



This is a contribution from

Cultus:

The Journal of Intercultural Mediation and Communication

2021: 14

© **Iconesoft Edizioni Gruppo Radivo Holding**

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.
The author(s) of this article is /are permitted to use this PDF file
to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their
personal use only.

‘Dear Kimon’: Gatekeeping and politics in a translator’s correspondence.

Nadia Georgiou

Independent Researcher

Kimon Friar’s (1911-1993) voluminous translation work of Modern Greek literature in English has been lauded by fellow translators (Keeley 2000), poets and reviewers alike. The annual Kimon Friar lectures, delivering talks on Greek literature and translation, have become a testament to his extensive contribution, adding credence to his life-long occupation as literary translator (1949-1993). And yet, his multifaceted, and pivotal, role in selecting, translating, editing, circulating, and championing the authors and works he translated is far more complex and deems further exploration. Friar was not only a prolific translator but also an outspoken proponent of the rights of literary translators, particularly regarding royalties and the translator’s moral right for attribution. At the same time, Friar, in conjunction with some of the Greek poets he translated, performed a gatekeeping, regulatory role regarding the authors and works selected for English translation. Finally, Friar was vocal in his correspondence with editors and publishers regarding other potential translators of Modern Greek into English, which he did not deem as good practitioners. This case study draws data from Friar’s correspondence, located at Princeton University Rare Books and Special Collections, which offers key insights into the motives and rationale behind some of Friar’s attitudes and decisions. As a result, the motives behind the selection, production, circulation, and promotion of translated Modern Greek poetry are exposed. The study provides evidence of the potential difference a single translator may make, particularly when translating a literature of lesser diffusion into a more dominant language. The paper also proposes an expanded definition of the translator/gatekeeper.

Keywords: translator/gatekeeper; Modern Greek; archival research; correspondence; gatekeeping.

1. Introduction

Historically, translators have appropriated and introduced new ideas encountered in source texts, have been responsible for shaping or invigorating entire national literatures, and have among other things, acted

as political activists (Delisle and Woodsworth 2012). Translators' often-profound impact on their social, cultural, economic, and political environments are gradually gaining recognition through the increasing amount of scholarship focused on examining their multiple roles and the wide-ranging implications of their work (see, for instance, Voinova and Shlesinger 2013; Sela-Sheffy 2016).

Yet despite the already existing studies exploring the repercussions of translatorial work in terms of its variety, scope and impact, there is much uncharted territory. Crucially, the existing often-intriguing case studies of individual translators can serve as evidence towards the construction of broader, more generalizable theorisations regarding the role and professional identity of past and current translators. The current paper takes a step in that direction by exploring the correspondence of a translator, Kimon Friar, and discussing it within the broader theoretical framework of the terms 'gatekeeping' and 'gatekeeper' which within Translation Studies (TS) have been only loosely defined, as will be discussed in Section 4. Friar's actions as translator and the emerging professional identity gleaned, when viewed through the concept of 'gatekeeping', allow for broader theorisations of his role, which may in turn be applied to other translators.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 briefly introduces Friar. Sections 3 and 4 contain the literature reviews regarding the origin of the terms 'gatekeepers' and 'gatekeeping', along with a brief review of their application within TS. Section 5 presents the method used and in Sections 6 and 7 the archival material used is first presented and then discussed. In Section 8 some thoughts conclude the paper.

2. Who was Kimon Friar?

Kimon Friar, given name Kalogeropoulos¹, was a writer, scholar, literary critic, playwright and director, teacher and literary magazine editor. Above all else, though, Friar was a prolific, and self-confessed, translator of Modern Greek poetry into English who also acted as cultural agent and loyal proponent of the literary merit of Modern Greek literature.

