Around the World in Eighty Gays: 
Retranslating Jules Verne from a Queer perspective

Abstract
Studies of multiple causation of literary translation outcomes (e.g. Brownlie 2003, 2006) have found that individual translators may have a significant idiosyncratic input into the form of the translated text, in tandem with other causal influences, including the source text itself, translation norms and skopoi. The nature of translatorial self-inscription and creativity may include an original deconstruction of a source text, indeed, a radical reinterpretation of same. The translator Butcher has reinterpreted Around the World in Eighty Days (1873/1995) in the context of its author Jules Verne’s life history, original manuscripts of the French novel in question, prior to subsequent expurgation by their publisher Hetzel, and textual clues themselves. Butcher’s Queer Studies readings have had an important influence on his translation decisions. Examples of his translation solutions throughout this Verne novel are discussed, and are seen to purposively accentuate perceived sexual and sometimes specifically gay subtexts. This article also investigates, linguistically, the plausibility of some of Butcher’s controversial reinterpretations of the Verne imaginary.

Abbreviations

ATWED: Around the World in Eighty Days
TM: Le Tour du Monde en Quatre-Vingts Jours
TTL: Twenty Thousand Leagues under the Seas
ST: source text
TT: target text
SL: source language
TL: target language

Introduction:

Interpretation of a literary text – the example of Jules Verne, as translated by William Butcher

As a literary text is often multi-layered, and thus potentially open to different readings and responses by different individual readers, some literary and translation theorists view translation as a means of guiding a TT reader’s construal of possible alternative subtexts. Gaddis Rose (1997: 13, cited in Hermans,, 2007:81) argues that translation ‘help[s] us get inside literature’. It can help the reader to probe the meanings of
complex texts; for instance, William Butcher’s 1995 rendering of *Around the world in eighty days* contains certain radical new interpretations, based on his psychoanalytic reading of a Freudian subtext and his Queer studies explication of homosexual innuendo, as undercurrents regularly recurring throughout this novel. This article explores some of the ways in which Butcher has used translation as an instrument with which to convey and substantiate his Gay interpretation of segments of Verne’s novel. It will also ponder whether the sexual subtexts argued for by Butcher are semantically sustainable, judging from Verne’s language use and the lexicographical history of the meanings of certain French words and phrases occurring in this novel. However, as a descriptive-explanatory study of translation outcomes, this article strives to remain ultimately non-partisan as to the question of how Verne’s novel should be interpreted.

Damrosch (2003: 291) states that “[It is only] possible to engage critically with works in translation if we can allow that literary meaning exists on many levels of a work.” He also comments that “literary narratives work less by communicating fixed information than by creating suggestive gaps that the reader must fill in […] different readers will […] fill in these gaps in different ways.” Arrowsmith and Shattuck (1961:6) observe that “true translation is much more a commentary on the original than a substitute for it.” It is not merely individual literary translators who may perceive potentially plausible new meanings in an original expressive, poetic text such as a novel or poem; individual readers, in both the SL and TL(s), may also respond differently and bring their own unique understanding to a ST or TT. Thus, deconstruction operates individually, both intra- and inter-lingually. This makes literary translation potentially creative, and makes it a force which augments, reinforces and re-energizes a ST in different ways as its memes are spread, through translation, over time and across space (Chesterman 1997). In speaking of individual reader responses, Damrosch (2003:291) offers the following botanic metaphor:

[…] a poem can […] achieve its lasting effect […] by […] [adapting] to our private experience […] Readers in Seville and Berlin may […] cover Thomas Mann’s *Magic Mountain* with different flora, but so may two different readers in Berlin itself.
William Butcher’s paratextual commentary, especially his Introduction and Endnotes to his 1995 rendering of *Around the world in eighty days*, offers explanations and discussions of his original readings of hitherto unsuspected and unexplored subtexts, thereby fulfilling the so-called ‘exegetic and didactic functions of translation’ (Brownlie 2006). Such exegetic paratextual commentary is a predominant feature of Butcher’s translations of Verne. Together with his accurate and SL-oriented TTs of Verne classics, his annotated renderings contribute to the ongoing rehabilitation of Verne’s literary reputation; to a re-evaluation of his true literary merit, and to thus rescuing Verne from the truncation and semantic infidelity of earlier renderings. Butcher, who has been labeled ‘the Father of Verne studies’ by his fellow Verne scholars, is a foremost international scholar and translator of the literature of Jules Verne (1828-1905), the celebrated French author of more than sixty novels within a series of adventure, scientific anticipation and pedagogy, entitled *Les Voyages Extraordinaires dans les Mondes Connus et Inconnus* (*Extraordinary Journeys into the Known and Unknown Worlds*).

In a brief article summarizing the translation history of Jules Verne’s works into English, Gaddis Rose (2000: 1467) refers to the high quality of Butcher’s renderings, by first giving the example of one of his earlier translations of Verne in 1992:

> The following recent translations can be confidently recommended: […] Butcher’s *A journey to the centre of the earth* (1992) is carefully done. He had first written a study on Verne from which this translation profited […] Butcher’s [renderings are] best in terms of scholarly apparatus.

**The Translator’s Commentary on His/Her Translation Choices and Strategies**

Butcher’s detailed paratext serves a pedagogical and scholarly function which supplements the TT taken alone, so that I suggest that his thorough, explicative, scholarly, paratextual approaches – found throughout the TTs in such series as *Oxford World Classics* and *Penguin Classics* – help to lend new depths of merit and professionalism to translation as an activity. Butcher and other contemporary literary translators help to spread memes of world literary classic texts, through their accurate, stylized renderings, and their profound scholarly notes and references. TTs like
Butcher’s contribute, I suggest, to making the reading of literature in translation seem increasingly useful to literary scholars and comparatists; as Damrosch (2003: 288) says:

[…] the study of world literature should embrace translation far more actively than it has usually done to date […] [giving] students access to cultural context, via corollary readings [such as] websites and print resources.

The extensive paratext offered by Butcher and the 2004 retranslator of TM, Michael Glencross, including their references to much external scholarly material on Verne, offers valuable information to the TT reader, helping to place the ST within broader structural contexts such as those of Verne’s life and his other works, and surrounding socio-cultural and historical circumstances impacting upon his work and upon its reception over the years.

**Metaphors of translational newness**

Damrosch (ibid: 297) offers another pleasing original metaphor – again taken from the world of botany – for the fact of translatorial interpretation and of individual reader responses to literary texts generally:

[Translation] stands outside a work’s original language, facing a wooded ridge that each of us will forest with our own favourite trees […]

Even if literary translation entails some degree of stylistic alteration, due to such causes as material differences between SL and TL, the TT is a creative means of spreading ST/SC memes, which may be transferred in creative, diverse and positive new ways to the TC:

Literary language is […] language that either gains or loses in translation, in contrast to nonliterary language, which typically does neither. […] works become world literature when they gain in balance in translation, stylistic losses offset by an expansion in depth as they increase their range …

(ibid: 289)
Translation as ‘negentropy’ and afterlife: the myth of invariance

It can be argued that Butcher’s important, potentially controversial reinterpretations of *Around the world in eighty days* offer an illustration of a literary work which ‘negentropically’ (Cronin 2006) accumulates expanded meaning, depth and range when re-presented in the TL and TC. Cronin’s newly-coined concept of ‘negentropy’ is intended to represent the opposite to that of ‘entropy’ within translated texts, viz. the frequent accusations of ‘loss’ – of meaning, expressiveness, etc. – inherent in the translation process. Translation, according to Cronin (ibid), should be viewed as involving gain through diversity; this article, for example, demonstrates how Butcher’s retranslation of this Verne novel allows the original to gain from the translator’s fresh interpretations. Cronin’s concept of negentropic gain is similar to Damrosch’s allusion, cited above, to literature which can ‘gain in balance in translation’ (op. cit: 289). The concept of negentropic gain also has parallels with Chesterman’s (2007) discussion of the Eastern concept of translation as transmigration, by which a literary text may be reborn, given new life and a perhaps ‘better’, or at least new, form of existence in its translational (re)incarnation(s).

