances and at the same time is used to manipulate the reader, through a study of the presentation of Christa Wolf’s work at different times and for different audiences. Information about Wolf’s relationship with the Stasi inevitably led to a reconfiguration of her status and reputation, and a different author-function in the original source text and the later translation. A writer’s persona or author-function may be dramatically changed in the social, political and linguistic contexts of the receiving culture, and this in turn may have an effect on reception in the source culture. Summers traces this metamorphosis in Wolf’s work *Was bleibt* (What Remains), and the controversy surrounding the work in the 1990s.

Pingping Hou’s contribution involves the writing of one of the great, and controversial, figures of the twentieth century, Mao Tse-tung (1893-1976). In contrast with the stark controversies over Gage’s quasi-historical work and Wolf’s fiction, the paratext of translations of Mao’s writing and speeches investigated by Hou is aimed at “friendly” target readers. Hou discusses the effect of the paratext of two “official” translations of the work and the degree of translational compliance therein. Given the monolithic nature of Mao’s regime, and the continued reverence in which he is held, in China, at least, a dissenting view would be unlikely.

Szu-Wen Kung’s article also investigates a case of “friendly” and indeed “missionary” translation and the paratext supporting it. Kung’s article gives a comprehensive view of the issues attached to publication of literature, and shows how Taiwan agencies have endeavoured to bring Taiwan literature to an American audience. She shows that, among the various strategies employed by publishers and editors, book cover design wields extraordinary power.

Lenka Müllerová focuses on the intricate links between author, publisher and reader under the watchful gaze of authoritarian regimes. She shows how names of authors and titles of books reveal and conceal important political messages in the source culture. Not only do readers
understand when identities are disguised or missing, they are aware that omission and deception are messages in themselves. They are complicit in a complex political game played out through paratext.

**Joss Moorkens’** article brings us into the realm of modern media and translation technology. He describes the use of metadata in a study of inconsistencies found in Translation Memory data, and their effectiveness in retracing the steps of the translator. He shows how central metadata are to the whole process of translation, having not merely a role in the translation and localisation process, but also having value as a retrospective tool in studies of TM data. Metadata help us to trace back to a translator, date, and time, and to leverage and update material. Moorkens shows what an important role metadata play, and also how lack of support for them may result in inappropriate translation.

**Yvonne Tsai** takes up the complex notion of the interaction and relative status and role between text and illustration. Children’s books are gaining increasing recognition in the translation world, and picture books are a field of publication in which very often the graphic elements of the volume dominate, and pre-school children’s imagination is fired by the pictures. Tsai discusses the educational, psychological and social value of the picture book, and explores the extent to which the picture is paratextual to the written text, or the written text is paratextual to the dominant “text” of the picture.

**Yi-Ping Wu and Ci-Shu Shen** explore concrete poetry, a type of text which combines verbal and non-verbal elements and creates a very particular type of challenge for the translator in rendering the poet’s manipulation of visual and aural elements of the text. They show how fluid the concepts of translation and paratext can be, yet how limiting. The provision of paratext not only has limitations in itself, but limits the understanding of the reader. Epitext, such as interviews with the poet, may provide more appropriate interpretation and understanding than immediate and controlling paratext.

**Brian Holton**, by contrast, considers the rendering of classical Chinese poetry. His paper is in two parts, the first noting the importance of the traditional Chinese commentary, and suggesting that translators might find these rich paratexts helpful to modern translation. His discussion chimes with that of Wu and Shen, in the issues of the seeming untranslatability of sounds, and the use of the target language to create an evocative version for the target reader. In the second part, he illustrates how commentary on the technicalities of Chinese poetry can assist the translator, using as an example his rendering of one of Du Fu’s poems in Scots, focusing particularly on the aural nature of source and target texts. This article was
first published in Magma Poetry, 53, 2012, and we are grateful to Brian and to Magma for permission to include it in this volume.
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PART I:

IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL MOTIVATION
AND CONTROL IN THE USE OF PARATEXT
WHAT REMAINS:
THE INSTITUTIONAL REFRAMING
OF AUTHORSHIP IN TRANSLATED PERITEXTS
CAROLINE SUMMERS

Abstract

As narrative theories of translation demonstrate, the reconfiguration of texts in the social and linguistic contexts of a different culture opens them up to new interpretations (e.g. Baker 2006). Particularly in literary texts, the writer’s persona or author-function (Foucault 1977) is also renegotiated by contact with different languages and cultures. Cumulatively and dynamically constructed through texts, paratexts and contexts, the author-function emerges differently from source and translated texts.

