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This study explores the phenomenon of intertextuality in the framework of translation studies. Intertextuality has not been thoroughly dealt with in translation studies, even though it has been touched upon in various literary studies at least since the 1960s. The study analyzes cultural-religious intertextualities in William Faulkner’s novel *Light in August* (1932) and in its two Finnish translations, *Kohtalokas veripisara* (1945) and *Liekehtivä elokuu* (1968). The approach is interdisciplinary. The American South with its culture, religion, and literature, especially William Faulkner (1897–1962) and *Light in August*, are presented as necessary background information and an essential part of any nontrivial literary translation process.

The study has a twofold main goal. On the one hand, the study aims at corroborating, by means of an examination of a set of empirical data, the view that adequate translations necessitate, on the part of the translator, a considerable amount of intertextual cultural competence in the field(s) the original source text deals with and that adequate translations thus cannot be secured by the translator’s technical or theoretical translation skills only. On the other, the study equally purports to argue, by reference to the two sets of translation solutions made by the translators during their respective Finnish translations, that the religious components of the cultural contents of the novel constitute a set of data which is not fully accounted for in the translations and that the two translations accordingly both exhibit properties or tendencies which are not entirely adequate or even desirable either from a translational or from a cultural point of view.

The results of the analysis of the 30 text passages examined in detail are threefold. First, the analysis is able to establish that the Finnish translators of *Kohtalokas veripisara* either used the Swedish translation *Ljus i augusti* (1944) as the source text or that they edited the Finnish translation according to the Swedish translation. Owing to interference from the Swedish translation, *Kohtalokas veripisara* has a tendency to omit or ignore certain intertexts. This property cannot be said to be an adequate or desirable translational approach as it inevitably entails some losses of pertinent meaning, which are not furthermore insignificant in number. The analysis did not find any compensation of meaning in other passages, i.e. passages outside the ones containing the omissions. Omissions tend to distort some of the characters in the novel, some of the relationships between them, and even the whole cultural-religious setup of the Southern novel, and may thus diminish the pleasure of the reader’s experience of the translation.

Secondly, another tendency or property which is ascertained in the analysis is that the Finnish translator of *Liekehtivä elokuu* has somewhat secularized the picture Faulkner paints of the Southern religion in the original text, thus secularizing some of the cultural-religious intertexts related to the American South. Secularization takes place through what might be called an “assuaging effect,” i.e., by turning some of the cultural-religious elements in the novel into more secular expressions in the Finnish translation.

Thirdly, the study demonstrates that neither specific nor general intertextuality seem to exhaust all the intertextual references needed by the reader-translator. A third kind of intertextuality is therefore proposed in the study, called universal intertextuality. By this term is meant intertextuality which refers to various universal aspects of common humanity, e.g. moral or ethical issues.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study has gone through various stages over some years. It has changed focus twice with diverse effects. It would never have been completed without the strong support and profound knowledge of Professor Pertti Hietaranta who never failed to believe that the study would one day be completed. I owe him my deepest gratitude for his help and encouragement.

I am also grateful to many other scholars. Among them, I want to thank University Lecturer Hilkka Yli-Jokipii who at the very beginning of this study encouraged me, as well as Professor Outi Paloposki and University Lecturer Mari Pakkala-Weckström who both, at a critical point, gave me constructive feedback. Dr Ernst-August Gutt gave me brief but very helpful advice, especially concerning the ways of presenting the material. Professor Mikko Saikku helped me with the issues concerning Southern culture. Professor Joel Kuortti played a decisive role at the penultimate stage of research. Professor Laszlo Komlósi and Professor emeritus John Stotesbury as preliminary examiners contributed to the completion of the study.

Helsinki, September 2016

Risto Jukko
CONTENTS

ABSTRACT
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................................ 1
   1.1 The relevance of culture to translation studies ............................................................... 1
   1.2 Intertextuality and the reader-translator .......................................................................... 3
   1.3 Aims and material of the study ...................................................................................... 7
     1.3.1 Aims of the study ....................................................................................................... 9
     1.3.2 Research material .................................................................................................... 11
   1.4 Finnish Faulkner translations of the 1940s and the 1960s .............................................. 14
   1.5 The structure of the study ............................................................................................. 23

2 THE AMERICAN SOUTH, ITS WRITERS, AND ITS RELIGION ............................................. 27
   2.1 The American South and Southern writers ..................................................................... 27
   2.2 Religion in the South ...................................................................................................... 33
     2.2.1 Southern Evangelical Protestantism ......................................................................... 34
     2.2.2 Southern religion and slavery ................................................................................... 37
   2.3 The influence of religion on Southern literature ............................................................ 39
   2.4 Summarizing remarks ................................................................................................... 42

3 FAULKNER AND LIGHT IN AUGUST IN SOUTHERN CULTURE ........................................ 43
   3.1 Faulkner and cultural intertexts ..................................................................................... 43
   3.2 Light in August as a Southern intertext .......................................................................... 48
     3.2.1 The origin and critiques of the novel ..................................................................... 48
     3.2.2 The characters and stories in the novel ................................................................. 52
     3.2.3 Southern cultural features reflected in the novel .................................................. 54
     3.2.4 Peculiar readings of the Bible and issues of blood ................................................. 61
   3.3 Summarizing remarks .................................................................................................. 68

4 CULTURE, RELIGION, AND TRANSLATION IN MUTUAL INTERACTION ...................... 70
   4.1 Culture and cultural translation ................................................................................... 70
   4.2 Interdisciplinary translation studies .............................................................................. 77
   4.3 Religion and religious language as part of culture ....................................................... 81
   4.4 Summarizing remarks ................................................................................................. 85
### 5 INTERTEXTUALITY AS A METHODOLOGICAL TOOL IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

#### 5.1 Intertextuality or intertextualities?

#### 5.2 Differing understandings

#### 5.3 Categories of intertextuality

##### 5.3.1 Specific or limited intertextuality

##### 5.3.2 General or cultural intertextuality

#### 5.4 Subtext analysis

#### 5.5 Summarizing remarks

### 6 INTERTEXTUALITIES IN *LIGHT IN AUGUST* AND ITS FINNISH TRANSLATIONS

#### 6.1 Specific or limited intertextuality in *Light in August* and its translations

##### 6.1.1 Religious key-phrase allusions with cultural intertexts

##### 6.1.2 Religious key-phrase allusions

##### 6.1.3 Religious proper-name allusions

#### 6.2 General or cultural intertextuality in *Light in August* and its translations

##### 6.2.1 The Book

##### 6.2.2 Church

##### 6.2.2.1 Church as a source of specific, cultural, and universal intertextuality

##### 6.2.2.2 Presbyterian Church and its administration

##### 6.2.3 Revival meeting

##### 6.2.4 Mourners’ bench

##### 6.2.5 Preachers, deacons, and priests

##### 6.2.5.1 Preachers

##### 6.2.5.2 Deacons

##### 6.2.5.3 Priests

##### 6.2.6 Methodist circuit rider

##### 6.2.7 Negroes and niggers

##### 6.2.8 Christmas as an uncertain intertextual Christ figure

#### 6.3 Summarizing remarks

### 7 CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

### PRIMARY DATA USED

### REFERENCES

### APPENDIX: WILLIAM FAULKNER’S NOVELS AND THEIR FINNISH TRANSLATIONS
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The relevance of culture to translation studies

Translation has become more visible than ever before over the last two or three decades. What might be called the final consolidation of translation studies as an academic discipline in the Anglophone world can be argued to date to the 1980s and 1990s with the publication of Susan Bassnett-McGuire’s *Translation Studies* (Trivedi 2005; Munday 2008). In the 1990s the cultural nature of translation became clearer when cultural studies developed, discovering heterogeneous discourses, cultural overlaps, and syncretism (see Bachmann-Medick 2006: 37).

A clear sign of this deepening understanding of translation was Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere’s book *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation* (1998). Its last article is symptomatic. Bassnett pleads for a pooling of resources of translation studies and cultural studies and states that “in these multifaceted interdisciplines, isolation is counterproductive. … The study of translation, like the study of culture, needs a plurality of voices. And, similarly, the study of culture always involves an examination of the processes of encoding and decoding that comprise translation.” (Bassnett 1998: 138–139.)

This shift in translation studies from linguistic approaches to cultural approaches took place as scholars became more and more acutely aware that translation is essentially a cultural phenomenon. Translation never happens in a vacuum. The shift, “the cultural turn” in translation studies, seems to follow a general trend in the humanities and social sciences, which have been influenced by e.g. postmodernist, postcolonial, and feminist movements (see, e.g., Bassnett and Trivedi 1999; Gentzler 2001a; Wang Hui 2011; Flotow 2011). And yet, this seems to have happened without always explicitly defining some key terms, especially the concept of *culture*, which is a rather complex term with regard to its contents as well as its boundaries. In this study culture is understood to be a broad concept consisting in “patterned ways of thinking, feeling, and reacting, acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values.” (Kluckhohn 1951: 86, n. 5.)

This essentially anthropological definition implies that all peoples have culture. Culture encompasses a way of life that is learned and shared by members of a particular society; cultures include symbols, artifacts, and values, in particular. Cultures develop and evolve on a social level, which is higher than that of an individual. Reflecting various aspects of our lives and environments,
languages and religions can be justly considered expressions of culture. Culture entails activities shared by an ethnic, linguistic, or religious human group. The role of translation can therefore be considered culturally significant in that the cultural processes involved in translation entail a constant borrowing and mixing of ideas and practices (Lohmann 2005: 2088). Linguistic units, small or large, simply cannot be fully understood in isolation from the particular culture in which they each acquire and retain a meaning or meanings.

Even though translation without culture is impossible, there is no universal understanding of the significance of culture for translation studies. Some say that language and culture are two distinct entities (e.g. Reddy 1986), while others view language as culture (e.g. Nida 2001). Consequently, the former appear to think that translation is a universal linguistic operation of transfer of meaning: the message is first encoded in one language and then decoded (or recoded) in another language. In practice, what this means then is that culture – cultural differences included – can be carried into another language through linguistic operations (cf. the Latin *translatio, translatum* from *transfero*, ‘carry across’). The latter in turn seem to think that meanings cannot be carried over from language to language by linguistic operations. Rather, it is negotiated within each context of culture. Each reader receives and interprets a text according to his or her own expectations. The act of reading and the act of interpretation of any text are inseparable. Translation is thereby inevitably relativized; it becomes a process of, e.g., “manipulation” (Hermans 1985), “mediation” (Katan 2004), or “refraction” (Lefevere 2008) between two different cultures (Katan 2009: 75).

The concept of *cultural translation* is understood in this study of literary translation to mean “those practices of literary translation that mediate cultural difference, or try to convey extensive cultural background, or set out to represent another culture via translation” (Sturge 2011: 67). Cultural translation is not limited solely to the linguistic level, even though complex technical issues such as dialect, intertextual literary allusions – especially cultural-religious allusions in the case of William Faulkner’s *Light in August* – food names, and architecture are dealt with. Cultural translation deals also with the assumed contextual cultural knowledge of the source text readership and conveys its meaning to the target text readership. As Sturge (2011: 67) notes, it is important to underline that cultural translation does not usually mean any particular type of translation strategy but rather entails a perspective or perspectives on translations.

Some proponents of the postcolonial translation theory (e.g. Bhabha 1994; Wolf 2002) criticize the notion of cultural translation, affirming that translation is less an interlingual transfer as a procedure than itself a fabric of culture. Doris Bachmann-Medick (2006: 37), for instance, argues that the translatedness of cultures is often referred to as ‘hybridity.’ It shifts the concept of culture “towards a dynamic concept of culture as a practice of negotiating cultural differences, and of
The distinction between source language cultures and target language cultures seems to be blurred when cultures are seen as dynamic processes of translation. The postcolonial translation theory seems to be right to assert that literary translation is more than linguistics; it is also a question of cultures, of which religion is typically an important component.

A plural approach as regards perspectives of translation is preferred in this study. An approach to translation that extends beyond its interlingual aspects to intertextuality is important for this study as long as it does not undervalue the linguistic difference (Trivedi 2007). Translation studies thus has to come to terms with its interdisciplinary and hybrid nature without losing its more traditional coexisting sense. In the case of analyzing cultural-religious elements in any such a culture-bound novel as *Light in August*, interdisciplinary translation studies necessarily needs some concrete tools. Intertextuality, serving intercultural connectivity, is argued here to be capable of functioning as such a tool.

The present study argues, in particular, that intertextuality has an important function in translation and translation studies. It is a concept which provides support for the reading, understanding, and translating of any novel. It may help the reader, especially the reader-translator, to focus on certain aspects of the text without which translating (the process) and translation (the product) may result in unsatisfying, inadequate, or even partially confusing forms of output. Intertextuality may thus function as an important methodological tool in literary translation, apparently ignored so far to a surprising extent in translation studies. It must be borne in mind, too, that whatever the method(s) or tool(s) used in translation studies, the results of research concerning translational practices and strategies are always relative. Translation is a human enterprise and thus inherently a complex heuristic phenomenon if anything.

### 1.2 Intertextuality and the reader-translator

Intertextuality is neither a limited nor a recently discovered phenomenon. In short, it is a universal phenomenon which signifies a “relationship of copresence between two texts or among several

---

1. The concept of *reader-translator* is used throughout the study to illustrate the processual nature of translation. The translator is before anything else a critical reader of a text, before any translation can take place. The term thus indicates the role of the translator as a critical reader as well as the order of things in the translational process, which does not imply anything about the order of importance of processual stages.

2. For instance, in Baker and Saldanha (2011) there is no entry for the subject, with only occasional references to the phenomenon (see the index on page 667).
texts” (Genette 1997: 1). At its least presumptuous meaning, it basically means the actual implied or understood presence of one or many other texts within another text. To the extent that this entails that no single text comes into being or exists in total isolation but is, rather, necessarily connected with earlier and later texts and with the wider world, it is clear that this is a phenomenon which directly involves translation and translated works as well.

Even though intertextuality as a technical term was not introduced until the late 1960s (Allen 2011: 1–7), as a phenomenon it has been part of western literary tradition since Antiquity. Translation is one sort of intertextuality, as all texts ultimately are translations of translations. Every text is thus a translation in the sense that any instance of writing is a transformation of some other text, i.e., no writing is original in any absolute sense but stands in a relation with preceding and surrounding texts. It may be that the writer is not even conscious of this fact when s/he is writing. It is impossible to trace the very original text, the “Ur-text”, because it would mean tracing the origin of human language; we cannot speak of something that exists before language without the language itself (Eagleton 1978: 73). Intertextuality describes processes of cultural interconnectivity – inside or outside of a given culture – normally, but not only, centered on a printed text.

Cultural interconnectivity in the form of cultural and religious elements found, for instance, in Faulkner’s works and in the particular case of this study, in Light in August, can be said to be discernible traces of such interconnectivity in a text, these traces being essentially of a cognitive nature (Miller 1985: 31).3 The traces can be intratextual as well as intertextual. Michael Riffaterre (1980: 627) argues that intertextual connections take place when intratextual anomalies draw a reader’s attention to them. They are traces left by absent intertexts and signs of an incompleteness of the text to be completed elsewhere. Indeed, it is only after these traces are detected and intertextual relationships have been perceived that “the literary work becomes more than a linear sequence of successive, discrete meanings”. It is the intertext that provides the basis for a text’s unity and identity (Riffaterre 1985: 58, 68).4

It is commonly agreed that the first notions of intertextuality as a concept are based on Mikhail Bakhtin’s work on horizontal and vertical intertextuality, presented to a western audience by Julia

---

3 ‘Trace’ is an important term in deconstruction. According to Jacques Derrida, “every sign… contains a ‘trace’ of other signs which differ from itself. … No sign is complete in itself. One sign leads to another via the ‘trace’ – indefinitely.” (Cuddon 2013: 729.)

4 This is a debatable affirmation in translation studies, where the creativity, particularly in literary translation, is a growing theme (see, e.g., Loffredo and Perteghella 2006).
Kristeva at the end of the 1960s.\(^5\) Horizontal intertextuality is explicit as a text or extracts of it are written in an attempt to reply to or to develop another text. Vertical intertextuality is more implicit, and is thus more difficult to recognize, and can relate e.g. to macro-textual conventions. A similar pair of intertextualities is presented by Fairclough (2000), who makes a distinction between manifest intertextual reference, expressed explicitly through surface textual features, e.g. quotations and citations, and constitutive intertextual reference, more opaque by nature. The latter is more difficult for a reader to work with as s/he has to detect and activate the reference, and trace it back to its source.

Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1997: 18) in turn argue that intertextuality can operate on any level of text organization, i.e., phonology, morphology, syntax, or semantics. Its expressions can range from the micro-level to the macro-level, from a single word to macro-textual conventions. It is characteristic for intertextuality that it is motivated and is thus used to convey something on the level of a text’s meaning.

It is worthwhile to note that a distinction can be made between socio-cultural objects and socio-textual practices as vehicles of intertextual reference. Socio-cultural objects exist on the micro-level of a text. They may be conveyed by a single word or phrase. Hatim and Mason (1997: 18) give as an example the biblical intertextual allusion to Job in the phrase “the patience of Job.”\(^6\) Such intertextual references to the Bible – so essential in Faulkner’s case – and other universal timeless literary works (e.g. Iliad and Odyssey) are long-lasting and well-known in many – at least western – cultures. What is important to note is that it is not always necessary to know the exact source of a reference in order to understand its meaning. Many people can understand the meaning of the phrase “the patience of Job” and can use it appropriately without ever having read the Book of Job in the Old Testament or without being able to locate it there.

Socio-textual practices in turn operate on the macro-level of a text. They are constraints and conventions concerning register, genre, discourse, and text type. These practices enable a reader to recognize a text as a member of a wider class of texts. They may be based on similar styles or ideologies of texts (see, e.g., Fairclough 2006: 218, and Hatim and Mason 1997: 143–163, 218), as well as on shared cultural membership and common humanity.

\(^5\) However, Mai (1991: 33) argues that “M. Bakhtin’s relevance for the intertextual debate is rather doubtful,” as “much has been written about his notion of ‘dialogism’ without ‘intertextuality’ being mentioned at all.”

\(^6\) In Finnish, there is an expression “jobinposti” (‘Job’s message’), meaning bad news, a message bringing bad, sad, or negative news (see, e.g., Kielitoimiston sanakirja [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish], s.v. ‘jobinposti’).
Intertextuality is thus a precondition for the intelligibility of texts (Hatim and Mason 1997: 219). It is a system through which a text can refer backward or forward to other, previous or future texts. This is done e.g. by alluding, quoting, borrowing, through citation, sometimes even through plagiarism. A reader experiences a variety of meanings, due to the intertextuality of a text. If s/he does not recognize intertextual references, the result is a partial or incomplete understanding of such references. In the case of translation, especially if and when intertextuality is motivated, the reader-translator needs to take it into consideration as one important aspect when translating. Intertextuality challenges the reader-translator to recognize intertextual references, which requires a solid cultural and social knowledge, including religion.

When we say “inter-text,” we are immediately in the world of texts, as Riffaterre (1980: 625) puts it: “In a nutshell, the very idea of textuality is inseparable from and founded upon intertextuality.” Texts can be linked with an intersubjective relationship between two authors, too, but in this study the important relation is between a text (the so-called “source text”), another text (the so-called “target text” or “translation”) and a reader, especially in the sense of a reader being a translator. Roland Barthes (1990c: 159) explicitly argues that “the plural of the Text depends, that is, not on the ambiguity of its contents but on what might be called the stereographic plurality of its weave of signifiers (etymologically, the text is a tissue, a woven fabric). The reader of the Text may be compared to someone at a loose end”. The text consists of numerous discourses, and only a reader can establish a relationship between himself or herself, the text s/he is reading, and an intertext, the text in a specific or a general sense.

As can be seen, the notion of a reader occupies a central position in any translation process. The importance of the reader in constructing or retrieving the literary work has been strongly brought forward by the reader-response theory (see, e.g., Ingarden 1986, Jauss 1989, and Schneider 2005). It underlines the critical position of the reader in any understanding and interpretation of a text by focusing criticism on the reader and his or her experience of a text. The reader-response theory is particularly interested in how readers construct meanings for a text during the process of reading. Wolfgang Iser (1991) argues that readers actualize texts by filling out their gaps, i.e., those parts of texts which they find lacking, or vague, or ambiguous.

Stanley Fish (1980) in turn argues for the role of “an interpretive community” in reading, and thus of an interpretive reader, which applies to any given text a set of a priori conventions. Fish even gives the reader the role of the re-producer of the text. In contrast, Peter W. Nesselroth (1985)

---

7 Translation studies has mainly concentrated on target text readers’ expectations, e.g. studying statements of critics, editors, and publishers (Toury 1995: 65; Ruokonen 2011: 74).
argues that different reading experiences depend on the difference between everyday communication and literary communication. Reader-response criticism is thus interested in the structure of a reader-experience, and not so much in the structure of a literary work. These emphases are particularly important for translation studies in that any translator is above all a reader, and the product of his or her work is meant to be used by readers, even if s/he cannot control reader-responses.8

When the main interest moved from a literary text to the reader’s cognitive activity, it was in opposition to the New Criticism that emphasized that only that which is in a text can contribute to the meaning of a text. In translation studies it is easy to see that it cannot be either only the text or only the reader but both. A translator is always a reader, and a meaning of a literary text cannot be obtained without the text, even though the meaning is not limited to the written text. It can also be noted that the modern reader-response theory, even if it has roots in the 1920s and 1930s (see, e.g., Tompkins 1988), was properly launched in the 1960s and 1970s, about the same time as translation studies as an academic discipline was taking its first steps, which may thus have been one of the factors helping translation studies to come into existence. Without entering the debate on the distinctions between different kinds of reader-response theories (see, e.g., Freund 1987 and Tompkins 1988), in the present study a reader means a kind of average representative typifying all readers in a specific culture. This admittedly loose definition of ‘reader’ is adequate for the purposes of the present study, even if it does not make a distinction between reading as an experience and the verbalization of the experience. As we simply do not have access to reception per se, a reader, real or implied, is inevitably always in the end a theoretical construction.

1.3 Aims and material of the study

William Faulkner (1897–1962) was an American Southern writer, who has a reputation of being difficult to understand. Faulkner is generally recognized as a real challenge to readers. In Finland, for instance, Simo Rekola (2007: 436) notes “for Finnish readers, understanding William Faulkner proved to be more laborious than understanding Steinbeck and Hemingway. The main

---

8 Barthes (1974: 10) has emphasized a re-evaluation of the position of the reader: “This ‘I’ which approaches the text is already itself a plurality of other texts, of codes which are infinite or, more precisely, lost (whose origin is lost).” However, if the intertextual relationships of any literary work are said to be “infinite,” as Barthes claims, there would be no possibility to make use of intertextuality in translation studies.
reasons were the author’s original style and complicated and innovative narrative techniques renewing the form of the novel.”

Another important aspect, which makes Faulkner’s works interesting from the point of view of translation studies, is his background as a Southern writer. The American South and its culture are something particular, a mixture of the tragic history of slavery, secession, the Civil War, and post-Civil War history, as well as Evangelical Protestant Christianity with its revival meetings and particular religious sentiments. Irving Howe (1991: 22–23) notes that the other regions of the United States submitted to dissolution, becoming a self-conscious nation, but the South wanted desperately to keep itself intact and keep the regional memory the main shaper of its life. All this can be found in Faulkner’s works.

Faulkner created a local world, a micro-cosmos, an imaginary region called Yoknapatawpha, which is a kind of micro-South “owned” by Faulkner. This Southern background can be experienced in most of his novels, especially through cultural and religious characteristics. Whoever reads and translates Faulkner cannot escape or ignore them. Indeed, Yoknapatawpha includes a concentration of various networks of cultural and religious intertexts. Faulkner as a Southern writer is easier to grasp if it is understood that “the South is the most overtly Christian region of the country, the most Protestant region of the country, and the most Baptist region of the country” (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: xxix).

In his Nobel Prize acceptance speech in 1950 Faulkner expressed his hope for humankind in religious and metaphysical terms: “I believe that man will not merely endure: he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance.” Faulkner is not a Christian or religious writer if by that is meant somebody whose religion is dogmatic. Once questioned about his religious beliefs, Faulkner answered that the trouble with Christianity was that it had never been tried yet (Moore 1989: 1292). On another occasion he answered the same question more personally: “Within my own rights I feel that I’m a good Christian.” Faulkner probably used the term ‘Christian’ without much reference to Christian dogma. He continued: “… whether it would please anybody else’s standard or not I don’t know” (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 203).

9 “Suomalaisille lukijoille osoittautui hankalammaksi William Faulknerin kuin Steinbeckin ja Hemingwayn ymmärtäminen. Keskeisinä syniä olivat kirjailijan omintakeinen tyyli ja monimutkaiset, romaninmuotoa uudistaneet kerrontaratkaisut.” From the point of view of the present study, it is interesting to note that Rekola does not mention cultural differences between the American South and Finland.

10 Faulkner’s famous address in Stockholm on December 10, 1950, can be found, e.g., in Cowley 2003: 649–650.
In Faulkner’s novels humanity’s religious yearning for God is conspicuous. This human quest for God who transforms and elevates human beings is obvious e.g. in *The Sound and the Fury* (1929; translated into Finnish as *Ääni ja vimma*, 1965), even though in Faulkner’s later novels the quest seems to take a somewhat inward turn. He describes the complexity of the human religious situation mainly through his characters. Two of his most religious novels are *Light in August* (1932) and *A Fable* (1954; cf. Woodruff 1961). The former has been translated twice into Finnish whereas the latter has never been translated into Finnish. The third religious novel full of biblical sayings, doctrines, and general folk wisdom in the South is *As I Lay Dying* (1930; translated into Finnish as *Kun tein kuolemaa*, 1952). The presence of intertextual cultural-religious allusions, especially biblical terms and themes from the Old Testament, is familiar to anyone who has read Faulkner’s novels (e.g. *Go Down, Moses; Absalom, Absalom!; Sanctuary; Requiem for a Nun*). They “indicate a tendency to call upon biblical points of reference – and a specific mode – to express apocalyptic apprehension” (*Go Down, Moses*) or “a mood of lamentation” (*Absalom, Absalom!*†) (Jeffrey 1993: 458). Although most readers and critics of Faulkner agree that his works are in some sense religious, there is no clear consensus among scholars on what that metaphysical religiosity is and what it implies.11 It is less clear in which way Faulkner links culture-bound human spirituality with transcendence. Mountains of Faulkner criticism are inconclusive on this matter.

Given the many expressions of cultural-religious intertextuality in Faulkner’s work, it is amazing that virtually no attention has been paid to the specific problems of rendering these expressions in other languages and cultures. Literary texts that are not religious in the sense of sacred texts of religion seem to constitute a gray area in translation studies between translations of sacred texts (see, e.g., Barnes 2011 and Long 2005), and those of other types of texts, e.g. texts of medicine, law, technology, and politics (see, e.g., Baker and Saldanha 2011, Malmkjær and Windle 2011, and Ahmad & Rogers 2007).

### 1.3.1 Aims of the study

This study approaches cultural-religious elements in Faulkner from the point of view of intertextuality. The plurality of intertextuality is taken for granted in this study, which will argue that it is indeed justified to speak of intertextualities in the plural.

---

11 Rougé (1974: 381) says that “on saisit donc combien la phrase faulknérienne... est une métaphysique, car elle est dans sa structure une méditation sur le réel et l’Autre, sur le temps et l’éternité.” According to Richardson (2004: 148), “Faulkner’s use of vague, dense, or opaque language is not merely a formal aspect, but rather serves to reinforce the message of metaphysical uncertainty that often pervades Faulkner’s work.”
The present study has a twofold main goal. On the one hand, the study aims at corroborating, by means of an examination of a set of empirical data consisting in the novel *Light in August* by Faulkner, the view that adequate translations necessitate, on the part of the reader-translator, a considerable amount of intertextual cultural competence in the field(s) the original source text deals with and that adequate translations thus cannot be secured by the translator’s technical or theoretical translation skills only.

On the other hand, the present study equally purports to argue, by reference to the translation solutions made by the translators during their respective Finnish translations of *Light in August*, that the religious components of the cultural contents of the novel constitute a set of data which is not fully accounted for in the translations and that the two translations both exhibit properties or tendencies which are not entirely adequate or even desirable either from a translational or from a cultural point of view.

Situated in the domain of literary translation studies, the present study is mainly descriptive-exploratory in that it describes, explores, and analyzes cultural-religious intertextuality, i.e., intertextual features in Faulkner’s *Light in August* and its two Finnish translations, *Kohtalokas veripisara* and *Liekehtivä elokuu*, by viewing them as elements in a given cultural and religious environment, viz. the American South. As there is an inherent danger that descriptive translation studies can become detached from reality, the present study will consciously concentrate on close-reading both the source text and the target texts (see Chapter 6). This analysis is typically a “description of individual translations, or text-focused translation description” (Holmes 1988: 72). However, contrary to the principle of pure target-orientation, in its efforts to do justice to the source text, this study is both source-oriented and target-oriented. As is characteristic of descriptive translation studies in general, this study does not propose norms or laws of translation that would indicate how the source text and the target texts should correlate with relations between the culture in the American South and in Finland (see Toury 1995: 55; Pym 2010: 78–83). With these remarks and understood in this sense, the present study belongs to the research area of descriptive translation studies (cf. Pym 2010; Munday 2008), and its approach is interdisciplinary. On this view, then, translation studies, literary studies, and cultural studies are closely connected with one another.

---

12 In order to aim at establishing norms or laws of translation of Southern cultural-religious intertextuality into Finnish, it would require, e.g., studying also other Southern authors who use cultural-religious language, e.g. Flannery O’Connor and Walker Percy, and the translations of their works in Finnish.
It should be noted at this point that the study does not constitute per se an attempt at literary criticism or at translation criticism either; rather, the study is a project which seeks to substantiate the view that adequate translations in the sense of Gideon Toury (1995) crucially depend on the reader-translator’s ability to detect various intertextual, culturally significant traits or properties in the source texts the translations textually stem from. As religion is part of culture, and as translation also implies translating cultures, the knowledge of cultural-religious concepts in the context of the American South is necessary to produce an adequate translation.

Adequacy here also means that a translation seeks to follow the source text, and is inevitably a compromise but still an adequate – and acceptable – product in the target culture whose reading seems natural to the reader, without leading him or her astray on the cultural-linguistic level (see Hatim and Mason 1997; Shuttleworth & Cowie 1999).

### 1.3.2 Research material

The research material for this study is taken from William Faulkner’s seventh novel *Light in August* and its two Finnish translations, *Kohtalokas veripisara* and *Liekehtivä elokuu*. The text used here is a Random House edition, first published in 1968. This edition is identical with the first edition and printing published by Smith and Haas on October 6, 1932. In 1985 the original text of the novel was corrected under the direction of Noel Polk, when the text was compared with the holograph manuscript and a carbon typescript. The 1985 text was published by the Library of America, and in 1987 in the collection of Vintage Books of Random House. Both of these texts were established by Noel Polk.

I have chosen the novel *Light in August* among Faulkner’s works in order to show the importance of the combination of the American Southern culture, in particular religion, and intertextuality, and their impact on translation in another language and culture. It is evident that much of what will be analyzed is *mutatis mutandis* relevant to Faulkner’s other works and their translations. This wider

---

13 Toury (1995: 56–57) notes that “whereas adherence to source norms determines a translation’s adequacy as compared to the source text, subscription to norms originating in the target culture determines its acceptability.” (Boldface in the original.)


scope of the intertextual presence of the Southern culture in Faulkner’s other works will be referred to throughout the analysis.

Exploring intertextuality, the present study is a novelty concerning Faulkner translation, as it is a fact that of the few studies of Faulkner translation, none deals specifically with the problems encountered in translating cultural-religious intertextuality in Faulkner. For instance, Eberhard Boecker’s *William Faulkner’s later novels in German: A study in the theory and practice of translation* (1973) is a study of Faulkner’s six novels (*The Hamlet, Go Down, Moses, Intruder in the Dust, Requiem for a Nun, A Fable, The Mansion*) in German translation. Boecker devotes only about one page (pp. 146–147) to intertextual biblical allusions.


Faulkner’s French translator, Maurice Edgar Coindreau (1971: 90) notes that “William Faulkner is a difficult author, and consequently one who gives to those who translate him the greatest of satisfactions, because a victory can be profoundly gratifying only if the adversary presents a real challenge.” Coindreau (1971) includes two relevant articles: “Preface to *Light in August*” (pp. 31–40) and “On Translating Faulkner” (pp. 85–90). An earlier study is Stanley D. Woodworth’s *William Faulkner en France (1931–1952)* (1959). Woodworth (1959: 6) estimates that there is often “l’écart significatif” between Faulkner’s work and its translation in French.

The present study is a qualitative research project. The aims of the study serve also as salient ingredients for the hypotheses of the study, and the analysis of cultural-religious intertextual elements (Chapter 6) leads the research into a better understanding of the whole phenomenon of intertextuality in translation, and thus helps to formulate the hypotheses in a more precise way as well as leadings to new research questions (Chapter 7). This process can be called a hermeneutic circle (see, e.g., Norris 2005; cf. Allen 2011: 128).

As the hypotheses of the study depend for their reliability on the research material selected, an important question is what criteria are used for corpus selection. As Luc van Doorslaer (1995: 251) affirms, there is no theoretically established way to select material for a comparison in translation studies. The essential thing is to select material in such a way that it has translational relevance (Doorslaer 1995: 251; cf. Laviosa 2002). The researcher is always between the Scylla of
exhaustiveness and the Charybdis of representativeness. As to the question of exhaustiveness in this study, there is a systematic method of referring to other novels of Faulkner throughout the textual analysis in Chapter 6.

In order to verify the quantitative reliability of the corpus, I have used Jack L. Capps’s (ed.) *Light in August: A Concordance to the Novel* (1979). Capps’s work provides a useful checklist for quantitative analysis when looking for cultural-religious intertextual elements in the novel. Another reference book that has proved useful for the handling and especially for the analysis of the representative textual material of *Light in August* is Hugh M. Ruppersburg’s *Reading Faulkner: Light in August: Glossary and Commentary* (1994). Ruppersburg’s work specifically comments on some of the representative intertextual cultural-religious elements that will be discussed in this study. It therefore serves as a good qualitative refinement for the understanding and interpreting of text passages in *Light in August*.

To have a both exhaustive and representative corpus of research material, I first selected, through a thematic close-reading, passages in the novel with biblical allusions and with some of the most common words in religion and in particular, in Christianity, like *God*, *church*, *Book*, as the novel is set in the American Southern Evangelical Protestant religious context (see Chapter 2). This list of the first reading was checked and edited when the final list of intertextual cultural-religious passages – each of them may include several lexical cultural-religious items – was compiled. The final list consists of 229 text passages of various lengths extracted from the novel.

After the first thematic close-reading, I looked up the corresponding passages in the Finnish translations and set them side by side with the source text passages and started a comparative reading, observing similarities, differences, and making possible categories of the passages. At the third stage, using specific and general intertextuality as the main categories, I chose 30 passages as examples from the point of view of intertextuality, culture, and religion. It was only after the categorization of the English and Finnish examples that I looked at other translations, i.e., first the Swedish but then also the French translation of the passages in question.

The 30 passages are representative and exhaustive examples in the sense that they are culturally and semantically significant from the point of view of translation studies. Other research hypotheses and other disciplines would have produced a different kind of list of examples. The number of passages analyzed in the study, 30, is big enough to be both quantitatively representative and
exhaustive in corpus design (Biber 1993: 248, 253), even though the present study is not quantitative but qualitative by nature.16

1.4 Finnish Faulkner translations of the 1940s and the 1960s

Rosella Mamoli Zorzi’s (ed.) The Translations of Faulkner in Europe (1998) is an anthology of papers presented at a workshop on Faulkner translations, held in 1995 in Warsaw. It contains Matti Savolainen’s article “Fatal Drops of Blood in Yoknapatawpha: On Translations and Reception of Faulkner in Finland” (pp. 69–79). Hence, Savolainen’s article is a useful introduction to Faulkner in Finland. In one of the few Finnish contributions to Faulkner translation, Elina Randell (1986: 19) remarks that “Faulkner is in many respects a translator’s nightmare” and that his text is very “tangled.”17 Even though Faulkner has been regarded in Finland as a difficult author to read and to translate, 11 out of his 20 novels have been translated into Finnish (see Appendix; cf. Savolainen 1998: 79). The latest translation of a novel by Faulkner into Finnish was published in 1987. It was the novel The Unvanquished, originally published in 1934, and translated as Voittamattomat by Paavo Lehtonen. In 2016 Faulkner’s New Orleans Sketches, a collection of early pieces (1925), was published in Finnish, translated as New Orleansin tarinoita by Kristiina Drews.

The story of Faulkner translations in Finland began in the 1940s which was a difficult period for the country. The socio-cultural and historical context (Chesterman 2000: 20; Ruokonen 2011: 76) of translations was materially hard. Finland was at war twice, first 1939–1940 against the Soviet Union, and then 1941–1944 again against the Soviet Union. However, even though the economy was based on rationing, books – alongside matches and vinegar – were free from restrictive regulations. The years 1941–1948 were kind to the Finnish publishing industry. Newly established publishers gained independence, and the demand for books was growing, maybe because real life was difficult and living conditions hard. Some of the newly established publishing houses edited translated literature, even though there was also censorship in place in the country. Especially is to be noted that Tammi, the “Faulkner publisher” in Finland, was established in 1943, in the middle of

16 An example of a quantitative analysis is Whissell 1994. She compared with the help of a computer program the style and emotional connotations of Ernest Hemingway (A Farewell to Arms), John Galsworthy (To Let) and William Faulkner (The Unvanquished).

the war period. The two large, well-established Finnish publishers, WSOY and Otava, privileged national priorities of the school system and the national defence forces. This left less space for translated literature in their activities (Rekola 2007: 435–436). It was difficult to translate English literature as Finland was in war against the Soviet Union. It was not until after World War II that English literature translated into Finnish started growing in numbers (Nyman - Kovala 2007: 175; Rekola 2007: 426–428).

The depression in the early 1930s and the war years in the 1940s brought about inflation and deep cuts to Finnish cultural life that were perhaps less sharp among Swedish-speaking Finns (Laitinen 1991: 438). The period of war was an interim period in Finnish culture and literature. After the war there was a general feeling in the country that there had been a fatal rupture in cultural life. There was no return to the year 1939, but there was no clear way forward, either. One important factor was that there was a growing interest in translation. Within a few years Hemingway, Steinbeck, Faulkner, Mann, Kafka, D.H. Lawrence, Gide, Sartre, Camus, Anouilh as well as Soviet writers Sholohov, Gladkov and Simonov were translated into Finnish (Laitinen 1991: 439).

A geopolitical and economic disequilibrium between Finnish culture and Anglo-American culture should be mentioned here. Finland had lost the war against the Soviet Union in 1944, although the country was never occupied by the Soviet Union but it had to pay heavy war reparations. The country was experiencing a deep societal transformation. The United States with its allies was among those countries that dominated the world politics after World War II. This had no doubt consequences on the translational processes of that time. Political and historical events turned a pre-war Finnish cultural orientation toward German culture to a post-war Anglo-American cultural orientation, even if a lot of information seeped into Finnish cultural life through Swedish culture. French influences were also present in Finnish culture and literature (Laitinen 1991: 439; Rekola 2007: 438; cf. Kujamäki 2007: 402). However, after World War II English-speaking and American culture were considered as the upholder and sustainer of humanism and democracy (Hökkä 1999: 74).

The last years of the 1940s saw a revival in literature: in 1945, 467 books of fiction were published in Finnish, out of a total of 2025 books published in the country in Finnish (Laitinen 1991: 439; Rekola 2007: 438; cf. Kujamäki 2007: 402). However, after World War II English-speaking and American culture were considered as the upholder and sustainer of humanism and democracy (Hökkä 1999: 74).

18 Tammi introduced modern American fiction to Finland through its translations. The first novel of Faulkner that Tammi published in Finnish was The Wild Palms in 1947, two years later than Kohtalokas veripisara by the publisher Kirjokansi. Villipalmut was translated into Finnish by Alex Matson, maybe the most important translator of Anglo-American literature in Finland in the 1940s. Villipalmut was the first Faulkner translation published in the Tammi’s series called Keltainen kirjasto (“Yellow library”), founded in 1954. In the 1950s there were many famous U.S. authors not translated into Finnish, including e.g. Hemingway and Steinbeck (see Pulkkinen 2007).
1991: 441; see also Rekola 2007). Among the most famous books written in Finnish and published that year were Pentti Haanpää’s *Yhdeksän miehen saappaat* (‘Boots of nine men’) and Mika Waltari’s *Simuhe, egyptiläinen* (*Simuhe the Egyptian*), which was published in an abridged English translation by Naomi Walford in 1949.

Likewise, in 1945, after four decades during which only a few novels were translated from English (British or American) into Finnish, *Light in August* (abbr. LIA) was the first of Faulkner’s novels to be translated into Finnish. It was published under the title *Kohtalokas veripisara* (‘A Fatal Drop of Blood’; abbr. KV), referring obviously to the mixed parentage of Joe Christmas, who is one of the main protagonists in the novel.\(^1^9\) The translation was published by Kirjokanssi Oy, a small, newly-established publishing house in Turku, 13 years after the appearance of the source text, and V. Vankkoja and Sorella Soveri are named as its translators. The publication of the novel is important not only because it is the first Faulkner translation in Finland but also because it illustrates the above-mentioned cultural turn in Finland toward the post-war Anglo-American period.

As many names of translators in Finland in the first half of the 20\(^{th}\) century, “V. Vankkoja” is probably a pseudonym (Cronvall 2007: 363). The name can be found in other translations in the forms of “V.V. Vankkoja” and “Vankka Vankkoja.”\(^2^0\) Sorella Soveri (1906–1963) in turn worked as a librarian in the University library (Helsingin yliopisto 1977: 343) and was a part-time translator. *Kohtalokas veripisara* is the only translation Vankkoja and Soveri did together. The catalogue of the National Bibliography of Finland, Fennica, indicates that Vankkoja later translated another book, Alfred Hitchcock’s *A hangman’s dozen*, in Finnish *Hirttäjän tusina*, together with Väinö J. Tervaskari in 1964, published by Tammi. The catalogue of Finnish libraries gives 57 different titles translated by Vankkoja, and 44 different titles translated by Soveri.\(^2^1\) Both of them translated from several languages into Finnish. Vankkoja translated e.g. Dorothy L. Sayers (*The Nine Tailors*, 1935), Erskine Caldwell (*Georgia Boy*, 1943), Erich Maria Remarque (*Arc de Triomphe*, 1945), and August Strindberg (*Giftas*, 1884–1885) into Finnish whereas Soveri mostly

\(^{19}\) That this strange name plays an important role is intratextually confirmed by the text itself. See, e.g., LIA, 29.

\(^{20}\) In Finland, “Vankkoja” is a very rare surname, and “Vankka” a very rare first name. Ruokonen (2011: 82) mentions that in the records of the Finnish Population Register Centre (catalogues from the 19\(^{th}\)and 20\(^{th}\) centuries), only four Finns have had the surname Vankkoja, and less than 40 Finns have had the first name Vankka. Whoever Vankkoja was, s/he probably worked only part-time as a translator. – The answer from the National Library of Finland to my request confirmed the probable pseudonym of V. Vankkoja (e-mail received July 21, 2015).

\(^{21}\) [www.kirjasampo.fi](http://www.kirjasampo.fi) (accessed July 21, 2015). The lists include all literary pieces translated by them, including short articles.
translated girls’ and boys’ books. In this regard they seem to have been a complementary pair of translators.

The use of two translators could be explained e.g. by a hurry to publish the novel. In the novel in Finnish, there is no indication as to which of them translated which part of the novel. Neither are there any traces of this in the files of Kirjokansi in the Finnish National Archives where its files are situated. It seems that the only way to find out which translator translated which part of the novel would be to carry out a very thorough and detailed quantitative analysis of the text of KV.

What can be concluded is that the publisher probably gave to each of them one part of the novel to be translated. Both had translated earlier from Swedish into Finnish, but not from English into Finnish, and not for Kirjokansi. This was the first time. It is not known whether it was precisely the same number of pages they were given, or whether one got more than the other. The order of names (“V. Vankkoja ja [‘and’] Sorella Soveri”) on the editorial page may imply that the first part was given to Vankkoja and the second part to Soveri. There may have been an editor in the publishing house who, having received the translated parts from the two translators, joined the translated texts, and also unified the style of the text.

Their translation, which was an ambitious literary enterprise, did not raise much interest in the middle of the translation boom going on in Finland at the time (Rekola 2007: 437). Rafael Koskimies noticed the translation and expressed his annoyance at the gaudiness of the book cover and stated that the gaudy cover does not give the real picture of the contents of the master-piece, even though, as he admitted, “the novel itself does not lack a certain glare.” Koskimies considered Faulkner – together with Dreiser and Dos Passos – as a modernist. For him, Faulkner represented “young novel poetry in its so-called hard-boiled forms.” Koskimies placed Faulkner and Joyce in the same category but remarked that Faulkner’s modernism meant above all an ideological change.

---

23 The answer from the Finnish National Archives to my request (e-mail received July 20, 2015). The only piece of information of some relevance from the point of view of the present study is that Kirjokansi Oy was founded on May 13, 1945, and was dissolved as a company on July 31, 1981.
24 This is not the aim or the focus of the present study, and thus such an analysis is beyond the scope of the study.
25 Admittedly, Kirjokansi was a small publisher and might not have done any thorough editorial work.
26 Rafael Koskimies was Professor of esthetics and modern literature at the University of Helsinki 1939–1961.
27 “Varsin rääkeän kirjava päällälehti – sellaisethan ovat viime vuosina tulleet meillä käytöön – ei anna sellaisenaan vielä oikeata kuvaan tämän mestarillisen teoksen sisällyksestä, vaikka toisaalta kyllä on sanottava, ettei romaani suinkaan ole vailla tiettyä rääkeyttääkään.” (Koskimies 1951: 258.)
28 “... Faulkner v. 1897 syntyneenä edustaa muotta romaanirunoutta sen niin sanotuiissa kovaksikeitetyissä muodoissa” (Koskimies 1951: 269–270).
in culture (Koskimies 1951: 270). He also emphasized the historical importance of the novel, i.e. Faulkner’s writing about his own region and about people he knew. The novel “gives a competent description of the life and conditions in the American South between the World Wars,” thus affirming the importance of the Southern culture for the novel and its translations. Koskimies’s comments reflect both a rather loose use of the term modernist and the fact that the entering of modernism into Finland is firmly connected with translations (Kantola - Riikonen 2007: 447, 456).

Koskimies’s comments belong to the socio-cultural aspects in translation studies (Chesterman 2000: 20). In addition, there are textual factors influencing the first Finnish Faulkner translation, Kohtalokas veripisara (1945). It stands in an interesting relation to the earlier Swedish translation of Light in August (William Faulkner, Ljus i augusti. Översättning Erik Lindegren. Bokförlaget Lind & Co 2001 (1944); abbr. LIAS). Whenever there is an omission of a source text element in the analyzed text passages in Kohtalokas veripisara, there is a corresponding omission in the Swedish translation. In my view, this textual evidence, in addition to the fact that V. Vankkoja and Sorella Soveri translated a lot from Swedish into Finnish in the 1940s and 1950s – both of them started their career as translators with translations from Swedish into Finnish – indicates that the two Finnish translators either used the Swedish translation as an additional source text, or at least that they edited the Finnish translation according to the Swedish translation. It was a common policy in those days to use a translation as the source text of a translation, especially from the Swedish language (Cronvall 2007: 363; cf. Hollo 1943: 1). In addition, in the 1940s it was expected that the entirety of a source text was translated, without omissions or abridgments (Ruokonen 2011: 80; Saarimaa 1943: 352; Hollo 1943: 1; Leppihalme 1997: 88). What this means is that if the translators

29 “Puhtaasti historiallistakin mielenkiintoa teos tarjoaa sen vuoksi, että siinä annetaan asiantuntevaa valaistusta etelävaltioiden elämään ja oloihin maailmansotien välisenä aikana” (Koskimies 1951: 260).
30 The year 1946 was particular in Finland as to the translation of modernist works. James Joyce’s A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man (1916) was translated into Finnish by Alex Matson under the title Taitelijan omakuva nuoruuden vuosilta. Xavier Herbert’s Capricornia (1938) was translated into Finnish (Capricornia; translator was Otso Pietinen) as well as Franz Kafka’s Der Prozess (1925) as Oikeusjuttu (translator was Aukusti Simojoki). Both Capricornia and Der Prozess were translated first into Swedish, the former in 1944 and the latter in 1945. (Kantola - Riikonen 2007: 453.)
31 Chesterman (2000: 20) calls “translation event” the issues of source text, skopos, computers, deadline, pay, etc.
32 To determine the original source text of Kohtalokas veripisara I compared some seventy pages in various parts of the novel, and the result was always the same: Kohtalokas veripisara follows the Swedish translation textually and literally.
33 Ruokonen (2011: 83) affirms that Vankkoja’s translation of Sayer’s The Nine Tailors, too, contains omissions and is heavily abridged.
of KV had the original English text, they most probably translated the entire source text. The impact of the Swedish translation on the Finnish translation will be discussed in Chapter 6 below, where the Swedish translation is presented as the (other) presumed source text of KV.

In translation studies, the phenomenon of a translation of a translated text into a third language is called relay translation or indirect translation (on relay or indirect translation, see Ringmar 2012; Dollerup 2000; Pajares 2000; Toury 1995: 129–146). As a term, relay translation focuses more on the translational process whereas indirect translation focuses more on the end product of a translational process (Ringmar 2012: 141; Dollerup 2000: 23). Even though there are frequent instances of relay translation in the history of translation, the phenomenon has received little attention from translation scholars in recent years. This can be understood through the commonly accepted idea that if there are mistakes in the first translation, they are necessarily repeated in the relay translation. However, Cay Dollerup (2000: 20) argues that indisputable errors are few in relay translation when it deals with conference interpreting (see also Shuttleworth & Cowie 1999: 142–143). That is why it is always preferable – where possible – to translate from the original source text.

Relay translation has its advantages in the diffusion of culture and knowledge, e.g. the role of the Arabic language as a mediating language of Greek culture (St André 2011: 230–231). The problem with relay translation is that it is a sensitive practice that might be concealed or even denied. The editorial page of Kohtalokas veripisara does not give any clue as to the use of the Swedish translation as the source text of translation, against a heavy textual support of a case of relay translation. In other words, there is no other mention of the source text of Kohtalokas veripisara than what is written on page 4: “Englanninkielisen alkutekstin nimi” (‘The name of the English original’).

It can be noted that at the end of the 1940s and at the beginning of the 1950s Faulkner was so little known in Finland that the publisher Tammi asked the translator Alex Matson to write a short introduction for Villipalmut (1947; Wild Palms) and for Kun tein kuolemaa (1952; As I Lay Dying). There have been three major translators of Faulkner into Finnish: Alex Matson, Kai Kaila, and Paavo Lehtonen. The choice of works translated means that Finnish readers have become acquainted with the Faulkner of Yoknapatawpha County (see Appendix). In The Literary Career of William Faulkner (1961), the editor James B. Meriwether mentioned the 1948 Finnish translation of The Wild Palms (Villipalmut) by Alex Matson, and the 1952 Finnish translation of As I Lay Dying (Kun tein kuolemaa) by the same translator, both published by Tammi, but for some reason not the 1945 translation of Light in August. Meriwether (1961: 123) himself admitted that “the list [of Faulkner translations] is quite certainly both incomplete and inaccurate.”
Another aspect which makes Faulkner’s *Light in August* interesting from the point of view of translation studies is the fact that *Light in August* is the only one of Faulkner’s novels to have been translated twice into Finnish. This phenomenon of translating a work that has been previously translated into the same language is called retranslation in translation studies (see, e.g., Gürçağlar 2011, Koskinen & Paloposki 2015, and Paloposki and Koskinen 2004). In 1968 *Light in August* was translated again by Kai Kaila, this time entitled *Liekehtivä elokuu* (‘Flaming August’; abbr. LE), published by Tammi in Helsinki.\(^{34}\) Kaila had already translated Faulkner’s *The Sound and the Fury* (1929; translated as *Ääni ja vimma*, 1965\(^{35}\)), *The Reivers* (1962; translated as *Rosvot*, 1966), and *Absalom, Absalom!* (1936; translated as *Absalom, Absalom*, 1967; see Appendix). Kaila was a productive translator: he translated a total of 208 books from eight different languages into Finnish (Kapari 2007: 36).\(^{36}\)

Randell (1986: 25–28) briefly compares *Kohtalokas veripisara* and *Liekehtivä elokuu*. Her conclusions are that in KV spoken dialogues and narrative descriptions have been made more literary. Some original divisions into paragraphs have been changed in KV, whereas LE follows more faithfully the source text division into paragraphs. KV eliminates some syntactic structures and compound nouns while LE follows more closely Faulkner’s syntax (cf. Ruokonen 2011: 80). As a whole, LE is closer to *Light in August* than KV, which confirms the so-called retranslation hypothesis in translation studies. It argues that a later translation tends to remain closer to the source text than the first translation of the same text (Gambier 1994: 414; cf. Lefevere 1992b and Tymoczko 1999), although some researchers (e.g. Paloposki and Koskinen 2004) have remarked that the hypothesis is not universally valid as the translations depend also on other, e.g. socio-cultural, aspects. – Randell does not mention the retranslation hypothesis. Nor does she mention that in the three examples given in her text, every KV passage follows very closely the Swedish translation.\(^{37}\)

---

\(^{34}\) There are no records available as to reasons for this new translation of *Light in August* (oral information received from Tammi by phone on June 6, 2015).

\(^{35}\) The Finnish Association of Translators and Interpreters (www.sktl.fi) gave him the Mikael Agricola Prize in 1966 for this translation (Kapari 2007: 36–37). There is one M.A. Thesis on Kai Kaila, see Ikävalko 2011.

\(^{36}\) As the meaning of *translator* is not as clear as it may seem, in this study impersonal “translations” (KV and LE) are spoken of as agents of translational actions (see Toury 1995: 278).

\(^{37}\) Randell (1986: 27–28) mentions an allusion to John Keats’s (1795–1821) poem *Ode on a Grecian urn* in the novel (LIA, 5) and how KV (KV, 9) has better translated the allusion than LE (LE, 8). There is also an allusion to Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, Act 1, Scene V, on LIA, 453 (KV, 482 and LE, 365). These intertextual literary allusions are not included in this study.
There is thus an influence of *Kohtalokas veripisara* on *Liekehtivä elokuu*. However, as the main focus of the present study is on cultural-religious intertextuality in *Light in August* and its translations in Finnish, the emphasis is not on comparing the Finnish translations between themselves, as e.g. Randell (1986) has done, but rather on comparing some of the intertextualities of the source text with those found in *Kohtalokas veripisara*, on the one hand, and those found in the source text and in *Liekehtivä elokuu*, on the other (see Chapter 6). Consequently, there is no research in the present study on whether “a first translation [*Kohtalokas veripisara*] always tends to be more assimilating, tends to reduce the otherness in the name of cultural or editorial requirements … The retranslation [*Liekehtivä elokuu*], in this perspective, would mark a *return* to the source-text” (Paloposki and Koskinen 2004: 28, citing Gambier 1994).

By the beginning of the 1960s, Finland had economically recovered from the war and wanted to establish itself as a peaceful Nordic democracy. Yet, Finnish society was undergoing some rapid structural changes. Even if the socio-cultural and historical context of translations was materially unlike that of the 1940s, it was not a calm period. Urbanization, unemployment, industrialization, and rootlessness characterized much of Finnish society and caused many social problems (see, e.g., Haataja 1988: 198–204; Jussila-Hentilä-Nevali 2000: 283–287). For instance, while approximately 32% of the Finnish population lived in cities in 1950, in 1965 the percentage was 43%. During one generation almost one third of the population changed from farming to industry. Industrialization represented 23% of the labor force in 1960, and 26% in 1970. In 1950 46% of the population earned their living in farming, in 1970 only 15%. Unemployed rural people moved from the northern parts of Finland southwards, and often to Sweden, where approximately 300,000 Finns were living at the end of the 1970s (Laitinen 1991: 436–437). In 1968 Finnish students joined radical European student movements e.g. by occupying *Vanha ylioppilastalo* (‘the Old Students’ House’) in Helsinki.

Also literature began to look at, and was engaging with, social and societal issues. A milestone was Arvo Salo’s musical drama *Lapualaisooppera* (‘Lapua Opera’), which was performed in 1966 for the first time. The music was composed by Kaj Chydenius. Artistic radicalism was turning into political radicalism. At the end of the 1960s non-fiction gained importance in Finland, the idea being that a direct contact with reality was needed, not a link through fiction. It was finally the oil crisis in 1973 that broke the dominance of radically political literature. (Laitinen 1991: 539–543.) In 1964 the Finnish author Hannu Salama was accused of blasphemy for his novel *Juhannustanssit* (‘Midsummer dance’). Compared to this novel, *Liekehtivä elokuu* in 1968 did not present a particular sensation. In addition to presumed blasphemy, Salama’s book was also accused of being excessively obscene and an undesirable description of uncivilized young people. However, the
novel as such is a thorough-going description of life and death, in which a fatal car accident turns everything upside down. (Laitinen 1991: 561.)

Salama was not the only one sued in Finland in the 1960s for literature. Also the publisher Gummerus was sued in 1962, accused of offending sexual morals and decency, the reason being the Finnish translation *Kravun kääntöpiiri* (1962) of Henry Miller’s *Tropic of Cancer* (1934). The translator was Pentti Saarikoski, who also translated James Joyce’s *Ulysses* (1922) into Finnish under the title *Odysseus* (1964; Koskinen 2007: 461). Saarikoski embodied Finnish poetry in the 1960s, e.g. through his anthology *Mitä tapahtuu todella?* (‘What is really happening?’) in 1962.

Maybe because of this societal and political interest in literature, the 1950s-1970s in Finland were also a period when there was a strong interest in African American authors like Richard Wright, James Baldwin, and Ralph Ellison. For instance, Wright’s *The Long Dream* (1958) was translated into Finnish as *Pitkä uni* in 1960 (translated by Seppo Virtanen), Baldwin’s *Go Tell It on the Mountain* (1953) as *Mene ja kerro se vuorilla* in 1963 (translated by Reijo Tuomi), and Ellison’s *Invisible Man* (1952) as *Näkymätön mies* in 1969 (translated by Jouko Linturi). One of the reasons for the retranslation of *Light in August* may then have been the interest in the American political situation with the success of the human rights movement in the society. (Nyman - Kovala 2007: 183.)

Matti Savolainen (1998: 74) observes that Faulkner has never had a wide audience in Finland. So far there has been only one dissertation published on Faulkner in Finland, Savolainen’s *The element of stasis in William Faulkner: An approach in phenomenological criticism* (1987).38 As far as I know, only one dissertation has dealt directly with the translation of Faulkner’s *Light in August*. Daniel C. Richardson’s dissertation *William Faulkner’s Dark Vision Transposed: Light in August and the Brazilian Translation Luz de Agôsto* (2004) focuses specifically on *Light in August* and its Brazilian translation. It presents an analysis of the first Brazilian translation of *Light in August*, published in 1948 as *Luz de Agôsto*. The dissertation examines the social and literary climate in Brazil into which the novel was transposed from its North American context. It may also be mentioned here that Sergio Perosa’s (ed.) anthology *Le traduzioni italiane di William Faulkner* (1998) contains one article by Mario Materassi entitled “Da *Light in August* a *Luce d’agosto*: i reati letterari di Elio Vittorini” (pp. 75–96).

Faulkner translations played an important role in the Finnish literary scene. They – among other translations at the end of the 1940s – strongly helped modernist literature to enter Finland, which

took place relatively late, because Finland during the first half of the 20th century did not have very close contacts with European literary centers, and during the time between the World Wars there were no longer modernist influences entering the country through Russian literature (Kantola-Riikonen 2007: 457). Some major Finnish novelists, e.g. Veijo Meri and Christer Kihlman, have mentioned Faulkner’s influence on their works (Savolainen 1998: 75–76).

1.5 The structure of the study

Chapters 1–5 present the aim and material of the study, the research hypotheses, the author and the novel, the cultural framework, some other relevant background information and the theoretical concepts used in the study. Chapter 6 presents a text analysis of cultural-religious elements in *Light in August* and its Finnish translations, using intertextuality as the methodological tool. Chapter 7 is the concluding chapter, presenting the results of the study and reflecting on wider implications of the connections between intertextuality and translation.

In this introductory chapter I have argued that a translator of Faulkner cannot do his or her work adequately without an adequate knowledge of the American South and its culture, which is the topic of the next chapter. That is why Chapter 2 will briefly discuss the salient features of the American South, its literature, and its religion. The chapter will deal with Southern literature and with some Southern writers and their attitudes to religion in the South. The chapter will depict the Evangelical Protestant (often described as Calvinistic) landscape in the American South, in order to better understand cultural-religious intertextuality in literature and translation. The Southern religion is thus described and analyzed with its particularities and special features with special reference to the roles of cultural elements in translation.

Chapter 3 will focus on Faulkner and *Light in August*. Faulkner was a thoroughly Southern writer, and heavily influenced by his cultural-religious environment. In the American South there have been religious groups and forces that in a very real sense produced Faulkner. The chapter will describe and establish influences and connections between Faulkner’s life, Southern culture, and *Light in August*. Especially noteworthy is the combination of religion and race, e.g. biblical intertexts and churches, in Southern culture, both of which are clearly visible in the novel.

Chapter 4 will deal in more detail with the issues of culture, cultural translation, religion, and religious language. It will become clear that the concepts of culture and translation are highly complex and intertwined. In particular, it will be established that culture in the present context

\[\text{On Faulkner and modernism, see, e.g., Moreland 1998.}\]
includes religion as one of its major elements. Consequently, a discussion of religious language as part of culture is offered.

Chapter 5 will discuss the notion of intertextuality in detail with special reference to translation. There is quite a lot of literature available on this concept, the use of which seems sometimes quite vague, or even confusing. The chapter will present various types of intertextuality and will attempt to find suitable categories of intertextuality to make it a useful methodological tool for translation studies and for an analysis of a literary text, in this case, of a novel. Intertextuality as such is a powerful and also necessary means when reading and translating any text. An interesting attempt to analyze texts through intertextuality in a somewhat different context is Kiril Taranovsky’s subtext analysis, which will be presented in the chapter and later referred to.

Chapter 6 focuses on text analysis, illustrating both specific (also known as limited) intertextuality and general (also known as cultural) intertextuality. In this chapter, 30 extracts or passages from the source and target language texts are presented and analyzed from the point of view of various intertextualities. Culture, religion, and ecclesiastical life are discussed with regard to source texts and translations.

As most of the specific cultural-religious intertexts in the novel are biblical allusions, the analysis starts with them. They constitute an example of specific intertextuality par excellence, even though they are often intertwined with culture in the American South. Biblical allusions can be found relatively easily in the novel. They are categorized in Chapter 6 as examples of specific or limited intertextuality, divided into three subcategories: religious key-phrase allusions with a clear cultural intertext (6.1.1) to show the interconnectivity between the Southern culture and the Bible, religious key-phrase allusions (6.1.2), and religious proper-name allusions (6.1.3), categories adopted from Leppihalme (1994). In total, they represent 18 text passages out of the 30 passages analyzed in Chapter 6 together, with the corresponding text passages from the two Finnish translations and the Swedish translation.

In the next section (6.2), the remaining 12 passages illustrate general intertextuality of cultural-religious elements. Four of them, the Book (6.2.1), church (6.2.2), revival meeting (6.2.3), and preachers, deacons, and priests (6.2.5), even if they are of general or cultural intertextual nature and could be thought of representing no particular translational difficulty, present translational challenges in another culture discussed in relation to the Finnish translations. Two of the passages, mourners’ bench (6.2.4) and Methodist circuit rider (6.2.6) are part of general intertextuality, too, and in that sense they share the same intertexts in English as in Finnish, and yet they present particular difficulties to translators working from English into Finnish.
An example of negroes and niggers (6.2.7) is included because of the translational challenges it presented to translators into Finnish in the 1940s and 1960s, even if the question of race and racial relations in the South are not the particular focus of the present study. However, the intertextual cultural importance of the blacks in the novel and in the American South is undeniable, and the issue of the race of Joe Christmas is one of the main themes in the novel. The reader does not know whether he is a black or not. The Christian religion of blacks is strongly present in the novel and in the American South. Negroes and niggers illustrates intertextual cultural-religious dimension of the novel in a very concrete way.

Section 6.2.8 deals with the most problematic protagonist in the novel, Joe Christmas, and his possible intertextual character linked with the figure of Christ. The issue here is whether that which may be intertextually understandable to a Southern reader could actually be understood by the Finnish translators and how this kind of cultural-religious intertextuality was (or was not) transferred into the Finnish language and culture. Section 6.3 recapitulates and discusses intertextualities of the passages.

The form of presentation of Chapter 6 leads to slightly idealized and abstract entities, and there are admittedly borderline cases and redundancies in the analysis performed on the passages. However, a certain margin of flexibility and overlapping is unavoidable in this kind of qualitative study. A careful and suitably redundant presentation of the examples is necessary for the reader so that s/he does not have to move unnecessarily back and forward in the chapter. As there are several approaches to one passage, a certain amount of repetition cannot be avoided. However, the aim is to gain in clarity and readability with this type of presentation of the research material.

Chapter 7 is the concluding chapter of the study, presenting the results of the whole study and opening some new avenues for further research. The Appendix contains bibliographical information about Faulkner’s novels and their translations in Finnish.

Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from other languages into English have been made by the author of the present study. Terms and meanings are given in italics or single quotation marks respectively. Square brackets are used to identify missing or complementary information within a quotation. Unless otherwise indicated, the information given in square brackets has been supplied by the author of the present study. The symbol Ø indicates a textual omission, i.e., that there is no visible corresponding linguistic element of the source text in a target text passage.