Friar was born to Greek parents in current-day Turkey in 1911 but the family migrated to Chicago in 1915, thus sowing the seed for Friar's

¹ Friar's chosen surname is a translation of his family name: Kalogeropoulos means 'child of a monk'.

diasporic and diglossic identity. Friar graduated from the University of Wisconsin at Madison with a BA in English Literature and Drama in 1934, also receiving an MA in English Literature in 1940. He visited Greece for the first time in 1946 and developed a profound and often life-long connection with the Greek poets he met in Athens during that first visit. His correspondence attests to meetings with several eminent poets, such as those with the later Nobel Laureates George Seferis and Odysseas Elytis. These encounters were clearly paramount for Friar. He finally moved to Greece in 1948 where he lived, with brief interludes, for the rest of his life. As a member of a wide and diverse diasporic community of writers, artists and publishing agents, Friar used his connections to gain funding and support for his translations and to give talks on Modern Greek poetry elsewhere, such as in New York and Chicago, particularly with the help of the Greek Orthodox Church. In recognition of his work, in 1978 Friar received the Greek World Award.

Friar in his lifetime was regarded both by others (and by himself) as translator first and foremost, as is evidenced by the biographical notes included in his anthologies, in the obituaries composed after his death and also in his private, unpublished correspondence (Saxon 1993; Kazantzakis 1985). At the same time, Friar is the example par excellence of a translator who acts in many different capacities. He was also editor, and public disseminator of Modern Greek poetry as well as ambassador and ‘gatekeeper’, as will be shown in the next sections.

3. Gatekeepers and Gatekeeping

The concept of gatekeeper was coined within Social Psychology by Lewin (1951). His theory of channels, gates and gatekeepers describes pivotal points in societal changes and the actors who engaged in them. His empirical research on consumers, which focused on their decision-making processes, showed how decision-making depended on social influences from specific agents he termed gatekeepers. The theory was visualised with the metaphor of entering a channel through a ‘gate’, an ‘in’ or ‘out’ decision point (Shoemaker 1991).

In this paper, I will use the definition developed in Journalism Studies, which views gatekeepers as “the filters for either inclusion or exclusion of information from a given system” (Zelizer and Allan 2010, 50). This view sees gatekeepers as controlling the flow of information while often being influenced by internalised notions of professionalism (ibid 2010: 51).

Translators' notions of professionalism are determined by their specialized habitus (Bourdieu 1990), developed before (and often as a prerequisite for) their entry into the field and is constantly reshaped during their careers. This is a significant point for the definition and one I will be addressing in relation to the archival material discussed in the paper.

Zelizer and Allan (2010: 50-51) also note the standard critique against studies on gatekeepers and gatekeeping, as they tend to "favour individual selection over organisational or institutional constraints", and often isolate one stage of a complex process while exaggerating its significance (2010: 51). Barzilai-Nahon (2008) addresses that critique by introducing 'network gatekeeping' as a useful framework, which offers a nuanced approach that acknowledges the relationships between various gatekeepers and the hierarchies of institutional gatekeeping mechanisms.

4. Gatekeepers and Gatekeeping in TS

There is limited literature on gatekeeping and translation, despite the term being used loosely in several studies. A first point to note is that the gatekeeping role of translators is often paired with the far more frequent description of translators as cultural ambassadors (Jones 2009), cultural brokers (Sela-Sheffy 2016), or guardians of domestic culture/language (Sela-Sheffy 2008; Solum 2017). A translator/gatekeeper (T/G) is portrayed as the other side of the Janus-faced practitioner: the ambassadorial role complementing the gatekeeping role of the translator. This intrinsic complementarity, a fascinating aspect of the translatorial practice, will be discussed further in relation to the Friar material presented in this paper.

The most comprehensive study involving the terms was conducted by Vuorinen (1997) in the context of news translators serving as filters and facilitators in the knowledge transfer process of news reporting. Vuorinen (1997: 169) states that "translation which takes place in an institutional setting cannot be examined as isolated from the whole individual, institutional, social and cultural framework surrounding it". Jones (2009), discussing the networked nature of the translator's ambassadorial role, also recognizes that poetry translating takes place over a 'distributed' space, either physical or digital, created by the network of agents involved in a translation project. Jones also recognizes that the poetry translator's role is often less significant than the role of the poets themselves or of that of

anthology/journal editors, as shall be seen in the material discussed in Section 7.