Understanding authorship as a narrative that is reconfigured in translation, we can see how the author-function of the German writer Christa Wolf has been (re)constructed through her translation into English. Often referred to in Anglophone studies and reviews as the most significant East German writer, Wolf has simultaneously acquired emblematic status and been reconfigured by her translations and by their paratexts, which act as powerful interpretive frames. The shifts in narrative emplotment engineered by the publishing strategies that frame Wolf’s texts in English translation demonstrate the vast differences that characterise her author-functions in Germany and elsewhere. These differences have proved influential upon domestic understandings of Wolf, particularly in the early 1990s, when Wolf faced controversy in Germany over the publication of her text Was bleibt (What Remains) and her revelation of her involvement with the Stasi.

By exploring the narratives dominant in the paratexts of the English translations, this paper examines how these have played a crucial role in reframing Wolf’s writing through translation. Looking particularly at the translation of Was bleibt, it shows how differing author-functions emerge and develop through the presentation of the translated text.
Introduction: Christa Wolf and Was bleibt

Christa Wolf was one of the most prolific and internationally successful writers to emerge from the former German Democratic Republic (GDR), and remains one of Germany’s best-known contemporary authors, whose death in December 2011 was mourned in and beyond Germany. However, German and non-German responses to Wolf’s writing have not always been so unanimous, and have often been strongly influenced by the differing receiving contexts of the texts and their translations. This is best demonstrated by contrasting German and Anglophone responses to events following German reunification in 1989/90. In the context of angst-ridden and public debates about questions of guilt and victimhood circulating in post-war and post-1990 German discourse, and especially during the Literaturstreit which questioned the political and moral integrity of writers who had remained in the GDR (Anz 1991), Wolf was a target for those seeking to criticize the “failure” of East German writers whose apparent complicity with those in power had allowed them to benefit from the patronage of a repressive state whilst others suffered. Amongst the factors making Wolf a particular focus of such criticism was the publication of her story Was bleibt (1990a), a closely autobiographical text that had been written in 1979: the story, describing the experience of a female writer being observed by the East German secret police (Stasi) and providing insights into the psychological suffering of the narrator, became a focal point of the Literaturstreit debates (Huyssen 1991: 127). Wolf was lambasted by prominent members of the German literary institution such as Frank Schirrmacher (1990) and Ulrich Greiner (1990), who saw her text as a belated attempt by a member of the socialist elite to align herself with the victims of repressive GDR socialism. Wolf’s position was exacerbated in 1993, when she revealed that she had worked as an Inoffizielle Mitarbeiterin (unofficial collaborator), for the Stasi from 1959-1962 (1993a). Her brief Stasi cooperation was emphatically interpreted by many German commentators as affirmation of deep-seated complicity with a corrupt regime, and exposed her to further heavy criticism.

While the hostility between East and West German intellectuals did not go unnoticed by the Anglophone press, American and British commentators were reluctant to pass judgment. Only days before Wolf’s 1993 revelation, the New York Times published an article on the alienation of East German intellectuals since Reunification, framing them sympathetically as having been “the Oprah Winfreys and Phil Donahues of the nation” (Hafner 1993) and describing Wolf as “East Germany’s most famous writer, […] a kind of Mother Confessor”. As far as the German response to Wolf was
concerned, Hafner explained that “no one has doubted her talent; it’s her politics they question” (my emphasis). Meanwhile, in the UK, the Guardian cautioned that “we should hesitate before passing judgment” (Christy 1993). The American and British response to the Literaturstreit and to Wolf’s revelation suggests a receiving context drawing on different frameworks of morality that did not emplot her first and foremost as a perpetrator. The differences between German and Anglophone attitudes towards Wolf in the early 1990s suggest the importance of institutional context in the determination of authorial identity. This study of the 1993 English translation of Was bleibt shows how this institutional dominance is particularly evident in paratexts, where discursive voices compete for control over the interpretive frame of the text. Wolf’s example not only affirms the importance of the paratext as threshold to the text, but also problematizes the stable and unified concept of authorship at the heart of Genette’s model.

