Studi di estetica, anno L, IV serie, 1/2022
ISSN 0585-4733, ISSN digitale 1825-8646, DOI 10.7413/18258646198

Francesca Iannelli, Alain Patrick Olivier

# En traduisant Hegel. Traducendo Hegel
## Aesthetic theory and/in Translation practice

Abstract
*This paper aims to investigate the intersections between Hegel's aesthetics lectures and translation theory and praxis, with reference to the French-Italian translation project Hegel Art Net. Against the background of the historical reconstruction (1) that sees Hegel repeatedly confronted with the fruition and production of translations, we intend to examine the hermeneutic (2), philological (3) and political (4) challenges that a translator of the aesthetics* Nachschriften *encounters today, following the "philological turn" of the 1990s and the publication of new sources documenting Hegel's Berlin lectures on the philosophy of art*.

Keywords
*Hegel*, *Translation*, *Aesthetics lectures*

Received: 23/01/2022
Approved: 13/02/2022
Editing by: Serena Massimo

© 2022 The Author. Open Access published under the terms of the CC-BY-4.0.
francesca.iannelli@uniroma3.it, alain.olivier@univ-nantes.fr

## Introduction

"Il y a un fleuve souterrain qui unit les cultures".
Ariane Mnouchkine
(Picon-Vallin 2014: 214)

The wind of renewal that has swept through and shaken the *Hegel-Forschung* in recent decades has called for a "re-engagement" with Hegel's philosophy in different fields and with a renewed gaze, involving a wide range of critical-philosophical perspectives. From literary criticism to feminist interpretations, from the philosophy of biology to ecological thought, from analytical philosophy to political philosophy, from philosophy of right to intercultural thought, innovative readings and attempts at rehabilitation and theoretical reconciliation with Hegel have multiplied beyond the initial prejudices and tensions. This is also the case in the growing field of philosophy of translation, which in recent years has looked with interest at a "Hegelian theory of translation", capable of enriching both the theoretical reflection and the praxis of translation, as well as the research on the interactions between philosophy and translation (Berner, Milliaressi 2011). In recent years, there has also been an ongoing interest in Hegel's fragmentary and, at times, ambiguous considerations on translation, translatability, and untranslatability (Garelli 2015; Nuzzo 2020). The debate then focused on Hegel's desire "to teach philosophy to speak German" (Hegel 1984: 107), to build a speculative philosophy engaged in the constant activity of "übersetzen" as self-reflective mediation (GW 20: 44), admitting even the universal translatability of poetry (GW 28.1: 486). Scholars have also endeavored to trace in the dialectical movement of Hegelian philosophy a rhythm conducive to productive praxis (Nardelli, Hrnjez 2020).

In what follows, we intend to address the question of translation with specific reference to Hegel's lectures on aesthetics by distinguishing different, but in some cases complementary, perspectives, including historical (1), hermeneutical (2), philological (3), and political (4). We can first consider Hegel himself as an avid reader of translations, as a theorist of a dialectical and intimately "translational" philosophy, and as a translator, as we shall see. Moreover, we must take into consideration that his "speculative thought", genuinely proceeding from the speculative dimension of the German language (GW 21: 11), is not easily translatable into another language according to its own framework. However, we cannot

simply accept this statement as a *fait accompli*, because Hegel himself practiced translation from poetry and philosophy (cf. § 1: Hegel's translating theory and practice relating to the lectures on aesthetics).

Second, with regard to translation theory, Hegel's aesthetics appears as an exemplary system of translation and as a possible inspiration for a poetics of translation that still has relevance today. To look at the translational challenges through an aesthetic magnifying glass means, first of all, to reconsider translation in a broad sense and to consider the lectures on aesthetics as a vast "treatise" on translation, in which we might locate the translative activity of spiritual content in a sensuous appearance, as well as in the language and properties of the three art forms. But this issue goes well beyond the scope of this paper and can also be considered from other parts of the system (Nardelli, Hrnjez 2020: X-XVII), if not also as an internal articulation of the encyclopedic system itself (Lejeune 2020). We will therefore focus on other specific questions, such as: is it possible to intercept a theory of translation in the *Nachschriften* of Hegel's aesthetics that provides new insights? (cf. § 2: Aesthetics and translation/Aesthetics in translation).

Our principal concern is about the relevance of a translation or re-translation of Hegel's aesthetics and its value to us now[1]. Unlike other works published by Hegel, such as the *Phenomenology of spirit* or the *Science of logic*, the aesthetics was for a long time available only in the form of a posthumous edition, assembled and published (1835-38; 1842) after Hegel's death in 1831 by one of his students, the art historian Heinrich Gustav Hotho. This edition formed, worldwide, the basis of the most prominent translations of the Hegelian aesthetics in the 19$^{th}$, 20$^{th}$, and in some cases still in the 21$^{st}$ century. Although the aesthetics holds a storied position in Hegel's system, as it represents the part that has been translated the most, these translations over the course of nearly two hundred years could be considered obsolete. An important question then arises: can we translate and re-translate Hegel in the same way over the centuries?

A new constellation has been defined since 1968 with the launch of the critical edition of Hegel's *Gesammelte Werke*. After many years of research, the Hegelian lectures on aesthetics can finally be consulted according to various manuscript sources, which document the four Berlin lectures of philosophy of art (1820/21; 1823; 1826; 1828/29). This "philological turn" has been undertaken since the 1990s by German scholars

[1] On the problematic of translation and re-translation in general, cf. Kahn 2019.

who have devoted themselves to the transcription and publiccation of the *Nachschriften*; that is, auditor's notebooks (written directly, like a *Mitschrift*, or revised later, like an *Ausarbeitung*) that document the famous Hegelian lectures. The editorial and interpretative work of Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert and Helmut Schneider at the Hegel-Archiv in Bochum and at the Fern University in Hagen initiated a significant process of renewal and revival of Hegelian studies of aesthetics worldwide, in which the authors of the present article were also actively involved. The individual manuscripts of the auditors of the four *Ästhetikvorlesungen* of 1820-21, 1823, 1826, and 1828/29 have in fact already been published separately (Hegel 1995; Hegel 1998; Hegel 2004; Hegel 2005; Hegel 2017) and then translated into various languages[2].

Many of the auditors' *Nachschriften* already published separately (e. g., Hegel 1995; Hegel 1998 or Hegel 2017) were later published a second time in the *Gesammelte Werke* (GW 28.1; GW 28.2; GW 28.3) according to transcriptions that were, in part, different or by the inclusion of comparative sources in the main manuscript, as in the case of the variants and additions taken from the Kromayer manuscript in GW 28.1. Additionally, a new source in French of Hegel's lectures on aesthetics was discovered by one of the authors of the present paper in the Bibliothèque Cousin in Paris at the beginning of the 21st century (Hegel 2005b), necessitating a reassessment of Hegel's complex relationship to the practice of translation. Consequently, from an exquisitely aesthetic point of view, is there a specificity of the text or, more precisely, of the various and heterogeneous sources related to the lectures on aesthetics with regard to Hegel's other writings, such as the *Logic*? (cf. § 3: Philological challenges of translating Hegel's aesthetics *Nachschriften* today).

With these premises in mind, there is an obligation to reconsider the translation of Hegel's aesthetics because the reference text has changed

[2] For example, the first course of 1820-21 was translated into Korean by Jeong-Hyouk Seo (2013) and into Japanese by Ishikawa Iori, Ogawa Masato and Takimoto Yuka (2017). The course of 1823 had already been translated into Italian by Paolo D'Angelo (the first edition was in 2000; the translation is now in its 11th reprint), into Hungarian by Zoltai Dénes (2004), into Korean by Jeong-Im Kwon & Don-won Han (2008a, 2018b), and into English by Robert F. Brown (2014). The 1826 aesthetics course was translated into Castilian by Domingo Hernández Sánchez (2005) and into Hungarian by Zoltai Dénes (2009). The 1828-29 course is currently being translated by the French team of Hegel Art Net. For further ongoing translations of the Berlin lectures on aesthetics, we would be grateful to translators from around the world for a notification at our institutional addresses on the Hegel Art Net web page (cf. note 4).

and also – both philologically and from a socio-cultural point of view – the times have changed, for a reader who is no longer Hegel's contemporary. This implies the emergence of ethical and political questions about how Hegel's text can be received in the 21st century in different cultural areas, in an age of globalization (and its crisis), and with new forms of politicization (cf. § 4: Translating as a political act).

In this paper we also strive to transversally address more the French and Italian linguistic areas[3], given our desire to join our theoretical reflections with a translating practice of Hegel's aesthetics lectures that are currently underway. The authors of the present paper are also coordinators, with Mildred Galland-Szymkowiak and Mario Farina, of the international network Hegel Art Net[4], founded in 2019 with the intention of establishing a French-Italian research project that envisions a translation of Hegel's aesthetics lectures into both languages according to the recently published German manuscripts of the Berlin lectures on the philosophy of art.

Against this complex and articulated background, in the following sections we will distinguish four main perspectives of our investigation, namely: 1) Hegel's theory and translation practice; 2) Aesthetics and translation/Aesthetics in translation; 3) Philological challenges of translating Hegel's aesthetics today; 4) Translating as a political act.

## 1. *Hegel's translating theory and practice relating to the lectures on aesthetics*

### a) *Hegel's theoretical interest in translation and his practical experience*

The theory and practice of translation might seem marginal in Hegel's corpus, in contrast to, say, Schleiermacher. In fact, we most often refer to the few observations on translation scattered throughout his works and *Vorlesungen*. But this marginality is also an opportunity, allowing us to approach the system from a decidedly external perspective. These considerations raise the question of our contemporary relationship to

[3] For a reconstruction of the history of translations of Hegel's aesthetics in France and Italy, cf. Iannelli, Olivier 2020.

[4] For a more detailed overview of the Hegel Art Net Project, see https://bacheca.uniroma3.it/hpat/

Hegel's philosophy and offer us the occasion to reflect on our engagement with Hegel's thought through the unique lens of translation. While this perspective may be considered negligible, it is by no means non-existent, whether it concerns the theory or practice of translation, particularly with reference to the aesthetics.

The interest in Hegel's dialectical philosophy in this regard is that it appears at a time of widespread translation efforts in German (Thomas 2011; Nebrig, Vecchiato 2019), which tend to see translation as a powerful instrument and ally of *Bildung* as a tireless dialectical construction of the proper through the extraneous (Berman 1984: 72-86). It is important to point out that there are also philosophical texts, such as those of Plato translated by Friedrich Schleiermacher, and poetic or literary texts, such as those of Homer, Aristophanes, and Virgil translated by Johann Heinrich Voss; Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis* translated by Schiller (Pinna 2019: 157-76); Aeschylus's *Agamemnon* translated by Wilhelm von Humboldt with an important preface (Humboldt 1992: 55-9); the texts of Shakespeare translated by the Schlegel brothers; the works of Cervantes and Calderon translated by Ludwig Tieck and August Wilhelm Schlegel; the tragedies of Sophocles translated by Friedrich Ast, Gottfried Fähse, Friedrich Hölderlin and Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand Solger (see Baillot 2012); the texts of Dante translated by Friedrich Schlegel, Fichte and Schelling (see Adolf-Altenberg 1958); the *Rāmāyana* translated partially by Friedrich Schlegel (1808) and by August Wilhelm Schlegel (1829); the Iberian epic *El Cid* translated by Johann Gottfried Herder and Firdusi's *Schah-Nameh* by Joseph Görres; Hafiz's *Divan* translated by Joseph Freiherr von Hammer-Purgstall and later by Goethe; and Rumi's poetry translated by Friedrich Rückert. Hegel refers to these multiple translations in his Berlin aesthetics lectures and sometimes discusses them (e.g., GW 28.2: 665). He may also mention in his *Humboldt-Rezension* (1827) Charles Wilkins' first translation (1785) and Warren Hastings' foreword of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, which he compares carefully with A. W. Schlegel's Latin translation (1823) and finally with Alexander von Humboldt's translation and interpretation, presented in two lectures at the Academy of sciences in Berlin (1826). Some elements on Indian poetry of his review of 1827 are later integrated into the lectures on aesthetics of 1828-29 (Hegel 2017: 84; GW 28.3: 1009) regarding the Indian art form in the chapter on symbolic art. In his lectures on aesthetics, Hegel then also refers to translations of scientific treatises on aesthetics such as those by Lukian and Horaz (by Wieland), Henry Home (by Meinhard), Charles Batteux (by Ramler), and Diderot (by Goethe). He also

considers translations of poetry into musical works (Hegel 2017: 181-6; GW 28.3: 1135 and 1140), mentioning Händel's translations of oratorios from English to German, and translations of operas and vaudevilles (such as translations of Gluck's operas).