What does the concept of the T/G involve? For Jones (2001; 2009), the most basic function of the T/G is that “by translating or refusing to translate, she has the power to decide which writers and which ideas can be heard in the target culture” (Jones 2001, 263). This approach, however idealized it may seem, certainly holds true for literatures of lesser diffusion, such as Modern Greek, or experimental/marginal writers who may not easily appeal to a wide audience whether in their own language or in any prospective target language. Jones’ view is also echoed by Chitnis *et. al* (2020). They discuss the “ambassadorial-gatekeeping logic” or inclusion and exclusion of texts and writers, particularly regarding issues of the translator’s supposed impartiality towards the socio-political conditions of the source culture, which is an issue also encountered in Friar’s selection of poems/poets.

Sela-Sheffy (2016) describes a “restricted circle of elite literary translators”, who determine the hierarchies and professionalisation of the entire field through their sense of occupational identity and actions. This is echoed in Tekgül (2017), who notes the contradictory powers of competition and cooperation among literary translators within the field of Turkish literary translation. Sela-Sheffy and Tekgül do not label these translators as gatekeepers. In my view, however, the definition of a T/G should include this function of peer monitoring, since, as Simeoni (1998: 26) observes “the real proof of belonging to the field is found when the relevant decisions made by the stakeholders are taken with an eye on what their peers are doing, either to go along with them, or to oppose them”.

This final point demonstrates how questions of gatekeeping are linked to the issue of professionalism in translation. For Shoemaker (1991: 74), one of the characteristics that affects gatekeeping is the individual gatekeeper’s conceptions of their role. The interlinked relationship between gatekeeping and professionalism in translation is further discussed in Section 7.

The discussion of Friar’s gatekeeping role and its implications are explored via three main attributes of gatekeeping, gleaned from the studies discussed above.

These attributes are:

- selecting poets/poems to be translated, thus exercising some control over what and who gets translated,

- peer monitoring of the translation field, thus exercising some control over who may translate,
- guarding the translator's moral right to attribution, the right to approve or refuse permissions and to receive recompense when their works are used, thus establishing agency in their professional translatorial identity.

5. Method and material

The collected papers of Kimon Friar were viewed at the Rare Books and Special Collections department at Princeton University Library². The document created by the curator of the Kimon Friar papers (Finding Aid) details the collection's contents, which include 158 boxes, a substantial amount of material particularly considering the sparsity of translator-created material in archives around the world. The main type of archival material examined was correspondence, most of which was in English with Greek words/phrases appearing throughout. Intriguingly, the letters in the archive are mainly the carbon copies of the typewritten letters sent to his correspondents. This detail demonstrates that Friar kept a detailed record of his own letters as well as of his correspondents' responses which gives us an insight into Friar's professional attitude.

Reading archival material, following Connors (2016: 55), is to "browse with directed intention" and it entails keeping in mind the key concepts the researcher is interested in. In my case these key concepts were the translation process, the poet-translator relationships, translator networks, translator agency, and the translator's professional identity. Connors (2016: 57) warns that since the archival records we find are all written by humans, "they are necessarily filled with self-justification, optimistic delusion, pessimistic distortion, partisan argument". This facet of archival research added an element of surprise and complicity in the reading of the material and greatly enhanced my understanding of the realities of literary translation.

This largely unpublished material offers the opportunity to glean important, and otherwise unknown, information regarding the mechanics of the translatorial practice. Significant questions, such as how Friar selected who to translate and why, reveal how political affiliations, ideological

² I am grateful to have been awarded a library travel grant from the Friends of Princeton Library in order to conduct this trip in spring 2017.

beliefs, and aesthetic hierarchies, can and often do shape the production of translated literature. The role of the editors of poetry anthologies and the source culture poets is revealed, while Friar's gatekeeping role is exposed, defined and its significance discussed.

6. Presentation of material³

This section presents excerpts from Friar's correspondence with Editors-in-Chief, publishers and administrative staff in publishing houses. Excerpts from letters Friar wrote have been included, as it is his opinions, processes and gatekeeping role that are the focus of this paper.

1. Selecting poets/poems to be translated.

Regarding the poems/poets to be included in anthologies and selected works, Friar's selection process, and his motives, are clear in his statements (I have underlined the parts that Friar himself emphasised).

