

ISSN: 1579-9794

## Translation and Retranslation of *Niebla*, a *Nivola* by Miguel de Unamuno

## Traducción y retraducción de *Niebla*, una *Nivola* de Miguel de Unamuno

AINHOA RODRÍGUEZ-HERNÁNDEZ  
ainhoarodri@usal.es  
Universidad de Salamanca

Fecha de recepción: 28/09/2023

Fecha de aceptación: 27/09/2024

**Abstract:** Miguel de Unamuno (1864-1936) was a key figure in the Spanish scenario before the Civil War. Several studies throughout the years have researched his role as a writer, philosopher, politician, and translator. Here we explore one of the aspects of Unamuno's works which remains virtually untouched, *i.e.* the translation of his novels into English. Specifically, we examine the five existing versions of *Niebla* (1914), one of his most acclaimed works, into that language. This novel was first translated into English by Warner Fite during Unamuno's lifetime (1928). Nevertheless, after the author's death, this text was retranslated four more times, and we wonder why. In order to answer this question, we review the concept of *retranslation* and analyse these five renderings to determine their differences and similarities. So as to do so, we explore each rendition focusing on three aspects: the translator's profile, the publishing house which has produced each volume, and the various types of editions printed. After that, we discuss some of the translation techniques employed in the different versions of *Niebla*. We study the adaptation of the original title and several examples which illustrate specific translation problems. Also, we take a quick look at the reception of these works within the English-speaking public. Based on the retranslation theories and the information obtained by our extensive analysis, we try to explain why this novel has five different versions in English.

**Keywords:** Unamuno, *Niebla*, Translation, Retranslation, English

**Resumen:** Miguel de Unamuno (1864-1936) fue una figura clave del panorama español previo a la Guerra Civil. Como tal, multitud de estudios han examinado su faceta como escritor, filósofo, político y traductor. En este artículo, exploramos un aspecto al que no se le ha prestado demasiada atención hasta la fecha, es decir, a la traducción de sus obras al inglés. En concreto, examinamos las cinco traducciones existentes de *Niebla* (1914),

una de sus obras más aclamadas, en lengua inglesa. Esta novela fue traducida por primera vez por Warner Fite en 1928, durante la vida del autor. No obstante, tras su muerte, *Niebla* fue retraducida cuatro veces más. Esta investigación intenta averiguar el porqué de estas retraduccionen y, para ello, revisa el concepto de *retraducción*. Una vez hecho esto, se propone determinar las diferencias y similitudes entre las cinco versiones de *Niebla*. Con ese fin, nos centramos en tres aspectos: el perfil del traductor, la editorial responsable de la traducción y el tipo de edición que se ha publicado. A continuación, analizamos algunas de las técnicas traductológicas que se han utilizado en las diferentes versiones de la novela: examinamos las adaptaciones del título original y una serie de ejemplos que presentan problemas de traducción. Por último, nos aproximamos a la recepción de esta obra entre el público anglosajón. La información de este análisis, junto con las teorías sobre la retraducción, nos permite responder a la pregunta de por qué esta novela cuenta con cinco versiones diferentes en lengua inglesa.

**Palabras clave:** Unamuno, *Niebla*, Traducción, Retraducción, Inglés

#### INTRODUCTION

Translation has played an essential role in Miguel de Unamuno's life and work. He felt proud of his knowledge of Greek, Latin, French, English, and German, and he claimed to have some notions of Italian and some Nordic languages, especially Swedish. For him, translation was a hobby and a way of learning languages (Rabaté and Rabaté, 2014, p. 115), but it was also his way of earning a living for some years until he was named head of the University of Salamanca in 1900. Since that moment, the earnings from publishing his writings were sufficient to provide for his family and translation became a hobby again. This facet of Unamuno as a translator has been widely studied. However, a few scholars have shown interest in his profile as a translated author.

Unamuno himself confessed in a letter written in 1913 that his main interest was to be translated (Robles, 1996, p. 411). By this time, several of his works had been published in other languages such as French, Italian, and German. Nonetheless, his objective was to be known by the English public (Robles, 1996, p. 210) and that would not be fulfilled until his exile in 1914. At that moment, he became a referent against the current Spanish government and achieved the international acknowledgement he ambioned, especially in English-speaking countries (Callahan, 2005, p. 235). The newfound interest in Unamuno resulted in translations of some of his works into English in the 20s and 30s.