The biblical intertextual citations are from the Authorized King James Version, which was the translation Faulkner had access to when he was writing his novels. This Bible translation was in nearly universal use among all American Protestants until the 1960s. Another Bible translation worth mentioning is the American Standard Version (ASV) of 1901. It opened a market for newer
versions, but only after World War II (Noll 2001: 401; Daniell 2003: 735–737; 764–768). In Finland, the latest Bible translation dates from 1992. Before that, the translations that were available to the translators of both KV and LE were the Old Testament translation published in 1933, and the New Testament translation published in 1938. Before these, the translation that has had a great impact on the Finnish language and culture was the 1776 translation called the “Old Church Bible” (‘Vanha kirkkoraamattu’; Huhtala 2007: 51–53). It is still used by some Christian groups in Finland. The 1933 and 1938 translations will be used here as references for the biblical intertexts in the Finnish translations. The latest translation is referred to when appropriate.

---


41 E.g. by branches of Laestadianism and Beseecherism, Lutheran revivalist movements (www.uskonnot.fi; accessed January 31, 2016).
2

THE AMERICAN SOUTH, ITS WRITERS, AND ITS RELIGION

2.1 The American South and Southern writers

In order to understand and interpret *Light in August* and other associated Southern literature which is intertextually bound with culture, we need to have some basic information about the American South and its culture. This chapter will focus on Southern religion and literature, even though there is much more to the region’s culture: e.g. architecture, crafts, cuisine, music, dance, politics, storytelling (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: xxx).

Southern culture began with four major groups of human beings in the American South: Native Americans, first to settle the region; English settlers from the region of England south and west of London in the 1600s; settlers from southern Scotland, northern Ireland, and northern England in the late 1600s; West Africans and Central Africans, who were a forced migration. After the Civil War, millions of Southern blacks and whites left the region. In the 1960s a migration into the South began, from the U.S. Northeast and foreign countries, especially from the Caribbean, Central America, and South America (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: xvii–xxvii).

There is some dispute about the precise geographical borders of the American South. Even so, it can be situated in the southeastern corner of the U.S.A. If there is a need for mapping, it can be argued that the American South is a geographical area with the following boundaries: the Mason-Dixon line in the north and the Mississippi River in the west. Some scholars speak of “the Mississippi River culture” (Wilson & Ferris 1989: xv). In the east there is the Atlantic Ocean, and in the south the Gulf of Mexico. These boundaries mean that the geographical focus is on the eleven states of the former Confederacy (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia). They are also boundaries of experience and tradition.

Common experiences have given the American South some attitudes or senses that have marked it definitively different from other American regions. These are, typically, the sense of failure – the

---

42 The Mason–Dixon line was surveyed between 1763 and 1767 by English astronomers Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon in the resolution of a border dispute between British colonies in Colonial America. It was long associated with the dividing line between free states and slave states, and it is still a demarcation line among four states, forming parts of the borders of Pennsylavia, Maryland, Delaware, and West Virginia (originally part of Virginia) (see Makowski 2006).

43 Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, and Missouri were slave states at the time of the Civil War (Wilson & Ferris 1989: xv).
Southerners are the only regional group of Americans who have been defeated in an armed conflict, and the subsequent military occupation, economic poverty, reconstruction, and agricultural economy. Then there is the sense of guilt, which is the consequence of the enslavement before the Civil War and the later segregation of the black, i.e., the black’s second-class citizenship in the 20th century. This sense of guilt in the South, combined with a sense of evil, may be a product of the Evangelical Calvinistic religion, or of the poverty and suffering. It seems to be a characteristic of the Southern writer, too. Finally, there is the sense of frustration, which “comes from the consistent inadequacy of the means at hand to wrestle with the problems to be faced, whether they be poverty, racial intolerance, or the preservation of a historical past rich in tradition” (Holman 1972: 87). To these can be added inborn conservatism, the unique ethnic origins of the inhabitants, and even the weather (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: xiv).

To be a Southerner means having not the characteristic American attitude of “know how,” but having an attitude of “make do.” This kind of state of mind and imagination is haunted by the imperfection, the guilt, and the tragedy of human experience. Flannery O’Connor (1984b: 44) has said that from the standpoint of a writer, “it is safe to say that while the South is hardly Christ-centered, it is most certainly Christ-haunted.” To put it simply, the South is obsessed – and sentimentalized – with the past. The name of Bertram Wyatt-Brown’s study, Yankee Saints and Southern Sinners (1985), is not for nothing.

It has been argued, too, that the American South is found wherever Southern culture is found (Wilson & Ferris 1989: xv).44 The South is above all a state of mind. Even though Southern culture is a peculiar combination of regional cultural and religious characteristics, there is a specific Southern concern with history. This means “a desire to know how something came to be, a tendency to see the past as emblem if not as allegory, and a belief in the forces of history and tradition” (Holman 1972: xii). For instance, William Faulkner’s characters live passionately with the past that makes them enormous demands. Out of the Southern past Faulkner created materials for a cosmic fable, tracing the long history of his Yoknapatawpha County. The American South distrusts progress, it refuses to believe in perfectibility, it has experienced compromise and paradox. At the heart of Southern culture there is a union of opposites, a paradox. All these opposites culminated in the defeat in the Civil War and its long aftermath, and the Civil War itself became a myth and a symbol of the South, called the “Lost Cause.” From these opposites, Southern writing is like a metaphor of a cultural and spiritual experience.

---

44 Wilson & Ferris (1989: xv), the coeditors of Encyclopedia of Southern Culture, affirm that their definition of the American South is broad and inclusive, based on culture.
The Southern writer has shown how the human being is caught in a tragic dilemma. Part of this tragic dilemma is the experience of the South since 1860. This experience was that of military defeat, military occupation, and reconstruction, and it was deepened by the sense of defeat. The presence of blacks, the shame of their enslavement, the inequity of the freedman’s case, and the second-class citizenship of blacks become both the cause and the symbol of the guilt, and Southern writers like Faulkner repeatedly have used them for their purposes.

When speaking about the American South, there is a tendency to form a monolithic image of the South, even though it can be argued that within the concept there are several views about what it means. There is an internal diversity in the region; in fact, many subcultures can be found within the South. There are thus many “Souths” with many histories and many problems (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 47–120).

To start with, there is the aristocratic South of broad lawns, great trees, and tall and white columns. To put it simply, the upper class was a slaveholding planter class, in the middle was a class of small farmers (the overwhelming majority of rural white people), and at the bottom were black slaves. This is the old South of Stark Young (1881–1963) of Mississippi and of Margaret Mitchell (1900–1949) of Atlanta. This old South survived in the Civil War and in the abolition of slavery without losing its good manners and its sense of honor. Then there is a South of an apocalyptic or Gothic vision, the South of the abolition societies for which Harriet Beecher Stowe (1811–1896) created its most enduring metaphors in Uncle Tom’s Cabin (1852). It was also the South in Robert Penn Warren’s Band of Angels (1955).

There is also a South of industrialization and liberalism, viewed as a problem in the management of society, its natural resources and its people, represented e.g. by the journalist and orator Henry W. Grady (1850–1889; Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 22–23) and the ecologist Howard T. Odum (1924–2002; Holman 1972: 96, 187). Another South represents a special and deceitful state of mind.

---

45 Even though filled with many stereotypes, Margaret Mitchell’s novel Gone with the Wind (1936), translated into Finnish in 1937–1938 under the title of Tuulen viemää (Nyman - Kovala 2007: 172), has molded the Finns’ image of the American South during the times of the Civil War, quite probably more than any Faulkner’s novel. Especially popular has been its film version (1939), with Vivien Leigh and Clark Gable.

46 The author was a Calvinist Congregationalist minister’s daughter and faculty wife in Maine, and her whole book is based on the understanding that personal and national morality is built on the Bible (Noll 1992: 314–315). The book was a success: some 300,000 copies were sold during the first year of publication.
torn between dreams of a glorious past and a sense of guilt. This South is represented e.g. by Wilbur J. Cash (1900–1941) and his book, *The Mind of the South* (1941).47

Another South is also a region of ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed people, a degenerate, poor world. In this South economic deprivation and cultural illiteracy linked with despair ended up in utter hopelessness and violence. This is the world of Mark Twain (1835–1910), whose *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1885) is a biting satire and critique of the South (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 452).48 This is the world that Erskine Caldwell (1903–1987) explored in detail in his *Tobacco Road* (1932).49 This is also the world of William Faulkner’s Snopeses and Bundrens. Finally, there is also the South that means for many a lost paradise of order and stability, of honor, and a religious view of the human being. It is an ideal that has been celebrated “in some of the best poetry and fiction of the region as a repository of the finest traditions of the old South” (Holman 1972: 97).

The earliest Southern writers were essayists, historians, and in modern terms spoken, social geographers.50 Several works by former slaves, e.g. Frederick Douglass’s *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* (1845), attacked slavery and questioned the moral character of a society sustaining it. After the Civil War, the obsession with the past and the region meant that whereas middle-western writers went to east and from Greenwich Village and New Haven wrote of the failings of the Middle West, and eastern writers went to Paris and Rome and had influences on their writings there, Southern writers mostly stayed at home and sought to correct their heritage, not to destroy it. This correction included the Southerner as best in his or her relation to the soil, especially as it was in the pre-Civil War South. The fundamental difference between the North and the South was the difference between capitalistic industrialism and agricultural society: it has been argued that it was even more divisive than the slavery issue. The South was agricultural and a society based on stability, tradition, class structure, and the idea of an aristocracy. The North was progressive and industrial, with a society valuing change and revering science (Holman 1972: 90, 190).

47 After Wilbur J. Cash’s controversial representation, the first major reinterpretation of southern life has been Bertram Wyatt-Brown’s *Honor and Violence in the Old South* (1986), exploring southern ethical habits and traditions.
48 The novel has been translated twice into Finnish. The first one was in 1904 under the title *Huckleberry Finnin (Tom Sawyerin toverin) seikkailut* translated by Tyko Hagman, the second one in 1972 under the title *Huckleberry Finnin seikkailut* translated by Jarkko Laine (Heikkilä-Halttunen 2007: 474, 484).
49 Erskine Caldwell’s novel has been translated into Finnish by Niilo Teerimäki in 1947, and again in 1963 by Mikko Ukkonen under the title *Tupakkatie*.
50 The first literary work worth mentioning produced in the South was the translation of part of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* by George Sandys (1577–1644), who was at that time treasurer for the colony at Jamestown. The translation was published in London in 1621 (Inge 2008: 1).
In the post-Civil War situation, Southern writers used the myth of good order in the past to show the bad order of modern industrialism. Southern writers returned to a romantic and idealistic vision. For them, human beings are tragic figures, trapped in time, rather than mechanical victims, and their meaning can be found in a larger structure of events and history. They expressed their revolt against naturalism and realism looking backward to a tradition and an order in which meaning can be sought and found, the human being has dignity, and history is a record of a purpose (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 450–456, 462–468; Holman 1972: 95). There is an interest both in the problems of social situations and of individual development and identity. The South has remained a self-conscious region. This self-consciousness is a challenge to anyone trying to transfer Southern culture depicted in its fiction to another culture.

Among Southern writers, there are three names that emerge out of the fictional accomplishment in the 1930s, when the Southern Renaissance was at its height. They all tended to plan work of enormous scope. These are Thomas Wolfe (1900–1938), Robert Penn Warren (1905–1989), and William Faulkner (1897–1962), who will be dealt with more in detail in Chapter 3 below. For the purposes of the present study, a fourth author can be added, namely Flannery O’Connor (1925–1964). There are other important major Southern writers, e.g., notable African American writers such as Jean Toomer, Zora Neale Hurston, and Richard Wright. Female writers such as Carson McCullers, Lillian Smith, Eudora Welty, and Katherine Ann Porter can be mentioned, too. Probably the most well-known Southern writers nowadays are Alice Walker, Anne Rivers Siddons, Tom Wolfe, and Pat Conroy (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 454–468; see also Wilson and Inge 2008).

Thomas Wolfe was born in North Carolina (see, e.g., Idol 2008). He was a man of great sensitivity, who wanted to experience all emotions and to express the totality of life through his own person and through the impact of the world. Typically of a Southern writer, Wolfe’s “self” was trapped in the coils of time. He described a threefold controlling function of time in human life. The first one is the simple present, a “clock time” – the incessant flow of clock ticks, seconds, minutes, hours, events. The second function of time is the past time, which makes the present, but also determines this moment’s actions. Sometimes an unpremeditated action of an insignificant person in the distant past is more important to our actions now than the immediate reactions we may have out of them. The third controlling function of time for Wolfe was “time immutable, the time of rivers, mountains, oceans, and the earth; a kind of eternal and unchanging universe of time against which would be projected the transience of man’s life, the bitter briefness of his day” (Holman

51 “Southern writers are stuck with the South, and it’s a very good thing to be stuck with.” (Flannery O’Connor in Friedman and Lawson 1966: 239).

A typical representative of Southern writers, Robert Penn Warren looked for the discovery of a cosmic dream of history in his works (see, e.g., Payne 2008).\(^{53}\) His characteristic was his seriousness with religious and philosophical ideas. Warren tried to write the novel of ideas in which there are Southern characters, and the essentially Southern view of the human being is dramatized through melodramatic actions. For Warren, human problems are two: finding identity and expiating guilt. Finding identity a human being moves from innocence to guilt, which means that guilt is an inevitable part of identity. In Warren’s novels, fiction as a literary genre is set aside, and the use of knowing and metaphysical language expresses meaning. Warren’s works include *All the King’s Men* (1946),\(^{54}\) a political novel but a novel also about the narrator’s, Jack Burden’s, self-discovery, *World Enough and Time* (1950), *Band of Angels* (1955), a slave narrative about a white girl who proves to be a black and is sold into slavery, and *The Cave* (1959), a search for original innocence through escaping out of time into noontime. Warren’s characters find themselves in a world of intermingled good and evil, in which they seek the nature of themselves and try to understand identity.

A crucial difference between Flannery O’Connor and most of her fellow Southern writers is that she was a Catholic novelist in the Protestant South (Koon 2008: 379–381; Holman 1972: 104–107; cf. Rubin 1967). Even if she and Faulkner often deal with spiritually deformed characters, O’Connor speaks of writing in terms of religious convictions in a different way from that of Faulkner, and declares: “For I am no disbeliever in spiritual purpose and no vague believer. I see from the standpoint of Christian orthodoxy. This means that for me the meaning of life is centered

---

\(^{52}\) Thomas Wolfe’s works have not been translated into Finnish (Nyman - Kovala 2007: 184).

\(^{53}\) Robert Penn Warren was a member of the Nashville Fugitive group, a group of young poets and scholars, called also Southern Agrarians, at the Vanderbilt University. They attacked the industrial order in the United States and defended agrarianism (Payne 2008: 456; Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 8–10). In 1930 Warren contributed to the group’s manifesto entitled *I’ll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press 1983, pp. 246–264; Minter 2002: 255–259).

\(^{54}\) This novel has been translated into Finnish by Juhani Koskinen in 1976 under the title *Kaikki kuninkaan miehet*. The Finnish Association of Translators and Interpreters (*www.skil.fi*) gave him the Mikael Agricola Prize in 1977 for this translation (Kapari 2007: 58–59).
in our Redemption by Christ and what I see in the world I see in its relation to that” (O’Connor 1984a: 32; see also Mallard 2006). O’Connor’s works depict the American South as a microcosm of the human lot, and they are rich in religious symbolism. She deals with poor white people and black people in the South, and to both groups religion and sex were important, and basically only moments of climax in the midst of despair, dullness, and ignorance. O’Connor’s people are grotesque because of their hunger for God – they are restless souls that reject God and suffer from that – and she surrounds them with her religious-theological themes. For her, it is a tragedy that there is a failure of the seeking soul to find rest in God. Her truth was a Roman Catholic and universal truth. There is an unrealized potential in the life of her characters, but they are defeated by the environment and social forces and circumstances. O’Connor’s characters are victims of a religious environment that stifles the hunger for God. Her first novel is *Wise Blood* (1952) and the first collection of short stories is *A Good Man Is Hard To Find* (1955). Her second novel is entitled *The Violent Bear It Away* (1960). Another collection of short stories is *The Complete Stories* (1971).

Much of the Southern literature has been focused on the clash between the traditional values and customs in the South and more modern values and customs. Some authors (e.g. Wolfe) view the decline of the traditional culture with sadness; some others (e.g. Twain) see the transformation in a more positive light. The conflict of tradition and modernity will probably continue in the works of the best Southern writers, when they deal with such typical Southern themes as family, place, honor, despair, sin, and redemption (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 467–468), all of which are also important religious themes.

### 2.2 Religion in the South

In addition to the richness of Southern literary tradition, an understanding of the religious faith in the American South is crucial for any non-Southern reader and in particular for a non-Southern reader-translator. An Evangelical Protestant religion and the broader culture of the American South have been interconnected “as a jigsaw puzzle,” and it has been even called an official state religion (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 266). Indeed, scholars have recognized religion as a key factor in

---

55 Flannery O’Connor said in 1962: “Any fiction that comes out of the South is going to be called grotesque by northern readers – unless it is really grotesque. Then – it is going to be called photographic realism.” (Friedman and Lawson 1966: 243).

56 Some short stories of Flannery O’Connor from this collection have been translated into Finnish by Jussi Nousiainen and published by Otava in 1984 under the title *Palava kehä* (‘A Burning Circle’).
the culture of the American South. People in the South are some of the most religious people in the U.S.A., and their religion, professed and often practiced, is Christianity in its Protestant form, as in the South most of the church-going people are Protestant Christians. Hill (1990: 116) notes that “Christianity in the American South has stronger claim to a cultural establishment than it does anywhere in historic Christendom”, and in particular among the traditionally Protestant societies. This has not always been so, but since the 19th century, various, mostly Evangelical Protestant denominations have dominated the religious life in the American South.

2.2.1 Southern Evangelical Protestantism

In the 18th century, a mid-century religious quickenings, called the Great Awakening, represented more revivalistic piety than a distinct event, but they touched many aspects of colonial life and were important for the churches and society. The southern colonies were affected in the last phases of the Great Awakening, leading to a new growth of Baptists and preparing the way for Methodists (Noll 1992: 91; see pp. 92–113; Ahlstrom 2004: 314–329). The largest Baptist denomination in the U.S.A. is called Southern Baptists (see Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 280–281). However, the state of Christianity after the American Revolution was declining, as well as interest in religion more generally. A change took place from the mid-1790s onward. From about 1795 to about 1810 there was the Second Great Awakening, probably “the most influential revival of Christianity in the history of the United States” (Noll 1992: 166; Ahlstrom 2004: 415–454). Baptists and Methodists became the largest denominations in the whole United States. The Second Great Awakening led to a rapid growth of Presbyterian churches, too, in the South (Noll 1992: 167). A later development in the 20th century has brought Pentecostal and holiness groups to the South.

‘Evangelical’ originally is a term used to refer to the reforming movements in Central Europe in the 1510s and 1520s. Evangelicalism is a religious mood, belief, and movement with the Protestant tradition that originated in reaction against the theological naturalism of the 18th century in Great Britain and British America. Mathews (1977: 40; cf. Bebbington 1993) notes that “Evangelicals were people who for one reason or the other were dissatisfied with traditional modes of authority and behavior, modes which were affirmed by inherited religious institutions and identified with the elites of a relatively stratified society.” Evangelical Protestant religion is characterized by a special emphasis upon the supreme authority of the Bible and the atoning death of Jesus Christ. The Bible

57 Noll (1992: 169) affirms that the Second Great Awakening made a more permanent impact on society than the first Awakening, e.g. in the form of establishing voluntary societies, having long-lived institutional influence, in the 1810s-1830s. See Noll 1992: 170–190; Ahlstrom 2004: 422–428.
is the basis for all Christian life. Most Southern churches use only the Bible and no prayer books, creeds, or doctrines (cf. McGrath 1997: 65, and Passage 19 in Section 6.2.1 below). In the 19th century Evangelicalism became a determinant factor in Southern culture and still continues to play an important role in the South. For instance, in 1926, when Faulkner published his first novel, 43% of the Southerners were Baptists, and 28% Methodists (Fath 2004: 117).

What, then, makes Southern Evangelical Protestant religion so distinctive? Three features have been proposed (Hill 1989: 1269–1270). First, the forms of religion common in the region are relatively homogeneous. They can be called the “shared religion” of the South (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 226). Secondly, the American South is the only society in Christendom where Evangelical denominations are dominant. Their influence has been decisive making the South the religious region and giving it various patterns, practices, and perspectives not found elsewhere. Thirdly, four common convictions occupy a normative position in the religious culture of the South. These four convictions or beliefs are the following. First, the Bible is the sole reference point of Christian life, the authoritative guide to faith and morals (cf. Section 6.1 and 6.2.1 below). The Holy Scriptures is religious authority. Religion in the South is more firmly rooted in a tradition of personal Bible study than any other region in the U.S.A. “The earlier Protestant faith in teaching people to read, meshed with religious beliefs, had made the Bible the most imported book, and then the most printed, most distributed and most read text in North America.” (Daniell 2003: 703). Secondly, direct and dynamic access to God through Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit is open to all. Justification happens by faith in Christ alone, through conversion. Believers are urged to repent and to establish a personal relationship with God, through Jesus Christ. This feature can lead to an extreme individual type of Christianity. Thirdly, morality is defined in very individual and personal terms. A new way of life (sanctification) is characterized by a conscious struggle to subdue the self in service to the Divine. A strict moral code is traditionally followed, and for example drinking has been considered at least morally suspect if not sinful. Fourthly, worship life is informal, non-liturgical, with few, if any, rituals. The focus of a service is on a long sermon – anywhere from 20 minutes to three hours. Communion often takes place once a month, or once a quarter. Services often include an altar call, a time when sinners are invited to repent and be saved or to re-dedicate

---

58 If these properties are distinctive, they are characteristic of the region. Therefore, they need to be reflected somehow in the translation(s) too.

59 For the Bible in English, see Daniell 2003, and more specifically, the English Bible in America, pp. 389–426, 539–554, 580–603, 624–658, 701–733.

At the early 1800s religion played an important role in ordering the Southern life and establishing a sense of cultural identity. The success of revivalist Protestantism dramatically altered Southern culture. Noll (1992: 226) mentions, e.g., that to honor wives and daughters meant much more clearly to respect Christianity. “Acting responsibly in the world at large was now much more clearly associated with making a place for the church” (Noll 1992: 226). Calvinism became an influence in the South through the importance of the Scots-Irish on the southern frontier. These Scots-Irish settlers were paradoxically both hedonistic and Puritan (Cash 1991: 54). Even though the South has been religiously homogeneous, there has been Enlightenment-based individuality producing various kinds of religious beliefs and practices. The Baptist and Methodist movements in the second half of the 18th century had their roots in the New England Calvinism of the Great Awakening.

This amplified Calvinism stressed repentance, conversion, personal piety, and the importance of achieving one’s personal salvation. Individuals must be “born again.” It laid aside abstract theology and ethical responsibility in society. One had to struggle inwardly with an inherent sinfulness. “American Calvinism, then, conceives of man as bound to sin and threatened by damnation, but not doomed to it. The way to redemption, by an act of choice, remains open.” (Douglas and Daniel 1972: 39.) This kind of voluntarism stressed the central place of individual decision in all stages of the life of faith. It was up to those who were listening to the message to decide whether they would spend eternity in heaven or in hell. The influence of Calvin can be detected in a serious and very often gloomy view of human fate, in an emphasis on strict behaviour, and in the belief that sexuality is the chief sign of human fallen nature (Douglas and Daniel 1972: 39). “Calvinism became largely

---

60 However, Berends (2004: 104) argues that the identity-forming role of religion in the South did not begin before the Civil War. On Southern novelists and the Civil War, see, e.g, Sullivan 1954.

61 Calvinism is a theological perspective, based on Jean Calvin’s thinking and later developed in the confessions and catechisms of the Reformed churches. There is no uniform, generally accepted systematization of Calvinism, which has thus taken many forms, some even contradictory to the original thinking of Jean Calvin (1536–1559) himself. Most North American denominations have been influenced by Calvinistic elements, because they were present in the thinking of the Puritans and of the Founding Fathers. In the American South, the Baptists and the Presbyterians have embodied Calvinistic thinking most clearly.

62 The repressive religious policies of King Charles I in England (1625–1649) forced many Puritans to emigrate to North America. Puritanism is a version of Reformed (Calvinist) orthodoxy. In fact, Puritanism became a major force in North American Christianity during the 17th century. It is one of the most abused words in American religion. (Smith 2005: 643.) See also Coffey and Lim 2008.
detached from theology and came to be more a set of attitudes than belief” (Fletcher 1979: 202; cf. Hill 1967: 25).

2.2.2 Southern religion and slavery

One of the explanations of the importance of private morality and non-engagement with issues of public morality was the South’s commitment to slavery. It has left its scars in the South, described by Southern writers. Without knowing its religiously founded reasons, a reader – and from the point of view of this study, a reader-translator – can hardly measure the nature of these issues, leading to the Civil War.

It is estimated that perhaps 5% of over ten million black people, i.e. some 500,000, transported over the Atlantic Basin, went to territory that would later become the United States (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 127; see also pp. 121–180). Some Evangelical Protestants (Calvinists) used Reformed theology to justify a slave society, whereas others used it to justify change. By the 1820s, Methodists and Presbyterians were still questioning the morality of slavery, but as abolitionism gained momentum in the North, a willingness to attack on slavery gradually disappeared in the South (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 243). Evangelicals attacked less and less on slavery, and were less likely to suggest that slave-owners should free their slaves. Evangelicals never identified successfully slaveholding as morally wrong, or sin. On the contrary, they defended slaveholding as consistent with God’s plan and vilified its critics as ungodly. They affirmed that the church should deal only with issues of personal piety and salvation. “Also, the southern church undertook elaborate missionary efforts to teach the slave community to share its outlook” (Moore 1989: 1291; see Peterson 2005b).

White Evangelicals accepted the notion that people of African descent were inferior for genetic or cultural reasons. Slavery thus simply recognized this fact and provided a tool to white people to guide, teach, and control black people. Slaveholding became not only permissible, but a positive Christian responsibility (Mathews 1977: 174). Leaning on the centrality of the Bible, Evangelical churches in the South defended slavery by reciting standard biblical texts on patriarchal and Mosaic acceptance of servitude as well as Paul’s counsels of obedience to masters. Starting from some Old Testament and New Testament texts, they claimed that slavery became a Christian institution at the moment when the masters were Christians. If the owners were good Christians, slavery would no longer be a problem, because the slave and the master belong, both of them, to the people of God,

---

63 On the Atlantic slave trade, see, e.g., Klein 1999. On antebellum slavery, see, e.g., Lockley 2006, and on colonial slavery, see, e.g., Gallay 2006.
respecting each other. This argumentation caused a real fusion between Christianity and hierarchy. The basic idea was that all social institutions described in the Bible (and belonging to their time and conditions) were good in themselves and thus to be perpetuated, with the exception of polygamy (Fath 2004: 54). Antislavery caused divisions among Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists (see, e.g., Noll 1992: 316).64

In the first half of the 19th century, the issues of slavery and the forthcoming Civil War caused the polarization of North and South: each side saw its position as holy and justified by religion. Reformed theology became a particularly important aspect of the Southern culture during and after the Civil War (1861–1865). Reformed theology was one of the factors that led the South to expect victory of the Confederacy. There was the belief in God’s sovereignty and his determination of the elect. This firm belief led Southern white people to regard themselves as God’s chosen people, engaged in a holy war (Leith 2006: 48).65 Protestant churches in the South defended slavery and blessed soldiers going off to war (Wilson 2007: 5).

For most Christians, the Civil War was above anything else a religious event. “In a word, the Civil War was a religious event because it consumed the energies of a religious people. Not surprisingly, however, the character of Civil War religion was dictated by the character of the dominant Protestant faiths in the nation.” (Noll 1992: 320.) Ministers on both sides declared that their cause was holy and just. Both believed firmly that God was on their side, so patriotic sermons were heard at Sunday morning worship services in the South and in the North. Some compared the war to a “baptism of blood.” Both sides interpreted the Bible to support slavery or to be against it (see Daniell 2003: 708–713). Over 600,000 soldiers died in the war. It cannot be denied that theologically the Civil War was a deep theological – and biblical – crisis. It was not only a crisis for theology, but also a crisis of theology (see Noll 2006).66 The Southerners after the war were frustrated, trying to understand the defeat in a holy war. They could not see the explanation except

---

64 The main branches of northern and southern Methodists (the latter formed the Methodist Episcopal Church, South) did not reunite until 1939, and it was not until 1983 that the divisions of the 19th century were overcome among the Presbyterians. – It was clear that as long as Christian denominations in the South avoided confronting the institution of slavery, they could not address other ethical issues in society, either.

65 Berends (2004: 106) affirms that there was a change of Protestant message over the course of the Civil War: “Presbyterians and Baptists who had formerly emphasized God’s sovereignty in conversion began to stress the individual’s role in choosing salvation. Their message was twofold: Confederate soldiers could choose salvation, and death in the ranks offered redemption to both the soldier and the country. The Civil War was a holy war.”

in the mysterious will of God. Their popularized Reformed (Calvinist) theology brought them to the idea that they had sinned, and God was punishing them for their sins, preparing his people for a greater future. God had not failed them, but it was they who had been unworthy.  

Maybe for these reasons, the most profound religious view on the war came, not from a theologian or a clergyman, but from a layperson, a lawyer turned politician, Abraham Lincoln, sixteenth president of the United States. For him, the doctrine of providence was central: God’s will is done through nature and history of the nation. His Second Inaugural Address (March 1865) speaks of God who is above the South or the North. “Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other. …The Almighty has His own purposes.” (White 2006: 18).

After the Civil War, white Evangelical churches supported segregation and defended it into the 20th century (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 244). And yet, after the Civil War, African Americans in the South formed thousands of new churches, either Baptists or Methodists. At the beginning of the 20th century, Evangelicalism was as dominant in the black community as in the white community. Evangelical Protestant Christianity is still today highly important and influential in the American South, even though more pluralistic values and lifestyles prevail today, especially in larger towns, cities, and suburbs. The South with white and black Protestants (more than 50%) and Catholics (some 18%) has become more of a melting pot of religions. However, the percentage of “highly committed” Evangelical Protestants in the South has been growing, and whereas the number of all white Protestants is declining in the South, they want their “shared religion” to go national (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 286–288). It must be noted that non-Christian religions, too (e.g. Judaism, Islam, and Buddhism) are today present in the American South.

2.3 The influence of religion on Southern literature

As seen above, religion in the South is an inherent part of Southern culture. Southern literature reflects the interaction between culture, religion, and the Southern way of thinking. On the most
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67 The Civil War is a major theme in Faulkner’s Absalom, Absalom! E.g. there is a passage in which Rosa Coldfield tells young Quentin Compson her version of Sutpen’s history: “It’s because she wants it told he thought so that people… will read it and know at last why God let us lose the War: that only through the blood of our men and the tears of our women….” (Faulkner 1990: 8).


69 For religion in America generally, see especially Ahlstrom 2004, and Noll 1992. For religion in the South, see e.g. Mathews 1977, Boles 1994, and Hill 2006.
basic level, both religion and literature seek to establish an order on apparently arbitrary human action and random occurrences. On the one hand, religion connects ordinary events with an extraordinary, i.e. divine, power, and provides a meaningful pattern for life. On the other hand, literature plays its role in maintaining the order and identity. Literature constructs a fictive world, letting the reader enter it and asserts then its own force helping the reader to perceive the daily life differently.\textsuperscript{70}

A distinctively Southern literature was born at the early 1800s. Religion has influenced the imagination of Southern writers in profound ways.\textsuperscript{71} It has given them the aesthetic and thematic framework within which they interpret human experience. The influence of religion on Southern writers is often unacknowledged, even unconscious. When asked by a University of Virginia student about biblical images in his works, William Faulkner replied, joining his religious background tightly with his Southern culture and breathing in the dramatic, emotional atmosphere of Southern Christianity:

\begin{quote}
Remember, the writer must write out of his background. He must write out of what he knows and the Christian legend is part of any Christian’s background, especially the background of a country boy, a Southern country boy. My life was passed, my childhood, in a very small Mississippi town, and that was part of my background. I grew up with that. I assimilated that, took that in without even knowing it. It’s just there. It has nothing to do with how much of it I might believe or disbelieve – it’s just there. (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 86; quoted also in Moore 1989: 1291; cf. O’Connor 1954).
\end{quote}

Southern writers, such as Faulkner, typically deal with issues that preoccupy Southern culture (Jones & Magee & Detweiler 2005: 461). These issues often arise from religion. However, it would be mistaken to say that only religion has defined the South or, that Southern literature has only regional character and has no wider audience or cultural significance. Southern religion and literature share certain structural components and thematic elements. These elements allow them to have a better view of one another and to reveal new insights into Southern culture.

The literature of the South played an important role not only in the ordering of Southern life and the establishing of a sense of Southern identity, but also in the maintaining of that order and identity. Evangelical Christianity, especially its Baptist and Methodist movements, stressed personal piety and the importance of achieving one’s salvation. It did not care about abstract theology or issues of ethical responsibility in society. One must struggle inwardly with an inherent


\textsuperscript{71} I loosely follow here Moore 1989.
sinfulness. Consequently, engagement with public issues became less frequent. Southern writers such as William Faulkner, Flannery O’Connor, and Erskine Caldwell blamed the Southern church’s preoccupation with personal behavior and especially its historical blindness to slavery. They created “communities of self-righteous churchgoers and hypocritical preachers practicing a narrow, spiritless religion insensitive to the moral issues with which these writers were concerned” (Moore 1989: 1291).

Many of the Southern writers accept the views of the Southern religion, even though they criticize a formal practice of religion and a self-satisfied attitude of many religious establishments in the South. They follow the widespread belief in the devil, in the reality of evil. For example, Flannery O’Connor addresses a modern world where evil is dismissed either as sociological or psychological aberration. O’Connor (1984a: 35) has cited St. Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 387): “The dragon sits by the side of the road, watching those who pass. Beware lest he devour you. We go to the Father of Souls, but it is necessary to pass by the dragon.” In the Protestant South, this Roman Catholic writer perceives the religious experiences of the majority of Southerners.

Other Southern writers, too, insist upon the reality of evil as active, powerful, inescapable, irreducible force that threatens the individual from within and without. They criticize the view that a human being is essentially good. In consequence, humans are flawed, limited, and faulty. Individuals are proud, greedy, and bestial. They resist and succumb to their own imperfect nature. “It is a mistake, however, to label such a vision of human behavior as pessimistic or deterministic. Within the context of the accepted religious beliefs of their culture, southern writers turn their attention to how one conducts life given these imperfections.” (Moore 1989: 1292.)

It may be the emotional style of Evangelical Christianity and its dramatic atmosphere that is the clearest point of contact with religion and literature in the South. Especially the preacher (cf. Section 6.2.5.1 below) has acted as a model for imaginative and creative uses of language (see Rosenberg 2007; Nunnally and Reid 2007). Joining the oral tradition of story-telling,72 s/he has offered Southern writers literary tools and visions. The result has been the description of hypocritical preachers, self-righteous congregations, rigid Calvinists, and spiritually twisted fanatics. Southern writers have described camp meetings and revivals.

72 “Southern religion and Southern literature both rely heavily on the oral tradition of storytelling, and this mutual dependence informs their content, provides their primary structure, and creates the ground for their interaction. … These biblical stories were translated into a rural idiom and then transmitted by word of mouth from preacher to preacher and then to congregations” (Jones & Magee & Detweiler 2005: 462, 463). On story-telling in the South, see, e.g., Bronner 2007.
Southern writers have clearly indicated the human limits and drawn a vision of the world in which good and evil fight against each other. Contemporary writers, such as Clyde Edgerton, Lee Smith, Dennis Covington, James Wilcox, and Randall Kenan continue to deal with themes deeply rooted in the religion in the South (see, e.g., Ketchin 1994). It is most probable that as long as religion remains a central part of Southern culture, religious beliefs will influence the Southern writers’ vision and work.

2.4 Summarizing remarks

In this chapter I have briefly dealt with what is usually subsumed under the American South and its culture, with special reference to Southern writers and to religion. Southern culture is a peculiar combination of regional and cultural-religious characteristics. The American South is a geographical region that has certain common features that can be recognized. The most important of these features are the presence of blacks and the shame of their enslavement and disenfranchisement and second-class citizenship. Related to that, there is the common historical experience of military defeat, military occupation, and reconstruction. The importance of Evangelical Protestantism and agricultural economy are essential. People in the South are some of the most religious people in the U.S.A., and most of the church-going people in the South are Baptists (especially), Methodists, and Pentecostals.

Until the 20th century, the South was mostly rural with few cities (see Chapter 1, “The Agrarian South”, in Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012). The appearance of race-based slavery in the South produced a kind of class system where blacks were at the bottom and in which there were substantial differences between upper and lower class whites, with their own subcultures. Southern culture is thus a product of blacks and whites in distinctive combinations. The attachment to history, and especially to the role of the Civil War, is important to Southerners. The Civil War became a myth and the symbol of the South. It was the “Lost Cause”, with all its meanings.

The American South has been a cultural location which religion and literature share. It has been a location in which an emotional, dramatic, fundamentalist, and non-theological religion has formed expressions for itself. Southern writers have been influenced by their culture and the pervasive Evangelical Protestant religion in the South. They insist upon the reality of evil, and criticize the view that a human being is essentially good. One of the most important Southern writers who vividly depicted these issues of religion and race in the 20th century was William Faulkner.
3 FAULKNER AND LIGHT IN AUGUST IN SOUTHERN CULTURE

3.1 Faulkner and cultural intertexts

In this chapter, I will deal with the Southern author, William Faulkner, and then consider *Light in August* as a cultural and intertextual literary work in the light of this background information on Faulkner. In this way the reader will be able to understand better the cultural-religious nature of the novel, and can better appreciate its intertextual character, firmly set in the context of the Southern culture. This is the kind of background information that any translator of *Light in August* would need in order to be able to read, interpret, and translate the novel adequately.

William Faulkner is claimed to be “the greatest American writer of the 20th century” (Inge 2008: 8) and “the giant of Southern literature” (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 456; cf. Minter 2002: 266–281). For Faulkner, Southern history was the overall frame for his literary work. Faulkner described history as he saw it happening in the life of his imaginary Yoknapatawpha County in Mississippi. This county has a complex history, unfolded in his production, and with the stories of its citizens it is “one of the great imaginative creations of the American mind.” The Yoknapatawpha County legend can be even called a Southern *Paradise Lost*. (Holman 1972: 92, 193.)

The cultural and intertextual character of Faulkner’s works becomes more understandable as soon as some important aspects of his life are recognized. William Cuthbert Falkner was born in New Albany, in northern Mississippi, on September 25, 1897. Ten years later, in 1907, a religious census revealed that in Oxford, Mississippi, “there were only 180 unconverted persons in the community, 2/3 of this number being under the age of 12 years” (Blotner 1974: 89; 1991: 16).

There is no information on whether Faulkner was a convert or not, but what is known is that a 1906 religious census of the white South revealed that 90 % of the population were either Baptist or Methodist (Hill 2007: 110). One of Oxford’s most faithful church attendants of Methodist Sunday services was Faulkner’s mother Maud who took her son with her. She was raised a Baptist, but she had her children baptized in her husband’s, Murry Falkner’s, Methodist church. Her husband’s family had been Methodists since the mid-19th century, and even beyond. The children attended Methodist Sunday School, and Faulkner’s grandmother would sometimes take him to a Baptist

---

73 In that sense I come close to Genette (1997: 407) who asserts that the most essential character of the paratext’s properties is to “ensure for the text a destiny consistent with the author’s purpose.”

74 By far the most extensive updated biography of Faulkner is Joseph Blotner’s *Faulkner: A Biography* (1991). This is a one-volume condensation of Blotner’s two-volume edition of 1974. It was only in 1918 when William Falkner began to spell his name with an “u”, i.e., Faulkner (Blotner 1991: 61).
There were annual summer camp meetings, too, where Maud Falkner went regularly and took her son with her. “As many as half a dozen ministers, from Water Valley, Holly Springs, and even as far away as Memphis, would be there. Cottages and tents were erected around the tabernacle.” (Blotner 1974: 88.) Faulkner must have attended revival meetings, as Southern piety and spirituality permeated his hometown and meant for Faulkner also regular church attendance. He was also expected to study the Scriptures, and his great-grandfather, Dr John Young Murry, expected everyone who sat down to have breakfast with him to recite a Bible verse before the meal. In 1956 Faulkner answered a question about his religious background as follows:

My Great-Grandfather Murry was a kind and gentle man, to us children anyway. That is, although he was a Scot, he was (to us) neither especially pious nor stern either: he was simply a man of inflexible principles. One of them was, everybody, children on up through all adults present, had to have a verse from the Bible ready and glib at tongue-tip when we gathered at the table for breakfast each morning; if you didn’t have your scripture verse ready, you didn’t have any breakfast; you would be excused long enough to leave the room and swot one up… It had to be an authentic, correct verse.75 (Meriwether and Millgate 1968: 250.)

Around the age of 12, Faulkner’s regular church attendance began to decrease, as he preferred spending time at his father’s livery stable and involving himself in other typical Southern pastimes, e.g. hunting. Later, married to Estelle Oldham, Faulkner attended services with her mainly on religious holidays at St. Peter’s Episcopal Church in Oxford, Mississippi. Faulkner preached a funeral sermon for his servant lady, and he was known to pray regularly at his table. However, despite his religious education and Bible readings, Faulkner most probably did not have any narrowly conceived Protestant Christian convictions, especially of the dominant Southern kind. He was buried a member of St. Peter’s Episcopal Church in 1962.

Though he seems to have been a rather passive church attendant (Blotner 1991: 483), his interest in the Bible was keen throughout his life. He said in 1962: “Every year I read Don Quixote, the Bible, an hour of Dickens, The Brothers Karamazov, Chekhov – ” (Meriwether and Millgate 1968: 284).76 He even bought a 14-volume Cambridge edition of the Bible, including the Apocrypha,

75 This habit in Faulkner’s life has an obvious link to Light in August in the relationship between Simon McEachern and Joe Christmas. See LIA, 137–143.

76 This statement may be compared with something he said in 1955: “I read Don Quixote usually once every year. I read Moby Dick every four or five years. I read Madame Bovary, The Brothers Karamazov. I read the Old Testament, oh, once every ten or fifteen years. I have a complete Shakespeare in one volume that I carry with me and I read a little of that almost any time. I read in and out of Dickens some every year, and in and out of Conrad, the same way, some every year.” (Meriwether and Millgate 1968: 110–111.) When Faulkner visited the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1962, he said: “I like Sarah Gamp – she’s one of my favorite people – and Don Quixote. I read in and out of the Old
which are not normally printed in Protestant editions of the Bible. This seems to account for the fact that in Faulkner’s fiction biblical categories play a major role (Waggoner 1959: 249).

Faulkner used intertextual biblical heritage and the Christian legend for fiction and created his mythical county of Yoknapatawpha not so much as an expression of Christian doctrine but of the Christian narrative. One of the values in the Christian narrative is its ability to teach humanity its potential. He repeatedly maintained that people, his characters, come first, symbolism second (Harrington 1991: 161). Faulkner said in 1956 that Christianity “cannot teach man to be good as the text book teaches him mathematics. It shows him how to discover himself, evolve for himself a moral code and standard within his capacities and aspirations, by giving him a matchless example of suffering and sacrifice and the promise of hope.” (Meriwether and Millgate 1968: 247.)

As Southern culture is “Christ-haunted,” it is no surprise that Faulkner used the Christ narrative as an account of guilt, vicarious suffering, and attempt at expiation. There are traces of the Christ narrative e.g. in The Sound and the Fury (the use of the Passion Week; see Miner 1952), in which Quentin Thompson assumes and pays for the vicariously shared guilt, and in Light in August. Joe Christmas firmly believes that he has black blood, which for him means a guilt that he must expiate. Indeed, there are some parallels between Joe’s actions and those of the Passion Week in the life of Christ. And in A Fable, probably the most religious novel of Faulkner, he uses the Christ narrative as a frame to describe an attempt to establish peace on earth. Faulkner’s thinking can be said to have been dialectical: on the one hand, he accepted the Christian view of the universe as a place Testament every year. Shakespeare – I have a portable Shakespeare I’m never too far from.” (Fant and Ashley 2002: 61.)


78 Faulkner said in 1957 that the name ‘Yoknapatawpha’ is a Chickasaw Indian word. It means water which runs slow through flat land (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 74).

79 In an interview in 1956 Faulkner remarked that “no one is without Christianity, if we agree on what we mean by the word” (Cowley 1958: 132; Meriwether and Millgate 1968: 246). Faulkner also said in 1953: “So He used that split part of the dark proud one’s character to remind us of our heritage of free will and decision; He used the poets and philosophers to remind us, out of our own recorded anguish, of our capacity for courage and endurance. But it is we ourselves who must employ them.” (Meriwether 2004: 138.)

80 Faulkner said in an interview in 1956: “In A Fable the Christian allegory was the right allegory to use… Whatever its symbol – cross or crescent or whatever – that symbol is man’s reminder of his duty inside the human race. Its various allegories are the charts against which he measures himself and learns to know what he is… It shows him how to discover himself, evolve for himself a moral code and standard within his capacities and aspirations. … Writers have always drawn, and always will, of the allegories of moral consciousness, for the reason that the allegories are matchless.” (The Paris Review 12, Spring 1956, p. 42.)
where evil has real effects and the human being is fallen; on the other, he does not confess a belief in the Christian doctrine of redemption through supernatural agency (Hunt 1965: 229). Be that as it may, Christian intertexts deepened and enriched his stories.

Faulkner was influenced by the South’s predominant forms of Evangelical Protestant (Calvinistic) Christianity, especially Baptism and Methodism, and the predominant Christian culture (see Berland 1962). It should be noted here that Calvinism was not the only form of Southern religion that Faulkner explored. His fictional depiction of Southern culture and religion was, to a great extent, informed and shaped by the experiences and knowledge he derived from his regionalism and Southern history and culture. Even if Faulkner drew from a tradition of literary portrayal of the religious culture in the South, he described no memorable scenes of baptism, or of itinerant preachers, or of faith healing, speaking in tongues, or snake handling (Wilson 2007: 61).

Although Faulkner’s novels portray his region, the American South, they do more than that: they portray the human condition in the modern world. It is worthwhile mentioning that some of Faulkner’s noblest characters are blacks, like Dilsey and Lucas Beauchamp. Dilsey is a deeply religious black woman, and her Christianity involves discipline and self-sacrifice (Brooks 1991: 37; cf. Caron 2000). Dilsey’s attendance at Easter Sunday morning service is perhaps the most famous scene of Southern religious culture in Faulkner’s works.

Time is another important element for Faulkner. In his novels, the past is so strongly present for his characters that it seems that what really matters for them is the past. For example in Absalom, Absalom! (1936), Quentin Thompson tries to find an answer to the riddle of the South. He looks also for his self in the past events of Thomas Sutpen’s life. As the structure of the novel intertwines past and present in a complex way, Faulkner chose to supply a timetable in the appendix. Very much in the same way in The Sound and the Fury (1929) and As I Lay Dying (1930) there is a search of inner selves through interior monologues. As his characters must be seen against the larger context of the past in Faulkner’s imaginative Yoknapatawpha County, there were difficulties to understand his work. Normally the larger context has to be seen before the role of the parts can be understood, but Faulkner gave the parts first. Faulkner’s historical context is something as follows (Holman 1972: 92):

81 Hunt (1965: 22; cf. Kohler 1955) makes two important remarks concerning Faulkner’s religious convictions: “In the first place, we cannot accept the tacit assumption that Faulkner’s vision is the same as that of his lost characters. … In the second place, the kind of religious meaning Faulkner’s vision entails is as much Stoic as it is Christian.”

82 See the description in The Sound and the Fury, in which even the procession to the church is important (Faulkner 2006: 1100–1106). – Lucas Beauchamp is an important figure with mixed racial heritage in Go Down, Moses, Intruder in the Dust, and The Reivers.
The South once knew an order and a tradition based on honor and personal integrity, but it was guilty of the exploitation of fellow human beings, the Indians and the Negroes. Because of this great guilt, the Civil War came like a flaming sword and ended the paradise of the noble but guilty past. After the war noble men for ignoble reasons submitted themselves to the moral duplicity and the mechanical efficiency of the mindless new world, and the region fell into the darkness of moral decay.

The Southern context of abolition and the haunting tragedy of the Civil War was the context for most of Faulkner’s works and attitudes. In 1956 when Faulkner was interviewed by Russell Howe (Meriwether and Millgate 1968: 257–266), he displayed ambivalence over the situation of Southern blacks and sounded somewhat like a racial Conservative.83 He was of the opinion that the South was wrong on the civil right question as it was on the question of slavery a hundred years earlier. Faulkner seemed to have compassion for blacks, when he said that he was on the “Negroes’” side. A dangerous situation would be an eventual alliance of conservative whites, such as Faulkner himself, with more extreme, more radical, and more violent whites.

O’Connor (1954: 158) argues that the Calvinistic Puritan spirit is one of the most significant factors in black-white relationships in the American South and that this theme has been more explicitly worked out and elaborated in Light in August: “If one does not perceive that the Calvinist spirit is the central issue of Light in August, the novel of necessity will seem confused in theme.” The French scholar André Bleikasten (1990: 329) agrees with O’Connor, when he notes that the only mythology in the novel is the Christian mythology. He says that there are too many interrelated biblical allusions, notably references to the life and death of Christ. They simply cannot be dismissed as literary decoration. Bleikasten’s remark refers directly to cultural-religious intertexts, which are analyzed and whose translations are discussed in Chapter 6 below.

Faulkner used the material he could find in the American South to create a symbolic picture of the South as an historical myth and a cosmic tragedy. His novels have plots that are melodramatic and come close to that of a detective story. There are also scenes – like in Greek tragedy – in which the character perceives the truth previously hidden from him or her (Holman 1972: 199). These features can be seen also in Light in August.

83 In his study A Rage for Order (1986), the historian Joel Williamson describes the Southern white positions as Conservative, Liberal, and Radical. Liberals are those who believe in the unlimited upward potential of blacks, Radicals are those who believe in a limitless degeneracy outside of slavery, and Conservatives are those who distinguish themselves by their comparatively moderate position on race issues. – On Faulkner and blacks, see, e.g., Howe 1991: 116–137.
3.2  *Light in August* as a Southern intertext

3.2.1  The origin and critiques of the novel

On August 17, 1931, William Faulkner sat down at his desk and took up a sheet. In the middle of it he wrote “Dark House” and underscored it with three pen strokes. Down to the left he wrote the place and time. *Light in August*, the seventh and the longest novel, apart from *A Fable* and *The Mansion*, of William Faulkner, had begun. One day in August he and his wife Estelle sat on the east gallery of their house, when she asked him: “Bill, does it ever seem to you that the light in August is different from any other time of the year?” Faulkner got up, said “That’s it”, and walked into the house. After a while he returned and sat down, with no word of explanation. He had drawn four pen strokes through the title “Dark House”, and above he had written “Light in August” (Blotner 1974: 702). A cultural-regional feature – luminosity in the American South in August – gave the novel its title. This information is crucial for the translation of the title.

However, the meaning of the title has been debated. It was Malcolm Cowley who in *The Portable Faulkner* (Cowley 2003: 525–526) gave the following interpretation to the title: “Incidentally the title of the novel refers primarily to Lena Grove and her baby. In the Mississippi backwoods it is sometimes said of a pregnant woman, but more often of a mare or a cow, that she will be *light* in August or September.” Faulkner himself rejected Cowley’s interpretation as false: “I had never heard that business of after the cow drops the calf she’s light in August” (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 265; cf. Coindreau 1971: 88). For Faulkner, it was the question of the light in August in his own region.

It has been claimed that *Light in August* is one of Faulkner’s most popular works but that it remains essentially obscure (Lind 1957: 308). It is also one of his most heavily reworked manuscripts. During composition Faulkner shifted various blocks of material, in particular to the beginning. For instance, at various times the novel seems to have begun with Hightower’s biography, with him sitting in his study (now in Chapter 3) and with Christmas’s capture (now in Chapter 15; Ficken 1972; Fadiman 1975: 31–32; Kreiswirth 1987: 59). It is known that the first version started with the arrival of the young minister Hightower to Jefferson. It is known that

---

84 Millgate (1978: 124) pays attention to the similarities of the novel with Dickens’s *Bleak House* (1852–1853). This title reappears at the title for an early draft of *Absalom, Absalom!* (1936), but there the link consists of the part played by a decayed mansion (Millgate 1987b: 7). Faulkner wrote in his letter to Harrison Smith in 1934: “The one I am writing now will be called Dark House or something of that nature.” (Blotner 1977: 78.)

85 I loosely follow here Bleikasten 1995.
Faulkner originally wanted to introduce the reader to Jefferson through Hightower and his wife; in the final version Faulkner used Lena Grove for that purpose (Gresset 1989: 200). It is also known that Faulkner was apparently very much influenced by the lynching of a black person, Nelse Patton, in Oxford, Mississippi, on September 8, 1908. He had killed a white woman, Mrs. Mattie McMillan, by cutting her throat with a razor and almost completely severing her head. Faulkner was eleven years old at the time. It seems that the central role of Joe Christmas emerged gradually from earlier drafts.

Faulkner rewrote the first chapters and cut out some parts of a previous version, pasting them onto the pages of the manuscript to become the final version (Pitavy 1973: 48). He wrote a year and a half later that he began *Light in August* “knowing no more about it than a young woman, pregnant, walking along a strange country road” (Blotner 1974: 703). He had hoped to feel the same rapture he remembered when writing *The Sound and the Fury*. This rapture did not return, but its place was filled with artistic self-consciousness and self-discipline. Faulkner wrote that he was “deliberately choosing among possibilities and probabilities of behavior and weighing and measuring each choice by the scale of the Jameses and Conrads and Balzacs” (Blotner 1974: 703). His notes on the manuscript indicate that he had started on August 17, 1931, and finished on February 19, 1932. Faulkner was in New York during much of November and December 1931, working on the novel there. After extensive revisions, Faulkner sent off the 165,000-word, 507-

---

86 This event becomes an intertextual feature in Faulkner. Chapter 16 of *Sanctuary* begins with an account of a very similar murder. See Cullen and Watkins 1976: 89–98. “In some ways, the entire book of *Light in August* is centered around the lynching of Joe Christmas, and it seems to me [Cullen] that Faulkner used the stories he had heard about the Nelse Patton case. There are a number of parallels between the stories of Nelse and Joe. Joanna Burden and Mrs. McMillan both lived outside of town, and each of them had her throat cut from ear to ear by a Negro man using a razor. Nelse and Joe both attempted to escape in a similar way over similar terrain. Both of the Negro men were lynched: Nelse was shot in the jail, and Joe was shot in the kitchen of the Reverend Hightower. Senator Sullivan, who incited the mob to riot in Oxford, reminds me a little of Percy Grimm, who led the lynchers in *Light in August*. Both bodies were mutilated, though in slightly different ways. These likenesses seem more important because Faulkner knew more about Nelse Patton’s lynching than about any other single episode of that kind.” (Cullen and Watkins 1976: 92.)

87 E.g. Fadiman (1975: 24) is of the opinion that “Faulkner may have written an early version of the story in which Joe Christmas was merely a name or was seen only externally through the eyes of the other characters.”

88 When in 1957 asked about changes in style in *Light in August*, e.g., using the present tense to tell the story rather than the past, Faulkner said that “that just seemed to me the best way to tell the story. It wasn’t a deliberate change of style. I don’t know anything about style.” (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 77.) However, the manuscript shows that the changes of the tense of the verbs were deliberately carried out. See also, e.g., Millgate 1978: 125 and Meriwether 1961: 66–67.

89 It must be remembered that the claims of Faulkner are not always reliable on such matters.
page manuscript to his publishers, Harrison Smith and Robert Haas. The typescript shows that Faulkner continued to the end to make minor revisions and adjustments to his text.\(^90\)

Faulkner is similar to John Dos Passos\(^91\) (the trilogy *U.S.A.*, 1930–1936) and John Steinbeck (*The Grapes of Wrath*, 1939; translated into Finnish in 1944 by Alex Matson under the title *Vihan hedelmät*) in that he, too, wrote during the Great Depression in the U.S.A. In fact, his four major novels were published at the beginning of the Depression. *The Sound and the Fury* was published in 1929, in the very year of the Stock Market Crash, followed by *As I Lay Dying* (1930), *Sanctuary* (1931), and *Light in August* (1932). It has been argued that the Great Depression brought the American North closer to the experience of the American South – failure and defeat – but that it also sped the South’s integration in the United States (Minter 2002: 252). Literature plays an important role in this two-sided movement.

*Light in August* was published on October 6, 1932 in New York. Most reviews, e.g., in the *Saturday Review*, the *New York Times*, the *New York Tribune*, and the *Nation*, treated Faulkner as a major novelist but expressed also reservations about the novel. It was criticized, among other things, of sensationalism and lack of unity.\(^92\) There has been an ongoing debate on the nature of the unity in *Light in August*.

The novel is easier to read than e.g. *The Sound and the Fury*, because Faulkner apparently is not experimenting on any new or striking novelistic form. And yet, the novel is in many ways complex and impressive. A great deal of the action is not told but rather reflected in the memories of witnesses who are not involved in the action: such as Gavin Stevens, giving his intellectual interpretation of the events leading to Joe Christmas’s death; the furniture dealer at the end of the novel, telling his wife about Lena Grove and Byron Bunch; the impersonal “they” in the latter part

\(^{90}\) Blotner (1974: 784) notes: “Whoever had done the editorial proofreading displayed little understanding of Faulkner’s style and little sympathy with it. The blue-pencil charges and queries had the tone of an instructor impatient with the work of a student in freshman composition.” Faulkner’s reaction was irritated: e.g. “O.K. as set, goddam it.”

\(^{91}\) The only novel of Dos Passos published in Finnish so far is *Manhattan Transfer* (1925), translated in 1945 by Toini Aaltonen under the title *Suurkaupungin kasvot*.

\(^{92}\) For the reception of the novel, see, e.g., Bassett 1975: 136–175, Millgate 1987b: 12–17, and Fowler and Abadeen 1984. Millgate (1987b: 17) notes: “Some of the least perceptive and most hostile comments on Faulkner’s work did indeed come from British critics and reviewers over the course of his career, but the reception of *Light in August* in the United Kingdom was, if anything, more positive and perceptive than its reception in the United States itself – in part, perhaps, because the British reviewers did not need to confront so directly the bleakness of the novel’s social and political implications.”
of Chapter 15, telling the story of Christmas’s arrest in Mottstown and the strange behavior of Mr. and Mrs. Hines (Millgate 1978: 126).93

*Light in August* contains within itself many different fictional genres, from the pastoral to the detective story. Some mysteries are not decanted from their plots, and several loose ends remain untied. For instance, the truth of Christmas’s birth is never known, and it cannot be incontrovertibly determined whether it was Christmas who murdered Miss Burden and set fire to her house.94 Be that as it may, Pitavy (1973: 11) notes: “Even though he could not recapture the ecstasy of writing, Faulkner admits that in *Light in August* he had complete control over his materials and was master of his profession.”95

The novel is impressive, not only because of its length. Most commentators rank it among Faulkner’s greatest fiction, along with *The Sound and the Fury* (1929) and *Absalom, Absalom!* (1936).96 Faulkner himself wrote to his friend and agent, Ben Wasson in 1932: “I dont see anything wrong with it [*Light in August*]. I want it to stand as it is. This one is a novel: not an anecdote; that’s why it seems topheavy, perhaps.” (Blotner 1977: 66.)

The parallels between Joe Christmas and Jesus Christ have not gone unnoticed in the novel (see Section 6.2.8 below).97 Some critics have suggested that there is a paralleling of character traits, actions, and structural shapes to the story of Christ. The novel seems to be a parallel – but pervasive – story of the life and death of a man who is similar to Christ in many particulars. However, it is grotesque to say that unless other stories in the novel – in particular the Hightower story and the Lena Grove story – “are seen as being contrasting portions of a thematic statement also made suggestively by analogies to the Christ story” (Holman 1972: 149). Faulkner used parallels to Christ to write modern stories with timeless meanings. The use of the Christ story is a pervasive aspect of *Light in August* that consists of three major and mostly separate story strands: the story of Joe

---

93 Even though Mrs. Hines behaves less fanatically than her husband, her deep religious convictions are clearly described in the novel (see, e.g., LIA, 355–361).
94 See an interesting article by Meats (1971): “Any person, the sheriff or the reader, judging from the evidence we are given in the novel, should conclude that Joe Christmas’ guilt is an assumption and nothing more” (p. 277).
95 Pitavy (1973: 150) concludes: “The grandeur of *Light in August* has its source not only in its subtle structure, the forceful presence of its characters, and the wealth and the variety of its themes, but also in the mastery of its style, a style in which a poetic sense of rhythm and sound, a powerful imagination and a steady control of technique remain firmly harnessed to the author’s purposes. The remarkable mastery of language places *Light in August* alongside Faulkner’s greatest masterpieces.”
96 E.g. Millgate (1987c: 52) places only *The Sound and the Fury* and *A Fable* on the same level as *Light in August*.
Christmas, the story of Gail Hightower, and the story of Byron Bunch and Lena Grove. These three strands are loosely interwoven by the accident of time, some contacts between protagonists, and by the means of having characters in one strand narrate events in another. None of the characters alone are adequate representatives of the Christ story, but each one of them represent a certain limited aspect of Christ (Holman 1972: 149).

In addition to the parallel between the Christ story and Joe Christmas, there is a parallel between Lena Grove and the virginal Roman goddess Diana: “Both are nature and fertility goddesses; both are huntresses (though Lena’s quarry is a husband); though unmarried both have childbirth as their particular concern; and both are associated with fire in August.” (Langston 1961: 49.) Furthermore, with the blue color of her dress, Lena Grove is also a Mary who will soon have her gentle Joseph in the character of Byron Bunch. So she is a kind of fertility goddess, Greek and Christian, virgin and mother, or “a kind of impersonalized catalytic force, effecting change but itself unchanging” (Millgate 1978: 125–126). She is a carrier of life. Critics have seen these religious and mythological features in Lena Grove already in the opening paragraphs of the novel (Waggoner 1959: 108; Millgate 1978: 133–134, 136; Bleikasten 1990: 276–278; Ruppersburg 1994: 18).

However, it should be noted once again that the present study concentrates on the translation of Southern cultural-religious intertextual features, not on analyzing the conceptual or motive level of *Light in August* from the point of view of literary theory. Consequently, aspects of literary theory are given only in support of understanding better intertextual dimensions of the novel, and Southern cultural-religious features is the lens through which characters and biblical readings are looked at.

### 3.2.2 The characters and stories in the novel

The original version of *Light in August* presented some 60 different characters. However, among those some 60 named persons there are five who are followed more closely. Faulkner said in 1957 that *Light in August* was “mainly the story of Lena Grove” (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 74). However, it can be argued that its central character is Joe Christmas, even if the opening and concluding chapters do not tell his story but the story of Lena Grove, whose story is only slightly connected with that of Joe Christmas. They actually never meet, even though the link between them is plain enough. They have much in common: both are orphans, both are in flight, both have set out on their adventures through a window, both have been abandoned, both end in Yoknapatawpha.

---

98 These two aspects of Lena Grove are expressed by Byron Bunch’s words to Hightower: “It’s like she was in two parts, and one of them knows that he is a scoundrel. But the other part believes that when a man and a woman are going to have a child, that the Lord will see that they are all together when the right time comes.” (LIA, 285.)
County and Jefferson (Duvall 1988: 150–151). Joe Christmas and Lena Grove are nomads, strangers on their way from somewhere to somewhere else. But their fates are different.

Other important characters are Gail Hightower, Joanna Burden, and Byron Bunch. However, these five, even though there are common points and encounters, do not constitute a narrative unity. If ever there is a unity, it is the social – and moral – unity of the place, the town of Jefferson and more widely, Yoknapatawpha County (Bleikasten 1995: 1137). This is even more striking, because contrary to Sartoris, The Sound and the Fury, and As I Lay Dying – none of these five characters has family ties between each other, and none of them has family ties in the town of Jefferson. *Light in August* is the only major novel of Faulkner in which the protagonists are not members of the same family. Gail Hightower is an ex-Presbyterian minister, denied by his church and denomination, outcast by local people, living alone. He is the only ordained minister in the novel.99 Joanna Burden, “a Yankee and Negro lover”, an unmarried woman, lives an isolated life in her house, the Burden place. As a Northerner who has philanthropic motives, she is unacceptable to the people of Jefferson (cf. Wright 1996: 55). Even Byron Bunch is an outsider who has come from somewhere to Jefferson seven years earlier, and who will leave the town at the end of the novel. It is the community that protects Lena Grove, it is the community that first persecutes and then ignores Gail Hightower, and it is the same community that destroys Joe Christmas. It is clear that Faulkner in *Light in August* is concerned to tell the stories of Lena Grove, Joe Christmas, and Gail Hightower but also to show the impact of these stories on the community in Jefferson (Millgate 1978: 126).

*Light in August* can be said to present three interwoven stories, three quite different types of narrative: Joe Christmas’s story is a tragedy, the ordeal of Gail Hightower is a problem novel, and the Lena Grove-Byron Bunch romance is a comedy. Each story has its own mood, tempo, plot, and theme as well (Lind 1957: 307; see also McElderry 1958, and Waggoner 1959).100 The time of the novel101 is by no means limited to the present, which consists of ten days between the murders of

99 Burrows (1961: 139–140) classifies Gail Hightower among those Faulknerian ministers who possess “commendable character traits”. The other ones are Reverend Shegog of The Sound and the Fury, the Negro minister from St. Louis who preached the Easter service Dilsey heard (cf. Brooks 1991: 345), and Dr Mahon, the rector in Soldiers’ Pay.