However, Hegel was not only a reader, a commentator and critical interpreter of translations, he was also a translator of literary, philosophical (e.g., Plato and Aristotle, GW 10.1: 517-21) and political texts from Greek, Latin and French, often preferring in his own writings to translate the poetic work he quoted, whether written in Greek or Latin. As is well known (GW 1: 414 and 515-17), Hegel had devoted himself from a very young age to translation from ancient Greek and Latin: in 1786 he translated the *Enchiridion* by the Stoic philosopher Epictetus, Tacitus' *Agricola*, as well as the *Treatise on the sublime* by Longinus. He also translated Thucydides. Unfortunately, most of his translations have been lost. Many were the translational exercises of Sophocles' *Antigone* and *Oedipus at Colonus*. The few original quotations of Sophocles' *Antigone* in his works (for example in GW 9: 236 and 256) are a testament to this practice and remind us of that extreme translation engagement devoted, according to Rosenkranz (1844: 11-2), in particular to the tragedy that Hegel esteemed most, precisely *Antigone*. This familiarity with the Sophoclean text leads him in the *Phenomenology* to the point of touching the limits of "reformulation", due to Hegel's philosophical use of his literary source, in order to incorporate it into his own philosophical discourse[5]. This is also why it is not unexpected that the question of the translation of Sophocles remains an issue that is also discussed in the *Solger-Rezension* (GW 16: 79) and that Hegel takes a particular stance on Hölderlin's translation activity. In fact, for Schelling and Hegel, Hölderlin's translations are primarily a symptom of his mental decay, so much so that Hegel dissuaded Hölderlin's admirers from publishing these translations in the collection of works that appeared in the 1820s. Hegel also compared Hölderlin's translation to Solger's *Oedipus Rex*, considering the latter the "most admirable" (GW 16: 79), even if, probably influenced precisely by Hölderlin, Hegel attempts, with debatable outcomes, to give back not only the dialogues, but also the choruses in metric[6].

[5] On this translation metamorphosis, which should not be reduced to a "mistranslation" cf. Caramelli 2021; whereas on the philosophical significance of Antigone as an auroral figure of subjectivity, cf. Iannelli 2006.

[6] Cf. Olivier 2008: 57-8. It is likely that this unsuccessful experience also contributed to the Hegelian awareness that a full understanding of ancient metrics is unattainable, given that in ancient Greece it was intimately connected to words (Caramelli 2017:

In view of all this, it is therefore not surprising that the first writing published by Hegel in 1798 is a translation from French, namely the *Vertrauliche Briefe über das vormalige staatsrechtliche Verhältnis des Waadtlandes (Pays de Vaud) zur Stadt Bern* by Jean Jacques Cart, a girondine text whose translation had been started in Switzerland and printed anonymously by Hegel in Frankfurt (GW 2: 387-581). This political pamphlet about the French revolution, which appeared at the time of those events, is obviously of particular interest to the translator of not only French, but also Italian, insofar as it concerned a neo-Latin language.

The examination of this Hegelian translation, the comparison between the original French and the translated German text, allows us in fact to consider the way Hegel operates as a translator. We must first point out that the translation appears before the moment of his conversion to the scientific system of transcendental idealism and before his close collaboration with Schelling. Indeed, in Cart's pamphlet and in Hegel's translation, one will find very little of the speculative vocabulary that is characteristic of Hegel's main writings from the *Phenomenology of spirit* onward. For example, the term "begreifen" is used by Hegel primarily to translate "embedded", in the sense of an inclusive relation[7]. Hegel also does not strictly associate a German word with a French one. For example, the term "Stand" or "Stände" – so difficult to translate in the context of the philosophy of right, but also of the aesthetics lectures – translates equally well the French "représentants du peuple", "corps" and "états."

Accordingly, the "Hegel translator" gives evidence that a rigid consistency in translation can be pernicious and should be avoided through that struggle against the fixity of thoughts, which would later be conceptually theorized in the *Phenomenology* (GW 9: 28; cf. also Garelli 2015: 286).

### b) *Some fluctuations in Hegel's translation theory and practice*

But Hegel did not necessarily abandon the practice of translation nor the critical reflection on them after the publication of the *Phenomenology of spirit* (1807) and the *Science of logic* (1812-1816), where the theory and

559-60). It should be pointed out that the translation activity on Sophocles is not at all a scholastic exercise far removed from philosophical research, but that it takes place also at the time when Hegel's dialectic was being conceived and could also be considered as its foundation (cf. Lacoue-Labarthe 1978: 187-91).

[7] For example: "pourquoi j'y ai été compris" is translated by Hegel as "warum auch ich darunter begriffen worden bin", GW 2: 50.

practice of translation – in a narrow sense – are marginal[8]. An explicit reference to the translation as interlingual transfer is found, however, in lesser cited texts from the Hegel scholarship, which may instead contribute to our analysis. In fact, in his *Discourse to the students of the Nuremberg Ägidiengymnasium* on September 29, 1809, Hegel had been rather critical of translations, comparing them to "artificial roses" which cannot attain the "loveliness, delicacy and softness of life". The translation delivers *only* the content, not the "form" of the artwork (GW 10.1: 460). What is lost is the "musical element" of the language, "the element of intimacy" which is like the "fine fragrance" (*der feine Duft*) or "flavor" of a rhine wine. Depriving it of this musicality, the translation becomes an evaporated (*verduftet*) wine. For this reason, the masterpieces of the ancients, which appear like "golden apples in silver bowls", in order not to be indigestible, are properly savored in the original language (GW 10.1: 460) instead of being enjoyed through a "surrogate" (*Ersatz*; GW 10.1: 461).

This is obviously not to argue that Hegel considered the translating activity of literary texts superfluous. According to Clemens Brentano's curious testimony dating back to 1810, Hegel would at that time translate the *Nibelungenlied* edited by Friedrich von der Hagen into Greek for his own purposes, "to taste" this ancient German epic poem (cf. Nicolin 1970: 103). If, as Hegel suggests to his gymnasium students, Greek literature should not be translated into German, but studied in the original language, the opposite is not entirely true; an old German poem could be translated into Greek to prove its aesthetic value (probably in comparison to the greatness of Sophocles). Now beyond the fact that Hegel in Berlin will express himself with detachment on the *Nibelungenlied*[9], because "die Interessen sind längst abgeschnitten von unserem Zustande" (GW 23.2: 633), if Brentano's testimony is reliable – beyond a pinch of irony – this would imply that Hegel thinks in German, while he tastes in Greek!

Therefore, Hegel – as a teacher and director of the *Ägidiengymnasium* – criticized the reading in translation of Greek and Latin classics in order to encourage the hard learning of "the world and language of the ancients" (GW 10.1: 461-2), arguing that education (*Bildung*) requires a

[8] While a subterranean philosophical approach on translation as a self-reflective activity is significant. Cf., e.g., Sell 2002: 126-8; Marder 2020.

[9] As Terry Pinkard comments in his biography of Hegel, this episode also reveals a certain "disdain" for Germanness that had infected other intellectuals and other artists of his time, and which will reach its peak in the following decades with Wagner. See Pinkard 2000: 390-91 and also Hegel's letter to Paulus of October 9, 1814, where he speaks of "dumb teutonism" (Hegel 1984: 312).

process of alienation, a loss of security of the "own" to immerse oneself in the "foreign". This could also explain why Hegel himself was able to engage in the hermeneutic activity of translating for his own convenience. Moreover, Hegel was also well prepared for learning foreign languages since childhood, first of all thanks to his mother Maria Magdalena Louisa Fromm, an extraordinary and educated woman who spoke French and was his first teacher of Latin declensions (Rosenkranz 1844: 4; Vieweg 2019: 35-7).

Such fluctuations between a strong belief in translatability and a critical view of translation as an artificial output (expressed with the metaphor of unnatural flowers in GW 10.1: 460) return also in the Berlin period, when he seems to reconcile what to many scholars appear to be two extremes: the universal translatability of the poetic defended in the *Lectures on aesthetics* (GW 28.1: 486), as we will see[10], and the observation expressed in 1827, in the review on Alexander von Humboldt's study *Über die unter dem Namen* Bhagavad-Gītā *bekannte Episode des Mahābhārata*, previously referred to, for which not everything is translatable without altering the original *Vorstellung* because the restitution in the target language often refers to concepts that are completely missing in the original (Caramelli 2017: 549-56; Karyekar 2014). Not knowing Sanskrit, Hegel not only considered Humboldt's text of the two lectures presented at the Academy of sciences in Berlin, but also A.W. Schlegel's translation in Latin (1823), and compared it with the English translation by Charles Wilkins and Alexandre Langlois' Review in French (1824) of Schlegel's translation. Hegel discusses (GW 16: 33) the particular difficulty encountered when translating an expression like "yoga" in German, in Latin, in English or in French, since this expression refers to some spiritual content that seems to belong to Indian culture (cf. Gipper 1986; Marchignoli 2002 and 2004).

Translations, on the other hand, are in Berlin indispensable to allow him to approach Indian poetry or Chinese novels; for example, the Chinese novel *Ju-Kiao-Li, ou Les deux cousines*[11], translated into French in 1826 by the renowned sinologist Abel-Rémusat, and to provide his lectures on aesthetics with a global perspective, neither classicist nor

[10] This controversial statement, which returns even in the posthumous edition published by Hotho, has been addressed in recent years by Garelli 2015, Caramelli 2017, Farina 2019, to whom we refer for a more detailed discussion.

[11] On Hegel's interest in such a novel cf. his *Exzerpte* (GW 22: 123-26). We know that Hegel in 1827 met the sinologist in Paris during his journey to France (Olivier 2008: 199-200; Vieweg 2019: 561).

romantic, and not exclusively centered on Western art, but a reflection on the beautiful, the ideal, the no more beautiful and the ugly (cf. Iannelli 2007) that crosses all cultures and especially oriental cultures, as it appears in his theory of the symbolic artform.

In light of these considerations, the most intriguing and remarkable document from Hegel's Berlin period worthy of mention here – and considered in more detail below (II) – is the aesthetics manuscript titled *Cahier de notes de philosophie en français et en allemand/xix*$^{e}$ *s[ièc]le]* from the "Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Victor Cousin" (MSVC 90) section of the Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, which documents the second aesthetics lectures in Berlin of 1823 (Hegel 2005b). It is a document of the time, more precisely a translation from German to French carried out, if not by Hegel, at least by a Hegelian, like Leopold von Henning or Heinrich Gustav Hotho, who were in contact with Victor Cousin and should have responded to the French philosopher's wish to receive the notebooks of Hegel's lectures (cf. Nicolin 1970: 290; Hegel 1984: 631-41; Olivier 2005b: 18). Moreover, it is the first and only known translation concerning a Hegelian Berlin lecture produced during his lifetime[12]. This document, for the speculative language used in it, is also important both as a source for the reconstruction of the aesthetics lectures and as evidence of a (possible) translation practice conducted according to a Hegelian translation framework.

In this sense, such a precious document should be added to the young Hegel's translation of Jean-Jacques Cart's pamphlet from the Frankfurt period, helping to enrich a possible debate on a Hegelian theory of translation that some scholars tend to exclude (Sell 2002: 129) or to devalue, reducing the Hegelian vision of translation to a mystifying domestication of otherness (Marchignoli 2002: 102; Marchignoli 2004: 262), whereas others strive to intercept and develop even "against Hegel" (Nardelli, Hrnjez 2020: XXVII).

Let us now consider the suggestions on translation offered by Hegel's lectures on aesthetics, followed by the specific problems related to the translation activity in this valuable document from the Berlin period.

[12] We know that, as far as his published works are concerned, an "unsolicited" Latin translation of the beginning of his *Encyclopedia* was made by Jeremias Meyer, auditor of Hegel's lectures in Berlin between 1819 and 1821, who 1830 approached the master to find a publisher (Pinkard 2000: 637).