**Authorship as Narrative**

Whilst Barthes (1977) pronounces the death of the author in favour of the authority of the reader and of the text itself, Foucault (1977) argues for the ongoing significance of authorship as a discursive category or author-function that prescribes textual meaning, the agency of which is not identical to that of the individual writer. By publishing a literary text, a writer implicitly requests the status of “author”, a discursive function constituted both by interpretations of the text and by its relation to the institutions in which it is embedded. In return, this discursive construct provides a framework of textual interpretation, identified under the name of the author as the author-function. The author is “what gives the disturbing language of fiction its nodes of coherence” (1981: 58): as a “node”, the author simultaneously unites disparate textual statements and embeds herself in the wider networks of the literary institution. Foucault identifies the institutional context of authorship as influential when he says of the discourse drawn together under an author’s name that “its status and its manner of reception are regulated by the culture in which it circulates” (1977: 123). Discursive authorities such as publishers, editors, reviewers and readers act as (distorting) mirrors of the author-function, selecting material for publication and presenting it to readers. The participation of the media and other discursive authorities in the construction of the author-function is not only passive, maintaining through their presence the institutions in which the author circulates, but also active, since their position within these institutions enables them to determine and define
What Remains

what or who an author “is”: Anna Kuhn describes Wolf’s German author-function as “an image that the media itself had been instrumental in constructing” (Kuhn 1994: 200).

Translation, which encourages the emergence of a new author-function by re-articulating the writer’s texts in new textual and contextual forms, shows how an “author” is (re)constructed through linguistic transfer to a new discursive context. The translated writer, lacking a continuous presence in target-language discourse, is especially reliant on others embedded in that discourse for the circulation of her author-function. Translation tests Foucault’s model against his own genealogical approach, revealing its reliance on a monolingual frame of reference: by considering it a commentary rather than an original statement, he is unable to account for the discursive shifts that accompany the translation of a text to generate this different author-function. The multiple interpretive possibilities that surround the author and the text are recognized by theories of social narrative, which understand the telling of stories as “an ontological condition of social life” (Somers and Gibson 1994: 38). Sociology explores narrative, the organization of selected events through the revelation of temporal, causal and relational links between them, as an essential structuring framework in human knowledge and experience. This can be combined with Foucault’s concept of the discursive function as a framework for understanding the construction of translated authorship.

Since a narrating “I” posits not only a “we” but also a “you”, narrative establishes community by assuming an “other” (Cavarero 2000: 20). The translated author is positioned in relation to the “self” of the institutions that control discourse, but also implicitly to a discursive concept of otherness, that which is excluded from discourse. From a Foucauldian point of view, the translated author’s success depends on the consonance of her author-function with the ordering unities of target-culture discourse, and on submissiveness to its “prohibitions” (Foucault 1981: 52). The narrative instinct is seen as “the impulse to moralize” (White 1980: 18), with the narration of events directly linked to the moral frameworks in which the narrator is embedded. Wolf’s author-function in Germany depreciated in value in the early 1990s as those with the right to narrate her authorship embedded her actions in moral frameworks that condemned her, while her Anglophone author-function has been narrated within British and American discourses that do not embed her collaboration with the Stasi in the same specific narratives. Thus translation constitutes a transfer between linguistically and ideologically defined discursive spaces, where different framing values are dominant. The translated author’s
identity is subject to negotiation by the institutions of the receiving discourse and their narratives of self, over which the writer has no control.

Accounting for the pervasive presence of narration, sociologists have identified different types of narrative that reflect the various discursive levels on which it operates (e.g. Hart 1992; Gergen and Gergen 1997; Carr 1997; Crites 1997; Pratt 2003). Somers and Gibson (1994) identify four types of narrative: ontological, or the personal narratives of individuals; public, or institutional narratives; conceptual, or disciplinary narratives that define theoretical terms; and metanarratives, which define seemingly universal categories of identity and experience. Their model has been successfully applied in recent years as a framework for analyzing translation and interpreting (Baker 2006, 2007, 2010a, 2010b; Baldo 2008; Boeri 2008; Valdeón 2008; Harding 2011). They also list four features of narrative behaviour: relationality, or the meaningful associations between events; temporality, or the temporal ordering of events; the causal emplotment of relationships between events; and the selective appropriation of particular events for inclusion in the narrative. Thus Foucault’s concept that the author is a discursive construction, purporting to offer a coherent and comprehensible account of the author’s writing and actions, can be understood as one of the essential social narratives that make up the contextualizing framework of the literary text. Analysis of Wolf’s translated texts shows how this author-function is constructed by the institutions that circulate it, and how it demonstrates features of narrativity. This can be seen most clearly in the interpretive frames constructed by the paratexts of the translations.