100 Yorks (1961: 128) notes: “*Light in August* does not end, however, in Joe’s mutilation and death… The tragic Joe Christmas is destroyed; the comic Byron survives; but the eternal Female [Lena Grove] triumphs.”

101 For Faulkner, the distinctions between past, present, and future did not exist. He said in 1956 that “time is a fluid condition which has no existence except in the momentary avatars of individual people. There is no such thing as *was* – only *is.*” (Meriwether and Millgate 1968: 255.) – In the novel, “many of the characters display an extraordinary awareness of time: Byron meticulously keeps his own time when working alone; Hightower always knows the time
Joanna Burden and Joe Christmas. The time of these ten days is often interrupted by flashbacks that take up roughly half of the book. Faulkner used mechanically the past and the present tense in the novel. As the significance of present actions is to be found in the past, and the main part of the novel consists of retrospective accounts of that antecedent action, he preserves “a sense of present action as opposed to antecedent action by the device of telling in the present tense all events that are imagined to be occurring in a forward motion” (Holman 1972: 151) during the ten days between the moment when Joe Christmas kills Joanna Burden, and the moment when he is killed by Percy Grimm. To contrast this, Faulkner tells all retrospective and antecedent events in the past tense. 

*Light in August* may appear an overambitious undertaking, as Faulkner follows the three plots and outwardly connects them to one another. He goes beyond the interest of each plot so that the meaning of the novel would arise from the combination of the plots (Pitavy 1973: 55). The three concluding chapters bring together the three main strands of the novel. Chapter 19 recounts the death of Joe Christmas. Chapter 20 presents Gail Hightower, who finally can think honestly of himself, his ministry, and the world; he realizes how he has betrayed the church. In Chapter 21 Byron Bunch, Lena Grove and her child move toward Tennessee.

To sum up, *Light in August* is a novel on human condition, a tragedy. Its greatness is achieved through setting people in place and time. This may be one of the reasons why what many people consider to be Faulkner’s best novels – *The Sound and the Fury*, *Light in August*, *Absalom, Absalom!* *The Hamlet*, *Go Down, Moses* – all are irrevocably linked with the South, its culture and history, its experience and memory. They have a lot to say about contradictions and conflicts in Southern society at the first half of the 20th century (and second half of the 19th century). Pitavy (1973: 93) argues that “*Light in August* is a complex novel with many themes: the racial problem, the search of identity, the alienation and isolation of man, the burden of Calvinism, fate, sexuality, the rejection of life, or alternatively, the humble acceptance of it.” *Light in August* should not – or cannot – be reduced to one general intertext only. Such an attempt would be either futile or even misguided.

### 3.2.3 Southern cultural features reflected in the novel

It can be asked whether *Light in August* simply replicates the white South’s culturally intertextual web of race and religion. It has been suggested that *Light in August* is a critique of the Southern
synthesis of racism and religion (Caron 2000: 61). The way Joe Christmas is dealt with is the white community’s discursive response to racial questions. Intertextual features become visible in the lives of individuals and community in the novel.

At least three distinct bodies of material can be distinguished in the novel: Evangelical Protestant religion, sex, and the black in Southern society. The story of Joe Christmas is centered on the problem of black people in Southern society, but religion also plays an important part in his story, as does sex. The Joanna Burden episode with the sexual material is fatal for Joe Christmas. As he kills his lover when she tries to shoot him, he cannot survive her killing. An act of religious self-preservation leads Joe Christmas to kill her, and it leads to his own death. For him, the killing of Joanna Burden was “a symbolic annihilation of the world which had denied his claims to selfhood and status” (Abel 1971: 46). In this sense Joanna Burden was a victim par excellence because she embodied in her person the three coercive elements Joe Christmas had experienced in his life: Evangelical Protestant religion (Calvinism), femaleness (sex), and obsession with racial issues (color-difference).

The story of Gail Hightower is centered on religion – he is an outcast Presbyterian minister – but his story involves, although to a lesser degree, the black and sex. In Lena Grove’s story sex has a dominant role, but religion – as she has a rather naïve faith in God – and the issue of blacks, too, are only loosely present in her story. These materials are used to knit the parts of the novel into a whole, but they have their thematic expression as contrasting analogues of the story of Christ (Holman 1972: 151).

Following the Civil War, a new class system arose. At the bottom were sharecroppers, millworkers, and small farmers. The Southern characters portrayed in *Light in August* are largely poor and white. Poor whites in the American South were people who owned very little or nothing at all. Many of them were farmers, and many of them worked as loggers and miners (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 70–72). Even after the Civil War, race separated the white and the black into two class systems, and the blacks figure in *Light in August* only now and then (if Joe Christmas is not counted as a black). References to the old aristocratic Southern families in Jefferson are only casual. The only real exception may be Reverend Gail Hightower. He is highly educated, he has gone to college and seminary, and in this community he can be acknowledged as a learned man. For instance, he can even cite Shakespeare: “‘But there are more things in heaven and earth too than truth,’ he thinks, paraphrases, quietly, not quizzical, not humorous; not unquizzical and not

---

humorless too.” (LIA, 453.) Unfortunate for him, he has been defrocked and even declassed. Financially speaking, he is not wealthy at all. People in Faulkner’s novels are poor, like the South as a whole after the Civil War up until World War II. “The economy of the whole region was basically a colonial economy, manipulated from the outside. Even the so-called aristocracy, as Faulkner depicts them, had little wealth.” (Brooks 1991: 19.)

All the other persons in Light in August come from another level of society. Lena Grove, for instance, is an orphan who has nothing. When she travels and looks for Lucas Burch, she walks barefoot because in that way she can save her shoes and can feel more comfortable. She used to live with her brother who worked in a small sawmill town. Her encounter with Mr. and Mrs. Armstid is revealing in relation to her social position and aspirations, too: “‘I et polite,’ she thinks… ‘Like a lady I et. Like a lady travelling. But now I can buy sardines too if I should so wish.’” (LIA, 23.)

Lena Grove receives in the novel pity and charity from community members in Jefferson, such as Byron Bunch’s landlady, Mrs. Beard who feeds her and suggests that she would stay in the cabin at the Burden place, and Mrs. Armstid who gives her hard-earned egg-money to Lena Grove for her trip into Jefferson. Perhaps this is so because she reminds the community of the mercy and kindness Christ showed toward those (women) who were accused of sexual transgressions. Besides, even though she obviously has transgressed communal laws on white female chastity, she has not violated the strictest taboo, i.e., racial mixture. That is why she never becomes an object of violence or social exclusion.

Financial poverty does not imply moral or spiritual poorness, however. Mrs. Armstid, for instance, even though she befriends Lena Grove, obviously disapproves her swollen figure. It cannot be concluded that people of Lena Grove’s and Mrs. Armstid’s social class are morally lax and easily accept sexual relations outside marriage. It should be remembered that, even though young unmarried women could become pregnant, especially if poor, there had been a strong Puritan attitude among the Southern farmers. “Even the wild young men and the too-easygoing young women have behind them a stern moral tradition from which they have lapsed or against which they are in conscious revolt.” (Brooks 1991: 18.) A positive example of this stern Puritan tradition is

---

103 This is an intertextual allusion to Shakespeare’s Hamlet’s words in Act I, Scene V: “There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, / Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.” In an earlier version of the manuscript there was the word Horatio (“… truth, Horatio”; see Bleikasten 1995: 1275). It might even be a two-level intertext. The word heaven, linked with the word earth, may be an intertext, alluding to two biblical passages. The first one is at the end of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, where Jesus says: “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” (Matthew 28:18). The second one is the well-known passage in the Lord’s Prayer in the New Testament: “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.” (Matthew 6:10b; cf. Coffee 1983: 104–105).
Byron Bunch, the young man who falls in love with Lena Grove and tries to protect her.\textsuperscript{104} Byron is a methodical and hard-working man. In 1930 almost half of the lumber produced in the United States comes from the South (Wright 1996: 61), and Byron works at a sawmill also on Saturday afternoon, when the others have left for town wearing their Sunday clothes and neckties. As an example of his honesty, when Lena Grove comes to the saw-mill to ask about her “husband,” Byron checks the time by his watch in order to know how much to deduct from the working time which the employer will pay him. “I reckon I aint paid for setting down, he says.” (LIA, 47.) Besides his high working moral, Byron Bunch is a religious man. He leads a church choir every Sunday in a country church some thirty miles away, and it can be supposed that he is at least a deacon in his church (Brooks 1991: 19).

The main characters in the novel are strangers at least in two ways: first, they are strangers in the community. They are more or less tolerated, and nothing more. None of them strictly follows the rules, the moral-religious code of the community. They all are apt to be reproached by what they do. Whereas in his earlier novels Faulkner had the institution of family at his disposal to mediate between society and individual, in Light in August there is none. Maybe the novel wants to show a direct confrontation between a community and individuals who dare to break its unwritten rules, to ignore its values and social order. Another sense in which all of them are strangers is the question of their identity: they are, in essence, rootless people, not knowing exactly who they are.

Olga Vickery (1964: 67–68) emphasizes the tension between the private dimension of the major characters and the public roles forced upon them by society: “Collectively, Jefferson is Southern, White, and Elect, qualities which have meaning only within a context which recognizes something or someone as Northern or Black or Damned.” Joanna Burden, Joe Christmas, and Gail Hightower are scapegoats who represent qualities that must be rejected by the white community, if it wants to maintain its self-defined character.

Joe Christmas and Joanna Burden are at once symmetrical and opposite figures, which is shown already by their first names. She is a descendant of an abolitionist family coming from the North. He does not know his father or mother, but the question of race is fatal for both of them. The racial

\textsuperscript{104} Pearson (1952: 6) links Byron Bunch to the poem of John Keats: “Fair youth, beneath the trees, thou canst not leave / Thy song, nor ever can those trees be bare; / Bold lover, never, never canst thou kiss, / Though winning near the goal – yet, do not grieve; / She cannot fade, though thou hast not thy bliss, / For ever wilt thou love, and she be fair!” John Keats, \textit{Ode on a Grecian Urn}. In Stillinger (ed.) 1979: 372. – \textit{Ode on a Grecian Urn} has been translated into Finnish by Jaakko Tuunikoski and entitled \textit{Oodi kreikkalaiselle uurnalle} (John Keats, \textit{Runoelmia}. Porvoo: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö 1917, pp. 23–25).
issue has haunted Joanna Burden since she was four years old and her father told her about the curse.

“I had seen and known negroes since I could remember. I just looked at them as I did at rain, or furniture, or food or sleep. But after that I seemed to see them for the first time not as people, but as a thing, a shadow in which I lived, we lived, all white people, all other people. I thought of all the children coming forever and ever into the world, white, with the black shadow already falling upon them before they drew breath. And I seemed to see the black shadow in the shape of a cross. And it seemed like the white babies were struggling, even before they drew breath, to escape from the shadow that was not only upon them but beneath them too, flung out like their arms were flung out, as if they were nailed to the cross. I saw all the little babies that would ever be in the world, the ones not yet even born – a long line of them with their arms spread, on the black crosses. I couldn’t tell then whether I saw it or dreamed it. But it was terrible to me. I cried at night.” (LIA, 239.)

By this experience she is crucified as the children in her dreams are. Her identity is crucified at least in three ways: she understands that she belongs to an abolitionist family, to a Southern community, and to cursed people. As to Joe Christmas, he feels himself black among whites, and white among blacks. When Joanna Burden remembers the speech of her father and wants to imprison Joe Christmas in his mythical identity of black, the only escape for him is by way of killing her.

It was quite usual that every Southern town had a black part of town where most black people lived and went to church. It is in Freedman Town, the blacks’ part of Jefferson, where Joe Christmas has a scaring experience: “On all sides, even within him, the bodiless fecundmellow voices of negro women murmured. It was as though he and all other manshaped life about him had been returned to the lightless hot wet primogenitive Female. He began to run…” (LIA, 107.) Joe Christmas seems to fear for losing his identity.

The question of racial identity is something that haunts Joe Christmas all his life, and culminates in his death. The novel only hints at but does not give a clear answer to the question. He seems to seek out trouble when he proudly tells the whites he is black, and telling flauntingly the blacks that he is white. “Tortured by his conjectural mixed blood in his quest for identity, he would show the terrible effects of the vicious race prejudice and vindictive religiosity visited upon him from earliest childhood” (Blotner 1974: 704). The whole question remains vague throughout the novel: Eupheus Hines rejects his daughter Milly, the mother of Joe Christmas, because her lover, i.e., Joe Christmas’s father, could have been black – Milly claims that he was Mexican; when Joanna

---

105 “On this [black] side of town, there was generally a black business district of stores, offices, restaurants, jook joints, and poolrooms” (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 161).
Burden asks Joe Christmas about his parents, he does not know and states: “If I’m not [part nigger], damned if I haven’t wasted a lot of time.” (LIA, 241.)

Southern whites had lost their identity with the Civil War, so they struggled to rediscover who they were and what their society stood for (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 149). Defining identity is something that takes place to a great extent through language. For example, a black was referred to in newspapers as “a negro,” a white was referred to as “a man” or “a woman.” In Light in August, the word that determines Joe Christmas’s identity and fate is the word nigger, used by the community. When Joe Christmas arrives at Jefferson and starts working at the sawmill, no one uses this label. However, there are some doubts concerning his appearance: “‘Is he a foreigner?’ ‘Did you ever hear of a white man named Christmas?’ the foreman said. ‘I never heard of nobody a-tall named it,’ the other said.” (LIA, 29.) When Christmas has been labeled as black by the community, the community also defines itself. He has become the other, a fearsome thing, probably the most fearsome thing, in the South. In defining him black and thus reprehensible, the community defines itself as acceptable and harmonious. The white citizens of Jefferson declare their own identity when they label Joe Christmas black and have recourse to violence. “To merge white and black would have been the ultimate holocaust, the ultimate damnation of Southern civilization. And yet that was precisely what the mulatto, by his very being, represented.” (Caron 2000: 63; cf. Williamson 1980.)

The tragedy of Joe Christmas is that he does not know who he is. He is nobody’s son, therefore he is nobody. He has no name of his own. The reader knows that he was born out of wedlock to the daughter of Eupheus Hines, who is a religious and racist fanatic. However, his problem is not a biological one, it is a psychological and social one. He is a man who searches his identity.

Indeed, his alienation springs in part from the fact that each new experience leads him further from self-knowledge and self-acceptance instead of nearer to them, divides the elements of his character instead of harmonizing them, so much so that during his affair with Joanna he is really a white by day, and a Negro by night. His uniform of black trousers and white shirt is a perfect image of the dichotomy in his personality. (Pitavy 1973: 112.)

Joe Christmas carries the secret of his indeterminate heritage and tells only two persons in Jefferson of his secret that he might be of mixed racial ancestry: Joanna Burden, his lover, and Lucas Burch, his accomplice. She tells no one this secret, but she sees him as a black. Her attempts to make him accept her own religious code and racial convictions cause him to kill her. Lucas Burch alias Brown

---

106 Faulkner said in 1957: “That the only person in that book [Light in August] that accepted a tragic view of life was Christmas because he didn’t know what he was and so he deliberately repudiated man. He didn’t belong to man any longer, he deliberately repudiated man.” (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 97.)
is the one who first labels Joe Christmas during the sheriff’s interrogation. “‘Go on. Accuse me. … Accuse the white man and let the nigger go free. Accuse the white and let the nigger run.’” (LIA, 91.) The sheriff and the marshal are skeptical at first of Brown’s revelation. “‘You better be careful what you are saying, if it is a white man you are talking about,’ the marshal says. ‘I dont care if he is a murderer or not.’” (LIA, 91.) Then the sheriff concludes that Lucas Burch is telling the truth at last. “‘A nigger,’ the marshal said. ‘I always thought there was something funny about that fellow.’” (LIA, 92.) Race becomes more important than murder.

Violence is another central feature in the novel in addition to religion, sex, and race. It is not, however, violence without aim. It is there because the community wants to keep itself pure. Violence is always near where purity makes its demands. It is through Puritanism that the community in the novel defines its values and legitimizes its priorities. Its authority cannot be contested because it is based on divine transcendence. “Each time when there are racist or sexist prejudices openly formulated, either by Doc Hines, McEachern or the father of Joanna, rhetoric immediately takes prophetic accents of the Old Testament, and the ultimate justification of every action is almost always theological.”107 (Bleikasten 1995: 1148.) As a way of thinking and conducting, Puritanism dominates and engages everybody to follow its code of conduct, with commandments and prohibitions. Puritanism necessitates a discipline of the body and the mortification of the flesh. For a puritan, life cannot be other than life for the death. Joanna Burden confirms this idea. Peace and piety are looked for in suffering, in deprivation, and in physical pain.

Sacrifices are performed upon suitable victims and the purpose is “to deflect upon a relatively indifferent victim, a ‘sacrificeable’ victim”, to deflect violence away from community and to knit it even tighter together (Girard 1977: 4). A community selects a surrogate victim who can contain the spread of violence by taking it upon himself or herself. The surrogate victim can be seen as a “monstrous double,” a figure who is both inside and outside the community, embodying all its possible differences but belonging both to the community and to the sacred (Girard 1977: 271). The ultimate model is the Christ’s crucifixion, the innocent who died for the guilty ones. Consequently, Gail Hightower sees a parallelism between Christ’s crucifixion and Joe Christmas’s lynching “in whose crucifixion they too will raise a cross.” (LIA, 348.)108 However, even following Gail

---

107 “Chaque fois que des préjugés racistes ou sexistes sont ouvertement formulés, que ce soit par Doc Hines, McEachern ou le père de Joanna, la rhétorique prend aussitôt les accents prophétiques du Vieux [sic] Testament, et la justification ultime de toute action est presque toujours théologique.”

108 Beck, Frandsen & Randall (2012: 154) note that lynchings of blacks in the American South “served as a sort of ritual sacrifice; when white frustration levels were high and the relationship between black and white seemed tense, a
Hightower’s thinking, nothing seems to give Joe Christmas’s sufferings and death redemptive value. When he dies, he dies for himself and because of the others. But there is no expiation, no redemption. There is always personal and collective guilt. The American South suffers for its treatment of Indians and the crime of slavery.

In this section I have shown how firmly *Light in August* is anchored on those cultural-religious elements that were present in the American South after the Civil War: religion, sex, and race. Violence is closely attached to them. Without an understanding of these elements and their largely intertextual nature it would be difficult to read, interpret, and translate a novel such as *Light in August*. In the following section we will see how intertextual issue race, and more particularly, slavery, can be.

### 3.2.4 Peculiar readings of the Bible and issues of blood

One of the attempts at justifying slavery in the South was to argue that slavery was part of the institutional structure of Southern society. Before the Civil War, Evangelical Protestant Christians seemed to repeat a kind of litany: “Slaveholding is a civil institution; *and we will not interfere*. The character of civil institutions is governed by politics; *and we will not interfere*. Politics are beyond the scope of the church; *and we will not interfere*.” (Mathews 1977: 157; emphasis in the original). But Southern churches also referred to the Bible. They affirmed that in the Bible God had sanctioned slavery in the Old Testament, both among the patriarchs and the Hebrews, and God had enforced its obligations in the New Testament, too. Evangelical Christianity argued that only those things that broke a law given by God either directly – the Ten Commandments – or indirectly, as in the lives of the patriarchs, were sinful (Mathews 1977: 157).

In *Light in August*, Calvin Burden – notice the significance of both names\(^\text{109}\) – professes Unitarianism, associated chiefly with New England and the direct historical descendant of Calvinism. His father, Nathaniel Burrington, was a Calvinist minister who named his son to honor the Protestant reformer of Geneva. When discussing with Joe Christmas, Joanna Burden rehearses actions and long held opinions of her family that show them being outside the Latin desire to be at ease with the world. In spite of being Yankee, Calvin Burden as well as his son Nathaniel Burden appropriate a seemingly biblical justification for racial hatred and slavery: the biblical story of lynching was like a thunderstorm that cleared the air, and, in a perverse way, set the world right, right being a dominant white population and a suitably submissive black population.\(^*\)

\(^{109}\) Slavery was generally regarded as a *burden* to the whites (see, e.g., Mathews 1977: 152–155; cf. Wood 1990).
Ham’s curse. Nathaniel Burden supports fully-heartedly this myth when he characterizes blacks as living under a “curse which God put on a whole race before your grandfather or your brother or me or you [Joanna Burden] were even thought of.” (LIA, 239; see LIA, 234.)

The story of Noah and his sons Ham, Shem, and Japheth after the Deluge, is told in Genesis 9:20–27. Noah gets drunk and lies naked in his tent. Two of the brothers, Shem and Japheth, cover their father’s nakedness, whereas the third one, Ham apparently commits a sin – not defined in the story – while viewing the naked patriarch. For this transgression, Ham and his descendants – the servant position of Canaan is really emphasized – are doomed by God to be servants to the other brothers. One of the results is that Ham and Canaan are excluded from their nation’s patriarchal power structure. “In much the same way, because they were viewed as the children of Ham, African-Americans’ biblical interpretive communities were either excluded from or denigrated by the interpretive practices of the white South” (Caron 2000: 66). For some expositors of the Bible, Ham had actually married into the race of Cain, making blacks two times cursed (Mathews 1977: 171). Many understood Ham’s descendants to mean black slaves, who are thus referred to as the ‘sons of Ham.’

In Light in August, Nathaniel Burden makes allusion to the story of Noah and his sons. Burden, too, thinks that slaves are black because of the sin of slavery that has stained “their blood and flesh” over the years. This is why he can argue, following his own logic, that now that slaves are freed, the blacks will “bleach out now. In a hundred years they will be white folks again.” (LIA, 234.) Burden apparently thinks that God’s curse on the black race is that the black race is forever bound to the white race. The white race has its own curse to bear. It has to bear the curse for its own sin, i.e. the primal original sin. The white race is cursed even before there was a black race (Ruppersburg 1994: 152).

Joanna Burden’s religious heritage was a religion, in which – besides the consequences of sin – there was the biblical curse God had put on the sons of Ham (Lind 1957: 320).

---

110 In a short story called Wash, this idea is said even more sharply: “It would seem to him [Wash Jones] that that world in which Negroes, whom the Bible told him had been created and cursed by God to be brute and vassal to all men of white skin…” (Faulkner, Collected Stories 1995: 538). – The short story has been translated into Finnish by Kai Kaila and is in William Faulkner, Karhu ja muita novelleja. Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Tammi 1969, pp. 95–108.

111 In his comment, Ruppersburg (1994: 149) refers to Genesis 4:8–15, which is the story of the curse of Cain. He obviously means Genesis 9:20–27, the story of the curse on Canaan. This only shows how easily these two biblical stories can be – and often are – confounded.

112 Swiggart (1962: 134) comments: “Whereas Hines sees his grandson’s Negro ancestry as a token of the Devil, the Burdens look upon Negroes as the sign and symbol of the white man’s moral sin.”
The story of Noah and its application to slavery and, later on, to institutional and personal racism was deeply ingrained in the South. The story of Ham was powerful because it came directly from the Bible – even though its interpretation did not – and the Bible was the major source for answers to racial and religious questions. It should be said, however, that biblical exegesis is in great difficulties if it has to identify the enslavement of black people with the curse on Canaan. It has been suggested that there was a textual gloss and that Noah really cursed Ham, the father of Canaan. Another explanation has been that Canaan as Ham’s eldest son stood for all Ham’s descendants. There has been a long history of the identification of Ham as black. It can be followed from the Babylonian Talmud to medieval writings, and from there to English Bible commentaries used by Americans (Peterson 2005a).113

Some interpreters of this passage suggest that because blacks were slaves, they had to be the descendants of Ham, and their owners, consequently, the descendants of Shem and Japheth. This “black curse” was often cited before the Civil War as biblical justification for slavery. It helped to mediate the contradiction between Christians holding blacks as slaves and the Christian principle of the universal brotherhood of everybody, and the Golden Rule (Peterson 2005b: 732).114 After the Civil War, it was cited to show white supremacy. Some Evangelicals were of the opinion that the blacks’ inferiority was based upon the will of God. They explained that this was revealed either in the curse of Noah or in the punishment of Cain (Mathews 1977: 171; see also Haynes 2002).

This story and its application to slavery was widely known and spread in the American South, leading later on to institutional and personal racism. As the biblical story is not clearly applicable to blacks, the South somehow had to embellish the story in order to explain the most distinct differences between whites and blacks. Even though there is no mention about the skin color in the biblical text, it became a common idea that God had placed his mark, i.e., the darker skin, upon Ham and his family to mark them as the race of servants. The white community in the South explained this idea through their idea of God: as God is omniscient and infallible, he must have

113 Mitchell (1976: 500) notes: “Many explanations of this apparent cursing of Canaan for what Ham had done have been put forward, perhaps the most plausible being that Canaan did something not recorded which was worthy of cursing and that the phrase ‘his younger son’ … in verse 24 might refer to Canaan.”

114 Peterson (2005b: 732) explains how the Southern Protestantism was recast to fit slavery: “First, the core of true religion was the individual’s conversion experience, not the restructuring of society. Second, civil institutions such as marriage, the family, and slavery were necessary to restrain human beings tainted by original sin. Third, Christianity’s appropriate role was to ameliorate the improper uses of authority by encouraging personal piety, not to challenge valid social structures. Fourth, a literal reading of the Bible was the sole means for judging the legitimacy of all institutions.”
provided a mark to indicate those who belonged to this group of social and moral inferiors. The text was a support of pro-slavish people who considered Africans to be Ham’s descendants.

The white community believed that this curse passed from generation to generation through blood. This was another belief that had tragic consequences. In *Light in August* Eupheus Hines seeks out his daughter’s lover and kills him because he believes that God himself had revealed to him that “the fellow had nigger blood.” (LIA, 354; see also LIA, 424–425.) This so-called “one-drop rule”, applied to Joe Christmas’s case as well, was laid in the early 19th century. It clearly stated that one drop of black blood in a person’s veins made him or her black. By the beginning of the 20th century, faith in blood transmitting racial characteristics was unshakable. Race would determine a person’s behavior.

A typical example of the Southern attitude to racism in *Light in August* is Simon McEachern. As Calvin and Nathaniel Burden together with Eupheus Hines represent active racist interpretation of the Bible, Simon McEachern remains silent like many of the white Southerners when facing the dilemma of Christian faith and unjust social practices. He does not consult his Bible or catechism on matters of racial justice. He consults them for matters of his personal salvation, and because of that, he does not seem to be interested in improving material concerns on this earth. He teaches his foster-son a list of commandments – Reformed Christianity tends to establish codes of conduct – and the result is that Joe Christmas brings a chair down on his head and escapes.

White men feared most mixed ancestry or miscegenation. The end result of the mixing of the races would be the “Africanisation” of the South. The fear of amalgamation was a stumbling-block toward black emancipation, as many people thought that equality for blacks would promote amalgamation. After the Civil War, “the new Negro crime” was the rape of a white woman (see

---

115 In biblical exegesis, the mention of Canaan seems to refer to Israel’s conquest of Canaan as fulfillment of Noah’s curse. See, e.g., Deuteronomy 9:1–3; Judges 4:23–24. The idea of dark skin as the curse of Noah has no biblical or theological basis.

116 See Mencke 1979. Cf. Girard 1977: 36–38. He discusses blood with double function: as purifier and stain in religious discourse. – In the novel, the townspeople are disoriented about Joe Christmas’s race: “He dont look any more like a nigger than I do. But it must have been the nigger blood in him.” (LIA, 330.)

117 In 1955 at the Nagano Conference Faulkner argued in an interview that the basis of racial conflict in the South was economic: “That because of the fear of the economic upset, they will vest it with all sorts of extraneous moral reasons, but they are not worried about those moral reasons, they are afraid of the economic upset. There are certain ignorant people that can be led to believe that one man is better than another because the Christian Bible says so, they believe all sorts of delusions about him, that he has different sort of blood in his veins, which is not so; any student in chemistry could answer that question. But it’s primarily, I think, economic.” (Meriwether and Millgate 1968: 183; emphasis added.)
Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 123, 151–152; Wyatt-Brown 1986: 110–115). It was distressing to the white South as some mulattos could pass as whites. There was a fear that mulattos were the most frequent rapists of white women. Senator Benjamin Ryan Tillman of South Carolina said in 1907 that “Negro brutes” were men with “their breasts pulsating with the desire to sate their passions upon white maidens and wives… Forty to a hundred maidens … were sacrificed annually to the Minotaur, and there is no Theseus in sight.” (Williamson 1986: 84; cf. Williamson 1980.)118 The worst aspect of this attitude was that the potential danger of mulatto rapists was cloaked. The issue was the whole white Southern identity and the definition of the borderline between the whites and otherness.

Indeed, there is only one thing worse than being a black in Faulkner’s Jefferson. It is being a black who murders or rapes a white woman. It is striking in *Light in August* that Joanna Burden, when she is alive, is presented as an outcast because her family consisted of abolitionists and Yankees, but when she is dead she becomes a full-right member of Jefferson. Suddenly she becomes as a Southerner as the hysteria of the community requires (Sundquist 1985: 84). Southern culture is “trained to see the black male as oversexed and uncivilized, waiting to rape the undersexed and overcivilized white woman” (Weinstein 1992: 50–51.) Only after the perception of Joe Christmas as black, the town of Jefferson adds to Joanna Burden’s murder also her sexual violation.119

The physical appearance was thus no longer an accurate test to determine who was black and who was not. Black blood could have been transmitted through several white generations. There were no other means to detect it than to judge by reference to a sin or a moral failing, often a sexual transgression. If such a person looked like white, s/he must have been a “white nigger” because his or her act proved his or her blackness. No white member of the community could betray his or her race in such an evil way. It is no wonder that it is said of Joe Christmas in *Light in August*:

“‘Christmas! *That white nigger* that did that killing up at Jefferson last week!’” (LIA, 326; emphasis added). The community’s suspicions of something being wrong with Joe Christmas are confirmed. In fact, he seems to insult their beliefs in an insolent way till the very day he is caught:

---

118 Cash (1991: 116) comments that “this Southern woman’s place in the Southern mind proceeded primarily from the natural tendency of the great basic pattern of pride in superiority of race to center upon her as the perpetrator of that superiority in legitimate line, and attached itself precisely, and before anything else, to her enormous remoteness from the males of the inferior group, to the absolute taboo on any sexual approach to her by the Negro.”

119 Caron (2000: 67) notes that “once Christmas is convicted of the killing and of being a cursed descendant of Ham, he is then incapable of resisting the temptation to soil the most highly regarded emblem of the South’s ideology of racial purity, a white woman.”
“Then yesterday morning he come into Mottstown in broad daylight, on a Saturday with the town full of folks. He went into a white barbershop like a white man, and because he looked like a white man they never suspected him.” (LIA, 331.) Joe Christmas’s black blood is invisible, detectable only after the fact by his crime. The response to this crime and insolence is the Southern practice of lynching.120 Because Joe Christmas is a “white nigger”, he must have raped Joanna Burden before killing her. The tragedy of Jefferson is that the community will lynch Joe Christmas, and “‘they will do it gladly’ … ‘Since to pity him would be to admit selfdoubt and to hope for and need pity themselves.’” (Hightower; LIA, 348.) In a sense, there is no other way to react if they are to continue to read their Bibles in the same way and if they are to be faithful to their identity as a white community. Joe Christmas is lynched to preserve Jefferson racially pure.121

What makes his conduct insulting is that he does not conform to racist stereotypes. He does not even look like a black. The irritating thing is that he cannot be identified with black blood. This black is white, his blackness cannot be identified. But for the community like Jefferson, black must identified as black, appearance must show the opposite between black and white. If not, the social identity is in danger:

He never acted like either a nigger or a white man. That was it. That was what made the folks so mad. For him to be a murderer and all dressed up and walking the town like he dared them to touch him, when he ought to have been skulking and hiding in the woods, muddy and dirty and running. It was like he never even knew he was a murderer, let alone a nigger too. (LIA, 331.)

This is the reason of the hatred: when the other is no more identified as the other, when he has become similar, almost the same, almost a double, he is a threat and must be eliminated. When Joe Christmas dies, he embodies communal guilt and becomes an agent of purification. He affirms

120 Before the 1890s, lynching was most common in the West, and the victims were generally white people. Lynching in the South was decreasing rapidly at the time of Faulkner: a total of 1,111 blacks were lynched in the United States (not only in the South) between 1890 and 1899, in the next ten years the number fell to 791, and in the next five years to 288. “For of the grand total of 3,397 Negroes lynched in the nation from the beginning of 1882 until the close of 1938, only 366 were lynched outside the former Confederate States, and of these 185 were lynched in the border states of Maryland, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Missouri, themselves more than half Southern.” (Cash 1991: 299.) See also Harris 1984, Wyatt-Brown 1986: 185–213, and Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 152.

121 A very similar type of communal insistence takes place in Faulkner’s short story called Dry September, in which there is another lynching in Jefferson triggered by a supposed sexual attack upon a white woman. The short story was published in January 1931, one year before Light in August (Faulkner, Collected Stories 1995: 169–183). It has been translated into Finnish by Paavo Lehtonen and is entitled Kuiva syyskuu. (William Faulkner, Karhu ja muita novelleja. Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Tammi 1969, pp. 45–58). See also Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 152–154.
Girard’s (1977: 38) words: “As long as purity and impurity remain distinct, even the worst pollution can be washed away; but once they are allowed to mingle, purification is no longer possible.” Joe Christmas’s bloody mutilation at the end is a symbolic exorcism of the community’s evil.\(^{122}\) Ironically enough, Joe Christmas never had any other education than that of the white one: this made him “what he is: a racist, a sexist, and a puritan. Mentally and emotionally, he is indeed a white southern male – or would be, did he not believe himself to be tainted with blackness.” (Bleikasten 1990: 317; cf. Tanner 1980: 83.) This is shown, e.g., by the fact that his short living with a black woman in the North does not succeed.

A critical outside observer in the novel is Gavin Stevens – unlike in the Snopes trilogy where he is heavily involved in preventing the spread of Snopesism.\(^{123}\) Highly educated, sensitive, eloquent, he is the young district attorney who tells the sheriff that Joe Christmas will plead guilty to the murder of Joanna Burden. He is the one who offers an interpretation that focuses on Joe Christmas’s inner struggles, caused by the mixture of white and black blood:

… all those successions of thirty years before that which had put that stain either on his white blood or his black blood, whichever you will, and which killed him. … It was the black blood which swept him by his own desire beyond the aid of any man, swept him up into that ecstasy out of a black jungle where life has already ceased before the heart stops and death is desire and fulfillment. And then the black blood failed him again, as it must have in crises all his life. He… crouched behind that table and defied the black blood for the last time, as he had been defying it for thirty years. (LIA, 424–425; emphasis added.)\(^{124}\)

Gavin Stevens uses the language of the community to interpret these events which links him with the Burdens, Eupheus Hines, and Percy Grimm. All the white citizens of Yoknapatawpha County

---

\(^{122}\) When Percy Grimm castrates Joe Christmas and says: “Now you’ll let white women alone, even in hell,” (LIA, 439), there can be seen an ironic intertextual allusion to the word of Christ in the New Testament in Matthew 18:7–9. “Woe unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh! Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire.” – See Wyatt-Brown 1986: 34–35.

\(^{123}\) Stevens is a major character also in *Knight’s Gambit*, *Intruder in the Dust*, *Requiem for a Nun*, and appears in *Go Down, Moses*.

\(^{124}\) In the case of “black blood,” Faulkner said that Stevens’s surmise is simply “an assumption, a rationalization which Stevens made” (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 72).
believe that black blood contaminates its bearer with evil and moral depravity (Sullivan 1996: 506).

It should be noticed, too, that he uses a biblical idea of curse as a stain, or mark.\footnote{This was the case in Cain’s curse: “And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him” (Genesis 4:15b). In The Unvanquished Professor Wilkins, with whom Bayard Sartoris lives during the university term, says when he hears the word of Colonel John Sartoris’s killing: “Ah, this unhappy land, not ten years recovered from the fever yet still men must kill one another, \textit{still we must pay Cain’s price in his own coin.”} (Faulkner 1990: 465; emphasis added.)

The end of the novel makes the reader hesitate: on the one hand, there is the hope of finding a new way, at least for those who are white but different (Lena Grove, escorted by Byron Bunch). On the other, the community is still there, unchanged. Most citizens of Jefferson approve the lynching of Joe Christmas, even if there is a precisely and bibliically Christian level of meaning in \textit{Light in August}. It appears that the characters in the novel are judged in terms of their response to Joe Christmas. The professed white Christians of Jefferson appear to be convicted of having a dead faith, i.e., such a faith that never issues in works of love (Waggoner 1959: 250–251). It can be thus argued that whatever they call themselves, the white Christians of Jefferson read and follow more closely the Old Testament story of the curse of Ham than the New Testament narrative of forgiveness and love. “The vastness of Faulkner’s conception here is suggested in the irony that Christmas, martyred by the austerity of a faith rooted in the Old Testament, becomes a symbol of the suffering endured by Christ in the New.” (Lind 1957: 326.) This indirect and complex method of dealing with the issue of miscegenation makes \textit{Light in August} one of the most significant treatments of the issue in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century literature.

### 3.3 Summarizing remarks

This chapter has introduced some cultural-religious characteristics of the American South that can be found in William Faulkner’s life and in his \textit{Light in August}, and has also explicated their background. Understanding those characteristics is crucial for a reader-translator. They do not come out of a vacuum, as no literary work stands in a vacuum. The novel has its author, its context of creation, and its characteristics or elements have their intertextualities. In this chapter we have seen how Faulkner was deeply nurtured on biblical stories (Waggoner 1959: 249; cf. Mellard 1963), and how biblical texts ultimately became specific cultural intertexts in his production. His novels retain the Southern understanding of the curse of Ham, as well as the Puritan image of woman as the serpent and man as the eternal Adam who eternally tries to resist the temptation of the proffered fruit and to turn away from Eve. The American South for Faulkner represents humanity marked by...
original sin and suffering for it. However, it is important to be precise as to what kind of Puritanism is meant. In a loose sense of the word, Puritanism is a moral code, a kind of anti-religion in Faulkner’s works.

In *Light in August* there is a peculiar cultural-religious Bible reading in the American South. The Evangelical Protestant South used the Bible to its own ends. The Old Testament zealously is emphasized, and the New Testament message of grace and forgiveness – which does not equal an “anything goes” attitude – is to some extent left aside. It is, of course, a hermeneutical question in that particular cultural and historical situation, and it has its own reasons. As Bleikasten (1998: 85) reminds his reader, there is the inherent tension between fiction and reality, which means that “the sheer foregrounding of language through stylistic oddities and rhetorical heightening in all of his [Faulkner’s] novels prevents his prose from ever functioning as the transparent medium of realistic make-believe.” And yet, *Light in August* shows how the peculiar biblical reading of the American South had institutionalized race as a social issue.

When reading *Light in August*, the cultural-religious subject matter of the novel is dominant. Joe Christmas’s experiences, Lena Grove’s naïve faith, the sounds of church bells and choirs, and Gail Hightower, who is an ex-minister, all depict the Protestant religion in the South. Due to the cultural-religious intertextual nature of the novel, there are aspects that may seem to a non-Southern reader strange or even contradictory; for instance, religiously motivated racism may be hard to understand. This is why when translating the novel into another culture the issues of culture are to be taken carefully into consideration. This is why I have dealt with them in this chapter.

In *Light in August* much of the novel’s intertextuality lies in the tension between two poles: either the text itself is so clear that it directs its readers to the appropriate intertexts, or else it leaves the reader to decide arbitrarily which particular intertextual relation is the significant and interpretively informing relation (Allen 2011: 137). In the next chapter I will deal with much of this culture, religion, and religious language, from the point of view of interdisciplinary translation studies.
4 CULTURE, RELIGION, AND TRANSLATION IN MUTUAL INTERACTION

4.1 Culture and cultural translation

‘Culture’ is a crucial concept in translation, as no single text is produced in a vacuum. Every text is an intertext, a web of cultural influences and features because every language is part of a culture (Hofstede 2001: 21). Every translator – even a human-programmed computer – is influenced by some culture. As this study is situated in the field of literary translation and deals with Southern culture, we need to have an understanding what is meant by culture and cultural translation. In this chapter I will first deal with the relation of culture to translation and to translation studies, which is a recent academic discipline. A third issue will be that of religion and religious language, important from the point of view of any culture.

Many attempts have been made to define the concept of ‘culture,’ which is a rather complex term. Until the development of anthropology as a scientific discipline, culture referred to the humanist ideal of what was civilized in developed societies. Since then culture has been generally understood to mean the way of life of a people or a group of people, e.g. Finnish culture, American Southern culture, etc. A third meaning tries to identify political or ideological reasons behind a cultural behavior (Katan 2011: 70; cf. Holliday 1999). The world’s first professor of anthropology, Edward Burnett Tylor (1832–1917), understood culture to be “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (Lohmann 2005: 2087; cf. Singer 1968). Culture can be seen as the product of internal dynamics and external forces, operating over time (Ortner 2006: 9). Culture is “one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language” (Williams 1976: 76).

More than sixty years ago Alfred L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn listed 161 definitions of culture (Kroeber and Kluckhohn 1952: 43–72; cf. Lohmann 2005: 2088). This multitude led some British and American anthropologists to avoid the whole concept as incorrigibly vague (cf. Geertz 1968; Bellah 1968; Dittes 1968). In addition to being avoided altogether, the notion has been attacked since the second half of the 20th century (Brightman 1995; Ortner 2006: 12–14). Culture has been accused of being abstract and reified, or it has been regarded as a holistic, homogenous, totalizing and coherent pattern that minimizes or hides the reality of internal variations, fragmentations, disorder, and contradictions.

Culture is a difficult concept to analyze in the sense that even though it can be taught to others and learned, its influences are often hidden. Many humanists appear to think that culture is learned technically, through instruction, whereas many anthropologists appear to think that culture may be
learned through formal or unconscious parenting. Other possibilities are socialization or inculcation, the condition being in long-term contact with others. It may be typical for many sociologists to think that culture is above all a site of conflict, either for authority or for power (Katan 2009: 74–75).

It has been realized that human beings are so used to their own culture that they often are not aware that it defines and regulates perceptions. This attitude is opposed to cultural relativism, the tendency to avoid judging others and to try to understand their ways of life from their point of view (Lohmann 2005: 2086). From the point of view of translation, ethnocentrism in the translator’s approach to a source text is unavoidable. Being aware of this is one of the conditions *sine qua non* of being a professional translator.

The observation that the role of an anthropologist, as an interpreter of a culture, has parallels with the role of a translator, as an interpreter of a text, may in recent years have drawn attention to the important role of culture in translation studies. Translation studies scholars seem to be influenced in many ways by anthropological insights. A common point shared by anthropologists, translators, and translation studies scholars concerns the nature and characteristics of language. According to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, the particular language we speak, our mother tongue, conditions the way we conceptualize the world. Language is the way to the social reality. Benjamin Whorf (1956: 213–214) speaks of linguistic relativity and argues that the world as we experience it is determined by our cultural and linguistic background. This view seems to support the idea that the specificity of a culture is coextensive with the specificity of a language. Other scholars (e.g. Werner and Campbell 1973: 398) say that this hypothesis, combining linguistic determinism and linguistic relativity, “asserts that the human beings speaking different languages do not live in the same ‘real’ world with different labels attached: they live in different worlds – language itself acts as a filter on reality, molding our perceptions of the universe around us.” However, the sheer fact that translation is possible between different cultures seems to negate the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and instead supports Noam Chomsky’s theory of universals (see, e.g., Chomsky 1965).

It was the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski (1972: 305) who was the first to apply the term ‘context’ to translation. For him, translation aims at a context that is larger than a mere linguistic expression when he states that “language is essentially rooted in the reality of the culture” and that “it cannot be explained without constant reference to these broader contexts of verbal utterance.” Where religious expressions are involved, the concept of cultural context thus includes both cultural
as well as religious factors. They are closely intertwined. Malinowski (1972: 296) also speaks of a context of situation, which could be seen as a synonym for speech situation. Many translation studies scholars have discussed the notion of the “context of situation” (e.g. Halliday and Hasan 1989; see also House 1997).

The role of culture as a system of sense-making experience is crucial in any communication, and a condition sine qua non also for translation. Based on Bronislaw Malinowski’s context of situation and of culture, on neurolinguistic programming theory, and on the anthropological “iceberg model” of Edward Hall’s triad of culture (Hall 1990; on logical level theory, see O’Connor 2002), David Katan has developed an “iceberg presentation” of culture for translation studies (see Katan 2009: 78). The idea of hierarchical levels of culture is simple but impressive: as with an iceberg, the most important part of any culture is hidden, and only the tip of the iceberg can be seen. What is visible is only a small part of what exists, and it is the most concrete part. The two other levels below the waterline are more hidden, closer to our unquestioned assumptions about ourselves and the world around us (Katan 2011: 70). These three levels are the technical level, i.e., the part that is visible above the waterline, the formal level, i.e., the part that is just under the waterline (formal level), and the informal level, i.e., the part that is mostly underwater.

The technical level of culture is the level of language and the shared encyclopedic knowledge. In linguistics this level is equivalent to the denotative level, denotative meaning being what a dictionary attempts to provide. Language is understood to be an independent and idealized system. Technical culture is straightforward and is in search of the one correct answer, which is based on an objective technical principle.

On this level, the focus is on the text. Language signs have a clear referential function, and the reader-translator transfers the terms and the concepts from one culture to another. As each tip of an iceberg is different, so are the culture-bound terms, or cultural categories (see Newmark 1988). The range is wide, from geography to institutions and technologies. Various strategies have been introduced to compensate the lack of an equivalent on this technical level of culture (see especially Kwieciński 2001). Translation seems to be possible, as it is “technical” by nature. Katan (2011: 71)

---

127 The Bible translator and translation studies scholar Eugene A. Nida (1960: 20–21) uses the phrase “social context” to indicate apparently the same, but on a broader level of analysis.

128 The “iceberg theory” is a metaphor popularized in the 1950s by Edward T. Hall (The Silent Language 1990/1959). Another development of the iceberg theory is expressed, e.g., in Brake et al. (1995: 34–39) in terms of value orientations as the most powerful elements of culture, beneath the surface of everyday interaction.

129 Newmark (1988: 94–103) recognizes the following cultural categories: 1) ecology; 2) material culture (artefacts); 3) social culture – work and leisure; 4) organizations, customs, activities, procedures, concepts, and 5) gestures and habits.
notes that e.g. the chapter headings in Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth’s *Translators through History* (1995) illustrate this level of culture. The headings deal with translators and the invention of alphabets, the development of national languages and national literatures, the dissemination of knowledge, the reins of power, the spread of religions and cultural values, the writing of dictionaries.

The second level of culture is formal, and it derives from anthropology. The formal level is more hidden, already under the waterline. It refers to an accepted way of doing things, and focuses on what is normal or appropriate. It is acquired, as the culture of traditions, rules, customs, procedures, etc. – also religious ones – are parts of culture. As the formal level of culture is hidden, people are not aware of the conventions surrounding their routines of life but people notice immediately when a convention is flouted. Children learn this level of culture through trial and error at home and at school. The language of the routines of life can be scientifically studied and technically taught to others. It is important to note that once analyzed, these routines become technical, and at this stage this level of culture is sometimes above and sometime below the conscious waterline. It fluctuates.

Many translators would probably adopt Heinz Göhring’s definition of culture that seems to be situated on this level: “Culture consists of everything one needs to know, master and feel, in order to assess where members of a society are behaving acceptably or deviantly in their various roles, and in order to behave in a way that is acceptable or deviant for that society” (1977; given in Snell-Hornby 2006: 55). Culture is considered as “a predictable pattern of shared practices which guide actual language use” (Katan 2011: 72). This would typically include culture-specific genre preferences, prototypes, schemata, even good style (Katan 2011: 72; see, e.g., Candlin and Gotti 2004). What is considered as a good translation is produced following culturally specific translation norms, rules and conventions (see, e.g., Chesterman 1993, and Toury 1995). They guide the process, beginning from the choice of the texts to be translated, what type of translation strategies are used, and the criteria to judge a translation, i.e., what makes a translation adequate or inadequate. This is important because they also guide the translation to the expectations of the readers in another culture (Katan 2011: 72). Translation becomes a more complicated issue, as invisible but existing factors and phenomena must be taken into consideration. Adequate or acceptable translations cannot be secured by the translator’s technical or theoretical translations skills only.

The third level of the iceberg is the informal level of culture. By the word *informal* is meant here that there are no rules as such. There are no formal guides. Important on this level are unquestioned core values and beliefs, and stories about self and the world. On this level culture is acquired informally and “out-of-awareness” (Katan 2009: 83). It is not normally accessible to the conscious
brain on the level of metacognition. On this level of culture, thinking, action, power, time, and space are crucial. Culture, inculcated through family, school, and media, becomes a relatively stable internal representation of reality, and this representation has an impact on attitudes and reactions to the outside world. This is the level of “out-of-awareness” responses and emotional commitment and identification. This level of culture can be described in terms of Weltanschauung, of mental programming, or of the forms of things that people have in their mind (Katan 2011: 72). This invisible level of culture can be detected for instance in value orientations of a community responding to universal human needs or problems (Kluckhohn and Strodbeck 1961).

If the technical level of culture is clearly a denotative level, on the informal level of culture people react to words on the level of their connotative meaning. Connotation depends on knowledge of the context to understand the full meaning. Connotation refers to the socio-cultural and personal associations of a sign. As a consequence, it is argued that translation is an intercultural practice requiring a mind-shifting from one cultural model of the world to another (Lefevere and Bassnet 1990). As the physical form of the iceberg implies, this level is the “heaviest” part of culture and the importance of the context of culture increases accordingly when moving from the technical level toward out-of-awareness uses of language (Katan 2004: 324). Translation becomes a more intuitive operation, practically impossible without at least some basic notions of connotative meanings, firmly linked with culture. This level is the most difficult to enter, but it is necessary in literary translation.

Researchers on translation tend to concentrate on the more hidden levels of culture, whereas practitioners of translation are more interested in what is visible on the cultural surface (Katan 2009: 79). This is an important distinction: a practitioner of translation tends to operate on the level of technical culture or civilization, on the level of formal culture or functionalist, appropriate practices. A researcher, on the other hand, usually operates more on the level of formal and informal culture, or cognitive systems. These levels can be respectively formally learned, unconsciously shared, and/or be a site of conflict. It can be argued that these levels are not exclusive in translation; on the contrary, they can be mutually enriching and complementary. Practice does not exclude research, and research supports practice.

Cultural anthropology has developed further the term ‘cultural translation.’ It is understandable because anthropological fieldwork often necessarily includes extensive interlingual translation (Rubel and Rosman 2003: 4). A situation in which a fieldworker may find himself or herself may

---

130 In their article, Rubel and Rosman (2003: 4) ask the most fundamental questions: “Is translation from one culture to another possible and if so under what conditions? Can an anthropological researcher control another language
be a bodily and intellectually immediate, even painful, experience. It is clear, too, that when the researcher’s experiences are produced in a form of linear, written text, there is an interlingual, even intersemiotic translation, and furthermore, a translation between cultures. As language and culture filter human experiences, the degree to which different systems of filters can grasp and convey experiences is an open and hotly debated question (Sturge 2011: 67). It is rather easy to agree with Vincent Crapanzano (1986: 52), for instance, who argues that an ethnographer/translator “must render the foreign familiar and preserve its very foreignness at one and the same time”. An ethnographer/translator must make sense of the foreign. Another question is how to do it, and further, how to verify it that it is done adequately.\footnote{E.g. Feleppa (1988), Needham (1972), Tambiah (1990), and Pálsson (1993) have studied the issue of finding a common ground of understanding between different frames of reference.} There seem to be two extremities to be avoided. On the one hand, there is a danger to orientalize a translation, associated with hierarchical representations of other cultures. On the other hand, there is a danger to appropriate a translation, downplaying the distinctiveness of other cultures (Sturge 2011: 67–68).

The notion of cultural translation or translation of cultures has been objected by many anthropological critiques of the notion of culture (see Brightman 1995). If culture is understood to refer to a homogeneous, monolithic, unchanging and clearly bounded human community, it leads to a representation of radically separate and sealed-off society and fails to take into consideration, e.g. the violent contact of colonialism (Sturge 2011: 69; cf. Niranjana 1992).

Cultural translation is a complex term in translation studies, too. Cultural translation can be said to be based on the model of cultures as distinct languages translated into other cultures and languages. It may be used in a very wide sense, as translation of cultures in anthropology is an almost banal description (Asad 1986: 141). In a wide, metaphorical sense the expression questions traditional parameters of translation. Cultural translation does not normally signify a particular translation strategy, but a perspective on translations, focusing on “their emergence and impact as components in the ideological traffic between language groups” (Sturge 2011: 67). In her study of early Irish literature in English translation, Maria Tymoczko (1999: 298; cf. Tymoczko and Gentzler 2002) has argued that translation is essential for the encounter of cultures in the world, “part of ideological negotiations and cultural struggles, a form of intellectual construction and creation, a metonym in the exercise of cultural strength: it is a matter of power.” Her idea seems to adequately enough to carry out a translation? How should a researcher deal with the presence of class dialectics, multilingualism and special-outsider language use? What constitutes an acceptable translation, one which contains more of the original or source language or one which focuses on the target language and the reader’s understanding? What is the relationship between translation and the conceptual framework of anthropology?”
be that translation is a conflictual encounter of cultures (cf. Baker 2006). This view is confirmed by Talal Asad (1986) who thinks that a cultural translator is in the position of knowing better than a cultural text, which is relegated to the status of an unknowing provider of source material for interpretation. An imbalance of power and of source and target languages emerges (cf. Álvarez and Vidal 1996).

There is a more figurative use of the term cultural translation, common in postcolonial studies. In this understanding, translation is less a procedure but itself the very fabric of culture. Translation is understood metaphorically, as a hybrid in language and cultural identity, culture being both a transnational and translational hybrid (Bhabha 1994: 7). Translation means a process of mixing and mutual contamination, a third space beyond both source culture and target culture, where “conflicts arising from cultural difference and the different social discourses involved in those conflicts are negotiated” (Wolf 2002: 190). Understood in this way, cultural translation dissolves the notions of source-language culture and target-language culture. Doris Bachmann-Medick (2006: 37) argues for a hybrid model, in which cultures are seen as processes, not locations, of translation, constantly shifting, multiplying, and diversifying. Cultural translation would thus mean an anti-essentialist and anti-holistic metaphor. It would aim to uncover counter-discourses, discursive forms, and resistant actions in a culture, “heterogeneous discursive spaces within a society.”

This kind of postcolonial and postmodernist use of the concept of translation does not totally exclude translation as an interlingual practice, but is clearly more interested in wider senses of translation. Going to extremes, cultural translation may undervalue the linguistic differences between cultures (Trivedi 2005). Extended uses of the translation metaphor in anthropological and cultural studies may present a false sense of monolinguism, “globally dominant English without the need for bilingual translation to take place” (Sturge 2011: 69).

Translation cannot be reduced into a mere interlingual practice. There is a need to preserve a place for translation as a basically bilingual, bicultural action, addressing directly the real situation in the world with concrete linguistic and cultural differences. Translation of a literary text deals with both languages and cultures. Translation studies has come a long way from John C. Catford’s book *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics* (1965) to Homi Bhabha’s work *The Location of Culture* (1994) and to the title of its Chapter 11, just before the concluding chapter,

---

132 The idea of culture as text was set out by Clifford Geertz in his *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973). As the title indicates, Geertz’s view is a hermeneutic approach to cultures, capable of being read as texts. Then the concept of translation becomes important. Critics of Geertz have argued that culture is not a text or a system, but rather a historically contingent conversation and interaction (e.g. Pálsson 1993). This argument comes close to the concept of general intertextuality (see Section 5.3.2 below).
“How newness enters the world: Postmodern space, postcolonial times and the trials of cultural translation.” There is no doubt in translation studies on this: it is always also culture that will be translated, not only the language (e.g. Reiβ und Vermeer 1984: 4).

4.2 Interdisciplinary translation studies

If ‘culture’ is a complex term, so is ‘translation,’ too. And yet, there have been literary translations for almost as long as literature has existed. Beginning with the early translations of the Classical authors of ancient Greece and Rome and the first translations of the Bible, translation studies has always been based on the practice of translating. Among the most famous theoreticians in the European contexts are Martin Luther (1483–1546), Etienne Dolet (1509–1546), John Dryden (1631–1700), and Alexander Frazer Tytler (1747–1813; see Robinson 2002). The academic roots of translation studies have been situated in (applied) linguistics and/or comparative literature; however, as a discipline, it has adopted and adapted concepts and methods from text linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and more recently, from history, and cultural as well as postcolonial studies. Many interdisciplines are possible in translation studies.

One of the characteristics of translation studies is that there are no watertight categories for translation. In recent years research into translation has become diverse. However, many reference books seem to take for granted – or explicitly refer to – the tripartite definition of translation by Roman Jakobson (1971: 261). His first category is intralingual translation or rewording. This means “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language.” Jakobson’s second category is interlingual translation or translation proper. This means “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language.” His third category is intersemiotic translation or transmutation. This category involves “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems.”

Roman Jakobson’s use of the word interpretation is noteworthy. Each reading and understanding of any text necessarily constitutes an interpretation. The issue of hermeneutics cannot be avoided in translation. The features of a text cannot be discussed without some reference to text production and/or interpretation (Fairclough 2000: 73). Translation always involves some form of interpretation. In order to translate a text, a translator needs to make an interpretation out of it. To
guide his or her interpretation, it is necessary that s/he knows both the source and the target linguistic system (the word) and cultural system (semiotic knowledge).^{133}

The term ‘translation studies’, first proposed by James S. Holmes in 1972 (in Holmes 1988) – has become established within the English-speaking world. It was Holmes, too, who presented a “map” of translation studies, graphically presented by Gideon Toury in Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond (1995: 10). The map divides the discipline into pure and applied applications. The pure side is then subdivided into theoretical and descriptive, and then further subdivided. Nowadays, it seems that most scholars argue that translation studies must be descriptive rather than prescriptive (see, e.g., Toury 1995; cf. Toury 1980, Lefevere 1992b, Munday 2008). “The descriptive and systemic perspective on translation and on studying translation was prepared in the 1960s, developed in the 1970s, propagated in the 1980s, and consolidated, expanded and overhauled in the 1990s” (Hermans 1999: 9).

In introducing the term ‘descriptive translation studies’, Holmes wished to establish translation research as a scholarly discipline and to lay its epistemological foundations. Later, especially Gideon Toury, Theo Hermans, and José Lambert have been instrumental in reaching this goal and establishing translation studies as an academic discipline (Brownlie 2011: 78). In an article that was published in 1972, Holmes (1988: 71) proposed that the study of translation should seek illumination rather than to hand down rules on how to translate. It can be argued that “the core activity of the discipline was to be theoretical and descriptive, with any prescriptive orientation relegated strictly to the applied branch” (Brownlie 2011: 77). The objectives of descriptive translation studies are to describe, explain, and predict translational phenomena (Brownlie 2011: 77; see also Shuttleworth & Cowie 1999: 38–40), as it actually occurs and has occurred, as part of cultural history.

Typical for Toury and other descriptivists has been that they reject value-laden evaluations of target texts in relation to their source texts. They replace the idea of “X must be translated as Y” by a more descriptive approach: “in this text, which is produced under such and such conditions and constraints, X is translated as Y.” Toury speaks of norms that affect the translation process, from the beginning as the selection of texts to be translated to the real textual choices on a page. Norms lead to generalizations, which, in turn, lead to the formulation of probabilistic laws of translation

^{133} A good example of this linguistic-cultural-religious knowledge is the term mourners’ bench or mourners’ pew in Light in August (see Section 6.2.4 below). Without a cultural knowledge of the Southern tradition of revival meetings and a knowledge of its use by the Anglo-American religious culture, mere linguistic competence will hardly suffice to find its adequate translation in Finnish – nor will it be accessible to an Anglophone reader unfamiliar with the specific religious culture. S/he would need Roman Jakobson’s “intralingual translation.”
and to the idea of translation universals (see Pym, Shlesinger & Simeoni 2008). A result of
descriptive translation studies has been that norms and laws have been understood primarily as
constraints on translation rather than something creative and imaginative.

Analyses of translations may reveal patterns of discrepancies between a source text and a target
proposes the following rule of thumb: “Isolated deviations are mistakes; deviations that can be
shown to follow certain patterns indicate a strategy the translator has developed to deal with the text
as a whole.” Related to this, one of the debated issues in translation studies has been the concept of
strategy, which basically means an action undertaken to achieve a particular goal in an optimal way.
The term has been used in different ways in translation studies, meaning ‘procedures,’ ‘techniques
of adjustment,’ ‘transformations,’ ‘transfer operations,’ etc. (Kearns 2011: 282; see a list by
Kwieciński 2001: 121).

Proposals have been made to distinguish between procedural strategies and textual strategies
(Molina and Hurtado Albir 2002). Procedural strategies have been used by psycholinguistic and
cognitive approaches to translation and have focused on solving problems. Textual strategies
concentrate on the results of procedures rather than on procedures themselves. They tend to focus
on such issues as free vs. literal translation or on translatability. As such, distinctions between the
two strategies are not always clear. Another possible dichotomy is local strategies versus global
strategies (see, e.g., Jääskeläinen 1993). Local strategies mean translations of specific language
structures and lexical items, units in the text, whereas global strategies concentrate on broader
issues involving the text as a whole, such as textual style and omissions and emphasis of specific
aspects of the source text (Kearns 2011: 282–284). This division is controversial, too (see, e.g.,
Chesterman 2005). Other classifications of strategies have been proposed, as well (e.g. Lörscher

Lawrence Venuti has worked in the area of global translation strategies. Reacting to Friedrich
Schleiermacher’s suggestion of 1813 (see Schleiermacher 2008), Venuti proposes that those aspects
of a source text that are foreign to a monolingual culture, such as Anglo-American culture, should
be valorized and transferred into the target culture. This foreignizing method is called “resistancy”
by Venuti, for whom domestication has negative connotations. He notes that whereas
foreignization and domestication indicate ethical attitudes toward a foreign text and culture, such
terms as ‘resistancy’ and ‘fluency’ indicate discursive features of translation strategies, related to
the target text reader’s cognitive processing (cf. Kwieciński 2001: 13–15). For Venuti,
foreignization becomes a genuine strategy of translation, including even the choice of the text to be
translated. It transcends literalism. Whereas domestication entails finding a transparent, fluent style
and minimizing the strangeness of the foreign text for its target language readers, Schleiermacher himself preferred a foreignizing practice in a deliberate desire to break target text’s cultural conventions. This means for the reader “the impression he would have received as a German reading the work in the original language.” (Schleiermacher 2008: 50).134

However, even foreignizing a translation necessarily domesticates it and allows values of target culture to emerge. Foreignizing translations that are opaque “are equally partial in their interpretation of the foreign text, but they tend to flaunt their partiality instead of concealing it” (Venuti 2008a: 28–29). In view of their fuzziness, these notions describe tendencies more than anything else. Foreignization and domestication may be useful concepts, but as such they cannot serve as the basis of a new translation paradigm (Snell-Hornby 2006: 145). They describe a spectrum rather than a binary opposition, and raise the issue of ethics of translation in cultural translation: whether to lean more toward naturalization/domestication, or more toward exoticization/foreignization (Sturge 2011: 67).

An important aspect of culture is the issue of societal power relations. For sociologists and translation studies scholars, individuals are said to have many cultural provenances and to be continually negotiating their position in complex, competing cultural systems. In translation studies, e.g. Itamar Even-Zohar with polysystemic theory (1990), Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi (1999) and Tejaswini Niranjana (1992) with postcolonial theory in relation to power relations, and Mona Baker with narrative theory (2006), share this approach to culture (Katan 2009: 87). In addition, culture itself is constantly subject to questioning. Texts and translators can be considered to be carriers of ideologies. This means that even the whole system in which translators work is subject to doubt. Translators work between different power systems that are competing and unequal. They are aware that texts as well as themselves are carriers of various ideologies. The translator becomes an ethical agent or maybe an activist (Katan 2009: 88; cf. Fairclough 1994). His or her decisions as a critical reader and as a writer determine to a large extent the way a reader interprets a text. Translation from this angle raises many ethical questions concerning power, hegemony, and cultural values (Katan 2011: 73).

Indeed, translation does not take place in a cultural vacuum. As cultural processes entail a constant borrowing and mixing of ideas and practices (Lohmann 2005: 2088), the role of translation remains significant, as translation brings otherness and the other to another culture. It has been clearly understood that “culture is communication and communication is culture” (Hall 1990: 186).

---

134 “... dem Leser durch die Uebersezung den Eindrukk zu geben, den er als Deutscher aus der Lesung des Werkes in der Ursprache empfangen würde...” (Störig 1963: 49).
Especially in the 1990s links between translation studies and cultural studies became stronger. In their 1990 article André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett called this phenomenon the “cultural turn” in translation studies. They noted that “neither the word, nor the text, but the culture becomes the operational ‘unit’ of translation” (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990: 8). Culture and the cultural context seem to be at the heart of that statement. The cultural context includes the speakers’ and writers’ social conditions, professions, education, etc. (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990: 4; Snell-Hornby 2006: 47–67). Not surprisingly, such diverse currents in translation studies as descriptive translation studies (e.g. Gideon Toury), the polysystemic theory (e.g. Itamar Even-Zohar), the Manipulation School (e.g. Theo Hermans) with its exact methodology for the case studies, the skopos theory (e.g. Hans J. Vermeer) focusing above all on the purpose of the translation, and the Göttingen Research Group (e.g. Armin Paul Frank) with its emphasis on transfer-orientation rather than target-orientation can all be included into the cultural turn in translation studies (see Tirkkonen-Condit 2007: 348–349). This has led to a greater emphasis on cultural studies in translation studies involving e.g. postcolonial and feminist/gender issues; the concept of norms, constraints, and rules within descriptive translation studies; ethics, identity formation and ideology; patronage and translation as “rewriting” (Munday 2009: 11). Many works on translation and gender studies, translation and postcolonial studies, translation and minorities, etc., fall within the scope of descriptive translation studies. As religion is part of culture, translations studies cannot ignore religion, either.