*Niebla* is one of Unamuno's novels –or, as he called them, *nivolas*– that was translated then. It was first published in 1914, and it is considered by many his most celebrated work. In its third edition, published in 1935, Unamuno wrote that *Niebla* had been his most translated text to date. Warner Fite was in charge of the English version, published in 1928 and titled *Mist: A Tragicomic Novel*. Nevertheless, he is not the only translator of *Niebla* into English. There are four translations more: *Mist*, by Anthony Kerrigan (1976); *Juan Cruz, a translation of Niebla (fog) by Miguel de Unamuno*, by Juan Cruz (2006); *Mist*, by John Macklin (2014); and *Fog: A Novel*, by Elena Barcia (2017). Therefore, there are five versions of *Niebla* in English, and we cannot help wondering why.

The main purpose of this study is to present the five English translations of *Niebla* and their translators, as well as to explain why this novel has been retranslated so many times. In order to do so, firstly, we will examine the concept of *retranslation* and the different reasons why a novel is normally retranslated. After that, we will briefly analyse each translation focusing on its author, its publisher, and the kind of edition we are facing. Then, we will study the translation techniques employed in the renditions. For that, we will look at the titles of each publication and a couple of passages which represent a problem for the translator. Lastly, we will approach the reception of *Niebla* translations in English-speaking countries.

## 1. RETRANSLATION

*Retranslation*, defined as “the act of translating a work that has previously been translated into the same language” (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2011, p. 233), has been an object of discussion in several studies. In *Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation*, Deane-Cox (2014) pictures a map of the studies about this phenomenon including the writings of Goethe, Berman, Pym, Chesterman, Venuti, Paloposki and Koskinen, Brownlie, etc. Here, we aim to summarise the possible reasons for a work to be retranslated under the premise that “(re)translation is as much a socially and a culturally embedded phenomenon as it is a textualized one” (Diane-Cox, 2014, p. 190).

What first comes to mind when we think about causes for retranslation is the passing of time and the presence of errors. Time constitutes a fundamental element given that some features of the original translation can easily become outdated. In the same way, some existing translations can be regarded as deficient now (Koskinen and Paloposki, 2013, p. 296), and consequently, must be corrected. Nevertheless, we must note that when a previous translation is considered obsolete or wrong nowadays, revision is more practised than retranslation (Ortiz Gonzalo, 2004, p. 56).

Additionally, we must take into account individual factors or even coincidence. Some retranslations are simply generated by the lack of awareness of previous translations, or the lack of coordination or communication between publishing houses (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2011, p. 234). In other cases, the mere particular interest of a translator can be a reason for retranslation (Venuti, 2004, p. 30), as well as the aim of introducing a new interpretation of the original material (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2011, p. 235) or paratexts such as introductions, prologues, epilogues, commentaries, etc. (Venuti, 2004, p. 33).

In the case of *Niebla*, other factors intervene given it is a Hispanic classic. The classics' retranslation is a common practice in publishing houses because "their canonicity ensures a market demand, and they are cheaper to publish than copyrighted texts, which require the purchase of translation rights from a foreign author or his assignees" (Venuti, 2004, p. 30). Accordingly, classics are the most retranslated works because they are more economically rentable to publish, and their demand is always guaranteed.

## 2. NIEBLA'S TRANSLATIONS INTO ENGLISH

After revising the concept of *retranslation*, we will examine each of the five translations of *Niebla* into English in order to identify their differences and similarities. We will approach them from different perspectives, focusing on the translator profile, the publishing house, and the edition of each translation. In doing so, we may find the key to *Niebla*'s retranslations.

### 2.1 Mist: A Tragicomic Novel, by Warner Fite (1928)

The first translation of *Niebla* was made by Warner Fite, an American philosopher. He was born in 1867 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, where he earned a doctorate in Philosophy in 1894. He worked in various universities until he was installed at Princeton University, where he spent thirty years. Fite wrote numerous philosophy books and articles and was a regular collaborator in *The Nation*. Regarding translation, *Niebla* was the only translation he ever made, and Fite himself considered this task a pastime (Fite, personal communication, 5 January 1928).