Sites of the Institutional Framing of Authorship: Paratexts

As Baker (2006, 2007) shows, the concept of framing can be reconciled with narrative to offer insights into the transfer of experiences to new contexts through translation. The framing of a narrative suggests to the receiver before the first encounter what it is “about”, and this information guides the receiver’s response. Such interpretive prompting is an integral feature of the translation process, which mediates between the differing contexts of the narrative and its receivers. Thus translated authorship is problematized by the writer’s lack of authority over the frames placed around the translated text, which are often controlled by institutional agents such as publishers, editors and reviewers. As the most easily identifiable site of interaction between the text and its surrounding discourse, the paratext, or the presentational material surrounding the text, frames the translation (both in a figurative and in the most literal sense) for
its target-culture readers. Paratexts are identified by Genette as “the most socialised side of the practice of literature” (1997: 14), an understanding shared by others who have adopted Genette’s concept: Richard Watts claims that “it is only in circulation that a text assumes its significance, and the paratext is perhaps the most useful site for understanding how, for whom, and at what potential cost that significance was constructed” (2000: 42-43). As a first, and in some cases only, encounter with the social narratives embedded in the text, the paratext delimits the reader’s “horizons of expectation” (Harvey 2003: 48) with regard to the text and to the author-function. Urpo Kovala (1996: 135) explains that the paratext “works together with the entire universe of discourse of a certain society at a certain point in time”, identifying it as a frame embedded in its own institutionalized context. Although ostensibly a mediating, permissive space, from a Foucauldian perspective the role of the paratext is one of control and authority. Genette attributes this authority to the “author”; however, he does not acknowledge the problematic discursivity of authorial identity. This is reflected in the criteria he uses to identify paratexts.

Genette sub-divides the paratext into *peritext* (features of the text in its published form such as prefaces, notes, and cover material) and *epitext* (texts circulating independently from the book itself, such as interviews, letters and marketing material). He acknowledges the possibility of multiple “senders” (1997: 8), but insists that the crucial, unifying criterion of the paratext is that the material be “characterised by an authorial intention and assumption of responsibility” (1997: 3). On this basis, he explicitly excludes from the paratext key sites of authorial construction such as reviews and scholarship which are not “authored” by the writer. However, bearing in mind the vital participation of literary and social institutions in the construction of the author-function, it can be argued that the author “authorizes” the construction of such texts by participating in the narratives of publishers and other institutions. Genette’s definition of the epitext as the “conveyor of a commentary that is authorial or more-or-less legitimated by the author” is compatible with secondary texts such as reviews if we accept that these are “text-specific meta-discourses” (Tahir-Gürçaglar 2002: 44), authorized or authored by the author-function. Thus a discursive understanding of authorship necessitates a revision of the paratext as defined by Genette. Most significantly, this discursive understanding of authorship also demands the reconsideration of the status of the translated text in Genette’s model. The assumptions made by Genette throughout his book about authorial control of the paratext lead him to define translation as an authorized, derivative process that extends
the writer’s authorship, an approach for which he has been criticised by Translation Studies scholars (Tahir-Gürçaglar 2002: 46-7). His categorization, like Foucault’s, of translation as commentary to the “original” text is undermined by a narrative approach to cultural transfer, in which the meaning of the text is subject to change as it enters a new discursive context, fragmenting the identity of the individual “author”. In such a framework, translations assume the status of texts in their own right, something which is not acknowledged by Genette, and which invites a closer examination of the paratexts to (rather than the paratext as) the translated text.

Particularly in translation, where linguistic, spatial and temporal boundaries distance the writer from the target text, the author’s authority over paratextual elements that introduce her writing to target-culture discourse is minimal. Normally controlled by the publisher, the paratext negotiates the “otherness” signalled by the translated status of the text (Watts 2000). Watts describes a process of “cultural translation” in the bindings of the “foreign” text that results in reducing the cultural specificity of the source text, in order to attract and reassure readers unfamiliar with the narrative realities of the writer’s social context (Watts 2000: 39, 2005: 19). Keith Harvey draws on Michael Cronin’s claim that “proactive translation is as much an attempt to create an audience as it is to find one” (Cronin 1996: 153), to show how the paratext constructs the reader’s horizons of expectation. As demonstrated by both Watts and Harvey, whether the bindings of the text choose to conceal or endorse its otherness, it is not the writer but (in this case) the publisher who assumes authorial authority in order to meet the reader at the threshold to the text. Such involvement of multiple third parties problematizes the premise of unified authorship central to Genette’s definition of the paratext. Although neglected by Genette, the translated text is an exemplary object of study for the complex question of paratextual authorship, as it necessitates the (re)negotiation of the relationship between the text and its audience, which is often out of the control of the individual writer.