4.3 **Religion and religious language as part of culture**

Like culture and translation, the concept of ‘religion’ is rather complex. The etymology of the term is most commonly associated with two Latin verbs, *religare*, meaning ‘to bind, to fasten,’ and *relegere*, ‘to collect again, to go over again [as in reading]’ (Alles 2005: 7702). Some scholars think that religion can be defined functionally, through what religions do. Other scholars, like Melford Spiro, demand that conceptions of religion must be substantive. Spiro (1969: 96) defines religion as “an institutio consisting of culturally patterned interaction with culturally postulated superhuman beings.” Following this, religion is part of any cultural heritage. Superhuman beings are beings

---

135 This definition can be compared with another famous one by Emile Durkheim (1964: 47): “A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden – beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere them.” Durkheim strongly emphasizes the collective moral character of a religion. Cf. Durkheim 1979: 34.
that are believed to be more powerful than human beings, working for or against them. Their existence is, Spiro (1969: 98) argues, “culturally postulated.” Spiro also argues that any culturally postulated institution consists of belief systems, action systems, and value systems. Religions differ from the other institutions precisely in that their three component systems have reference to superhuman beings.

The term ‘religion’ can be defined on the basis of the Austria-born philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein’s reflections on family resemblances (Wittgenstein 2001: 66–67). Religion can be conceived polythetically rather than monothetically. The monothetical approach considers all properties of a religion as necessary, and together they are sufficient to define religion. The polythetical approach is more relaxed: it considers no particular property as necessary to religion, as the presence of a collection of properties selected from a master set is “sufficient to make a specific item a member of the class called religion.” (Alles 2005: 7703; cf. Needham 1975.) However, none of the polythetical approaches proposed so far has been particularly successful (see Alston 1967 as one of the earliest attempts to define religion polythetically). These difficulties have led some scholars to suggest that the term ‘religion’ should be replaced by such terms as ‘faith,’ ‘worldview,’ ‘social formation,’ or, not surprisingly, ‘culture’ (Alles 2005: 7705). Universal definitions of religion can be contested: “My argument is that there cannot be a universal definition of religion, not only because its constituent elements and relationships are historically specific, but because that definition is itself the historical product of discursive processes.” (Asad 1993: 29.) Nevertheless, there is no need to abandon religion as a concept despite its fuzzy edges, as the same affirmation can be said about culture.

As the terms themselves, the relationship between culture and religion is complex, too. Biological factors certainly enhance religious behavior, but it also needs cultural inputs and processes, as culture overlays and elaborates the biological components and gives them meanings that motivate a human being in his or her religion. Cultures shape religions, and religions penetrate cultures. This interaction between religions and culture makes religions profoundly and inherently cultural. It is not possible to understand a specific religious system – e.g. the Southern Protestantism – without recourse to culture. Beck, Frandsen & Randall (2012: xxix) strikingly say: “Understanding the unique brand of Christianity practiced in the South by most people is, therefore, critical to understanding Southern culture.” In other words, particular religious traditions are forms of culture, and they exist within broader cultures (Lohmann 2005: 2089). In addition, no peoples or cultures
lack religious thinking and behavior. Following these lines, the view adopted in this study is that culture is a broader concept than religion. Religion is thus subsumed under culture, and there is a continuous interrelation between them. The Protestantism in the American South is socially learned and widely shared by most people within Southern culture, strongly reflected also in *Light in August*.

Religion, as part of culture, needs language. Religious language may be generally understood to be those written or spoken texts that are used in various religions for religious purposes (Jeffner 1972: 3). However, it can be argued, too, that religious language is language that uses religious concepts to communicate religious issues. It most probably uses the same rules of phonology, morphology, and syntax as those of other types of language. Some scholars (e.g. Yri 1998: 17; cf. Grass 1967: 129) believe that there is no need to create a theory of religious language.

An important distinction is made between religious language or language of religion, and language about religion (Kela 2007: 16). The former is the language of the practice of religion, used in religious situations and/or places: the language of prayer, allusions to sacred texts, any situation where a human being meets with transcendence. In *Light in August*, Joanna Burden uses this kind of language. The latter is the language of theologians and philosophers who want to talk about religious language, but do not engage themselves. This is a type of ex-Reverend Gail Hightower’s discourse in *Light in August*.

Religious language always is a language of a speech community. The Finnish scholar Päivikki Suojanen (1975: 231) has emphasized two dimensions of religious language. One must experience as sacred both the speech situation and the speech content:

> I understand religious language to be a system that is spoken, read, written or/and interpreted either in a situation experienced to be sacred, or in a situation in which such states of consciousness and items are considered by a social group or an individual to be holy and religious in nature. The choice of the elements of this system is regulated by the religious tradition of the speech community and its social network.137
Suojanen’s definition is more anthropological and sociological than linguistic. She strongly argues that these two aspects are the ones from which religious language is to be studied: linguistic and social structural (Suojanen 1975: 231). One reason for the scarcity of definitions of religious language is that an exclusively linguistic analysis is not capable of describing many important dimensions of religious language, nor can it distinguish it from other types of language use or language forms. Religious language is not a logical entity, as its usage varies even in the use of one single individual (Suojanen 1975: 242). Suojanen’s own definition does not limit religious language only to the language of the Christian religion; it can be applied to the language used by any human group in a religious situation, and her emphasis is on the study of religious language from the point of view of the speech situation.

Suojanen (1975: 232) warns the reader against using the term ‘religious language’ too inclusively to refer to all communication concerning that which is believed, e.g. folk stories, traditional stories, etc. She proposes three limiting conditions for religious language: first, the situation must be religious for those present (e.g. a worship service, burial, marriage), and/or, secondly, the topic must be considered sacred by the group in question (e.g. reading the Bible or catechism, prayer), and/or, thirdly, the roles required by the situation are totally or partly supranormal (e.g. that of a priest). There are no pure languages or uses of languages; the situations and uses change and vary. But at least in principle, any word of a language may be used religiously. Suojanen (1975: 255) also notes that religious terms are often situated on a high abstract level. On the one hand, this kind of language seldom has an exact meaning or contents. On the other, in institutionalized organizations religious concepts are usually defined by religious scholars or theologians as normative concepts that can be understood rightly or wrongly (Yri 1998: 17, 30–31).

Ludwig Wittgenstein is sometimes seen as the pioneer of research on religious language, and especially his later writings (Wittgenstein’s “second philosophy”) are important in this respect. He observed that the meaning of a word depends on its function and use (Wittgenstein 2001: 18e; cf. p. 93e). In those writings that were to serve as the basis of linguistic philosophy,138 he deals with religious expressions. The major work of the later Wittgenstein, Philosophical Investigations (Philosophische Untersuchungen 1953), starts strikingly with a reference to one of the greatest Christian theologians and philosophers, Augustine, and then starts to deal with the concept of language-game, i.e. “the whole process of using words… as one of those games by means of which children learn their native language. I will call these games ‘language-games’” (Wittgenstein 2001: 4e; cf. Hick 1990: 96–97). The whole concept is rather complicated, however, as he immediately

---

138 Also called ordinary language philosophy; see Quinton 2005.
presents two other definitions and ways to use the concept. First, he affirms that a language-game can be naming the stones or repeating words after someone. Secondly, he calls “the whole, consisting of language and the actions into which it is woven, a ‘language-game’” (Wittgenstein 2001: 4e; cf. Työrinoja 1984: 105).

A basic idea of Wittgenstein confirms that religious language cannot be separated from other uses of language and that religious language can be found anywhere, e.g. in literature. In a religious language-game a word has no separate meaning. Its meaning is always derived from the language in a language-game. Outside this language-game, the meaning of a word either disappears, is transformed, or is distorted. A religious word has no specific religious meaning; its religious meaning is linked with the other uses of the word. When an ordinary word is used in religious language, it is used according to new rules that operate analogically with the old rules in the ordinary language (Työrinoja 1984: 103–107, 130–131, 149–151). In *Philosophical Investigations*, Wittgenstein (2001: 10e) gives a list of the “multiplicity of language-games.” He ends the list with the following passage: “… Translating from one language into another – Requesting, thanking, cursing, greeting, praying.” Interestingly enough, he closely links translation and religion (praying), both of which are cultural phenomena.

There is not a single watertight definition of religious language, as it is a broad concept and can be approached in diverse ways. A very basic definition then, but adequate for the purposes of the present study, is to say that religious language is language used in culturally religious situations and/or language used when religious issues are spoken of or written about in reference to somebody/something that one considers to be transcendent, i.e., belonging to another world, and to be more powerful than oneself (cf. Nissi & Mielikäinen 2014). This is a cultural and relational dimension of language. Religious language is not only a linguistic phenomenon, as it inevitably goes to the deeper levels of culture than the technical level (see Section 4.1 above) and includes a relation between human beings and a human being with himself or herself (cf. Grass 1967: 134). Especially in the western world, this type of language has been closely linked with biblical and ecclesiastical language, used in *Light in August*.

### 4.4 Summarizing remarks

In this chapter we have seen how the concepts of culture, translation, and religion are complex. Culture includes language and religion as its parts. In this study it becomes clear that translation is a transaction between cultures and languages. It necessarily includes both linguistic and cultural dimensions, and religion is an essential part of any culture, using language. Translation as a cultural...
practice is not new, whereas translation studies as an academic discipline is fairly new. Born inherently interdisciplinary, it is eager to push the range of the discipline “as wide and retrospectively as far back as possible” (Trivedi 2005) which is understandable for the sake of identity. There has been a development in translation studies from a linguistic emphasis to a cultural turn, i.e., from translation only – or mainly – as a linguistic operation to translation as the “adaptation of everything to the dominant idiom of western capitalism” (Sturge 2011: 69). The academic roots of translation studies have been in applied linguistics, but it has profited the contact with anthropology, ethnology, and more recently, with cultural and postcolonial studies (see Niranjana 1992). A risk of the widened use of the concept of translation in so many different meanings (e.g. Bhabha’s 1994 sense of human migrancy) is that it loses all of its meaning. When everything becomes translation, nothing is translation.

Translation studies apparently vacillate between grand theory and close textual interpretation. What is often missing is the middle ground.139 Brian McHale (1994: 65) reclaims mid-range theory in literary studies and states:

> Instead of theory being brought to bear directly on the text, so as to yield an interpretation that is, in effect, merely a mirror or double of the theory that underwrites it, the introduction of a descriptive level compels our discourse to hesitate, to linger over or circulate among a range of possibilities. Instead of rushing to specify a text’s meaning in the light of a theory, the descriptive project encourages us to map out a range of possible meanings, or to seek to grasp the conditions of meaning in specific texts.

This middle ground is preferably to be reclaimed in translation studies, and the present interdisciplinary study intends to be a step in that direction. In this study a plural approach, i.e., plural perspectives on translation, is adopted. An approach to translation that extends beyond its interlingual aspects is important for the present study as long as it does not undervalue the linguistic differences (Trivedi 2007). Translation studies has to come to terms with its interdisciplinary and hybrid nature without losing its more traditional coexisting sense. One of the signs of this interdisciplinary and hybrid nature of translation studies is the ability to include theoretical and methodological tools that come from other disciplines. The study argues that there is a methodological tool, having its roots in linguistics, which can be fruitfully used to make us “map out a range of possible meanings” in translation and translation studies. This concept is intertextuality, and it will be the topic of the next chapter.

---

139 To reclaim this area between theory and interpretation, Hermans’s (1999) suggestion is to turn to sociology (e.g. Pierre Bourdieu and Niklas Luhmann).
5 INTERTEXTUALITY AS A METHODOLOGICAL TOOL IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

5.1 Intertextuality or intertextualities?

Language and translation include texts in a wide sense but here we are concerned with a specific aspect of their relations. There is, in particular, a concept that seems to be useful for translation studies in the sense that it can help us to understand better various components and dimensions of culture, religion, and language, and to keep them together when doing research into translation. This concept is intertextuality, which is not foreign to translation as it can be argued that translation is inherently one sort of intertextuality. In this chapter, I will first consider the concept of intertextuality, its origin and introduction into scholarly discussion, its various meanings, and then consider its usefulness for translation studies. I argue that especially for translation studies intertextuality is a good methodological tool.

‘Intertextuality’ is a term used in many ways. It is an expression which refers to a universal phenomenon that basically signifies “all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts” (Genette 1997: 1). In other words, it means – at least – the actual presence of one or many other texts within another. As a single text does not come into being or exist in total isolation and is necessarily connected with earlier and later texts, it becomes clear that this is a phenomenon that engages translation and translated works. In that sense, even though intertextuality as a technical term was not launched until the late 1960s, as will be seen, as a phenomenon it has been part of western literal tradition since Antiquity, i.e., at least as long as translation has existed.

From the point of view of this study, there are interesting connections between intertextuality, translation studies, and two of Michel Foucault’s (Foucault 1972; 1984) ideas. The first is the...

---


142 Allen (2011: 98) is of the opinion that Genette’s structuralist intertextuality is different from the intertextuality of poststructuralism, as Genette does not include semiotic processes of cultural and textual signification. However, Allen (2011: 99; cf. Morgan 1989) admits that the tension between two kinds of intertextuality is not resolvable.
constitutive nature of discourse. For Foucault, discourse constitutes the social, including “objects” and social “subjects.” Discourse helps to construct social relationships between people, but it also helps to construct systems of knowledge and belief. This is clear e.g. in the case of religious language. In a discourse, this can happen in a cross section where the intertextual background of a text becomes tangible for a reader.

The second is the primacy of intertextuality; that any discursive practice is defined by its relations with others and draws upon them in various and complex ways (Foucault 1972 and 1984; cf. Fairclough 2000: 37–61). Foucault (1972: 98) claims that “there can be no statement that in one way or another does not reactualize others.” The major difference between Foucault’s approach and the one taken in this study is that Foucault’s analysis of discourse does not include analysis of real texts, whereas the present study is an analysis of an existing literary text and its translations. The function of intertextuality in translation is a process whose result cannot be mechanically calculated. There is no predestined result because there is a human factor, the contributing and to some extent unpredictable reader-translator, between the source text and the target text.

Foucault’s ideas are reminiscent of writings on genre and dialogism by the Russian scholar Mikhail Bakhtin (Bakhtin 1990; 2002), which the French poststructuralist Julia Kristeva introduced to western audiences with the term ‘intertextuality,’ which she coined in the late 1960s (see Kristeva 1967; intertextualité in French; Kristeva 1969; intertextuality in the English translation of the 1967 French article in Kristeva 1980b). Julia Kristeva (1980b: 66) affirms that “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations... The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double.” Through Mikhail Bakhtin, she saw each text as a web of citations, full of influences from other texts. She saw texts as functioning along two axes: the first is the horizontal axis that determines the relationship between the reader and the text whilst the second is the vertical axis that contains the complex set of relations of the text to other texts (Lea 2006: 121; cf. Orr 2008: 26). “The word’s status is thus defined horizontally (the word in the text belongs to both writing subject and addressee) as well as vertically (the word in the text is oriented toward an anterior or synchronic literary corpus.” (Kristeva 1980b: 66; 145)

---

143 Morgan (1989: 274) remarks that “Foucault’s idea of the ‘always already’ of our knowledge resonates with Bakhtin’s emphasis on the fundamental interdiscursivity of the human world”.

144 And also interpretation, following Fairclough’s (2000: 73) category that “procedure which deals with the analysis of texts can be called ‘description’, and the parts which deal with analysis of discourse practice and with analysis of the social practice of which the discourse is a part can be called ‘interpretation’.”

145 As far as I know, there has not been so far a wider cultural historical research of the term, although it would be very useful.
emphasis in the original). These two axes join in the framework of pre-existing codes that guide and shape every text and its reading. Reading becomes a process of moving between texts. Horizontal intertextual relations are those between a text and those texts which precede and follow it in the chain of texts, that is, they are relations a text has to other specific texts.

Two intertextual examples are speaking turns and a letter. Speaking turns in a conversation respond to turns that precede them, and equally anticipate those that will follow. A letter in turn is related to earlier and subsequent letters within a given correspondence. Vertical intertextual relations exist between a text and other texts that constitute its more or less immediate or distant contexts, i.e. intertextual relations of texts to conventions.

Both of these intertextual relations may refer to linguistic, generic, and structural relations. At least it can be argued that intertextuality means that texts are full of snatches of other texts which the text may assimilate, contradict, echo, or relate to in some ways. These other, prior texts have contributed to their production and meaning. In other words, texts always constitute additions to existing chains of speech communication (Bakhtin 2002: 94). It can be argued that intertextuality has its roots in the origins of 20th century linguistics, in particular in the work of the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (Allen 2011: 2; see Saussure 2008). It seems that Julia Kristeva attempted to combine both Saussurean and Bakhtinian theories of language and literature (Kristeva 1980b: 69; cf. Hayes 2002: 27).

It must be noted that the term intertextuality is not used by Bakhtin himself, and yet, in his work, the development of translinguistic (in Kristeva’s terms: intertextual) analysis of texts was a major theme, closely linked to some other issues of language including his theory of genre (Bakhtin 2002, written in the early 1950s). He was one of the first scholars to underline the social character of language which makes it dialogical. He observes how the ways in which written and spoken texts are related to each other, to those prior texts they respond to, and to those subsequent texts they anticipate. All texts are demarcated by a change of writer or speaker, and are oriented retrospectively to the utterances of previous speakers. They are also oriented prospectively to the anticipated utterance of the next writers or speakers. “Our speech… is filled with others’ words,

---

146 For Saussure (2008), signs are not referential. Their meaning is determined by the combinations and associations in relation to other signs. Signs exist within a system and have their meaning through their similarity to and difference from other signs. Meaning resides in the sign. Structuralism based its ideas on Saussure’s definitions of sign and linguistic structure.


148 Kristeva privileges the term ‘text’ in order to remove any bias in Bakhtin toward the spoken utterances (Still and Worton 1991: 16).
varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of ‘our-own-ness,’ varying degrees of awareness and detachment. These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate.” (Bakhtin 2002: 89.) Texts are thus inherently intertextual in the sense that they are constituted by elements which originated in other texts. When we read a text, we unconsciously compare it to other texts we have read, even though it may be that we do not remember those texts. Also, we do not learn language by reading a dictionary but through other speakers and writers.149

This means that a text cannot exist as a hermetic or self-sufficient entity, and that it is not a closed system. The writer is also, to a nontrivial extent, a reader of texts. The repetition of other texts – past or contemporary – can range “from the most conscious and sophisticated elaboration of other poets’ work, to a scholarly use of sources, or the quotation (with or without the use of quotation marks) of snatches of conversation typical of a certain social milieu at a certain historical moment.” (Still and Worton 1991: 1). The whole cultural and socio-political context (cf. Foucault) is a larger framework of texts.

Intertextuality has been used by structuralist and poststructuralist theorists to show that language is a code system existing before and irrespective of whether a given speaker makes any communicative act. Structuralists basically identified language as a series of interconnections between signs. Consequently, it became important to recognize the relationships between signs and the ways they interact to produce “meaning-formations” (Lea 2006: 121). This meant that a code system of language and genre was given a preponderant place, and the importance of the author began to decline. In France Kristeva introduced the term ‘intertextuality’ during a period when structuralism was debated, leading to the emergence of poststructuralism. Structuralists emphasized the idea that human culture may be best understood by analogy with language, i.e., through a linguistic structure that is distinct from the organizations of reality and ideas. Poststructuralists150 emphasize not only the ways in which signs depend on each other, but also the ways in which the more complex relations, especially texts, depend on each other for their meaning. Texts refer to

149 Pfister (1985: 4–5) claims that Bakhtin’s theory is dominantly intratextual and not intertextual: “Damit ist Bachtins Theorie dominant intratextuell, nicht intertextuell. Und die fremden Wörter und die fremden Reden außerhalb seiner selbst, auf die sich ein Sprachkunstwerk bezieht, sind in Bachtins Sicht nicht dominant literarisch, sondern eben ‘alle sozioideologischen Stimmen der Epoche’, der allgemeine Diskurs der Zeit, für den der literarische Diskurs nur einen schmalen Sektor ausmacht.”

150 Seminal poststructuralist thinkers are, e.g., Jacques Lacan, Jacques Derrida, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, and Louis Althusser. It was Roland Barthes who provided the entry for ‘Texte (théorie du)’, in the French Encyclopédie universalis in 1973.
other texts. These meaning-forming interconnections take place within the structures and frameworks of genre and discourse (Lea 2006: 121). Pre-existing linguistic codes and structures mean that everyone is already positioned within certain interpretive systems and can use only those systems that are available to him or her when s/he describes the reality. Julia Kristeva’s interpretation of Mikhail Bakhtin shows how poststructuralism already inhabits structuralist discourse: “What allows a dynamic dimension to structuralism is his [Bakhtin’s] conception of the ‘literary word’ as an intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point (a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character), and the contemporary or earlier context.” (Kristeva 1980b: 65.)

It must be emphasized that the idea of ‘intertextuality’ according to Bakhtin was conceived in a different kind of linguistic understanding than Kristeva’s (cf. Allen 2011: 16). Bakhtin viewed language and types of discourse as social systems more than anything else. A text is for him part of a spoken utterance, it refers to other utterances, i.e., it is characteristically dialogical. An oral dialogue, speaking, is part of the human being’s social being. Bakhtin’s work centers on human beings employing language in specific social situations. Bakhtinian dialogism or intertextuality implies “the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history” (Kristeva 1980b: 68). The insertion of history into a text means that the text absorbs and is constituted by texts from the past, history, as texts are artefacts that constitute history. The insertion of a text into history means that as the text “responds to, reaccentuates, and reworks past texts,” it helps to make history and contributes to wider processes of shape in society as well as it anticipates and tries to shape subsequent texts (Fairclough 2000: 102).

Thus, Julia Kristeva’s intertextual idea of Mikhail Bakhtin’s dialogism is limited to dealing with no direct reference to the reality outside of texts, where dialogue takes place as social reality. Texts refer only to each other, speak only of each other; they do not speak of a world outside the texts (Saariluoma 1998a: 9).\footnote{Cf. Pfister (1985: 8): “Kristevas Konzept der Intertextualität ist dagegen für sie der texttheoretische Hebel, mit dem sie im Kontext einer marxistisch-freudianischen Dekonstruktion der Subjektivität der bürgerlichen Begriff eines autonomen und intentionalen Subjekts aus den Angeln heben will.”} She seems to evade human subjects in favor of the more abstract terms, i.e., texts and textuality (cf. Kristeva 1980b: 71 and 1980a). It was Gérard Genette, among others, who in the second-wave response redefined Julia Kristeva’s intertextuality as the five-pronged intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality, and architextuality (Genette 1997: 1–5).
Another important current working in the same direction of intertextuality has been
deconstruction (see, e.g., Richmond 2005; Culler 1993; cf. Morgan 1989). One of the most famous
representatives of this philosophical and literary criticism current has been the French philosopher
Jacques Derrida. “Intertextuality… means that for Barthes, as for Derrida, ‘nothing exists outside
the text’ [Barthes’s famous phrase in French: ‘il n’y a pas de hors texte’; see Barthes 1974: 6]…
text here meaning the intertextual” (Allen 2011: 71).152

Any expression whatsoever is intertextual and can be referred to another text or other texts. In
fact, intertextuality becomes the condition *sine qua non* for the existence of a text. The
identification of an intertext is an act of interpretation, and the intertext cannot be regarded as a real
and causative source but as a theoretical construct, serving the purposes of a reading (Frow 1990:
46). The link is not absolute and cannot be objectively defined, as it is generated in each reading
process and for the purposes of each reading. The occasional appearance of that kind of
intertextuality means that it is difficult, or occasionally even impossible, to research on anonymous
or unconscious connections. For this reason, there is no generally accepted methodology of research
on intertextuality, and the research has remained on a rather abstract level (Ruokonen 2006: 61).
This may also be one reason why any study of translation practices and strategies is relative, not
absolute, as the link between text and other texts is not absolute.153

These intertextual ideas of structuralist and poststructuralist theorists disturb a belief in the
uniqueness of a text and/or in the originality of an author. However, until the Renaissance it was
commonly accepted that a literary text was a patchwork of existing texts. This patchwork either
directly appropriated or indirectly modified existing texts into a new form. The identity of the
author was not so important. Literature was a common matter, and themes, mythical elements, and
forms of expressions were at everybody’s disposal, and were repeated from one work to another. A
literal work was no one’s private property; it was part of tradition, and the free use of contents and
styles proposed by tradition was natural.154 The Bible, the myths of Antiquity, and history were
continuously used as the source texts.

152 See Koskinen (2000) for translation studies and Derrida.
153 Newmark (1988: xii) notes: “There are no absolutes in translation, everything is conditional, any principle (e.g.
accuracy) may be in opposition to another (e.g. economy) or at least there may be tension between them.”
154 Orr (2008: 97) affirms that all western cultural forms hark back to Plato and Aristotle: “Neither those forms that
follow a strictly Aristotelian lineage (genre classifications, Formalist theories of literary properties, rhetoric) nor those
that follow a strictly Platonist line (the *mise en abyme* of representation itself, including intertextuality and
deconstruction as its postmodernist variants) can deny the ultimate importance of imitatio per se or mimesis as central
But tradition did not offer only literal sources, it also offered ideals of successful literary works and figures, e.g. Homer, Virgil, and Cicero, and their masterpieces were unattainable and eternal models (Saariluoma 1998a: 7). Even after the Renaissance, texts were often revisions of prior works not regarded as copies but as “respectful homages to tradition and to the skill of the source-material” (Lea 2006: 122).

It was the second half of the 18th century that saw this classical paradigm abandoned. Romanticism gave importance to the notion of authorial originality. Romantics emphasized the idea of the singularity of the creative consciousness. In doing this, they naturally opened the door to the modern concept of individualism. As regards texts, they became “a product of an autonomously acting mind and something that is unique as the vision of the individual that inspired it” (Lea 2006: 122; cf. also Plett 1991: 19 and Koppenfels 1985: 142–143). Especially early German Romantics supported the modern idea that an artist creates art through his or her experiences and life. As an oeuvre expresses a unique experience, it cannot be constituted by elements from outside. Tradition was no longer the source; rather, it was the person of an artist, his or her experiences and life which gained in importance: an authentic artist was one who relied on himself or herself, and not on the works of others. To borrow from others would seriously question the originality of art (Saariluoma 1998a: 8).

In the 19th century Realism did not forsake the romantic idea of original genius, even though an artist was understood more like the parallel figure of a scientist researching the universe. Creativity and originality were not abandoned when realistic descriptions of society and people were set as the aim of art. A realist did not see the importance of tradition when s/he autonomously researched the reality. The “Real” is that which is here and now and can be empirically verified. In fact, an author described reality in such a way that a reader experienced the presence of that which was described. But s/he had to conceal those means by which this illusion was made – the whole arsenal of literary tradition. A literary work should not seem to be built on literary tradition but directly on life (Saariluoma 1998a: 8).

In the 20th century, Modernism questioned the existence of a common reality that could be objectively described. It was replaced by a reality experienced subjectively. Modernism also began to question the transparency of language as a means of description. It was not until the 1950s and 1960s that the author as an authentic and autonomous subject and as the source of a text was questioned. A written text was no longer seen as an expression of an author’s experience or life, but rather as constructed by other texts, or as being based upon other texts (Saariluoma 1998a: 9, cf. Moraru 2005: 261). At the same time, reality outside a textual world was excluded.
However, it is commonly accepted today that a text can and does operate in a reality which is to some extent also non-linguistic. Texts are in contact with the world outside. This has given some value back to the author. S/he is not considered an autonomous creator and source of a text but a socially and culturally determined and determining social and cultural reality. This gives a slightly different view of intertextuality from that offered by Kristeva’s textual concept. Texts do not refer to other texts in an eternal circle, but intertextuality means relations with literary conventions and that which other texts claim from the reality outside the texts. Many authors speak of reality with the help of tradition, and intertextuality and the use of literary tradition are also means of speaking about non-literary reality, about the context outside the texts (Saariluoma 1998a: 10–11). Borrowing from others is acceptable, if the borrowed elements are used in a creative way.

To summarize: it can be said that intertextuality, understood in a wide sense, has always been part and parcel of western literature, but it was not until the 20th century that it was systematized on an academic level, a bit earlier than translation studies as an independent academic discipline took its first steps. To study intertextuality means to plunge oneself into a series of questions, as it is a split, multiple concept. “The very notion of intertextuality turns out to be a *mise-en-abîme*, an abyss of infinite semiosis at whose brink we stand, delighted or terrified.” (Morgan 1989: 255–256). The postmodern world we are living in with the World Wide Web, electronic books, and hypertexts transforms the nature of intertextuality in an unprecedented way.¹⁵⁵ In any case, intertextuality can offer many advantages in that it can help to discover and remind us of the inherent intertextual character of translation and constitute a methodological tool which we can use to analyze both the source text and the target text. In order to do that, we need to look at intertextuality in more detail.

### 5.2 Differing understandings

It was pointed out above (5.1) that intertextuality is commonly understood to be a literary phenomenon, meaning the presence of another text in or its influence on another text, and texts constructed on other, previously conceived texts. When looked at more closely, this definition is not very clear. Starting from Julia Kristeva’s somewhat limiting understanding of intertextuality, the term has been used in various ways both as a theoretical concept and as a methodological strategy. As there is no common constituent feature, which would allow us to define intertextuality (Miller...

¹⁵⁵ Allen (2011: 210) notes that “from today’s viewpoint poststructuralist theories of intertextuality appear to have influenced and perhaps have already been assimilated in a computer-dominated world in which, increasingly, every item we would call a text is connected with every other text.” See Allen 2011: 203–216.
1985: 19), some scholars prefer to speak of intertextualities in the plural. Intertextuality is such a wide concept that it seems to be impossible to define – and limit – it in one specific, universally valid way. Only a few scholars have used it systematically as a theoretical concept. Julia Kristeva herself later abandoned its use in favor of a new term, transposition: “The term inter-textuality denotes this transposition of one (or several) sign system(s) into another, but since this term has often been understood in the banal sense of ‘study of sources,’ we prefer the term transposition” (Kristeva 1984: 59–60, emphasis in the original; cf. Angenot 1983: 129). It is no use to call relations between two texts intertextual if there are no specific criteria of definitions. This being said, it can be argued that the term has had various useful functions in literary and cultural debates (Angenot 1983: 130–131).

A translator is a reader, who needs a method or a tool to highlight the diverse and often contradictory elements that make up a text. The intertextuality of a text can incorporate “the potentially complex relationships it has with the conventions (genres, discourses, styles, activity types…) which are structured together to constitute an order of discourse” (Fairclough 2000: 103). French discourse analysts Jacqueline Authier-Révuz (1982) and Dominique Maingueneau (1987) have proposed a distinction between manifest and constitutive intertextuality. Manifest intertextuality manifests itself in texts in which other texts are explicitly present. In this case, specific other texts are overtly drawn upon within a text. They are manifestly marked or cued by features on the surface of the text, such as quotation marks or italics, for instance. This is not as clear as it may sound, as a text may include another text without showing it explicitly, and consequently “one can respond to another text in the way one words one’s own text, for example” (Fairclough 2000: 104). Constitutive intertextuality in turn indicates the configuration of discourse conventions that produce it (Fairclough 2000: 104). A discourse type is constituted through a combination of elements of orders of discourse (Fairclough 2000: 118; see also pp. 62–100).

In literary studies there is a division of intertextuality into general intertextuality and specific or limited intertextuality (Ruokonen 2006: 58). The term general intertextuality means that any

---

156 The French theoretician Marc Angenot (1983: 122) says provocatively that if we today use the term intertextuality, we do not speak of a specific literary problem but we take up a banner: “À l’instar de ‘structure’, ‘structuralisme’, ‘inter texte’ aujourd’hui est autant un outil conceptuel, qu’une bannière, un pavillon épistémique, signalant une prise de position, un champ de référence, le choix de certains enjeux.”

157 When the focus is on discourse conventions, Fairclough prefers the term interdiscursivity (2000: 104).

158 I loosely follow here Hakola 2007. This division into two categories can be compared with Pfister’s (1985: 25) remark that “im wesentlichen zwei Konzepte miteinander rivalisieren: das globale Modell des Poststrukturalismus, in
expression whatsoever is intertextual in its context and that the existence of each and every written text is based on an uncountable quantity of other, generally unknown or anonymous, texts. There is no literature without prior-existing literature. A text becomes understandable only in the larger context of earlier texts (Saariluoma 1998b: 53; Ruokonen 2006: 58). In this most extensive meaning, intertextuality becomes the condition of any communication, and thus it is no longer part of a linguistic or literary system but an essential part of culture (Makkonen 1991: 8). In this sense of intertextuality, a writer, though not seen as an autonomous creator and originator of a text, is a culturally and socially determined agent, who, aware or unaware, uses social, cultural, and textual sources to construct what will ultimately be his or her text.

There is a risk that with such a wide definition of intertextuality its value for research into concrete texts is not very high. Thinking of translation studies, it is obvious that a source text is constituted on an infinite number of anonymous social, cultural, and textual sources as is the target text also. But to mention this first, and then to add that these anonymous sources cannot be defined, risks ruining the whole analysis. It seems that for a practical, concrete intertextual analysis of texts for translation purposes, there is a need also for a more specific type of intertextuality. Specific or limited intertextuality means that in a text there are recognizable allusions to other texts, groups of texts, or literary conventions (Saariluoma 1998b: 53; Ruokonen 2006: 58). However, even this more limited concept may be too vague for some research purposes. If the notion of a text is understood broadly, a text can refer to any cultural, historical, or social feature or event (Ruokonen 2006: 70). In this case, it comes close to the concept of realia in translation studies, realia meaning textual elements that provide local and historical color in one language and have no exact equivalents in other languages (Shuttleworth & Cowie 1999: 139). From the point of view of translation, this seems to entail three further conditions: first, the scope of analysis must be well defined and limited; secondly, to analyze intertextual connections there must be prioritizations;
one text must be chosen as the main text to be analyzed, and normally all other texts must
be submitted to it. Thirdly, there is a constraint on the chronologically obligatory prior intertext,
with all that this restriction entails. It seems reasonable, with the help of the notion of presupposition as a
condition of usage, to define intertextuality chronologically. However, this must be done with the
understanding that “the chronological constraints we place on the choice of intertext are not a
necessary or constitutive feature of intertextual identity” (Miller 1985: 30).

Intertextuality has sometimes been defined in opposition to its historical forebears, source-

influence studies. Differing from intertextual studies, the source-influence research is interested
in the material the writer uses as his or her sources, as well as in influences and inspirations s/he is
involved with. Source-influence research entails a juxtaposition of actual texts, their lexical,
syntactic, and especially semantic features. If the source is acknowledged by the author, studies try
to clarify the extent of the ‘debt.’ If the source is not confirmed by the author, research tries to
prove that the two texts are not linked by chance but by necessity. Then the studies advance to a
second stage. When it has been shown that the elements have been intentionally borrowed, the
source-influence research tries to show how these elements are successfully appropriated and the
new text functions independent of prior associations (Miller 1985: 26–27). Source-influence
research focuses on the writer, or the author.

The interest of researchers in intertextuality focuses more on the reader and less on the author’s
intentions (Makkonen 1991: 16). It is not so important whether the author has borrowed while
aware or unaware of the borrowing. The starting-point is an observation made by a reader that there
is the presence of a(nother) text – or several texts – in the text s/he is reading. It is acknowledged
that any literature is conceived on the basis of other literature and that any writing is always a sort
of palimpsest. There is a tendency to avoid focusing on causal relations in the sense of how one
author has influenced another author or what is the originality of an author. What is more important

---

161 Miller (1985: 28) reminds that “to restrict intentionally or implicitly the intertext on the basis of chronology is to
open oneself to the objection that authorial intentionality has crept in the back door and that the restoration of meaning
(…) has become the dominant strategy of interpretation.” A later text can have an effect on previous literature in
changing the conventions of reading, for instance (Tammi 1991: 74).
162 Cf. Miller 1985: 19. There is no need here to go into a detailed discussion as to which degree intertextuality opposes
or overlaps source-influence studies.
163 Broich (1985: 31) includes both the author and the reader into intertextuality: “… liegt Intertextualität dann vor,
 wenn ein Autor bei der Abfassung seines Textes sich nicht nur der Verwendung anderer Texte bewußt ist, sondern auch
vom Rezipienten erwartet, daß er diese Beziehung zwischen seinem Text und anderen Texten als vom Autor intendiert
und als wichtig für das Verständnis seines Textes erkennt.”
is to see how texts together create new meanings. Riffaterre (1980: 626) argues that a missing intertext can be presupposed: “Intertextual reading is the perception of similar comparabilities from text to text; or it is the assumption that such comparing must be done if there is no intertext at hand wherein to find comparabilities. In the latter case, the text holds clues (such as formal and semantic gaps) to a complementary intertext lying in wait somewhere.”

From the point of view of translation, this missing intertext is a real challenge and must be seen in the whole of the textual frame. It can be argued that the reader-translator can – at least to a certain extent – guide the target text reader toward missing intertexts. Yet, it may be more interesting to ask how a literary work is seen through another literary work (Makkonen 1991: 16). An intertext may be seen to have identities: it is an independent text with a function of its own outside the text under study, and it is a version of that independent text integrated in the text under study (Miller 1985: 21).

5.3 Categories of intertextuality

There are evident advantages involved in making intertextuality a methodological tool of text analysis for translation. However, intertextuality has been only touched on in translation studies, even if there has been an increasing awareness of the complexity and intertextual nature of translation since the 1980s, based on a new perception of the relation between language as signs and understanding. Maybe it has been so obvious or evident – perchance too obvious – that translation is part of intertextuality that only a few translation studies scholars have been interested in it. A translation may be said to have “mediated intertextuality” (Neubert & Shreve 1992: 118). Be that as it may, intertextuality has important consequences for translation studies as will be shown in what follows.

Intertextuality as a complex phenomenon is a source of many of the difficulties of understanding and interpretation when reading texts. Intertextuality draws a reader-translator’s attention to the heterogeneity of texts, which may vary considerably in terms of their degree of heterogeneity. Texts differ “in the extent to which their heterogeneity is evident on the surface of the text” (Fairclough 2000: 104). It may be that different meanings coexist, and it is not possible to determine the...

164 Barthes (1990b: 148) seemingly agrees when he says that “a text is made of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation, but there is one place where this multiplicity is focused, and that place is the reader”. Barthes’s S/Z (1974) defines the text as multiple, both multidisciplinary and multisubjective.

165 I owe Professor Pertti Hietaranta this insight.
meaning. The issue and the meaning of intertextuality in relation to translation have not usually been in the focus of translation studies.

Even so, intertextuality and translation are closely related. Intertextuality implies interaction between culture, an author, a text, and a reader. In this interaction the author manages the echoes from his or her particular arrangement of textualized forebears, and the reader decodes that pattern (Lea 2006: 122). Both the author and the reader are indispensable to the creative process. For translation, it is of interest that any meaning derived from any text depends on the reader-translator’s prior encounter with the intertexts that are invoked. A text is available only through some process of reading. A writer is a reader of texts, and at the moment of reading “crossfertilization” takes place. Prior knowledge remains a major issue for intertextual research. The reader brings all the other texts to the “packaged material” (Still and Worton 1991: 1–2). The meaning of the text cannot be reduced to the sum of the meanings of its individual sentences, as the comprehension of a text is produced by the overall organization of different elements. During the reading process readers make thematic references, adding information and filling the gaps (Pajares and Romero 1997: 290).

Equally important is to note that “without the necessary semiotic exposure the reception of the work would inevitably bring forth differing, but equally valid interpretations” (Lea 2006: 123). This explains why any given text can be translated in different ways by different translators, who act first as readers, i.e., co-producers of texts (Pajares and Romero 1997: 293). Some of them have encountered the intertexts invoked, some of them have not. An intertext may be unknown to the reader and will thus have a dormant existence in his or her reading. On the other hand, the reader may be aware of some practice or theory that is unknown to the author, and this will lead to new interpretations (Still and Worton 1991: 2). Thus, there is the text and those texts intertextually constituting it that shape interpretation. In addition, there are all the other texts which an interpreter of the text variably brings to the interpretation process (Fairclough 2000: 85).

---

166 Ben-Porat (1976: 109–110) describes this reading process as follows: “The more complex process of actualizing a literary allusion can be described as a movement starting with the recognition of the marker and ending with intertextual patterning. The reader has to perceive the existence of a marker before any further activity can take place. This perception entails a recollection of the original form of the marker, and in most cases leads to the identification of the text in which it has originally appeared. The recollection of the marker’s original form may suffice for a modified and fuller interpretation of the sign as it appears in the alluding text. Identification of the marker’s larger ‘referent,’ the evoked text, is mandatory for intertextual patterning beyond the modified interpretation of the marker itself.”

167 Both Riffaterre and Genette agree that an intertext needs not be discovered in order to achieve full understanding of a text (Morgan 1989: 270). However, from the point of view of translation, this is only where the work begins.
The act of reading and the act of interpretation are thus inseparable. To understand a text necessitates that the reader should interpret it. There is no other way. The reader is obliged to choose from many possibilities in order to fill in the gaps of a text, and the reader-translator has to choose a particular interpretation of a source text when translating it. A text has an inexhaustible nature, within certain limits. A text is not an open collection, to which the author brings the words and the reader takes the meaning (Pajares and Romero 1997: 290). Even if any text allows for several different interpretations, it cannot be concluded that anything will do, that any interpretation is possible. “The rights of the text” set limits to the interpretation (Pajares and Romero 1997: 292, citing Umberto Eco). This is especially clear in the case of Light in August, in which Southern culture plays such an important guiding role for interpretation. The same limitation is valid for intertextuality, which is not a free association of a narrative with whatever previously read texts that the reader-translator might recall (see, e.g., Morgan 1989: 264).

Interpretation implies a necessary processing of a text, as the text is not the same after it has been read. It acquires a new dimension. Transformation continues when the process of translation begins. A reader-translator is first of all the reader-receiver of the original text (Pajares and Romero 1997: 293–294). But s/he is also an intermediary between the text and the receiver, the common reader. The translator is supposed to reconstruct the world offered by the source language text. This necessitates a more intense reading process than usual (Pajares and Romero 1997: 294). The translator is a non-ordinary reader; “whereas the ordinary reader can involve his or her own beliefs and values in the creative reading process, the translator has to be more guarded. Ideological nuances, cultural predispositions and so on in the source text have to be relayed untainted by the translator’s own vision of reality.” (Hatim and Mason 1990: 224.) However, one may wonder whether any translation work can possibly be done “untainted.”

It cannot be overemphasized that translation is a multifold type of intertextuality (Koppenfels 1985: 138). As the source text is already a collage of various texts, anchored in their historical, cultural, and social environment, the translation – the translated text – is a multifold intertext. It is based, then, on those texts that were prior to the source text and gave it its form and content; it is, in a special way, also an intertext of those texts that come after the source text and uses snatches of it. A translation is a special case in the sense that it uses extensively the source text. Another level of intertextuality of a translation is brought about by the fact that it not only uses the source text as its base text, but it also uses many of those texts in the target language that have existed before the

Understanding a text – with or without its intertexts and presuppositions – is the basis of any translation. Perceiving intertextuality of a text facilitates the following stages of a translation process.
coming into being of the target text itself. Pre-existing texts have created the translation norms which the translator probably recognizes and follows (see, e.g., Toury 1995 and Chesterman 1993). This shows how even the most extraordinary, the most literal, and the freest translations are to a substantial extent nothing but intertexts – as translations. In fact, this intertextual dimension is an advantage that warrants the literary value of translation (Koppenfels 1985: 139).

As it is clear that a text is a historical and social-cultural product, the cultural background of any linguistic expression inevitably shapes it and invokes cultural phenomena that may not be in the conscious area of human thinking but much of the process involved may remain unconscious. This front line between culture and language has been the object of many socio-linguistic researches and also translation studies. As has been shown, some lines of researches also include the wider framework of text in intertextuality. In this sense intertextuality covers more than just linguistic expressions. It covers both horizontal and vertical intertextuality (Kristeva), and manifest and constitutive intertextuality (Authier-Révuz, Maingueneau), and interdiscursivity (Fairclough).

In the following sections I will deal more closely with the two types of intertextuality used in literary studies: specific or limited intertextuality (Section 5.3.1) and general or cultural intertextuality (Section 5.3.2). After that, I will look at one of the best-known attempts at using intertextuality in literary analysis, viz. Kiril Taranovsky’s subtext analysis (Section 5.4), and consider its importance for translation studies, before summing up the discussion.

5.3.1 Specific or limited intertextuality

Specific or limited intertextuality seems to offer concrete tools for textual analysis. However, the borderline between specific and general intertextuality is not always fully clear, and it is not always possible to determine the definitive spot where general intertextuality is transformed into specific, recognizable intertexts (Ruokonen 2006: 69). As intertextuality is based on the subjective reader perception of a text, various readers can recognize in the same text various intertexts.

Literary studies concentrating on specific intertextuality may have at least three kinds of aims. First, a research project may seek to uncover recognizable allusions and their meanings in a certain literary work or in the works of a certain author. A good example – and for the purposes of the present analysis a useful study – is Jessie McGuire Coffee’s *Faulkner’s Un-Christlike Christians: Biblical Allusions in the Novels* (1983). Secondly, attempts have been made at analyzing what happens in the process of interpreting allusions and what kinds of functions intertextual allusions may have (e.g. Perri 1978 and Pucci 1998; Nash 1986). Thirdly, there have been some classifications of types of specific intertextuality. For instance, Wolfram Wilss (1989) presents a
classification of the sources of allusions found in German newspapers. Another classification of allusions is given by Ritva Leppihalme (1994; 1997). Notably, both of them mention the Bible as the first item in their lists of intertexts (cf. Long 2005).

Three types of (specific) intertextual allusions can be mentioned (Hebel 1991: 142–145), and these can be applied to any intertextual elements.\footnote{Pfister (1985: 26–27) specifically argues that the classification of intertexts allows for the evaluation of the text’s referentiality and communicativity.} The first type is onomastic intertexts. In their case the distinction between a marked and an unmarked element is of minor importance, as proper names can direct the reader to referents all by themselves. They are also readily affirmed as allusive signals. A good example in \textit{Light in August} is Joanna Burden’s grandfather’s name Calvin. However, onomastic intertexts are more difficult to interpret when a character in the fictional world bears a name that in itself is an intertext. An example is the equation and inversion of initials as in the case of Jim Conklin, one of the soldiers in Stephen Crane’s \textit{The Red Badge of Courage}, and Jesus Christ (Hebel 1991: 143). The same kind of onomastic intertextual connection can be made between Joe Christmas and Jesus Christ (cf. Pitavy 1973: 77; see also 6.2.8 below). It remains an open question as to what extent a translator is influenced by this kind of intertextuality, and whether it plays any role in the translation process.

The second type is quotational elements, which need to be divided into marked and unmarked quotations. In the case of an unmarked quotation, the recognition depends on the reader-translator’s intertextual competence. Marked quotations can be detected by means of quotation marks, by italicization, by italicization and reproduction in the original language, or by spacing longer quotations, and are thus easier to detect.

The third type is titular elements, which also can be described as marked or unmarked signals. Unmarked titular intertexts are among the most difficult signals to recognize (Hebel 1991: 144) whereas most marked titular intertexts employ the typographical conventions. The use of typographical conventions may help to lexically distinguish between identical intertexts to different points of reference.

The exact semantic content of an intertextual element cannot be formalized too strictly. “As soon as the interpretation of allusions tackles questions related to the understandability of a text in general, and its semantic openness, its presuppositions, and its implied reader\footnote{An “implied reader” is a concept created by Wolfgang Iser. An implied reader is based on a text, and s/he is not the same as the empirical reader. An implied reader is a construction by the real reader, by asking what kind of worldview and knowledge the text in question requires. “It [the concept of the implied reader] denotes the role of the reader, which is definable in terms of textual structure and structured acts” (Iser 1991: 38).} in particular, it
becomes obvious that the text’s infinite, ever elusive semantic potential cannot, and must not, be pressed in heuristic categories” (Hebel 1991: 153). This is so because an intertextual citation is never innocent. It is always edited in some ways, either transformed, distorted, or condensed, suiting the speaker’s or writer’s value system (Morgan 1989: 260).170

The reader-translator’s cultural background and knowledge, and differences related to the cultural framework of the source text will necessarily both affect the understanding of intertexts and their translation. Thus, from the point of view of translation studies, issues of reader-oriented intertextuality are of major interest. This becomes even more evident as in any real-life situation there are some – or many – intertextual allusions that are problematic in the source text, and yet the translator has only a limited time available for his or her project, convened with the contractor. Not all of the potential meanings can be fully taken into account.

Through his or her cultural and literary competence the reader-translator is able to decipher intertexts and their presuppositions in the framework of the whole novel. An essential task of a reader-translator is then to verify his or her discoveries in the text. These are basically textual elements that strike him or her as possible intertextual elements. S/he may have a cultural-religious or linguistic competence in the case of unmarked intertexts, or s/he may notice the special features of intertextuality, such as quotation marks, italicization, capitalization, or a character’s comment, in most cases of titles or marked quotations. Subsequently, s/he has to check his or her discovery, i.e., to verify or falsify his or her initial assumption. “The verification of a textual element as intertextually related allusion is the prerequisite for actualizing an evocative potential that is independent from the interpreter’s individual disposition” (Hebel 1991: 141; cf. Kaskenviita 1991 and Gambier 2001).

As it is impossible to anticipate all the possible interpretations, it is generally assumed that those elements classified as intertextual, e.g., as allusions, must be such that they can be localized and proven. If, however, a textual element, e.g. an allusion, cannot be verified extrafictionally and is thus a pseudointertext, associations remain personal and they do not establish verifiable links between the text and the reader-translator’s repertoire.171

In translation studies, it is argued that allusions are metonymic tellings of the tales themselves (Tymoczko 1999: 46). There are massive obstacles in translation related to history, values,

---

170 See Kristeva’s (1984) detailed typology of intertextual relations based on the method of semanalysis, tested in the poetry of Mallarmé and Lautréamont, using presuppositions, the grammar, the semantics of the reference, and transformative texts.

171 Hebel (1991: 142) notes that pseudointertextuality has become prominent in postmodern literature.
worldviews, and literary features such as allusions, and all this particularly in non-canonical or marginalized literature. However, it can be argued that these obstacles are always present, no matter what the relationships between the source text and the target text. In any case, some allusions are no doubt transcultural, known in both the source culture and the target culture, whereas many others are culture-specific, understood only by people sufficiently familiar with the specific (source) culture.

One of the most extensive empirical studies of intertextual allusions in translation studies is the work of the Finnish scholar Ritva Leppihalme entitled *Culture Bumps: An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions* (1997). She deals with the function and translation of allusions from English into Finnish, in English prose and journalistic texts. Focusing on allusions more as translation problems than literary phenomena, she divides allusions into key-phrase allusions and proper-name allusions (Leppihalme 1997: 66–71). Key-phrase allusions are activated if the reader can associate the words of the allusion as the clue with the use of the same or same kinds of words, and proper-name allusions with the characteristics of the name of a person in another text. Some allusions have developed into clichés, some have been lexicalized so that they are no longer linked with their original sources, while others presuppose familiarity with very specific sources and thus can be recognized only by some readers (Leppihalme 1997: 4). This means that allusions may remain unrecognized even in their source culture. However, in intercultural communication there are what Leppihalme calls culture bumps (term first used by Carol M. Archer in 1986), meaning situations in which a target text reader has a problem in understanding an allusion coming from the source culture. The allusion may remain puzzling in the target culture. There is considerable latitude in the use of the term allusion, varying from scholar to scholar (Leppihalme 1997: 6).

Allusion has a connection with the idea of play: *ad ludere: alludere*. Besides humor, definitions of the term share the idea of reference to something (see Leppihalme 1997: 6). This reference is by no means limited only to literature or non-fictional texts; there can be allusions to music, paintings, films, etc. “Allusion is more or less closely related to such terms as reference, quotation or citation borrowing (even occasionally plagiarism) and the more complex intertextuality, as well as punning and wordplay (for modified allusions)” (Leppihalme 1997: 6).172

---

172 For Pasco (1994: 12), “allusion is the metaphorical relationship created when an alluding text evokes and uses another, independent text.” For Genette (1997: 2), allusion is an enunciation whose meaning “presupposes the perception of a relationship between it and another text, to which it necessarily refers by some inflections that would otherwise remain unintelligible.” Genette (1997: 2) treats allusion and quotation as subcategories of intertextuality. However, if allusion is understood to refer the reader to another text outside the alluding text, quotations can be
In her study, Leppihalme (1997: 31) considers both the function of allusions and the strategies used in their translation. She affirms that they are causally linked: when a translator identifies the function of an allusion, s/he takes an important step toward choosing an appropriate translation strategy for the allusion in question. She also emphasizes the importance of the context in which a particular allusion occurs.

An important and useful distinction from the point of view of translation studies are those allusions that operate mainly on the macro-level of the text and those that operate on the micro-level of the text. The macro-level of the text involves the whole internal narrative structure of the entire text, including its interpretation: division of the text, titles of chapters, presentation of acts and scenes, relation between types of narrative, dialogue, description; between dialogue and monologue, solo voice and chorus, dramatic intrigue, poetic structure, authorial comments, stage directions, etc. (Leppihalme 1997: 31–32, referring to Lambert & van Gorp 1985: 52), i.e., structural and thematic use of allusion.

The micro-level is concerned with the selection of words, dominant grammatical patterns and formal literary structures, forms of speech reproduction, narrative, perspective, and point of view, modality, language levels, etc., i.e., the lexico-semantic and stylistic level. Systemic context includes oppositions between micro- and macro-levels and between text and theory, intertextual relations, and intersystemic relations (Lambert & van Gorp 1985: 53).

Considering translation strategies, Leppihalme (1997: 78–80) divides the translation of allusions into two groups. To translate proper-name allusions there are three basic strategies: to keep a proper name unaltered, to change it, or to omit it. If the proper name is kept, the name can be used as such, or it can be used, adding some explanatory elements. The proper name can be replaced by another source language name or by a target language name. In some case, the name can be omitted, but its sense can be transferred by other means, e.g. by a common noun, or the name and the allusion can be omitted altogether. It is decisive whether readers in the target culture are familiar with the name or not. The familiarity of a name or the lack of it is of vital importance when translating texts containing such elements.

To translate key-phrase allusions (Leppihalme 1997: 83–84), the list of strategies for their translation is different although the general approach is similar. There is the use of a standard

---


174 Leppihalme does not mention that Lambert & van Gorp’s (1985: 52) scheme starts with “preliminary data”, e.g. title and title page, metatexts, and general strategy. By “general strategy” they ask: “partial or complete translation?”
translation, and a minimum change (a literal translation). There can be additional extra-allusive
guidance, including the use of typographical means. There can be footnotes, endnotes, translator’s
prefaces and other explanations. Simulated familiarity or internal marking is a potential strategy.
A key-phrase allusion can be replaced by a preformed target language item. One possibility is to
reduce the allusion to sense by rephrasing, or an allusion can be recreated, or it can be omitted.

André Lefevere (1992a: 22) offers three possibilities for dealing with intertextual allusions in
cases where the target language does not share a cultural element with the source language. The
translator either has to introduce an allusion, possibly with an explanation in a footnote, or to omit
it, or to replace by a suitable allusion in the source language culture. In fact, Lefevere (1992a: 22–
29) does not talk about intertextuality at all, but through some illustrative examples he makes an
interesting four-type categorization of allusions in literature written in English: biblical, classical,
cultural (e.g. Greek and Roman mythology), and literary. From the point of view of the present
study, there is an overlapping in his categorization in that biblical allusions can be – and in the case
of Light in August, i.e., the American South, they truly are – part of cultural allusions, as well. On
the other hand, biblical allusions concern a collection of written texts called the Bible, whereas
cultural allusions involve a larger context, the whole of culture.

Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1990: 124) are somewhat more nuanced in their semiotic approach.
First, they offer a distinction between active and passive intertextuality. The passive kind of
intertextuality is simply the basic requirement that any text should be internally coherent (i.e.,
intelligible). The active kind of intertextuality activates knowledge and belief systems beyond the
text itself. The authors then offer a typology of intertextuality. The translator makes adjustments
because different groups of readers bring different knowledge and belief systems when they process
texts – they start with their own knowledge and belief systems, which affect the translator’s

175 Helpful as they may be, it can be argued that such explanations inevitably diminish the joy of reader experience (cf.
Nash 1986: 77).

176 Hatim and Mason’s (1990: 132) first category is references (one indicates title, chapter, etc.) while the second
consists of clichés. The third group contains literary allusions, “citing or referring to a celebrated work.” Fourthly there
is self-quotation (Hatim and Mason offer no explanation), and fifthly, conventionalism. The sixth group contains
proverbs, and the seventh group, meditation, “putting into words one’s hermeneutic experience of the effects of a text.”
Within a framework of informational (the form), intentional (the function) and semiotic (the interaction with other
signs) status of the intertextual reference (cf. Jakobson 1971), they propose a five-step set of procedures involved in
transferring intertextual reference (Hatim and Mason 1990: 136). The first step in the procedure is to retain semiotic
status. The second step is to retain intentionality. The third step is to retain linguistic devices which uphold coherence.
The fourth step is to preserve the informational status, and the fifth is to preserve extra-linguistic status (e.g. the genre
of a text).
decisions (Hatim and Mason 1990: 137). In this study, passive intertextuality is taken into consideration (see Chapter 3 above) but I will concentrate specifically on active intertextuality (see Chapter 6 below).

One of the problems in recognizing intertextual allusions is that their form can vary. An allusion can be a direct quotation, but it can also be a reduced version where one or more words of the source text are ignored as far as the use of explicit translation equivalents is concerned. An allusion can be a proper name, a quotation with a proper name, a quotation in a foreign language, a translated quotation, a paraphrase, a cultural concept, a stylistic means. Special allusive features in a text, such as quotation marks, italicization, capitalization, and titles, may draw the reader's attention.

Judging from these various translational approaches, it seems that specific or limited intertextuality takes place and interprets the allusions in a text as the author has meant or as what can be inferred in a text. This approach lays a special emphasis on the author, whose position is almost immutable, and the reader's role is reduced to that of a civilized observer. Allan Pasco (1994: 10) remarks: “When allusion is unnoticed or misunderstood, the blame should often fall on readers rather than on the writers and their occasional use of covert allusion.” In any case, some intertextual allusions will go unnoticed by some readers. Being a translator means, in the ideal case at least, that one is a cultivated reader, operating on the level of intertexts.

If this were the case, it would be enough to translate the allusions detected as literally as possible and assign the responsibility of interpretation and understanding to the reader. In that case it would depend on the degree of education of the reader to determine whether s/he can recognize and understand the allusion. This would be an easier way for a translator. However, in practice the process of reading and translating is more complicated. Besides, there are also pseudointertextual allusions with a traceable extrafictional referent.

It is impossible for a single person to recognize all the intertextual elements even in any text produced in one’s own mother tongue, so it can be asked what chance a reader-translator has to recognize them in the source language text through his or her training and experience, instinct, and education. As s/he is necessarily a culturally and socially determined agent working in a limited framework, s/he hardly can recognize them all. To find intertextualities in the actual analysis of a

177 Here I am loosely following Ruokonen 2006: 72–73.

178 Leppihalme’s (1997: 90–) study shows that some 70 % of proper-name allusions were transferred as such, using existing translation or translating literally. Ruokonen (2006: 73) mentions that she arrived to similar results in her study: in four novels translated into Finnish in the 1980s same strategies were used from 69 % to 87 % of cases.
text is like “trying to find a needle in the haystack of a corpus or of a canon” (Riffaterre 1991: 57). In addition, a translator needs a number of tools to systematically analyze the source text, in order to find the maximum number of intertextual elements, even before s/he is able to decide on any particular translation strategy. After all, it is useless to talk about translation strategies concerning certain material if the reader-translator as a reader has not analyzed the nature of the material to be translated.

5.3.2 General or cultural intertextuality

Since the appearance of the cultural turn in translation studies in the 1980s, promoted in the 1990s, it has no longer been possible to disregard the role of culture in translation studies. Crucially for our present concerns, culture is radically intertextual (Morgan 1989: 246). General or cultural intertextuality adds some interesting aspects to the discipline (Ruokonen 2006: 61).

The concept of general intertextuality has changed the understanding of the nature of a text, of its interpretation, and of the role of the writer, reader, and translator. From the point of view of intertextuality and a reader, the meaning of a text is undetermined and unstable, and there cannot be a single, definitive interpretation of a text. A written text is not an unchanging group of words on paper. It gets its meaning when a reader reads it and adjusts the reading to the social, cultural, and historical context. Each reading is a unique encounter between a text, a reader, and a context, which means that each reader reads a text in different times and different situations through his or her own needs. As there is no single “correct” way of reading a text, its translation is always an attempt at intertextual interpretation of the source text in a certain point of time and in a certain situation. A translator cannot control all the possible associations and interpretations s/he might make while reading, and even less those of a target text reader.

In translation studies, the so-called “Manipulation School” defines translation as manipulative force and rewriting. Symptomatic of this is André Lefevere’s article “Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm” (Lefevere 1985; see Snell-Hornby 2006: 47–50). Rewriting is said to refer to “a range of processes, including translation, which can be said to re-interpret, alter or manipulate an original text in some way.” (Shuttleworth & Cowie 1999: 147). Lefevere (1992b: 7, 9) argues that non-professional

179 The “Manipulation School” follows Harold Bloom’s ideas that all texts – poems – are intertexts; accordingly, poetic writing is intertextually rewriting (see Bloom 1973). Bloom himself follows Freud and the Kabbalah’s intertextuality (Moraru 2005: 259). Cf. Barthes (1974: 5): “The writerly text is ourselves writing” (emphasis in the original).
readers of literature are exposed to rewritings much more than they are to original texts. Translation is the most obviously recognizable type of rewriting. The source text as such “is not anything, but it is read and understood always as something, as a kind of a text” (Oittinen 2000: 266). This means that there is no need for the source text and the target text to be equal. Admittedly, a translator interprets the source text during his or her own reading process from his or her own premises and then rewrites the text in the target text language (Oittinen 2000: 265–267). This also emphasizes the creative and renewing power of translation, as it is a new interpretation of the source text, and it offers readers the possibility of reinterpreting the text and thus continuing dialogue with it (Ruokonen 2006: 62).

This kind of emphasis on translation as interpretation and dialogue means that a professional, informed translator is well aware of the readers of the target text and their context. This understanding in itself is enough to question the justification of the notion of equivalence, as the translation is made considering its readers and the purpose for which they need the translation. In translation studies this has been strongly underlined by the so-called functionalist approaches, represented e.g. by Katharina Reiß and Hans Vermeer (1991) and Christiane Nord (1997; see Schäffner 2011).

General intertextuality tends to idealize the reader and his or her freedom to interpret a text. However, a reader-translator works under various constraints. S/he cannot interpret a text and rewrite it in the way that s/he would like to, as there are also the expectations of the client and all the laws, regulations, and contracts concerning the translation activity. In a given communication situation some interpretations of a text are more justified and acceptable than others. That is why a translator, when s/he makes an interpretation of a source text, needs to be aware that s/he is opening to readers some possibilities of re-reading but shutting some others out (Ruokonen 2006: 62–63). As s/he cannot choose all possible interpretations, s/he has to choose one (or some) interpretation(s), and translate it (or them). This has two consequences: first, a translator cannot ever be totally objective in his or her work, as s/he is, like the source text writer, a socially and

---

180 Lefevere (1992b: 41) argues that translation, or rewriting, “manipulates” the source text with two constraints. The first one is the translator’s conscious or unconscious ideology. The ideology determines the translator’s basic strategy and dictates solutions to problems. The second constraint is the poetics dominant in the target culture at the time the translation is made. For Lefevere (1992b: 26), poetics is a combination of “literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, and symbols,” and the cultural notion of “what the role of literature is, or should be, in the social system as a whole.”

181 “Lähdeteksti ei siis ole jotakin, vaan se luetaan ja ymmärretään aina jonakin, aina jonkinlaisena tekstinä” (emphasis in the original).
culturally determined agent who interprets a text from his or her premises. Secondly, being conscious of his or her own subjectivity can help the translator to look for the most objective or most justifiable way of reading and interpreting, which enables him or her to work toward an optimal translation, for the reader (Hakola 2007: 11). With his or her competence, a translator is a literate and cultural-social being with access to certain facts and commonplaces. If such an access is missing, s/he cannot recognize intertextuality.

On the one hand, general intertextuality seems to deal with general issues concerning translation’s nature and principles. It has a tendency to reduce the idea of a writer as a genius, seen above, as it shows how the writer is always influenced by other texts, which s/he uses from various sources in different social, historical, cultural, and textual contexts. S/he uses them either consciously or unconsciously, through his or her own experiences. A text is thus a product of much of the whole of the surrounding culture (Ruokonen 2006: 61–62).

On the other hand, due to general intertextuality, the position of the reader of a translation is enhanced. The reader becomes a second creator, who interprets the text from his or her own point of view in social, historical, cultural, and intertextual contexts. S/he can always interpret a text differently from what the translator has thought. The passing of time can also change the ways of reading (as evidenced by e.g. postcolonialism or feminism). A translator may try to consider what kinds of meanings and intertextual networks a reader is likely to project into the text in question.182 The translator’s role and his or her expertise are thus emphasized or even enhanced by general or cultural intertextuality.

One possible solution to the problem of finding a suitable intertextual method for a translation task is Kiril Taranovsky’s structuralist subtext analysis (1976). As its suitability has been tested earlier in translation studies (from German into Finnish in Hakola 2007), it is worth presenting it here, and discuss its possible suitability for purposes of the present study.