## 2) *Aesthetics and translation/Aesthetics in translation*

### a) *A theory of translation after the aesthetics* Nachschriften?

In a metaphorical sense, we have stated that the aesthetics lectures can be considered a kind of "treatise" on the translation of the spiritual into the sensible, but the focus of our investigation is more on the very possibility to glimpse a Hegelian theory of translation in the *Nachschriften* on philosophy of art. Many scholars (Garelli 2015; Caramelli 2017; Farina 2019) have reflected on some arduous passages in which Hegel explicitly addresses the translation as interlingual transfer. One of these is particularly challenging. In the published version of Hegel's aesthetics, there is the very controversial thesis of the universal translatability of poetry, which one might be tempted to interpret – with the editor Hotho, as did Berman (1984: 299) – as any literary expression that can be translated according to its content "without essential detriment to its value" ("ohne wesentliche Verkümmerung", TWA 15: 229)[13]. Language would be considered by Hegel, including in his aesthetic theory, as a mere vehicle for thought, which seems paradoxical from an aesthetic point of view. This thesis, present in Hotho's edition, seems to be confirmed in the student notebooks; in particular, in Hotho's own notebook (Gethmann-Siefert 1998: 271; GW 28.1: 486[14]) and in Victor Cousin's manuscript of 1823

[13] "Consequently, in the case of poetry proper it is a matter of indifference whether we read it or hear it read; it can even be translated into other languages without essential detriment to its value, and turned from poetry into prose, and in these cases it is related to quite different sounds from those of the original". (Hegel 1975, II: 964)

[14] In the Hotho manuscript of 1823 (in the translation of Robert F. Brown), we read the following: "The content is the representation, and the representation's externality is the sound as sign. So the sound is mere means. Sound as such, as sensible, is itself no longer the externality of the content, and externality that of course expresses itself but is not immediately present in the sensible element, for this sensible element is downgraded to a sign. [...] That is why we say that the representation itself is the element or the mode in which the substantial content becomes explicit. [...] The represented object is the material here, just as previously the material was the marble or the color or the musical sound. So spirit becomes objective to itself on its own distinctive soil; it has its objects before it as representation. Language becomes a mere means, partly the means of communication, partly the medium of the immediate externality, of the representation. In poetry the matter is no longer immediately external but instead exists in representations; for a work of poetry can be read even if translated into a different language, even with changes in the relationships of the sounds. It is all the same whether we hear a poetic work or read it. The representation

(Hegel 2005b: 131), as some scholars have already noted (e.g., Nardelli, Hrnjez 2020: 18-21). In truth, however, the context seems to be different, since the manuscripts do not confirm at all that in translation something is not lost, as Hegel had clearly stated in Nuremberg with reference to the musical element, comparing it to a perfume (GW 10.1: 460).

Let us consider the quotation in Victor Cousin's manuscript:

> Le contenu est la représentation; l'élément, le son articulé; mais celui-ci, la langue, n'est pas l'extériorité propre du contenu. Elle est accidentelle. L'élément du contenu substantiel est la représentation elle-même, comme auparavant le marbre, les couleurs. L'esprit s'objective de cette manière sur son propre territoire. *La langue n'est que le moyen; le contenu n'est plus attaché au son comme dans la musique;* nous pouvons lire un poème; une traduction donne d'autres sons, mais les mêmes représentations. (Hegel 2005b: 131, *our italics*)

Hegel's thesis does not apply in general, but only to poetry, and to poetry insofar as it is independent and detached from music; that is, from the logic of the sound. Indeed, it appears in the Hotho manuscript in the transition between the chapter on music and the chapter on poetry as such. The question of translation thus arises in the articulation between music and poetry, which is where the differentiation takes place. In music, for example, in the texts of *lieder*, opera and oratorios, the question of translation cannot be dissociated from that of rhythm, prosody, melody and form. But in poetry, it is indeed the representation that takes precedence, and therefore the content. As Mario Farina argues: to translate poetry properly, it seems to be indispensable to find the words that allow the reader "to compose that same image that the native speaker composes in the original language" (Farina 2019: 62).

The sign is considered independently of its sonic dimension and is freed from musicality, and this is how we move on to poetry, where the sign is apprehended in its relationship to representation. This setting aside of the musical and sonic dimension, of form, is the very condition of attention to content, even if it leads to a loss, contrary to what is claimed in the *Aesthetics* edited by Hotho. In this way, Hegel's position in the Berlin aesthetics lectures seems to accord with the Nuremberg Discourse of 1809. In both cases, Hegel develops a musical conception of language and translation, where the musical element appears as the life, "fine fragrance" (*der feine Duft*) and "ethereal soul" (GW 10.1: 460) of the

> is the actual element by which the matter becomes objective for us". (Hegel 2014: 407-8)

language. Not surprisingly, the German term "Duft" used in Nuremberg also returns in the last course of Aesthetics documented in the Heimann manuscript of 1828-29 (Hegel 2017: 189; GW 28.3: 1145) to assert that the "fragrance" of poetry is versification. But it is precisely this perfume that is inevitably lost in translation when, for instance, we try to imitate ancient metrics in order to reproduce them in modern languages, as Caramelli (2017: 559-60) well explains, so that today we can only grasp the content of ancient poetry, whereas the "fragrance" of the ancient is lost.

In Berlin, Hegel also considers translations of poetry into musical works, since an important part of the section on music concerns not only music as such, but also music in relation to poetry, and the musical and especially rhythmic aspects of poetry, namely prosody. Hegel argues that Latin languages offer more freedom by emancipating themselves from the constitutive iambic rhythm of English and German. Translation is considered "dangerous" because it could "suffer musical harmony" by changing the link between word and effect (Hegel 2017: 185; GW 28.3: 1140).

This question is still relevant today. One of the dilemmas for the translator is whether to consider the musicality that is present in every text, not only in musical texts, in lyrical or dramatic poetry, but also in philosophical writings; otherwise, one must argue that the dimension of musicality is inessential, that only signification matters to the translator and that attention to musicality distracts her/him from the question of signification, which alone would be important, and that translating the musical element into language would be "fatal", as Antoine Berman (2018: 80) argues[15].

We can also consider that philosophy and language, and particularly Hegel's dialectic, also proceeds from a logic of sonority, a concrete logic of the *Klang* (Olivier 2014), which determines the sequence of words, concepts, and categories and then the signification. One can consider that this dimension of language and thought is not translatable, or one can seek, on the contrary, to account for the untranslatable in the translation, to find an equivalent.

[15] "By emphasizing the latent musicality of its language, the text loses its relationship to its mother tongue. Musicality amplifies an element of this mother tongue that is destructive for the text, because it comes at the expense of the way in which it speaks and makes its meanings. 'De la musique en toutes choses' is a fatal principle for a text composed of language". (Berman 2018: 80)

b) *Logic and aesthetics: translatable or untranslatable?*

The manuscript of the Bibliothèque Victor-Cousin also raises the question of the relationship between aesthetics and the other parts of the system, and logic in particular. Is aesthetics a separate field, a domain that should be more accessible, that is easily translatable? Or is it a part of a philosophical system that has the same density of other parts of the system, in particular on the logical and conceptual level? We can ask ourselves about the "greater or lesser translatability" of some parts of the system with respect to others. Angelica Nuzzo, for instance, has reflected on the logic as the first part of the encyclopedic system as a paradigmatic case of the untranslatable from which the dialectical translation takes place (Nuzzo 2020). This would seem to be confirmed by the fact that the first translation of a Hegelian text to reach America is the so-called "Greater logic", in 1861. This was a translation by Henry Conrad Brokmeyer (1828-1906), leader of the St. Louis Hegelians, dictated to William Torrey Harris: an "unreadable" translation that no publisher wanted to publish (see Cowan 1991: 8)[16].

According to a pithy statement by Alexandre Koyré, Hegel's language is not translatable in general (Koyré 1971: 191). Nevertheless, aesthetics as a philosophy of art seems to be a paradigmatic case of the translatable. In fact, in Europe, aesthetics was one of the first parts of Hegel's philosophy to be translated or adapted and known in the 19th century (cf. Iannelli, Olivier 2020). But this may be an illusion due to the pleasantness of the edition curated by Hotho and of the translations based on this editorial "assemblage", such as the one in French by Charles Bénard. Hotho's aim was in fact to publish a work written in an elegant, smooth and fluent style, qualities that according to him were lacking to Hegel the orator, who with his resounding voice struggled during his Berlin lectures to push the German language beyond its ordinary limits, as Hotho himself in the *Vorstudien für Leben und Kunst* (1835) recounts (Hotho 2002: 258).

If, conversely, we consider the *Nachschriften* of aesthetics, including their own transcription, the scenario that unfolds before us is much more complex and challenging. The reception today of the aesthetics manuscript (1823) of the Cousin Library, bristling with speculative concepts and

[16] It is not possible here to retrace the translation history of the *Science of logic*. For an overview, see Giuspoli 2020.

saturated with logic, demonstrates this exemplarily[17]. The text is not as immediately accessible as Charles Bénard's attractive and academic French translation of the aesthetics begun in the 1840s[18], based on the no less enjoyable edition of a forging disciple like Hotho. Rosenkranz (1836) reports that for contemporaries, prior to Hotho's edition, the aesthetics seemed to be the most difficult part of Hegel's system to understand, especially because of the richness of the content and the constant references to religion and philosophy in addition to art. The "recreation effect" mentioned by Friedrich Engels in a letter to Konrad Schmidt of 1 November 1891 (see Engels 1979: 204) regarding the published *Aesthetics*, therefore, would be largely due to Hotho's "treatment". One could say that Hotho attempted to "translate" Hegel into readable German; that is, into a language other than that of the Hegelian speculation, which even today some scholars tend to prefer to Hegel's own theoretical language.

c) *The Cousin manuscript as norm?*

The Cousin manuscript is also interesting among all the transcripts of Hegel's lectures on aesthetics because this document is possibly a translation that has been produced by Hegel himself or by his students with his oversight within his lifetime. As editors, translators, or Hegel scholars we should consider this source today (even though it is curiously not the case in the *Gesammelte Wer*ke, GW 28.1). However, believing this translation to be authentic and original to the period does not necessarily mean that its translation choices should be elevated to a translational standard; first and foremost, because the 1823 course is translated into a French language that is still very much rooted in the late 18th and early 19th century, with Germanisms, and translation choices of conceptual terms that do not necessarily match the customary way to translate Hegel's writings today.

*Kunstwerk*, for example, is translated also as "ouvrage de l'art" (e.g., "ouvrages de l'architecture" in Hegel 2005b: 119) and not only "oeuvre d'art" (e.g., Hegel 2005b: 40, 76, 133). *Dasein* is "être determiné" (Hegel

[17] On the correspondence between logical and aesthetic categories cf. Olivier 2005: 20-3.

[18] Bénard published his translation in five volumes (1840, 1843, 1848, 1851, 1852) with an essay on Hegel's aesthetics as part of the 5th volume (cf. Iannelli, Olivier 2020).

2005b: 81-2; "determinated being") and not just as "existence". The verb *aufheben* is occasionally translated as "ôter" (Hegel 2005b: 69, 138; "to remove"), an original translation, which reminds us that the same crucial term of the Hegelian dialectics is in turn a translation from the Latin *tollere*; indeed it is a double translation (also from the Greek *anairein*), as Chiereghin (1996: 249) well points out. This translational fluidity of decisive terms is obviously due to the fact that there was still a lack of translational coherence; therefore, translational talent – which Caramelli (2017: 553) rightly emphasizes as indispensable *Kunstgeschick* – could express itself more freely. It would remain so for a while, as is also shown by the translation of *aufheben*, not fixed at that time and not extensively discussed, as has been the case since the end of the 20th century[19]. Even Bénard can originally translate *aufheben* with "s'absorber"[20].

The term *Begriff* is then translated in the Cousin manuscript as "notion" (Hegel 2005b: 48, 55, 56, 68, 93, 113, 141, 142), which could be surprising for a translator in the 21st century, but this was the most common translation in the 19th and 20th centuries in France. Charles Bénard and Augusto Véra – often vilified by their contemporaries – translate it in the same way, and this will still be the case with Jean Wahl. This translation is not necessarily wrong, but it may seem outdated today. According to Koyré (1971: 210-11), the translation with the term "notion" is just too abstract, while the word "concept" is preferable because it still has a perceptible relationship with "capio", "conceptus", equivalents of *greifen*. Koyré is cautious, but this usage of translating *Begriff* as "concept" has now become established. For Jean Hyppolite, instead, Wahl was right to translate it as "notion" in order to make a "revolution" against the use of the word "concept" at that time by the psychologist Théodule Ribot (Wahl 1984: 25). We know that Koyré defends the idea that Hegel's terminology is a "concrete" terminology and that the best commentary is a good historical dictionary of German (Koyré 1971: 224). It is also true that for him the French language would be too "abstract" and therefore inappropriate to translate Hegelian dialectics properly.