I have asked many poets to send me a list of about 35 living poets they would like to see represented in this anthology. [...] because I wish to be fair and impartial. Those who have complied have given me invaluable assistance. Indeed, it is surprising to see how uniform their opinions are.

K. Friar to C. Athanasoules, July 25th, 1960

The correspondence demonstrates that Friar was constantly battling against his publishers, but some issues were outside his control. Note the language used, which shows Friar's frustration, as well as the warning regarding bad publicity.

My own reputation as a scholar and critic is at stake here: I could not possibly defend the omission of four or five who rank among the ten best poets of Greece. On what basis were omissions made? Altogether, a very deplorable and unethical act. [...] And you can imagine what the Greek press will make of all this?

³ The unpublished archival material presented here appears under fair dealing, an exception to British Copyright Law, which allows the lawful use or reproduction of a work without having to seek permission from the copyright owner(s) or creator(s) or infringing their interest if the work is used for the purposes of research, and/or criticism, review or quotation (Sections 29 and 30 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988).

K. Friar to Bantam Books, January 29th, 1966

Interesting insights, regarding the poems selected for publication, indicate that the length of a work is directly relevant to costs of publication, which were significant, particularly for University presses. The *Modern Greek Poetry* anthology, if it were to be published as it stood in February 1970 would have run to about 900 pages and would have been sold at \$20, well over \$100 today, so the Editor-in-Chief wanted to reduce its size.

Most of the poets are living, and with all of them I have worked in translating their poems. They all know what poems have been chosen to represent them—indeed, they and I chose the poems together—and I don't know how I could possibly tell them that I would now have to cut [...]. I don't want to jeopardize my standing with the poets here; I find it somewhat of a miracle that I have worked with them for so many years in harmony.

K. Friar to Mike Korda, Editor-in-Chief of Simon and Schuster, February 10th, 1970.

2. Peer monitoring: Other translators of Modern Greek into English

A manifestation of Friar's gatekeeping role as surveyor of the field was the expression of his opinions regarding other translators of Modern Greek into English.

I think you did wrong in the first place to entrust the translation of Kazantzakis' plays to Athena Dallas, for his rhetoric needs the sure hand of a poet [...]

K. Friar to Mike Korda, February 10, 1970.

Friar's peer monitoring is two-fold in the following instance: he provides a critique of Dalven's book, while requesting a copy in order to peruse and perhaps review it.

You have probably heard that a Modern Greek Poetry has been brought out by Rae Dalven. It's her old book brought somewhat up to date. If the first and main part is a reprint, then it is utterly useless and filled with ten or more errors to a page. [...] Can you have it sent to me promptly?

K. Friar to Mike Korda, August 26th, 1971.

Friar exercised his gatekeeping role by refusing to comment on another translator's English version of a poem by Yannis Ritsos, thus refusing to publicly endorse the translator's work. Friar, in the same letter, offered to

write to the translator and explain his refusal. The translator's name here has been omitted for reasons of anonymity.

I wish [...] had sent me his translation before he had sent you his final draft. His version of the 'Lady of the Vineyards' is an excellent second draft, but it is not, in my opinion, a final draft. [...] is capable of becoming a superb translator. [...] he has deliberately chosen to translate in this manner, and it all boils down to your principles of translation. He is aware of what he is doing and has made a deliberate choice.

K. Friar to Peter Pappas, Editor-in-Chief of Pella Publishing Company Inc, June 20th, 1978.

Friar was vocal regarding his own views on the principles guiding the translation process. A pertinent example is Friar's narrative about a surrealist poem by Andreas Embiricos, which Friar translated. Friar observed that "one should not [...] try to extract a meaning from such poems, nor perhaps even a theme, but note simply, perhaps, the situation" (Friar 1983, 16). Friar focused on the effect that the sounds of the poem would have on the Anglophone audience and went to great lengths to come up with alliterations which would recreate in the mind of the reader/listener the images of waters falling and of the passing of time (which is the theme of the Greek poem).