Genette’s paratextual categories provide a valuable starting point for analysis of the multiplicity of points at which the text interacts with surrounding discourse. However, his criteria of paratextual identification do not account for the instability of authorial authority at the “threshold”. His model is both complemented and contradicted by theories of authorship that assume the interdependence of authorial identity, textual meaning and discursive context and invite a reconsideration of his main paratextual criterion, “authorial intention”. Revealing authorship as a problematic notion and looking specifically at how this has been significant
in the development of Wolf’s Anglophone author-function, a narrative and Foucauldian approach demands a reconsideration of Genette’s paratextual categories to account for the translation as a legitimate “text” with paratexts that reveal the institutional negotiation of textual meaning. The importance of such a revision is clear from the following analysis of the 1993 translation of Wolf’s much debated story. The translation is particularly interesting from a peritextual perspective, which will be the focus here: in particular, this article explores how authorship is shaped by the “ideological closure” in the paratext (Kovala 1996) that results from institutional mediation of the text.

What Remains and Other Stories

The two English translations of *Was bleibt* show how the difficult questions it raises are pre-empted and often concealed at the physical thresholds to the text, reframing the relationship between Wolf’s ontological narrative and the specific public narratives of the GDR. Martin Chalmers’ translation for the literary magazine *Granta* in 1990 was framed by a thematic narrative bringing various contributions together in a volume entitled *What Went Wrong?*. The second translation was completed by Heike Schwarzbauer and Rick Takvorian for a collection of Wolf’s translated stories published by her American publisher Farrar Strauss Giroux (FSG), which appeared very shortly after her Stasi revelation in 1993. The volume was published simultaneously by Virago in the UK, and was republished in 1995 by FSG in collaboration with the University of Chicago Press (UCP): the text of the three editions is identical. Whilst Wolf’s author-function is more visibly reframed in the peritexts to the translation in *Granta*, which are strongly marked by the institutional identity of the magazine, the peritexts to the published book reveal just as much intervention on the part of the institution in the framing of the text and its authorship, as the following analysis of the two American editions shows.

Within the category of paratext, the peritext is defined by Genette as including elements contained within the physical unit of the book. His list of possible peritextual elements is extensive and includes the dust jacket and covers,1 title pages and intertitles, dedications, epigraphs, prefaces and notes. He acknowledges the discursive contest for dominance in the

---

1 These can be listed as Covers 1-4, where Cover 1 is the front cover and Cover 2 its inside, followed by Cover 3 as the inside back cover and Cover 4 as the back cover.
framing of the text when he observes that the publisher’s peritext, those elements of the peritext for which the publisher is answerable such as the contents page and publicity material included in the volume, “encroaches on the prerogatives of an author” (1997: 23). This article examines the negotiation of authorial identity in the peritexts to the 1993 collection, between Wolf’s author-function and the public narratives of Anglophone literary institutions. The 1995 FSG/UCP version is the most accessible in print of the three editions, and is therefore the focus of this discussion: a high degree of similarity can be assumed between the 1993 and 1995 FSG editions so both will be discussed together.

External Peritexts

Genette identifies the title of a book as a paratext, explaining that “the title (like, moreover, the name of the author) is an object to be circulated—or, if you prefer, a subject of conversation” (1997: 75). By selectively foregrounding “What Remains”, the title *What Remains and Other Stories* achieves two framing effects simultaneously: it frames “What Remains” as the centrepiece of the book, and simultaneously as a “story”, framing Wolf’s writing as fiction. The cover designs (Figs 1 and 2) also foreground “What Remains”, using a smaller font for the second half of the title. The author-function is clearly invoked: in Fig. 1, the large font size used for the title is repeated for Wolf’s name, and in Fig. 2 the eye follows a Z-shaped path from the title in the top right-hand corner to the name of the author in the bottom left-hand corner.

The emphasis in the peritext on Wolf’s author-function is affirmed in the FSG editions by the lack of a publisher logo on this front threshold to the text: identity with the writing is left to the author, consolidating the positioning of the text in an individual authorial narrative. The publisher’s name appears in a small font on the spine and the back cover, deferring to the author as the unifying origin of the volume.