His translation of *Niebla* was published as *Mist: A Tragicomic Novel* in 1928 by the publishing house Alfred A. Knopf, a famous New York firm. It is important to note that this translation has been reprinted three times. It was reprinted twice by Alfred A. Knopf, firstly in 1929 in the publisher's London headquarters (Callahan, 2005, p. 385), and in 1955 in New York. In 2000, it was reprinted again by the University of Illinois Press thanks to an agreement with Random House, who acquired Knopf's firm in 1960. In this edition, it was added a preface written by Theodore Ziolkowski, an academic in the German

language and compared literature fields. This preface presents Unamuno's biography and context, and delves into the principal points of his dogma. Ziolkowski defends that his ideas, as the tragedy of life, converge in his *nívolas*, specifically in *Niebla*, and explains how is so through the plot, the real meaning of *niebla*, the prologues of the novel, and the funeral oration written by Orfeo, the dog.

The most remarkable feature of this translation is that it was made during Unamuno's lifetime. This means that there was communication between the author, the translator, and the publisher and, thankfully, part of this correspondence is preserved in the Casa Museo Unamuno in Salamanca.

The relationship between Miguel de Unamuno and Alfred A. Knopf started some years before the translation of *Niebla*. This publishing house published Unamuno's *Essays and Soliloquies* in 1924 and *The Life of Don Quixote and Sancho* in 1926, and we know that, at least, the first one had "very little luck" in sales (Knopf, personal communication, 12 February 1926). On the other hand, Warner Fite tried to get in touch with the Spanish writer in 1925. The philosopher wrote to him about how much he admired his work and expressed his wish to meet him. However, Unamuno never received the letter. Fite tried again to reach him, and this time he was luckier. Both started an interchange of letters that lasted several years. In one of these letters, which is thought to have been sent in the first half of 1927 (unfortunately, it is not conserved), Warner Fite informed Unamuno of his intention to translate *Niebla* into English. He attached some passages translated and asked him some questions about the original text: incoherences and mistakes found in the source text and the sense of some passages, as for example, "Cualquier día vuelvo yo a darme un rato así" (Unamuno, 2021, p. 223). Unamuno thanked the initiative, although he criticised some of his translation decisions:

Ahora debo decirle ante todo que a mi juicio mantiene usted demasiado del original. Acaso alguna expresión como señorito y ¡bueno! sea intraducible, pero ¿por qué deja usted el hijo mío, hijo mío, hijo mío, en vez de "my son, my son, my son" [...] En general mi criterio es que al traducir se debe tender a conservar lo más posible el estilo del original, pero no de la lengua. (Fite, personal communication, 28 June 1927)

In this letter, it can be deduced that Warner Fite had already sent a manuscript to Alfred A. Knopf. Moreover, the publisher referred to this translation in a letter received by Unamuno the same year:

May I take advantage of this occasion to say that we are very much interested in your novel, NIEBLA and I hope that you will not dispose of it to any English or American publisher without first consulting us. I cannot make you a firm offer for it at this writing as I must see how

DON QUIXOTE goes. I don't believe that NIEBLA is copyrighted in this country; at any rate a very poor translation has been offered us by Professor Fite of Princeton University and since we rejected it, he may well be offering it to other publishers. (Fite, personal communication, 20 September 1927)

Because of the next letter sent by Alfred A. Knopf, it can be assumed that Unamuno interceded between the translator and the publisher in favour of the former: "We are much interested in what you say about NIEBLA and about Professor Warner Fite and will ask Professor Fite to resubmit to us his translation for reconsideration in view of what you said" (Knopf, personal communication, 24 October 1927). In December, Knopf communicated to Unamuno the intention of publishing Fite's translation of *Niebla* and commented: "I am glad that Professor Fite has now put his translation into excellent shape and as soon as I hear from you we will close matters with him" (Knopf, personal communication, 3 December 1927).