Translation inevitably entails manifold shifts: Damrosch (ibid) states that: “Travelling abroad […] a text does […] change, both in its frame of reference and […] language.” Translatorial interpretation may be an intrinsic feature of literary and poetic translation generally.

To use translation means to accept the reality that texts come to us mediated by existing frameworks of […] interpretation. [Translators help to] shape what we read and how we read it […][translation constitutes] the continued life [or] afterlife [of the ST]

(Damrosch, 2003: 297)

I agree that translation, universally and inevitably, entails change, shifts, difference and diversity, of language, style and interpreted meaning; it can never offer the myth of sameness of identity; invariance is impossible. Cronin (2009: 126) offers an original cinematic metaphor, inspired by the *Star Wars* trilogies, for the fact of translation as creating context-bound variance; this metaphor highlights the reality that, at the hands of the translator, and in the reception of text by ST and TT readers,
an original text is an entity which is mutable, alterable and versatile. A ST becomes, in translation and retranslation, a protean entity, subject always to unpredictable and potentially infinite metamorphosis. Translation, then, cannot possibly offer carbon copies or mirror images of original (written and spoken) texts; this contradicts the impression given by the so-called ‘universal translator’ technology featured in the Star Trek television programmes or by the androids of the Star Wars films, as Cronin’s imagery makes clear:

[… the fantasy of translation as droid-speak or as a form of verbal cloning runs aground on the shifting realities of context. […] [human] beings are not simply static programmes that produce responses independently of context.
(Cronin 2009: 126).

The causes of translation

In the following discussion of Butcher’s Queer reading of Around the world in eighty days, the context acting as the principal vector of ‘Queer-oriented’ and other shifts is that of William Butcher himself as an individual literary scholar, translator/interpreter and biographer of Verne; Butcher is the causa efficiens or ‘efficient cause’ (Pym 1998) of his translation decisions. The other three Aristotelian causes of social phenomena, applied by Pym (1998), Brownlie (2001; 2003) to translation outcomes, are the causa materialis (material cause) of the source and target languages themselves, i.e. the building blocks with which translators work; the causa formalis (formal cause) of norms of translation, e.g. of accurate and idiomatic renderings, and the causa finalis (final cause), which includes the purpose or skopos (cf. Nord 1997) of the translation undertaking, and ideological attitudes towards a source author.

Butcher’s Queer reading of Around the world in eighty days

In his Introduction to this TT, Butcher has commented that

… the serene surface of [Around the world in eighty days] hides depths of sex and violence, a fair amount of contradiction, and concerns about personal identity, love, time and space. How is the anguish cloaked? [It is concealed through] … humour …the comic of the mechanical [and] the violence [is]
oddly detached … many of [Verne’s] thematic concerns coincide with those of the writer, caught between ‘what he wants to say’ and inchoate forces seeking expression.

(Butcher, in Verne, 1995: xxiv-xxv)

Furthermore, in his Introduction to his 2006 biography of Verne, Butcher links the veiled sexual and often specifically homosexual themes and suggestive imagery of some of Verne’s works, to the ST author’s personal life:

[One of the matters explored in this biography is the question of] whether Verne was homosexual […] Bisexuality certainly occurs in Verne […] his timidity with strangers and yearning for reclusion; his relationship with probable homosexual Aristide Hignard at school … the double entendres to Hetzel about oral sex; the evidence of the series of Extraordinary Journeys, with an absence of desire for women and indeed of attractive women, but with much obscene ribaldry between the men … all implies that a homosexual streak permeated his character.

(Butcher, 2006: xxv)

Butcher (2006:84) in his biography of Verne, describes the period when Verne was, between 1848 and 1851, a law student frequenting the Parisian literary salons (at which stage Verne would have been aged between 20 and 23). Butcher (2006: 259-62) states that

… certain characteristics were beginning to emerge … a preference for male companionship, combined with a strong sensuality; a homosexual leaning, that would become more pronounced in later years … Verne’s sexuality constituted one of the great enigmas of his life … heterosexual desire clearly governed much of his life… But at the same time, an inescapable undercurrent emerges with a remarkable number of hints, none conclusive in itself, but significant when laid end-to-end. The all-male boarding schools … the affectionate childless uncles as ‘unmarried husbands’, Genevois’s [Ernest, a lawyer friend] rumored preference, the mixing of fresh adolescents and mature adults in the Nonboarders’ Club … transvestite longings … romantic poems dedicated to members of the same sex – all indicated at least a bisexual undercurrent. In Verne’s artistic milieu, homosexuality remained an accepted fact of life … Verne consciously camped up homosexuality, for his letters vibrated with innuendo: the hose stretching out, the nozzle standing up, the flexible tube extending …in Verne’s style, the very metaphors would multiply like tomcats, all openly revealing their networks of desire… Did [Verne] compensate for his frustrations by channeling the sensuality back into his writing? Certainly the rampant desire forms part of a generalized and throbbing pansexuality … The works do provide … a treasure trove of sly sexual hints, humming as they are with desire, innuendo and imagery … Hetzel allowed surprisingly open allusion to bestiality and masturbation to slip in … [Voyage au Centre de la Terre] focuses on the penetration of orifices … and abounds with daggers, pillars, geysers … eruptions, etc… Verne, in sum, greatly enjoyed ambiguously bisexual flirting, and his sexuality was not fully heterosexual, diverted here, there and everywhere … Disney’s sanitized,
This notion of Verne’s apparent bisexuality, or pansexuality, being a sexuality that was diverted by him in several directions, seems to exemplify the notion in Queer theory (lesbian and gay literary criticism) of fluid, non-stable, non-essential sexual identity. Barry (1995: 144-46) explains that

... anti-essentialism in relation to sexual identity is taken further by some critics ... [Judith Butler] argue[s] [that] the concept of homosexuality is itself part of homophobic ... discourse, and indeed, the term ‘homosexual’ is a medical-legal one, first used in 1869 in Germany, and preceding the invention of the corresponding term ‘heterosexual’ by eleven years. In this sense, heterosexuality only comes into being as a consequence of the crystallisation of the notion of homosexuality. Thus, lesbianism, say, is not a stable, essential identity ... so that ... identity can become a site of contest and revision ... subject identity is necessarily a complex mixture of chosen allegiances, social positions, and professional roles, rather than a fixed essence ... being ‘in’ or ‘out’ is not a simple dichotomy or a once and for all event ... ‘coming out of the closet’ is not a single absolute act...such apparently elemental categories as heterosexual and homosexual do not designate fixed essences at all – they are merely part of a structure of differences without fixed terms ... We construct instead an anti-essentialist, postmodernist concept of identity as a series of masks, roles, and potentials, a kind of amalgam of everything which is provisional, contingent, and improvisatory...

In The Columbia Anthology of Gay Literature: Readings from Western Antiquity to the Present Day (1998), Fone notes that, in European gay literature from 1870 to 1969, ‘In general, most written creations of homosexual identity prior to the twentieth century challenged popular conceptions of homosexuals as sinful and criminal, as pathologically unmanly and afflicted members of a despised species ... European inventions of modern homosexuality were products of a world between wars, of a Europe in which the vision of emancipation from the homophobia of ancien régimes was soon to be one more casualty of antidemocratic and totalitarian regimes’ (p. 401).