Apart from their shared emphasis on “What Remains” and clear identification of Wolf as author, the covers are very different, although both images implicitly foreground particular details of the “What Remains” narrative. The image of the teapot in Fig. 1 recalls the narrator’s breakfast:

>The coffee had to be hot and strong, filter coffee, the boiled egg not too soft; homemade jam was preferred, dark bread. Luxury! Luxury! I thought, as I did every morning upon seeing everything assembled on the table – an everlasting feeling of guilt which penetrates and heightens our every pleasure – those of us who have known want. (Wolf 1995: 234)
Food and drink is a cohesive motif for the collection, often appearing at moments of crisis or climax: the moment in “Exchanging Glances”, for example, when the narrator’s joy at finding an abandoned supply truck is haunted by the appearance of the concentration camp prisoners, and the
tense supper at the end of “Self-experiment” when Anders tacitly challenges the professor to recognize her/his new identity. Fig. 2 depicts a solitary female figure walking down a street lined with the watchful faces of the houses: the dark brown and red colouring of this front cover establishes a gloomy and oppressive atmosphere. The size of the figure and the narrowing of the street as it tapers away from her, where no sky can be seen, are claustrophobic. The image of the street is reminiscent not only of *Was bleibt*, in which the narrator speculates about being followed on a walk to the shops, but also of other stories in the collection: “I can still observe the first transitions to the pictures one sees before falling asleep; a street appears leading to that landscape I know so well without ever having seen it” (Wolf 1995: 39), “I went out into the street in my bitter shame. I ridiculed it. Straight as an arrow, I sneered. Street to the heart of the matter… Street of coincidence, I swore at it. Newspaper street.” (Wolf 1995: 117). Whilst emphasizing “What Remains”, the cover motif unites the contents of the book in a selected framing narrative of the narrator’s oppression. Wolf’s author-function is thus framed, by the choice of illustration, as a victim narrative rather than narrative of guilt.

The back cover of the 1995 edition continues the colouring of the front and is almost entirely covered with white text, which stands out against this dark background. In the top left-hand corner, the category “fiction” is printed in orange, standing out because of its colouring (the only other text of this colour is the name of the University of Chicago Press at the bottom left). Like the genre indication of “stories” in the title, this categorization in a conceptual narrative of “fiction” frames Wolf’s writing as a creative, if not completely imaginary, engagement with social narratives, ascribing less importance to the autobiographical aspect of the texts by distancing the author-function from the writer’s ontological narrative. This distinction between the writer’s public narrative of authorship, emphasizing her mastery of literary categories, and her ontological narrative, embedded in politically charged public narratives, reframes the autobiographical parallels of the texts. Their categorization as “fiction” makes Wolf’s exploration of identity and selfhood a diegetic rather than a mimetic act: the narrator is recounting rather than undergoing a process of self-discovery. This reflects an author-function not emplotted in the relationship of “truth” to the writer’s ontological narrative that made Wolf vulnerable to criticism in Germany following her revelation in 1993.

Interestingly, Kovala (1996: 136-7) finds the opposite is true of the early twentieth-century Finnish paratexts studied: these demonstrate an emphasis on biographical and social context, rather than on the literary context of the writing.
The please-insert is preceded by a quote from “Exchanging Glances” (Blickwechsel). In context, the quotation frames the narrator’s ontological narrative in a public narrative of post-war German guilt mixed with victimhood, as the narrator’s sense of complicity in the plight of the concentration camp survivors (“the ragged”) manifests itself and disappears. In isolation on the back cover, the extracted quotation invokes less specific metanarratives of deprivation and guilt:

Now the ragged would put on our clothes and stick their bloody feet in our shoes, now the starved would seize hold of the flour and the sausage we had just snatched. And to my horror I felt it was just, and I was horrified to feel that it was just, and knew for a fraction of a second that we were guilty. I forgot it again.

This peritextual threshold frames the text in recognizable categories (“guilt”, “horror”) that convey the strength of the narrator’s reaction but do not identify her experience (or that of the author) as specifically German.