The example of Victor Cousin's manuscript of 1823 shows us, therefore, that it is possible to recognize inspiring suggestions for the theory

[19] Cf. Chiereghin 1996 and Büttgen 2004. How flexible *aufheben*'s translation still is in the 20th century is also evident in the English language, as is well documented in Charlston's book on Miller's translation practice, which provided for extreme "lexical variety with 44 different translations of *aufheben*". (Charlston 2018: 176)

[20] "L'idée se pose ou s'affirme, elle s'oppose ou se nie, elle s'absorbe (*aufhebt*) dans un terme supérieur qui réconcilie les deux premiers". (Bénard 1875: XXIX)

and practice of translation present in Hegel's aesthetics lectures: translation should never be too mechanical or brutally literal, but rather accurate and evocative, in accordance with that ideal profile of the translator outlined by Hegel in the *Humboldt-Rezension* of 1827 as gifted with tact, filled with culture, and talented in spirit (GW 16: 34). This profile, far from being a mere disembodied ideal, could be traced back to a concrete historical figure, or perhaps to the same recipient of the manuscript of aesthetics; that is, to Cousin himself. Therefore, it should be remembered that the figure of Cousin himself, in addition to becoming the most influential French intellectual of the time, is strongly linked to the practice of translation. Between 1820 and 1827 Cousin devoted himself to translate Proclus, while between 1822 and 1840 he translated Plato (in 12 volumes). The fourth volume of the Proclus' translation (1821) was dedicated precisely to Hegel, who in a letter to his friend in 1828 confessed to Cousin that he wished to consult his translation of Plato because he considered it a "model" of what the practice of translation should be:

> To my mind it is a model of translation. You have preserved the original precision, clarity, grace; and one reads it as a French original. You master your language by [the force of] your spirit. In your arguments as well the same originality and power of turning a phrase are found. (Hegel 1984: 665)

Hegel's high esteem for "Cousin translator" is also expressed in a draft of his letter of November 4, 1824 to Minister Baron Friedrich von Schuckmann, in which he admits: "I confess I would hardly consider myself capable" of such an exertion (Hegel 1984: 635).

Putting in synergy the translation suggestions traceable in the Cousin manuscript of 1823 with Hegel's appreciations for Cousin's translational activity[21], we evince a tendency that can still orient us today. In fact,

[21] It should be specified that in the spring of 1828 Cousin held in Paris a *Cours de l'histoire de la philosophie* of resounding success, in which he also treated the *Bhagavad-Gītā* on the basis of Schlegel's "literal" translation into Latin (1823). He did so, not knowing Sanskrit, as Hegel had also done, without, however, the scrupulous cross comparison of different translations and sources conducted by the master. Therefore, Cousin's hermeneutic approach to the translation problem has thus been considered "naïve" by the critical literature (cf. e.g., Droit 1988: 189; Marchignoli 2002: 101), even though in Hegel's laudatory letter of November 4, 1824, the German philosopher explicitly refers to Cousin's translation efforts from Greek into French (usually praised by scholars as "paradigms of exegetical thoroughness" Manns, Madden 1990: 569), and not to the 1828 lectures.

translation, understood as a combination of accuracy and talent, should always strive to be "objective," without, moreover, being "antiquarian" (see section IV of the present paper), and to be "critical" without turning into a hyper-interpretation. It should be remembered that hegelian philosophy itself invites us to fluidize the speculative and not to remain caged in a semantic protocol established once and for all (Garelli 2015: 286).

Therefore, we cannot completely follow Antoine Berman by considering that there is an essential connection between translation and commentary, which goes back to the Middle Ages and to the medieval association between philosophy and theology. In fact, for Berman "the essence of commentary [...] and translation is religious" (Berman 2018: 148) and "when critical discourse established itself as an autonomous entity, the traditional link between translation and commentary was broken" (Berman 2018: 27), or we must consider that there is also an essential connection between translation and critical instance, as well as between translation and modernity, that is at the origin of modern editions and translations.

In the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Hegel's philosophy, for instance, Wilhelm Dilthey's critical approach at the beginning of the 20th century prompted Georg Lasson's edition. Wilhelm Dilthey had in fact not only introduced in Germany a new interest for Hegel's philosophy in the academic world, but he also proposed new methods of critical interpretation and publication (Gethmann-Siefert 1976: 609). A first critical edition of Hegel's work started also with the Lasson edition, who wanted to provide a scientific edition of the lectures based on the students' manuscripts, but he mostly used the transcripts from the years 1823 and 1826, added some passages from Hotho's second edition, and introduced his own divisions and titles. He only published in 1931 the first volume of his translation, one year before his death[22]. After about 35 years, this pioneering enterprise found a new impulse with the *Gesammelte Werke* edited by the Hegel-Archiv of the Ruhr-University of Bochum after 1968. This titanic editorial effort in the context of the *Gesammelte Werke* and of the preparatory editions of Hegel's lectures (the so called *Ausgewählte Nachschriften und Manuskripte*) caused an earthquake against the "authority" of the posthumous edition of the *Aesthetics* curated by Hotho. It is therefore this same "critical" editorial tradition that allows and solicits

[22] G. W. F. Hegel, *Die Idee und das Ideal*, Leipzig, Meiner, 1931.

us to translate the Hegelian Berlin lectures with a critical-modern sensibility, free from a more "medieval", religious, and theological approaches.

## 3. *Philological challenges of translating Hegel's aesthetics* Nachschriften *today*

### a) *Choosing and establishing the texts*

Translating Hegel's aesthetics today implies, first, making an autonomous choice concerning the texts and the establishment of meaning without following the "authority" of any edition. We remain free to re-translate even the Hotho edition, if one considered it appropriate. This was, for example, the choice of Jean-Pierre Lefebvre (1995) for his French re-translation, although he would have the opportunity to translate the transcriptions of the *Nachschriften* that were about to be published[23]. But we can also choose to translate the aesthetics critically on the basis of notebooks, especially since these sources are nearly all transcribed, published and accessible[24]. This was the choice of Paolo D'Angelo in Italy[25] in 2000, just 5 years after Lefebvre's edition, which has significantly contributed to legitimizing that important "philological turn" that began with the publication of the first *Nachschrift* of aesthetics (Hegel 1995).

What might be the arguments today for a translator to choose to re-translate the classic edition? One can first argue in favor of Hotho's edition that the editor was closer, at least in spirit, to Hegel's time than the contemporary editors of the *Nachschriften* in recent decades. But this does not consider the very early phase of the reception of the aesthetics through the student notebooks that circulated in Berlin, in Germany and

[23] In volume 2 of his translation of Hegel's *Cours d'esthétique*, Lefebvre considers the publication of Ascheberg's manuscript of 1820-21 that had just taken place (1995) as a dissenting act on the part of Helmut Schneider, with respect to whom Hotho's edition seems to him the most reliable and faithful (Lefebvre 1996: 7-8).

[24] It should be noted that of some *Nachschriften*, such as those of Löwe (1826) or Rolin (1828/29), only variants have been published in GW 28.2 and 28.3, and not the manuscript in its entirety, which could be published in the future.

[25] The italian translator motivates his choice to translate Hotho's *Mitschrift* of 1823 by stating that "it is a source that cannot be ignored" (D'Angelo 2000: XV) and adding that "the edition of the aesthetics that we know is two degrees away from the original, while this transcription is only one degree away. In this sense, the *Nachschriften*, in particular this one that we present, are documents not less, but more reliable than the previously known text" (D'Angelo 2000: XVI, our translation).

in Europe, before Hotho provided the posthumous printed version between 1835 and 1838 by collecting, harmonizing, and transforming them to produce a compilation that differed in content, as well as form, from the sources. Hegel himself used his students' notebooks to set up his Berlin lectures; for instance, Leopold von Henning's notebook of the 1820-1821 aesthetics lecture to prepare the 1823 lecture. The translator who still chooses to translate the posthumous edition may do so comforted by the fact that Hotho was privileged to have access to Hegel's two lost notebooks (*Hefte*) from Heidelberg and Berlin, but in truth the weakness of this argument is evident, since Hotho himself also admitted that Hegel's notebooks would not have been sufficient to complete the edition (Hegel 1967: 11; Gethmann-Siefert 1991: 94). That Hotho's edition was not criticized by contemporaries, but on the contrary was highly appreciated, is subordinate to Rosenkranz's review (1836: 19-20) and to the circumstance that he alone had access to the sources for several years.

Contrary to Lefebvre's misunderstanding[26], each course was conceived by Hegel to be taken by his students only once. Although Hegel evolved and developed the content and structure of his aesthetics course, the four lectures he taught in Berlin between 1820 and 1829 represent a sort of "rerun" of the same teaching, not its continuation. As a result, the editor or translator may certainly find it sufficient to focus on one of his formulations in a particular semester or may decide to publish/translate all four courses in order to map and track each of Hegel's subtle changes, revisions, and additions. In this regard, one may choose to translate only one *Nachschrift*, as the French team of Hegel Art Net decided to do, relying on the 1828-29 course. Conversely, the choice of the Italian team of Hegel Art Net was to translate all four courses, which meant publishing the aesthetics lectures in several volumes following the *Gesammelte Werke*.

It is certainly valuable to translate at least one manuscript for each year of the course for the sake of completeness. The lectures on aesthetics are in fact a work in progress (Gethmann-Siefert 1998: XLIX), which also considers the artistic, cultural, and scientific events of the moment. The translation of four lectures thus offers material comparable in scope to Hotho's posthumous edition, yet without being an embellished compilation or reformulation. However, when one considers that

[26] "Il est fréquent que des étudiants suivent ces cours plusieurs semestres de suite" [...] "Hegel lui-même considérait cette durée comme nécessaire" (Lefebvre 1995: XIV).

the content from one semester to the next is largely repeated by Hegel, albeit with significant additions and variations, and that the succession of courses is not designed to be attended by students as a continuation from one year to the next, it is not even indispensable to translate the entirety of the different years of the course, but rather it is a free hermeneutic choice.

The translator must in fact interpret, establish the text, compare sources, and decide which version to translate. This question of text definition continues to be raised today, as the *Gesammelte Werke* does not necessarily bring the work of publishing the *Nachschriften* to its ultimate end. Moreover, this edition is not finished at the time of this writing, as the long-awaited volume GW 28.4, which should account for the choices made, the critical apparatus and the notes, is still missing. Nonetheless, there may still be relevant issues. For example, we do not know which sources Johann Carl Kromayer refers to in his manuscript when he documents long passages (such as GW 28.1: 369-73) that are absent from Hotho's 1823 notebook[27]. In addition, some words of Hotho's manuscripts are transcribed in the GW very differently compared to the preparatory edition of the so called *Ausgewählte Nachschriften und Manuskripte*, leading to discrepancies in the German text[28]. Therefore, the publication of the latest critical edition of the *Gesammelte Werke* does not erase the previous editions, as the curators also make hermeneutical choices and readings that can and should be discussed. Thus, for the introductory definition of aesthetics in the course of 1828-29 (Hegel 2017: 3), Olivier (co-author of the present text) and Gethmann-Siefert read that aesthetics is the "expression of the beautiful and the art of the same" ("Ausdruck der Schönheit und der Kunst derselben"), while Walter Jaeschke and Niklas Hebing (GW 28.3: 909) transcribe that it is the art of the ancients ("Kunst der alten").

[27] The Kromayer manuscript is considered by the editor Niklas Hebing (2015: 137) as a valuable source from 1823 that would document entire hours of lessons missed by Hotho or passages that he, for a variety of reasons, would not transcribe (Hebing 2015: 141). But, as also admitted by Hebing himself, it is very likely that the manuscript was put in good copy (and, also, revised) by Kromayer after 1823 (until 1847), as evidenced for example by reference (GW 28.1: 371) to a "geistreicher Mann" who is most probably Karl Friedrich von Rumohr (Collenberg 2016: 218) and to his most renowned work *Italienische Forschungen* of 1827-31. The reader is thus confronted with a Kromayer "addition" that is most certainly later than the Hotho manuscript of 1823.