Fone goes on to speak specifically about the social, cultural and legal contexts of homosexuality in the France of between 1870 and 1945 (it was in 1873 that TM was first published):
In France, homosexual acts had not been criminal since 1791… Homosexuality was hardly unknown in nineteenth-century texts… The stormy love affair between Arthur Rimbaud and Paul Verlaine allowed Verlaine to confront and explicitly employ male homosexuality in poetry… [In] ‘fin-de-siècle’ literary productions… ‘decadence’… explored the spectrum of eroticism and sensuality emphasizing often the appeal of androgyny and the sensuality of lesbianism… (Fone, 1998: 402)

This paper asks whether the ‘coupled pairs’ of ST/TT segments analyzed here provide support for Butcher’s interpretation of ‘brazen homosexual overtures’ and ‘blatant sexual symbolism’ (1995: xxvii) in parts of Around the world in eighty days. In his 1990 monograph, Butcher comments on Verne’s suggestiveness: ‘[Verne’s] network of obsessions present symptoms but avoid the sore points themselves’ (ibid) and his works contain many ‘metaphors, puns, ambiguities and shifts in language’ (ibid). It is these linguistic ambiguities within the ST and its use of SL that will be discussed in the examples below.

Butcher is, in a sense, doing what some lesbian/gay literary critics do, viz. ‘[they] identify lesbian/gay episodes in mainstream work and discuss them as such… rather than reading same-sex pairings in non-specific ways… [they also] expose the ‘homophobia’ of mainstream literature and criticism, as seen in ignoring or denigrating the homosexual aspects of the work of major canonical figures… (ibid: 149).

Examples and Discussion of Butcher’s Queer-oriented translations of segments of Around the world in eighty days

In the following discussion of examples of Butcher’s translations of segments of ATWED as a form of Queer studies interpretation, I offer a stereoscopic comparison of Butcher’s TT segments with renderings of the same original French passages by other translators, principally Glencross (2004). This comparison and contrast serves to highlight the deliberate use of translational language choices by Butcher to accentuate his ‘gay’ readings. The following examples will also occasionally comment on other translation aspects and causes. However, our primary preoccupation will be with questions of sexually charged language in the original and in its translation.
The first replaced segment of Verne’s ST to be discussed (Example 1 below) is a description of Phileas Fogg, one of the novel’s central characters. Its more innocent, superficial interpretation would be to see it as referring to Fogg’s obsession with punctuality and precision. Butcher, however, detects a sexual undertone in this description of Fogg, which occurs very early on in the novel. In order to provide some context to this and other examples of textual-linguistic shifts at sentence level, which occur at various points throughout the 37-chapter novel, it should be pointed out that, on the surface of the narrative events, none of the fictional characters appears to me to be overtly presented as having any obvious, consistently-exhibited homosexual tendencies.

Some might argue, however, that Phileas Fogg appears impervious to the attractions of the opposite sex until towards the end of the novel, while my discussion, below, of such scenes as Passepartout’s interaction with the sailors on the final sea journey of the narrative, indicates possible homosexually suggestive imagery, as pointed out by Butcher in his endnotes. Fogg is, admittedly, at the outset, presented to the reader as a single gentleman, living alone, with no apparent interest in the opposite sex; however, neither does he appear interested in any interaction, other than platonic, with those (male) characters who surround him, principally, his fellow clubmen, members of the Reform Club. However, by the end of the novel, he has declared his love for Aouda and is happily married to her.

As regards Fogg’s valet Passepartout, we know nothing about him at the start of the story, other than his professional background, and though he is, like Fogg, romantically unattached, there are few specific suggestions, throughout the novel, of any sexual leanings on his part, whether heterosexual or gay. The only exception is the episode of the novel dealing with a sea crossing off the Japanese coast, during which, according to Butcher, Verne subtly hints at homoeroticism in his depiction of Passepartout’s affection towards the sailors. This contention, if tenable, may not, however, imply that Passepartout is invariably gay, but may be an example of Barry’s (op cit) reference to an ‘anti-essentialist’ and ‘fluid’ mix of ‘allegiances’.
Nevertheless, it is generally difficult to speculate authoritatively on the question of whether Verne sought to subtly hint at homosexuality or bisexuality in either Fogg or Passepartout. Also, it is important to mention, at this point, the descriptivist dilemma, viz. Descriptive-Explanatory studies of translation, such as this article, generally aim to be non-prescriptive, non-ideological and non-subjective, and thus do not set out to take overt personal stances on the merit of a translator’s interpretations of a ST; on the other hand, it is sometimes difficult, in a Bourdieusian sense, for even the descriptivist to completely avoid some degree of subjective evaluation of a translator’s readings and choices. After all, the descriptivist is a human being who must unavoidably react to literary texts in his/her own manner. Even so, this discussion of some of Butcher’s translation choices is primarily descriptive in nature, and uses lexicographical evidence to investigate the semantic plausibility of sexual interpretations of certain French lexemes, merely for descriptive-explanatory purposes. It is generally beyond the scope of this article to engage in textual interpretation of themes. Nevertheless, I have taken the liberty of using part of the following two paragraphs to briefly interpose my own overall assessment of the sexual component to *Around the world in eighty days*, before moving firmly back into a descriptivist mode.

Certain details of Verne’s own life, as discussed above, allow Butcher to argue that the author may have had some homosexual leanings. On the other hand, I suggest that the arguments by Butcher of (homo)sexual allusions within *Around the world in eighty days* seem to relate primarily to individual instances of suggestive language use, rather than to any consistent thread of homosexuality on the part of the characters. The language chosen by Verne in certain parts of this novel is, in general, plausibly argued, by Butcher, as we shall see in the forthcoming examples, to be sexually suggestive, and in some cases, specifically homosexual in its imagery. However, on the whole, it seems that the most Butcher can argue here is that Verne’s language in parts of *Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours* is sexually suggestive, and this does seem plausible.

It would, however, be more difficult to assert – and I doubt that Butcher wishes to go this far – that characters such as Phileas Fogg or Passepartout are definitively and unvaryingly gay or bisexual. On the other hand, Verne’s novel may be, at most, sexually suggestive in parts in its use of certain French words. Furthermore, Verne
may sometimes have used such sexual language consciously, thus deliberately, whereas at other times, he may have employed it subconsciously; please refer to Butcher (1995) for a discussion of themes of Freudian repression in *Around the world in eighty days* and in Verne’s own life.

In the following examples, emphases in bold have been added for this article.

1. *C’était l’homme le moins hâté du monde, mais il arrivait toujours à temps ...* / He was the least *rushed* man in the world, but always *came on time* (Glencross: *He was the least *hurried* person in the world, but he always *arrived* on time.*)

Butcher contends (ibid: 219) that the foregoing description, in this first example, of Phileas Fogg as being one of those persons who were what Verne originally termed in a first draft ‘jamais pressées’ (‘never in a hurry’) has a sexual origin. This description of Fogg first appeared in one of the original manuscripts of *Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours* (MS2: Verne’s second manuscript) as ‘who never came too late or too early’ (this is Butcher’s translation in the endnotes, which, regrettably, do not cite the original French from the manuscript): Butcher says that this original wording by Verne constituted a ‘blatant sexual reference’ (ibid: 219).

It was decided to test the linguistic (semantic) plausibility of a sexual *double entendre* being present within the meaning of the SL lexeme *hâté*, and within certain other French words used by Verne, in the course of the allegedly sexualized language of the ST segments analysed in this article. Translations of French definitions from monolingual French dictionaries are my own. A search in the *Grand Robert de la Langue Française* (2001) cites a number of similar meanings for *hâté*. An old meaning (labelled ‘vieux’ i.e. ‘old’, and first seen to be recorded in the French language in 1596) defines it as ‘*Qui est pressé*’ (‘*who is rushed*’) and actually cites this very passage from , describing Fogg, as an example of the word’s usage in this context. A further meaning, also labelled ‘vieux’, is *Qui doit être fait rapidement* (‘*which must be done rapidly*’) or *Pressé*. A further meaning dating back to about
1841 and labelled ‘Vieux, littéraire’ is Qui est poussé à aller vite, à faire vite (‘who is pushed into going quickly, doing quickly). By the end of the 19th century, a further meaning was Qui est fait vite (which is quickly done). Bilingual French-English dictionaries such as the Collins Robert (2006 : 474) offer such English translations of the verb hâter as to hasten, to bring forward, to bring on, and to force.