---

182 One approach to intertextual connections between texts is the so-called polysystem theory in translation studies. With similarities to general intertextuality, it tries to organize the connections into hierarchical systems (see, e.g., Even-Zohar 1990 and Toury 1995).
5.4 **Subtext analysis**

Subtext analysis is a method of text analysis developed by Kiril Taranovsky (1976).\(^{183}\) It was originally developed to analyze the use of quotation and allusion in the works of the Russian poet Osip Mandel’štam (1891–1938).\(^{184}\) What makes this analysis interesting from the point of view of translation is that it is concrete and developed for the analysis of a clearly defined set of data. Above all, it seems to be a strategy for reading. As such, it helps to distinguish the main characteristics of the selected text material, which is naturally one of the major interests of a reader-translator.

The cornerstone of Taranovsky’s method is the claim that every textual element (in Mandel’štam’s poetry) is motivated; there are no accidental or unmotivated elements in a text. The motivation of a text does not merely come from the internal structure of a text, or merely from the biography of the author, but the relevant frame of interpretation for the texts comes from other texts, other literary texts. These other texts Taranovsky calls subtexts. A subtext for Taranovsky is “an already existing text (or texts) reflected in a new one” (Taranovsky 1976: 18).

It seems that even if a reader does not discover a hidden subtext, s/he can still understand the text. However, discovering underlying subtexts will raise the semantic understanding to another level. In fact, only in setting the text in relation with other texts, i.e., subtexts, an integrated understanding and interpretation of a text is possible. Taranovsky’s idea is substantiated, among others, by Ziva Ben-Porat (1976: 109–112), who presents a four-stage process for actualizing a literary intertextual allusion, starting with the recognition of a marker, and ending with intertextual patterns, and who (Ben-Porat 1976: 115) notes that it “is possible to read and understand the alluding text (AT) without actualizing the allusion.”

Another cornerstone of Taranovsky is the division of intertextual elements into genetic and general intertextual allusions. Genetic allusion is a kind of causal relation: the writer has used another text either as a source of his or her own text or adopted influences from it.\(^{185}\) The general

\(^{183}\) In Finland Taranovsky’s ideas have been presented in particular by Pekka Tammi. I follow here Tammi (1991) on Taranovsky’s method.

\(^{184}\) Mandel’štam is an interesting person in relation to this study. He was born into a comparatively wealthy non-religious Jewish family. As a young poet he was converted to Christianity, and he was baptized in 1911 as a Finnish Methodist, which was an unlikely choice for anyone trying to find a better social position in the Russian Empire. His autobiographical texts do not contain any information about his conversion, but Taranovsky (1976: 55–57, 61–64) mentions Christian themes in the poetry of Mandel’štam. See also Swanström 2013.

\(^{185}\) There is at least a conceptual similarity to source-influence studies here.
reference is in question when the semantic meaning of the source text is widened, changed or opened in the light of a subtext. This, it seems, is an opening toward what is called general intertextuality in the present study (see 5.3.2 above). What is important is that the mere existence of a subtext and its discovery by the reader is not enough. The subtext as such has to bring in something new in the interpretation of the text.

A text must be analyzed on the one hand as one coherent entity, on the other hand observing all the time possible intertextual connections to other texts. This means that there might be intertextual elements in the text even though it appears to be a coherent and seemingly autosemantic entity. The translator, when dealing with a coherent text with intertextual elements, should be careful not to break the entity when translating intertextual elements (Hakola 2007: 15).

One important aspect of the subtext analysis is the fact that the method does not make a sharp distinction between references on the micro- and macro-levels of the text. An enlarged and more comprehensive interpretation may require that the reader-translator knows the whole production of the source text writer. Taranovsky (1976: 4) notes that in the case of Mandel’štam, the investigation of all his literary and cultural sources becomes an important prerequisite for the reader to understand and appreciate his poetry better. A further step is toward general intertextuality in which groups of novels and literary texts come into contact with one another. This leads to the issue of chronology, i.e., whether a later text can influence the interpretation of a prior text (see the discussion in Miller 1985: 27–30).¹⁸⁶

Performing a concrete text analysis, it can be systematic only when it is known what the analysis is looking for. There are four main categories in the subtext analysis to make entities of interpretation. The first category is the easiest to recognize. It is a direct quotation of another novel or a proper name. For example, a novel can be given the name of another literary work, which brings in some features of a prior text. Or the borrowed element can be hidden to make it part of the source text structure, in which case the effect is the same as in the visible case, but only less visible. Another type of the first category would be to simply refer to a proper name (cf. Leppihalme’s proper-name allusion), and especially to an author’s name, in which case the reference would be no longer to a specific person and his or her characteristics, but metonymically to the whole of his or her works, or to a certain type of poetry or literary current.

¹⁸⁶ Miller (1985: 30) argues that intertextuality can be defined as “the perception by the reader of relationships between a focused text and others, which have both chronologically preceded it and followed it.” Chronological constraints can be placed on intertexts but they are “not a necessary or constitutive feature of intertextual identity.”
The second way of finding intertextual connections is to find citations. A citation can include another writer’s text directly or adapting or modifying it (cf. Leppihalme’s key-phrase allusion). A writer can refer to his or her own texts, in which case the whole of earlier production of the writer plays the role of a subtext. For example, s/he can link the text to the thematics of the earlier production. There can be textual elements in a foreign language in the text, the citation can be translated in the text, or the subtext is translated as a play of words.

A third way to analyze a text is to look for not only lexical elements but stylistic subtexts. This is already more demanding, and it may be asked to what extent it is possible for the translator with all of the constraints s/he is working under to discover them. In some cases it may be possible to discover individually colored stylistic features that may activate a whole text. This can mean a “borrowing of a rhythmic figure and the sounds contained therein” (Taranovsky 1976: 18). This case also necessitates the semantic input in the meaning of the text: for example, a simple metrical similarity hardly activates a subtext.

A fourth possibility is that the connection is multiple. This means that one and the same textual element refers to more than one subtext or that a subtext itself has a subtext (see Taranovsky 1976: 4–5). In principle, this chain can be endless and thus approaches general intertextuality. The category of multiple sources is interesting in that it is directly applicable to Light in August. This is so because in the novel there are religious subtexts that come from various parts of the same source, viz. the Bible. Biblical texts have their own intertexts. The same remark applies to a good number of church-related subtexts that come either from the Bible or clerical documents, orders, regulations, etc.

Kiril Taranovsky’s method seems to offer some advantages for translation studies, especially for research into literary translation. First, it forces the translator to engage in a very careful close reading of a text. Secondly, it is created to be a tool for a well-defined textual material. Thirdly, it is definitively reader-oriented. Fourthly, it basically uses only two categories of intertextual elements. It will be seen whether these two categories are enough, from the point of view of translation, or whether a more nuanced classification is needed for a concrete text analysis (for details, see Chapter 6 below).

However, two important critical questions concerning the method can be raised (Tammi 1991: 90–92). The first critical question concerns the role of the author, i.e., what is the role of the intention of the original writer? Are only those intertextual elements relevant that the writer intentionally creates? How about those intertextual elements which s/he seems to have been unaware of in a text, but which a later analysis discovers? Taranovsky does not give a clear answer to the questions; on the one hand the writer is seen as an active agent, on the other s/he is
recognized as not always aware of all intertextual elements. Many later critics (see Tammi 1991: 91) are of the opinion that in a real reading situation it is always the reader’s interpretation that decides. We cannot always be sure of the writer’s intentions. If the analysis discovers real motivations and parallelisms in applying a systematic reading convention, they are real and acceptable. From the point of view of translation, this writer-based approach is hardly an issue in a real-life situation. The translator does his or her best, and depending on his or her competence, experience, and assignment, discovers a certain amount of intertextual elements that s/he has to deal with. For him or her, they all are in the text and are thus motivated textual elements. If they are difficult to analyze, not all writers are available for questions. Or the writer does not want to explain his or her own motivations or s/he does not know or does not remember what s/he thought when s/he was writing the passage in question (Hakola 2007: 17). Even so, the role of the author of the source text should nevertheless not be categorically ignored in translation studies.

The issue of culture leads to Tammi’s second critical question concerning the method. Mandel’stam has said: “If you would read me, you must have my culture” (Taranovsky 1976: 4). It is clear that recognizing intertextual elements demands a lot from a translator. In the case of translating Faulkner, s/he would probably agree with the Russian poet. It is of importance for the translator to know about Southern culture, as it is one of the basic conditions which one can use to distinguish intertextual elements in Faulkner’s novels and transfer them to another cultural setting. This second question is more important from the point of view of the process of translating, as the interpretation of subtexts always necessitates a certain cultural ability and knowledge to which the text itself directs the reader-translator (Tammi 1991: 92).

### 5.5 Summarizing remarks

In this chapter it has been shown that intertextuality is a complex concept, and argued with Bakhtin and Kristeva that a text is always linked with already existing texts, with their wider context. The emergence of intertextuality is a result of combining different texts, ways of speaking and writing, and features of social and historical structures and systems, i.e., culture. This means that no text is

---

187 *Pace* Plett (1991: 15) who is of the opinion that “part of the responsibility lies with the author who should feel obliged to supply the quotations with markers in such a way that their twofold encoding is clearly made apparent.” I tend to agree with Tammi and other critics and think that – at least in the case of Faulkner – the responsibility lies with the reader. The reader-oriented approach makes also more space and responsibility to a reader-translator, and his or her creativity.

188 Faulkner’s French translator, M.-E. Coindreau, was able to be in contact with him (Pitavy 1973: 107).
independent, but a combination of cultural intertextuality. There is the same textual material that is
the foundation of an individual text and the cultural text. They cannot be separated from each other
(Allen 2011: 35). An author communicates intertextual relations to a reader between the words s/he
uses and the words’ prior existence in previous texts.

In the text analysis offered in Chapter 6, in order to keep the focus, the present study will limit
itself to the following four dimensions: author, texts, reader-translator, and reader. The integral text
of Light in August is analyzed, looking for cultural-religious intertextual elements. This is done on
the micro-level. Only those cases of proper names are considered that have religious intertextual
meaning (cf. Leppihalme’s proper-name allusions). The other type of Taranovsky is citations, of
which there are plenty in the novel, most of them from the Bible, and many of them somehow
modified or transformed.189 This category comes very close to Leppihalme’s key-phrase allusions.

Literary texts often reshape prefabricated textual elements. In the analysis, there is no specific
need to separate word-for-word citations and modified citations. These preformed linguistic
elements are intertextual units that include literal and modified allusions, twisted out of their
original wording but still recognizable to a reader-translator accustomed to such intertexts. They are
a material kind of intertextuality (see Plett 1991: 8–17). They can be called authoritative quotations
and they demand an affirmative contextualization (Plett 1991: 13–14). Subtexts or intertexts are
manifestations of the text’s historical, cultural, and social coordinates. Textual structures and
meanings are not specific to the text itself. In the analysis the text of Light in August is subjected to
a close reading that shows how it guides the reader-translator toward its own intertexts.190

Intertextuality in the source text and the target text allows for a study of their metatextual
dimensions, deeply anchored in the ongoing dialogical process of cultural-literary history.

From the point of view of translation, the communication from the author to the reader entails two
important things. First of all, intertextuality does not mean that a textual unit just moves from one
previous text to another, and that its meaning remains semantically identical. Intertextuality means
that texts transform previous texts, and a text’s intertextual relations cannot be stabilized, located, or
listed in an exhaustive way. This will be seen in the text analysis offered in Chapter 6. Secondly,
intertextuality crucially relies on the importance of culture. The decisive factor for all readers of the
same text is the way in which they can perceive the text with its ideological and value structures and

---

189 Plett (1991: 9) notes: “The surface structure of citational deviations can be described in terms of transformations.”
(emphasis in the original).

190 This idea is strongly supported by Riffaterre, for whom “the intertext leaves an indelible trace in the text, a formal
constant which plays the role of an imperative for reading, and which governs the decoding of the message” (Morgan
struggles. Without awareness and knowledge of this larger cultural or social intertextuality, i.e., relying only on the linguistic level of a text, understanding in translation process becomes difficult, and the product of the process, the translated text in the target culture, will probably be inadequate in one or more respects. Understanding a text’s intertextuality has an important role to play when the reader-translator reads and tries to understand and interpret a text in order to translate it. To do that in the case of Faulkner’s work, and in particular with *Light in August*, s/he needs to have access to some basic information of the culture, author, and the structure of the text.

An intertextually defined meaning of any text is not only determined by the writer, but also by its place in wider cultural systems that a reader-translator needs to know. It has already been emphasized that Faulkner’s *Light in August* is firmly anchored in the culture, language, and religion of the American South. Therefore its translation into Finnish – or any other language and culture – inevitably encounters and deals with cultural, linguistic, and religious features typical of the American South in the 1920s and 1930s. An issue the translator of the novel immediately faces is how to distinguish and understand those features and their intertextual relations. Now it is time to see how translators do it and to embark on a close reading of *Light in August* and its translations.

---

191 Culler (1983: 100–118) argues that poststructuralist theorists of intertextuality talk of the infinity of intertextuality. However, when they analyze specific texts they produce a curtailed version of it. There is an obvious tension in the understanding of the nature of intertextuality between poststructuralists and structuralists, who believe that a text’s significance can be stabilized.
In this chapter it will be seen in detail how deeply one literary work, Faulkner’s novel *Light in August*, is intertextual both on the specific and the general level of intertextuality (see Chapter 5), and analyzed how these intertextualities are transferred into Finnish. As language is part of culture, and culture without any semiotic or signaling system hardly exists, these levels of intertextuality are not detached from one another. Faulkner’s works cannot be looked only one way, as a pre-existing reality, without being somehow aware of the other, as “autonomous and autotelic verbal structures” (Bleikasten 1998: 85). In addition, all texts – translations included – are intertextual. Translations are intertextual both in relation to source texts as well as in relation to other, similar types of works in the target culture.

Sections 6.1 and 6.2 have the same structure. Thirty numbered passages, i.e. source language texts, are presented first, and are then followed by relevant intertexts in Southern culture and religion, after which relevant intertexts in Finnish culture and religion and both Finnish translations are presented and examined. The Swedish translation of 1944 is given here, too, either in the corpus text or in a footnote, to confirm the hypothesis presented in Chapter 1 that the Finnish translators of KV either used the Swedish translation as an additional source text, or that they edited the Finnish translation according to the Swedish translation. i.e., to indicate how the Swedish text impacted on the translators of *Kohtalokas veripisara*. As each passage is presented with its intertexts and translations for the sake of analysis, there is inevitably some redundancy in the presentation. However, since it is precisely this type of redundancy which enables the reader to keep track of coherence and other connections within the text with relative ease, I have decided not to remove it entirely.

The chapter ends with a discussion of the main points examined, and notes the conclusions drawn on the basis of the analysis (6.3). The chapter contains multiple references to Faulkner’s other novels, and to translations of Faulkner in Finnish, where they exist. This is done in order to establish the intertextual influence of Southern culture on the author in general and to vindicate the importance of religious language for his whole production. As the most easily perceptible cultural-religious intertextuality in *Light in August* is constituted by biblical allusions, I will start with them in this section, and then gradually proceed to other types of intertextuality present in the novel.
6.1 Specific or limited intertextuality in *Light in August* and its translations

The Bible is one of the backbones of the western culture. Those lacking familiarity with it can hardly understand western art, music, and literature. It offers a rich supply of allusions in several European languages, especially in the English language. It is an important key for the interpretation and understanding of cultural phenomena (see, e.g., Gordon 1972). The Bible has been an omnipresent force in North American life, especially in the American South. “The most prominent role of the Bible in American history has almost certainly been its presence as the source (or at least a reference point) for sermons, homilies, meditations or harangues in church after church, week after week, throughout the length and breadth of the land” (Noll 1992: 407). It is no wonder that the concept *Bible Belt* was coined in the 1920s by Henry Louis Mencken to describe the particular importance of the Bible in the American South (Wilson 2005: 117). Mencken did not give any specific location, but associated the Bible Belt with rural areas of the Midwest and the South.

As a Southern writer, Faulkner attached great importance to the Bible. However, in his writings Faulkner often took liberties with the biblical text. When a student at the University of Virginia pointed out that it was Joseph, not Benjamin, who was sold into Egypt, he asked: “Is there anybody who knows the Bible here?” When somebody answered: “I looked it up and Benjamin was held hostage for Joseph,” Faulkner replied: “Yes, that’s why I used them interchangeably” (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 18; cf. Meeter 1996). Julia Kristeva (Waller 1989: 282) has said: “If one reads *Faulkner* without going back to the Bible, to the Old Testament, to the Gospels, to American society of the period and to his own hallucinatory experience, I believe one cannot reconstitute the complexity of the text itself.” Biblical narratives as well as characters are well-known in the South.

In *Light in August* there are plenty of cultural-religious elements. For example, when Simon McEachern beats Joe Christmas for not learning a definite religious dogma of the catechism, it is said that “he [Christmas] was looking straight ahead, with a rapt, calm expression like a monk in a picture” (LIA, 140). When Joe Christmas takes up the catechism, it is said of him that “save for surplice he might have been a Catholic choir boy…” (LIA, 140). When he comes home too late and gets beaten: “The boy’s body might have been wood or stone; a post or a tower upon which the sentient part of him mused like a hermit, contemplative and remote with ecstasy and selfcrucifixion” (LIA, 150). When he refuses food offered by Mrs. McEachern, he was “carrying

---

192 In the novel, Gail Hightower observes how “crucifixion” has become an ironic habit of people to make others suffer: “Pleasure, ecstasy, they cannot seem to bear: their escape from it is in violence, in drinking and fighting and praying;
the empty tray as though it were a monstrance and he the bearer, his surplice the cutdown undergarment which had been bought for a man to wear” (LIA, 145). What is to be noted in these cultural-religious elements in the quotations is that they all refer specifically to the Roman Catholic form of Christianity, a form of religion that was suspected by the Southern Protestantism. In the denominational sense, there are both Protestant and Catholic intertextual elements in *Light in August*.

As will be seen, in addition to verbatim quotations, in *Light in August* religious, viz. biblical intertexts can occur in many forms. They can be quoted, but in a modified form. One aspect of the intertextual allusion may be conveyed, but not others. Several allusions can be combined to make one. It must be remembered, too, that intertextual allusions may be made subconsciously. All such modifications complicate the reader-translator’s task. It may be that precisely those words that are omitted would help a translator find the allusion in a reference work (Leppihalme 1994: 62). I will first look at those religious-biblical intertexts in the novel which can be situated both on the specific and general level of intertextuality (6.1.1), then proceed to religious-biblical intertexts without a clear cultural intertext (6.1.2), and then analyze intertextual proper-name allusions (6.1.3). The corresponding Swedish text passage of *Light in August* is given either in the text or in a footnote. A French translation, too, is given when appropriate for the analysis.

### 6.1.1 Religious key-phrase allusions with cultural intertexts

**Passage 1: Two source texts**

Source text 1: “… and God said, ‘… I have put the mark on him [Christmas]…’” (LIA, 351)

Source text 2: “… and old Doc Hines said, ‘Do you think you are a nigger because God has marked your face?’ and he [Christmas] said, ‘Is God a nigger too?’…” (LIA, 362)

**Passage 1 in source culture: One specific biblical intertext and cultural-religious intertext**

Specific intertext: And the Lord set a mark upon Cain… (Genesis 4:15)

In these two source text passages, Faulkner has made Eupheus Hines use the biblical allusion (“I [God] have put the mark on him”, “God has marked your [Christmas’s] face”) but not the precise catastrophe too, the violence identical and apparently inescapable *And so why should not their religion drive them to crucifixion of themselves and one another?* he thinks.” (LIA, 347; emphasis in the original).
biblical wording in the King James Bible in Genesis 4:15 (“The Lord set a mark upon Cain”). To recognize the biblical allusion it must be noticed by the reader that the subject is God, and the verb is to mark. In the novel there are altogether four instances of the noun mark and seven instances of the verb to mark in the form of marked (Capps 1979: 513).

One of the most difficult cultural-religious intertextualities in the American South to be transferred into another culture is the religious belief that the blacks fell heir to a curse which God pronounced on Cain (see Genesis 4:9–15). Cain murdered his brother, Abel, and God placed a curse on the fratricide. Cain was to be a fugitive and a vagabond. When he complained that anybody could easily kill him, God placed a mark on him (“the mark of Cain”) to show that he was inviolable. In the Southern tradition, this mark becomes the black skin of the black persons because of the curse (Haynes 2002; cf. Hughes and Allen 1988).

Eupheus Hines’s obsession is race. His racism is based on Southern religious beliefs: God has cursed and marked black people. He is certain that he knows God’s will. In Chapter 16, Hines describes his dialogue with God, what God has said to him about Joe Christmas, and that the complexion of Joe Christmas is the mark of God, i.e., the mark of Cain. A biblical intertext is used to characterize Hines’s way of thinking. His idea of the curse on Christmas is based on a racist reading of the Bible.

As an intertext of specific or limited type, Passage 1 cannot be understood without taking into account the cultural and intertextual tendency in the South to understand that “the mark” in this racial connection refers to a biblical key-phrase allusion. This is the mark of the curse on Cain (Genesis 4:15). Eupheus Hines seems to mean that God has marked Joe Christmas in the same way as God once marked Cain. The reference to Christmas’s face is in itself also an obvious metonymic expression. It is said in Chapter 2 that “his [Joe Christmas’s] face was gaunt, the flesh a level dead parchment color” (LIA, 30). Religion and race are closely linked in the curiosity of young Joe Christmas: “Is God a nigger too?” (see also Passage 29 below).

Ruppersburg (1994: 209) says that Hines may also refer to a second specific intertextual allusion, to the mark of the beast in Revelation 13:16: “And he [another beast] causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads.” If this is what Hines has in mind, he is associating his grandchild with the forces of biblical evil, maybe with anti-Christ. Ruppersburg’s idea may be questioned, though. First, it is no longer following the Southern cultural-religious interpretation of this biblical passage and its association

---

193 Revelation 13:16: “Ja se saa kaikki, pienet ja suuret, sekä rikkaat että köyhät, sekä vapaat että orjat, panemaan merkin oikeaan käteensä tai otsaansa.”
with the blacks, and is clearly more distanced from it. Secondly, it would associate Hines’s daughter’s child with anti-Christ in the Book of Revelation, which is a strong religious statement, though not impossible.194

Passage 1 in target culture: One specific biblical intertext

Specific intertext: Ja Herra pani Kainiin merkin... (Genesis 4:15)

Passage 1: Translations

KV Translation 1: – Ja Jumala sanoi: – ... Olen merkinnyt hänet... (KV, 372)195
LE Translation 1: “... ja Jumala sanoi: ... Olen pannut häneen merkkini... (LE, 282–283)


KV and LE translate “Olen merkinnyt hänet” (KV Translation 1: ‘I have marked him’) and “Olen pannut häneen merkkini” (LE Translation 1: ‘I have put my mark on him’) and “Jumala on merkinnyt kasvosi” (KV Translation 2 and LE Translation 2 are identical: ‘God has marked your face’). The biblical wording of Genesis 4:15 in Finnish is: “Herra pani Kainiin merkin.” (‘The Lord put a mark on Cain.’). Both translations make it clear that the speaker is Eupheus Hines, who uses religious language and justifies on religious grounds what he sees around him in society. The

194 If the reader-translator had been able to use The Library of America Edition of the novel (Faulkner 1985), s/he would have found confirmation of these allusions. This edition has endnotes. On page 1032 there is an endnote in relation to Source text 1: “I have . . . him] Cf. God’s mark on Cain in Gen. 4:11–12, 15.” Joseph Blotner and Noel Polk who wrote the notes have detected the intertextual allusion in Source text 1, but they have not included Source text 2. It may have seemed too a modified allusion to them.

195 “… och Gud sa: ‘… Jag har märket på honom... ” (LIA, 285).


197 In LE, the translator seems to have understood “Doc” to be an abbreviation of a title, ‘doctor’ (‘tohtori’) and translated the word as “tohtori Hines.” However, in LIA “Doc” is only the nickname of Eupheus Hines. The 1945 Finnish translation, KV, has kept the word Doc, instead of translating it. LIA, 324: “he was known as Uncle Doc.” (KV, 342 translates: “häntä kutsutiin Doc-sedäksi”, ‘he was called Uncle Doc’). LE, 260–261 notes: “mies, jota sanottiin Tohtori-sedäksi”, ‘man who was called Uncle Doctor’). – On translating names, see, e.g., Lefevere 1992a: 39–41.
translations let the Finnish reader know that Hines thinks that there is a mark of God, visible in the face of Christmas,\textsuperscript{198} even if s/he may not know the biblical interpretation of this mark in Hines’s thinking or in the larger Southern cultural-religious context.

A non-Southern reader can hardly come to the conclusion that the mark put on Christmas’s face by God is an allusion to the curse on Cain in the Book of Genesis, unless s/he is explicitly informed on that. This happens, e.g., in a French translation of *Light in August*. In *Lumière d’août*,\textsuperscript{199} there is an endnote given on page 1259: “Allusion au ‘signe de Cain’. Voir Genèse, IV, 5 [sic].” It gives the French reader – if s/he is interested enough – the possibility to look up the intertextual biblical allusion, even if that does not explain the Southern cultural-religious tradition of combining the biblical passage and the black skin.

Passage 1 shows how it is possible to translate an intertextual biblical allusion and to give the reader of the translation in another culture the specific intertextual clue, but as such the Finnish translations do not transmit the cultural intertextuality. Even the use of an endnote or a footnote, giving only the biblical references, does not help, if the whole cultural-religious setup is not explained.

However, there is an intratextual support given to the reader in the novel itself. It is important to know that in the novel Eupheus Hines uses the same explanation about his daughter’s lover whom he killed (LIA, 353–354), so the reader knows from elsewhere about the “black curse” (LIA, 354). Another thing is, of course, whether s/he is able to join together these passages and ideas of Hines. Calvin Burden – Joanna Burden’s grandfather – refers to the curse in the novel (LIA, 234), as well as her father Nathaniel Burden (LIA, 239–240): “The curse of the black race is God’s curse.” (LIA, 240). In addition, reading Faulkner more extensively shows numerous intertextual

\textsuperscript{198} The biblical intertext does not give any precision of the location of the visible mark in Cain’s body.

\textsuperscript{199} “Je l’ai marqué déjà” (Faulkner 1995: 276). The volume belongs to the prestigious collection of Gallimard called “Bibliothèque de la Pléiade,” whereas in the collection of Gallimard called “Folio” there are some footnotes given by the translator, but nothing in this particular case. As the translator is the same in both cases, the translations seem to be meant to two different kinds of public.
allusions to the curse on black people in *Absalom, Absalom!*,

200 *Go Down, Moses*201 (Ike McCaslin), and *Requiem for a Nun.*202

Passage 2: Source text

“… But he [Hines] kept in touch with God and at night he said, ‘That bastard, Lord,’ and God said, ‘He is still walking My earth,’ and old Doc Hines kept in touch with God and at night he said, ‘That bastard, Lord,’ and God said, ‘He is still walking My earth,’ and old Doc Hines kept in touch with God and one night he wrestled and he strove and he cried aloud, ‘That bastard, Lord! I feel! I feel the teeth and the fangs of evil!’ and God said, ‘It’s that bastard. Your work is not done yet. He’s a pollution and a abomination on My Earth.’” (LIA, 365)

Passage 2 in source culture: Two specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Specific intertext 1: Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it. (Job 1:7)

Specific intertext 2: And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day. And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and the hollow of Jacob’s thigh was out of joint, as he wrestled with him. And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me. And he said unto him, What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed. And Jacob asked him, and said, Tell me, I pray thee, thy name. And he said, Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name? And he blessed him there. (Genesis 32:24–29)

Faulkner sometimes uses biblical intertexts in *Light in August* combining two or three of them in the same passage. They often belong to the discourse of the same character. In the novel, this happens especially with Eupheus Hines. In Chapter 16, he explains to Byron Bunch and Gail

---

200 In *Absalom, Absalom!*: “… that burlesque uniform and regalia of the tragic burlesque of the sons of Ham…” (the young son of Charles Bon); “… the tattered hat and the overalls – of his ancient curse…”; “… niggers, that the Bible said had been created and cursed by God to be brute and vassal to all men of white skin, were better found and housed and even clothed than he and his granddaughter…” (Wash Jones) (Faulkner 1990: 163, 169, 233.)

201 In *Go Down, Moses*: “… the boy’s cousin McCaslin told him what that was: not the heritage of Ham, not the mark of servitude but of bondage…”; “… and McCaslin ‘The sons of Ham. You who quote the Book: the sons of Ham.’” (Ike McCaslin) (Faulkner 1994: 124, 192).

202 In *Requiem for a Nun*: “… men like Grenier and Compson and Peabody who had grown from infancy among slaves, breathed the same air and even suckled the same breast with the sons of Ham: black and white, free and unfree…” (Faulkner 1994: 501).
Hightower his actions at the orphanage and his dialogue with God. After Simon McEachern has come and taken the boy Christmas away, Hines also goes away. But he keeps “in touch with God” who tells him that his work is not yet done because “the bastard” is still “walking My [God’s] earth.” The repetition of the phrase is to be noted.

Set in this religiously colored passage, there are probably two modified biblical key-phrase allusions which may be difficult for the reader-translator to detect. However, there are hints pointing to them. The first one is the tone of the whole passage in which Eupheus Hines is speaking. It has become clear to the reader by this point that Hines is a religious fanatic using biblical and religious language, even if the reader is not familiar with the biblical language. The second one is the dialogical nature of the passage. The fact that Hines is describing a dialogue with God links his speech in this passage immediately with those biblical books that describe a human being’s dialogue with God. The biblical key-phrase allusion in the passage seems to be to Job 1:7. As Hines believes that Joe Christmas represents evil (see Passage 1), he hears God using the same expression about his grandson as Satan would use of its own movements, “walking the earth.” The combination is essential for the allusion. There are 46 instances of walking and 59 instances of earth in the novel (Capps 1979: 955, 234–235). However, only in these two instances in the novel God says: “He is still walking my earth” (LIA, 365).

In Eupheus Hines’s opinion, God would thus place Satan and the “bastard” on the same level of evil, and he does the same. In other words, Doc Hines sees his grandchild as the devil (Coffee 1983: 124). His worldview is black and white. The fact that religiously fanatical Hines, through this allusion to Job 1:7, associates Joe Christmas with evil and the devil, supports the presence of an allusion.

Through the hints, a reader-translator might suspect that there is a biblical intertext here. To recognize the exact source of the allusion would necessitate a biblical knowledge. If the reader knew the exact source of the intertext, this would provide him or her for the piece of information that probably is alluding to Job (1:7), Hines is in fact associating his grandson with Satan, who is the dialogue partner of God in the biblical passage in question.

The second instance of biblical intertextuality is the expression “he wrestled” which shows how a specific intertext can be also a cultural intertext. Hines’s words seem to be a biblical key-phrase

203 “He’s a pollution and a abomination on My earth” (LIA, 365) is no longer counted here as an intertextual allusion, as “walking” is no more there.

It can be asked whether “he wrestled” is an intertextual allusion. If that is the case, at least the allusion and the analogy drawn to it are rather weak. Two aspects seem to refute the presence of an allusion. First, this may be only a one-word allusion, based only on the verb wrestled. Besides, the verb is a hapax legomenon in the novel (Capps 1979: 1008). Secondly, Faulkner uses only one aspect of the intertext, that of fighting and wrestling. In Genesis 32:24–29 it is clear that Jacob wrestled with an angel of God,205 who blesses him after the wrestling, but there is no reference to the devil, as in Light in August. In addition, the angel touched the hollow of Jacob’s thigh that was disjointed. Eupheus Hines does not mention any such permanent injury.

However, two other aspects seem to confirm the presence of an allusion. First, the image of the wrestling with Satan or with an angel is an intertext used in Faulkner’s other works. There is a mention of it at least in As I Lay Dying (Preacher Whitfield),206 A Fable207 and The Mansion (V.K. Ratliff).208 The use of the allusion elsewhere in Faulkner’s works seems to support its presence also here. Secondly, the context of a nocturnal struggle by a religiously deranged person, using religious language, seems to speak for the presence of a biblical intertext. This passage also shows to the reader-translator that Faulkner may be – consciously or unconsciously – using biblical intertexts, but also changing them to fit his imagination and his creative purposes.209

204 Barthes (1990a) has analyzed this section in Genesis. Barthes speaks of the text as an “open network which is the very infinity of language,” and of a textual analysis trying to say “no longer from where the text comes (historical criticism), nor even how it is made (structural analysis), but how it is unmade, how it explodes, disseminates – by what coded paths it goes off.” (Barthes 1990a: 126–127; emphasis in the original). The use of the biblical intertext in Light in August is one way of “explosion” or “dissemination” of the biblical passage, i.e., intertextuality.

205 This narrative is also an example of intratextuality in the Bible. In Hosea 12:4 it is said: “Yea, he [Jacob] had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept, and made supplication unto him”.

206 “… have I not wrestled thigh to thigh with Satan myself?” (Faulkner 1985: 120.)

207 “‘You have wrestled all night,’ the group commander said. ‘With what angel?’” (Faulkner 1994: 714.)

208 “… like Jacob with his angel…” (Faulkner 1999: 478.)

209 A third aspect confirming the allusions may be the fact that The Library of America Edition of the novel (Faulkner 1985) mentions these allusions. This edition has endnotes. On page 1032 there are two endnotes in relation to the source text: “‘He … earth’] Cf. Job 1:7.” and “one … strove] Cf. Gen. 32:24–26.” Admittedly, the Finnish translators in the 1940s and the 1960s did not have this edition at their disposal.
Passage 2 in target culture: Two specific biblical intertexts and cultural intertext

Specific intertext 1: Saatana vastasi Herralle ja sanoi: ‘Maata kiertämästä ja siellä kuljeksimasta’. (Job 1:7)


Passage 2: Translations


In the context of Eupheus Hines’s nocturnal dialogue with God, the reader knows that this is religious language, even if s/he may not see the possible intertextual allusion to Job 1:7. As KV uses the phrase “maan päällä” (‘on earth’), Jesus’s well-known words in the Lord’s prayer in the New Testament (Matthew 6:10), the reader is given a clue to detect traces of biblical language, even if not an allusion. On the other hand, KV – as the Swedish translation – omits the repetitious

emphasis of the source text. LE’s “maani pinnalla” (‘on my Earth’) is not a word-for-word biblical allusion, but as it is God speaking, it normally provides the reader with a framework of religious discourse. The French translation of *Light in August* helps the French reader. In *Lumière d’août*, there is an endnote given on page 1261: “Voir Job, I, 7.” If there is intertextuality, it deals with a specific intertext.

In the case of the second probable intertext (“he wrestled”), it is precisely Faulkner’s creative use of intertextuality that challenges the reader-translator. The Finnish verb *painia* used by LE works better to evoke the biblical allusion than KV’s phrase *kävi kovaa kamppailua* (‘(he) struggled hard’), as Finnish has the well-known cultural-religious expression “Jaakokin paini” (‘Jacob’s wrestling’). If the reader of LE suspects an allusion here, general intertextuality supports his or her reading. In the Finnish arts, e.g., there is in the Kempele church a painting by Mikael Toppelius (ca. 1790) whose motif is Jacob’s wrestle, showing the intertextual popularity of this biblical text (see Lempiäinen 2002: 191). Intertextuality in the translations – at least in the case of LE – is supported by both specific and general intertextuality. Again, it can be noted that the French translator notes that there is a specific intertextual allusion here. In *Lumière d’août*, there is a endnote given on page 1261: “Allusion à la lutte de Jacob avec Dieu. Voir Genèse, XXXII, 23–30.”

In this particular case, the biblical intertext seems to be both general and specific, cultural-religious type. Both types of intertextuality sustain each other, and may help to detect and translate both of them. It seems that the more general – and well-known – the type of intertextuality is in question, the more easily it seems to be detected, and eventually be translated.

In this passage it can be seen how Eupheus Hines is more interested in evil than in goodness. He imagines himself wrestling with the devil – not with an angel that would bless him. The reader notices his lively, rather folkloric description of evil, with its teeth and fangs. KV translates “Tunnen pahan kynnet ja kuristavan otteen kurkullani” (‘I feel the nails of evil and a strangling on my throat.’). The direct influence of the Swedish translation on KV, “Jag känner det ondas klor och kvävande snara” (‘I feel the nails of evil and a strangling snare’; LIAS, 296) is evident in the passage.

LE’s translation is “Tunnen pahuuden kynnet ja hampaat!” (‘I feel the nails and fangs of evil!’) Admittedly, there is a colorful description of evil locusts in the Book of Revelation (9:3–11), with

---

211 “Il marche encore à la surface de Ma terre” (Faulkner 1995: 287).
212 In the western arts, there are famous paintings on this motif e.g. by Rembrandt (1659), Gustave Doré (1855), and Paul Gauguin (1888). These paintings are good examples of general intertextuality in relation to specific intertextuality.
213 “… une nuit, il s’est débattu, il a lutté…” (Faulkner 1995: 287).
their teeth as “the teeth of lions,” “leijonain hampaat” (v. 8; cf. Daniel 7:7). In spite of that, there hardly is overt intertextuality here, neither in the source text, nor in the translations.

If the reader-translator suspects that there is an intertextual allusion here, it is probably because the western reader can detect a cultural-religious intertext. In the Middle Ages in Europe it was quite customary to paint the devil as having the head of an animal and teeth with sharp fangs. The body and skin were often described as a combination of various parts of many animals. One source of inspiration was the Book of Revelation, which describes “a great red dragon,” an enemy of God, in colorful terms (Revelation 12:3–4, 7, 9; 13:2, 4, etc.).

For the Finnish reader, scary descriptions of the devil with teeth and fangs have been familiar since the Middle Ages (see, e.g., Lempiäinen 2002: 365–373). In colloquial language Finns can speak of the “sarvipää” (‘the one with the horns’), alluding to the devil (see, e.g., Kielitoimiston sanakirja [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish], s.v. ‘sarvipää’). In churches there are horrible paintings depicting the devil (e.g. in the Lohja church and in the Taivassalo church).

Passage 3: Two source texts

Source text 1: [Simon McEachern] “… I make no doubt that with us he [Christmas] will grow up to fear God and abhor idleness and vanity despite his origin.” (LIA, 134)

Source text 2: [Simon McEachern] “… For I will have you learn soon that the two abominations are sloth and idle thinking, the two virtues are work and the fear of God.” (LIA, 135)

Passage 3 in source culture: Eight specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Specific intertext 1: The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom (Psalm 111:10)

Specific intertext 2: Fear the Lord, and depart from evil. (Proverbs 3:7)

Specific intertext 3: By the fear of the Lord men depart from evil. (Proverbs 16:6)

Specific intertext 4: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. (Ecclesiastes 12:13)

Specific intertext 5: Slothfulness casteth into a deep sleep; and an idle soul shall suffer hunger. (Proverbs 19:15)

Specific intertext 6: And through idleness of the hands the house droppeth through (Ecclesiastes 10:18)

Specific intertext 7: And they followed vanity, and became vain. (II Kings 17:15)
In Chapter 6 of the novel, when Joe Christmas is adopted by the McEacherns, Simon McEachern comes to pick him up and converses with the matron of the orphanage. A stern Presbyterian, he says that he is ready to teach Joe Christmas the fear of God and the value of work (Source text 1). When he is taking Joe Christmas to his new home, McEachern basically repeats to him some of the things he has already said to the matron at the orphanage (Source text 2).214

For the sociologist Max Weber (1864–1920), Protestantism, and specially Calvinism and Puritanism, represented by Simon McEachern here, encourages an ascetic-type of attitude toward the “world,” i.e., a religiously motivated denial to enjoy the goods of this world. In certain economic conditions, Max Weber argues, the Protestant ethic encourages people to invest the earned money instead of spending it (see, e.g., Schweiger 2004). It is to be remembered that the Reformation set the Christian in the world as the only possible place to live an authentic Christian life. The disapproval of monasteries by the Reformers eventually led to the result that the “world” lost most of its negative connotations, and that for a Protestant Christian, serving God and serving one’s neighbor could take place in the world.

The influence of this cultural intertextuality of the American South cannot be ignored in the passage. The emphasis on work and fear of God in Simon McEachern’s and the Protestant (Calvinistic) ethic is so strong that he even mentions work before the fear of God (Source text 2). Work in the Protestant ethic is important in the sense that those who are elected must show their election by the success of their earthly enterprises. Simon McEachern, as poor as he is, follows this idea rigorously. He intends to force Joe Christmas to learn this idea that is – at least in his view – based on biblical texts, i.e., on divine will.

Simon McEachern demands rigid adherence to a religious and moral code of conduct; any deviation from it is a sin. The code can be found in the Bible and in the catechism, and he thinks the best way to learn religion is to memorize the code (see LIA, 137–143). He is so eager to teach the religious code to Joe Christmas that he forgets to treat him and other persons with dignity.

The reader-translator can immediately recognize religious language, but s/he may not be able to locate the allusion. There are 18 instances of the word fear in the novel (Capps 1979: 279), but only in these two instances the word is linked with the word God (which has 114 instances, Capps 1979: 331–333). Passage 3 alludes to many biblical intertexts in Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and II

214 The reaction of Joe Christmas to this rather abstract speech can be expected: “He had neither ever worked nor feared God.” (LIA, 135).
Kings. In the Bible, the fear meant here is “God-given, enabling men to reverence God’s authority, obey His commandments, and hate and shun all form of evil” (Douglas 1976b: 419; cf. Kramer 2006: 674 and Koehler/Baumgartner 1985: 399). There is only one specific allusion to the New Testament, to Acts 14:15, linking up with “vanities,” not with the fear of God. Besides being a cultural-religious combination of specific intertexts, this passage shows a strong emphasis on Old Testament texts in Simon McEachern’s Presbyterian religion.

Passage 3 in target culture: Eight specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Specific intertext 1: Herran pelko on viisauden alku. (Psalm 111:10)

Specific intertext 2: Pelkää Herraa ja karta pahaa. (Proverbs 3:7)

Specific intertext 3: Herran pelolla paha välitetään. (Proverbs 16:6)

Specific intertext 4: Pelkää Jumalaa ja pidä hänen käskynsä, sillä niin tulee jokaisen ihmisen tehdä. (Ecclesiastes 12:13)

Specific intertext 5: Laiskuus vaivuttaa sikeään uneen, ja veltto joutuu näkemään nälkää. (Proverbs 19:15)

Specific intertext 6: Missä kädet velttoina riippuvat, tippuu huoneeseen vettä. (Ecclesiastes 10:18)

Specific intertext 7: He seurasivat turhia jumalia, ja turhanpäiväisiksi he tulivat. (II Kings 17:15)

Specific intertext 8: Että te kääntyisitte noista turhiista jumalista elävän Jumalan puoleen. (Acts 14:15)

Passage 3: Translations

KV Translation 1: – ... Minä en ollenkaan epäile, että emme pystyisi opettamaan häntä pelkäämään Jumalaa ja pakenemaan kaikkea mielettömyyttä, olkoon hän millaista perua tahansa. (KV, 146)

LE Translation 1: “… Olen varma, että meidän luonamme hän oppii pelkäämään Jumalaa ja kammoamaan laiskuutta ja turhamaisuutta syntyperästään huolimatta.” (LE, 110)

Cf. McEachern’s words to Christmas: “You’ll have time and opportunity (and inclination too, I dont doubt) to make me regret that I have spoken. To fall into sloth and idleness again” (LIA, 170; emphasis added). In the novel there are three instances of sloth (Capps 1979: 796), five instances of idleness (Capps 1979: 400), and six instances of vanity (Capps 1979: 940–941).

“Jag tvivlar inte alls på att vi ska lära honom att frukta Gud och fly all dårskap vad han än har för påbrå.” (LIAS, 113).
The reader-translator can recognize Simon McEachern’s religious worldview. There is, above all, cultural intertextuality that is conveyed by cultural-religious intertexts. For the Finnish reader who is familiar with biblical texts it might be difficult to find the exact biblical texts that served as the intertextual foundation for the passage. The passage shows how the characterization in the novel necessitates that the cultural intertextual elements (here “fear God and abhor idleness and vanity”, which really are a major feature in Calvinistic Christianity), are to be retained in translation, which both translations in Finnish do.

The recognition of allusions by the reader-translator is helped by wider, cultural intertextuality affecting Simon McEachern and his character. In Source text 2 there are two pairs: two abominations and two virtues. There is the first pair, sloth and work, and the second pair, idle thinking and fear of God. KV translates “the two abominations” as “kaksi suurta syntiää” (‘two great sins’). KV’s solution may be the result of interference from the Swedish translation: “de två stora synderna” (‘the two great sins’). However, there is no notion of (two) great sins in the Bible or in the Presbyterian catechism McEachern most probably uses.218 Neither Presbyterianism nor mainline Protestantism have a list of capital sins in the same way as Roman Catholic Christianity does (see Catechism of the Catholic Church, passages 1865–1869).219 In this sense the characterization of the Protestant Presbyterian McEachern in KV Translation 2 is not entirely adequate.220 LE refers to “iljettävyyksiä” (‘abominations’) and “hyveitä” (‘virtues’), but does not quite transfer McEachern’s fixed idea that there are “the two abominations” and “the two virtues.”

If the Protestant ethos is viewed as cultural intertextuality, it seems that it is the dominant feature in this passage to be transferred. Admittedly, it is a more foreign element to the reader of the Finnish translations, but it has a value in itself, as its value is based on the Protestant Calvinistic

---

217 “Redan från första början vill jag att du ska lära dig att de två stora synderna är lättja och onyttiga tankar och att dygderna är arbete och gudsfruktan.” (LIAS, 113).
218 McEachern’s “Presbyterian catechism” is quite probably the Westminster Shorter Catechism written in 1646–1647 by the Westminster Assembly in Britain (see Pipa 2008: 351–360).
219 In the Roman Catholic Church the capital sins are the counterpart of the seven cardinal virtues: pride vs. humility, avarice vs. charity, envy vs. kindness, wrath vs. patience, lust vs. chastity, gluttony vs. temperance, and sloth or acedia vs. diligence.
220 Eupheus Hines says to the dietitian in the novel that “my sin is greater than your sin” (LIA, 120).
source culture and to a wide extent understood by the Protestant (Lutheran) target culture in Finland. The ethos of work lives in Finnish culture among other things in the form of proverbs (e.g. “Hiki laiskan syödessänsä, vilu työtä tehdessänsä”, a warning of laziness; Sinnemäki 1982: 102).

As to the biblical intertexts, the reader of the Finnish translations is given enough clues to understand that there may be religious or biblical allusions but in this case specific intertextuality does not play a major role. The Finnish reader shares enough common cultural-religious intertextuality with an American Southern reader.

Passage 4: Source text

[Byron Bunch saying] “This other one aint lost now. She has been lost for thirty years. But she is found now. She’s his grandmother.” (LIA, 345)

Passage 4 in source culture: Four specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Specific intertext 1: … for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found. (Luke 15:32)

Specific intertext 2: For this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. (Luke 15:24)

Specific intertext 3: Rejoice with me: for I have found my sheep which was lost. (Luke 15:6)

Specific intertext 4: Rejoice with me: for I have found the piece which I had lost. (Luke 15:9)

Basically, there seems to be no clue to the reader to recognize an intertextual allusion in Passage 4. However, it is argued that there is specific intertextuality here, being a borderline case for the reader-translator. How can we recognize the case as there is no clear intertextual clue?221

This is a case in which the role of a wider context is important for the reader-translator. S/he knows that Byron Bunch, who is speaking, is a religious Christian person. Through his or her reading, s/he knows that Byron Bunch’s understanding of religion is more merciful than that of Eupheus Hines or Simon McEachern, who both tend to lean on strict, legalistic type of Protestant Calvinism. Bunch is a member of a country church, and as a Southern Protestant Christian he most probably knows his Bible. In addition, he is speaking to his friend Gail Hightower, who is an ex-Reverend, so the language used can be explicitly or allusively religious. There are 37 instances of the word lost in the novel (Capps 1979: 495–496), and 122 instances of the word found (Capps 1979: 308–309).

221 For instance, the French translation gives no note here.
From these facts it can be concluded that this is a biblical key-phrase allusion by Byron Bunch to the *locus classicus* of the three parables told by Jesus in the Gospel of Luke, Chapter 15, especially to the climactic parable of the prodigal son: he “was lost, and is found.” The idea of being lost and then being found, religiously and spiritually speaking, is part of general (cultural) intertextuality in the American South where people fall short but are forgiven (see Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 266–267). In addition, it is argued that “the pattern of lost and found is the over-arching plot of the Bible” (Ryken, Wilhoit & Longman III 1998: 517).

The passage in Luke 15:11–32 is one of the most famous Jesus’s parables in the Bible, and it is well-known in the source culture. It is a story of a rebellious son who rejects parental authority and squanders the property his father has given him. However, it also conveys a powerful message of repentance and restoration. When the son repents and returns home, his father runs to him and restores his natural relationship to his father. Ruppersburg (1994: 206) suggests that this “lost – found” pattern is “a loose paraphrase of the famous line from the hymn ‘Amazing grace:’ ‘I once was lost but now am found.’” However, Ruppersburg (1994: 206) does not mention the biblical allusion behind the well-known hymn by John Newton (1725–1807).

It cannot be determined with certainty whether Faulkner uses this particular biblical allusion consciously or whether he is unaware of his use of it. In any case he uses it in a rather unexpected way. Instead of attaching the parable to Joe Christmas, he uses the parable of the prodigal son in reference to a woman. In fact, Faulkner seems to have understood the point to be that “the Prodigal Son” is a rather inadequate title for the parable because the older brother’s story is neglected.

In the parable, the prodigal son has an older brother who remains with the father, but is embittered by the reception the father gives to the younger brother when he comes back home. In any case, “the unifying character here is the father, whose gracious love is extended to both his younger, unrighteous son and his older, self-righteous son” (Ryken, Wilhoit & Longman III 1998: 665).

In the source text, when applied to Mrs. Hines, the parable can be understood at least in two ways. First, Mrs. Hines is now “found” in relation to Joe Christmas, and secondly, she has found herself, her identity, as grandmother. Even if the reader-translator does not recognize the religious intertext, the dramatic and emotional situation can draw his or her attention to the intertextual passage.

Passage 4 in target culture: Four specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

---

222 It must be remembered that in Luke 15:8–10 it is a woman who loses and finds a piece of silver: “I have found the piece which I had lost.” (v. 9; see Specific intertext 4.)
Specific intertext 1: “... sillä tämä sinun veljesi oli kuollut ja virkosi eloon, hän oli kadonnut, ja on jälleen löytynyt.” (Luke 15:32)

Specific intertext 2: “... sillä tämä minun poikani oli kuollut ja virkosi eloon, hän oli kadonnut ja on jälleen löytynyt.” (Luke 15:24)


Passage 4: Translations


The passage in Luke 15:11–32 is well-known in the target culture, too. In Finland there are e.g. church paintings illustrating the parable (Lempiäinen 2002: 282). The translator of KV probably follows the Swedish translation (LIAS, 280): “Den där andra är inte vilseförd nu längre. Hon var det i tretti år. Men nu har hon funnit honom. Sin dotterson.” (‘The other one is no longer lost. She was lost for thirty years. But now she has found him. Her daughter’s son.’) KV translates the first “lost” as “harhaanjohdettu” (‘misled’, ‘led astray’; in Swedish: ‘vilseförd’). In addition, KV adds a relative clause: “mitä on etsinyt” (‘that which she has been looking for’), unlike the Swedish translation does. This is confusing as in the same chapter it is clear that Mrs. Hines was not actively looking for her grandson. She herself was “found”, because she herself was “lost.” This intertextual pair of words “lost and found” is not transmitted by KV, and thus KV does not transmit Byron Bunch’s familiarity with the well-known biblical allusion. It consequently weakens the characterization of Bunch as a Southern Christian.

It cannot be said with certainty that the translator of LE, either, has recognized the intertext. However, LE looks more closely to the meaning of “lost” and translates the idea as “kadoksissa” enabling the Finnish reader to have a clue of the allusion. If the intertextual allusion is recognized, Byron Bunch’s character as a Southern Christian is enhanced. In this sense, transmitting cultural intertextuality gives the reader a better chance to detect also specific intertextuality.
Passage 5: Source text

[Gail Hightower thinking] ‘… what could I have expected save disgrace and despair and the face of God turned away in very shame? ...’ (LIA, 462)

Passage 5 in source culture: Specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext (see especially the Book of Job, e.g. 13:24, and Psalms, e.g. 13:1, 27:9, 30:7)

Three possible intertexts: Specific intertext 1: The Lord bless thee, and keep thee: The Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace. (Numbers 6:24–26)

Specific intertext 2: Then shall they cry unto the Lord, but he will not hear them: he will even hide his face from them at that time, as they have behaved themselves ill in their doings. (Micah 3:4)

Specific intertext 3: For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open unto their prayers: but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil. (I Peter 3:12)

The metonymic expression “God’s face” does not mean only that God is near, but refers to God himself and his presence (see Payne 1976, and Bauer 1988: 1443–1446), i.e., God being everywhere (see e.g. Psalm 139:7). When somebody speaks of God’s face, s/he normally is referring in a reverent way to God’s omnipresence in the world, i.e., to God himself (e.g. Genesis 4:14–16; Jonah 1:3, 10; Jeremiah 15:1; Revelation 6:16). Sometimes it is said that God may hide his face because of people’s iniquities (Deuteronomy 31:18; Isaiah 64:7). Sometimes God’s face refers to his grace, favor and good will, as in Numbers 6:25. In the Bible it is said that nobody can see God’s face and live (Exodus 33:20). Seeing God face-to-face is a blessing reserved for the future life (I Corinthians 13:12). In biblical language, the face refers metonymically to the self: one’s face is one’s true self. Biblical passages also use face as a symbol of one’s nature and character (Ryken, Wilhoit & Longman III 1998: 259). There are 376 instances of the word face in Light in August (Capps 1979: 266–270).

In addition to this religious-biblical intertextuality, there is also a cultural intertext here. In the Old South, the eyes indicated honor, and also looked down in shame or deference. In the American South an inappropriate look could precipitate affairs of honor (Wyatt-Brown 1986: 33; Haynes 2002: 80).

In the light of this information, the intertextual expression used by ex-Reverend Gail Hightower in Chapter 20 of the novel can be understood more easily. In this chapter and passage he understands that he has failed to love and care for his wife, as he has failed to serve the Church, and this makes
him think of his relationship with God. As a trained theologian and an ordained clergyman in the South, he estimates that the only legitimate reaction to his shameful behavior on God’s side is that God turns away his face.

Here, Gail Hightower’s thoughts explain the situation: he does not expect to receive anything else from God than disgrace, despair, and shame. It does not matter whether the reader-translator can detect the key-phrase allusion to biblical intertexts, or not.\(^{223}\) In any case, if the reader belongs to the western culture, s/he will understand the cultural-religious meaning of the expression, even if s/he does not know the significance of honor in the American South.

Passage 5 in target culture: Specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext (see especially the Book of Job, e.g. 13:24, and Psalms, e.g. 13:2, 27:9, 30:8)

Three possible intertexts: Specific intertext 1: Herra siunatko sinua ja varjelkoon sinua; Herra valistakoon kasvonsa sinulle ja olkoon sinulle armollinen; Herra kääntäköön kasvonsa sinun puoleesi ja antakoon sinulle rauhan. (Numbers 6:24–26)

Specific intertext 2: kerran he huutavat Herran puoleen, mutta hän ei vastaa heille, vaan kätkee heiltä kasvonsa sinä aikana, koska he ovat pahoja töitä tehneet. (Micah 3:4)

Specific intertext 3: Sillä Herran silmät tarkkaavat vanhurskaita ja hänen korvansa heidän rukouksiansa, mutta Herran kasvot ovat pahantekijöitä vastaan. (I Peter 3:12)

Passage 5: Translations

KV Translation: ‘... Mitä muuta saatoin odottaa kuin häpeää ja epätoivoa ja että Jumala kääntäisi kasvonsa minusta? (KV, 492)\(^{224}\)

LE Translation: ‘... mitä saatoin odottaa? Mitä muuta kuin epäonnistumista ja epätoivoa ja sitä, että Jumala käänsi häpeissään kasvonsa pois minusta? ...’ (LE, 373)

In this passage, cultural intertextuality is the dominant one. For any western reader-translator of the source text, the expression is probably clear. Even if s/he does not detect or recognize specific intertexts, s/he can still understand that the turning away of God’s face is something negative,


\(^{224}\) “Vad kunde jag annat vänta än vanära och förtvivlan och att Gud skulle vända sitt ansikte ifrån mig?” (LIAS, 374).
something to regret. In this passage to transmit cultural intertextuality is enough to transmit the message. If somebody does not want to look at you, there is a reason, normally something emotionally strong and negative (shame, fear, hate, etc.). The expression transmits rejection. Faulkner uses the same intertext also in the famous description of a revival meeting in *The Sound and the Fury* (the visiting preacher).

Numbers 6:24–26 in the Bible is called the “Priestly Blessing” (in Finnish: “Herran siunaus”) in Christianity. As specific intertextuality is included and contained in cultural intertextuality, the Finnish translations transmit the intertextual expression, and they both use almost the word-for-word rendering of the passage in the Finnish Bible.

Passage 6: Source text

He [Gail Hightower] sees the faces which surround him mirror astonishment, puzzlement, then outrage, then fear, as if they looked beyond his wild antics and saw behind him and looking down upon him, in his turn unaware, the final and supreme Face Itself, cold, terrible because of Its omniscient detachment. (LIA, 462–463)

Passage 6 in source culture: Specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext (see Passage 5 above)

The intertextual allusion to the “Face” can be found in another passage, too. In Chapter 20 of the novel, Gail Hightower realizes and admits to himself that he has served his ministry, his wife, and his church only for his own purposes, not for the good of the others or for the glory of God. This passage immediately comes after Hightower’s “repentance.” This is probably the reason why Hightower sees the Face, but he does not see the face of a merciful God, but the ominous face of a judging God (see LIA, 463). This face is the Face of God, yet at the same time also the Face of Truth, “about to discover to Hightower the failures of his life” (Ruppersburg 1994: 290).

Intertextually, the “Face” is the specific intertext, the biblical key-phrase allusion referring to various verses in the Bible. In addition, it is also an intratext in the novel as it comes just after the passage dealing with “the face of God” (see Passage 5). Intertextuality is thus clearly visible here, as well as intratextuality. In this case Hightower thinks that the Face (of God) is cold and terrible,

225 “… I hears de weepin en de cryin en de turnt-away face of God: dey done kilt Jesus; dey done kilt my Son!” (Faulkner 2006: 1105; emphasis added). Here the expression is used at its maximum negative effect to indicate the suffering and death of Jesus.
which no longer corresponds to the biblical image of God’s face. The intertext gains a new meaning in this extract, given by the author.226

One indirect clue of intertextuality is the word *detachment*, especially as it is combined with the adjective *omniscient*. In the *Oxford English Dictionary*, ‘detachment’ is defined as “the action of detaching; unfastening, disconnecting, separation.” But detachment is also “a state of separation or withdrawal from connection or association with surrounding things. … A condition of spiritual separation from the world. … More widely, freedom or aloofness from ordinary concerns or emotional commitments.” This is a rather broad definition, but does justice to the spiritual dimension of the word, especially in its intertextual context of ex-Reverend Gail Hightower.

Passage 6 in target culture: Specific biblical intertexts and cultural intertext (see Passage 5 above)

Passage 6: Translations

KV Translation: Hightower näkee kasvoilla ihmetystä ja hämmennystä, sitten suuttumusta ja pelkoa, ikäänuin ne näkisivät hänen hurjen eleittensä ja koko olemuksensa lävitse ja olisivat huomanneet hänen takanaan kasvot, jotka hänen tietämättään katselevat häntä – Korkeimman omat kasvot, kylmät, kaikentietävää yksinäisyydessään kauhistavat. (KV, 493)227

LE Translation: Hän näkee ympäröivien kasvojen kuvastavan hämmästystä, ihmetystä, sitten harmia ja pelkoa, ikään kuin ne katselisivat hänen hurjen ilveidensä taustalle ja näkisivät hänen takanaan Perimmäiset kasvot, jotka hänen huomaamattaan katselevat häntä kaikkikitietävässä ylemmyydessään kylminä ja pelottavina. (LE, 374)

Each of the two translations deals with intertextuality in its own way. KV helps the reader in inserting the adjectival noun *Korkeimman* (‘of the Highest’) that immediately and specifically – with the uppercase “K” to help the reader to detect the allusion, precisely like in the Swedish translation (*den Högstes*) – transmits the idea of God’s finality and supremacy. It gives to detachment the idea of solitude (“yksinäisyysydessään,” ‘in its solitude’; in Swedish: “i sin …

---

226 There is a striking similarity with the French philosopher Emmanuel Levinas’s (1906–1995) thinking here. Levinas was very much concerned with human relationships. He wanted to delineate an ethical “face-to-face” relation with the Other. This Other is immediate and singular, and none the less transcendent (see especially *Totalité et infini* 1961). The presence of the Other brings ethical responsibilities. It comes as no surprise to discover that Levinas was influenced by Jewish philosophy.

227 “Han ser ansiktena återspeglar förvåning och förvirring och sedan indignation och fruktan; som om de såg tvärsigenom hans vilda åtbörder och hela hans jag, och bakom honom fått syn på Ansikte, som utan att han visste det såg ner på honom – den Högstes eget ansikt, kallt, förfärande i sin allvetande ensamhet.” (LIAS, 374).
ensamhet”) and refers clearly to the Superior Being. The relationship between Hightower and Korkeimman omat kasvot in KV is that of God and the human being.

LE opts for a different solution for the “Face.” LE combines the idea of finality and supremacy in the adjective Perimmäiset (‘the Ultimate’), and thus leaves the nature of the transcendent more undefined and in a way, more secularized. The uppercase “P” indicates that this is an epithet. It is defined by the adjective kaikkitietävässä (‘omniscient’), which characteristic, omniscience, is normally associated in Christianity – and in religions in general – only with God.

Passage 7: Source text

Then the man would say, “What have you been into now?” and the child [Gail Hightower] could not answer, could not speak, staring at his father with on his child’s face an expression as of the Pit itself. (LIA, 444)

Passage 7 in source culture: One specific biblical intertext and cultural-religious intertext

Specific intertext: And the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth: and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit. And he opened the bottomless pit; and there arose a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace; and the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit. (Revelation 9:1–2)

In Chapter 20, Gail Hightower has found his father’s Civil War uniform, has understood some of the horrors of the war, and is frightened. His father notices his facial expressions, and asks him for the reason. Young Hightower’s horror is shown by an intertext, a biblical allusion. The one-word biblical key-phrase allusion, the “Pit”, can be easily recognized through the uppercase “P” to be an expression for the biblical hell (see, e.g., Barnhart 2005). It is one of the easiest allusions to recognize as there are only five instances of pit in the novel (Capps 1979: 666), and this is the only time when the word is written in the novel with an uppercase “P.”

Ruppersburg (1994: 270) affirms that the word means “Hell”. The expression comes from Revelation 9:1–2. The passage, attached to young Hightower, characterizes him and also shows the strong intertextual presence of the Southern religion in his life.

Passage 7 in target culture: One specific biblical intertext and cultural-religious intertext

Specific intertext: Ja viides enkeli puhalsi pasuunaan; niin minä näin tähden, taivaasta maan päälle pudonneen, ja sille annettiin syvyyden kaivon avain; ja se avasi syvyyden kaivon, ja kaivon savu, niinkuin savu suuresta pätsistä, ja kaivon savu pimitti auringon ja ilman. (Revelation 9:1–2)

228 In the 1992 Finnish Bible translation: “syvyyden kuilu,” ‘the pit of deepness.’
Passage 7: Translations

KV Translation: Hän kysyi: – Mitäs sinä nyt olet keksinyt? Eikä lapsi kyennyt vastaamaan, ei puhumaan, tuijotti vain edelleen häneen syvillä silmillään. Ø (KV, 475)

LE Translation: Mies kysyi: “Mitä olet tehnyt?” eikä lapsi kyennyt vastaamaan, puhumaan, vaan tuijotti isäänsä kasvoin, jotka näyttivät juuri nousseen suuresta pimeyden kuilusta. (LE, 358)

It is cultural intertextuality that places the good on high and the bad down under. In one of the most famous descriptions of hell in the western culture, the Hell (inferno) in Dante Alighieri’s (1265–1321) Divine Comedy, La Divina Commedia (early 14th century) is located within the earth. In Finland, this general intertextuality is shown e.g. in many church paintings (see Lempiäinen 2002: 195).

Finnish culture knows the concept of hell. In Finnish “helvetti” (‘hell’) can be described as “hornan kuilu” (‘the bottomless pit’), with all its horrors and darkness. “Helvetti” is used also as a swearword in Finnish. KV omits the biblical allusion, probably following the omission in the Swedish translation (LIAS, 361: “Han frågade: – Vad är det nu du har hittat på? Och barnet kunde inte svara, inte tala, bara stirra på honom med brädjupa ögon. Ø”). The Finnish adjective syvillä, ‘deep’, may be an attempt to express a characteristic of the Pit, but does not give the reader any clue of an allusion to hell. KV omits both general and specific intertextuality, as the Swedish translation does.

LE translates the Pit as “suuresta pimeyden kuilusta,” ‘out of great pit of darkness,’ emphasizing the aspect of the size and darkness of hell. It transfers both the idea of deepness and darkness, both present in the religious intertext. The Finnish reader may not immediately associate the “suuri pimeyden kuilu” with the specific intertextual reference of the biblical hell of Revelation, but s/he is given a clue of general intertextuality. LE aims more at rendering the contents rather than the form of the allusion. In any case, it is clear to the reader that the expression means something terrible and frightening.