[28] Cf., for example, the long list of differently transcribed terms given by Niklas Hebing (2015: 142), which are presented as corrections of reading mistakes made by the previous transcriber, namely Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert.

The translator is thus urged to at least point out if not make a choice between these different possibilities, participating in the constitution of the text itself, if s/he does not choose to rely passively on one or the other edition. If certain passages of the *Nachschriften* continue to present philological challenges for the editors of the German text, the translators should return to consult the original manuscripts themselves.

b) *The uncertainty of signification*

This complexity in establishing meaning not only concerns the transcribing activity of the manuscripts, but also, of course, their translation and hermeneutic interpretation. In this sense, it may be valuable to recall Koyré's claim that Hegel's language is not only untranslatable, it is also unintelligible, even for a German (Koyré 1971: 191). He reiterates Haering's hypothesis (the "secret de Polichinelle") that none of Hegel's interpreters has been able to explain word for word a single page of his writings (Koyré 1971: 191-92). The translator must therefore take a position in one way or another on the meaning of the text in her/his translation activity, on the translatability of untranslatability, on the intelligibility or non-intelligibility of the text.

To resolve the question of meaning, the translator can be pressured into an exercise of comparing with other sources available for the same semester, as well as with sources for other semesters of the lectures, and finally referring to Hotho's edition, where the meaning is more transparent, although one is never sure if it is not rather Hotho's (mis)interpretation, than Hegel's thought itself. There are, however, passages for which equivalents are not found in other sources, and which incite one to search for resonances in other main writings or other texts on aesthetics, or even in the complex constellation of the history of Hegelian translations[29]. In all cases, the task of the translator is not to refer to a single "sacred" text, but to a protean web of texts, manuscripts, editions, translation and re-translations. The feeling will be that of grappling with a cat's cradle: nowhere in Hegel's work – and perhaps nowhere in the corpus of

[29] In the case of the history of Hegelian French translations, it is a question of referring to Bénard, Jankélévitch and Lefebvre, while in the case of the history of Hegelian Italian translations, the translations of Novelli (1863), Merkel, Vaccaro (1963), Valagussa (2012) will be taken into consideration, while D'Angelo's translation (2000), based on Hotho's *Nachschrift* of 1823, may be, for some translation choices, revised in light of the new publishing situation (cf. Iannelli, Olivier 2020).

philosophical works – will one in fact find a text less unitary, more heterogeneous, controversial and rebellious than Hegel's aesthetics, which the philosopher never wrote. On the threshold of the "philological turn" of the 1990s, Gethmann-Siefert (1991: 92) could therefore rightly describe the critical edition of the lectures in aesthetics as a bratty child (*Sorgenkind*) that would drive the editors/parents mad!

This helps to explain why, in some cases, the translator becomes an explorer or an investigator who is urged to reveal some terms that have gone unnoticed in previous translations and that have received more attention in other contexts. This is the case of the term *Materiatur*, a word that Hegel uses in the Nuremberg Discourse of 1809 (GW 10.1: 460), in the *Logic* (GW 12: 197) and that returns in many of his Berlin *Vorlesungen* – from that of *History of philosophy* of 1820-21 (GW 30.1: 298) to that of *Philosophy of nature* (GW 24.1: 628 and 659; GW 24.2: 892 and 1047; GW 24.3: 1308-9, 1375 and 1420) and *Philosophy of the subjective spirit* of 1827/28 (GW 25.2: 816) – that should be rediscovered. This term, which goes back to Vitruvius, went unnoticed in general in the *Hegel-Forschung* and particularly among Hegel scholars of aesthetics, but it has resonated in the *Marx-Forschung* (see Bellofiore 2014: 179). A translator must therefore also be sensitive to a possible hermeneutic "retroactive" effect, an ontological enhancement and unfolding of latent meanings that can emerge in the history of translations of an author or others who take him up in a more or less evident (dis)continuity (as Garelli 2015: 295 proposes with reference to Gadamer). The term *Materiatur* is also used by Hegel in the aesthetics lectures (cf. GW 28.1: 235-236 and the variant from Rolin in GW 28.3: 957), but it has often been obscured in earlier Hegelian translations[30], whereas it also returns in Bruno Bauer's *De pulchri principiis* (Bauer 2018: 85b) and Marx's *Capital* (MEGA 2, II/10: 54). The translator then, as exegete, can intuit the existence of an unexplored constellation and reveal it, as it occurred in our Hegel Art Net team[31].

[30] For example, at the passage corresponding to GW 28.1: 235-236 in the Cousin manuscript, the German word *Materiatur* is translated with "matière" (Hegel 2005b: 44), as well as in Paolo D'Angelo translation of Hotho's *Mitschrift*, where it is translated as "materialità" (Hegel 2000: 22). In the translation of the first Nuremberg Discourse of 1809 in Italian (Hegel 1993: 49), the term is given with "materiale sensibile", whereas in the *Science of Logic* in Italian, *Materiatur* is translated as "materia" (Hegel 1988, II: 887).

[31] Special thanks are due to Gabriele Schimmenti for focusing on this term within the Hegel Art Net team and pointing out its presence in the post-Hegelian aesthetic and

c) *Three registers of conceptuality and the musicality of the text*

Thus, although the aesthetics in its edited version has often been able to open in a "friendly" way the door to Hegel's complex system, the need to translate and re-translate it – even this part of the system, as the *Nachschriften* show well – does not conceal surprises, shadows and translation challenges. One wonders therefore: is there a conceptual specificity of the aesthetic lectures? One of the difficulties is posed by the very nature of the terms or concepts to be translated. In the aesthetics lectures, the philosophical language is indeed rigorous; we find there speculative and metaphysical concepts, as well as the logical structure transposed from the *Wissenschaft der Logik*, as is well evident in Cousin's manuscript. But we must also distinguish between different linguistic levels and make room for the theoretical-scientific language of the individual aesthetic doctrines, literary language, and the terminology of the individual arts, from architecture to sculpture, from painting to music and to poetry. Then there are concepts, such as the category (still) queen of the aesthetics of the time, that is beauty, which are discussed from the contemporary aesthetic-philosophical debate, not only from the point of view of Kant's transcendental philosophy, but also from the works of Winckelmann, Hirt, Goethe and Rumohr. Such changes in register only make the translation more complex. The specific difficulty of Hegel's aesthetics is that at least three types of conceptuality are permanently distinguished and equally intertwined: the logical and speculative conceptuality that is proper to the Hegelian system; the conceptuality that is typical of the field of aesthetics and the history of the arts; and everyday language, with its concrete abundance of meanings that cannot be reduced to mere logical definitions.

The whole system is reflected in aesthetics, and a logical justification runs through and endorses the artwork (Farina 2017). In the aesthetic lectures we thus find the terminology of the whole system. To this is added the use of terms in common use at the time of Hegel, for us frequently obsolete. We are also confronted with an extreme richness, not, however, due to a language that wants to be specialized, incomprehensible, and exclusionary, but, on the contrary, one that is too exuberant, because "Hegel's concepts are linguistically embodied, residing in the

philosophical-economic debate. In this sense, for a broader contextualization on post-Hegelian aesthetics, see Schimmenti 2021 and his entry on the Young Hegelian Aesthetics in the ILAe (Schimmenti 2019).

living organism of the language, so that rather than being abstract and expressionless, they express too much, putting in relation different and often opposite meanings and semantic allusions" (Nardelli, Hrnjez 2020: VI).

Depending on the translator's choices, one establishes a continuity between the text of the aesthetics lectures and Hegel's other writings; or conversely, with other aesthetic conceptions, particularly the aesthetic theories of his time. One may even consider its continuity with ordinary language, whose speculative potentialities are highlighted as Hegel himself admits in the preface to the second edition of the *Science of logic* (1831), when he stated that philosophy does not need to create a specific terminology (GW 21: 11). In terms of form, it means taking into account the concrete dimension of language and the dialectical process, the relationship to "calembours," the use of metaphors, puns, popular etymologies, referred to by Koyré (1971: 212), as well as the association to concrete language in relation to the speculative one. There is an unstable balance of meanings; concepts cannot be frozen into identities of understanding, into close correspondences, otherwise they lose much of their life. The concrete logic of Hegel's use of words or concepts such as "Äusserung", "Entäusserung", but even more so of "Wesen" or "Schein," also moves from the abstract to the concrete register. Above all, we observe that the meaning of the concepts varies and that the categories are immersed in a flow. Meaning is not imposed from the beginning. It is therefore difficult to establish a table of categories (much more so in Aesthetics than in *Logic*), and one must often limit oneself to establishing the *Grundbedeutung* of a term. The regime of understanding is thus constantly put to the test.

The text possesses its form, and the translation may or may not reflect it; it may challenge it in its inability to systematically match German and French or Italian terms, or to distinguish rigorously between abstract and concrete terms, technical and ordinary terms. To reduce to logical definitions is to reduce the philosophical imagination that is at play in its production of meaning and conceptuality. To erase the logical and technical dimensions is to eliminate the harmonics of the text. In fact, as stated by Reid (2007: 85-95) and Di Giovanni (2020: 253): "Unlike most of his contemporaries in philosophy, Hegel's imagery is musical rather than spatial." This has important consequences for a translator, who cannot disregard the musicality of a text, even a philosophical one, when the formation of meaning itself lies in this dialectical, musical logic of words and their sounds.

## 4. *Translating as a political act*

### a) *German language and Latin languages: "domestication" or "foreignization"?*

The activity of translation implies taking a position with respect to Hegel's writings and lectures and to his philosophy both from a content and a formal point of view, in the very use of language. In fact, translating Hegel already means to operate a transformation due to the very fact of having to "extract" his thought from its organic and vital bond with the German language, which he himself claims as the condition of the speculative dimension of his thought. We have seen that Koyré (1971: 191) poses the problem of a translation from a concrete language such as German to a more abstract one, as in the case of a Latin language such as French. This transition could be seen as a deficit or, on the contrary, as a valuable contribution of the activity of translation. That is, one can consider the enterprise of "de-Germanization" as an opportunity to make Hegelian philosophy more acceptable and readable, paradoxically for the German reader himself. In this sense, the purpose of the translation would be to latinize and thus "clarify" German philosophy. This translation tendency is still very present in the choices that Charles Bénard proposes in the presentation of his translation of the aesthetics. In fact, he tries to reduce everything that could appear as "Germanic strangeness" in the translation, as he declares: "Nous le disons sans détour: c'est en français et pour des Français que nous avons voulu écrire" (Bénard 1875: II). The Hegelian language is then for other translators like an idiom in itself – which, for example, Lefebvre calls "le hégélien" – and which produces a strong estrangement in German as in Latin languages. It is precisely this specific Hegelian language that Hotho tries to rewrite in a more pleasant and elegant style in his editorial work that flows into the published *Aesthetics* (1835-38; 1842).

To return to the *Nachschriften* implies then, in many cases, to return to the very speculative language of the master, which the manuscripts preserve in their harshness, making us still hear echoing in the background the voice, perhaps inelegant but certainly potent, of Hegel. The often-syncopated sentences preserved in the manuscripts take us back in fact, as translators and readers, to those Berlin halls where Hegel, with a Swabian accent, was in a permanent struggle with the German language to shape the words to the thing itself (*Sache selbst*). As Alexander Jung masterfully recalls in his *Vorlesungen über die moderne*

*Literatur der Deutschen* of 1842: "One might think, listening to him, that no language yet exists, but that he is creating it right now, thinking. His thinking is speaking and vice versa. Everything is being born right now" (Nicolin 1970: 557, our translation). In fact, Hegel was against the creation of a specific, hyper-technical vocabulary, since the ambitious task of philosophy was to identify, not without travail, in the language of everyday life, expressions and words with speculative potential and to enhance them (GW 21: 11).