All things considered, it is plausible to suppose that there may be a sexual double meaning in the ST’s use of the term. But how likely is it that the SL verb arriver might be intended to suggest the notion of orgasm? After all, the usual verb in French taken as equivalent to the phrase to have an orgasm or, in slang usage, to come, is jouir. The Grand Robert (op cit) cites such meanings for arriver as atteindre, parvenir à un état (to reach, to arrive at a state) (p. 798) and réussir (to succeed). In English, the verb arrive can include such senses, in certain contexts, as to succeed, to manage, to come to (e.g. a conclusion – arrive à une conclusion. Once again, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Verne intended a sexual double meaning in his choice of the verb arriver.

In this foregoing comparison of renderings by Butcher and Glencross, it is evident that Butcher is deliberately exploitative of possible sexual insinuendo in Verne’s description of Fogg, through his purposive selection of the TL phrase ‘came on time’ or even ‘rushed’.

2. Il savait que dans la vie il faut faire la part des frottements, et comme les frottements retardent, il ne se frottait à personne. / He knew that in life you can’t avoid rubbing against people – and since rubbing slows you down, he rubbed himself up against no one. (Glencross: he knew that everyday life involved social contact and because such contact took up time he chose to live without it.) This is a further description of Fogg, again occurring towards the beginning of Verne’s novel. It is again evident in this comparison of Butcher’s translational choices with those of his contemporary, Glencross, that the latter’s TT segment here seems to neutralize the sexual innuendo potentially cloaked in Verne’s use of language. Butcher, on the other hand, expressly seeks to capitalize on the semantic possibilities which form part of his own personal interpretation of sexualized SL usage by Verne. Butcher thus mirrors the ST’s three occurrences of lemmas of the verb ‘frotter’ in this one ST sentence, and
his more literal rendering of these SL items through lemmatization of the TL verb ‘to
rub’, not only accords with his general translation strategy of philological closeness,
but also involves careful manipulation of SL and TL meaning and lexis in order to
accentuate the ST’s suggestive expression and to lend emphasis and support to his
own reading (between the lines, perhaps) of the ST.

Glencross may have been aware of Butcher’s interpretation of the ST, and apparently
chooses not to similarly reproduce or emphasize a latent gay undercurrent of meaning,
either because he disagrees with it, or because distinction from Butcher’s translational
choices forms part of his goal of differentiating his rendering of TM from that of his
contemporary. On the other hand, Glencross may not have discerned or been aware of
any sexual subtext throughout this novel. In the case of his renderings of these
allegedly sexualized ST segments, the posited translation ‘universals’ of
neutralization and normalization may also be at work (cf. Shuttleworth and Cowie,
1997).

The Grand Robert (ibid: 1094) cites one meaning of the SL verb *frotter* (labelling it
as *familier*) as *Avoir des attouchements érotiques avec quelqu’un/Avoir des relations
érotiques sexuelles* (*To engage in erotic touching with somebody/to have erotic
sexual relations*). This would seem to lend support to Butcher’s sexual interpretation.
On the other hand, Le Petit Robert (2008: 1109) distinguishes between two similar
verbal phrases. The phrase used here by Verne, *se frotter à qqn* (*avoir des relations
avec; frayer avec; fréquenter, i.e. to have involvement, dealings or relations with; to
mix, to associate with*) seems to refer to non-sexual concepts such as *to rub shoulders
or to cross swords* with somebody (Collins Robert, ibid: 436), as in the notion of
mixing socially with others, or of having ‘a brush’ with the police, according to the
example given by Le Petit Robert. This would seem to make Butcher’s interpretation
less credible. On the other hand, *se frotter sur qqn* means, in familiar French, *profiter
d’une occasion de contacts érotiques* (*to benefit from an opportunity for erotic
contact*) (ibid: 1109), but Verne did not use the conjunction *sur*.

Perhaps Glencross’s rendering ‘social contact’ could thus be seen as a semantically
safer interpretation of ‘frottements’, in the light of this lexicographical detail; indeed,
Glencross’s asexualised renderings could even be a form of risk avoidance in
translation, a concept posited by Pym (2004). Nonetheless, the noun *frottement* carries the primary sense of *contact de deux corps dont l’un se déplace par rapport à l’autre/friction* (contact between two bodies, one of which moves in relation to the other/friction) (ibid: 1108). All things considered, it is probably reasonable to suggest a possible sexual – though not necessarily a specifically homosexual – interpretation.

3. Or, les applaudissements redoublaient, et les instruments de l’orchestre *éclataient* comme autant de tonnerres, quand la pyramide *s’ébranla*, l’équilibre se rompit, un des nez de la base vint à manquer, et le monument s’écroula comme un château de cartes … / … The applause was just increasing, and the orchestra’s instruments *bursting* like claps of thunder when the pyramid suddenly *jerked* to and fro, the equilibrium was lost, one of the noses in the bottom row faltered, and the whole structure came crashing down like a house of cards. (Glencross: By now, the applause was getting louder and louder [...] … *blasting out* [...] *wobbled* … [one of the noses] disappeared [...] came tumbling down like a pack of cards. The context in which this extract appears is that of a circus performance in Japan, by a troupe of acrobats known as the ‘Long Noses’, all of whom have an elongated, artificial nose attached to their faces, an appendage which serves to balance fellow troupe-members in order to create a human pyramid; Butcher interprets these appendages as having phallic undertones. He therefore evidently sees the description in this ST passage, of a climatic, exciting moment during an acrobatic performance, featuring Passepartout as one of the acrobats, as part of Verne’s continuing sexual metaphors, and he consistently reflects this in his intentionally evocative choice of TL imitative expression. For instance, whereas Glencross neutralizes the ST item ‘*éclataient*’ (which has the sense of an explosion, with a sudden, thunderous sound) by giving it a non-imitative, semantically more distant rendering which is plausible in the context without being the most accurate choice (‘*blasting out*’), Butcher conveys a sexual metaphor thorough his (also more accurate) TL lexeme ‘*bursting*’. The sexual *double entendre* which he posits to be present in the ST is continued to be matched, in this segment, by Butcher, through the equally suggestive terms ‘*jerked to and fro*’ (the TL verb here also being semantically close to its ST corresponding item ‘*ébranler*’), ‘*faltered*’ and ‘the whole structure … came crashing down’.
4. Jamais l’équipage n’avait vu un garçon plus gai, plus agile. / The crew had never seen a fellow more cheerful and active. (Glencross: The crew had never seen such a high-spirited and nimble fellow).

The context of this segment is that Passepartout is on board ship, climbing acrobatically among the ship’s masts, and generally behaving in a very – perhaps ambivalently – affectionate manner towards the sailors. Butcher does not opt, here, for the TL cognate ‘gay’, in spite of its seemingly appropriate dual meaning in this context: the likely reason is that it would probably be considered not to be fully faithful in terms of representing likely ST semantic intent, as the homosexual sense of ‘gay’ was not present, either in the SL or TL, at the time of writing of the ST. Ironically, White’s (1874) imitative rendering reads ‘The crew had never seen a gayer, (emphasis added) more agile fellow’, yet this usage of a lemma of the adjective ‘gay’ clearly draws on its original meaning of carefree and merry, though, since the late twentieth century, the word’s meaning of ‘homosexual’ has become its primary sense. This illustrates how changing linguistic norms have caused translational choices to change accordingly, so that even Butcher, despite his emphasis on the homoerotic subtexts of this paragraph, feels obliged to avoid the TL adjective ‘gay’ in this context. The Grand Robert (ibid: 1247) states that the homosexual reference in the lexeme gay, Gallicized as gai, dates back to about 1965-1970 in the French language, and specifies that gay, as transferred into French from English, is a … mot anglais des États-Unis, «gai», utilisé, dans ce sens spécial, par euphémisme discret dans l’argot des prisons, dès 1935, puis répandu dans le public après la guerre. Anglic. Relatif à l’homosexualité masculine, aux homosexuels (surtout en parlant des lieux de rencontre). Dans ce sens, le mot est souvent francisé en «gai».