3. The translator's right of attribution.

The final attribute of Friar's gatekeeping role is his safeguarding his moral right to attribution as translator. The first excerpt refers to the poetry anthology *Modern European Poetry* (1966).

And may I wryly point out that among the translators listed on the cover my name and that of Mr. Reavey might have been included since we not only edited but also translated entire sections?

K. Friar to Bantam Book, January 29th, 1966.

Referring to the same anthology, Friar highlights the absence of his name from the cover.

But I should like to lodge a very serious complaint. Neither in the old edition, nor in the new one, on the cover, is my name mentioned among the translators. [...] Since we were not paid much, at least we should like proper acknowledgement.

K. Friar to Bantam Books, May 9th, 1970.

The translated book Friar is referring to in the second and in the last excerpt is *The Odyssey* by Nikos Kazantzakis. Since the translation by Friar was the first and only one at the time, and the subject matter of Kazantzakis' *Odyssey* is different to Homer's *Odyssey*, any adaptation of that work for stage, radio or television would require the translator's explicit permission before it was broadcast in accordance with US Copyright Law. Adaptations of translated classical works are very common; however, the translator's name is seldom acknowledged. Friar appears adamant in his demand to be informed about any adaptation of his translated work for reasons of attribution but also (in the hope of) some financial return.

I have complained several times of not having received letters which were written to me in care of your firm, some of them having to do with permissions for mounting or using sections of the *Odyssey* for stage, radio, or television. [...] You recall I never did receive a letter from Claribel Baird of the University of Michigan, asking my permission to mount parts of the *Odyssey* as a dramatic production and offering fees.

K. Friar to Mike Korda, August 26th, 1971.

The archival material is discussed in the following section, as is the literature regarding gatekeepers and gatekeeping presented in Sections 3 and 4.

7. Politics and (re)defining the translator/gatekeeper

The literary polysystem within which Friar functioned allowed him to perform and expand his role into that of a regulatory agent. The functions of the T/G, as performed by Friar and evidenced in his correspondence, demonstrate that he had a degree of control over which poems/poets were translated. Friar also expressed a definitive opinion regarding who was worthy of translating Modern Greek poetry, according to his own aesthetic principles for translating. At the same time, Friar was also adamant in demanding what was due to him as translator, regarding acknowledgement and royalties. Through his translatorial practice, and his insistence on being recognized and credited for his work, Friar embodies the attributes of a T/G.

Translators often offer little insight into their rationale for selecting texts for translation or their translation process, except in scattered and passing comments in peritexts. Friar is the exception to that, having dedicated introductory notes as well as entire papers discussing his translation process,

approaching it from not just linguistic but also cultural and sociological perspectives (1972; 1982; 1983).

A significant insight into his process of selection and the criteria employed is found in his letter to the poet Criton Athanasoules, cited in Section 6, in which Friar asks for a list of poets, a request he had made to other poets. This practice exposes the significant input of the source-culture poets themselves regarding who and what was to be translated. On a related note, Friar admits that the poets knew which of their poems were to be included in the anthology and if any poems were omitted, which the poets themselves had selected alongside Friar, the omission would not go unnoticed.

When Modern Greek poetry started being translated into English in the mid-20th century, the Greek poets selected for translation were often those whose poetry most resembled what was considered canonical in the receptor language, in this case English. In a letter from Christianopoulos, whom Friar met in the late 1940s, the poet observes that Friar had only met a very select group of Greek poets during his initial visit to Athens in 1946, mainly those grouped under the umbrella term ‘The 30s generation’. As Friar notes, he met most of those poets socially in small cafes around Syntagma Square in central Athens, where they used to congregate in the years after WWII. His decision to translate the poets followed a somewhat predictable path. As Hersant (2017: 96) notes “friendships are at once the cause and effect of some collaborative translations”.

Friar’s comment of how uniform the recommendations of the poets included in the anthology are exposes a certain naiveté on his part as he seems to disregard that poets often form groupings with similar aesthetic and ideological predispositions. Friar’s desire for fairness and impartiality later grew to embrace other poets who were newer or considered more minor, as his selection of poets/poems in his *Modern Greek Poetry* (1982) testifies.