The French translation clarifies the expression in question and simply says “l’enfer” (‘hell’): “Il regardait son père, et l’expression de son visage d’enfant semblait venir de l’enfer même” (Faulkner 1995: 349). The gain in semantic clarity is lost in intertextuality.

Passage 8: Source text

Very likely he [Simon McEachern] seemed to himself to be standing just and rocklike and with neither haste nor anger while on all sides the sluttishness of weak human men seethed in a long sigh of terror about the actual representative of the wrathful and retributive Throne. (LIA, 191)
Passage 8 in source culture: Specific biblical intertexts, cultural-religious intertext and universal intertextuality (see especially the Book of Psalms and Revelation)

Three probable intertexts: Specific intertext 1: Thy throne is established of old: thou art from everlasting. (Psalm 93:2)

Specific intertext 2: When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory (Matthew 25:31)

Specific intertext 3: And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. (Revelation 20:11–12)

The image of a throne and its associated cultural intertextuality are universally intertextual. The idea that the one who has authority and power has a physical place, a throne, situated higher than the others is well-known by most of human cultures, including the American and Finnish cultures. The throne is often made of valuable materials to show people how powerful is the one who is authorized to sit on it. In Christian church architecture the idea of Khristos Pantokrator, ‘Christ Almighty,’ is expressed by paintings of Christ the King often painted on the main dome of a church, or in icons. The image can be found in wall paintings in Finnish churches, e.g. in the Koivulahti church there is a painting by Johan Alm (1765), combining the image of Khristos Pantokrator and the Trinity (Lempiäinen 2002: 194–195). There are dozens of biblical verses mentioning the “throne” (see, e.g., McKelvey 1976). The great white throne in Revelation 20:11–12 indicates that the judge is God (Beasley-Murray 1970: 1306). In Light in August, however, this is the only instance of the word throne (Capps 1979: 890).

In Passage 8 the biblical, apocalyptic imagery becomes intensified but is somewhat blurred at the same time. The same Chapter 9 of the novel mentions both Jezebel and Michael, well-known biblical figures, both of them mentioned also in the Book of Revelation. Here, the word throne could refer to a passage in Psalm 93:2, or to Matthew 25:31, but more probably it refers to the passage in Revelation. The passage from Revelation is a description of the last judgment. The throne is the place where God sits and from where God will judge the good and the bad (cf. Ruppersburg 1994: 118). None of the biblical passages, not even in Revelation, expresses wrath or retribution. Simon McEachern is described to believe in judgment and consequently, in heaven and hell, the “Pit.” The biblical allusion to the throne can be detected because of the uppercase “T.” For
the reader-translator, this is enough to inform that this must be *the* throne known in Southern Protestant culture.\(^{229}\)

Passage 8 in target culture: Specific biblical intertexts, cultural-religious intertext and universal intertextuality (see especially the Book of Psalms and Revelation)

Three probable intertexts: Specific intertext 1: Sinun valtaistuimesi on vahva aikojen alusta, hamasta iankaikkisuudesta olet sinä. (Psalm 93:2)

Specific intertext 2: Mutta kun Ihmisen Poika tulee kirkkoudessaan ja kaikki enkelit hänen kanssaan, silloin hän istuu kirkkautensa valtaistuimelle. (Matthew 25:31)

Specific intertext 3: Ja minä näin suuren, valkean valtaistuimen ja sillä istuvaen, jonka kasvoja maa ja taivas pakennivat, eikä niille siijaa löytynyt. Ja minä näin kuolleet, suuret ja pienet, seisomassa valtaistuimen edessä, ja kirjat avattiin; ja avattiin toinen kirja, joka on elämän kirja; ja kuolleet tuomittiin sen perusteella, mitä kirjoitettu, tekojensa mukaan. (Revelation 20:11–12)

Passage 8: Translations

KV Translation: Luultavasti hän uskoi seisovansa vanhurskaana ja lujana kuin kallio, malttiaan menettämättä ja ilman vihastusta, kun taas hänen ympärillään hyrskysi ja kihisi heikkoja, velttoja ihmisraunioita, kauhistuneina ja pitkään huokaillen, nähdessään vihastuneen ja kostavan Valtaistuimen ruumiillistuneen edustajan. (KV, 205)\(^{230}\)

LE Translation: Luultavasti hän kuvitteli seisovansa oikeuden kalliona, hätäilemättömänä ja ilman vihaa keskellä heikkoja ihmisraunioita, jotka henkäisivät pitkään pelosta katsellessaan vihan ja koston valtaistuimen elävää edustajaa. (LE, 155)

As mentioned, the Throne is part of the textual chain describing Simon McEachern’s religious belief and apocalyptic scenery (LIA, 190–191). The description starts with the angel Michael, advances to Jezebel, an adversary of God’s people, and ends with the Throne, the place where God will judge the good and the bad. To break this intertextual and intratextual chain in translation

\(^{229}\) If the reader-translator had been able to use The Library of America Edition of the novel (Faulkner 1985), s/he would have found confirmation of this allusion. On page 1032 there is an endnote in relation to the source text: “wrathful . . . Throne.] Cf. Rev. 20:11–12.”

\(^{230}\) “Antagligen trodde han att han stod rättfärdig och fast som en klippa, utan övervinst eller vrede, medan svaga och slappa människokräck sjöd och svallade kring honom under långa, skräckslagna suckar vid åsynen av en förkroppsligad representant för den vredgade och vedergällande Tronen.” (LIAS, 159).
would mean to deprive the reader from some key elements for the interpretation of the text and for the characterization of Simon McEachern.

The two Finnish translations use two different approaches. KV has capitalized the word *Valtaistuimen*, making it thus clear to the Finnish reader that there is something special, most probably something religious, in the meaning of the word. It can be noted, too, that KV literally follows the Swedish translation: “den vredgade och vedergällande Tronen”, which is rendered into Finnish with the attributes “vihastuneen ja kostavan” (‘angered and revenging’). This metonymical use of “Throne” emphasizes its active role as well as the role of its “embodied representative.” KV transmits the cultural and specific intertextuality.

LE, however, has not capitalized the word *valtaistuimen*. It has trusted more than KV in universal and general intertextuality but takes the risk that the reader does not recognize universal intertextuality and thus loses the specific intertextual image of the passage, in which “weak human men” are in front of the representative of the heavenly Throne, viz., God. LE secularizes the passage.

A third possible solution is both to capitalize the word *throne* and to make the intertextual allusion clear to the reader. This is the solution the French translation of *Light in August* uses. In *Lumière d’août*,231 there is the word *Trône* and an endnote given on page 1225: “Voir Apocalypse, XX, 11–12.” It can be asked whether the maximizing information with the uppercase “T” and with the endnote is really necessary, but then, put in the intertextual and intratextual chain in this chapter of the novel, it has the advantage of helping the reader to follow the chain till the end and recognize each intertext. Another question is whether the reader of the French translation takes the trouble to first look at the endnote and then, after that, at the biblical intertext.

**Passage 9: Source text**

The old, strong, farmbred horse returned home at its slow and steady canter. The youth [Joe Christmas] upon its back rode lightly, balanced lightly, leaning well forward, exulting perhaps at that moment as Faustus had, of having put behind now at once and for all the Shalt Not, of being free at last of honor and law. (LIA, 194)

**Passage 9 in source culture: Two specific biblical intertexts, cultural-religious intertext and universal intertextuality**

Specific intertext 1: Exodus 20:2–17 (The Ten Commandments)

---

231 “… Trône de colère et de rétribution.” (Faulkner 1995: 152).
There is a great interest by Faulkner in the Ten Commandments. Coffee (1983: 119) mentions that “in nine of his novels Faulkner makes a total of fifteen references to at least seven of the Ten Commandments (Ex. 20).” For example, in Chapter 16 of *Light in August*, Mrs. Hines says that her husband “hadn’t begun then to take God’s name in vain and in pride” (LIA, 352; allusion to Exodus 20:7). Faulkner refers to the Ten Commandments also in *As I Lay Dying* (Cora Tull), *Sanctuary* (Horace Benbow), *Absalom, Absalom!*, *The Unvanquished*, *Go Down, Moses* (Ike McCaslin), *Intruder in the Dust*, *Requiem for a Nun* (Temple Stevens), *A Fable* (a priest), and *The Mansion*. This intertextual information is valuable to the reader-translator of Faulkner. The Southern Protestantism has left its deep traces in Faulkner’s oeuvre. Joe Christmas’s attitude can be seen in larger, cultural-religious intertextuality.

In this Chapter 9 of the novel, Joe Christmas’s view of religion seems to be essentially negative; religion for him is something forbidden, the intertextual “Shalt Not.” The “Shalt Not” refers to the commandments of the Decalogue, the Ten Commandments in the Old Testament (Exodus 20:2–17 and Deuteronomy 5:6–21), of which 1 and 2, and 5–10 are in the negative form, “thou shalt not.”

---

232 “And God is a jealous God.” (Faulkner 1985: 113.) Allusion to Exodus 20:5.

233 “This morning the Baptist minister took him for a text. Not only as a murderer, but as an adulterer” (Faulkner 1985: 267). Allusion to Exodus 20:13–14.

234 “And he not calling it retribution, no sins of the father come home to roost” (Faulkner 1990: 221). Allusion to Exodus 20:4–5.

235 “I have stolen and I have borne false witness against my neighbor” (Faulkner 1990: 418–419; Granny Millard); allusion to Exodus 20:16; “Thou shalt not kill must be it” (Faulkner 1990: 467; Bayard Sartoris II; emphasis in the original). Allusion to Exodus 20:13.


237 “… and not violate the Sabbath…” (Faulkner 1994: 308); allusion to Exodus 20:8; “… thou shalt not kill…” (Faulkner 1994: 312; Chick Mallison); allusion to Exodus 20:13; “Thou shalt not kill…” (Faulkner 1994: 434; Gavin Stevens); “… thou shalt not kill… Thou shalt not kill in precept and even when you do, precept still remains unblemished and scarless: Thou shalt not kill… Thou shalt not kill at all” (Faulkner 1994: 435; Gavin Stevens; emphasis in the original.)


241 I disagree with Ruppersburg (1994: 119) who limits the expression “thou shalt not” to mean only “the power of moral law, embodied in the Shalt Nots of the Ten Commandments”. The Southern religion, not only cultural ethos or morality, is also in the background. When he hits Simon McEachern, Joe Christmas shows his anger and hatred toward the religion that his foster-father represents.
The Ten Commandments are common to the Jewish and Christian religion, and their ethos is universally shared by many other religions, too. In a wider sense, the expression may refer to the catechism used by Presbyterians, and to going to church, represented by Simon McEachern whom Joe Christmas literally puts behind him and escapes on McEachern’s horse. This is the only instance of the *Shalt Not* in the novel (Capps 1979: 770). This is a clear clue, and the capitalization of “Shalt Not” helps to detect the allusion. The reader-translator may not be able to locate the Ten Commandments in the Bible or even know their exact contents, but s/he can detect specific intertextuality in the expression.

Passage 9 in target culture: Two specific biblical intertexts, cultural-religious intertext and universal intertextuality

Specific intertext 1: Exodus 20:2–17 (The Ten Commandments)

Specific intertext 2: Deuteronomy 5:6–21 (The Ten Commandments)

Passage 9: Translations

**KV Translation:** Vanha, väkevä maalaishevonen juoksi kotiäntä verkkaista ja raskasta neliään. Nuorukainen istui sen selässä kevyesti, tasapainoltaan varmana, kallistui etukenen, riemuiten ehkä samalla tavoin kuin Faust jäätettyään kerta kaikkiaan lopullisesti taakseen ‘Älä’-käskyt, riemuiten siitä, että viimeinkin oli päällystetä kunnia ja laista. (KV, 208)

**LE Translation:** Vanha vahva työhevonen palasi kotiäntä verkkaista lyhyttä laukkaa. Nuorukainen sen selässä tunsi olonsa kevyeksi, pysyi kevyesti tasapainossa syväässä etunojassa, riemuitsi kenties Faustin tavoin siitä, että oli vihdoinkin lopullisesti ylittänyt kielletyn rajan. [sic] irtaunut kunniasta ja laista. (LE, 158)

KV translates “the Shalt Not” as “Älä-käskyt,” (‘Commandments of Not’). It transmits the description of Joe Christmas as a person who sees religion mainly in the light of negative commandments, the “Shalt Not.” Most Finnish readers can probably allude to the Ten Commandments.

---

242 In the Westminster Shorter Catechism (of the Presbyterian Church) Questions and Answers 43–82 out of total 107 deal with the Ten Commandments.

Commandments in the Bible; maybe they connote the intertext also to the Luther’s Small Catechism.244

LE translates “put behind…the Shalt Not” as “oli…ylittänyt kielletyn rajan” (‘had crossed the forbidden line’). For the reader of LE, this is not very clear, especially when connected with Faust. Even with what follows (‘detached from honor and law’), there is no clear clue to any intertext, except Faust (see below). The reader is made to understand that Joe Christmas crosses the moral and legal borderline as Faust, but s/he is not helped to see the religious intertext behind Christmas’s attitude.

This secularization of LE translation has at least two consequences. First, it does not help the reader to recognize the dimension of the moralistic religion represented by Simon McEachern, based on negative commandments, and against which Joe Christmas is rebelling. In other words, the connection of McEachern’s emphasis on the Ten Commandments and legalistic religion and that kind of religion against which Christmas is fighting is lost. Secondly, it makes Joe Christmas a less religious character than he is in the source text. In fact, throughout the novel he is in contact with religion and spirituality, understood and experienced in his own way (see, e.g., Passage 10 below). LE detaches him from a larger, general cultural-religious intertext of Southern Protestant culture.

In this passage there is another instance of intertextuality, an easily recognizable proper-name allusion (see 6.1.3 below). Faulkner seems to have an interest in the legend of Faust, of which the most famous version is probably Goethe’s Faust (1808; 1832). For instance in The Reivers (1962), young Lucius Priest asks “why didn’t I go the whole hog and be a coward too? be irrevocable and irremediable like Faustus became?” (Faulkner 1999: 773). – This is the only appearance of Faustus in Light in August (Capps 1979: 279).

It can be argued that for many readers of Faulkner “Faustus” is not well-known, neither in the U.S.A., nor in Finland. Not many people know well the German legend about a magician and alchemist who sells his soul to the devil in exchange for knowledge and power. However, a cultural-religious intertextual idea of giving oneself to the evil in exchange of power, money, or some other personal gain has been and is a common theme in several narratives in literature, theatre, and cinema. In religious traditions, practically every central figure of any religion is depicted to go through temptation of power or wealth. This seems to be universal intertextuality, common to any human culture and religion.245

244 In the Lutheran form of Protestantism, the Ten Commandments, too, are an essential part of the Catechism. They are taught to every Finnish young person who wants to pass the confirmation in the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

245 The most symbolic description in the western culture is the temptation of Jesus (Matthew 4:1–11).
The proper name *Faustus* has been translated into Finnish as *Faust*, without any comments, in both translations.\(^\text{246}\) This is the most usual way of translating intertextual proper names. Both Finnish translators and their readers have had the Finnish translation of *Faustus* available, as the first part of Goethe’s *Faust* was translated into Finnish already in 1884 by Kaarlo Koskimies, again in 1916 by Valter Juva, and then *Faust I–II* in 1934–1936 by Otto Manninen.\(^\text{247}\)

Passage 10: Source text

… [Joe Christmas] thinking *God perhaps and me not knowing that too* He could see it like a printed sentence, fullborn and already dead *God loves me too* like the faded and weathered letters on a last year’s billboard *God loves me too* (LIA, 98; emphasis in the original)

Passage 10 in source culture: Specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Three possible intertexts: Specific intertext 1: For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. (John 3:16)

Specific intertext 2: … God is love. (I John 4:8)

Specific intertext 3: Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. (I John 4:10)

In Chapter 5 of the novel, Joe Christmas is preparing to meet Joanna Burden in the night. He knows that the encounter would probably be fatal, and somehow his thinking turns to God, God’s works in his life, and God’s attitude toward him. This is Joe Christmas’s religious thinking, as surprising as it may come to the reader. In a decisive moment of his life, he cannot help recalling basic Christian teachings he must have heard in the church where Simon McEachern used to take him when he was a young boy. Passage 10 shows how Joe Christmas has religious thoughts and spiritual sentiments, even if he is considered by many in the novel (and by many critics of the novel) to be without any human feelings. This information is given to the reader through a modified biblical key-phrase allusion. Among multiple biblical intertexts dealing with God’s love, especially John 3:16 is one of the most famous verses in the New Testament, so Christmas may be alluding to it, even though the remembering seems to happen somehow fuzzily, “like the faded and weathered letters on a last year’s billboard,” as the idea would not be quite clear, or that it belongs somehow to the past “already dead,” but not to the present moment.

\(^\text{246}\) There is no note in the French translation.

Passage 10 in target culture: Specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Three possible intertexts: Specific intertext 1: Sillä niin on Jumala maailmaa rakastanut, että hän antoi ainokaisen poikansa, ettei yksikään, joka hänene uskoo, lukkuisi, vaan hänellä olisi iankaikkinen elämä. (John 3:16)

Specific intertext 2: … Jumala on rakkaus. (I John 4:8)

Specific intertext 3: Siinä on rakkaus – ei siinä, että me rakastimme Jumalaa, vaan siinä, että hän rakasti meitä ja lähetti Poikansa meidän syntiemme sovitukseksi. (I John 4:10)

God and God’s love, as well as the fuzziness of Joe Christmas’s religious thinking are transmitted in both translations. In Finland, every young person at the age of 15 who goes through the confirmation teaching of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, either learns the biblical verse John 3:16 by heart, or at least hears it several times during the teaching sessions.249 Through the translations, a Finnish reader can recognize and locate the modified biblical intertext in the Bible. Both cultural and specific intertextuality are thus transferred into Finnish.

However, in KV, which follows the Swedish translation, the omission of the expression “like the faded and weathered letters on a last year’s billboard God loves me too” has at least two consequences. First, the omission of the repetition weakens somewhat Joe Christmas’s religious thinking – the repetition in the source text emphasizes it – and secondly, the fuzziness of this thought is not transmitted as well as in LE, which transmits the phrase in the target text. In this case

---

248 “Han tänkte: Gud kanske och det har jag inte vetat. Han kunde se det som en tryckt mening, en fullgången men redan död sats: Gud älskar mig också. Ø” (LIAS, 84).

249 The percentage was 83.5% in 2015, i.e., more than four out of five young Finns go through the Lutheran Church’s confirmation teaching (http://sakasti.evl.fi; accessed July 23, 2016). The percentage was even higher in the 1940s and in the 1960s.
the more literal translation of LE renders intertextuality better and transmits Joe Christmas’s character, rooted in Southern culture and influenced by its religion.

6.1.2 Religious key-phrase allusions

The passages above are examples of such passages in the novel that clearly have general, cultural-religious intertexts in the American South. In this section, some other passages will be dealt with containing an intertextual religious key-phrase allusion that cannot be clearly shown to have wider general, cultural-religious intertextuality. Some of them are borderline cases. There is a difficulty, first to recognize biblical allusions, and then to decide how important they are for translation. We start with the most fanatic religious person in the novel, Eupheus Hines.

Passage 11: Source text

[Eupheus Hines saying] “... and it wasn’t long before she come back and her face was like the face of a ravening beast of the desert. … and her face looked like the ravening beast of the desert, laughing out of her rotten colored dirt at God. …” (LIA, 364–365)

Passage 11 in source culture: Three specific biblical intertexts

Specific intertext 1: No lion shall be there [the wilderness, the desert], nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there (Isaiah 35:9)

Specific intertext 2: But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there… (Isaiah 13:21)

Specific intertext 3: They gaped upon me with their mouths, as a ravening and a roaring lion. (Psalm 22:13; cf. I Peter 5:8; Jeremiah 25:38; Daniel 7)

Kiril Taranovsky, in his subtext analysis, speaks of a possibility of multiple connections, i.e., that the same textual element refers to multiple subtexts or intertexts. In this passage in Chapter 16 of the novel Eupheus Hines uses multiple biblical intertexts and reveals his attitude toward women. Behind his attitude is the whole Southern biblical tradition of another curse, this time the curse of Eve (Genesis 3:16; I Timothy 2:14). He is speaking of the dietitian at the orphanage. He seems to imply that there is a link between a beast of the desert and female, because the laughter of the beast is defiantly addressed to God. The creatures presented in Isaiah 13:21–22 are repulsive and

250 Ruppersburg (1994: 218) is of the opinion that the expression “her rotten colored dirt” refers to the dietitian’s makeup. Coffee (1983: 61) is of the same opinion.
ceremonially unclean (Kidner 1970: 599), whereas in Psalm 22:12–13 the psalmist compares his tormentors with fierce animals, which are ready to devour him. Rebellion, uncleanness, and female are connected in Eupheus Hines’s religious thinking.

The reader of the novel is given clues of a biblical key-phrase allusion. The first indication is the repetition of “ravening beast of the desert.” Any repetition is a clue to the reader that the expression in question is important. In the novel these two instances are the only ones for the word ravening (Capps 1979: 698). The word beast appears eleven times, and the word desert only three times in the novel (Capps 1979: 58, 195\(^\text{251}\)). The second clue is the religious, even prophetic kind of tone of the whole passage in which Eupheus Hines is speaking. The third clue is the hostility described by Hines between the woman and God. Biblical stories of Adam and Eve and human beings against God are not unknown to the western reader, even if s/he might be unable to locate them to the beginning of the Bible.

The biblical key-phrase allusion here is a combination of motifs of three specific intertexts. The first biblical verse (Isaiah 35:9) is a prophecy interpreted usually as applying to a coming exodus and a millennial age when wild beasts will not harm the Israelites (Kidner 1970: 609). The second verse (Isaiah 13:21) is a prophecy predicting the fall of Babylon (Kidner 1970: 599)\(^\text{252}\). The third verse in Psalm 22 is regarded in Christianity as a prophecy dealing with the passion of Christ (M’Caw and Motyer 1970: 464). The way Faulkner is using the expression “ravening beast of the desert” here combines – admittedly in a haphazard way – female with rebellion and uncleanness, and characterizes Eupheus Hines and his misogyny.\(^\text{253}\)

Passage 11 in target culture: Three specific biblical intertexts

Specific intertext 1: Ei ole siellä [erämaa, aromaa] leijonaa, ei nouse sinne raateleva peto; ei sellaista siellä tavata. (Isaiah 35:9)

Specific intertext 2: Erämaan eläimet lepäävät siellä… (Isaiah 13:21)

---

\(^{251}\) The third instance of desert is said of Joe Christmas: “Yet though he was not large, not tall, he contrived somehow to look more lonely than a lone telephone pole in the middle of a desert.” (LIA, 106).

\(^{252}\) Babylon has a female character in Isaiah: “Come down, and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon, sit on the ground: there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans: for thou shalt no more be called tender and delicate.” (Isaiah 47:1; see also verses 2 and 3.)

\(^{253}\) If the reader-translator had been able to use The Library of America Edition of the novel (Faulkner 1985), s/he would have found confirmation of these allusions. On page 1032 there is an endnote in relation to the source text: “her . . . desert] See Isa. 13:21 and 35:9.” Joseph Blotner and Noel Polk have detected two intertextual allusions to Isaiah, but they have not included the intertext in the Book of Psalms.
Specific intertext 3: ... avaavat kitansa minua vastaan, niinkuin raatelevat, kiljuvat leijonat. (Psalm 22:14; cf. I Peter 5:8; Jeremiah 25:38; Daniel 7)

Passage 11: Translations

KV Translation: –… eikä kestänyt kovinkaan kauan, kun nainen tuli takaisin ja oli näöltään kuin aavikon kiljuva villipeto. ... – Ja nainen oli aavikon kiljuvan villipetoon näköinen ja nauroi Jumalalle kurjassa maalattussa saastassaan. (KV, 387)

LE Translation: “... ja pian tyttö palasi ja hänen kasvonsa olivat kuin erämaan raivoavan pedon. ... ja tuon naisen kasvot olivat kuin erämaan raivoavan pedon hänen nauresaansa Jumalalle mustan saastansa seasta.” (LE, 293)

It cannot be said with certainty whether the translators have detected the allusions or not. KV and LE render the biblical key-phrase allusion “ravelling beast of the desert” in different wordings: “aavikon kiljuva villipeto” (KV: ‘roaring beast of the desert’) and “erämaan raivoava peto” (LE: ‘ravelling beast of the desert’). The Finnish Bible has it as “erämaan raateleva peto.” However, the reader-translator knows that this passage is a discourse of a religious, fanatical character. S/he knows that Eupheus Hines uses biblical language extensively, s/he knows that he is a misogynist, and s/he basically knows the story of Adam and Eve, a famous religious narrative, at least in some form. Both KV and LE render the connection between rebellion, uncleanness and female, which seems to be the main point in Eupheus Hines’s discourse here. After this general type of intertextuality, it depends on the reader-translator’s personal competence of biblical language whether s/he is able to say whether there seems to be an allusion and if that is the case, whether it is to the Old Testament or to the New Testament. As there is no framework for the biblical verses, the specific intertextual knowledge of the verses does not provide any advantage to the reader in this particular case. For those interested in precise intertextual biblical allusions, there are other editions like the French translation of Light in August. In Lumière d’août, there is an endnote given on page 1261: “Voir Isaïe, XIII, 21 et XXXV, 9”.255 The reader-translator may or may not have recognized

254 “… och det dröjde inte länge förrän hon kom tillbaka och då såg hon ut som ett öknens ryckande vilddjur. ... och hon såg ut som ett öknens ryckande vilddjur och skrattade i sin usla sminkade smuts åt Gud.” (LIAS, 296).

255 The endnote refers to page 287: “…elle est venue, le visage semblable à celui des bêtes voraces du désert. ... Et son visage était semblable à celui des bêtes voraces du désert” (Faulkner 1995: 287). The intertext in Psalm 22 is not mentioned in the endnote of the French translation.
the intertexts, but both Finnish translations have resulted in a text that is so close to the intertexts that the reader – if s/he knows some biblical language – can in fact detect the intertext.

Passage 11 shows how it is possible to translate literally intertextual biblical allusions and to give the reader of the translation specific intertextual clues, even if the translator may not have noticed that there are allusions. Multiple intertextual connections may create new meanings both in the source text and in the translations (see Section 5.4 above).

Passage 12: Source text

“… [Eupheus Hines saying] ‘You and all sluts. You are an instrument of God’s wrathful purpose that nere a sparrow can fall to earth. You are an instrument of God, the same as Joe Christmas and old Doc Hines.’…” (LIA, 364)

Passage 12 in source culture: Two specific biblical intertexts

Specific intertext 1: Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows. (Matthew 10:29–31)

Specific intertext 2: Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God? (Luke 12:6)

In this passage, Eupheus Hines explains how he has spoken with the dietitian at the orphanage. She is afraid of being disgraced and fired, as she has discovered that Joe Christmas was hidden behind the bed when she was there with the intern. Hines’s attitude is expressed in a biblical intertext, which he serves for his own purposes. The passage also reveals his attitude to women who are described as “sluts.”

It is not difficult to recognize the religious tone in the passage, especially when the reader-translator knows that the speaker is Eupheus Hines. At least s/he detects the general religious tone in the passage. It is more difficult for him or her to say whether there are any intertexts, even modified allusions, in the passage. However, I claim that there is one: “nere a sparrow can fall to earth.” This is the only instance where the word sparrow appears in the novel (Capps 1979: 817).

The reader-translator of the novel knows Eupheus Hines’s religious-biblical use of language. S/he knows, too, that Hines distorts the original meaning of allusions. It is, indeed, the distortion of the meaning of the intertext that is a clue to the reader-translator, who may or may not recognize Jesus’s words in the Gospel according to St. Matthew and St. Luke. Eupheus Hines is employing the Scriptures, not to comfort – what Jesus is doing when speaking of sparrows – but to scare the
dietitian. In addition to the moralistic tone of his speech, he simultaneously speaks of God’s wrath with words that have originally the meaning of loving care, but without any mention of Jesus or of the Gospel. At the same time he emphasizes God’s irresistible purpose.

Besides this specific religious intertextual use, “sparrow” or “sparrow’s fall” is an intertext used by Faulkner himself elsewhere. He uses the same biblical intertext also in *The Sound and the Fury*256 (Jason Compson), *As I Lay Dying*257 (Anse Bundren), *Absalom, Absalom!*258 (Charles Bon), and *The Mansion*259 (Mink Snopes). These uses of the biblical allusions are modified and used to express various motifs.260

Passage 12 in target culture: Two specific biblical intertexts

“Eikö kahta varpusta myydä yhteen ropoon? Eikä yksikään niistä putoa maahan teidän Isänne sallimatta.” (Matthew 10:29)


Passage 12: Translations


---

256 “Talking about peace on earth good will toward all and not a sparrow can fall to earth.” (Faulkner 2006: 1067).
257 “… I know that Old Marster will care for me as for ere a sparrow that falls.” (Faulkner 1985: 26).
258 “God may mark every sparrow, but we do not pretend to be God, you see. ... Perhaps He does not even require of us that we save this one sparrow... Yes: a sparrow which God Himself neglected to mark.” (Faulkner 1990: 95–96.)
259 “He had simply had to trust them – the Them of whom it was promised that not even a sparrow should fall unmarked.” (Faulkner 1999: 335).
260 If the reader-translator had been able to use The Library of America Edition of the novel (Faulkner 1985), s/he would have found confirmation of this allusion. On page 1032 there is an endnote in relation to the text: “nere . . . earth] Matt 10:29.”
The reader-translator who is already used to Eupheus Hines’s alluding to the Old Testament might be led to think of the Old Testament texts, literal or modified, in this religiously colored passage. Again, Hines’s character and the religious context of his discourse are the main clue the reader has. Then there is the specific intertext. The Finnish reader – if s/he has some knowledge of these Jesus’s words – is more likely to detect the intertext in LE than in KV, because a Finnish reader of LE Translation “Ilman sitä ei yksikään varpunen putoa maahan” (vs. KV Translation “eikä varpunenkaan voi pudota maahan vastoin Hänen tahtoaan”, following the Swedish translation; cf. the biblical intertext: “Eikä yksikään niistä putoa maahan”) comes closer to the wording of the biblical intertext than the reader of the English novel: “nere a sparrow can fall to earth” vs. the biblical rendering “one of them [sparrow] shall not fall on the ground.” Here it is clear that a specific knowledge of the Gospel text provides an advantage to the reader. Besides, as LE syntactically separates the allusion as a sentence unit of its own, it is easier to notice in reading than in KV.

However, this passage is an interesting and overlapping case, as for a Finnish reader there may be another, cultural-general intertextual link in this passage. A sparrow, besides being a bird signifying modesty for many people, may possibly come to his or her mind through a famous Christmas carol called “Varpunen jouluamuna” (‘A Sparrow in the Morning of Christmas Day’), originally written in Swedish (“Sparven om julmorgonen”) by Zacharias Topelius (1818–1898) in 1859. In this carol known and sung by millions of Finns each Christmas time, Topelius is echoing his own sorrow caused by the death of his son Rafael in May 1858. As it is a Christmas carol and often sung in churches or church-owned buildings, there is a strong cultural-religious association to the notion of ‘sparrow.’

The specific intertext is used to characterize Eupheus Hines as cruel and arrogant. There is an ironic tone in the whole passage: it would be logical to think that God is interested in the fate of the dietitian, as the intertext expresses the idea that God takes care of everybody and everything, even of the smallest creatures. However, Hines is alluding to and twisting biblical texts to suit his own purposes.

---

262 The expression “nere a” means “never a,” “not any” (negative of “ere a”; Brown 1976: 138).
Passage 13: Three source texts

Source text 1: [Eupheus Hines saying] “… A walking pollution in God’s own face I made it. Out of the mouths of little children He never concealed it. …” (LIA, 119)

Source text 2: [Eupheus Hines talking] “… old Doc Hines give God His chance too. So out of the mouths of little children God used His will. …” (LIA, 351)

Source text 3: [Eupheus Hines speaking] “… And old Doc Hines watched and heard the mouths of little children, of God’s own fatherless and motherless, putting His words and knowledge into their mouths even when they couldn’t know it since they were without sin yet, even the girl ones without sin and bitchery yet: Nigger! Nigger! in the innocent mouths of little children. … ” (LIA, 361–362)

Passage 13 in source culture: Two specific biblical intertexts

Specific intertext 1: Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger. (Psalm 8:2)

Specific intertext 2: Yea; have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise? (Matthew 21:16)

In Chapter 6 of the novel, when speaking with the dietitian at the orphanage, Eupheus Hines refers to the other children of the orphanage who call Joe Christmas “nigger” (Source text 1). He believes that their insults speak the truth about Joe Christmas’s racial identity. In Chapter 16, Byron Bunch has taken Mr. and Mrs. Hines to see Gail Hightower (Source text 2 and 3). Eupheus Hines alludes three times to the same biblical verse in three passages. These three text passages are Hines’s biblical allusion(s) to Psalm 8:2 and Matthew 21:16. There is a biblical intertextual link between them, as Jesus quoted and adapted the Psalm verse when he rode into Jerusalem on an ass. However, Hines slightly modifies the allusion: the biblical “the mouth of babes and sucklings” becomes “the mouths of little children.” It is difficult to say whether he is quoting the Psalm or Jesus’s words. Knowing his religious sentiment and predilection for having dialogues with God and insistence on the wrath and judgment of God, it seems that Hines refers more to Psalm 8 in the Old Testament than to Jesus’s words in the Gospel according to St. Matthew in the New Testament (cf. M‘Caw and Motyer 1970: 455).

The reader-translator has the advantage to know that Eupheus Hines is a religious, deranged, and fanatic person who quotes religious-biblical texts extensively. In addition, in each of these three source text passages, there is the word God in the same passage. On the surface level of the text there are thus clear clues of religious discourse, due to Hines’s religious character. As this phrase is
repeated three times in the text (Source text 1 in Chapter 6, and both Source text 2 and 3 in Chapter 16 of the novel) and used by the same character of the novel, the reader-translator may notice it and associate religious intertexts with Southern culture and its religion. The word *mouths* appear seven times in the novel (Capps 1979: 549), and the word *children* 40 times (Capps 1979: 137–138). And, if the reader-translator had read other novels by Faulkner, s/he might have noticed that the phrase “out of the mouths of babes/babes and sucklings/little children/babes and sucklings and old ladies” is an expression used by Faulkner elsewhere as well (Coffee 1983: 108–109). Besides *Light in August*, Faulkner uses this biblical intertext also in *Sartoris/Flags in the Dust*265 (a woman), *The Sound and the Fury*266 (Benjy Compson), *Intruder in the Dust*267 (Gavin Stevens), and *Requiem for a Nun*268 (Temple Drake). The more the reader-translator of *Light in August* is acquainted with Faulkner’s other works, the better chances s/he has to understand the novel and its expressions. In this respect, LE is in a better position. By 1968 all Faulkner’s novels with the exception of *Flags in the Dust* (1973) were published, whereas *Intruder in the Dust* (1948) and *Requiem for a Nun* (1951) were published after 1945, i.e., after the publication of KV.

In conclusion, it can be said that the reader-translator, because here the speaker is Eupheus Hines, may guess that the expression “out of the mouths of little children” is an intertext, probably a biblical allusion. Those who know biblical texts may be able to locate the text (in Jesus’s words in the Gospel and/or the intertext in Psalms), and the fact that the allusion is to the Gospel in the New Testament increases its probability of being detected.269

---

265 “‘Out of the mouths of babes –’” she said.” (Faulkner 2006: 693).
266 “Out of the mouths of babes.” (Faulkner 2006: 953.)
267 “‘Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings and old ladies –’ he paraphrased.” (Faulkner 1994: 364.) The addition “old ladies” is a humorous allusion to Miss Habersman, one of the main characters in *Intruder in the Dust*. This phrase shows how the author can adapt intertextual allusions to suit his or her own purposes and give the text the tone (humorous, ironic, etc.) s/he wants.
268 “… right out of the mouths of – how is it? – babes and sucklings?” (Faulkner 1994: 525). Here the expression “how is it?” separated by dashes, is a clear micro-level clue to detect the allusion.
269 In today’s world of internet it is easy to check such phrases. For instance, [www.phrases.org.uk/meanings](http://www.phrases.org.uk/meanings) immediately gave both biblical references (accessed July 24, 2016). – If the reader-translator had been able to use The Library of America Edition of the novel (Faulkner 1985), s/he would have found confirmation of these allusions. This edition has endnotes. On page 1032 there is an endnote in relation to Source text 1 and 2: “Out . . . children] See Psalms 8:22 [sic]; Matt 21:16.” Joseph Blotner and Noel Polk who wrote the notes have detected the allusions in Source texts 1 and 2, but for some reason they have not included Source text 3. It may have seemed too a modified allusion to them.
Passage 13 in target culture: Two specific biblical intertexts

Specific intertext 1: Lasten ja imeväisten suusta sinä perustit voiman vastustajaisi tähden, että 
kukistaisit vihollisen ja kostonhimoisen. (Psalm 8:3)

Specific intertext 2: “Eottekö ole koskaan lukeneet tätä sanaa: ‘Lasten ja imeväisten suusta sinä olet 
hankkinut kiitoksesi’?” (Matthew 21:16)

Passage 13: Translations

KV Translation 1: –... Olen tahrannut Jumalan kasvot. Imeväisten suusta se kuullaan. (KV, 130)

LE Translation 1: “... Tein siitä Jumalan silmien edessä vaeltavan saastan. Pienten lasten suusta. Hän ei 
kosaan sitä salannut. ...” (LE, 98)

KV Translation 2: –... vanha Doc Hineskin antoi Jumalalle tilaisuuden. Ja lasten ja imeväisten kautta 
Hän ilmaisi tahtonsa. (KV, 371)

LE Translation 2: “... vanha tohtori Hines myös antoi Jumalalle tilaisuuden. Lasten suusta Jumala sitten 
ilmoitti tahtonsa. ...” (LE, 282)

KV Translation 3: –Ja vanha Doc Hines otti siitä vaarin, ja Jumalan pienet orvot, joiden suuhun Hän on 
pannut sanat ja viisauden, nuo, jotka eivät mitään voineet tietää, koska olivat lapsia ja synnittömiä, 
vieläpä tyttölapsetkin olivat vielä ilman syntyä ja iljetystä, he huusivat: ‘Neekeri! Neekeri!’ hennoilla 
viattomilla äänillä. (KV, 383)

LE Translation 3: “... Vanha tohtori Hines katseli ja kuuli puheen pienten lasten suusta, Jumalan 
isättömien ja äidittömien orpojen suusta, ja Jumala pani sanansa heidän suuhunsansa, vaikka he eivät sitä 
tienneet, koska olivat vielä synnittömiä, tyttölapsetkin vielä ilman syntyä ja huoruutta: ‘Neekeri! 
Neekeri!’ pienten lasten viattomista suista. ...” (LE, 291)

Both translations in all three cases convey the image of Eupheus Hines as a religious fanatic who 
uses religious-biblically colored phrases and who thinks that he really talks with God. This passage 
shows a rather strange idea of a young female being without sin and bitchery. None of the 
translations uses the biblical expression “lasten ja imeväisten suusta” word-for-word, nor repeats 
the phrase in the same form. This may imply that the translators have not recognized the allusion. 
The variation of renderings makes it more difficult for the reader of the translations to recognize the

270 “... Jag har befläckat Guds ansikte. Ur spenabarnens mun får man höra’t.” (LIAS, 101).
271 “... därför gav gamle Doc Hines Gud ett tillfälle också. Och genom barnens och spenabarnens mun uppenbarade 
Han sin vilja.” (LIAS, 285).
272 “... Och gamle Doc Hines passade på, och Guds föräldralösa små, som Han lagt orden och kunskapen i munnen på, 
de som ingenting kunde veta för de var barn och utan synd, till och med småflickorna var utan synd och styggelse än, de 
ropade: Nigger! Nigger! med sina oskyldiga röster.” (LIAS, 293).
allusion. Only KV Translations 1 and 2 have the rather rarely used Finnish word *imeväinen* (‘suckling’) which immediately draws the reader’s attention. If KV 1 and 2 use such a word that serves as a clue to the biblical allusion, KV 3 follows the syntax and vocabulary of the Swedish translation in a way that makes the allusion practically disappear.

LE follows more closely the source text in these three passages. In LE Translation 1, the phrase “Pienten lasten suusta.” is for some reason syntactically separated by a dot, to be an independent clause. It has the same effect as KV’s “imeväinen”: it draws the attention of the reader, and in that sense may help him or her to detect the allusion. In LE Translation 2 there is “lasten suusta” (‘out of the mouth of children’), leaving out the adjective *little*. It can be noted that in LE Translation 3 there is a tautology, “isättömien ja äidittömien orpojen.” The Finnish word *orpo* (‘orphan’) itself means by definition to be ‘isätön ja äiditön’ (“fatherless and motherless”). Maybe the translator has felt a need to add a noun after these two adjectives, but has not realized that the result is a tautology.

Besides the specific intertext, there is a general-cultural intertext, typical in the target culture. In Finland the majority church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, practices infant baptism. When an infant is baptized in the Lutheran church, one of the biblical passages read is Mark 10:14, in which Jesus says: “Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.” As the great majority of Finns has been baptized in the Lutheran Church and many Finns are godparents, the majority of Finns has at least heard this other allusion and become acquainted with the idea of Jesus’s attitude toward (little) children. General (cultural-religious) intertextuality may help them to situate Hines’s words.


Passage 13 shows that the same biblical intertext can be found in more than one instance both in the Old Testament and the New Testament. Many Old Testament intertexts (the Hebrew Scripture) are used by the New Testament writers. This multi-level intertextuality is visible in Faulkner, when he quotes and adapts such a biblical intertext as Matthew 21:16 that is an adapted quotation by Jesus of Psalm 8:2 (which might be an adapted quotation of a Mesopotamian or Egyptian text or oral tradition). The intertextual chain continues, when Faulkner’s text in *Light in August* is

---

273 At the end of 2015 some 73% of all Finns were members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland ([http://evl.fi](http://evl.fi); accessed July 23, 2016).

274 Faulkner 1995: 1198. It can be noted that on page 276 (“Et, par la bouche des petits enfants…”) and on page 284 (“… il a entendu la bouche des petits enfants… Sa connaissance dans la bouche…”) there are no notes.
translated into Finnish (in KV’s case, probably as relay translation through Swedish). All this shows true Barthes’s famous words in the entry for ‘Texte (théorie du)’, in the Encyclopédie universalis:
“Every text is an intertext; other texts are present in it, at variable levels, in more or less recognizable forms: the texts of the previous culture and those of the surrounding culture” (Barthes 1973: 1015275). In addition, the Finnish translations of the novel contain in some form the Finnish biblical text which is a translation out of Hebrew and Greek source texts. The chain shows how any translation truly is an intertext: … cultural (general) intertext (Mesopotamia/Egypt) –> specific intertext (the Hebrew scripture) –> specific intertext (Jewish-Christian text)276 –> an artistic use of a biblical text -> translation <- specific intertext (Christian text) that is a translation in itself.

As seen in Passage 13, many biblical wordings are intratextual themselves. This kind of relation can be found in the following Passage 14, too, in which Hightower is recalling his behavior in face of suffering and humiliation in Jefferson.

Passage 14: Source text

… [Gail Hightower] allowing himself to be persecuted, to be dragged from his bed at night and carried into the woods and beaten with sticks, he all the while bearing in the town’s sight and hearing, without shame, with that patient and voluptuous ego of the martyr, the air, the behavior, the How long, O Lord (LIA, 463–464; emphasis in the original)

Passage 14 in source culture: Three specific biblical intertexts

Specific intertext 1: My soul is also sore vexed: but thou, O Lord, how long? (Psalm 6:3)

Specific intertext 2: O God, how long shall the adversary reproach? shall the enemy blaspheme thy name for ever? (Psalm 74:10)

Specific intertext 3: And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? (Revelation 6:10)

The prayer-form phrase How long, O Lord may probably be detected by most readers and translators as being religious language. The phrase is even in italics. In the same passage there is already the use of the word martyr, and then the biblical key-phrase allusion. The reader-translator may not know the reference, but s/he can easily perceive that there is a religious and biblical

---

275 The English translation is in Gresset 1985: 4. See also Orr 2008: 33.
276 To complicate the matter even more, it can be noted that Jesus probably spoke Aramaic as his mother tongue. The Greek words in the Gospel according to St. Matthew are probably a translation from Aramaic into Greek.
intertext here. The allusion is to three biblical verses, Psalm 6:3, Psalm 74:10, and Revelation 6:10. In fact, Gail Hightower seems to wonder: “How long, O Lord, must I put up with this?” (Ruppersburg 1994: 292). This passage reveals quite a lot of Hightower’s character as he seems to enjoy the role of a martyr (Coffee 1983: 104; cf. Beasley-Murray 1970: 1289). In the novel, there are three instances of O (Capps 1979: 606277) and 27 instances of Lord (Capps 1979: 495).

Passage 14 in target culture: Two specific biblical intertexts

Specific intertext 1: ... ja minun sieluni on kovin peljästynyt. Voi, Herra, kuinka kauan? (Psalm 6:4)

Specific intertext 2: Kuinka kauan, Jumala, vihollinen saa herjata, vihamies pilkata sinun nimeäsi lakkaamatta? (Psalm 74:10)

Passage 14: Translations

KV Translation: … salli itseään ahdistettavan, antoi raastaa itsensä vuoteesta keskellä yötä ja kantaa metsään piestäväksi. Samalla hän osoitti kaupunkilaisille koko ajan ilmeillään – häpeämättömästi ja martyyrinunteissaan hekumoiden – muka ajattelevansa: – Miten kauan vielä, oi Herra? (KV, 494; emphasis in the original)279

LE Translation: ... ja häneen kohdistuneen vainon, yölliset pieksäjäiset metsässä, jonne hänet raahattiin vuoteestaan – kaupunkilaisten näkyvissä ja kuuluvissa kaiken aikaa häpeämättä, martyyrinaisen kärsivällisesti, jopa nautinnollisesti omaksuttu vainotun asenne... Ø (LE, 374–375)

As the reader-translators follow the source text closely, the reader of the Finnish translations can read the expressions “martyyrinunteissaan” and “martyyrinai.” KV translates the How long, O Lord with specific “Miten kauan vielä, oi Herra?” The Finnish reader may detect an intertext. It is

277 In fact, in the edition used for the study there are only two of them. Capps (1979: xvi) says that he uses the 1968 Modern Library issue of Light in August. This is the only occasion where I found a difference between Capps’s concordance and the text edition I have used. The second instance of O, according to Capps, is where there is a messenger whom Nathaniel Burden sent back home. The messenger says: “Oh [or: O], yes; I nigh forgot. He said to tell you the woman and the kid was fine.” (LIA, 231). The third instance of O is in LIA, 319: “It’s Friday, the negro says. “O Lawd God, it’s Friday.”

278 The biblical verse in the Book of Revelation in Finnish does no serve here as an intertext: “Ja he huusivat suurella äänellä sanoen: “Kuinka kauaksi sinä, pyhä ja totinen Valtias, siirrät tuomiosi ja jätät kostamatta meidän veremme niille, jotka maan päällä asuvat?”” (Revelation 6:10.)

279 “... han låt sig bli förföljd, låt sig dras upp ur sängen mitt i natten, bäras ut i skogen och prygglas, medan han hela tiden skamlöst och med vällustiga martyrkänslor inför staden visade upp en min av: Huru länge ännu, o Herre?” (LIAS, 375).
not the exact biblical wording, but it is so close that religious-biblical intertextuality can be easily recognized. A rather close following of the source text seems to work well here. Besides, the expression is printed in italics both in the source text and KV.

LE, however, provides another solution. The translation simply omits the biblical intertext. Gail Hightower is using the biblical allusion, applying it to his own personal life. The first intertext is in David’s psalm of repentance, the second one is a prayer as the temple in Jerusalem was destroyed, and the third one is in the passage of Revelation where the souls under the altar, “slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held,” are crying to God (Revelation 6:9). As the biblical intertext in Revelation strongly emphasizes the idea of martyrdom, LE secularizes the source text and Hightower’s character. It makes his character less religious than he is in the source text. This secularizing solution is not adequate and does not do justice to his religious Southern character.

6.1.3 Religious proper-name allusions

So far there have been religious-biblical key-phrase allusions, either modified, word-for-word repeated, or simply depending on one word. Many of them have both a general-cultural as well as specific-limited intertextual dimension. In this section I will deal with still one type of intertexts, namely proper-name allusions. Proper-name allusions to the Bible are often associated with dramatic scenes and confrontations – of which the story of Jesus is the ultimate example – and on such occasions, the human memory is helped by visual representations in books, paintings, or films of the stories of e.g. David and Goliath or of Samson and Delilah (Leppihalme 1997: 67). General-cultural intertextuality and specific-limited intertextuality are in constant interaction in such images. As will be seen, characters in Light in August, besides using biblical intertexts in the form of key-phrase allusions, also use biblical intertexts in the form of proper-name allusions to suit their own purposes.

The options for a translator of the novel are the same as with a key-phrase allusion. There are three basic ways of dealing with proper names in translation: first, they may be translated as literally as possible. Sometimes linguistic differences between languages cause minor differences, but most of the time a literal translation can be easily recognized by the speakers of various languages. Secondly, the translator may decide that a proper name is, for various reasons, not to be translated. It can be culturally too specific or having no great importance for the text. Often a translator can compensate the loss in other parts of the text. Thirdly, a translator may try to render the semantic meaning of a proper name into a translation (cf. Leppihalme 1994: 94).
Passage 15: Three source texts

Source text 1: “Answer me, Jezebel!” he [Eupheus Hines] shouted. (LIA, 123)

Source text 2: “… And it was her, the Jezebel of the doctor, that was the Lord’s instrument, that said, ‘We’ll name him Christmas,’ and another one said, ‘What Christmas. Christmas what,’ and God said to old Doc Hines, ‘Tell them,’…and they quit laughing and they looked at old Doc Hines and the Jezebel said, ‘How do you know?’ and old Doc Hines said, ‘The Lord says so…”’ (LIA, 363–364)

Source text 3: “And he just had to watch and to wait, and he did and it was in the Lord’s good time, for evil to come from evil. And the doctor’s Jezebel come running from her lustful bed, still astink with sin and fear…” (LIA, 364)

Passage 15 in source culture: Six specific biblical intertexts

Specific intertext 1: And it came to pass… that he [Ahab] took to wife Jezebel the daughter of Ethbaal king of the Zidonians, and went and served Baal, and worshipped him. (I Kings 16:31)

Specific intertext 2: For it was so, when Jezebel cut off the prophets of the Lord, that Obadiah took an hundred prophets, and hid them by fifty in a cave, and fed them with bread and water. (I Kings 18:4; also vv. 13 and 19)

Specific intertext 3: And Ahab told Jezebel all that Elijah had done, and withal how he had slain all the prophets with the sword. Then Jezebel sent a messenger unto Elijah, saying, So let the gods do to me, and more also, if I make not thy life as the life of one of them by to morrow about this time. (I Kings 19:1–2)

Specific intertext 4: But Jezebel his wife came to him [Ahab], and said unto him, Why is thy spirit so sad, that thou eatest no bread? (I Kings 21:5; also vv. 6–25: But there was none like unto Ahab, which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord, whom Jezebel his wife stirred up. v. 25)

Specific intertext 5: And thou [Jehu] shalt smite the house of Ahab thy master, that I may avenge the blood of my servants the prophets, and the blood of all the servants of the Lord, at the hand of Jezebel. (II Kings 9:7; also vv. 10, 22, 30–37: And the carcase of Jezebel shall be as dung upon the face of the field in the portion of Jezreel; so that they shall not say, This is Jezebel. v. 37)

Specific intertext 6: Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols. (Revelation 2:20)

In Chapter 6 of the novel, Eupheus Hines enters the room of the dietitian, which he characterizes, typically for Hines, as “womanfilth,” “before the face of God” (LIA, 124). Hines tries to make her
talk about the future of Joe Christmas. When she does not, he becomes impatient and starts yelling at her, calling her “Jezebel.” In Chapter 16, Eupheus Hines tells Byron Bunch and Gail Hightower what he did at the orphanage and how the baby (Joe Christmas) was found on Christmas Eve on the doorstep of the orphanage and carried into the house. Hines follows him and enters the room. There are five instances of the word *Jezebel* in the novel (Capps 1979: 416), four times used by Hines, and once by Simon McEachern.

The first five specific intertexts refer to the Old Testament figure of Jezebel. Though she was the daughter of Ethbaal, priest-king of Tyre and Sidon, and married to Ahab, king of Northern Israel, she continued to worship her native god Baal in Samaria (I Kings 16:31; cf. I Kings 21:25). Her cult was fiercely contested by the prophet Elijah. After Ahab’s death she continued in her role as queen-mother. When Ahab’s son Jehoram was killed by Jehu, she dressed regally and awaited him and death (II Kings 9; see Beeching 1976; Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 204).

In the New Testament Book of Revelation (see Specific intertext 6), the name of Jezebel occurs pejoratively, as it is given to a seductive prophetess who encouraged immorality and idolatry in the church of Thyatira, under the guise of religion (Revelation 2:20; see Beasley-Murray 1970: 1285). In both the Old and New Testament the connotations of “Jezebel” are negative: she personifies idolatry and immorality. “Her religion, as well as the sexual practices associated with it, accounts for her promiscuous, licentious reputation among Biblical historians.” (Ruppersburg 1994: 82; see also Delahunty, Dignen & Stock 2005: 222–223).

In a certain way this proper-name allusion is a clear case for the reader-translator. There is in the source text a proper name, and the reader-translator may know or not know that it is of biblical origin. If s/he does not know, it is easy to check what the name stands for. In the case of Source text 1, even knowing nothing about Jezebel and the biblical character, the reader-translator probably associates the name with something unpleasant, probably insulting, as it is Eupheus Hines who is shouting. The reader-translator may think of something religious, as Hines is all the time using religious expressions when speaking.

Source texts 2 and 3 are more difficult, as they are more ambiguous in the expression. The reader-translator recognizes “Jezebel” as a proper name in the expression “the Jezebel of the doctor, that was the Lord’s instrument.” S/he knows that in Hines’s discourse this probably means something religious, maybe biblical, but is the name something positive or negative? S/he may think and remember (Source text 1) that “Jezebel” is something negative, but here she is said to be “the Lord’s instrument” that may sound positive.\(^{280}\) However, Source text 3 shows that “Jezebel” is

\(^{280}\) This is again an example of Faulkner creating new meanings by intertextuality.
something negative, as the name is associated with sin and fear: “And the doctor’s Jezebel come running from her lustful bed, still astink with sin and fear.” The reader-translator knows, too, that “Jezebel” refers to Miss Atkins, the lover of a doctor, and has something to do with a love affair.

Passage 15 in target culture: Six specific biblical intertexts

Specific intertext 1: Ei ollut siinä kylliksi, että hän vaelsi Jerobeamin, Nebatin pojan, synneissä, vaan hän otti myös vaimokseen lisebelin, siidonilaisten kuninkaan Ethbaalin tyttären, ja rupesi palvelemaan Baalia ja kumartamaan sitä. (I Kings 16:31)

Specific intertext 2: … niinpä Obadja oli silloin, kun lisebel hävitti Herran profetat, ottanut sata profeeattaa ja piilotannut heidät luolaan, viisikymmentä kerrallaan, ja elättänyt heitä leivällä ja vedellä. (I Kings 18:4; also vv. 13 and 19)

Specific intertext 3: Mutta kun Ahab kertoi lisebelille kaiken, mitä Elia oli tehnyt ja kuinka hän ol i tappanut miekalla kaikki profetat, lähetti lisebel sanansaattajan Elian luo ja käski sanoa: ‘Jumalat rangaiskoot minua nyt ja vasta, jollen minä huomenna tähän aikaan tee sinulle samaa, mikä jokaiselle näistä on tehty’. (I Kings 19:1–2)

Specific intertext 4: Niin hänen vaimonsa lisebel tuli hänen luokseen ja puhui hänelle: ‘Miksi olet niin pahoilla mielin ja miksi et syö mitään?’ (I Kings 21:5; also vv. 6–25: Totisesti ei ole ollut ketään, joka olisi niin myynyt itsensä tekemään sitä, mikä on pahaa Herran silmissä, kuin Ahab, kun hänen vaimonsa lisebel vietteli häntä. v. 25)

Specific intertext 5: ”Ja sinä olet surmaava herrasi Ahabin suvun; sillä minä kostan lisebelille palvelijaini, profettain, veren ja kaikkien Herran palvelijaini veren.” (II Kings 9:7; also vv. 10, 22, 30–37: ‘… ja lisebelin ruumis on oleva niinkuin pellon lanta Jisreelin vainiolla, niin ettei voida sanoa: Tämä on lisebel”’. v. 37)

Specific intertext 6: “Mutta se minulla on sinua vastaan, että sinä suvaitset tuota naista, lisebeliä, joka sanoo itseään profetaksi ja opettaa ja eksyttää minun palvelijoitani harjoittamaan haureutta ja syömään epäjumalille uhrattua.” (Revelation 2:20)

Passage 15: Translations

KV Translation 1: – Vastaa minulle, Jesabel! huusi mies. (KV, 135)

LE Translation 1: “Vastaa minulle, portto!” hän huusi. (LE, 101)

281 “– Svara mig, Jesabel! skrek han.” (LIAS, 104).


KV Translation 3: Ja siten hänen tarvitsi vain odottaa ja valvoa, ja hän tekikin sen, kunnes Jumalan hetki löi ja paha synnytti pahaa. Silloin lääkärin Jesabel tulee juosten irstaasta vuoteestaan ja lemuaa synniltä ja kauhistukselta. (KV, 386)

LE Translation 3: “Hänen oli vain katseltava ja odotettava ja hän teki niin kaikessa rauhassa, kunnes pahaa sikisi pahasta. Ja tuo lääkärin huora juoksi himojen vuoteesta ja löyhkäsi syntiä ja pelkoa.” (LE, 293)

KV uses the proper name “Jesabel.” This is a non-standard Finnish transcription for “Jezebel,” who is called “Iisebel” in the 1938 Finnish Bible and “Isebel” in the 1992 Bible. The fact that the Swedish translation has “Jesabel” may be taken as an indication of the direct influence of the Swedish translation on KV. That may imply that the translators of KV may have estimated the use of the proper name important for the Finnish reader’s understanding of the passages, but, for an unknown reason, have not looked it up in the Finnish Bible to see intertexts and the proper name’s orthography. The cultural intertext may have influenced their choice. In any case, “Jesabel” does not offer the reader of KV an easy check-up as the Finnish version of this biblical proper name is different. S/he knows that it is the dietitian in question, but the intertextual religious-moral dimension associated with the name of Jesabel is not directly available to him or her. S/he can only rely on what s/he knows the dietitian has done so far, and also what s/he knows about the character of Hines. S/he may guess that the biblical “Iisebel” is the person alluded to.

LE has another solution: it does not translate “Jesabel” or “Iisebel” at all. LE Translation 1 has “portto” (‘whore’), inferring the importance of this aspect of the biblical allusion. Indeed, “portto”


in LE probably transmits the meaning in which the word is used by Eupheus Hines; however, by trying to clarify the concept, LE secularizes the character of the religiously fanatical Hines. LE’s solution is based on the semantic meaning of the allusion, as *portto* is the word used in the 1938 Finnish Bible for a prostitute (see, e.g., Matthew 21:31; I Corinthians 6:16; Revelation 17:1, etc.). LE Translation 2 omits allusions to “Jezebel,” and makes the dietitian first “the whore of the young doctors” and then twice “the whore of the physician” (LE Translations 2 and 3). Again, this considerably secularizes the character of Hines, who uses biblical allusions in his speech. It can be argued, too, that this solution only partially transmits the image of the biblical “Jezebel,” who was a king’s daughter in the Old Testament, not a “whore” (cf. II Kings 9:22), and in the New Testament a prophetess, not a prostitute (Revelation 2:20).

As it stands, the translator of LE has probably known the religious intertext of “Jezebel,” as he has used some semantic contents of it in the translation. On the one hand, he has estimated a literal translation “Iisebel” not to be the best solution for a Finnish reader, i.e., the cultural intertext to be not sufficiently similar to the allusion to be detected. This may also tell about the place of religion and of religious knowledge in the Finnish society in the 1960s or/and about the editor’s policy. The translator’s solution may be justified in the sense that the Catechism of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland (“Kristinoppi lyhyesti selitettynä”, 1923) is more doctrinal than biblical and more concentrated on the New Testament and the Gospels than on the Old Testament. On the other hand, there is the disadvantage that the religious fanatical character of Eupheus Hines is only partially transferred into Finnish. After all, he is a fictional character in the American South, not a fictional Finn. Besides, LE deprives the reader’s experience of detecting the proper-name biblical allusion from those readers familiar with biblical narratives, and it transmits only some – although admittedly main – aspects of the biblical intertext.

Passage 16: Source text

“Away, Jezebel!” he [Simon McEachern] said. His voice thundered, into the shocked silence, the shocked surrounding faces beneath the kerosene lamps, into the ceased music, into the peaceful moonlit night of young summer. “Away, harlot!” (LIA, 191)

Passage 16 in source culture: Six specific biblical intertexts (see Passage 15)

---

284 *Kielitoimiston sanakirja* [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish] notes that in today’s Finnish ‘portto’ (s.v. ‘portto’) is an old word for prostitute, and ‘huora’ (s.v. ‘huora’) is a pejorative word for prostitute.
An apocalyptic image in Chapter 9 of the novel takes place in a dance hall where Joe Christmas is with Bobbie Allen and Simon McEachern addresses her. These are the only words he says on this occasion before Joe Christmas knocks him down.

As with Eupheus Hines (see Passage 15 above for more details), the biblical proper-name allusion in this passage is to the biblical figure of Jezebel. Simon McEachern calls Bobbie Allen both “Jezebel” and “harlot.” This emphasizes what Jezebel is thought to represent. For him, Jezebel is a representative of idolatry and immorality. The two phrases he uses are almost identical, and that is why they can be easily understood to mean roughly the same thing, i.e., that “Jezebel” means something like “harlot.” The reader-translator is given a clear sign of allusion with “Jezebel,” and s/he and the Finnish reader are guided toward a certain understanding of the meaning of the proper name.

Passage 16 in target culture: Six specific biblical intertexts (see Passage 15)

Passage 16: Translations

KV Translation: – Pois, Jesabel! huusi hän. Hänen äänensä jyrisi säikähdyksen synnyttämää hiljaisuudessa, säikähtyneillä kasvoilla öljylamppujen alla, vaienneessa soittokunnassa, tyynessä, kuunpaisteisessa suviyössä. – Pois, portto! (KV, 205)


The reader-translator is guided from specific intertextuality toward a more general intertext, even if “harlot” is only one of many biblical associations concerning Jezebel. KV follows the Swedish, not Finnish, orthography of “Jesabel,” which is enough to give the reader of the translation a clue of an intertextual allusion. Interestingly enough, here LE uses the biblical name and translates “Iisebel.” With Eupheus Hines (see Passage 15 above) the translator of LE has not used “Iisebel” but has secularized his character and has preferred general intertextuality. There may be two reasons why LE uses “lisebel” here, in association with Simon McEachern. One reason may be that there is a developing apocalyptic image at the beginning of Chapter 9 of the novel, with proper names “Michael” and “Jezebel”, and the translator of LE has understood the importance of this image.

285 Bort, Jesabel! ropade han. Hans röst dånade in i den förskräckta tystnaden, de förskräckta ansiktena under fotogenlamporna, in i den tystnade musiken, in i den fredliga, månljusa försommarnatten. Bort, sköka!” (LIAS, 159).
Another reason may be that the translator has preferred a more specific intertextual allusion here because the two phrases (“Away, Jezebel!” and “Away, harlot!”) are so near one to the other, and because they obviously explain each other. Both Finnish translations facilitate the understanding of the intertextual nature of the name by translating “harlot” as “portto,” which is used in the 1938 Finnish Bible for a prostitute.

The French translation wants to make sure that the reader detects and recognizes the intertexts. The orthography of Jezebel is rendered by the form used in the French Bible, “Jézabel,” and to follow the intertextual chain, in Lumière d’août there is an endnote given on page 1225: “Épouse phénicienne d’Achab, roi d’Israël, dont le principal adversaire fut le prophète Élie. Le nom de cette reine païenne et criminelle, qui signifie peut-être ‘chaste’, est associé dans la Bible aux pires abominations. Voir I Rois, XVI, 31; XVIII, 4, 13, 19; XIX, 1–2; XXI, 5–25; II Rois, IX, 7, 10, 30–37; et Apocalypse, II, 20.” It may be noted that this time there is both an explanation as well as the biblical references.

Passage 17: Source text

“… and old Doc Hines said, ‘His name is Joseph,’ … and then they laughed again, hollering, ‘It is so in the Book: Christmas, the son of Joe. Joe, the son of Joe. Joe Christmas,’ …” (LIA, 364)

Passage 17 in source culture: Eight specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Specific intertext 1: And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ. (Matthew 1:16; also vv. 18–20, 24)

Specific intertext 2: And when they [wise men] were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him. (Matthew 2:13; also v. 19)

Specific intertext 3: … To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin’s name was Mary. (Luke 1:27)

Specific intertext 4: And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; (because he was of the house and lineage of David:) (Luke 2:4; also v. 16)

Specific intertext 5: And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli (Luke 3:23)

Specific intertext 6: And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. And they said, Is not this Joseph’s son? (Luke 4:22)

Specific intertext 7: Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, ‘We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.’ (John 1:45)

Specific intertext 8: And they said, Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven? (John 6:42)

In Chapter 16 of the novel, Eupheus Hines tells Byron Bunch and Gail Hightower what he did at the orphanage and how the baby (Joe Christmas) was found on Christmas Eve on the doorstep of the orphanage and carried into the house. Hines follows and enters the room. There are two instances of the word Joseph in the novel (Capps 1979: 419).287

The biblical allusion in the source text is to Joseph, husband of Mary, who is not the father of Jesus, Mary’s child, though Joseph acted as a father toward Jesus, and people believed him to be the father (see Specific intertexts 5–8). Joseph took Jesus to Jerusalem for the purification (Luke 2:22), and took him and Mary to Egypt to escape Herod (Matthew 2:13–14; see Specific intertext 2). Once returned to Nazareth, he took the boy to Jerusalem each year for the Passover (Luke 2:41; see Nixon 1976).