(ibid : 1094)

In his Explanatory Notes to his TT of TM, Butcher (Verne, 1995/1999: 242) comments that the paragraph from which the foregoing sentence is taken ‘is full of homosexual language’.

5. Il faisait mille amitiés aux matelots et les étonnait par ses tours de voltige. / He was friendly with the sailors in many different ways and astonished them with his
acrobatic turns. (Glencross: He was very friendly towards the sailors and amazed them with his acrobatics).

This is a further part of the section of the novel dealing with Passepartout’s friendly behaviour towards the sailors throughout a sea crossing off the coast of Japan. The SL expression ‘faire des amitiés à’ does contain the sense of saying affectionate things to a friend, yet some Verne readers might consider it to have a generally non-sexual, platonic sense: one wonders, then, whether Butcher is somewhat altering or ‘over-translating’ this ST/SL phrase in order to, again, accentuate and justify his construction of a homosexual subtext (which may, of course, be present more generally in the surrounding ST paragraph). Admittedly, this type of translational analysis within DTS enters more blatantly into the prescriptivist realm of speculation as to what may have taken place within the mind of the ST author and TT creator. This shift indicates that agency can include some alterations to strict ST meaning, in order to imprint the translator’s own exegesis and lexical creativity on the TT. Butcher’s explicating addition ‘in many different ways’ seems to be an interpretative, adventitious addition on his part. The Grand Robert (ibid: 452) describes amitiés as paroles obligeantes, témoignages d’affection, des choses affectueuses (kind words, demonstrations of affection, affectionate things).

The term may seem to be platonic, on the surface, but could, on the other hand, perhaps be argued to imply a form of homoerotic male bonding in this instance.

6. Sa bonne humeur, très communicative, s’imprégnait à tous. / His good mood, highly infectious, was caught by everybody. (Glencross: Everyone was susceptible to his infectious good humour.) This is a further segment from the section dealing with Passepartout and his allegedly ambiguous relations with the sailors. Through a translation which is syntactically imitative, and by means of his careful choices of TL words such as ‘infectious’ and ‘caught’, hinting at sexual transmission in order to represent the ST layers of meaning, Butcher continues to convey the ST’s playful sprinkling of double entendres. The ST use of a lemma of the verb ‘imprégnier’ (to impregnate) conveys the ambiguous sense of penetration of a body with liquid, while its cognate in the TL, though not used by either translator, has the additional sense of fertilization. Verne’s use of this word, coupled with the ambiguity of ‘humeur’ –
which has multiple semantic possibilities, in that it can refer to bodily fluids such as blood and saliva, as well as to human mood which such fluids were traditionally thought to determine (thus hinting at transference of body fluids through rampant sexual contact) – appears to be a sexually suggestive use of the SL. Surprisingly, however, Butcher translates these SL lexemes by ‘caught’ and ‘mood’ respectively, which – though retaining the global sexual ambiguity of the ST segment – appear not to fully exploit the ambiguous, suggestive nature of the source segment. Though he relays some of the ST’s sense of sexual transmission, he may have felt obliged to sacrifice a more lexically imitative translation of ‘humeur’ and ‘imprégnait’ because of a need for natural TL expression. ‘His pleasant humour, which was infectious, was imbued by all/infused to all’ (my translation) might have sounded much less like familiar TL usage. Yet such a rendering might have maximally conveyed TL sexual innuendo.

7. Dans ce but, il avait commencé à modifier le caractère naturellement doux de l’animal, de façon à le conduire graduellement à ce paroxysme de rage appelé «mutsh» dans la langue indoue, et cela, en le nourrissant pendant trois mois de sucre et de beurre. / To achieve this he had begun to modify the elephant’s naturally gentle character in such a way as to gradually lead it into the frenzied paroxysm called musth in the Indian language – by feeding it with sugar and butter for three months. (Glencross: With this aim in mind, he had begun to change the animal’s naturally gentle temperament in order to arouse him gradually to a state of excitement and frenzy, which the Indians call ‘musth’, and to do this he fed him for three months with sugar and butter. This section deals with Fogg’s purchase of an elephant, which he intends to use as a means of transport through the Indian jungle. The two different renderings of the ST phrase ‘Dans ce but’ are both non-imitative, lexically, but it is Butcher’s which is the more concise, perhaps due to personal stylistic choice. Butcher’s rendering ‘he had begun to modify … character’ is lexically imitative, to the greatest extent possible consistent with norms of natural expression, whereas Glencross’s rendering demonstrates the opposite strategy, that is, it is as lexically non-imitative as possible: Glencross has chosen TL synonyms such as ‘change’ (‘modifier’) and ‘temperament’ (caractère), the probable cause being that of agentive imprint/translatorial ego, including perhaps a deliberate distancing from Butcher’s TL
choices. There may also be ‘universal’ strategies of neutralization and standardization at work in this shift, together with Glencross’s generally evident TL style of choosing a less formal register.

Butcher’s rendering ‘in such a way as to gradually lead it’ is lexically and semantically close to the ST corresponding segment, whereas Glencross’s TL solution ‘in order to arouse him gradually’ (emphasis added) involves the use of non-imitative lexis, together with simplification. It is therefore less close, semantically and in form, to the ST segment, than Butcher’s solution. Glencross’s use of the TL lexeme ‘arouse’ is, ironically, more sexualized than Butcher’s ‘lead’, the latter being the more accurate translation of the ST’s ‘conduire’: however, the reasons for this choice by Glencross may not be the reading of a sexual subtext, given that this reading is not evident in any other of his TL solutions. Instead, it could be due to such ‘efficient causal’ factors as self-distancing from Butcher’s solutions, agentive style and self-inscription on the TT.

On the other hand, given that the term mutsh/musth has a sexual meaning, perhaps Glencross’s use of the verb aroused is, after all, deliberately a sexual one.

Butcher’s use of the TL phrase ‘frenzied paroxysm’ is lexically more imitative than Glencross’s solution, but is also partly non-imitative in the use of the lexeme ‘frenzied’. Butcher sees continuing sexual innuendo in this use of SL. Thus, the imitative rendering ‘paroxysm’ conveys the ST sense of a fit, convulsion or uncontrollable outburst. The word ‘frenzied’ is semantically accurate in conveying the ST’s (‘de rage’) sense of wild excitement or agitation, but is also a non-imitative TL synonym for the SL term, being a personal translatorial choice and also conveying the sexual connotation of the ST item.

Butcher translates the ST segment ‘en le nourrissant’ as ‘by feeding it’ (emphasis added), thus being more syntactically imitative than Glencross’s ‘he fed him’. It is also worth noting that Butcher attributes neuter gender to the animal, in contrast to Glencross’s attribution to it of male gender: both TL solutions are appropriate in terms of fulfilling norms of natural TL expression, and Glencross’s ascription of masculine gender is accurate in context, and more specific than Butcher’s choice. This
differential choice, though seemingly minor, highlights the differing influence of the *causa materialis* of SL/TL contrasting grammatical systems, whereby the French language has grammatical gender, whereas the English language has natural gender: therefore, the use of the pronoun ‘le’ in this context, in the ST, is open to either a neuter or a gender-specific interpretation.