Friar’s correspondence reveals the complexity of the question: “how were the poets/poems selected?” Initially, driven by the circumstances of his meetings with the poets as explained above, Friar read and translated the poets within whose circle he had found himself and who were acting as mediators and gatekeepers by introducing him to their peers. Friar’s initial visit coincides with the Greek Civil War (1946-9), a direct consequence of which was that several important poets, such as Yannis Ritsos, Manolis Anagnostakis and Tasos Livaditis, who were exiled in 1948 for their involvement in the Communist Party, were absent from the Athenian

literary scene. In this instance, external, as in non-literary, political forces conspired towards an initially skewed representation of what Modern Greek poetry had to offer in the late 1940s. Friar may seem to lose part of his agency in this instance, subjected to the whims of history. However, his gatekeeping role is solidified in the long-term as he continuously renegotiated who and what got translated.

Despite Friar's actions, forces within the publishing industry, as seen in the Bantam anthology excerpt in Section 6, testify that Friar as translator was one of several gatekeepers. The editor of the anthology, Willis Barnstone, was another in addition to the marketing agents and the publisher, whose decisions affected the representation of Modern Greek poetry in that anthology. The more comprehensive concept of network gatekeeping (Barzilai-Nahon 2008) would likely capture the complexity of the phenomenon more accurately. This concept is similar to Jones' embassy networks, which highlight how "agency lies not so much in individual actors as in the network as a whole – in the cooperation between technical operators and translators" (2009: 320), particularly in the context of translated poetry from minor to major languages.

Regarding the second aspect of the T/G, Friar criticized freely the quality of work done by other translators of Modern Greek into English. The recipients of his criticisms were key agents in the field, such as editors-in-chief and publishers, potentially leading to unfavourable impressions of the translators in question.

As discussed in Section 4, Sela-Sheffy cautions that translators may act as competitors against less qualified practitioners who wish to enter the field (2008, 2016). Tekgül's study (2017) presents a more nuanced picture which reflects the situation viewed in Friar's correspondence: a dynamic of simultaneous competition and cooperation may be observed among literary translators with the same working languages. This dual approach is also observed by Voinova and Shlesinger in accounts of individuals who stress their exclusivity and block the entry of newcomers whom they consider amateurish or mercenary, while collegial support is also present in these accounts (2013: 45-6).

Athena Dallas and Rae Dalven, the two translators that Friar maligned, were both part of the same extensive Greek diaspora based in the US that Friar belonged to. Friar's objections were two-fold: Friar protested the two translators' incomplete knowledge of Modern Greek, who, according to him, did not have the occasion or inclination to improve, unlike him. This led them to mistakes and misinterpretations that Friar itemised. Friar also

objected to the stylistic choices particularly of Athena Dallas who translated Kazantzakis' plays into English. Kazantzakis was a writer with whom Friar shared a particular literary and personal bond, and whose epic poem *The Odyssey: A Sequel* he had translated into English. In Friar's article (1972) about their unique collaboration, as he termed it, Friar's admiration, verging on awe, towards the Greek author is evident, as is Friar's attitude of a mentee and disciple to Kazantzakis. Dallas was a journalist by profession and Friar found the style of her prose unsuitable for the philosophical and poetic peregrinations of Kazantzakis' work.

Friar corresponded with both Dallas and Rae Dalven, as the Princeton archive demonstrates. His dislike for Dalven is expressed in correspondence with other translators (e.g., Andonis Decavalles). It is also revealing that the Friar-Dalven correspondence contains just a single letter, from Dalven asking for a meeting. There is no copy of Friar's response. The correspondence between Friar and Dallas, in which Friar expresses his view towards some of Dallas' stylistic choices in her translation of Kazantzakis is more extensive. The tone of the exchange is amicable, and Friar is diplomatic in his criticism.

Not everything Friar has to say about fellow translators is negative, however. The excerpt regarding the translation of Ritsos' poem showcases Friar's aesthetic criteria for judging the quality of translations. In the letter Friar gives specific examples of mistranslations and of the translator's own overall principle of 'tidying up' Ritsos' unruly syntax and punctuation, which Friar did not agree with. This letter demonstrates his clear vision of his own translation practice and the principles governing it; while simultaneously displaying his ability to differentiate between routine linguistic errors and purposeful translation choices. Friar's appreciation of the translator's approach is evident, as is the didactic character of Friar's comments.