The challenge of translating the aesthetics *Nachschriften* today is then also an opportunity to make the target language evolve, to put it to the test of the travails of the negative, of a vital dialectical thought, and to do so – instead of having to "soften" too much the harshness of a speculative language – one can even, in some cases, choose to go the way of Germanization, with the risk of barbarism. This is the very conception of translation that took hold in Germany in the early 19th century, in opposition to the French use of translation in the 18th century, which aimed at "adapting" the original language to the characteristics of the target language (Thomas 2011: 149-50). It is worth mentioning the words of Heinrich Heine, himself an auditor of Hegel's aesthetics lectures in Berlin, in his introduction to the French translation (1834) of his *Reise-bilder*: "Selon mon avis, je ne crois pas qu'on doive traduire le sauvage allemand en français apprivoisé, et je me présente ici moi-même dans ma barbarie native" (Heine 1973: 350).

However, this passionate approach to language defended by Heine cannot be too radical and must be counterbalanced in some way. It may be useful in this sense to recall that even among Italian Hegelians in the second half of the 19th century there was no lack of reflections on the translation route to be taken. If, for example, Antonio Labriola criticized the transnational ambition of Hegelianism in Naples and hoped for a translation capable of adapting first of all to the target country (i.e., to the culture to which the translation is addressed), because "the weapons and modes of criticism must, from country to country, undergo the law of variability and adaptation" (Labriola 1976, II: 698; our translation), in our days of globalization, of increasingly multicultural societies, a translation must strive to transcend national boundaries and open itself to the confrontation with difference. This certainly means coming to terms with different themes and translation traditions, without falling into the extreme of "domestication" practiced by Bénard and urged by Labriola, but neither into the opposite; that is, into the "barbaric" and extreme "estrangement" advocated by Heine. In this sense, the translator must

find a balance between domestic "adaptation" and "foreignization", between softening and hardening of the translated text as our Hegel Art Net strived to do by collectively and chorally responding to the most ambitious translation challenges raised by the less peaceful and more speculative terms (cf. e.g. Battistoni 2020).

b) *Feminism and decolonialism*

Furthermore, the translator must make ethical or political choices, taking into consideration that s/he is dealing with a text from the 19th century, which s/he has to translate into a 21st century language. But the audience of the 21st century is not that of Hegel and his students. We must translate Hegel today in an era marked by an awareness of the urgent need to eliminate all forms of discrimination. The readers of today are not the *Zuhörer* who were attending Hegel's lectures at the Berlin University. They were at that time exclusively men, mostly Christian, Christian converts, and white, even though there were also foreign students (e.g., the Belgian Hyppolite Rolin or the Pole Karol Libelt) and students from Jewish families (like Adolf Heimann and Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy). Not even a woman was among the listeners of Hegel's lectures, who in fact used to begin his courses by greeting his listeners with "Meine Herren"[32], as will also be done a few years later by a Hegelian like Vischer (Schlaffer, Mende 1987: 28 and 85-6), even if there were women in the audience listening to him with interest and who used to leave poems and flowers on his lectures desk[33]!

Today, the text of the aesthetics lectures is obviously addressed to women, ethnic minority groups and to the LGBTQ+ community as well[34].

[32] This greeting is also attested, for example, by the Hotho edition (1835: 3) which, however, except for Bénard, no subsequent French translator (like Jankélévitch and Lefebvre) has translated; whereas in Italy it returns in the Merkel, Vaccaro edition ("Signori", Hegel 1963: 5), but not in the Valagussa edition (2012).

[33] The fact that among the listeners of his lectures on German literature in Tübingen there were women was perceived by F. Th. Vischer himself in 1843 as a rather bizarre situation, so much so that he sent his friend Heinrich Kern a humorous sketch in which he portrayed himself standing on the podium with a female listener writing without looking up from the paper, as if to reiterate a sharp asymmetry between genders (Schlaffer, Mende 1987: 86).

[34] In this regard it must be mentioned that obviously Hegel is quoting in his lectures famous representatives of "Greek love" of the past and present and in some respects, like Goethe and many others, he may have contributed to divulge Winckelmann's

The readers can be Muslim, Buddhist, Taoist, atheist, agnostic, or anything else. It is disseminated in a written, static form and not in the form of a teaching that allows for debates. The transition from oral to handwritten form and then to printed book form can itself be an expression of "translation" in the broadest sense. Moreover, Hegel's philosophy is marked by features specific to his time which may seem conservative and disorienting today (cf. e.g., Habib 2019). Therefore, the choice that a translator makes of the most appropriate terms may vary depending on whether one considers Hegel's text as a historical document, distant from us, a thing of the past, which one considers scientificcally, or, on the contrary, if one seeks to make Hegel's text immediately readable for the contemporary reader, as if it had just come out of the printing press, which would then presuppose adaptations to make it ethically and politically acceptable.

In the last decades, also thanks to the diffusion of particular forms of translation studies such as "feminist translation", there has been a growing awareness of the role of translators as "mediators" of an inclusive language capable of negotiating gender power relations (Castro, Ergun 2018). In this sense, a team of translators – like the Hegel Art Net – in which gender difference is respected, is more aware of the difficulties due to a text that may take on patriarchal, sexist, discriminatory, or misogynistic overtones in some cases[35], which for this reason will not be "purged", but critically evaluated.

Moreover, in recent years, there has been an attempt to take stock not only of the comparison between feminism and idealism (Bauer, Hutchings, Pulkinnen, Stone 2010; Blunden 2019; Vuillerod 2020), but also of the question of the role played by some female figures in Hegel's life and philosophy in general (Habib 2019: 290-301; Iannelli 2021; Rózsa 2021). From this debate, instead of reiterating Hegel's sexism, as was the tendency in early feminism (e.g., with Carla Lonzi), an evident emancipatory potential of some paradigms of Hegelian philosophy, such as the highly debated notion of recognition, emerged, among which it is hoped that, in the future, the Hegelian "theory and practice of translation" as a dialectical exercise of openness to otherness will be enhanced.

homoerotic or androgynous aesthetic sensibility with respect to classical art. This will lead to the clearance of the taste for "queer beauty" that from the 19th century comes down to us (on "queer" beauty, cf. Davis 2010; on Hegel's remarkable acknowledgement of Winckelmann's aesthetics, cf. Iannelli 2019).

[35] Such as Miller's re-translations, see Charlston 2018: 210.

In such a reconstruction, the *Nachschriften* of aesthetics themselves might offer insights into the Hegelian constellation of the feminine. Some of Hegel's acknowledgements of the talent of famous women in the Europe of his time, such as the Italian opera singers Gentile Borgondio (1780-1830) and Angelica Catalani (1780-1849), who performed in Berlin, are expressed during the 1820-21 lecture (GW 28.1: 181 and 163; cf. Olivier 2003: 68-72). Hotho did not consider these female references for his posthumous edition, potentially contributing to the reputation of a sexist Hegel, as his edition does not mention any living women. On the contrary, the philosopher's biography shows that there were social and intellectual interactions with talented and progressive women of his time, not only with opera singers, but also with the novelist Caroline Paulus or Meta Dorothea Forkel-Liebeskind, Volney's translator (Sanman 2019; Habib 2019: 292-4; Vieweg 2019: 320).

To return from the Hegelian constellation of the feminine to our experience of translative activity in Hegel Art Net as an inclusive practice, we first took care not to flatten the translation of *Mensch* on the term "uomo"/"homme", but rather to extend it to "essere umano"/"être humain". In fact, it can be argued that the term *Mensch* as well as "homme" in French or "uomo" in Italian, does not necessarily and exclusively refer to the masculine, but to the generic being, the ἀνθρωπος; as the concept of "homme" in the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* can be considered as the generic being, although, in a more Marxist perspective, can be referred more exclusively to the "bourgeois" and in a feminist perspective to the masculine, since the active citizens during the French revolution were not primarily women. On the other hand, in Hegel's lectures on aesthetics, "der Mensch" refers not only to men such as Ulysses, Orestes, and Macbeth, but also to women such as Antigone, Juliet, and Miranda, and thus in consideration of this gender difference it should be translated as "human being".

An additional question is how to deal with *Umworten*? That is, how to translate those words that did not have a pejorative or discriminatory meaning, but which acquired it over the centuries? The German word *Neger*, for example, currently has an explicitly racist meaning, but in the past it could have a neutral or even ideal connotation in literature, for example in the Abbé Grégoire (1808) in the early 19$^{th}$ century. However, this is no longer the case, and it is not certain that it was for Hegel either (cf. Tavarès 1993 and Buck-Morss 2009). For Jean-Paul Sartre (in the *Black Orpheus*, 1948) and others in the 20$^{th}$ century, there is the possibility that the injurious word can be proudly reappropriated and that a positivized

blackness can express "the divine, the strong, the beautiful, and the sublime" (Bailey 2014: 47), but this is only possible through a dialectical reversal.

With these considerations in mind, even if the translation team does not feel the need to justify a term that had no discriminatory value in Hegel's time, to use it in Italian or in French in a contemporary translation without any comment by the curators would have unwelcome consequences. First, young readers might be unaware that the term had no such racist resonance in Hegel's time. Second, non-specialized scholars could easily conclude that Hegel was a racist and take the use of the term *Neger* as evidence of this. Instead, as Hegel scholars we know that the debate over an alleged Hegelian racism or his Eurocentrism is still being accessed and that one must move extremely cautiously[36]. The debate is quite heterogeneous and fiery and oscillates between stereotypes and blame, legitimization and condemnation.

What choices does the translator have if s/he does not want to fall into the extreme of a cancel culture that claims to "rewrite", "sweeten" and "improve" the classics, but who does not want to preserve the passive respect for authorship and for the past either? Even if it is not easy to assume a proper position of transcultural hermeneutics, one must at least avoid ignoring a translation problem altogether in an indifference to or exasperation of the present, as well as an indifference to the past. Translating today with an anti-discriminatory spirit should not mean flattening differences or clearing all textual shadows, but rather contextualizing and dealing with contemporary uncomfortable words by welcoming them into the text, albeit critically, without considering them "harmless" because they belong to a past in which they had a different, more neutral, value.

### c) *Anachronistic actualization or antiquarian historicization?*

In our increasingly globalized and interdependent world, translation has been considered the best "metaphor" describing the hyperconnections

[36] The issue is quite broad to be addressed within the scope of this paper. For a general contextualization, cf. Bonetto 2006. See also, for example, the two rather polarized views on Hegel's conception of Africa by Sarhan Dhouib (2020: 548) and Klaus Vieweg (2020). Cf. also the controversy between Zander (2021) and James, Knappik (2021) on the prae|faktisch blog.

of our time (Guldin 2016). However, translating can signify making very different methodological and philosophical choices. In general, there are in fact two extreme positions for a translator. One is the radical actualization of a text by giving voice to the cultural trends and socio-political orientations of one's time. We could exemplify this first tendency by recalling Alain Badiou's (2013) "hyper-translation" of Plato's *Republic* by adapting it with the addition of a female character named Amantha in the dialogue who in truth has no correspondence in the original, and changing all the passages that would not correspond to the conception that the translator could assume as a philosopher today, thus violating the principle of a neutrality of translation. In a certain sense, this is what Goethe did by adapting Euripides to the sensibility and taste of the Weimar theater, and Hegel himself justifies this adaptation in his lectures on aesthetics (GW 28.1: 48 and 308; Hegel 1998: 101; Hegel 2017: 60; GW 28.3: 977). Goethe is in fact no longer addressing a Greek audience, but a modern German Christian audience; the sacrifice of Iphigenia no longer has the same meaning in ancient Greece as it does in enlightenment Germany.

This extremely actualizing approach to the original is, in general, criticized by Friedrich Schleiermacher[37] in his essay *Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens* of 1813, for whom one ends up losing the anchoring to the historical context (Schleiermacher 1992: 49-50), as Friedrich Ast did in translating Plato, as if he were an idealist philosopher (cf. Schleiermacher 1802; Thomas 2011: 159). Conversely, one can aspire to the presentation of a philologically impeccable text that strives to extract from the present in order to give voice solely to the past. These are clearly two excesses. Keeping in mind what Beiser (2008: 7), in another context, has effectively defined a "dilemma" between anachronism (imposing the present over the past) and antiquarianism (imposing the past over the present), Hegel Art Net seeks also to avoid falling into the two extremes of excessive actualization that forces the text onto the

[37] Schleiermacher's reflections on the incommensurability between the original and the translation constitute a significant stage in the history of translation. Up to that moment, there was a great amount of translational freedom, an abundance of so-called "belles infidèles" translations. Until the beginning of the 19th century, there was in fact no strict distinction between *imitatio auctorum*, adaptation and translation (Nebrig, Vecchiato 2019: 1). Beyond that, it should be highlighted, moreover, that it was not until the course of the 19th century – precisely between 1840 and 1886 (see Nebrig 2019: 45) – that translation rights were also legally defined, putting an end to the freedom of translation still typical of the 18th and early 19th century.

present, but also an excessive antiquarian respect, admitting instead the vitality and the fluidity of the Hegelian language, of its translation, of its re-translation and of its reception, even after the historical Hegel, whom a translator cannot ignore. Translating or re-translating Hegel's aesthetics today, in a rather critical global scenario for philosophy and *Bildung,* is thus undoubtedly a hermeneutic challenge, a valuable transformative and self-transformative practice and, at the same time, an attempt to avoid the dangers of an overly "subjective," anachronistic and eccentric translation, as well as a gesture of resistance against the illusion of a totally "objective" and an antiquarian one.