In his endnotes, Butcher (Verne, 1995: 229) comments on the sexual allusions in these narrative episodes dealing with the purchase and later disposal of the elephant:

…*musth* (Verne: ‘mutsh’) < *must* (Urdu) < the Persian for ‘drunk’. *Collins Dictionary:* ‘a state of frenzied sexual excitement in the males of certain large mammals, especially elephants …’. Verne smuggles the remarkable notion of the elephant’s ‘frenzied paroxysm’ past Hetzel’s eagle eye; and then compounds the felony by having Passepartout feed the animal some sugar, the ‘elephant produc[ing] a few grunts of satisfaction’, and then give ‘give the animal a good stroke’ …

(Butcher, in Verne, 1995: 229)

This is a further indication by Butcher that Verne’s publisher, Hetzel, censored the ST author’s manuscripts, and this censorship may be a contributory factor towards Verne’s veiling of the sexual references in TM, through varying degrees of disguise, metaphor and implicitness.

8. *Passepartout n’était point un de ces Frontins ou Mascarilles qui, les épaules hautes, le nez au vent, le regard assuré, l’aïl sec, ne sont que d’impudents drôles. Non. Passepartout était un brave garçon, de physionomie aimable, aux lèvres un peu saillantes, toujours prêtes à goûter ou à caresser, un être doux et serviable, avec une de ces bonnes têtes rondes que l’on aime à voir sur les épaules d’un ami. / Passepartout was not one of those Frontins or Mascarilles with shoulders shrugged and noses in the air, self-assured and steely eyed, who are nothing but impudent rascals. No, Passepartout was an honest fellow, with a pleasant physiognomy and slightly sticking-out lips always ready to taste or kiss. A gentle being, ever prepared to help, he was endowed with one of those good round heads that you like to see on a friend’s shoulders. / (Glencross: Passepartout was not one of those cheeky or scheming servants who strut about trying to be clever and cocky … On the contrary,
he was a good chap with a friendly face and prominent lips that were made for eating, drinking and kissing. He was a kind and helpful soul, with just the type of roundish head you’d like to see on a friend’s shoulders.) This description of Passepartout’s physical appearance, and character, occurs very early on in the narrative. It can be generally noticed, in comparing these alternative renderings of this ST segment, that Glencross uses explicitation and simplification, thus non-imitativeness, to represent Verne’s use of the terms ‘Frontins’ and ‘Mascarilles’, whereas Butcher, typically, is imitative and thus philologically very close to the original text, going on to explain the meaning of these two cultural/literary references to French dramatic characters, in an endnote. Glencross also, and non-typically, employs significant reduction and simplification in this rendering. Butcher is thus, typically, more imitative, lexically and syntactically, thus not shying away from the occasional use of what nowadays reads as somewhat antiquated, excessively formal or technical TL expression (‘physiognomy’). On the other hand, his choice of ‘sticking-out’ seems more colloquial than Glencross’s more neutralized and standardized ‘prominent’, perhaps because of a perceived presence of suggestive imagery in Butcher’s chosen solution. Thus, translators occasionally deviate from their global TL styles and registers for different reasons: in this case, perhaps, in order to convey a particular interpretation of meaning, a certain ST ironic tone and humour. Even Butcher’s choice of the term ‘endowed’ constitutes a semantic addition which seems designed to convey an innuendo for which there is no direct lexical corresponding term in the ST. Agency therefore appears to be a primary cause of this choice of word.

9. Sur la cheminée, une pendule électrique correspondait avec la pendule de la chambre à coucher de Phileas Fogg, et les deux appareils battaient au même instant la même seconde. «Cela me va, cela me va !» se dit Passeparout. / On the mantelpiece an electric clock kept perfect time with the clock in Phileas Fogg’s bedroom, the two devices striking the second simultaneously. ‘This is a piece of alright, suits me down to the ground, down to the ground!’ he said to himself. / (Glencross: On the mantelpiece an electric clock matched the clock in Phileas Fogg’s bedroom and both instruments showed exactly the same time down to the last second.) This segment is part of a description of Phileas Fogg’s residence. Butcher’s more imitative rendering accentuates what he perceives as the sexual innuendo of the
ST item (‘the two devices’ … ‘kept perfect time’ … ‘striking the second simultaneously’). Glencross’s rendering, is, on the other hand, less accurate in parts, in that he modulates the ST sense of ‘battre’ and thus, at least from the perspective of a contrast with Butcher’s rendering, Glencross neutralizes the erotic, metaphorical insinuendo of two devices in perfect synchronization.

10. ... les artistes ne devaient s’emmancher que par leur nez. / ... the artistes (sic) ... were to be fitted together using nothing but their noses. (Glencross: the artistes (sic) ... were to be linked to one another only by their noses.) This segment forms part of the episode in which Passepartout participates in an acrobatic act at the Japanese circus, in which the members of the troupe of acrobats form a human pyramid. The ST verb ‘s’emmancher’ contains the sense of the noun from which it is derived, ‘un manche’, which can refer to a handle and has the wider denotation and connotation of ‘une partie allongée’. Therefore, there is here, arguably, in Verne’s choice of ST expression, a further sexual, phallic connotation, which is, surprisingly, somewhat neutralized by Butcher’s ‘fitted together’. Perhaps this is because a more literal, imitative or sexually-charged rendering might be felt by Butcher to significantly compromise natural TL expression (e.g. the artists were to be hitched together by means only of the elongated appendix of the noses, my rendering.)

11. Souvent aussi, le digne garçon tournait autour de Fix ; il le regardait d’un œil «qui en disait long» ! mais il ne lui parlait pas, car il n’existait plus aucune intimité entre les deux anciens amis. / Often, too, the worthy fellow circled round Fix, looking at him with an expression which spoke a thousand words, but he did not talk to him, for all intimacy had been lost between the two friends. (Glencross: The worthy fellow often circled around Fix, looking at him knowingly, but not saying a word, because there was no longer any closeness between the two former friends). This section refers to Passepartout’s hostile attitude towards Detective Fix during one of the sea crossings. Translatorial individual choice of lexis, based on the translator’s distinctive creative personhood, is evident in the alternative renderings of the ST phrase ‘qui en disait long’, with Butcher’s choice again seeming the closer in form insofar as is
consistent with TL natural expression, while Glencross opts for a TL word (‘knowingly’) which is lexically non-imitative but semantically accurate. Butcher’s decision to choose the TL cognate ‘intimacy’ helps retain the sexual ambiguity of the ST segment, whereas Glencross’s non-imitative rendering ‘closeness’ neutralizes any possible ST innuendo. In both the SL and the TL, the word ‘intimité’ (‘intimacy’) can refer to a close, warm but platonic friendship, or to sexual intimacy.

12. *Le dernier exploit de son maître, dont il ne voulait pas voir les conséquences, l’enthousiasmait.* / **His master’s latest exploit, with consequences he didn’t dare consider,** fired him with enthusiasm. (Glencross: He was full of enthusiasm for his master’s latest exploit, though he didn’t want to think about the consequences). This passage ostensibly refers to Passepartout’s admiration for Fogg’s use of innovative methods of transport to help him win his wager. It can again be seen from these two contrasting TL segments that Butcher is, broadly, more syntactically imitative of the ST, but that the material cause of SL/TL differing resources does impose a departure from SL form which he deals with through an individual, creative and accurate rendering: ‘with consequences he didn’t dare consider’). In this TL segment, Butcher is also perhaps, in Toury’s terms (1995) creating or adding a TT/TL metaphorical image where none is present in the ST, i.e. in the TL phrase ‘fired him with [enthusiasm]’. This is a nautical metaphor which is also, perhaps, sexually suggestive within the overall context of a homosexual latent meaning. In contrast, Glencross does not see, or chooses not to represent, any such gay subtext, though his rendering of ‘enthousiasmait’ is also necessarily non-imitative, owing to the *causa materialis* which imposes a lexical shift in this case. The *Grand Robert* (ibid: 2230) cites synonyms such as *électriser, enflammer, embraser* and *enivrer* (to electrify, to inflame, to set alight, to inebriate) for *enthousiasmer*. It defines the noun *enthousiasme* as *émotion intense qui pousse à l’action dans la joie/ ardeur, feu, flamme, passion, zèle/ (une émotion) se traduisant par une excitation joyeuse* (an intense emotion which propels one to joyful action/ardour, fire, flame, passion, zeal). Thus, the notion of being filled with enthusiasm could perhaps be extended to having sexual connotations in some contexts.
13. Mais ce qui les distinguait plus spécialement, c’était ce long nez dont leur face était agrémentée, et surtout l’usage qu’ils en faisaient. / But their special trademark was the long noses adorning their faces, and above all the use they made of them. (Glencross: […] and in particular the use they put it to.) In this section describing the acrobatic performance at a Japanese circus, referred to earlier in this article, a performance in which Passepartout participates, Butcher sees a continuation of the (homo)sexual insinuendo of earlier parts of the ST, though in some cases there is less evidence here, than in the sections examined from Chapter 2 of the ST, above, of Glencross’s rendering being neutralized or in some way ‘purified’ of its sexual suggestiveness compared to the Butcher TT: this may be due to the causa materialis of SL/TL similarities and the transfer from SL to TL here offering fewer possibilities of alternative/neutralized renderings. Verne’s SL usage and ST context is thus perhaps bolder, at this point, in the explicitness of its double entêndres.