To understand the meaning of this proper-name allusion necessitates the reading of a larger passage. In fact, the reader-translator is given a clue by people having a party. It is they who immediately link the biblical name with the day and moment they are living, i.e., Christmas Eve. It is they who understand the allusion to the biblical Joseph. Without Joseph and Mary there would be no Christmas – event or person.

Passage 17 in target culture: Eight specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Specific intertext 1: Jaakobille syntyi Joosef, Marian mies, hänen, josta syntyi Jeesus, jota kutsutaan Kristukseksi. (Matthew 1:16; also vv. 18–20, 24)

287 The other instance is in Chapter 6, where the matron asks Christmas: “Joseph,” the matron said, “how would you like to go and live with some nice people in the country?” (LIA, 132).
Specific intertext 2: Mutta kun he olivat menneet, niin katso, Herran enkeli ilmestyi Joosefille unessa ja sanoi: ‘Nouse, ota lapsi ja hänen äitinsä ja pakene Egyptiin, ja ole siellä siihen asti, kuin minä sinulle sanon; sillä Herodes on etsivä lasta surmatakseen hänet. (Matthew 2:13; also v. 19)

Specific intertext 3: … neitsyen tykö, joka oli kihlattu Joosef nimiselle miehelle Daavidin suvusta; ja neitsyen nimi oli Maria. (Luke 1:27)

Specific intertext 4: Niin Joosefin lähti Galileasta, Nasaretin kaupungista, ylös Juudeaan, Daavidin kaupunkiin, jonka nimi on Beetlehem, hän kun oli Daavidin huonetta ja sukua (Luke 2:4; also v. 16)


Specific intertext 6: Ja kaikki lausuivat hänenä hyvän todistuksen ja ihmettelivät niitä armon sanoja, jotka hänen suustansa lähtivät; ja he sanoivat: ‘Eikö tämä ole Joosefin poika?’ (Luke 4:22)

Specific intertext 7: Filippus tapasi Natanaelin ja sanoi hänelle: ‘Me olemme löytäneet sen, josta Mooses laissa ja profeetat ovat kirjoittaneet, Jeesuksen, Joosefin pojan, Nasaretista’. (John 1:45)

Specific intertext 8: ja he sanoivat: ‘Eikö tämä ole Jeesus, Joosefin poika, jonka isän ja äidin me tunnemme? Kuinka hän sitten sanoo: ‘Minä olen tullut alas taivaasta’?’ (John 6:42)

Passage 17: Translations


The same phenomenon as in Passages 15 and 16 can be seen in the case of KV Translation of “Joseph.” The proper name Joseph in the source text becomes in KV “Josef,” although the Finnish version of this biblical name is “Joosef.” KV probably follows the Swedish translation “Josef” (“Hans namn är Josef”). There is a difference of one letter between the intertext and the translation.

This slight difference may not be a major hindrance for detecting the allusion, but it does not facilitate it, either.

Compared to KV, LE transfers “Joseph” as “Joosef” into Finnish. In this passage, which explains the origin of the Joe Christmas’s name and links it with the biblical intertext, LE uses a literal translation. Whereas in Finnish the proper name “Iisebel” (or “Jesabel”) may be unknown to many readers, the proper name “Joosef” is not. It immediately links up with the name of Mary, “Maria”, and with the biblical narrative of Christmas. For a Finnish reader, “Joosef” would have the same allusion to the biblical narrative as for an English reader – notice the moment of Christmas Eve – whereas “Joseph” is foreign and not so easily associated with the biblical story of Christmas.

In Finland, there is not only specific or limited intertextuality but also strong general and cultural-religious intertextuality concerning “Joosef.” Several traditional Christmas carols and hymns mentions “Joosef”, and many paintings especially in churches depict Joseph. For instance in Kempele church, there is painting by Mikael Toppelius (1785), in which Mary and child Jesus are in the middle. Joseph is depicted with an ox, a donkey, and three wise men from the East (Lempääläinen 2002: 279).

The translator of LE either has not seen the importance of general or cultural-religious and specific intertext, or has been influenced by his earlier choice to translate “Christmas” in the source text as “Joulu” in the target text; consequently, “Joseph” in the source text becomes “Joosef” in the translation. Admittedly, “Joosef Christmas” is a strange combination in Finnish, but the combination as such has not been used in the novel: “Joosef” is immediately abbreviated as “Joe” (“It is so in the Book: Christmas, the son of Joe. Joe, the son of Joe. Joe Christmas,’ they said”; LIA, 364), and Joe Christmas is as acceptable as any foreign name in Finnish.

Both Finnish translations loosen the link with a Southern cultural intertext as KV (386) states – Näin on kirjoitettu: Joulu, Joen poika. Joe, Joen poika, Joe Joulu”, and LE (293) says: “Niin on kirjaan kirjoitettu: Christmas, Joen poika. Joe, Joen poika. Joe Christmas”. KV ignores the important intertextual information about the “Book”, i.e., the Bible, and LE weakens it mentioning “kirjaan” (‘book’; see Passage 19 below). The mention of the “Book” is not only cultural intertextuality, but also specific intertextual information in the sense that Faulkner uses the “Book” elsewhere in his novels and short stories, e.g. in *The Sound and the Fury* (Dilsey), *A Fable* (the

---

289 “It’ll be in the Book, honey, Dilsey said. Writ out.” (Faulkner 2006: 922; emphasis in the original).

290 “Don’t the Book itself say he will return in thunder and lightning?” (Faulkner 1994: 740).
old man), and Wash291 (Wash). In addition, in A Fable,292 there is also an allusion to a day that may have been Christmas.

Passage 18: Source text
Perhaps, if he [Simon McEachern] were thinking at all, he believed that he had been guided and were now being propelled by some militant Michael Himself as he entered the room. (LIA, 190)

Passage 18 in source culture: Four specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext
Specific intertext 1: And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was nation even to that same time: and at that time people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. (Daniel 12:1)

Specific intertext 2: And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels. (Revelation 12:7)

Specific intertext 3: Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee. (Jude 9)

Specific intertext 4: But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me: and I remained there with the kings of Persia. (Daniel 10:13; see also v. 21)

One of cultural-religious intertextualities in Christianity (as well as in other religions) is the angels. The etymological meaning of the word *angel* (in Greek ἀγγελός, in Latin *angelus*, ‘messenger,’ ‘herald’) shows how angels have been considered to be active agents in religion. Simon McEachern certainly believes in angels. At the beginning of Chapter 9 of the novel, he follows Joe Christmas

291 “… the Book said also that all men were created in the image of God…” (Faulkner, *Collected Stories* 1995: 538). – The LE’s solution “kirjaan” (with a small “k”) is an interesting case, as the translator, Kai Kaila, translated also the short story Wash that was published in Finnish only one year later (1969) than Liekehtivä elokuu. Here the translator – or is it the editor of the publishing house that is the same in both cases? – has used an uppercase “K”: “… ajatteli Kirjaan myös kertovan että kaikki ihmiset olivat luotu Jumalan kuviksi…” (William Faulkner, *Karhu ja muita novelleja*. Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Tammi 1969, p. 98). It may show that the translational issue has been reflected upon, and two different solutions have been used to transmit this cultural intertextuality.

292 “Then it was winter; … it might actually have been the anniversary of the Son of Man…” (Faulkner 1994: 855). “Son of man” is a biblical intertext (Daniel 7:13–14). Jesus used it to describe his character and mission (see, e.g., Mark 8:38; 13:26; 14:62; Luke 17:24; 21:27, etc.; see Geldenhuys 1976: 629).
and enters a dance hall to threaten his adopted son. McEachern is described as being propelled by the angel Michael. There is only one instance of the word *Michael* in the novel (Capps 1979: 528).293

The reader-translator may or may not know that the angel Michael fights with the dragon in Revelation 12:7, but s/he certainly notices the proper name. Even though the angel Michael is mentioned only there and in Jude 9 in the New Testament, and in Daniel 10:13; 10:21; 12:1 in the Old Testament, s/he always has important missions in the biblical narrative. In Revelation 12:7–9 Michael and his or her companion angels wage war against Satan and the rebellious angels; in the Book of Daniel s/he is the angel protector of the people of Israel (Douglas 1976c; cf. Ruppersburg 1994: 118).

Simon McEachern seems to be driven by a supernatural force. There can be also seen an implicit reference to predestination. Even if this is the only instance of “Michael” in the novel, as already seen, there is intertextuality in Faulkner, as he mentions the archangel Michael elsewhere, as well. “Archangel Michael” (“Shingles for the Lord”) and “archangel” or “archangelic” are mentioned in *Collected Stories*294 and in *A Fable*.295

Passage 18 in target culture: Four specific biblical intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Specific intertext 1: Siihen aikaan nousee Miikael, se suuri enkeliruhtinas, joka seisoo sinun kansasi lasten suojana. Ja se on oleva ahdistuksen aika, jonka kultaista ei ole ollut siitä saakka, kun kansoja on ollut, hamaan siihen aikaan asti. Mutta siihen aikaan pelastetaan sinun kansasi, kaikki, jotka kirjaan kirjoitetut ovat. (Daniel 12:1)

Specific intertext 2: Ja syttyi sota taivaassa: Miikael ja hänen enkelinsä sotivat lohikäärmettä vastaan; ja lohikäärme ja hänen enkelinsä sotivat. (Revelation 12:7)

---

293 If the reader-translator had been able to use The Library of America Edition of the novel (Faulkner 1985), s/he would have found confirmation of this intertext. On page 1032 there is an endnote in relation to the text: “Michael Himself] The Archangel (cf. Rev. 12:7).”

294 In a short story called *Shingles for the Lord*, when speaking of Reverend Whitfield’s old long nightshirt, which he wears when he conducts a baptism, the narrator, a little boy, remarks that “to a boy of ten it wasn’t jest a cloth garment or even a iron armor; it was the old strong Archangel Michael his self, that had fit and strove and conquered sin for so long that it finally had the same contempt for the human beings that returned always to sin as hogs and dogs done that the old strong archangel his self must have had.” (Faulkner, *Collected Stories* 1995: 40). In March 1951, Faulkner won a National Book Award for Fiction for his *Collected Stories*.

295 “… at least we can match that with our archangels on the Aisne. … the tremendous aerial shapes patrolling our front, and each time they are thickest, heaviest, densest, most archangelic…” (Faulkner 1994: 925).
Specific intertext 3: Mutta ei ylienkeli Miikaelkaan, kun riiteli ja väitteli perkeleen kanssa Mooseksen ruumiista, rohjennut lausua herjaavaa tuomiota, vaan sanoi: ‘Rangaiskoon sinua Herra!’ (Jude 9)

Specific intertext 4: “Persian valtakunnan enkeliruhtinas seisoi vastustamassa minua kaksikymmentäyksi päivää, mutta katso, Miikael, yksi ensimmäisistä enkeliruhtinaista, tuli minun avukseni, sillä minä olin jään yksin sinne, Persian kuningasten tykö.” (Daniel 10:13; see also v. 21)

Passage 18: Translations

KV Translation: Ehkä hän uskoi – jos yleensä ajatteli mitään – että häntä kiidätti jokin koston enkeli, itse Mikael, kun hän syöksyi saliin. (KV, 204–205)296

LE Translation: Mikäli hän lainkaan ajatteli asiaa, hän kenties sisään astuessaan uskoi, että häntä oli opastanut ja nyt ajoeteenpäin joku tulinen arkkienkeli itse. (LE, 155)

Cultural intertextuality and the intertextual use of Michael in Faulkner’s works point to the importance of Michael in translation. In Finnish culture Christianity has played a major role as a cultural-religious phenomenon for centuries. This can be immediately noticed by the fact that the Finnish translations expand the source text and mention “enkeli” (KV) and “arkkienkeli” (LE). They show how general (cultural) intertextuality includes the specific (limited) intertextuality, i.e., the belief in angels’ existence in Christianity, as they are mentioned in the Bible.

In Finland, Michael has been part of the culture for centuries: “mikkelinpäivä” (the first Sunday of October) is named after the angel Michael,297 and in many old churches in Finland there are paintings or sculptures of the archangel Michael (as well as of St. George) fighting victoriously against the devil. “Michael” thus can be easily detected and recognized by the Finnish reader-translator. However, even though the biblical Michael is vigorous and warring, s/he is not normally considered to be an avenging angel (Douglas 1976c: 820).

When KV translates “some militant Michael Himself” into Finnish as “jokin koston enkeli, itse Mikael” (‘some angel of revenge, Michael himself”), there is an interpretation of the biblical intertext: “militant” does not mean “avenging.” It emphasizes, maybe unnecessarily, Simon McEachern’s character as avenging. The Finnish translation can be understood when compared

---

296 “Kanske han, om han nu alls tänkte något, trodde att han väglets och nu drevs framåt av någon vedergällningens ängel, av Mikael själv, när han rusade in i rummet.” (LIAS, 159).

297 Since the 5th century Christianity has celebrated the ecclesiastical feast of Michael. In the 18th century in Finland, it was transferred to the first Sunday following September 29. Nowadays in Finland the day is a special day in the Evangelical Lutheran parishes for angels, children, and Sunday school work (Lempiäinen 1983: 129–131). – On the archangel Michael, see, e.g., Fallon/Eds. 2003.
with the Swedish translation, which has it as “någon vedergällningens ängel, av Mikael själv”,
‘some angel of revenge, by Michael himself’. Again, KV follows the Swedish translation.

LE has wanted to keep the cultural level of intertextuality but has omitted the specific
intertextuality, viz., the name of the angel. LE has added the notion of “arkkienkeli” (‘archangel’),
as well as changed the adjective militant to the adjective tulinen (‘fiery’). Intertextuality has been
modified to some extent, but the omission has also other, intratextual consequences: it secularizes
and weakens an underlying network of biblical intratextual concepts in the Book of Revelation used
in the source text in this particular chapter of the novel: Michael – Jezebel – Throne (LIA, 190–
191). The text of Revelation is poetic, relying on universal images of the human race. The world is
in a process of transition. Nothing is static, and the array of visions and the cinematic structure of
intratextual and intertextual chain of allusions is broken; in the source text this apocalyptic chain
characterizes Simon McEachern to a large extent; in LE, to a lesser extent.

The French translation wants to make sure that the reader is appropriately linked with the relevant
intertexts. In the French translation of Light in August, Lumière d’août,299 there is an endnote given
on page 1223: “Allusion au combat de Michel et de ses anges contre le Dragon. Voir Apocalypse,
XII, 7–17.” However, as mentioned above, Michael has also other missions than waging war
against the devil. It may be asked whether the endnote should have been either shorter, e.g.
“allusion to the archangel Michael, see, e.g., Revelation 12:7–17”, or longer, explaining Michael’s
other functions, too. In this particular case the French reader is informed only about the archangel’s
warring character, but maybe Simon McEachern also wants to protect his adopted son, as Michael
protected the people of Israel in the Book of Daniel. This protective dimension of Michael is not
transferred to the French reader.

Translating intertextual proper-name allusions seems to necessitate a careful consideration
between cultural and specific intertexts and a decision upon which type of these intertextualities – if
any – is important for the reader. When the two Finnish translations are compared, it seems that KV
is more literal, probably following the Swedish translation of Light in August, when considering
specific intertexts. The influence of the Swedish text has created somewhat unnatural or at least
unexpected expressions in Finnish. LE seems to transfer cultural intertextuality but has a

---

298 This characteristic of the Book of Revelation reminds the reader of the “cinematic” Faulkner, who worked on and off

299 “… qu’il avait été guidé et qu’il était poussé maintenant par quelque archange saint Michel.” (Faulkner 1995: 151.)
It can be noticed how cultural intertextuality has influenced the French translator to identify Michael as the archangel
(‘archange’) and saint (‘saint’).
secularizing tendency and thus fails to some extent to create intertextual and intratextual links in translation, e.g., the allusion to the biblical “Joosef” and to the “Book” in Finnish is weakened in LE – and this in the American South, in the region called the Bible Belt (cf. Newmark 1982: 77).

6.2 General or cultural intertextuality in Light in August and its translations

In this section, I will deal with general or cultural type of intertextuality in the novel. As will be seen, cultural-religious intertexts support – and to some extent overlap with – specific or limited type of intertexts. Their function in the novel seems to be to develop and transmit the description of the Southern cultural and religious environment, requiring a cultural competence of these phenomena from the reader-translator. As the quantity of the specific intertexts in this group is more extensive than in Section 6.1, they are no longer listed.

6.2.1 The Book

In Chapter 3 of Light in August, Reverend Gail Hightower preaches in such a way that is faster than the words in the Bible. After the death of his wife, he comes to the church for the service and goes up into the pulpit to preach. At that moment, women begin to leave the building, an event that marks the beginning of the Presbyterian Church’s rejection of the minister (Ruppersburg 1994: 45).

In the same Chapter 3 he has gone to Memphis to fetch the body of his wife and comes back to Jefferson. Ruppersburg (1994: 45) remarks that Hightower “may have decided against a formal church service because his wife died by suicide, or because he wanted to avoid the disgrace. The ceremony is more a scandal, a public occasion, than a proper funeral.” A central item in those phases is the Book, i.e., the Bible. – In Chapter 19, Gavin Stevens comments the last moments of Christmas to a college professor, using the word “Book” (Source text 4).

Passage 19: Four source texts

Source text 1: Not a nightmare, but something which went faster than the words in the Book; a sort of cyclone that did not even need to touch the actual earth. (LIA, 56)

Source text 2: Then the men got up too, and then the church was empty save for the minister in the pulpit, leaning a little forward, with the Book open and his hands propped on either side of it… They told Byron about it; about how at last the minister closed the Book, carefully, and came down into the empty church and walked up the aisle… (LIA, 62)
Source text 3: It was not a funeral. He did not take the body to the church at all. He took it straight to the cemetery and he was preparing to read from the Book himself when another minister came forward and took it from his hand. (LIA, 63)

Source text 4: [Gavin Stevens] “And it was the white blood which sent him [Joe Christmas] to the minister, which rising in him for the last and final time, sent him against all reason and all reality, into the embrace of a chimera, a blind faith in something read in a printed Book.” (LIA, 425–425)

Passage 19 in source culture: Cultural-religious intertext and specific religious intertexts

The Bible is one of the basic elements in the American Southern culture. The importance and role of the Bible in the American South – and in a larger context, too – can be seen in the fact that it is called simply “the Book.” Especially the King James Bible has been influential, and it still is. The Bible has been the main reading material and source of cultural, religious, and intellectual stimulation in the South, especially for rural families (Wilson 2005: 117). The Bible Belt is a term used to refer to the areas of the United States that are dominated by literal interpretation of the Bible. This is linked with strict morality, puritanical mores, and Protestant conservatism. On some occasions the term has even been used as a synonym of the American South, as the Bible was “the book in the South, the good book, connected in the memories of Southerners with home, family, mothers, idealistic values, occupying a place of extraordinary authority in the regional culture” (Wilson 2007: 115; emphasis in the original).

In the source text the reader is given a clear clue of cultural-general intertextuality in the American South: the Book is written with an uppercase “B” (see also Passage 17 above). There are 34 instances of book in the novel, of which only six are written with an uppercase “B” (pp. 56, 62 (2 times), 63, 364, and 425; Capps 1979: 86). The uppercase “B” clearly distinguishes the allusions to the Bible from other books.

Passage 19 in target culture: Cultural-religious intertext and specific religious intertexts

300 According to a recent survey, the most often read translation of the Bible in the U.S.A. in January 2015 was the King James Version (39 % of the respondents) (www.statista.com/statistics; accessed September 24, 2016).

301 Wilson (2005: 117) mentions that at Eudora Welty’s funeral in 2001 – Welty (b. 1909) was an American author of short stories and novels about the American South – Methodist Bishop Clay Lee “made a point of using the King James Version in his readings because of her expressed love for it, typical of the region’s writers.”
Passage 19: Translations

KV Translation 1: Ei painajaisunta, vaan jotakin paljon nopeampaa kuin Raamatun sanat, jonkinlainen pyörremyrsky, jolla ei ollut minkäänlaista tarvetta edes kajota maahan tai sen todellisuuteen. (KV, 63)

LE Translation 1: Ei painajaista, vaan jotakin mikä kiiti nopeammin kuin Raamatun sanat, eräänlaista pyörremyrskyä, jonka ei edes tarvinnut koskettaa maan kamaraa. (LE, 48)

KV Translation 2: … sitten nousivat myös miehet, ja niin oli kirkko tyhjä, lukuun ottamatta saarnastuolissu olevaa pappia, joka seiso hivenen eteenpäin kallistuneena, Raamattu avattuna ja kädet nyrkissä molemmin puolin Raamattua… Byronille kerrottiin kaikki: kuinka pappi lopulta sulki huolessesti Raamattun ja laskeutui tyhjään kirkkoon ja asteli pääkäytävää… (KV, 69)

LE Translation 2: Miehet seurasivat ja pian kirkko oli tyhjillään lukuun ottamatta pappia, joka seiso saarnatuolissa hiukan etunojassa, Raamattu avoinna edessään ja kädet kaitteella sen molemmin puolinsa… Kohtaus selostettiin Byronille. Pappi sulki vihdoin huolessesti Raamattun ja tuli alas tyhjään kirkkoon ja käveli pitkän käänytkää… (LE, 53)

KV Translation 3: Ne eivät olleet mitään oikean hautajaisen. Pappi ei ottanut arkkua kirkkoon. Hän vei sen suoraan kirkkomaalle, ja hänen piti juuri ruveta lukemaan Raamattaa, kun muudan toinen pappi astui esiin ja otti sen hänen kädestään. (KV, 70)

LE Translation 3: Sitä ei voinut sanoa hautajaisiksi. Ruumista ei viety kirkkoon. Se kuljetettiin suoraan hautausmaalle ja Hightower aikoi juuri ryhtyä lukemaan menoja kirjastaan, kun muuan toinen pappi astui esiin ja hoiti asian. (LE, 54)

KV Translation 4: Ja valkoinen veri se johdatti hänet papin luokse ja kohotti päätään viimeisen kerran ja herätti hänessä vastoin järkeä harhakuvitelma, sokean uskon johonkin, mitä hän kerran oli lukenut Sanasta. (KV, 455)

302 “Inte en mardröm men någonting som gick fortare än orden i bibeln, ett slags cyklon som inte en gång hade behov av att röra vid jorden och dess verkligheter.” (LIAS, 49).

303 KV translates “hands propped” as “kädet nyrkissä” (“fists clenched”). This image intensifies Hightower’s agitation, even though not mentioned in the source text (following the Swedish translation: “händerna knutna”).

304 “… så reste sig männens också, och så var kyrkan tom, bortsett från prästen uppe på predikstolen som stod litet framåtlutad med bibeln uppslagen och händerna knutna med en näve på var sida om bibeln… De berättade alltihop för Byron, om hur prästen till slut omsorgsfullt lade ihop bibeln och kom ner i den tomma kyrkan och gick nerför mittgången… (LIAS, 54–55).

305 “Det var ingen riktig begravnning. Han tog inte in kistan i kyrkan. Han tog ut den direkt på kyrkogården och skulle just börja läsa ur bibeln när en annan präst steg fram och tog den ur handen på honom.” (LIAS, 55).

306 “Och det var det vita blodet som förde honom till prästen och som för alla sista gången steg upp i honom och mot allt förnuft drev in honom i en illusion, en blind tro på något han läst en gång i Skriften.” (LIAS, 345).
The Bible has had an enormous impact on Finnish culture, too. When Mikael Agricola (c. 1510–1557) was translating the New Testament (1548) and some other religious books (e.g. a catechism and several liturgical works) into Finnish, very few documents existed in the written form in Finnish. Agricola invented orthography and numerous new words in the language. Besides that, he prefaced the New Testament. In the preface he paid attention to dialectal differences when constructing a literary language for Bible translation (Robinson 2002: 98–101). Since Agricola, the Bible and other religious books served as the basic learning material of the Finnish people for centuries.

The Finnish language and general (cultural) intertextuality in Finnish does not normally use capitalization of common nouns (see, e.g., Itkonen 1982: 12–14). Even with an uppercase “K”, in Finnish culture the single word Kirja would not refer so clearly to the Bible as “the Book” (the uppercase “B” and the definite article) in English.

As can be seen in KV and LE Translations 1 and 2 and in KV Translation 3, both translations have rendered “the Book” as “Raamattu” (‘the Bible’), which can be considered as the standard translation. In addition, there are at least two other ways in Finnish to refer to the Book. There is the expression “kirjojen kirja” (‘the Book of the books’) that is sometimes used in Finnish in reference to the Bible. Another, maybe less known expression in Finnish is “Iso kirja” (‘the Big Book’), used typically – but not exclusively – in Pentecostal churches in Finland to refer to the Bible.307

KV Translation 3 translates “(from) the Book” as “Raamattua,” but LE Translation 3 as “kirjastaan” (‘from his book’), thus giving another, possible solution in Finnish. The translator of LE is aware that “the Book” refers to the Bible (see LE Translations 1 and 2), but he is probably aware that in the Finnish Lutheran funeral service the book a minister normally uses is a Lutheran liturgical book, called “Kirkollisten toimitusten kirja” (‘Book of pastoral services’)308 containing, among other things, the liturgy of a funeral ceremony, including biblical texts, but not the whole Bible. Taking the cultural-religious context in Finland into consideration, this translation is culturally adequate. It can be asked, though, whether LE’s “kirjastaan” (‘from his book’) transmits in Finnish the relevant cultural intertextuality of the American South, or whether it domesticates the

307 E.g. Finnish Pentecostal Christians’ training centre in Keuruu is called Iso Kirja-opisto (‘Big Book College’) (www.isokirja.fi; accessed October 18, 2014).

308 www.evl.fi/kirkkokasikirja (also in English; accessed July 16, 2014).
source text too much in this respect. It does not perplex a Finnish reader of the novel, but it diminishes the importance of one specific cultural intertextual feature of the source text, i.e., the Book. LE’s solution slightly changes the cultural-religious intertext in the novel. As Beck, Frandsen & Randall (2012: 263) affirm, most Southern churches use only the Bible, and avoid other books, creeds, and doctrines.

KV Translation 4 translates “(in a printed) Book” as “Sanasta” (‘in the [biblical] Word’), following the Swedish translation (“i Skriften”; LIAS, 345), but LE Translation 4 as “painetusta kirjasta” (‘in a/the printed book’), thus giving another, possible solution in Finnish. It can be asked, though, whether LE’s “painetusta kirjasta” transmits in Finnish the relevant cultural intertextuality of the American South, or whether it secularizes the source text too much in this respect. As Ruppersburg (1994: 256) affirms, ‘Book’ here clearly refers to the Bible, whereas “painettu kirja” in Finnish can refer to any printed book. LE’s solution secularizes one specific cultural-religious intertextual feature of the source text.

6.2.2 Church

The American South is the only society in Christendom in which the Evangelical Protestant Christianity is dominant and makes the South a “religious region.” There are four common convictions that occupy a normative Southern religious position. These four convictions are the following. First, the Bible, the “Book” (see 6.2.1 above), is the sole reference of belief and practice. Secondly, there is a direct and dynamic access to God that is open to all. Thirdly, morality is primarily individualistic and interpersonal. Fourthly, worship is informal, loosely structured and spontaneous rather than prescriptive (Hill 2006: 1–2; see also Chapter 2 above and Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 263–264).

Southern Protestant churches have been divided into four major families: liturgical, classical or Reformation, Evangelical, and radical. The Episcopal Church represents the liturgical branch of Protestantism, and has served as home for certain kinds of regional traditionalists and as an alternative for people dissatisfied with Evangelical Christianity. It practices formal worship. As representatives of the Reformation, the Lutheran faith has been viewed as suited to people of

309 Cf. the German translation: “Und das weiße Blut war es, was ihn zum Geistlichen sandte, was ihn, zum letzten und endgültigen Mal in ihm aufwallend, wider alle Vernunft und alle Wirklichkeit in die Arme einer Schimäre trieb, eines blinden Glaubens an etwas, das er in einer gedruckten Bibel gelesen hatte.” (Licht im August. Übertragen von Franz Fein. Hamburg: Rowohlt Verlag 1955, p. 324.)
German or Scandinavian descent and is present in the American South only in selected small areas. Moravians and Brethren, too, are considered to be ethnic. What remains is more or less a host of Evangelical denominations. It is true that there are differences in style, teaching, and emphasis between the Assemblies of God, the Disciples of Christ, the Churches of Christ, black Methodists, white Methodists, southern Congregationalists, and the independent Baptist congregations. Even Presbyterianism has been influenced by Evangelicalism, even though it is considered to represent the classical Protestant heritage. Radical Protestantism includes, among others, Mennonites, Amish, and Quakers (see Hill 2006). It must be noted that Presbyterians and Episcopalians have enjoyed a favored social standing (on Presbyterians, see, e.g., Balmer and Fitzmier 1993, and Loetscher 1983; on Episcopalians, see, e.g., Hein and Shattuck 2004).  

Faulkner devotes a lot of attention to the Presbyterians (Wilson 2007: 87). The Presbyterians built the first church in Oxford in 1836. Ruppersburg (1994: 40) notes that the Presbyterian Church in Mississippi was small during the 1920s and 1930s, compared with the Methodist and Baptist Churches. In 1926, 365 Presbyterian churches had 28,096 members in Mississippi, and ten years later, in 1936, the number of Presbyterian churches had shrunk to 272 and their membership was 22,493. By contrast, in 1936 there were 486,864 Baptists and 191,686 Methodists in Mississippi. These denominations were part of the social and cultural-religious environment influencing Faulkner when he was writing his Yoknapatawpha novels.  

Without this kind of information and understanding of cultural-religious intertextual references to various churches and their appearances in Faulkner’s novels and in particular in *Light in August* the reader-translator would not be able to situate them in the larger chains of cultural intertexts, and would not adequately decide the value of the expressions concerning churches as specific intertextual expressions.  

Only three Christian denominations are mentioned in *Light in August*. Gail Hightower is the ex-minister of the local Presbyterian church. The word *Presbyterian* appears six times in the novel (Capps 1979: 677). The word *Episcopal* appears once (Capps 1979: 247), and the word *Methodist* also only once (Capps 1979: 528). The very numerous Baptists in the American South do not appear in the novel at all. It has even been claimed that Faulkner invariably treated Southern

---

310 In the old days of Faulkner’s Yoknapatawpha County, the Sartorises and the Compsons were mostly Episcopal or Presbyterian (see James 1977). A character remarks in *Soldiers’ Pay*: “Funny goings-on in that house. And a preacher of the gospel, too. *Even if he is a Episcopal.*” (Faulkner 2006: 208; emphasis added).
Baptists with contempt (Howell 1967: 223). Faulkner once remarked on the Southern Baptist movement: “It came from times of hardship in the South where there was little or no food for the human spirit – where there were no books, no theatre, no music, and life was pretty hard and a lot of it happened out in the sun, for very little reward and that was the only escape they had.” (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 190; quoted also in Moore 1989: 1292).

Churches belong thus to the general and cultural intertextuality of the South, and the use of the word church and the references to various denominations in his works show that Faulkner is familiar with the ecclesiastical spectrum in the American South. According to Coffee (1967: 197), Faulkner uses the word in both traditional and unorthodox senses. First, it may mean the universal Church, i.e. all Christians. Secondly, the word may refer to the visible church (“constituents or officials of the local congregation”). Thirdly, the word may refer to the community in which the church is located. Fourthly, Faulkner uses the word church to mean the church building itself (Coffee 1967: 197). Often Faulkner may use the word several times in a passage, giving it a slightly different meaning each time. The forms church, Church, church’s, or churches occur 109 times in Light in August (Capps 1979: 142–144).

6.2.2.1 Church as a source of specific, cultural, and universal intertextuality

Various levels of intertextuality are intertwined in the English noun church. Its meanings extend from a concrete form of “church,” a building, to a group of people celebrating in that building to a national and international Christianity, and then to the worldwide community of Christians (Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. ‘church’). Semantically speaking, this phenomenon is called polysemy, i.e.,

---

311 Faulkner sometimes used the word Baptist for a more cultural than religious description. In 1957 he answered to a question about the tall convict in the Old Man: “His background would be the bucolic, provincial, Southern Baptist and it may be a debatable question whether that sort of Baptist believes in God or not.” (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 173). In Sanctuary (1931), Horace Benbow tells Miss Jenny (Virginia Du Pre) how a Baptist minister has preached against “a polluter of the free Democratico-Protestant atmosphere of Yoknapatawpha county”. The reply of Miss Jenny is: “They’re just Baptists” (Faulkner 1985: 267). In The Reivers (1962), Miss Reba makes a remark on the local deputy, Butch Lovemaiden: “… he dont give a damn about the sheriff of the county nor the governor of the state nor the president of the United States all three rolled into one. Because he’s a Baptist. I mean, he’s a Baptist first, and then he’s the Law. When he can be a Baptist and the Law both at the same time, he will.” (Faulkner 1999: 894–895.) In The Town Charles Mallison says that “ours was a town founded by Aryan Baptists and Methodists, for Aryan Baptists and Methodists.” (Faulkner 1999: 268.) The Town was published in 1957. At that time four-fifths of the Mississippi population belonged to churches, and over half of them were Baptists (Wilson 2007: 58).
the presence of a group of related but distinct meanings attached to a word (see, e.g., Saeed 2009: 370–377).

There are 94 instances of the word church in the novel, of which 6 are written with the uppercase “C” (Capps 1979: 142–144). Sometimes the word church in Light in August is used in just one passage in such a way as to encompass all of its intertextual ranges. This occurs e.g. in Chapter 3 in a passage that describes Hightower’s relation to his church in Jefferson. From the point of view of intertextuality, the passage is probably one of the most difficult to translate in the novel. Universal and cultural intertextuality and multiple specific intertexts are intertwined in a complex way. Distinguishing between these intertextualities may lead to different translations in Finnish.

Passage 20: Two source texts

Source text 1: When he [Hightower] quitted the seminary he had a small income inherited from his father, which, as soon as he got his church, he forwarded promptly… Then he lost his church, he lost the Church… (LIA, 52–53)

Source text 2: “Oh, yes,” the friend would say. “Hightower. He lives there by himself. He come here as minister of the Presbyterian church, but his wife went bad on him. … He had to resign from the church, but he wouldn’t leave Jefferson, for some reason. …” (LIA, 54)

Passage 20 in source culture: Specific religious intertexts, cultural-religious intertext, and universal intertextuality

In this passage, the reader-translator has no difficulty to detect the word church that occurs three times (excluding the expression “the Presbyterian church,” see Passage 21 below) and the word Church, occurring once. The first two instances probably refer mainly to the church as the employer of Hightower, as the local community of Presbyterian Christians in Jefferson. In other words, the word church refers to the church as a local organization, even as a job.

---

312 In LIA, 53, 346, 453, 456 and 461 (2 times). In every instance Church appears in connection with Gail Hightower, as in this Passage 20. – In the novel Hightower goes to the seminary, thinking that he would find there an asylum from the world. He gets a call to Jefferson thanks to his wife, the daughter of one of the seminary teachers. His ministry in Jefferson is ineffectual. His sermons are half-mad stories of the last cavalry charge of his grandfather, and his church and his wife seem to mean nothing to him. The wife commits a suicide, and he himself is disgraced and cast out of the Church. He does not want to leave Jefferson, so he stays, isolated. His only friend is Byron Bunch, who sends him to help Lena Grove in childbirth. He tries to save Joe Christmas by telling a lie, but fails to save him.
The third occurrence, Church in Source text 1, is the most problematic. A church in the American South is a cultural-religious intertextual feature. The fact that the reader-translator is given a clue of the intertextuality in question by means of the uppercase “C” is an indicator that there is something specific in here. Ruppersburg (1994: 38) notes: “When he [Hightower] lost his pulpit in the church, he lost his faith both in God and in the church as a social and religious institution.” This statement seems to be, however, too broad-sweeping. Gail Hightower may have lost his faith in the church as a denominational and sociological institution, but that he did not lose his faith in God is shown by his words and thoughts in what follows in the novel. When Hightower lost his trust in and vision of the Church, the uppercase “C” seems to indicate that this “Church” refers to the ideal entity of the universal Christian community, the invisible Church.

The fourth appearance of church in Source text 2 probably refers to the church as a local institution and the place of his employment.

Passage 20 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts, cultural-religious intertext, and universal intertextuality

Passage 20: Translations

KV Translation 1: Pappisseminaarista päästyään hän oli saanut isänperintönä pienen elinkoron, ja kirkkoherranviran saatuaan hän oli siirtänyt sen kokonaan… Sitten hän menetti virkansa Ø… (KV, 59)

LE Translation 1: Seminaarista päästyään hänellä oli isältään peritty pieni elinkorko, jonka hän heti paikan saatuaan neljännesvuosittain lähetti… Sitten hän menetti paikkansa, kun kirkko hylkäsi hänet… (LE, 45)

KV Translation 2: – Ai niin, se, vastasi tämä ehkä. – Hightower. Niin, hän asuu siellä yksin. Hän tuli tänne presbyteriläisen kirkon papiksi, mutta se ilo loppui lyhyeen, hänen vaimonsa takia. ... Miehen oli pakko ottaa ero, mutta jostakin syystä hän ei halunnut lähteä Jeffersonista. ... (KV, 60)

LE Translation 2: “Niin, Hightower”, tuttava sanoi. “Tuli tänne presbyteriläisen kirkon papiksi, mutta vaimo alkoi pettää häntä. ... Miehen täytyi eroa virastaan, mutta jostain syystä hän ei tahtonut lähteä Jeffersonista. ...” (LE, 46)

313 “När han lämnade prästseminariet hade han fått en liten ränta i arv efter sin far, och så snart han fått sin kyrkoherdebefattning lät han den oavkortad gå... Så miste han sin befattning Ø...” (LIAS, 46).

314 “– Jaså han, svarade kanske denne. Hightower. Jo han bor där för sig själv. Han kom hit som kyrkoherde i den presbyterianska församlingen, men den fröjden blev kort tack vare hans hustru. ... Han blev tvingad att ta avsked men av något skäl ville han inte lämna Jefferson.” (LIAS, 47).
In Finnish, too, the word *kirkko* is an example of polysemy (see *Kielitoimiston sanakirja* [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish] and *Nykysuomen sanakirja* [The Dictionary of Modern Finnish], s.v. ‘kirkko’; cf. Mielikäinen 1996: 15). This semantic characteristic can be seen in the translations. KV translates “his church” (two times) as “kirkkoherranviran” (‘the office of the leading pastor in charge of a parish’) and “virkansa” (‘his office’). To continue coherently, KV translates “minister” as “kirkkoherraksi.” Cultural-religious intertextuality of the American South is transferred to cultural-religious intertextuality in Finland, as KV orients the Finnish reader toward the Finnish Lutheran ecclesiastical system: “kirkkoherra” in Finnish refers to the leading pastor in charge of an Evangelical Lutheran local parish.315 This position can be found in a Finnish Lutheran – and Orthodox – parish, but not in a Presbyterian local parish. KV translates “Then he lost his church” as “Sitten hän menetti virkansa” (‘then he lost his office’). It must be noted that KV reduces an important feature of Hightower’s character when it omits the phrase “he lost the Church” as does the Swedish translation. The fourth appearance of “church” does not appear on the surface level of KV Translation 2 at all, as it states that “miehen oli pakko ottaa ero” (‘he had to resign’). The same solution is in the Swedish translation (“han blev tvingad att ta avsked”; LIAS, 47).

Admittedly, for most Finnish readers, words like *virka, kirkkoherra,* and *kirkkoherranvirka* are familiar, as these words – or something similar – have been part of Finnish culture several centuries. Lutheran and Orthodox ministers are civil officers in wedding ceremonies, as the Lutheran and Orthodox Church are public corporations in Finland. In KV translation, the Finnish reader can immediately recognize cultural-religious intertextuality known to him or her.

LE does not domesticate as much as KV. Cultural-religious intertextuality of the American South is transmitted to a larger extent. The translator of LE has understood “church” as the employer of Hightower and thus translates “his church” as “paikan” (‘position’) and “paikkansa” (‘his position’). Indeed, in the Finnish language there is a common expression “papin paikka” (‘position of minister’), meaning a job of a minister. The Finnish reader can easily follow the text that transmits Southern intertextuality and is valid also in Finnish culture, due to universal cultural features of (Christian) religion.

LE Translation 1 translates “Then he lost his church, he lost the Church” as “sitten hän menetti paikkansa, kun kirkko hylkäsi hänet” (‘then he lost his position when the church cast him out’). This is a difficult case of double-level intertextuality. The first level is cultural-religious intertextuality in the sense that it refers to the Presbyterian Church whose minister Gail Hightower

---

315 See the definition in the Finnish Ecclesiastical Law, *Kirkkolaki*, Chapter 13, §13, with duties as described in the Church Order, *Kirkkojärjestys*, Chapter 6, §34.
is. He lost the contact with that ecclesiastic institution, and he may have lost his faith in the church as a denominational institution. On that level LE transfers intertextuality. But there is still another, more general level of intertextuality, following the Church’s universality, and here LE is no longer following the source text neither transmitting its intertextuality. LE does not convey the idea that Gail Hightower has lost his faith or vision of the Church as the ideal or universal entity, which is invisible. LE does not transmit this kind of universal and invisible dimension of intertextuality, in which Faulkner’s “Church” is not only a cultural intertext, but even more significantly, a universal intertext in the sense of being part of the invisible Church in this world. A universal intertextual dimension is omitted, and replaced by more general intertextual allusion to ‘church’ as an employer and organization. LE secularizes an important universal intertext.

6.2.2.2 Presbyterian Church and its administration

Presbyterian Church is an instance of both a specific and a cultural-religious intertext. It alludes to a religious institution that has its own doctrinal base, own rules, and own regulations, but it is also a cultural intertext as it belongs to the culture of the American South. What makes its intertextuality interesting in this particular case is the fact that this kind of church body is practically unknown in Finland, whereas for many Southern readers it most probably evokes allusions to this particular denomination. There are six instances of Presbyterian in the novel (Capps 1979: 677).316

In Jefferson, Faulkner’s Yoknapatawpha County, the Presbyterian church was probably the main church. Twenty-five years ago Hightower was a “minister of one of the principal churches, perhaps the principal church” (LIA, 43; 54: “as minister of the Presbyterian church”). But there are also other churches in and around Jefferson. Besides Gail Hightower’s Presbyterian church, there are probably also Methodist and Baptist churches. For instance, when Hightower’s wife was buried, the following Sunday a lot of people “from the other churches came to his church to see what would happen” (LIA, 63). There were black churches and country churches.317

Another issue is that Faulkner does not seem to be very precise in his denominational descriptions. For instance, he does not seem to know how the catechism is learned in the

316 LIA, 54, 137, 138, 144, 442, 446.

317 In 1916, a comprehensive report revealed that half of the rural churches in the United States were located in the South (Flynt 2006: 52). Ruppersburg (1994: 40) assumes that Faulkner makes use of the Presbyterian Church in this novel because it explores questions central to Reformed (Calvinistic, Presbyterian) tradition, such as sin and predestination. However, Howell (1966: 185) has described Faulkner’s effort in Light in August to portray his Yoknapatawpha County as a Calvinistic and Presbyterian stronghold as “uncharacteristic.”
Presbyterian Church, as he makes Simon McEachern to force Joe Christmas to recite it as a litany instead of a group of answers to be repeated to questions (LIA, 137–143).\textsuperscript{318} Even though Hightower’s father’s name is not mentioned in \textit{Light in August}, there is in \textit{The Reivers} (1962) a character called Hiram Hightower, who is a Baptist minister.\textsuperscript{319}

Passage 21: Source text

“He [Hightower] come here as minister of the Presbyterian church”... He would not resign. The elders asked the church board to recall him. … The next day the town heard how he had gone to the elders and resigned his pulpit for the good of the church. (LIA, 54, 64)

Passage 21 in source culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

As a denomination, the Presbyterian Church is governed by elders. The word \textit{elder} is a translation of the Greek word \textit{presbyteros}. Elders are found in the Old Testament, e.g. Genesis 50:7, Numbers 22:7, etc., and in the New Testament: Acts 14:23, 16:4, 20:17; Titus 1:5 etc. The Presbyterian Church has three levels of assemblies: the session or consistory, the presbytery or classis, and the synod or general assembly (Smith 2005: 193–194). Brauer (1971: 673) defines Presbyterianism as “a representative form of government, in which the congregation elects ruling elders who, with the pastors, form the session, charged with maintaining the spiritual government of the church. The presbytery consists of all ministers within a district and representative ruling elders for each congregation.” (cf. Smylie 2006).\textsuperscript{320}

In Chapter 3 of the novel, Gail Hightower has lost his wife under scandalous circumstances, and he is supposed to resign. This passage is firmly anchored in cultural intertextuality of the South, especially in its religious intertextuality. The expression \textit{elders} is the first clue to the reader-

\textsuperscript{318} It is clear, too, that recording of history and its details is not an objective of an artist. Even if Faulkner would never exclude history (or features of Southern culture and religion) as one of his materials, he does not give it a place of the highest honor. That place is reserved for the imagination of the artist, who can “translate sociological data into the eternal problems of human culpability and compassionate feeling” (Holman 1972: 176).

\textsuperscript{319} “… when a Baptist minister named Hiram Hightower – also a giant of a man, as tall and almost as big as Ballenbaugh himself, who on Sunday from 1861 to 1865 had been one of Forrest’s company chaplains and on the other six days one of his hardest and most outrageous troopers – rode into Ballenbaugh’s armed with a Bible and his bare hands and converted the entire settlement with his fists…” (Faulkner 1999: 785).

\textsuperscript{320} Brauer (1971: 673) continues: “It [the presbytery] is the focus of authority, having jurisdiction over ministers and churches in its district. The removal or installation of a minister is by mutual agreement of congregation, presbytery, and individual.”
translator that there is an allusion to a religious intertext, followed by “church board,” “elders,” “pulpit,” and “the church.” Faulkner is here using “church board” instead of the presbytery or classis, the governing body in a region or district in the Presbyterian Church. Elders (clerical and lay) govern the church’s affairs through the session or consistory. “Church board” could refer also to the local governing body, i.e., the session, but it would make no sense here, as the elders – with the pastor(s) – form the session, i.e. the church board. In the novel it is never told to the reader whether Hightower was the only clergyman in his parish, or whether he had a colleague.

Passage 21 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts and different cultural-religious intertext

Passage 21: Translations

KV Translation: Hän [Hightower] tuli tänne presbyteriläisseurakunnan kirkkoherraksi… Hän ei tahtonut antaa periksi. Vanhimmat ehdottivat piirin pappeinkokoukselle, että hänet siirretäisiin muualle. ... Seuraavana päivänä kaupunki kuuli, että hän oli lähtenyt vanhimpien luokse ja pyytänyt eroa, seurakunnan parasta ajatellen. (KV, 60, 71–72)

LE Translation: “[Hightower] Tuli tänne presbyteriläisen kirkon papiksi”… Hightower kieltäytyi eroamasta. Seurakunta pyysi kirkkokunnan keskushallitusta siirtämään hänet muualle. ... Seuraavana päivänä kaupungilla kerrottiin, että hän oli käynyt kirkkoneuvoston puheilla ja pyytänyt eroa kirkon edun vuoksi. (LE, 46, 54–55)

Differences between cultural-religious intertextuality in the American South (Presbyterianism in this case) and in Finland (Lutheranism) cause difficulties for the reader-translator. S/he could try to adapt the Presbyterian Church structures to Finnish church structures, or s/he could use another kind of cultural intertexts – or maybe create ad hoc terms for this special occasion. If the target text is adapted to the structures of the Finnish majority church, the Finnish reader gains in the understanding and clarity of the text. There seems to be a choice between two denominational systems: either the Presbyterian Church with corresponding structures, or a Finnish (most probably Lutheran) administrative ecclesiastic system.

KV translates “elders” as “vanhimmat,” and then translates “the church board” as “piirin pappeinkokoukselle,” (‘district convention of ministers’). This translation seems to combine a concept of a Finnish Free Church, namely “vanhimmat,” with a Lutheran concept.

321 “Han kom hit som kyrkoherde i den presbyterianska församlingen… Han ville inte ge efter: De äldste anhöll hos kretssynoden att han skulle förflyttas. ... Nästa dag hörde stan att han gått till de äldste och lagt in om avsked av hänsyn till församlingens bästa.” (LIAS, 47, 56).
“pappeinkokous.” The aim of KV seems to give the reader an impression that Presbyterianism is comparable to a non-Lutheran denomination in Finland, i.e., a registered Protestant minority church.322 It seems that KV aims at domestication, trying to use non-majority Protestant church structures in Finland.

LE translates “the elders asked the church board” as “seurakunta pyysi kirkkokunnan keskushallitusta” (‘the parish asked the central governing body of the denomination’). In the light of the Presbyterian administrative structure described above, this translation seems to suffer from some disadvantages. First, in the source text it is not the parish that asked, but the elders. Admittedly, the ruling elders can be said to represent the parish, which may explain LE’s use of “seurakunta.” Secondly, the elders do not ask the central governing body of the denomination at the national level, but the governing body of the region or the district, the presbytery, which Faulkner for some reason calls “church board.” A Finnish reader, if s/he is a member of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, may understand the translation “kirkkokunnan keskushallitusta” to refer to the Lutheran Church’s “kirkkohallitus” (‘National Church Council’). However, in this specific case the translation may confound the reader if s/he knows that “kirkkohallitus” in Finland has no authority to recall pastors. If domestication is aimed at here, as seems to be the intention of LE, the corresponding administrative institution in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland is called “tuomiokapituli” (‘chapter’), which has responsibilities vis-à-vis the offices and ministers in its diocese. Each diocese has its own chapter.

LE translates the second reference to “elders” as “kirkkoneuvosto” (‘church board’). This shows how LE evokes cultural intertextuality of the target culture and tries to domesticate the source text, as “kirkkoneuvosto” exists in Lutheran congregations in Finland with specific duties. However, as mentioned, the corresponding administrative institution in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland is called “tuomiokapituli,” because a pastor who wants to resign must do it through the chapter of the diocese.323 LE aims at domestication, but using the majority Lutheran administrative structures. However, these structures do not correspond to the functions ascribed to them in LE.

322 The largest one in Finland is the Evangelical Free Church of Finland (15,064 members at the end of 2013; www.stat.fi; accessed July 13, 2015; also in English).
323 On “kirkkoneuvosto”, see the Finnish Kirkkolaki, Chapter 10, with the duties as described in the Finnish Kirkkojärjestys, Chapter 9. On an ordained minister’s resignation, see the Finnish Kirkkolaki, Chapter 5.
6.2.3 Revival meeting

The following passage shows how the novel combines both specific and cultural intertexts in the same passage. In Chapter 14, a black man comes to the town, goes to the sheriff’s home and wakes him at three a.m. He informs the sheriff that an unknown man, i.e. Joe Christmas, has disturbed a revival meeting in a black people’s church (“negro church”).

Passage 22: Source text

He had come direct from a negro church twenty miles away, where a revival meeting was in nightly progress. (LIA, 304–305)

Passage 22 in source culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

A revival meeting is a Christian meeting that stresses the importance of the conversion experience, a definite time and place in which one accepts Jesus Christ as Savior from sin and as Lord of one’s life. Revivals are periods of religious fervor during which an unusual number of conversions takes place, but revival meetings can be held at any time, not only during revivals. Revivals have characterized all of Protestant American Christianity since the time of the Great Awakening in the 1730s (see, e.g., Hardesty 2005; cf. Pinn 2003 and Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 231–241, 265). In the novel, there are three instances of the word revival (Capps 1979: 717).³²⁴

In the American South, it has been quite typical that the blacks have had their own churches, their own ways of worshipping, and their own revival meetings (see, e.g., Raboteau 2006 and Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 144–145, 249–256). Black churches have been part of the American culture and religion at least since 1816, when the first black denomination was organized. By 1860 there were almost 500,000 black Methodists and Baptists in the South (Mamiya and Lincoln 2005: 133–134).

Passage 22 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts and different cultural-religious intertext

Passage 22: Translations

³²⁴ LIA, 305 (here in Passage 22), LIA, 323 (Hines holding revival services in negro churches), and LIA, 447 (white people’s summer camp revival meeting).
Christianity in Finland has also had its revival movements since the 18th century, the latest ones taking place in the 1960s (see, e.g., Heininen & Heikkilä 1997). Revival meetings are a phenomenon known in Finnish culture. On the other hand, Finland has never had black churches.

The reader-translator is given a clue by “from a negro church” (‘neekerikirkosta’) that there is a cultural-religious intertext in question. “Neekerikirkko” is an expression that today’s Finnish would probably no longer use, the word neekeri estimated to be too pejorative (see Passage 29 below). KV translates “revival meeting” as “herätyskokous.” LE translates this expression as “hartaushetkiä” (‘devotional meetings’), which is not the cultural-religious meaning of a “revival meeting.” Especially in the context of what follows, “hartaushetkiä” is too weak an expression of the kind of meeting taking place in the black church. LE has not transferred the allusion to the type of charismatic and emotional religion, typical of black churches in the American South (and elsewhere in the South, too). “Hartaushetkiä” probably only confounds the Finnish reader because later in what follows in the text there is a woman who is “in a semihysterical state” in this “devotional meeting” (see Passage 23 below). Once again, LE tends to secularize or at least assuage a cultural-religious intertext.

6.2.4 Mourners’ bench

Passage 23: Source text

… and another woman on the mourners’ bench, already in a semihysterical state, sprang up… “… and he [Joe Christmas] knocked seventy year old Pappy Thompson clean down into the mourners’ pew…”

(LIA, 305–306)

325 “Han kom direkt från en negerkyrka tre mil därifrån, där det hållits ett väckelsemöte som dragit långt ut på kvällen.” (LIAS, 246).

326 The translations follow these tendencies also in LIA, 323: “The town wondered for a while, how they would live now, then it forgot to speculate about this just as later when the town learned that Hines went on foot about the county, holding revival services in negro churches…” KV (341) uses the culturally and technically adequate word herätyskokouksia, where LE (260) renders the term as hartaushetkiä, which is a more general, assuaging translation.
Passage 23 in source culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

A cultural-religious intertextual term, *mourners’ bench* or *mourners’ pew*, occurs here two times (the only instances in the novel; Capps 1979: 548) as Joe Christmas enters a black church and interrupts a revival meeting. It refers to “a bench, seat or rail set aside for penitents at the front of a church or revival meeting”\(^{327}\). It is a “pew where worshippers sit who desire to repent their sins and who will present themselves later in the service to be saved. The name derives from the fact that they are ‘mourning’ over their sins” (Ruppersburg 1994: 188–189). It is not usual in a devotional meeting in Finland to have somebody in a semi-hysterical state, whereas it is possible in a revival meeting in the American South. In other words, this kind of religious, emotional, and psychological state is not characteristic of Finnish Lutheran devotional life, though charismatic movement is known in Finland, too.

Passage 23 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts and different cultural-religious intertext

Passage 23: Translations

**KV Translation:** … ja joku toinen nainen, joka istui surevien penkissä ja oli jo ennestään puolihysterinen, hypähti pystyyn… – … ja [mies] löi vanhaa, seitsemäkymmenvuotiasta Thompsonin vaaria niin, että tämä lyyhistyi surevien penkille… (KV, 322)\(^{328}\)

**LE Translation:** Surijoiden penkissä toinen nainen, joka jo oli puoliksi hysteerisessä tilassa, hyppäsi seisomaan… “... ja [mies] iski seitsemänkymmentävuotiaan pappa Thompsonin kumoon surijoiden penkkiin...” (LE, 246)

A cultural-religious intertext leads to a certain kind of interpretation of a term which seems to have been unknown to the translators. The passage cited illustrates how LE’s “hartaushetkiä” as the translation of “a revival meeting” (see Passage 22 above) does not adequately transmit a revival meeting’s cultural-religious sense. Here, both Finnish translations have used a rather literal translation for “mourners’ bench.” KV calls it “surevien penkki” – the Swedish translation has “de sörjandes bänk” (‘the bench of the grieving’) – and LE calls it “surijoiden penkki” (‘a bench of those who grieve’). However, the object in question and the corresponding term are used, e.g., by

---


\(^{328}\) “… och en annan kvinna som satt på de sörjandes bänk och redan förut var halvhysterisk sprang upp... – ... och [mannen] slog till gamla sjuttilågra pappa Thompson så han damp ner på de sörjandes bänk...” (LIAS, 246–247).
the Salvation Army, established also in Finland since 1889. In Finnish this item is called *katumuspenkki* (‘a bench of repentance’).\(^\text{329}\)

The Finnish translations are not clear, as they basically imply that somebody is grieving. They are easily associated with people who are in grief, mourning for the death of somebody, not for those who repent their sins. The whole Southern cultural-religious context of the passage is important. Here it is a revival meeting in a black church, where people are invited to repent their sins and be spiritually renewed and saved. It is unlikely in such a meeting to have people to cry over their dead relatives or friends. In any case, in a revival meeting people normally lament their sins and the bad things they have done. Both Finnish translations associate the bench more with – and lead the reader toward – grief and death than with sin and repentance. In the American South it is normal that believers are urged to repent and thus (re-)establish a personal relationship with God (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 226). An important cultural-religious intertextual feature in the American South is weakened in the Finnish translations of the novel, as the cultural intertext does not seem to be recognized by the translators; or, even if recognized and known, the corresponding technical term used in Finland has not been known to them.

6.2.5 Preachers, deacons, and priests

6.2.5.1 Preachers

It is a universal feature of all religions that they have some people who are in charge of the transmission of the tradition, orally and/or in written form. The word *preacher*, heavily used in the Protestant form of Christianity in the American South because of the minister’s primary role, basically means a person who preaches, or “one whose occupation or function is to preach the (Christian) gospel; a person who delivers a sermon or sermons; a minister of religion” (*Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. ‘preacher’; cf. Smith 2005b). In the Southern religion the focus of the service is on a sermon. It must be “preached.” The preacher has no way an intermediary role between the congregation and God, and the preacher may have or may not have attended seminary (Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 226, 264).

In Chapter 11 of the novel, Joanna Burden explains to Joe Christmas that his father did not kill Colonel Sartoris because of his French blood, even though Sartoris had killed Calvin Burden and his grandfather in a Jefferson boardinghouse. Joe Christmas is astonished by the explanation.

Passage 24: Source text

[Joe Christmas saying] “… I guess your father must have got religion. Turned preacher, maybe.” (LIA, 241)

Passage 24 in source culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

This short and condensed passage gives a clue of an intertextual allusion when it mentions “religion,” even though the whole expression “must have got religion” is vague. The following expression “turned preacher” is vague, too. Joanna Burden’s reply (“I thought about that”; LIA, 241) does not give any help, either. The interpretation of the passage is dependent on the logical relations between these two phrases of Christmas, and on their relation to what happened to Joanna Burden’s grandfather and her half-brother.330 The whole of cultural-religious field of the American South is in the background. There are 12 instances of the word preacher/s in the novel (Capps 1979: 675–676).331

Passage 24 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Passage 24: Translations

KV Translation: –… Isäsi oli kaiketi jumalinen. Ehkä pelastettu? (KV, 255)

LE Translation: “… Isäsi tuli kai uskoon. Alkoi saarnata tai jotakin sellaista.” (LE, 194)

The Finnish language has three interrelated terms, designating a person preaching in the (Christian) religion, viz. pappi, pastori, and saarnaaja. Pappi (‘minister,’ ‘clergyman’) is a person whose profession (most often full-time) or task (part-time or voluntary) is to lead religious meetings:

330 Cf. a German translation: “Dein Vater muß wohl fromm gewesen sein. Vielleicht hat er es mit der Moral gekriegt.” (Licht im August. Übertragen von Franz Fein. Hamburg: Rowohlt Verlag 1955, p. 185.) The first clause is translated as seen above: Burden was a religious (“fromm,” ‘pious’) man. The second clause, however, gives a new interpretation: Burden was able to refrain from taking revenge because of his moral. This is not in line with the source text, which keeps the idea of Burden’s behavior being motivated by religion, not moral.

worship services, baptisms, weddings, funerals, etc. In Finland, s/he is normally a minister in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, a person who has studied theology at a State University, not at a pastoral seminary, who holds a Master’s degree (usually in theology), and who has been ordained to the ministry by high church officials, normally led by a bishop (see Kielitoimiston sanakirja [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish], s.v. ‘pappi’). “Pappi” is not a title, and this is one of the differences in Finnish between “pappi” and “pastori.” Pastori (‘pastor,’ ‘reverend’) is a general title for a Protestant minister in Finland. It is used to refer to a minister who is not in charge of a parish, as the responsible official of a parish is called “kirkkoherra,” literally “master of church” (Kielitoimiston sanakirja [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish], s.v. ‘pastori’). The word saarnaaja (‘preacher’) relates to a function. It refers to somebody who gives a religious speech in a worship service or any religious meeting. It is possible to hear words in a Finnish church to the effect that “the preacher today is Pastor X.” Saarnaaja also refers to a layperson delivering a religious speech, e.g. a sermon (Kielitoimiston sanakirja [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish], s.v. ‘saarnaaja’; Kirkkojärjestys, Chapter 2, §6). In the context of the novel, only saarnaaja may render the meaning of preacher here.

KV translates “must have got religion” as “oli kaiketi jumalinen” (‘was supposedly pious’). The idea seems to be that the state of mind is stable and continuous: Nathaniel Burden had a religious conviction, and that is why he did not kill the man who killed his father and his son. KV translates the second phrase with a question mark. “Turned preacher, maybe” is translated as “Ehkä pelastettu?” (‘maybe saved?’). This translation seems to indicate Nathaniel Burden’s inner spiritual state whereas the source text deals rather with his outward behavior and actions. KV thus proposes that at the time of these tragic events Nathaniel Burden was probably religious, “maybe saved.” A reason for this translation can be found by looking at the Swedish translation: “Di fars måtte ha varit religiös. Kanske frälst?” (LIAS, 197: ‘Your father must have been religious. Maybe saved?’). Nathaniel Burden was religious, “saved,” and for this reason he did not kill the man who had killed his father and his son.332

LE recognizes in “turned preacher” another intertext. It proposes that because of the events, Joanna Burden’s father became a believer and, as a consequence, began to preach (“alkoi saarnata”). However, in the novel Nathaniel Burden was a religious man, even long before these events. This is clear in the context (see, e.g., p. 233: “I wasn’t going to have any Burden born a heathen.”). LE translates the first clause as something dynamic: “tuli kai uskoon” (‘was supposedly

332 This is also the solution of the French translation: “… votre père avait de la religion, qu’il s’était fait pasteur, peut-être bien.” (Faulkner 1995: 190).
converted,’ ‘became a believer, maybe’), implying that the killing of Burden’s father and son produced a religious conversion.

In LE Translation, the second clause, “alkoi saarnata tai jotakin sellaista,” seems to be causally connected to the first one: because Burden was converted, he ‘began to preach or to do something like that.’ It is to be remembered that the word preacher may mean simply somebody who preaches and transmits a religious message, not necessarily a Protestant clergyman. It may be that the time of the second translation of Light in August into Finnish has affected the translation of LE. In the 1960s there were strong religious revivals in Finland, especially among the youth and students, and issues such as conversion, preaching, and lay involvement were widely known in the country. Lay preachers have been well known in Finland especially in revival movements. “Tai jotakin sellaista” (‘something like that’) is a rather vague expression.

Various uses of preacher in the source text can be seen also in Chapter 15, where the word is applied to Eupheus Hines.

Passage 25: Source text

“… Folks say that he [Eupheus Hines] used to be a preacher, too.” (LIA, 332)

Passage 25 in source culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

The intertextual clue is clear here, even if it might be surprising as the reader knows what kind of religion Hines represents. The cultural intertext in relation to Hines indicates that there is at least a nuance to be noticed in the translations. The reader knows also that it is said that “sometimes they decided that he [Hines] had once been a minister.” (LIA, 324).

Passage 25 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Passage 25: Translations

KV Translation: – … Ihmiset sanovat, että hän on esiintynyt saarnaajanakin. (KV, 351)

LE Translation: Kerrotaan, että hän on joskus ollut pappinakin. (LE, 268)

333 At the same time, in the 1960s, structural and ideological changes taking place in Finnish society were understood to threaten Christianity and the Christian (mainly Evangelical Lutheran) Church. See, e.g., www.uskonnot.fi (accessed August 20, 2015).

334 “Folk säger han har varit predikant också.” (LIAS, 269).
KV uses “saarnaaja” for “preacher.” It makes sense, as it takes into consideration the different cultural intertextual associations the word pappi (or pastori) would evoke in the Finnish reader. As mentioned, a preacher may not possess a seminary (or university) education and can be almost any Christian. In this particular case, the Finnish word saarnaaja (‘preacher’) has advantages. It evokes the allusion to the preaching function, not to the person.

However, LE translates “the preacher” as “pappi,” which surprisingly limits the personality of the preacher, as the most probable intertextual allusion recognized by most Finnish readers would be a Lutheran (ordained) minister. The disadvantage of pappi (‘minister’) is that it alludes to too a special person in the service of a church and to a person in Finnish culture that has not the same function as preacher in the American South. It does not seem to take into account Finnish cultural-religious intertextuality.

In addition to the characterization of Eupheus Hines, it is said just six lines earlier (LIA, 332) that Hines was “pure crazy by now, standing on the corner and yelling at whoever would pass, calling them cowards,” like a street preacher would do. The Finnish word pappi would not normally be used to describe such a person. LE may confound the reader. However, it can be seen in LE that it coherently translates the source text word preacher as the target text word pappi (see LE, 245–246).