This apparent universality is confirmed by the explanation that the book “collects Christa Wolf’s short fiction, from early work of the sixties to the widely debated title story, first published in Germany in 1990. These short stories shed light on her work as an artist and political figure, and as a woman”. The categories of “artist”, “political figure” and “woman” continue the universalizing narratives of the quotation from “Exchanging Glances”. The please-insert implies that the book contains a comprehensive collection of Wolf’s short fiction, concealing the inevitable selective appropriation of the chosen texts. There is no acknowledgement of the publishing history of the writing (the unexplained reference to “What Remains” as the “widely debated title story” is the only suggestion of the debates that surrounded its publication in Germany), nor is there an attempt to recognize the significance of such a narrative in connection with Wolf’s German author-function or at the particular moment at which it was published. The please-insert goes on to mention three stories individually:

“‘What Remains’, the title story, powerfully describes what it is like to live under surveillance by the Stasi police and how such a life gradually destroys normalcy for a writer. An interior monologue reveals the fear and
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3 Genette defines the please-insert as a printed text containing information about the work, designed to be included in its publication (1997: 104-5). The term comes from typical usage in the early twentieth century, when the please-insert was typically printed separately and inserted; Genette observes that this is no longer the case and that this text often appears on Cover 4 of a book (25).
Examining the power of memory, ‘Exchanging Glances’ captures the collision of childhood and war, as Wolf recollects her family’s flight from the Russian Army during World War II. She remembers imagining her own dead body and watching prisoners released from a concentration camp with a combination of fear and something more painful than fear: knowledge.

In ‘The New Life and Opinions of a Tomcat’, a satire of life in a totalitarian state, Max the cat and his owner, a psychology professor, work on a secret project called ‘Tohuha’, short for Total Human Happiness.”

Opening with a summary of “What Remains”, this affirms the emphasis of the collection on its title story and recalls the front cover design in its description of the writer’s ruined normalcy and her self-consciousness. An “other” is causally emplotted as perpetrator in the narrator’s ontological narrative: in “What Remains” the Stasi destroy the writer’s normalcy and disrupt her balance, and in “Exchanging Glances” the Russian Army pursue the young narrator and her family. Again, there is no indication of the ambivalent status of Wolf’s victimhood, and both summaries appeal to “universal” narratives of “the writer” or “childhood and war”. The third example encourages a generalized framing of Wolf’s satirical story that not only avoids the particularity of the GDR context but invokes a narrative of “totalitarian” states in which the persecuted or dissident writer is framed as a heroic victim and her fear confirms her as such. The please-insert offers an overview of the stories within the volume in terms of the metanarratives with which they engage. As the title story and as a constantly foregrounded focus of the collection, “What Remains” is framed as emblematic of these.

The exclusion of nuances in the publication history and socio-political context of What Remains and Other Stories is consolidated on the back cover of the translation by the concluding sentence of the please-insert, which assures the reader that, “encounters with topics ranging from sexual politics to the nature of memory, these unpretentious, and sometimes chilling, stories are a fascinating introduction to Wolf’s work”. Again, framing by selected recognizable concepts encourages the Anglophone reader to look beyond (or overlook) the specific East German public narratives that have contextualized Wolf’s writing. Most significantly, this final section of the please-insert frames the book as an introduction to Wolf’s writing. The publication of an “introductory” collection of Wolf’s texts after more than twenty years of success as an international author might suggest that her Anglophone author-function survived the debates of
reunification and the furore of her Stasi scandal to invite a fresh surge of interest.

The conceptualization of the book as an introduction, especially in the absence of explanatory notes, implies the accessibility of Wolf’s “short fiction”. However, this assumption belies the thematic and structural complexity of the texts: writing about “Jüninachmittag” in 1965, Wolf warned editor Günther Caspar at Aufbau that “das, was bei mir herauskäme, etwas ganz anderes wäre als etwa eine amerikanische ‘short story’” (Wolf 1965). The peritext does not encourage the reader to recognize that Wolf’s stories diverge from the familiar format of the fictional “story”: instead, the texts and the author-function are framed by the category of introduction and a conceptual narrative of literature as fiction. The unproblematic framing of the narrator’s observation by the Stasi in “What Remains” as fiction avoids problematic questions about the “truthfulness” and “authenticity” of the narrative that troubled its German publication.

The please-insert is followed by quotations from two reviewers: the author and journalist Herbert Mitgang, a regular reviewer for the New York Times, and the novelist Mary Gordon. The favourable comments of both act as consecrating frames for Wolf’s writing. Mitgang comments that

What Remains and Other Stories… is clear and farsighted. The eight heartfelt stories in the book show why she has been respected as a serious author since her 1968 novel, The Quest for Christa T… Wolf uses her own experiences and observations to create universal themes about the controls upon human freedom.