14. …[les acrobates] se couchèrent sur le dos, et leurs camarades vinrent s’ébattre sur leurs nez, dressés comme des paratonnerres, sautant, voltigeant, de celui-ci à celui-là, et exécutant les tours les plus invraisemblables. / … would lie flat on their backs and their comrades would come and frolic on their noses, erect like lightning-conductors – jumping, vaulting from one to the other, carrying out the most incredible performances. (Glencross: … lay on their backs and their companions sported themselves on their noses, which stuck up in the air like lightning conductors, leaping about and vaulting from one to the other, performing the most extraordinary tricks.) Butcher is again seen to purposively opt for certain TL lexical solutions which, though accurate and thus plausible TL faithful renderings, also help to accentuate and maximally convey the homosexual innuendo of this passage. Butcher’s use of such words as ‘frolic’ (matching the ST sense of ‘ébattre’ as seen in other SL expressions, such as ‘ébats amoureux’), ‘erect’ and ‘incredible performances’ carry greater suggestiveness than, say, the more neutral words ‘sported’ or ‘trick’ chosen by Glencross. In his endnotes, Butcher (Verne, 1995: 235) comments that in Verne’s ST, ‘this paragraph is flagrantly sexual’.

15. … ces longs appendices … / … these long appendages … Glencross opts for the same replacing segment, so that both renderings in this instance are lexically imitative, mainly because the material cause of SL/TL similarity in this case may have
precluded (Glencross) from being non-imitative or having alternative lexis to choose from: translatorial potential solutions are perhaps more limited in the case of this ST segment.

16. On ne l’avait jamais vu ému ni troublé. / Nobody had ever seen him aroused or troubled. (Glencross: He had never been known to be upset or disturbed). This is part of a description of Phileas Fogg’s imperturbable, phlegmatic character, occurring towards the outset of the story. The continuing contrast between Butcher’s intentional choice of suggestive TL words (‘aroused’) and Glencross’s erasure (conscious or otherwise) of ST innuendo, is evident. The sexual connotations of the SL word ‘émouvoir’ are, of course, plausible in terms of accuracy, and are thus exploited to the full by Butcher in his choice of a TL word, which is arguably more specific in meaning and connotation than its ST equivalent, thus serving to support and drive home Butcher’s interpretation. The Grand Robert (ibid: 2040) cites one meaning of émouvoir, the infinitive from which the adjectival participle ému is derived, as éveiller l’érotisme, la sensibilité amoureuse de as in émouvoir charnellement quelqu’un (to awaken the eroticism, the amorous sensibility of/to carnally arouse somebody). The term was used by the 18th century dramatist Beaumarchais in this context, and later in the same way by the 19th century writer, Maupassant, according to the aforementioned dictionary. Therefore, Butcher’s sexual interpretation is indeed semantically plausible, as sexual arousal is one of the meanings of the term ému.

17. … chez l’homme, aussi bien que chez les animaux, les membres eux-mêmes sont des organes expressifs des passions. / … in man, just like the animals, the members are veritable organs that express the passions. (Glencross: … in human beings as well as in animals, the limbs are themselves a means of expressing feelings.) This section is part of a physical description of Fogg. Glencross avoids Butcher’s strategy of lexically imitative renderings which exploit sexualized dual-meaning (‘members’ and ‘organs’ in this context). This non-imitative strategy employed by Glencross is also a consistent feature of his TT of TM generally, also involving simplification, in this case, of the ST segment.
18. Pour lui, ils manoeuvraient comme des gentlemen, et les chauffeurs chauffaient comme des héros. / To his mind, the sailors manoeuvred like gentlemen, the stokers stoked like heroes. (Glencross: For him, they went about their work like gentlemen, and the stokers stoked like heroes.) This segment forms part of the section describing Passepartout’s friendliness towards the sailors throughout a voyage off the Japanese coast. Butcher’s choice of the TL item ‘manoeuvred’ is typically imitative, whereas Glencross’s rendering of the same ST item is characteristically non-imitative, thus seeming to indicate agentive choice and self-differentiation from Butcher’s choices. Here, Butcher’s more imitative rendering seems to exploit, maximally, the ST’s possible sexual undertones. The SL verb ‘manœuvrer’ has the sense of ‘faire agir (qqn) comme on le veut par une tactique habile (to make somebody do what one wants through skilful tactics)’ (ibid: 1147), while chauffer has connotations of excitement – avoir un rythme excitant / une salle qui chauffe/surexcité, (to have an exciting rhythm/ a heated, overexcited room/hall) while Le Petit Robert (op cit: 407) cites a figurative and familiar meaning as exciter, attiser son zèle (to excite, to whip up zeal). The Collins Robert (op cit: 164) cites another meaning of chauffer, in relaxed rather than careful speech, as being equivalent to draguer or to try to pick somebody up. On the other hand, it has proved difficult to ascertain whether the verb carried this layer of meaning when used by Verne in or around 1873; in fact, this is unlikely to be the case. All things considered, however, this verb could indeed be argued to be ambivalent in Verne’s intended meaning(s).

19. Il ne songeait qu’à ce but, si près d’être atteint. / He thought only of the goal, so near to completion. / The only thing he thought about was the goal that they were so close to reaching. Butcher is here typically closer to ST form and meaning. His modulation of the ST term ‘atteint’ to ‘completion’ (Glencross’s ‘reaching’ is semantically closer) may again indicate his desired emphasis on the supposed sexual suggestiveness of ST expression. The goal referred to in this segment is ostensibly that of circumnavigating the globe within eighty days and of Fogg’s thereby winning his wager, but Verne may be again striving to be sexually ‘tongue-in-cheek’ in the context of Passepartout’s interaction with the sailors.
20. Il leur prodiguait les meilleurs noms et les boissons les plus attrayantes. / He showered them with kind names and attractive drinks. (Glencross: He treated them to compliments and tempting-looking drinks). This segment further describes Passepartout’s interaction with the sailors. Both translators here choose not to convey the superlative form of the relevant adjectives, perhaps owing to a ‘universal’ tendency to neutralize TL expression. One wonders whether (following Butcher’s deconstruction of the ST) Verne is here hinting at love potions or aphrodisiacs in his ST reference to inviting drinks. In this coupled pair of segments, I acknowledge the difficulty, in a Bourdieusian sense, of effecting a satisfactory separation between objective description and subjective reaction to (agreement or disagreement with) Butcher’s construing of a theme of sexual deviance in this ST: in this ST segment, among others, I agree with Butcher that there is a homosexual undercurrent close to the textual surface and which has perhaps been awaiting exposition by this translator. Thus, Verne’s reference, in this context, to affectionate name-calling and enticing beverages does indeed seem to have some homosexual resonance.