6.2.5.2 Deacons

Besides preachers, there are other functions in churches that have general (cultural) intertextual references. One of them is deacon. The Greek word diakonos basically means ‘servant,’ ‘table-servant,’ or ‘waiter.’ In the New Testament, the cognate diakonia is applied to the supply of material needs and service (e.g. Romans 15:25; II Corinthians 8:4), and also to preaching and pastoral work (I Timothy 3:8–13). The use of the word in the New Testament seems to be nothing more than semi-technical, but in the early Church the word was institutionalized and narrowed (Walls 1976: 297–298).

In many churches, e.g. in the Roman Catholic Church and Episcopal Church, the diaconate is the lower order of the clergy, being the first step toward the priesthood and eventual episcopate. In Presbyterian churches, a deacon is a lay officer concerned for the material aspects of congregational life – as distinguished from the elders – whereas in Baptist and Congregational Churches deacons have clear spiritual functions (Smith 2005a: 248). In Southern Baptist churches, deacons assist and advise the pastor in serving the congregation. These are honorary positions rather than fixed

---

335 This is also the solution of the French translation: “Il y a des gens qui disent qu’il a été prédicateur, dans un temps.” (Faulkner 1995: 262).
salaried offices. The *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. ‘deacon’, notes that it is “the name of an order of ministers or officers in the Christian church.”

In Chapter 14 of the novel, a black person tells about a man, i.e. about Joe Christmas, who has abruptly interrupted a revival meeting in the black church, hit the preacher, and how some deacons of the church tried to talk to him. Then Deacon Vines sent this black man to alert the sheriff. In the novel, the word *deacon* appears once, as well as its plural, *deacons* (Capps 1979: 187).

Passage 26: Source text

“… and then some of the old men, the deacons, went up to him and tried to talk to him [Christmas] and he let Brother Bedenberry go… and Deacon Vines says to me, ‘Roz will kill him. . .’” (LIA, 306–307)

Passage 26 in source culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

There is no mention about the denominational nature of the “negro church” in question in *Light in August*, but the reader-translator knows that in the novel this church is a rural church. It firmly belongs to the Southern tradition with revival meetings (LIA, 304–305). It can be inferred that as a rural and black church, it is most probably poor people’s church. It is a typical black church in the American South, with its own preachers, functions, and church structures (see Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 249–256, 273–276).

The first instance, “some of the old men, the deacons” evokes the question of the function of deacons in Southern culture. The reader-translator recognizes the word *deacon*, and knows that there are several of them in the church. The question is what the juxtaposition means. Does it mean “some of the old men,” that is, “the deacons,” i.e. one group, or does it mean “some of the old men and the deacons,” i.e. two groups? In addition, could the juxtaposition mean that those “old men,” besides being “the deacons” of the black church, were also the elders of the church? The first option, “some of the old men, that is, the deacons” seems the most probable, when we remember that the speaker is a black man, who is speaking of and describing a dangerous situation in his church. He is talking and recalling the situation and making a precision of the narrative. Those who went to talk to the stranger were old men – and he realizes – in fact, they were the deacons of the church. For the second option, there is no supporting clue in the source text, even though it is possible. The third option, i.e. that deacons were also elders of the church, relies on the expression “old men,” but it does not take into account that an “elder” does not always mean old in age, but
experienced in the spiritual and church life. So, for the second and third option of reading the expression there is no cultural or specific intertextual support.336

Passage 26 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts and different cultural-religious intertext

Passage 26: Translations


LE Translation: “… ja sitten muutamat vanhat miehet, seurakunnan vanhimmat, menivät sinne ja puhuivat muukalaiselle ja mies päästi irti veli Bedenberryn… ja diakoni Vines sanoi minulle: ‘Roz tappaa tuon miehen. ...’” (LE, 246–247)

For KV, the solutions seem to come from LIAS, 247: “… och så gick några äldre diakoner upp [‘some older deacons’] och försökte talas honom till rätta och då släppte han broder Bedenberry…”). KV translates “some of the old men, the deacons” as “pari vanhempaa diakonia” (‘a couple of older deacons’), and “deacon Vines” as “diakoni Vines” (LIAS, 248: “… och diakon Vines säger till mig: ‘Roz slår ihjäl’n.’”). KV has sought to make compact the expression. The issue of “diakoni” still remains. The description of the black church given by KV would require another kind of intertextuality than the source text provides.

LE translates the first instance, “some of the old men, the deacons,” as “muutamat vanhat miehet, seurakunnan vanhimmat” (‘some old men, the elders of the church’). However, deacons are not always exactly the same thing as the “elders” of a local church in the source text (the elders of a church normally elect the deacons). Elders have an administrative function, whereas deacons have an operational function in this type of churches. Nevertheless, in the first instance the reader is likely to recognize an allusion to a function in a church which is not Lutheran – there are no “elders” in Finnish Lutheran congregations – and not professional. The image created in the Finnish reader is close to the source text. However, in the second instance LE translates “deacon Vines” as “diakoni Vines.”

The issue is whether diakoni in Finnish conveys the meaning of deacon in the American South (cf. Malkavaara 2008: 10). It is clear that a deacon in a rural black church in the American South in

336 Interestingly enough, the third reading is the solution opted by the French translation: “… quelques-uns des plus vieux, les membres du consistoire… Vines, un des membres du consistoire…” (Faulkner 1995: 240, 241). Intertextual allusion of “diacre” in French would probably have been too strong in relation to the Roman Catholic Church.
the 1920s–1930s is not the same as a diakoni in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland in the 1940s–1960s (or later). In the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, a diakoni is a paid officer of a local parish. In fact, each Lutheran congregation must have at least one “diakonian virka” (‘position/officer of diakonia’; cf. Kirkkojärjestys, Chapter 6, §9).\(^{337}\) In order to become a diakoni in a local church, the candidate must have completed the requisite with exams.

If the translator uses here the Finnish word diakoni, s/he domesticates to a great extent intertextuality of the source text. KV, translating “pari vanhempaa diakonia”, and “diakoni Vines,” probably refers to a Finnish Lutheran parish with some full-time paid staff members, e.g., a minister and a deacon. Translating “deacon” as “diakoni” into Finnish, KV and LE add a Finnish cultural-religious intertext to the image the Finnish reader has of the black church: the rural church in translation becomes relatively well off, as it can have well educated and employeddeacons; in any case, it is not a poor church. In the Finnish translations, Deacon Vines has become somebody who has good education and is paid for his function. This is not the image of the source text in the American South. Deacon Vines is most probably not trained in diakonia work, and he is not paid by his church. His position is most probably an honorary worker. He is a lay member of the church, probably a fervent Christian and highly appreciated in his community, active in his church (he participates in a nightly revival meeting) and possibly – but not necessarily – old. A poor rural black church in the source text, based on the activity and generosity of its members, has become a wealthy rural black church in Finnish, being able to afford to pay full-time workers.

In translation studies, this is an example of what is called the pitfall of “faux amis.”\(^{338}\) Both KV and LE have used the Finnish word diakoni, which seems to be the most natural translation solution for the English word deacon. As shown above, deacon already in the source text context may have slightly different meanings, depending on the type of the denomination of the church, and diakoni Vines in the target text context refers to other intertexts than Deacon Vines in the source text context. As a matter of fact, deacon is a good example of cultural and specific intertextuality. The concept is largely shared by cultural intertextuality but no longer by specific intertextuality.

\(^{337}\) The situation of diakonia has been more or less the same in Finland since 1944, when the decrees of the Ecclesiastical Law were applied for the first time: local churches were to employ deacons and deaconesses. A good historical overview on the situation in Finland is given by Koskenvesa 2002.

Passage 27: Two source texts

Source text 1: “… You tell him,” he [Calvin Burden] said violently, “if he lets them yellowbellied priests bamboozle him, I’ll shoot him myself quick as I would a Reb.”

(LIA, 231)

Source text 2: There were no ministers out there where he [Nathaniel Burden] had been, he explained; just priests and Catholics. “So when we found that the chico was on the way, she begun to talk about a priest. But I wasn’t going to have any Burden born a heathen. So I begun to look around, to humor her. But first one thing and then another come up and I couldn’t get away to meet a minister…”

(LIA, 233)

In *Light in August*, there are interesting traces of, and allusions to, the Roman Catholic form of Christianity. In Source text 1 (in Chapter 11), Calvin Burden sends greetings to his son Nathaniel who has run away at fourteen. There is a strong opposition to and even contempt for the Roman
Catholic Church especially in Source text 1, to a lesser extent also in Source text 2 (on historic standoff, see, e.g., Noll 2001: 112–118). In Joanna Burden’s story in Source text 2 (Chapter 11), Nathaniel Burden comes home and tells his father and sisters what happened to him away from home. In the text there is a contrast between Protestant ministers and Catholic priests. Juana, Nathaniel’s Spanish concubine, who was pregnant, wanted to get married by a Catholic priest. But Nathaniel was not ready to be wedded by a Catholic priest. Ruppersburg (1994: 148) concludes that this passage means that Nathaniel Burden considers Spanish and Mexicans “racially impure.” However, Ruppersburg misses the fact that for Burden a Catholic priest would not do, not only for racial reasons, but also for cultural and religious-denominational reasons. And there simply were no Protestant ministers available, white or Spanish or Mexican. In Source text 2 the reader is given clear clues of universal and general intertextuality connected with specific denominational intertextuality through the words minister(s) (2 times), priest(s) (2 times), and Catholics.

Passage 27 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts, different cultural-religious intertext, and universal intertextuality

Passage 27: Translations

KV Translation 1: – ... Mutta viekää hänelle terveisä ja sanokaa, että jos hän vain päästää ne hymyilevät katolilaispapit vetämään itseään nenästä, joutuu hän tekemisii isänsä kanssa, sanoi Burden kiukkuisesti. – Silloin minä ammun hänet yhtä tarkasti ja nopeasti kuin nitistän kapinallisen. (KV, 245)

LE Translation 1: “... Kertokaa hänelle”, hän tokaisi kiivaasti, “ettei anna niiden pappihuijarien puijata itseään, tai muuten ammun hänet yhtä äkkiä kuin kapinallisen.” (LE, 186)

KV Translation 2: – Siellä maailmalla ei ollut missään kunnollista pappia, selitti poika. – Pelkkiä paavilaisia ja katolilaisia. – Ja kun huomasimme, että poika oli tulollaan, alkoi Juana puhua paavilaispapista. Mutta minä en halunnut, että yhdestäkään Burdenista tulisi pakana, joten halusin saada käsiini kunnollisen papin, jos pappi nyt kerran oli välttämätön. Mutta aina sattui jotakin esteeksi, niin että en päässyt lähtemään. (KV, 247)

343 “– ... Men hälsa honom från mig och säg, sa han häftigt, att om han låter dra sig vid näsan av de där smilande katolska prästerna, så ska han få med far sin att göra. Då skjuter jag ner honom lika säkert ock kvickt som jag prickar ner en rebell.” (LIAS, 189).

344 “Det hade inte funnits några ordentliga präster där borta, förklarade han, bara papister och katoliker. – Och när vi upptäckte att vår chico var på väg, började hon tala om papistprästen. Men jag ville inte att nån Burden skulle bli hedning, så jag ville ha tag i en ordentlig präst om det nu så skulle vara. Men det var alltid något hinder i vägen, så jag kom inte i väg.” (LIAS, 191).
To understand the Finnish context, it must be known that Finland used to belong to the sphere of the Roman Catholic Church till the 16th century, which has left its traces in the culture and language. In addition, the Reformation came to Finland – as to all Nordic countries – in the Protestant Lutheran form, which meant that changes were not as radical as, for instance, in Southern Germany or Switzerland (see Pelikan 1984; Bagchi and Steinmetz 2004). The Evangelical Protestantism in the American South is not similar to Protestant Christianity in Finland, and has been rather unknown in Finland. And yet, it is the same universal religion.

In Finnish, the word pappi can refer to a Christian denomination’s minister (cf. Passages 24 and 25 above). Kielitoimiston sanakirja [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish], s.v. ‘pappi,’ notes that ‘pappi’ is “the officer of religious worship and other religious acts; in Finland normally an officer of a Christian church, who has had theological training and who has been ordained into pastoral ministry.” The same type of definition is given by Nykysuomen sanakirja [The Dictionary of Modern Finnish], s.v. ‘pappi’: s/he is a person “whose task – normally profession – is to perform divine services and other religious acts; in Finland normally an officer of a Christian church who has theological training and has been ordained into pastoral ministry.”

In Translation 1, KV translates “them yellowbellied priests” as “ne hymyilevät katolilaispapit” (‘those smiling Catholic priests’). This is a word-for-word translation of the Swedish translation: “de där smilande katolska prästerna”. The idea of being yellowbellied, of cowardice, is lost for some reason, and replaced by a “smile.” But the cultural intertextual recognition has taken place, shown by the addition of “katolilais-” (‘Catholic’). In Source text 1 it is clear to the reader that “priests” are Catholic priests. LE Translation 1 gives a lot of emphasis to the idea of cheating or deceiving, emphasizing the ability of priests to cheat when translating “pappihuijarien,” ‘humbug ministers,’ and “puijata,” ‘to cheat’ or ‘to deceive.’ LE does not mention that the priests are Catholic priests. There is no clue to the reader elsewhere in this context that would indicate that “priests” allude to Catholic priests. The reader of LE knows only that this phrase deals with “professionals” of the Christian religion. Priesthood, religious professionals, is a universally known phenomenon in every religion.

KV Translation 2 translates “ministers” as “kunnollista pappia” (‘proper minister’), and “minister” as “kunnollisen papin.” With the Finnish adjective kunnollinen, KV tries to make a
difference between a Protestant minister (‘[protestanttininen] pappi’) and a Catholic priest (‘[katolinen] pappi’). However, the qualitative expression “kunnollista pappia” as such does not necessarily evoke the general intertextuality of a Protestant minister, especially if the Finnish reader is not aware of the position of the Roman Catholic Church in the American South. KV translates “priest” as “paavilaispappi” (‘papist priest’), and “priests and Catholics” as “paavilaisia ja katolisia” (‘papists and Catholics’). However, a papist is here the same thing as a Catholic. There is here, once again, direct interference from the Swedish translation that says: “papistprästen” (‘papist priest’) and “papister och katoliker” (‘papists and Catholics’).

Looking at Translation 2, LE has probably recognized the intertextual reference to Catholic priests but has not wanted to explicate. LE translates “ministers” as “oikeita pappeja” (‘genuine ministers’) and “minister” as “oikeata pappia.” “Pappi” in Finnish can refer either to a Protestant, Catholic, or Orthodox minister in Christianity. With the Finnish adjective oikea, it aims at the same solution as KV. The source text word minister refers here to the denomination of the ministers, i.e., to Protestant ministers, not to the quality of priests or ministers. “Priest” is translated as “katolisesta papista” that in Finnish precisely prefers to a Catholic priest in the source text. The distinction is made clear: “oikea pappi” (‘genuine minister’) means a Protestant priest, and “katolinen pappi” (‘Catholic priest’) is not a genuine priest, though priest he may be. LE translates “priests and Catholics” as “katolilaisia ja heidän sielunpaimeniaan” (‘Catholics and their pastors’).

This passage deals with three-level intertextuality. Universal intertextual concept of priesthood – known in all religions – is connected with cultural-religious intertextuality in Protestant Christianity and then with specific intertextuality of the religion in the American South. This three-level intertextuality forces the translator to decide which intertextuality s/he most wants to render to the target culture, and s/he needs to consider these intertextualities in the target culture. S/he needs to take into consideration that the Finnish religious history and landscape have never known the sharp distinction between the Roman Catholic and Protestant form of Christianity in the same way as in the American South. In this case cultural-religious and specific-limited intertextuality do not function in the same way in two different cultures even if they share universal intertextuality.
Methodist circuit rider

Passage 28: Source text

… and half of immediate hellfire and tangible brimstone\(^{345}\) of which any country Methodist circuit rider would have been proud. (LIA, 229)

Passage 28 in source culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

In Chapter 11 of the novel, Joanna Burden tells Joe Christmas about her family and ancestors. One of them was Calvin Burden, who had a lively way of reading to his son and who remembered the teaching of his father concerning hell.

The cultural-religious expression “country Methodist circuit rider” is difficult to translate as it is so tightly bound to the U.S. history and culture. A circuit rider was a travelling preacher sent out on routes in the 19th century. They were evangelists and preachers, but they also acted as ministers. A circuit rider was typically self-taught, young, and single. They were given food, clothes, and shelter by Christian people. Many of them died simply because of the harsh physical conditions they were living in (Koester 2007: 57).\(^{346}\) Ruppersburg (1994: 145) explains that a country Methodist circuit rider was a preacher who served “a large rural, undeveloped area, preaching in one place this week, another the next week, following a fixed schedule so that all who desire can hear a sermon periodically.” This instance is the only appearance of the expression in the novel. There is one instance of Methodist (here), one instance of circuit (here), and three instances of the word rider in the novel (Capps 1979: 528, 145, 718\(^{347}\)).

---

\(^{345}\) This is possibly a slightly modified biblical key-phrase intertext alluding to the “fire and brimstone” mentioned in Genesis 19:24; Luke 17:29; Revelation 14:10; Revelation 21:8 (cf. Revelation 9:18 and 19:20). Ruppersburg (1994: 145) notes that the word immediate refers to “the Puritan belief that hell is only a breath away, that only by God’s mercy are we saved from being thrown into hellfire.”

\(^{346}\) “Early in the nineteenth century, the Methodists assigned young preachers to circuits, collections of settlements on the frontier. The preacher assigned to a specific territory would travel, usually on horseback, from one settlement to the next in a regular circuit, organizing congregations, conducting services, and providing the various rites of baptism, marriage, and funerals.” (Balmer 2004: 172–173). “So aggressive and so thorough was the Methodist advance that other preachers lamented ‘The Methodists always get there first.’” (Koester 2007: 57; cf. Mathews 1977: 30). – In Finland, due to different kind of – and longer – Church history, this kind of “circuit rider” activity is unknown, even though there have been itinerant preachers in Finland, too.

\(^{347}\) The other two instances of rider are in LIA, 196 and LIA, 197.
Passage 28 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts and different cultural-religious intertext

Passage 28: Translations

KV Translation: ... osittain omista ihan kohta alkavaa maailmanloppua, rikinkatkua ja
tuomionpäävä koskevista kuvitelmistaan. Tämän kaiken hän esitti sellaisella tavalla, että mikä
kiertelevä metodistipappi tahansa olisi voinut olla siitä ylpeä. (KV, 242)\(^{348}\)

LE Translation: … ja puoliksi tarinoita havainnollisista helvetin liekeistä ja käsin kosketeltavasta
tulikivestä, joista kuka tahansa kiertävä metodistisaarnaaja olisi ollut ylpeä. (LE, 184)

The reader-translator typically has to choose continually among alternative translation solutions
(see, e.g., Newmark 1988: 7–8). S/he can probably convey only one or two aspects of cultural
intertextual expressions in the foreground of the text, leaving the others aside, depending on his or
her own capacity, experience, and knowledge of cultural intertextuality.

Both translations make it clear to the Finnish reader that this is a cultural-religious intertext. Both
translations convey the aspect of travelling around and preaching. KV renders the expression as
“kiertelevä metodistipappi” (‘travelling Methodist minister’).\(^{349}\) The Swedish translation is
interesting: “kringresande metodistpredikant”. The Swedish word *predikant* means, not only
‘preacher,’ ‘the one who preaches,’ but also ‘the travelling minister of a Free church.’ Methodism is
considered as a Free church movement in Finland.\(^{350}\) “Pappi”, as can be seen in the characteristics
of a circuit rider, associates the Finnish reader with other types of cultural-religious intertexts.

LE renders the expression as “kiertävä metodistisaarnaaja” (‘travelling Methodist preacher’). LE
is closer to the source text, as a circuit rider normally was not a minister, though often having the
functions of a minister. Neither KV nor LE explains that the Methodist circuit riders were often
self-taught, young, and single men who travelled the countryside and wilderness usually on
horseback in tough conditions and were in competition with other preachers. The information load
of the expression is too high for the readers in Finland, even though in Finnish there is the

\(^{348}\) “… och dels från sina egna dunkla föreställningar om en omedelbart förestående helvetesbrand och svavel och
domedag. Han uttryckte detta på ett sätt som vilken kringresande metodistpredikant som helst skulle ha varit stolt över.”
(LIAS, 187).

\(^{349}\) Without a note, the French translator chooses the same solution: “… pasteur méthodiste prêchant à travers les
campagnes.” (Faulkner 1995: 180).

\(^{350}\) There were 1400 members of Methodist churches in Finland in 2013 (www.stat.fi; accessed July 13, 2015; also in
English).
expression “matkasaarnaaja” (‘itinerant preacher’), which is a non-denominational expression and can be used even in a non-religious sense. Specific and cultural-religious intertexts are different.

6.2.7 Negroes and niggers

I have already dealt with racial issues in the American South and in *Light in August* (Chapter 3 above) and noted that even though the novel is one of Faulkner’s most race-obsessed, the main characters of the novel are not really black Southerners but white Southerners who worry that they may be black or involved with blacks, without knowing it. After all, Faulkner himself was a white Southerner and a great-grandson of a slave owner. And yet, as blacks are linked with the biblical story of the curse of Ham (see 3.2.4 above) and thus with a peculiar cultural-religious reading of the Bible in the South, unknown in the Finnish culture, it is worth briefly dealing with the phenomenon in the novel, even if racist language is not the main topic of the present study.

In addition to culture, the interpretation of any text is always dependent on time. In 1932, the publication year of Faulkner’s novel, the American economy was in collapse. Some 25% of the labor force was unemployed, and the general mood was in desperation (Wright 1996: 245). In spite of Roosevelt’s New Deal Programs, many blacks were paid at lower rates than whites. Blacks in the South commonly called the N.R.A. (National Recovery Act) the “Negro Run Around” or “Negroes Ruined Again” (Minter 2002: 252). Some New Deal urban housing projects even increased the concentration of blacks in certain areas. At the end of the 1930s, the unemployment rate was two times higher among the blacks as it was among the whites, and whites’ wages were two times higher than blacks’ wages (Garraty and Carnes 2001: 650–651). The typical situation of the blacks at that critical time is reflected in many ways in *Light in August*.

There is a lot of what can be considered racist language and attitude by today’s standards in the novel, this kind of language using *negro* and *nigger* being closely connected with the American history, slavery, and abolition. The situation in the American South after the Civil War remained particularly tense (see, e.g., Beck, Frandsen & Randall 2012: 146–180), and as language is part of culture, the situation is reflected also in Faulkner’s use of language in his works. Faulkner specifically said in 1958 that “the white man can never really know the Negro, because the white man has forced the Negro to be always a Negro” (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 211). And yet, he writes about them.

In *Light in August*, there are 141 instances of the word *negro* (118 times), *negro’s* (3 times), and *negroes* (20 times) (Capps 1979: 565–567), and 124 instances of the word *nigger* (110 times),
nigger’s (3 times), and niggers (11 times). There is also one instance of the word niggerblooded, and one instance of Niggertown in the novel (Capps 1979: 575–577). The following passage, combining religious and racial language, illustrates this kind of intertextuality in the novel.

Passage 29: Two source texts

Source text 1: And he went away and old Doc Hines watched him hearing and listening to the vengeful will of the Lord, until old Doc Hines found out how he was watching the nigger working in the yard, following him around the yard while he worked, until at last the nigger said, ‘What are you watching me for, boy?’ and he said, ‘How come you are a nigger?’ and the nigger said, ‘Who told you I am a nigger, you little white trash bastard?’ and he says, ‘I aint a nigger,’ and the nigger says, ‘You are worse than that. You dont know what you are. And more than that, you wont never know. You’ll live and you’ll die and you wont never know,’ and he says, ‘God aint no nigger,’ and the nigger says, ‘I reckon you ought to know what God is, because dont nobody but God know what you is.’ (LIA, 362–363)

Source text 2: “Well, they found that nigger’s [Christmas’s] trail at last,” the proprietor [of a store] said. “Negro?” Hightower said. (LIA, 291)

Passage 29 in source culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

In Chapter 16, Eupheus Hines is observing Joe Christmas in the orphanage. Source text 1 illustrates Eupheus Hines’s attitude and his racist use of language. The encounter between the boy Christmas and a black worker shows how the racial self-understanding is constructed in the novel. As Hines’s attitude toward blacks is racist, he systematically uses here the pejorative word nigger, whereas the word most often used of blacks in the novel is negro (see Capps 1979: 565–567). Nigger is the only pronunciation of negro that many people knew, and so it is not necessarily contemptuous, except when used by a black person of another (Brown 1976: 139; see LIA, 413). Then it is always pejorative. In Eupheus Hines’s case the use is certainly pejorative.

351 LIA, 96. KV, 106: “neekeripiru” (‘nigger devil’); LE, 80 “nekrurotuinen” (‘of negro race’).
352 LIA, 333. KV, 352: “Neekerikaupungissa” (‘in Niggertown’); LE, 268: “neekerien kaupunginosassa” (‘in the nigger part of the town’).
353 This concise extract was chosen as it illustrates both Hines’s and Christmas’s character. The reader may compare the passage e.g. with Brown’s (Burch’s) language: “Starting in at daylight and slaving all day like a durn nigger” (LIA, 39; cf. LIA, 408) and Mooney’s language: “Well, maybe some folks work like the niggers work where they come from” (LIA, 39). Bunch says: “They say she [Joanna Burden] is still mixed up with niggers. … Folks say she claims that niggers are the same as white folks.” (LIA, 48).
In Source text 2 in Chapter 13 of the novel, there is a dialogue between Gail Hightower and the proprietor of a store. The extract illustrates Hightower’s attitude toward Christmas. Spontaneously responding to the proprietor’s pejorative use of the word *nigger*, he uses the word *negro*. As this is not the only time in the novel when Gail Hightower refuses to use the pejorative word (see LIA, 83), it is an important feature of characterization, and thus something the reader-translator must carefully consider.

Passage 29 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts and different cultural intertext

Passage 29: Translations


**KV Translation 2:** – Jaha, de kom ju niggern på spåren till sist, sa handelsman. – Negern? sa Hightower. (KV, 308)

---


From the reader-translator’s point of view, the source texts with their cultural-religious and specific intertexts are a real challenge. In Finland in the 1940s, the existence of black population in many other countries outside Africa was known, of course, but few Finns had seen a black person in real life. However, many Finns had read Harriet Beecher Stowe’s novel Setä Tuomon tupa (Uncle Tom’s Cabin, 1852), translated into Finnish as a shortened edition for children already in 1856 (translated by G.E. Eurén) and the integral text in 1899–1900 (translated by Niilo Liaka), and Margaret Mitchell’s novel Tuulen viemää (Gone with the Wind, 1936), translated into Finnish in 1937–1938 by Maijaliisa Auterinen (Nyman - Kovala 2007: 168, 172; Kivistö 2007: 191).

In the 1960s, after the Olympic Games in Helsinki in 1952 and the gradual recovery of the country after World War II, the existence of black people was better acknowledged. Finland joined the United Nations in 1955, and the regular TV transmissions began in the country in 1956. Compared to a Finn in the 1940s and 1950s, an average Finn in the 1960s was thus more familiar with the idea of black population in 1968 when Liekehtivä elokuu was published. The average Finn probably was also better aware that there were racist attitudes in many parts of the world where blacks were living (see, e.g., Haataja 1988). This does not mean that in Finland there were not racist attitudes and language toward blacks before – and after – the mid-20th century (see, e.g., Rastas 2007).

Further, it should be noted that the portion of translated literature coming from the USA was steadily growing during the decades after the War: when in 1948 some 20 % of translated literature in Finland came from the USA, the percentage in 1973 was already 37 % (Nyman - Kovala 2007: 174–175), which also gave Finnish readers better insights into American culture. Nevertheless, in each of the two translations of Light in August considered here, the translators must have faced the same basic question of the meaning of a black in a predominantly white and homogeneous society like Finland.

In this particular case, there is no common cultural-religious intertextuality, only specific intertextuality, in Southern and Finnish culture. In KV, nigger is systematically translated as neekeri, which was generally not considered a pejorative Finnish word in the 1940s (cf. KV Translation 2 with the corresponding LIAS translation). LE has used two Finnish words, neekeri and nekru. The reason for using neekeri in the middle of the passage in LE Translation 1 (“… neekeri kysyi: ‘Kuka sanoi, että olen neekeri…’) seems to be unmotivated, whereas in LE Translation 2, the difference between the proprietor’s nekrun and Gail Hightower’s neekerin seems
to indicate something about the evolution of the language and the word *nekru* being felt as a pejorative expression in the 1960s in Finland while this was apparently not so with the word *neekeri*. This has an immediate impact on Hightower’s character.

In *Nykysuomen sanakirja* [The Dictionary of Modern Finnish], which was published at the beginning of the 1960s, *neekeri* is defined to be someone who belongs to the “negroid group of race”, and especially someone, who “belongs to African black indigenous peoples or is their descendant” (s.v. ‘neekeri’). The dictionary does not mention any style connected with the use of the word. It does not include the word *nekru*. It was only in 1980 when a supplementary volume of *Nykysuomen sanakirja*, containing Finnish slang words, included the word *nekru*, affirming that it is used pejoratively to mean *neekeri* (*Nykysuomen sanakirja: Slangisanat* [The Dictionary of Modern Finnish: Slang Words] 1980, p. 200; s.v. ‘nekru’).

In present-day Finnish, both *neekeri* and *nekru* are considered to be pejorative language, the recommendation being that *musta* and *mustaihoinen* be used of black people (see *Kielitoimiston sanakirja* [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish]). An authoritative change in the use of the Finnish word *neekeri* seems to have happened in the 1990s. In 1992 the Institute for the Languages of Finland (*Kotimaisten kielten keskus*) affirmed that *neekeri* is considered to be a pejorative word by some people, and in 2000 the Institute affirmed that the word is often used pejoratively. The shades and nuances of any word and its use can change rapidly in a language, and even if one word is replaced by another and more neutral word, the latter can become negatively loaded, too, and the same process starts again. Were the novel to be translated into Finnish today, it would be interesting to see what kind of postcolonialist language the editor (and most readers) would find acceptable.

### 6.2.8 Christmas as an uncertain intertextual Christ figure

To transfer intertextuality through translation can happen at least on two levels. First, there is the linguistic level of the text that generates intertextuality by unfolding the textual material by which the reader-translator constitutes it. Secondly, a character as an imagined entity “comes into being and falls out of being as it responds to the circumstances – to events and to other characters –

---

delineated in the text” (Hochman 1985: 141). On the first level, the translation of specific or limited intertextuality seems to be vital; otherwise the reader may not have the material to constitute a character. On the second level, however, which is more clearly the level of cultural or general intertextuality, the elements at the macro-level of the text gain in importance.

As many critics of the novel have noticed, Joe Christmas and Jesus Christ have the same initials, and Christmas has a somewhat analogous position with Christ (e.g. Pitavy 1973: 75–77, 83–84). When asked in 1957 if Joe Christmas was conceived as a symbolical Christ figure, Faulkner replied:

No, that’s a matter of reaching into the lumber room to get out something which seems to the writer the most effective way to tell what he is trying to tell. And that comes back to the notion that there are so few plots to use that sooner or later any writer is going to use something that has been used. And that Christ story is one of the best stories that man has invented, assuming that he did invent that story, and of course it will recur. Everyone that has had the story of Christ and the Passion as a part of his Christian background will in time draw from that. There was no deliberate intent to repeat it. That the people to me come first. The symbolism comes second. (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 117).

Faulkner clearly says that cultural intertextuality in the form of Christ narrative is something that he uses in his writing. Admittedly, Joe Christmas is a paradoxical and tragic character in *Light in August*. From the very beginning of his life he has no identity, no fixed place in any social structure. He is the illegitimate son of Milly Hines and a dark-skinned man, possibly part African American. He passes his first five years in an orphanage where his grandfather Eupheus Hines left him on a Christmas Eve. Adopted then by the McEacherns, he lives with them until he rebels at age 17, has a love affair with the waitress and prostitute Bobbie Allen, assaults his foster-father Simon McEachern at a dance hall, and escapes. He migrates aimlessly 15 years in the U.S.A., in conflict with, but also in search of, his identity. In his life, Joe Christmas seems to be driven to evil and to commit criminal acts. As a kind of counterforce in his life he has the religious education given by the McEacherns.

Then he arrives in Jefferson, where he works for a time in a planning mill, together with Byron Bunch, becomes the lover of Joanna Burden, and becomes also a full-time bootlegger. Quarrelling with her leads him to slash her throat with a razor and to set her house on fire. He is caught by the sheriff, he escapes and tries to hide in the house of Gail Hightower. Percy Grimm tracks him and shoots him. Before Christmas dies, Grimm castrates him with a butcher’s knife. “‘Now you’ll let white women alone, even in hell,’ he [Grimm] said” (LIA, 439).

Analogy can be argued to be intertextual. Christmas and Christ both are living embodiments of language’s generative, creative power. In Christianity Christ is the Word of God, Logos, made flesh who lived among humanity, God-man at the same time, and Joe Christmas embodies a certain –
racist – community’s discourse (Millgate 1978: 133). God created the cosmos by the Word, and the creation was good. In Christmas’s case the language has the dominant role, too, but now the rhetorical construction makes him the villain, an embodiment of evil, not good. He becomes, not anti-Christ, but an opposite figure to Christ. Joe Christmas is both a Christ figure and an inversion, maybe even a perversion, of Jesus Christ (see, e.g., Lamont 1957, Lind 1957, and Asselineau 1958). The bearing of the Christ symbolism is very problematic. The analogy is prominent, but it “has nothing to do with any resemblance in character or outlook between Christmas and Jesus: indeed, this is precisely the point…” (Waggoner 1959: 103). Rather, the religion depicted in the novel has a marked Old Testament flavor (Tanner 1980: 85).

Critics, even though they have noticed these parallels in the novel, have been looking for a theological savior, whose death would be an expiation for the human being’s guilt (Holman 1972: 153). Is Faulkner using Joe Christmas as “a matchless example of suffering and sacrifice and the promise of hope” (The Paris Review 12, Spring 1956, p. 42), as a Christ figure? In this allegory Christ, who parallels with Joe Christmas, seems not to be the Christ of the apostle Paul’s epistles, but the suffering servant of Isaiah in the Old Testament (see Isaiah 53:2–3, 7–8). He is the archetype of a human being who struggles against the order and the condition of himself and the world. Joe Christmas believes that he bears a strain of black blood, which is evil in Southern society and in his own eyes as well.

In spite of analogies especially with the Old Testament religion, a careful reader like Pitavy (1973: 77) can find a long list of analogies between Joe Christmas and Jesus Christ in the New Testament:

Joe was found on the doorstep of an orphanage one Christmas night, and on his arrival at the McEacherns’ his foster mother washed his feet. There is a consistent analogy between his last few days and the Holy Week… When he is asked if he is indeed called Christmas, he does not deny it; he is struck in the face by Halliday and suffers uncomplainingly, while Hines incites the crowd to lynch him. During his confinement in Mottstown [sic] prison, the guards recruited by Grimm play poker all the time. The ripping of his clothes by Grimm’s knife is perhaps brutally reminiscent of the sharing out of Christ’s garments. Hightower continually

357 Slabey (1960: 329) says categorically that “Joe is not a Christ-figure” (emphasis in the original). It is clear in the novel that at least in the area of sexuality Christmas is not a Christ-figure. Pitavy (1973: 97) notes: “His mother, because she lay with a man believed black, is responsible for his alienation and for his violent and vain attempts to find an identity. He is sent away from the orphanage because he is the unwitting and uncomprehending witness to the sexual relations of the dietitian and the interne. Mrs. McEachern’s blundering solicitude confirms him in his refusal of all feminine tenderness. Bobbie Allen’s seeming betrayal triggers his fifteen-year-long flight. Finally, Joanna Burden corrupts and destroys him by her sexual frenzy.” See also Zink 1956 and Yorks 1961.
thinks of Christmas’s death as a crucifixion (...); and finally, his spurring blood evokes in the spectators’ minds an ascensionlike image.

But, all this is not a proof that Christmas should be seen as a Christ figure (Pitavy 1973: 77–78). Readers have observed the parallels between Christmas and Christ, but have been unable to deal with them (Kartiganer 1988: 13). Also Faulkner’s best critics have avoided clear-cut identification between the two personalities. There seems little enough in common between the personality of the Christ of the Gospels and Joe Christmas in Light in August. However, Kartiganer (1988: 13) concludes that “the daring of Faulkner’s creation here is that Christmas is a Christ in the novel, a figure whose form – the antithesis in which his personality is rooted, the struggle for a wholeness of identity unknown to human beings – repeats the structure of the life of Christ.” However, he does not go on to explain how Christmas is a Christ and how he repeats the structure of the life of Christ. It may be that Faulkner simply “likes to create characters who resemble Christ, not at all in their totality, but in a few particulars” (Stewart 1958: 139). It seems that there are close parallels between Christmas’s birth and death, whereas in the middle period of Christmas’s life – of which Faulkner does not offer the reader a lot of information – analogies are rather uncertain (Holman 1972: 151).

At the end of Chapter 6, Simon McEachern, adopting Joe Christmas, says in the matron’s office that he wants to change Christmas’s name.

Passage 30: Source text


(LIA, 135)

Passage 30 in source culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Passage 30 in target culture: Specific religious intertexts and cultural-religious intertext

Passage 30: Translations


358 This uncertainty of analogies can be seen in a passage, where it is said that “He [the child Christmas] didn’t even bother to say to himself My name aint McEachern. My name is Christmas” (LIA, 136; emphasis in the original).

If a reader-translator wants to keep open a possibility of seeing and transmitting an intertextual analogy “in a few particulars” between the stories of Joe Christmas and Jesus Christ, s/he remembers that writers often use names to describe their characters. Faulkner is no exception (Gwynn and Blotner 1965: 97). The translator’s decision to translate Christmas’s name into Finnish can affect the reading, understanding, and interpretation of the whole novel. In that case s/he needs to decide whether s/he tries to transmit the intertextual analogy in the Finnish language. One possibility could be to pay attention to the allusive use of the initials in translation. The initials of Jesus Christ in Finnish would be JK for Jesus Kristus. This could be possibly achieved in translation, but not without difficulties. Even then, it remains an open issue whether the reader would see the allusion through initials.

Another possibility is to transfer the intertextually important meaning of ‘Christmas,’ as KV has done: Joe Christmas has become “Joe Joulu,” this time not following the Swedish translation which renders “Christmas” as “Christmas.” This is one of few differences between KV and Ljus i augusti detected, and it probably indicates that the English language was not well known in Finland in the 1940s. Joe Joulu – ‘joulu’ in Finnish means Christmas – sounds strange in Finnish, mainly because of the mixing of English and Finnish. However, in this case, cultural and specific intertextuality are transmitted through the term joulu.

Another possibility is to do what LE has done, that is, to keep the name as it is and trust that those readers who know some English would discover the analogy both through the initials and through the meaning of the ‘Christ-mas.’ The situation was changed in 1968, and Joe Christmas was as acceptable as any foreign name in Finnish in the 1960s, especially in a novel about which the reader knows that it is a translation. This is the solution that also other translations of the novel have followed, the French (1935/1995), the Swedish (1944), and the German (1955).
6.3 Summarizing remarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Intertextuality</th>
<th>Specific biblical intertexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passage 1</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>1 specific biblical intertext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 2</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>2 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 3</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>8 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 4</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>4 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 5</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 6</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 7</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>1 specific biblical intertext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 8</td>
<td>universal intertextuality</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 9</td>
<td>universal intertextuality</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 10</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 11</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>3 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 12</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>2 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 13</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>2 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 14</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>3 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 15</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>6 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 16</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>6 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 17</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>8 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 18</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>4 specific biblical intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 19</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific religious intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 20</td>
<td>universal intertextuality</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 21</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific religious intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 22</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific religious intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 23</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific religious intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 24</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific religious intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 25</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific religious intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 26</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific religious intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 27</td>
<td>universal intertextuality</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 28</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific religious intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 29</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific religious intertexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 30</td>
<td>cultural-religious intertextuality</td>
<td>specific religious intertexts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Intertextualities in the analyzed passages in *Light in August*

In this chapter, I have examined 30 passages of empirical data consisting in Faulkner’s novel *Light in August* and its translations in Finnish. Various kinds of intertextuality of cultural-religious elements of the American South have been analyzed and described how they have been expressed in the novel and its Finnish translations. The intertextual nature of the novel has been confirmed. The following two tables recapitulate intertextualities in the passages analyzed in this chapter.
Table 2. Intertextualities in the analyzed passages in *Kohtalokas veripisara* and/or *Liekehtivä elokuu*

Tables 1 and 2 show that in most instances there are at least two types of intertextuality combined; cultural-religious and specific intertexts are most often linked to one another. Whenever there is cultural-religious intertextuality, there is one or more specific intertexts, even if it is not always the
other way round.\textsuperscript{360} Even though it might seem simple to detect and translate as intertexts only those specific intertextual references that may have been intended by Faulkner and/or are recognized by the reader-translator as such, the analysis in this chapter has shown that translational difficulties may arise because the author modifies intertexts on purpose or unintended, or when the author may not even be aware of his usage of intertexts. The reader-translator needs a knowledge of the Bible and of Southern culture in order to detect possible allusions. Once detected, s/he can verify, e.g. through reference books and through internet, whether there may be a specific intertext in question or not. However, sheer technical or theoretical knowledge is not enough. S/he needs to be aware and understand the levels of the cultural-religious “iceberg” in order to deal with intertextual issues. As most of the time there are at least two types of intertextuality and two levels of culture concerned, adequate translations cannot be secured by the translator’s technical or theoretical skills only. In other words, knowing the technical level of culture is not enough for a reader-translator (see Section 4.1 above).

The analysis demonstrates that neither specific (or limited) nor general (or cultural) intertextuality seem to exhaust all the intertextual references needed by the reader-translator. A third kind of intertextuality is therefore proposed and used in the study, called universal intertextuality (see Passages 8, 9, 20, 27).\textsuperscript{361} By this term is meant intertextuality that refers to various universal aspects of humanity, in particular moral or ethical issues, as well as questions of power and beliefs. These concepts belong to universal intertextuality because they are not limited to one specific language, culture, geographical area, or one specific (inter)text, but are known – in some form or another – in all human cultures. The expressions of these concepts vary from one particular culture to another, and synchronically and diachronically within the same culture. Casagrande (1954: 338) neatly expresses the link between cultures, translation, and the human condition: “In effect, one does not translate languages, one translates cultures. … That it is possible to translate one language into another at all attests to the universalities in culture, to common vicissitudes of human life, and to the like capabilities of men throughout the earth, as well as to the inherent nature of language and the character of the communication process itself”.

To a certain extent, this kind of intertextuality – universal but at the same time humanly subjective – corresponds to the informal level of culture, and seems to be appropriate at least as far as religion

\textsuperscript{360} This combination opens an interesting topic for a further study to see whether this kind of combined intertextuality is characteristic of Faulkner in all his works, and not only of Faulkner, but of other Southern writers, too, “haunted” by Southern culture, religion, and issues of race.

\textsuperscript{361} The concept is not to be confounded with the concept of translation universals, understood as features of the translation process (see, e.g., Malmkjær 2011).
as a cultural phenomenon is concerned. It is inherent with humanity and cultures, and has to be perceived by the reader-translator in order to be able to move from various types of intertextualities to others (see Hatim and Mason 1997: 203). The proposed division into three intertextualities is by no means absolute, and there are overlappings between them, too.362

The analysis has also demonstrated that once intertextuality is recognized, there have been basically four different translation approaches363 to deal with intertexts. “Approach” is used here to mean the same as a conscious procedure for the solution of a translation problem. The first approach that can be discovered is to use a written, existing translation in the target language. As in *Light in August* the most often cited specific cultural-religious intertext is the Bible, and as the Christian Scriptures have an established position in both American (Southern) and Finnish culture, these intertexts are no specific difficulty for the reader-translator. Once recognized, there is a question of checking the specific intertext. This approach may be seen as the standard approach and called “literal translation,” or a kind of word-to-word approach (see, e.g., Shuttleworth & Cowie 1999: 95–97; cf. Robinson 2001). Here it means that in the target culture there can be a similar expression relatively easily recognizable – a word or a phrase – as there is in the source culture. This kind of intertextuality normally takes place at the word level (see Baker 2011: 95–50). If the reader-translator has not recognized the specific intertext and in the case of a proper-name allusion may use, e.g., an odd orthography, this may still serve as a clue to a reader that there is an intertext, in the best case by evoking a specific or cultural-religious intertext in the target culture, as it draws the reader’s attention by its oddity.

The second approach used by translators is to verify whether a written translation exists in the target culture, and if it does, to estimate that it is not familiar enough to the target text reader. In that case it is important to make sure that the semantic contents of the intertext are transferred to the target culture. Translators may do that by explaining the intertext, e.g. amplifying an intertext from an implicit to an explicit status. This approach may be called explicitation, meaning translational operations “making explicit in the target text information that is implicit in the source text” (Klaudy 2011: 104). Explicitation is somewhat risky in translation, as the reader-translator may presume to

---

362 In philosophy there is an old debate concerning universals between ‘Platonists’ and ‘Aristotelians.’ The former argue that things are as they are by virtue of their relationship to one universal thing with non-spatio-temporal existence distinct from all particular things, whereas the latter affirm that the universal thing only exists inseparably from the existence of particular things (Lowe 2005: 933).

363 The term strategy is avoided here because of its ambiguity and because finding out which potentially conscious procedures are used when translating a source text into other languages would necessitate another type of study, probably of quantitative nature, e.g., with an analysis of strategy indicators.
comprehend such implicit information that was not intended by the writer. In other words, there is a risk of reading too much information in the source text. The French translation of the novel referred to in this study uses endnotes for explicitation, but as it makes necessary for the reader first to look up an endnote, and then possibly to look for a reference to a specific intertext given in the endnote, there is no guarantee that the reader of the translation will engage in that kind of process that would interrupt his or her reading.

The third approach is that translators decide to downplay or ignore a specific intertext. This approach could be called “translation by omission” (see Baker 2011: 42–43).\textsuperscript{364} This approach may be justified in some special cases (see Davies 2007 and Leppihalme 1997: 88–89), but on the whole it cannot be considered an adequate approach, as there are inevitably some losses of meaning when intertextual references in the source text are ignored in the target text. In addition to changing the overall description of the fictional milieu, it also necessitates changes in the translation that tend to occur at the sentence level. In the case of Light in August, when intertexts have been omitted, this distorts both characters, relations between them, and the Southern cultural-religious setup and thematic impact of the novel. For example, we may try to think of a Eupheus Hines, who uses no biblical – or religious – intertexts in his speech. He would no longer be a religious fanatic in the American South. His discourse and behavior would turn out to be very different. He would become a secularized lunatic; or he would become a verbose speaker without religious discourse. Besides, if an intertext is omitted or ignored in translation, it deprives the reader of the possibility to detect it and thus, diminishes the pleasure of the reader’s experience, the reader-translator included. Owing to interference from the Swedish translation, especially Kohtalokas veripisara exhibits a tendency to downplay or ignore intertexts.\textsuperscript{365} This has been seen, e.g., in Passages 2, 7, 10, 13, 17 and 20. However, on the whole other approaches than omission have been more common both in Kohtalokas veripisara and Liekehtivä elokuu.

\textsuperscript{364} Some translation studies scholars, e.g. Englund Dimitrova (1993), call omission “implicitation.” Toury (1995: 274–279) calls this phenomenon “a law of interference.” In this study I prefer the term omission, and use in the analysis the sign Ø for it.

\textsuperscript{365} Franco Aixelá (1996: 71–72), comparing three translations of Dashiell Hammett’s detective novel The Maltese Falcon (1930) into Spanish, notices that omission is used much more in the earliest translation (1933) than in the other two versions (1969 and 1992). The 1933 version presents the novel as a work of popular literature, whereas the other two Spanish translations (1969 and 1992) view the novel as a piece of canonical literature. This raises an interesting question as to the status of Faulkner and his works in Sweden in the 1940s. The reader is reminded that Ljus i augusti was published in Sweden in 1944, and Faulkner received his Nobel Prize in Stockholm in 1950.
A fourth approach is associated with omissions. In addition to omissions, there is a way in which *Liekehtivä elokuu* has become more secular than the original novel with Southern cultural-religious impregnation. Secularization has happened through what might be called an “assuaging effect,” i.e., changing cultural-religious elements into more secular language. This can be seen, e.g., in Passages 8 (Throne ➔ valtaistuin, ‘throne’), 9 (Shalt Not ➔ kielletty raja, ‘forbidden line’), 15 (Jezebel ➔ portto, huora, ‘whore’), 17 (in the Book ➔ kirjaan, ‘in the book’), 18 (militant Michael ➔ tulinen arkkienkeli, ‘fiery archangel’; could be considered also as a case of explicitation, but why omit “Michael”?), 19 (from the Book ➔ kirjastaan, ‘from the book’; printed Book ➔ painetusta kirjasta) and 22 (revival meeting ➔ hartaushetki, ‘devotional meeting’). This is a striking feature in *Liekehtivä elokuu*, and surprising as well, as it seems to be intentional, even though the translator most probably used the integral text as the source text. He probably also had the 1945 Finnish translation available, as well as other translations, e.g., French (1935), Swedish (1944), and German (1955).

As *Kohtalokas veripisara* tends to downplay or ignore intertexts, following the Swedish translation, and *Liekehtivä elokuu* tends to secularize cultural-religious intertexts, the cultural-religious components of the Southern cultural contents of the novel are not fully accounted for in the translations. However, without a notion of cultural-religious intertextuality of *Light in August* it would be impossible to translate the novel adequately, because the novel is tightly linked with the Southern Protestantism and churches in the American South.

We can slightly modify Mandel’štam’s words and say: “If you would read and translate me, you must have my culture” (Taranovsky 1976: 4). In addition to cultural intertextual knowledge, we have seen in this chapter the support that a knowledge of the author’s other works can give to the reader-translator. The better the reader-translator knows at least some, preferably the whole production of the author, the better the close-reading will be.

What the analysis of the 30 text passages demonstrates is that the source text and the two Finnish translations are close cultural-religiously. The American South and Finland are both impregnated by the same religion for centuries, which has left its marks in the language, culture, and mentality of both of the regions and their inhabitants. Especially the importance of the Bible, the Book, has left its traces in both cultures.

However, there are differences, too. The most obvious is different history. Whereas Finland was more or less a Christian country (in the Roman Catholic form of Christianity) some 500 years before the Reformation, and has been a Protestant country (in the Lutheran form) some 500 years after, the American South has no medieval “memories” and has known the Christian religion almost
exclusively in its Protestant (Puritan, Calvinistic, and later Evangelical) form for over 400 years. The Roman Catholic Church has been suspected by most Protestants in the American South.

Another important difference is that in Finland, since the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, there has been basically only one Protestant church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, which is still today the majority Christian church in the country. Other Protestant churches and the Orthodox Church are very small compared to the Lutheran Church. As Evangelical Christianity in the American South, so Lutheran Christianity has had a great impact on Finnish culture, language, and religious life, and created its specific and cultural-religious intertextualities. For instance, we have seen the importance of religion and biblical texts for church architecture and paintings in Finland (see Passages 2, 4, 7, 8, 17 and 18).

A third difference is that there has never been the phenomenon of slavery or segregation of blacks in Finland in the way there has been in the American South. The slavery, the Civil War, and the abolition of slavery have left their marks in the American South and its culture and literature in a very deep way (see Chapter 2 above), unknown in the Finnish history and culture.
7 CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

This study has sought to substantiate, by means of an examination of a set of empirical data consisting in the novel Light in August (1932) by William Faulkner and its two translations in Finnish, Kohtalokas veripisara (1945) and Liekehtivä elokuu (1968), the view that adequate translations into another culture and language necessitate on the part of the reader-translator a considerable amount of intertextual cultural competence in the field(s) the original source text deals with, and that adequate translations cannot be secured by the reader-translator’s technical or theoretical translation skills only. Translation demands deeper cognitive understanding of culture, and good intuition, too.

The translator is also a reader of a text. A text is not passively received by the reader, but – and especially in the case of the translator – actively constructed with a view complying with the reader’s horizon of expectations (e.g. Jauss 1989). These horizons are typically cultural, literary, religious, and ethical in character. The relationship between a reader and a text is dissimilar to that between an observer and an object within one culture. As to the translator, in order to be able to detect intertexts in the framework of his or her horizon of expectations, s/he needs to be familiar with cultures, foreign ones as well as his or her own. In the case of Light in August, the reader-translator needs to know about the American South and, especially as far as cultural-religious elements in the novel are concerned, the forms of Christian religion in the American South (the source culture) and in his or her own culture (the target culture). Knowing about cultures and religions means being familiar with, among other things, various cultural-religious concepts. If the translator is not in possession of such relevant knowledge about churches or clerical life in the American South, this knowledge needs to be secured by suitable means. When translating into Finnish, the same thing applies to churches and clerical life in Finland. If the translator does not know about religion in the American South or in Finland, s/he can hardly translate adequately and acceptably, and the reader of the translation may be confounded if the intertextuality utilized in the translation does not come from the target culture, or if the linguistic expressions of the translation come from the target culture but the semantic meaning from somewhere else. If a linguistic expression is mechanically taken from the target culture, the case comes close to faux amis, i.e. a target language word which is outwardly similar to an expression in the source language is used in the translation even if it has a different meaning in the target language and culture.

The present study has equally affirmed, by reference to the two sets of translation solutions made by the translators during their respective Finnish translations of Light in August, that the religious components of the cultural contents of the novel constitute a set of data which is not fully accounted
for in the translations. Both translations exhibit properties or tendencies which are not entirely adequate or even desirable either from a translational or from a cultural point of view.

The qualitative analysis of the chosen 30 text passages in the novel is able to establish that the reader-translator has omitted or ignored a number of intertexts. The present study, through the analysis performed, has confirmed the hypothesis presented in Chapter 1 that the Finnish translators of Kohtalokas veripisara either used the Swedish translation as an additional source text, or that they edited the Finnish translation according to the Swedish translation. Owing to interference from the Swedish translation, Kohtalokas veripisara therefore exhibits a tendency to downplay or ignore certain intertexts. This has been seen in KV Translations in Passages 2, 7, 10, 13, 17 and 20 (see Chapter 6). This tendency or phenomenon of interference (e.g. Toury 1995) cannot be considered an adequate or desirable translational approach as it inevitably entails a variety of losses of meaning which are not insignificant in number. The analysis did not find any compensation of meaning in other passages of the novel, i.e. passages outside the ones containing the omissions. Omissions tend to distort some of the characters in the novel, some of the relationships between them, or even the whole cultural-religious setup of the Southern novel, and may therefore diminish the pleasure of the reader’s experience.

Another tendency or property whose presence is ascertained in the analysis is that the reader-translator of Liekehtivä elokuu has somewhat secularized the Southern religion of the original text, secularizing cultural-religious intertexts of the American South. Secularization takes place, not through omissions, but through what might be called an “assuaging effect,” i.e., changing cultural-religious components in the novel into more secular language. This can be seen in LE Translations in Passages 8, 9, 15, 17, 18, 19 and 22 (see Chapter 6). This is an exceptionally striking feature in Liekehtivä elokuu, possibly reflecting social changes in culture, religion, and language in Finnish society in the 1960s.

The present study has confirmed the claim by Kiril Taranovsky that in a carefully formulated text every textual element is motivated, and that the relevant frame of interpretation for the text to be read and translated comes to a notable extent from other literary texts, “subtexts.” In Faulkner’s works this is true at least in the case of Light in August, which was carefully written and re-written a number of times by the author (Chapter 3). It cannot be known for certain whether Faulkner was conscious of all the cultural intertextual elements inserted into the novel when he was writing it, but from the point of view of a reader of the novel in English or of the translations in Finnish this is not the crucial question.

The present study has also confirmed, by means of an empirical examination of the novel (Chapter 6) that it is possible to analyze and interpret the same material in more than one way. The
material allows for more than one absolute truth of analysis. There is always a possibility of borderline cases. This is important because such a conclusion entails that translations are based on an understanding and interpretation by the reader-translator, i.e. his or her reader experience. If and when intertextuality can be detected in a text, it helps a professional translator to understand, interpret, and translate. Intertextuality is a useful tool in a close-reading of a literary text as the present study has demonstrated. Using intertextuality as a methodological tool one can open up new paths for translation studies, in particular in the field of translation criticism as well as in teaching translation, providing students with an understanding of a certain type of approach to translation and equipping them with better tools for recognizing and establishing intertextuality and thus intercultural relations. Intertextuality can also help one to practice intralingual translating, e.g. for the purposes of understanding badly written (source) texts.

In this study dealing with issues of intertextuality, culture, and religion, in relation to literary translation, intertextuality is basically understood in two ways. It can be regarded as an inherent quality of specific texts, as done in traditional literary studies. The purest form of it is a word-for-word quotation from another text – which could be a quotation from another text, and so on. In the present study this is called specific or limited intertextuality. The writer uses another text as a direct source of his or her own text. There exist written texts prior to the creation of other written texts and to which the latter can allude or refer to. For instance, in *Light in August* there are numerous intertextual allusions to the Bible. Proper-name biblical allusions may be the easiest specific intertexts to recognize in a translation process. The more difficult instances in turn include one-word key-phrase allusions, and those modified key-phrase allusions where modifications of larger textual segments are carried out. In both cases the reader-translator can no longer be sure whether there is an intertext or not.

However, specific or limited intertextuality is a rather restricted type of intertextuality, and would not be sufficient for a reader-translator, who needs a tool to deal with intertextual cultural contemplations. The text analysis in Chapter 6 reveals that in most cases, even if there is one – or many – specific or limited intertext(s) behind the text passage in question, there is also another type of intertextuality which the present study calls general or cultural, or cultural-religious, intertextuality. General intertextuality is present when the semantic and semiotic meaning of the source text is widened or changed in the light of another text, a “subtext.” In the case of cultural-religious biblical intertexts in the novel examined here, which are specific or limited intertexts *par excellence*, it can be seen how they may become detached from their original source text, the Bible. People use and see them as part of culture, sometimes without even knowing that they come from the Bible. In addition, written texts may also continue their life in other intertextual forms, for
instance in the form of paintings or music. Today only a few could allude Leonardo da Vinci’s *The Last Supper* (around 1495) precisely to the text in the Gospel according to St. Matthew, Chapter 26, to St. Mark, Chapter 14, and to St. John, Chapter 13, but many could say that it depicts Jesus with his disciples having their supper together and that the image comes from the Bible – this is the level of more general, cultural-religious intertextuality. But there is a specific intertext, which links up with the question of the reader-translator’s intertextual cultural competence, i.e. whether s/he can distinguish the difference between the technical level and formal level of culture.

General or cultural-religious intertextuality thus alludes to existing phenomena in the culture and religion that are discussed in general or non-specific contexts. In *Light in August*, general intertextuality is used to describe the cultural and religious features and the stance of the Evangelical Protestant American South in the 1920s and 1930s. In this study, cultural-religious intertextuality refers to concepts that exist and are known by the participants of a given culture. It may be the case that the use of a concept in a given culture does not necessarily refer to any specific written text, as it refers to some or many of them (dictionary, encyclopedia, reference books, newspapers, etc.), or to non-written cultural elements (paintings, music, etc.), in a general way.

Another issue is to what extent a reader can understand the text if it is only in setting the source text/target text in relation with other texts that an integrated understanding and interpretation of a text is possible. It is specifically argued by Kiril Taranovsky (1976) that even if the reader does not discover an instance of intertextuality in a text or a hidden subtext, s/he can still understand the text. Developing this idea, it can be argued that the reason for the possibility of perceiving and understanding much of many widely known literary texts is based on common humanity. A reader uses his or her humanity, bound to a culture/cultures with a diversity of intracultural variations, to interpret a text for himself or herself.

To be able to do that, the reader-translator needs to perceive another type of intertextuality, called universal intertextuality in this study. Universal intertextuality may be the most difficult type for the reader-translator to take into consideration as cultures, languages, and religions vision and describe human life in such diverse ways. It includes dialectical relationships between culture and the practices of the reader-translator. In universal intertextuality it is basically the level of being or sheer existence which matters. This ontological level is important as it affects the self-understanding of the reader-translator in the larger framework of human existence as well as the understanding of the existence and nature of both the source text and the target text. This kind of intertextuality which is humanly universal by nature combines linguistic and philosophical dimensions with translation studies. It also comes close to religious studies and brings into daylight
the inherently interdisciplinary nature of translation studies, touching the epistemological and
cognitive foundations of translation studies.

In addition to confirming the crucial importance of intertextuality for translation studies, this
study has demonstrated that the interdisciplinary nature of translation studies can be constructive in
a number of ways. Translation studies is apparently to some extent still searching for its place and
identity among academic disciplines. On the one hand its scholarly diversity and interdisciplinary
nature are recognized in the field, on the other the debate in the discipline has been largely focused
on the center, where consensus, shared ground, and prescribed methodology seem to reign, whereas
new interdisciplinary insights are often pushed to the periphery (Gentzler 2001b; cf. also Kuhn
1962). However, being a relatively new and interdisciplinary discipline enables translation studies
to borrow methodological tools from other disciplines and apply them within its own sphere. What
this means is, in particular, that various tools and approaches can be tested and applied more widely
than might be possible inside a single established discipline. In the particular case of intertextuality,
there is a noted distance between Mikhail Bakhtin and Julia Kristeva. Further, the present study
applies intertextuality as a methodological tool in a different way from how Kristeva understood
and used intertextuality. To be interdisciplinary means to be ready to accept new insights, changes,
processes, and moves in research. At its best, the interdisciplinary character of translation studies
may enhance creativity and lead to the discovery of new epistemological issues.

As noted in the analysis here, the Finnish translators of *Kohtalokas veripisara* either used the
Swedish translation as an additional source text, or they edited the Finnish translation according to
the Swedish translation. This phenomenon of relay translation seems to have been largely neglected
in translation studies. The result of the analysis shows that translation studies would urgently need
to pay more attention to the phenomenon. The role of Swedish translations in relation to Finnish
translations of the same novels would provide a good starting point for further translation studies.
A related subject of further study would be to consider novels written originally in Finnish in the
1940s and 1960s, dealing with religion and religiousness, and see their cultural-religious
intertextuality in relation to intertextuality in Faulkner’s works. A connection between religious and
racist language in relation to translation would present an interesting challenge.

Another type of research could explore the question as to whether the Finnish translations of
Southern literature tend to adapt Southern cultural intertextuality to Finnish circumstances, or
whether reader-translators prefer to keep their translations as much as possible in the American
South and possibly try to explain and expand the translation in order to enable the Finnish reader to
understand Southern cultural expressions.
To conclude, the French scholar Paul Ricoeur (1998: 37) has pertinently said: “Text implies texture, that is, complexity of composition. Text also implies work, that is, labour in forming language. Finally, text implies inscription, in a durable monument of language, of an experience to which it bears testimony. By all of these features, the notion of the text prepares itself for an analogical extension to phenomena not specifically limited to writing, nor even to discourse.” This is the perspective inherent in all writing, reading, and translating. A literary text opens up a panorama from the inside to the outside. It refers intertextually to outside reality, to various dimensions of cultural phenomena and, ultimately, of common humanity. Translation – especially literary translation – is a cultural extension of both intertextuality and the human condition.
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### APPENDIX: WILLIAM FAULKNER’S NOVELS AND THEIR FINNSH TRANSLATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and publication year</th>
<th>Translation year and title</th>
<th>Translators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Soldiers’ Pay 1926</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mosquitoes 1927</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sartoris 1929</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the first Yoknapatawpha novel = revised and sharply cut Flags in the Dust 1926–1927)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Sound and the Fury 1929</td>
<td>1965 Ääni ja vimma</td>
<td>Kai Kaila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. As I Lay Dying 1930</td>
<td>1952 Kun tein kuolemaa</td>
<td>Alex Matson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sanctuary 1931</td>
<td>1979 Kaikkein pyhin</td>
<td>Paavo Lehtonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Light in August 1932</td>
<td>1945 Kohtalokas veripisara</td>
<td>V. Vankkoja &amp; Sorella Soveri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968 Liekehtivä elokuu</td>
<td>Kai Kaila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pylon (non-Yoknapatawpha) 1935</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The Unvanquished 1938</td>
<td>1987 Voittamattomat</td>
<td>Paavo Lehtonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The Wild Palms (non-Yoknapat.) 1939</td>
<td>1947 Villipalmut</td>
<td>Alex Matson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The Hamlet 1940</td>
<td>1972 Kylä</td>
<td>Kai Kaila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Go Down, Moses 1942</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Intruder in the Dust 1948</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Requiem for a Nun 1951</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A Fable (non-Yoknapatawpha) 1954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The Town 1957</td>
<td>1973 Kaupunki</td>
<td>Kai Kaila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Flags in the Dust 1973</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Light in August 1932 1945 Kohtalokas veripisara V. Vankkoja & Sorella Soveri
- The Wild Palms (non-Yoknapat.) 1939 1947 Villipalmut Alex Matson (intr. by the translator)
- As I Lay Dying 1930 1952 Kun tein kuolemaa Alex Matson (intr. by the translator)
- The Sound and the Fury 1929 1965 Ääni ja vimma Kai Kaila
- The Reivers 1962 1966 Rosvot Kai Kaila
- Absalom, Absalom! 1936 1967 Absalom, Absalom Kai Kaila
- Light in August 1932 1968 Liekehtivä elokuu Kai Kaila
- The Hamlet 1940 1972 Kylä Kai Kaila
- The Town 1957 1973 Kaupunki Kai Kaila
- The Mansion 1959 1974 Kartano Kai Kaila
- Sanctuary 1931 1979 Kaikkein pyhin Paavo Lehtonen
- The Unvanquished 1938 1987 Voittamattomat Paavo Lehtonen