Tracing Wolf’s author-function right back to the (German) publication of Wolf’s Nachdenken über Christa T. in 1968, he frames her as both a “serious author” and a writer who uses her own life to engage with “universal themes”. The “universality” of Wolf’s interest in “controls upon human freedom” masks the specificity of the freedom she hopes to discover within socialist narratives. Similarly, Mary Gordon states that “Christa Wolf has set herself nothing less than the task of exploring what it is to be a conscious human being alive in a moment of history”, drawing on the universal category of “human being” to identify Wolf’s approach and selectively avoiding an association with the public narratives of the GDR as the specific space in which Wolf hoped to realize this human consciousness. The ostensibly universal, humanist frame established by both these reviewers contributes to the familiarity of the narratives in which Wolf’s author-function is framed by the peritext.
At the bottom of the back cover, the book is contextualized in Wolf’s author-function alongside other selected texts: “Christa Wolf’s novels include Accident and The Quest for Christa T. The Author’s Dimension is available in paperback from the University of Chicago Press”. Here, the recognizable titles of Wolf’s most recent previous work and of one of her biggest successes endorses the text in hand for those already familiar with Wolf’s author-function, as well as promoting earlier texts to readers unfamiliar with Wolf’s writing, for whom the volume is truly introductory. The note continues: “Wolf has worked as an editor, lecturer, journalist and critic. She lives in Berlin”. This is the only biographical information offered in the peritextual frame of the book. The omission of the Literaturstreit and Stasi scandal from the selective contextualization of What Remains and Other Stories in relation to the writer’s ontological narrative frames her author-function as uncontested and as accessible to the Anglophone reader, determined by freely available texts and by recognizable categories of identity (editor, lecturer, journalist, critic). It also reinforces the distinction between the writer’s ontological narrative and her public narrative as “author”. Within the volume, the internal peritexts demonstrate a similar tendency to distance Wolf’s text and authorship from narratives of the GDR that frame them as problematic.

Internal Peritexts

The first textual material in the 1995 edition is on the verso of the flyleaf, where books “Also by Christa Wolf” are listed. Genette describes the listing of the author’s other work as “a sort of personal catalogue of the author’s” which can nonetheless also strongly reflect the publisher’s interests (1997: 100). Here, the list notably omits Divided Heaven, the 1965 translation by Joan Becker of Wolf’s Der geteilte Himmel. The omission suggests that, marked as “other” by its GDR origin and by this point also the subject of criticism for its distorting emphasis on socialist doctrine (Koerner 1984; von Ankum 1993), Divided Heaven has been overlooked in an Anglophone narrative of Wolf’s authorship dominated by FSG. The exclusion of a translation whose promotion is not in the commercial interest of the American publisher and which has been considered ideologically problematic by Anglophone voices, shows how

---

4 Exceptions to this trend are: the earliest British edition of The Quest for Christa T. (Hutchinson, 1971), The Reader and the Writer (Seven Seas, 1977), The Fourth Dimension (Verso, 1988) and In the Flesh (Verba Mundi, 2005). In each of these four editions, Divided Heaven is either listed among Wolf’s previous texts or briefly mentioned in a note on the author.
the public narrative of the publishing institution might intervene in the author-function whilst appearing to let the author’s texts speak for themselves. Although the author-function is granted prominence, this is “managed” by the publisher.

The collection has two title pages. The first, on the recto opposite “Also by Christa Wolf”, shows only the “half title” (Genette 1997: 32) of “What Remains”, selectively emphasizing it as a focal point of the volume. The verso between the two title pages names the translators, and on the next recto the second title page shows the full title of What Remains and Other Stories followed by Wolf’s name, and the name of the publisher in a smaller font. On all these pages, and on the title page and first page of each story in the collection, the text is indented from the left by a motif of three thick vertical lines. This uniformity draws several texts into one narrative which, in this ‘introductory’ collection of Wolf’s writing, emphasizes Wolf’s author-function as the narrative that unites the texts. This “introductory” status, as well as the cohesion and uniform origin of the stories implied by their identical presentation and the absence of information about their individual peculiarities, again shows how intervention by the publisher frames the author-function.

Finally, the contents page of What Remains and Other Stories suggests the ordering of the stories in the book as a narrative of progression from “Exchanging Glances” to “What Remains”. The order of contents is as follows:

Table 1: Contents of What Remains and Other Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (EN)</th>
<th>Title (DE)</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>First Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging Glances</td>
<td>Blickwechsel</td>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, September 27</td>
<td>Dienstag, der 27. September</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Afternoon</td>
<td>Juniabend</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1967 (GDR) 1971 (FRG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unter den Linden</td>
<td>Unter den Linden</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Life and Opinions of a Tomcat</td>
<td>Neue Lebensansichten eines Katers</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-experiment</td>
<td>Selbstversuch</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>