21. Et, allant à la bête, il lui présenta quelques morceaux de sucre, disant : «Tiens, Kiouni, tiens, tiens !» / And going up to the animal, he gave him a few sugar-lumps. ‘Here, Kiouni, here!’ / (Glencross: Then he went up to the beast and gave him a few lumps of sugar, saying: ‘Here, Kiouni. Here!’) This segment occurs as Fogg relinquishes ownership of the elephant, having crossed the Indian jungle. Both translators reduce the ST item ‘présenta’ to ‘gave’, this being probably attributable to a concatenation of causes: the material cause by which the SL habitually employs lexis which is more formal than the TL equivalent items; the formal cause of norms of natural TL expression then dictates a lexical shift, and the ‘universals’ of neutralization and standardization may also be at work.

Glencross’s use of the word ‘beast’ is, unusually, more lexically imitative than Butcher’s ‘animal’.

The concept of sugar may have been intended by Verne to have a sexual connotation, so that the posited gay subtext is a thread running continuously throughout the episodes dealing with the acquisition and subsequent relinquishment of the elephant, Kiouni. This word is also a slang term of affection, especially in United States
English. Furthermore, in French, the adjective ‘sucré’ has the figurative sense of ‘doucereux’ so that the SL expression ‘faire le sucré’ is defined by Le Robert Micro (2003: 1274) as ‘se montrer aimable avec affectation’ (‘to behave in an affectedly friendly manner’). ‘Sucre’ is also a homonym of the sexually-charged SL word ‘sucer’ (‘to suck’).

22. ... l’éléphant fit entendre quelques grognements de satisfaction ... Passepartout ... fit une bonne caresse à l’animal qui le replaça doucement à terre, et, à la poignée de trompe de l’honnête Kiouni, répondit une vigoureuse poignée de main de l’honnête garçon. / The elephant gave a few grunts of satisfaction [...] Passepartout gave the animal a good stroke, and was then deposited gently back down on the ground. To the trunk shake offered by the noble Kiouni, the honest fellow returned his own hearty handshake. (Glencross: The elephant gave out a few grunts of satisfaction [...] Passepartout stroked the animal [...] so, having received from the faithful Kiouni an elephant handshake, the dear fellow returned the compliment by taking the animal by the trunk and giving him a hearty human one.) Butcher does not replicate Verne’s double usage of ‘honnête’, so that he arguably does not create TL the ‘equivalent effect’ of the ST’s comparison of the qualities of Kiouni with those of Passepartout: this may be due to the translator’s considering that to describe the animal as ‘honest’ might have deviated from norms of TL natural expression and of clarity: therefore, by choosing a semantically plausible TL synonym (‘noble’) in this context, Butcher gives priority to norms of semantic accuracy and TL clarity over those of lexical imitativeness, thereby sacrificing some stylistic equivalence through non-matching of the prosodic effects of ST repetition. This is an instance of the translation process as sometimes obliging translators to make choices which inevitably involve sacrifice of one or more ST elements or effects in favour of others; here, a concern to adhere to norms of natural TL expression entails the non-reproduction of ST/SL prosodic effect.

Both translators offer the same philologically close rendering ‘gave … a few grunts of satisfaction’: the material cause of SL-to-TL transfer and SL TL similarity, together with the formal cause of norms of accuracy, preclude Glencross from neutralizing the ST’s possible sexual innuendo, if he had perceived same and had wished to neutralize it. On the other hand, Glencross’s choice of ‘stroked the animal’ offers a form of TL verb which does appear to neutralize and simplify the corresponding ST expression.
Butcher’s rendering of this ST phrase is, however, lexically imitative/ ‘word-for-word’: he thus maintains his global strategy of formal closeness to the ST, while simultaneously emphasizing his ‘sexual’ deconstruction of this ST section.

Glencross’s use of ‘returned the compliment’ is an instance of lexical expansion, motivated, I suggest, by translatorial ego, i.e. a desire for self-inscription on the TT. He is thus, typically, less concise than Butcher and introduces an element of explicitation. Glencross’s rendering ‘put him […] back’ is semantically closer, and more neutral/sexual, than Butcher’s ‘deposited’ (as in a ‘deposit of sperm’, perhaps). Butcher therefore departs occasionally from his general strategy of lexical imitativeness, in order to place his own agentive choice of TL synonyms on the TT. In addition, Butcher’s representation of a sexual subtext may have caused him to choose ‘deposited’ which may be considered by him to have a sexual connotation.

‘Queer Studies’ Interpretations and Unpredictable Translation Strategies: A Final Note

Given the significant quantity of (homo)sexual references detected by Butcher throughout *Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours*, it seems surprising that, in his 1998 translation of Verne’s *Twenty Thousand Leagues under the Seas (TTL)*, (of which the original title is *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers*, first published in 1870) he does not at any stage refer specifically to the possibility of homoerotic subtexts in that novel. Thus, possible subtexts in TTL, of male companionship and bonding between the crewmen on board the *Nautilus*, and the possibly sexual feelings of certain male characters for each other – such as Professor Arronax and Captain Nemo, or Conseil and Professor Arronax – are ignored in Butcher’s Endnotes and other paratext. This points to complex unpredictability and non-deterministic outcomes in translatorial processes (Longa 2004). If Butcher did detect a homoerotic subtext in TTL, he did not paratextually comment on it. A study of the themes and varying retranslations of TTL would, of course, be a separate research undertaking, and one which would be of interest.
Conclusion

The ‘gay’ case study presented in this article has offered examples of how a translator such as William Butcher can, through the use of both his translational linguistic choices and paratextual commentary, present new and sometimes radical interpretations of a canonical work of literature. In general, studies of multiple causation within translation history have indicated that the translating agent, as an individual, may have a significant influence on the form of her TT, regardless of the nature of the translation structures or norm systems within which she works. For instance, s/he chooses which subsets of translation norms to adhere to from among alternative sets of competing norms; Butcher, for instance, chooses to comply with norms of SL-imitativeness in order to convey the authorial voice and style of Verne, whereas some of his contemporary Verne translators, such as Glencross (2004), have chosen to translate the same Verne novels in a non-imitative, more idiomatic manner. Different translators have different reasons for choosing the norms they do, and may choose different norms for different literary translations, depending on a complex multiplicity of contextual influences. Similarly, the translator may inscribe his/her own interpretations on the TT. Thus, the efficient cause of translatorial agency, as in the case of Butcher, seems to be an important cause of literary translational choices.

In addition, Butcher’s high intellectual status and prestige as a foremost, respected contemporary authority on all aspects of Verne’s life and writings, may have conferred significant freedom upon him to credibly inscribe his retranslations with his own radical reinterpretations of the Verne imaginary. His Queer re-reading and Queer translation of Verne, presented in this article, is a salient example of the radical power of translational agency.

Whether all TT readers, Verne scholars or Verne enthusiasts are prepared to accept Butcher’s gay interpretation of Verne’s life and of his literary language and themes, is another matter. This article, grounded as it is in the concerns of Descriptive-Explanatory Translation Studies (DTS) – a methodology which strives to avoid prescriptive commentary on translations, and subjective evaluations in general –
cannot aspire to justifying or defending Butcher’s interpretations and renderings of Verne. This has not, however, prevented me from sometimes commenting on the semantic content and lexicographical history of certain ST lexemes perceived by Butcher as sexualized, for the sake of a full, rounded analysis. This article has thus sought mainly to account for some of Butcher’s translation strategies, by focusing on his ‘Queer’ deconstruction of *Around the world in eighty days*.

However, the fundamental point made by this article is that literary translators can, and often do, offer diverse, creative rewritings of source literary texts, through reinterpretation of themes, updating of language use, and inscription of own style, across differing retranslations. Each literary translator has her own unique style of writing; I label this *translatorial idiolect* or *translatorial diction*. For all of these reasons, translation often entails some form of ‘gain’ for original literary works, as their memes are spread to other languages and cultures across space and time, in a manner which helps them to survive, and to differentially and unpredictably evolve (cf. Chesterman 2007).
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