It is significant at this point to differentiate between the intended effect that Friar wished to have as a T/G and the actual impact of his intervention. The true effects of Friar's regulatory role are not easy to trace; however, the fact that he felt obliged and even justified in his critique suggests that Friar considered this peer monitoring function part of his translatorial role. Indeed, as an established and committed translator of Modern Greek poetry he felt that he was acting as a custodian, in other words a gatekeeper, of the quality of Modern Greek poetry in translation.

The final aspect of the T/G to be noted in Friar's correspondence relates to his safeguarding his rights of attribution as translator. As he wryly notes in the letter to Bantam Books, since adequate payment for his translations

in the anthology was a non-issue for the publisher, at least acknowledgement of his contribution was necessary. Friar demonstrates a sense of professional self-esteem, and a proactive attitude regarding his dues, which he requests should be commensurate to his contribution. As Robinson (2012: 26) notes “for the translator or interpreter a higher consideration than money or continued employability is professional pride, professional integrity, professional self-esteem”.

At the same time, Friar, in one more manifestation of his professional approach to translation, demands to be notified of all adaptations of his translated work. The rationale behind this demand is likely the desire to be acknowledged as the co-creator of the work.

Friar saw gatekeeping as an integral part of being a professional translator in his insistence that he be visible as a co-creator of the work, thus carving a space for himself as a recognizable figure of Modern Greek letters translated into English. By actively demanding his rights of attribution, Friar was among those 20th century literary translators whose attitude predated current voices within the profession. Friar set an example by attempting to determine the unwritten rules of the profession, define some of its premises that were more pertinent to the field of poetry translating and establish some of the principles that ought to govern it, according to his experience and expertise as poetry translator.

8. Conclusions

Friar, in his role as poetry translator, performed a pivotal function as a key agent in a peer monitoring and regulatory system. One of the objectives was the promotion of Modern Greek poetry in English translation. Simultaneously, Friar’s professional identity was displayed through his decision-making process regarding the inclusion/exclusion of both the source poets to be translated and his fellow translators, and making sure that his work was properly attributed to him. This system included other agents in the translation process, from the poets re-working the English versions with the translator, to editors negotiating the number of pages (and thus, the number of poets/poems to be represented) in an anthology, to the publishers facing prohibitive costs that guided their publishing decisions.

Friar’s practice and the conclusions drawn from tracing his regulatory behaviour may be generalized into an expanded definition of the translator as gatekeeper. The definition would recognize the T/G as a filter for the

inclusion/exclusion of information, ideas or people from the system the translator belongs to.

Three fundamental aspects of the proposed definition would recognise the translator/gatekeeper as:

1. exercising control over what and who gets translated,
2. acting in a peer monitoring capacity of the translation field,
3. guarding the translator's right to attribution; the right to approve or refuse permissions and to receive recompense when their works are used.

The definition aims at recognizing the roles translators perform within their multiple gatekeeping networks, as well as working towards measuring the potential impact of these individuals – thus defining translator agency and its remit in the process.

References

- Athanassoules, Criton; 1960-1977; Kimon Friar Papers, Box 69 Folder 6; Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- Bantam Books Inc.; 1962-1981; Kimon Friar Papers, Box 152 Folder 6; Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- Barzilai-Nahon, Karine. 2008. "Toward a Theory of Network Gatekeeping: A Framework for Exploring Information Control". *Journal of the American Society of Information Science and Technology* 59, no. 9 (May): 1493-1512. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20857>
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. California: Stanford University Press.
- Chitnis, Rajendra (ed.). 2020. "Literature as Cultural Diplomacy: Czech Literature in Great Britain". In *Translating the Literatures of Small European Nations*, edited by Rajendra Chitnis, Jakob Stougaard-Nielsen, Rhian Atkin and Zoran Milutinović, 69-90. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvvb7kq9.8>
- Connors, Robert J. 2016. "Dreams and play: historical method and methodology". In *Landmark essays on archival research*, edited by Lynce Lewis Gaillet, Helen Diana Eidson and Don Gammill Jr., 50.62. London: Routledge.