Closing with Antonio Gramsci, who in turn takes up and reformulates a metaphor of Benedetto Croce's *Aesthetics*:

> Il vocabolario è un museo di cadaveri imbalsamati, il linguaggio è l'intuizione vitale che a questi cadaveri dà nuova forma, nuova vita in quanto crea nuovi rapporti, nuovi periodi nei quali le singole parole riacquistano un significato proprio e attuale. (Gramsci 1917)[38]

Bibliography

1. Abbreviations

GW = Hegel, G. W. F., *Gesammelte Werke*, in Verbindung mit der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft, hrsg. Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Hamburg, Meiner, 1968 ff.

MEGA2 = Marx, K., Engels, F., *Gesamtausgabe*, on behalf of the Internationale Marx Engels Stiftung (IMES), 1990 to 2012: Akademie, Berlin; from 2013 ongoing: De Gruyter, Berlin-Boston.

TWA= Hegel, G. W. F., *Theorie Werkausgabe*, Werke in zwanzig Bänden, Auf der Grundlage der Werke von 1832-1845 neu edierte Ausgabe, E. Moldenhauer, K.M. Michel (hrsg.), Frankfurt a. M., Suhrkamp, 1968 ff.

2. References

Achella, S., Dhouib, S., *An unexpected dialogue. A conversation with Sarhan Dhouib*, "Estetica. Studi e Ricerche", n. 2 (2020) (*Hegel. So Far so Close*, ed. by S. Achella), pp. 525-54.

[38] "Vocabulary is a museum of embalmed cadavers, language is the vital intuition that gives these cadavers new form, new life in that it creates new connections, new periods in which individual words regain their own current meaning" (our translation).

Adolf Altenberg, G., *La figura di Dante nei paesi germanici*, "Aevum", n. 5-6 (1958), pp. 517-36.

Badiou, A., *La république de Platon. Dialogue en un prologue, seize chapitres et un épilogue*, Paris, Fayard, 2012 (Engl. transl. S. Spitzer, *Plato's republic: a dialogue in 16 chapters*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2013).

Bailey, J., *Philosophy and hip-hop. Ruminations on postmodern cultural form*, New York, Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.

Baillot, A., *Antigone est-elle weimarienne?*, in S. Humbert-Mougin, C. Lechevalier (eds.), *Le théâtre antique entre France et Allemagne (XIX^e^-XX^e^ siècles): de la traduction à la mise en scène*, Tours, Presses universitaires François-Rabelais, 2012, pp. 25-43.

Banoun, B., *Traduire une traduction?* Antigonä des Sophokles *de Hölderlin, texte français de Ph. Lacoue-Labarthe*, in S. Humbert-Mougin, C. Lechevalier (eds.), *Le théâtre antique entre France et Allemagne (XIX^e^-XX^e^ siècles): de la traduction à la mise en scène*, Tours, Presses universitaires François-Rabelais, 2012, pp. 159-82.

Battistoni, G., *La polivocità di Schuld nella moralità hegeliana: un contributo agli studi sulla traduzione di un concetto portante della filosofia hegeliana dell'azione*, "Teoria", n. XL/2 (2020), pp. 209-20.

Bauer, B., *Sui principi del bello*, a cura di D. Moggach, G. Schimmenti, Palermo, Palermo University Press, 2018.

Bauer, N., Hutchings, K., Pulkkinen, T., Stone, A., *Debating Hegel's legacy for contemporary feminist politics*, in K. Hutchings, T. Pulkkinen (eds.), *Hegel's philosophy and feminist thought. Beyond Antigone*?, New York, Palgrave, 2010, pp. 233-52.

Beiser, F. C., *The puzzling Hegel renaissance*, in F. C. Beiser (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Hegel and nineteenth-century philosophy,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 1-14.

Bénard, C. M., *Préface du traducteur*, in G. F. W. Hegel, *Esthétique*, vol. 1, Paris, Librairie Germer-Baillère, 1875[2].

Berman, A., *L'Épreuve de l'étranger. Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique: Herder, Goethe, Schlegel, Novalis, Humboldt, Schleiermacher, Hölderlin*, Paris, Gallimard, 1984.

Berman, A., Berman, I., Sommella V., *L'âge de la traduction: "La tache du traducteur" de Walter Benjamin, un commentaire*, Paris, Presses universitaires de Vincennes, 2008 (Engl. transl., and with an introduction, by C. Wright, *The age of translation. A commentary on Walter Benjamin's "The task of the translator"*, London, Routledge, 2018).

Bellofiore, R., *Lost in translation: once again on the Marx-Hegel connection*, in F. Moseley, T. Smith (eds.), *Marx's capital and Hegel's logic. A reexamination*, Berlin-Boston, Brill, 2014, pp. 164-88.

Berner, C., Milliaressi, T. (éds), *La traduction: philosophie et traduction. Interpréter/traduire*, Villeneuve-d'Ascq, Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 2011.

Blunden, A., *Hegel for social movements*, Berlin-Boston, Brill, 2019.

Bonetto, S., *Race and racism in Hegel – An analysis*. "Minerva. An internet journal of philosophy", n. 10 (2006), pp. 35-64.

Buck-Morss, S. F., *Hegel, Haiti and the universal history*, Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009.

Büttgen P., *Aufheben*, in B. Cassin (éd.), *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies: Dictionnaire des intraduisibles*, Paris, Seuil, 2004, pp. 152-6.

Caramelli, E., *Antigone and the phenomenology of spirit. Between literary source (vv. 925-928) and philosophical reading*, in S. Achella et al. (eds.), *The owl's flight. Hegel's legacy to contemporary philosophy*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, 2021, pp. 287-99.

Caramelli, E., *La cultura luterana della traduzione e Hegel. La traducibilità della poesia nella "Lezioni di Estetica"*, "Dianoia", n. 25 (2017), pp. 535-59.

Charlston, D., *Translation and Hegel's philosophy: a transformative, socio-narrative approach to A.V. Miller's cold-war retranslations*, London-New York, Routledge, 2020.

Castro, O., Ergun, E., *Translation and feminism*, in J. Evans, F. Fernandez (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and politics*, London-New York, Routledge, 2018, pp. 123-43.

Chiereghin, F., *Nota sul modo di tradurre "aufheben"*, "Verifiche", n. 2-3 (1996), pp. 233-49.

Collenberg-Plotnikov, B., *Review* to G. W. F. Hegel*, Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Kunst I. Nachschriften zu den Kollegien der Jahre 1820/21 und 1823* (ed. N. Hebing*, Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. 28/1, Hamburg, Meiner, 2015),"Hegel-Studien", n. 50 (2016), pp. 213-8.

Cowan, B., *The unreadable translation – toward thinking american writing*, in B. Cowan, J. G. Kronick (eds.), *Theorizing american literature: Hegel, the sign and history*, Baton Rouge-London, Louisiana State University Press, 1991, pp. 1-29.

Davis, W., *Queer beauty: sexuality and aesthetics from Winckelmann to Freud and beyond*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2010.

D'Angelo, P., *Introduzione* a G. W. F. Hegel, *Lezioni di Estetica. Corso del 1823. Nella trascrizione di H. G. Hotho*, tr. it. e cura di P. D'Angelo, Roma-Bari, Laterza, 2000, pp. V-XXXVI.

Di Giovanni, G., *In conversation with Hegel: a translator's story*, "Verifiche", n. 1-2 (2020), pp. 249-59.

Droit, R. P, *Victor Cousin, la* Bhagavad-Gītā *et l'ombre de Hegel*, in C. Weinberger-Thomas (éd.), *L'indie e l'imaginaire*, Paris, Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 1988, pp. 175-95.

Engels, F., *Letter to Conrad Schmidt*, 1st November 1891, in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Werke*, vol. 38, Berlin, Dietz, 1979, pp. 203-4.

Farina, M., *Il giudizio e la vita. Sulla logica dell'estetica di Hegel*, "Estetica. Studi e Ricerche", n. 2 (2017), pp. 363-90.

Farina, M., *L'idea della traducibilità universale. Hegel su poesia e umanità*, "Anterem", n. 99 (2019), pp. 59-62.

Garelli, G., *Hegel e lo spirito della traduzione*, in Id., *Dialettica e interpretazione. Studi su Hegel e la metodica del comprendere*, Bologna, Pendragon, 2015, pp. 283-98.

Gethmann-Siefert, A., *Ästhetik oder Philosophie der Kunst: Die Nachschriften und Zeugnisse zu Hegels Berliner Vorlesungen*, "Hegel-Studien", n. 26 (1991), pp. 92-110.

Gethmann-Siefert, A., *Gestalt und Wirkung von Hegels Aesthetik. Einleitung*, in G. W. F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Kunst (Nachschrift Hotho), 1823*, Hamburg, Meiner, 1998, pp. XV-CCXXIV.

Gethmann-Siefert, A., *Hegel Archiv und Hegel Ausgabe*, "Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung", n. 30 (1976), pp. 609-18.

Gipper, H., *Understanding as a process of linguistic approximation: the discussion between August Wilhelm von Schlegel, S. A. Langlois, Wilhelm von Humboldt and G. W. F. Hegel on the translation of the* Bhagavad-Gita *and the concept of "yoga"*, in T. Bynon, F. R. Palmer (eds.), *Studies in the history of western linguistics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 109-28.

Giuspoli, P., *Come si può tradurre la Scienza della logica?,* "Verifiche", n. 1-2 (2020), pp. 291-302.

Gramsci, A., *Sull'esposizione al circolo degli artisti*, "Avanti!", n. 4, 4 gennaio 1917.

Guldin, R., *Translation as metaphor*, New York-London, Routledge, 2016.

Habib, M. A. R*., Hegel and the foundations of literary theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Hebing, N., *Hegels Ästhetik historisch-kritisch. Eine neue Quelle eröffnet neue Perspektiven*, "Hegel-Studien", n. 49 (2015), pp. 123-55.

Hegel, G. W. F, *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik*, hrsg. H. G. Hotho, Erster Band, Berlin, Duncker und Humblot, 1835.

Hegel, G. W. F, *Estetica*, 2 vols., tr. it. N. Merker, N. Vaccaro, Milano, Feltrinelli, 1963.

Hegel, G. W. F, *Einleitung in die Ästhetik. Mit den beiden Vorreden von Heinrich Gustav Hotho*, hrsg. W. Henckmann, München, Fink, 1967.

Hegel, G. W. F., *Hegel's aesthetics: lectures on fine art*, Engl. transl. M. Thomas, Knox, 2 vols., Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1975.

Hegel, G. W. F, *The letters*, Engl. transl. C. Butler, C. Seiler, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1984.

Hegel, G. W. F., *Scienza della logica*, t. II, a cura di A. Moni, C. Cesa, Roma-Bari, Laterza, 1988.

Hegel, G. W. F, *La Scuola. Discorsi e relazioni*, *Norimberga 1808-1816*, Roma, Ed. Riuniti, 1993.

Hegel, G. W. F., *Vorlesungen über Ästhetik*, hrsg. H. Schneider, Berlin, Peter Lang, 1995.

Hegel, G. W. F., *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Kunst. Berlin 1823. Nachgeschrieben von Heinrich Gustav Hotho*, hrsg. A. Gethmann-Siefert, Meiner, Hamburg, 1998.

Hegel, G. W. F, *Lezioni di Estetica. Corso del 1823. Nella trascrizione di H. G. Hotho*, tr. it. a cura di P. D'Angelo, Laterza, Roma-Bari, 2000.

Hegel, G. W. F., *Philosophie der Kunst oder Ästhetik [Nachschrift Kehler]*, hrsg. A. Gethmann-Siefert, B. Collenberg-Plotnikov, mitarb. F. Iannelli, K. Berr, München, Fink, 2004.

Hegel, G. W. F., *Philosophie der Kunst [Nachschrift von der Pfordten]*, hrsg. A. Gethmann-Siefert, J.I. Kwon, K. Berr, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt, 2005a.

Hegel, G. W. F., *Esthétique. Cahier de notes de Victor Cousin*, éd. A.P. Olivier, Paris, Vrin, 2005b.

Hegel, G. W. F., *Estetica*, tr. it. F. Valagussa, Milano, Bompiani, 2012.

Hegel, G. W. F., *Lectures on the philosophy of art. The Hotho transcript of the 1823 Berlin lectures*, ed. R.F. Brown, with an introduction by A. Gethmann-Siefert, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014.

Hegel, G. W. F*., Vorlesungen zur Ästhetik. Vorlesungsmitschrift Adolf Heimann (1828-29),* hrsg. A. P. Olivier, A. Gethmann-Siefert, München, Fink, 2017.

Heine, H., *Preface* to the French edition of *Tableaux de voyage* (*Reisebilder*), in Id., *Historisch-Kritische Gesamtausgabe der Werke*, vol. 6, Hamburg, Hoffmann und Campe, 1973, pp. 350-8.

Hotho, H. G., *Vorstudien für Leben und Kunst* (1835), hrsg. B. Collenberg-Plotnikov, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, Frommann-Holzboog, 2002.

Humboldt, W., *Introduction to the translation of Agamennon*, in J. Biguenet, R-Schulte (eds.), *Theories of translation: an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1992, pp. 55-9.

Iannelli, F., *Oltre Antigone. Figure della soggettività nella Fenomenologia dello spirito di G. W. F. Hegel*, Roma, Carocci, 2006.

Iannelli, F., *Das Siegel der Moderne. Hegels Bestimmung des Hässlichen in den Vorlesungen zur Ästhetik und die Rezeption bei den Hegelianern*, München, Fink 2007.

Iannelli, F., *Projektionen, Annäherungen, Verklärungen und Abschiede. Winckelmann und Hegel über Italien als Land der Kunst*, in F. Iannelli, F. Vercellone, K. Vieweg (eds.), *Hegel und Italien – Italien und Hegel. Geistige Synergien von Gestern und Heut*e, Milano, Mimesis, 2019, pp. 21-39.

Iannelli, F., Olivier, A. P., *Translating Hegel's aesthetics in France and Italy: a comparative approach*, "Verifiche", n. 1-2, 2020, pp. 203-25.

Iannelli, F., *Hegel's constellation of the feminine between philosophy and life. A tribute to Dieter Henrich's* Konstellationsforschung, in S. Achella et al. (eds.), *The owl's flight. Hegel's legacy to contemporary philosophy*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, 2021, pp. 239-55.

James, D., Knappik, F., *Das Untote in Hegel: Warum wir über seinen Rassismus reden müssen* (27.5. 2021), prae|faktisch blog.

James, D., Knappik, F., *Warum wir über die rassistischen und pro-kolonialistischen Elemente in Hegels Denken reden müssen: Replik auf Folko Zander*, Part 1 (27.7.2021) and Part 2 (4.8.2021), prae|faktisch blog.

Kahn, R., *La* retraduction*: treize propositions*, in B. Banoun, I. Poulin, Y. Chevrel (eds.), *Histoire des traductions en langue française, XXe siècle*, Paris, Verdier, 2019, pp. 325-418.

Karyekar, M. C., *Hegel and the Latin* Bhagavad-Gitā *(1823): A critique of understanding and translating the foreign*, in F.M. Federici, D. Tessicini (eds.), *Translators, interpreters, and cultural negotiators. Mediating and communicating power from the Middle Ages to the modern era*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2014, pp. 155-72.

Koyré, A., *Note sur la langue et la terminologie hégelienne* (1931), in Id., *Études d'histoire de la pensée philosophique*, Paris, Gallimard, 1971, pp. 191-224.

Labriola, A., *Discorrendo di socialismo e di filosofia*, in F. Sbarberi (a cura di), *Scritti filosofici e politici*, Torino, Einaudi, 1976.

Lacoue-Labarthe, P., *"La Césure du spéculatif"*, in P. Lacoue-Labarthe, *F. Hölderlin, L'Antigone de Sophocle*, Engl. transl. P. Lacoue-Labarthe, Paris, Bourgois, 1978, pp. 183-223.

Lefebvre, J. P., *Présentation*, in G. W. F. Hegel, *Cours d'esthétique*, tr. fr. J. P. Lefebvre, V. von Schenk, vol. 1, Paris, Aubier, 1995, pp. VII-XIVI.

Lefebvre, J. P., *Avant-Propos*, in G. W. F. Hegel, *Cours d'esthétique*, Paris, Aubier, 1996, vol. 2, pp. 7-8.

Lejeune, G., *L'*Übersetzen *comme articulation interne du système encyclopédique. Hegel et Novalis en perspective*, "Verifiche", n. 1-2 (2020), pp. 37-54.

Manns, J. W., Madden, E. H., *Victor Cousin: commonsense and the absolute*, "The Review of Metaphysics", n. 43/3 (1990), pp. 569-89.

Marchignoli, S., *Che cos'è lo yoga? Traduzione ed egemonia alle origini dell'indologia tedesca*, in F. Squarcini (a cura di), *Verso l'India. Oltre l'India. Scritti e ricerche sulle tradizioni intellettuali sudasiatiche*, Milano, Mimesis, 2002, pp. 87-102.

Marchignoli, S., *Canonizing an indian text? A. W. Schlegel, W. von Humboldt, Hegel, and the* Bhagavad-Gita*,* in D. T. McGetchin, P. K. J. Park, D. SarDesai (eds.), *Sanskrit and "orientalism". Indology and comparative linguistics in Germany 1750-1958*, New Delhi, Manohar, 2004, pp. 245-70.

Marder, M., *Pure translation in Hegel's phenomenology*, "Verifiche", n. 1-2 (2020), pp. 113-27.

Nardelli, E., Hrnjez, S., *Is it possible to speak about a Hegelian theory of translation? On Hegel's* Übersetzungsbegriff *and some paradigmatic practices of translation*, "Verifiche", n. 1-2 (2020), pp. V-XXVII.

Nebrig, A., Vecchiato, D. (hrsg.), *Kreative Praktiken des literarischen Übersetzens um 1800*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2019.

Nebrig, A., Vecchiato, D., *Einleitung, Translatorische Kreativität um 1800*, in A. Nebrig, D. Vecchiato (hrsg.), *Kreative Praktiken des literarischen Übersetzens um 1800*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2019, pp. 1-16.

Nebrig, A., *Neue Schriften oder Übersetzungsfreiheit der Romantik*, in A. Nebrig, D. Vecchiato (hrsg.), *Kreative Praktiken des literarischen Übersetzens um 1800,* Berlin, De Gruyter, 2019, pp. 17-50.

Nicolin, F. (hrsg.), *Hegel in Berichten seiner Zeitgenossen*, Meiner, Hamburg, 1970.

Nuzzo, A., *The untranslatable in translation. A Hegelian dialectic*, "Verifiche", n. 1-2 (2020), pp. 1-18.

Olivier, A. P., *Hegel et la musique: de l'expérience esthétique à la spéculation philosophique*, Préface de B. Bourgeois, Paris, Libraire Honoré Champion, 2003.

Olivier, A. P., *Le concept de Klang*, "Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft", n. 13 (2014) (*Klang – Ton – Musik Theorien und Modelle (national)kultureller Identitätsstiftung*, hrsg. W. G. Schmidt, J.-F. Candoni, S. Pesnel), pp. 88-94.

Olivier, A. P., *Présentation*, in G. W. F. Hegel, *Esthétique, cahier de notes de Victor Cousin*, Paris, Vrin, 2005, pp. 9-30.

Olivier, A. P., *Hegel, la genèse de l'esthétique*, Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2008.

Picon-Vallin, B., *Le Théâtre du Soleil: Les cinquante premières années*, Arles, Actes Sud, 2014.

Pinkard, T., *Hegel: a biography*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Pinna, G., *Das Original erschaffen. Zu Schillers Übersetzungsstrategien*, in A. Nebrig, D. Vecchiato (eds.), *Kreative Praktiken des literarischen Übersetzens um 1800*, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 2019, pp. 157-76.

Reid, J., *Language and system in Hegel*, Toronto, University Press, 2007.

Rosenkranz, K., *Review* to G. W. F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik* (hrsg. H. G. Hotho. Erster Band, Berlin, Duncker und Humblot, 1835),"Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik", n. 1 (1836), pp. 1-18; n. 2, pp. 9-20.

Rosenkranz, K., *G. W. F. Hegels Leben*, Berlin, Duncker und Humblot, 1844.

Rózsa, E., *Von Antigone zur anständigen Frau. Hegels Frauenbild im Spannungsfeld zwischen der Phänomenologie des Geistes und der Rechtsphilosophie von 1820*, in S. Achella et al. (eds.), *The owl's flight. Hegel's legacy to contemporary philosophy*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, 2021, pp. 259-76.

Sanman, A., *Die andere Kreativität. Tendenzen weiblicher Uebersetzungspraxis um 1800 am Beispiel von Meta Forkel-Liebeskind und Caroline Wuiet*, in A. Nebrig, D. Vecchiato (hrsg.), *Kreative Praktiken des literarischen Übersetzens um 1800*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, 2019, pp. 237-58.

Sartre, J.-P., *Black Orpheus* (1948), Engl. transl. J. MacCombie, "The Massachusetts Review", n. 6/1, (1964-65), pp. 13-52.

Schlaffer, H., Mende, D., *Friedrich Thedor Vischer 1807-1887*, "Marbacher Magazin", n. 44 (1987).

Schleiermacher, F., *Review* to F. Ast, *De Platonis Phaedro* (Jena, Schmid, 1801), "Litteratur-Zeitung", n. 7/30 (1802).

Schleiermacher, F., *On the different methods of translating*, in J. Biguenet, R. Schulte (eds.), *Theories of translation: an anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1992, pp. 36-54.

Sell, A., *Perspektiven der Übersetzung in Hegels Gesammelten Werken*, in B. Plachta, W. Woesler (hrsg.), *Edition und Übersetzung. Zur wissenschaftlichen Dokumentation des intellektuellen Transfers*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 2002, pp. 119-31.

Schimmenti, G., *L'arte contesa. L'estetica, la sinistra hegeliana e il giovane Marx*, Napoli-Salerno, Orthotes, 2021.

Schimmenti, G., *Young hegelian aesthetics*, "International Lexicon of Aesthetics", Spring 2019 Edition, https://lexicon.mimesisjournals.com/archive/2019/spring/-YoungHegelianAesthetics.pdf.

Tavarès, P. F., *Hegel et l'abbé Grégoire*. *Question noire et Révolution française*, "Annales historiques de la Révolution française", n. 3 (1993), pp. 491-509.

Thomas, F., *Introduire le sauvage allemand dans le beau monde parisien: l'enjeu éthique et politique de la traduction dans le débat entre les Lumières et le romantisme allemande*, in C. Berner, T. Milliaressi (éds.), *La traduction: philosophie et traduction. Interpréter/traduire*, Villeneuve d'Ascq, Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 2011, pp. 147-62.

Wahl, J., *Le rôle d'A. Koyré dans le développement des études hégéliennes en France, Hegel-Tage Royaumont 1964: Beiträge zur Deutung der Phänomenologie des Geistes*, hrsg. H.-G. Gadamer, Bonn, Bouvier, 1984, pp. 15-26.

Vieweg, K., *Warum Hegel kein Rassist war*, "Die Welt", 27.12.2020.

Vieweg, K., *Hegel. Der Philosoph der Freiheit*, Munich, Beck, 2019.

Vuillerod, J.-B., *Hegel féministe. Les aventures d'Antigone*, Paris, Vrin, 2020.

Zander, F., *Hegel als Zombie. Eine Erwiderung auf Daniel James und Franz Knappik*, prae|faktisch blog (23. 6. 2021).