-
- Delisle, Jean, and Judith Woodsworth. 1995, reviewed edition 2012. *Translators through history*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.13>
- Friar, Kimon. 1971. "A Unique Collaboration: Translating the Odyssey: A Modern Sequel". *The Journal of Modern Literature* 2, no. 2 (October): 215-244.
- Friar, Kimon. 1982. *Modern Greek Poetry*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Friar, Kimon. 1983. "How a poem was translated". *Translation review* 11: 5-19.
- Hersant, Patrick. 2017. "Author-translator collaborations: A Typological Survey". In *Collaborative Translation: From Renaissance to the Digital Age*, edited by Anthony Cordingley and Céline Frigau-Manning, 91-110. London: Bloomsbury.
- Jones, Francis R. 2001. "Bringing Mak Dizdar into the Mainstream: Textual and Cultural Issues in Translating Dizdar's *Kameni Spavač*". *Forum Bosnae* 11: 61-285.
- Jones, Francis R. 2009. "Embassy networks: Translating post-war Bosnian poetry into English". In *Agents of Translation*, edited by John Milton and Paul Bandia, 301-325. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kazantzakis, Nikos. 1985. *The Odyssey: A Modern Sequel*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Keeley, Edmund, Peter Constantine and Karen Van Dyck. 2004. *A Century of Greek Poetry, 1900-2000*. River Vale, NJ: Attica Editions.
- Korda, Mike. Simon and Schuster; 1945-1987; Kimon Friar Papers, Box 156 Folder 11-14; Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- Kuhn, Manford H. 1951. *LEWIN, KURT. Field Theory of Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Pappas, Peter. Pella Publishing Company, Inc.; 1977-1980; Kimon Friar Papers, Box 156 Folder 2; Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
- Robinson, Douglas. 2012. *Becoming a translator: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Translation*, III Edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Saxon, Wolfgang. 1993. "Kimon Friar, 81, translator of Greek literature". *The New York Times*. Visited February 2021. <http://www.nytimes.com/1993/05/30/obituaries/kimon-friar-81-translator-of-greek-literature.html>

- Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. 2008. "The 'Translators' Personae: Marketing Translational Images as Pursuit of Capital". *Meta: Journal Des Traducteurs—Translators' Journal* 53, no. 3 (November): 609-622. <https://doi.org/10.7202/019242ar>
- Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. 2016. "Elite and non-elite translator manpower: The non-professionalized culture in the translation field in Israel". *The Journal of Specialised Translation: JoSTrans*, 25 (January): 54-73. https://www.jostrans.org/issue25/art_sela.php
- Shoemaker, Pamela J. 1991. *Gatekeeping*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Simeoni, Daniel. 1998. "The pivotal status of the translator's habitus". *Target* 10, no. 1 (January): 1-39.
- Solum, Kristina. 2017. "Translators, editors, publishers, and critics: Multiple translatorship in the public sphere". In *Textual and Contextual Voices of Translation*, edited by Cecilia Alvstad, Annjo K. Greenall, Hanne Jansen, Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov, 39-60. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing House.
- Tekgül, Duygu. 2017. "Competition and co-operation for recognition and professional esteem in the literary translation industry". *Translation Studies*, 10, no. 1 (October): 54-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781700.2016.1234971>
- Voinova, Tanya, and Miriam Shlesinger. 2013. "Translators talk about themselves, their work and their profession: the habitus of translators of Russian literature into Hebrew". *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 26, no. 2 (July): 29-57. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1037131ar>
- Vuorinen, Erkkka. 1997. "News translation as gatekeeping". In *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers of the EST Conference, Prague 1995*, edited by Mary Snell-Hornby, Zuzana Jettmarova and Klaus Kaindl, 161-171. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.20>
- Zelizer, Barbie, and Stuart Allan. 2010. *Keywords in News and Journalism Studies*. McGraw-Hill Education.