Not much later, on 5 January 1928, Fite wrote Unamuno:

But my remissness in writing you has been due to the fact that I have been waiting to find out whether my translation of *Niebla* was going to be printed —and also due to the fact that I have been busy with the translation. I have now virtually completed it— only a few chapters to go over once more, to see where I can improve the expression. And I think there is no doubt that Knopf will print it. He wrote me a day or two ago that he was waiting only to make arrangement for «the book itself» (with you, I suppose), and that he liked the second draft of part of it, which I gave him in November, «infinitely better» than the first. That amused me immensely; for the chief difference between the first and second draft was that I had the manuscript copied from an ugly and cheap brown paper to a respectable white paper —though I had been over it all again. (Fite, personal communication, 5 January 1928)

Also, he mentioned that his main purpose was conserving the character of Unamuno: "I still feel that it is more important that it should be Unamuno than it should be orthodox English. But I have sinned little against the English, and I have retained very few Spanish words" (Fite, personal communication, 5 January 1928). That year, Fite travelled to Hendaye, where Unamuno was exiled, and was able to finally meet him. In September, he sent to Unamuno his version of *Niebla*, which was eventually published on 12 October, with some comments:

I wish I could send you the translation just as I made it. I told you that an «editor» of Knopf's had made many changes in my ms., some of them utterly false. I corrected all the more necessary ones. But it would have been impossible to change them all, and those that

were merely matters of taste or opinion I allowed to stand. There are only a few changes that I would make if I were free to do so. And most of them refer to a few words, such as the rendering of the Spanish hombre. That was one of the two or three Spanish words I did not translate. But the editor had evidently the idea that there must be not a single Spanish word left in the English text. (Fite, personal communication, 29 September 1928)

Once the translation was published under the title of *Mist: A Tragicomic Novel*, Unamuno responded to Fite that “[d]e su traducción me había enviado tres ejemplares Knopf. La encuentro muy bien, fiel y en cuanto puedo juzgar muy adaptada al inglés” (Unamuno, personal communication, 19 November 1928).

The communication between the translator and the Spanish author continued some years after *Mist: A Tragicomic Novel* was published. Fite sent him several reviews about the translation published in the American and British press that we will discuss later in this article. In the Casa Museo Unamuno, there are no more letters from the publisher which could inform us about the reception among the public. In contrast to the previous translations published by Knopf, neither are there cheques charged from the sales of *Mist: A Tragicomic Novel*.

## 2.2 Mist, by Anthony Kerrigan (1976)

The second translator of *Niebla* was Anthony Kerrigan, a professional translator and poet known for his numerous translations of Spanish classics. He was born in Massachusetts in 1918, but he spent most of his childhood in Cuba, where he learnt Spanish. He kept strong bonds with Spain and Spanish writers, and he became one of the most important translators of Spanish literature into English. Among his translations, we can find *The Family of Pascual Duarte* (1964) by Cela, *The Revolt of the Masses* (1985) by Ortega y Gasset, and *Ficciones* (1962) by Borges (Massor, 2019). When he died in 1991, Camilo José Cela wrote: “Miguel de Unamuno, el alto poeta que fue dado a conocer en EE UU por las puntuales y hermosas traducciones que Kerrigan hizo de él” (Anthony Kerrigan, traductor y poeta, 1991).

His connection with Unamuno dates from 1956 when he moved with his family to Mallorca and began the project of translating the author’s major works. In 1958, he proposed to the Bollingen Foundation to publish five volumes of Unamuno’s works in English. The publishers agreed to a first volume about Quixote, but soon, two more books were added to the collection. After many changes, it was determined that Kerrigan and Martin Nozick, a Spanish teacher in New York, would oversee a collection composed of seven volumes (McGuire, 1982, pp. 236-240). The collection, called *Selected Works*

of *Miguel de Unamuno* (originally published between 1968 and 1985), gathered the most famous literary works and other secondary texts of the writer. *Niebla* would be part of the sixth volume of the collection titled *Novela/Nivola: Mist, Abel Sánchez and How to Make a Novel*.

Despite being the sixth volume, it was published fourth in 1976 –and reprinted in 2017– by Princeton University Press, a non-profit publishing company linked to Princeton University. Although the collection belonged to Bollingen Series, an original project by Pantheon Books and Bollingen Foundation, Princeton University Press acquired it in 1969.

The two editions published contain an introduction by Kerrigan and a preface by Jean Casou, but there is no reference to the translation process in any of them. Nevertheless, we know some of Kerrigan's opinions about translating Unamuno from other texts. As a translator, Anthony Kerrigan thought that a translator should be mostly a writer. He defended that it was essential to keep fidelity to the source, but also to the target language. However, this method differed when translating Unamuno: "It was a thought process, and you can't fool around with sequence if you're tracing thought. You have to get it pretty exact, and you can't paraphrase it too well" (Doyle, 1987, p. 137).

### 2.3 Juan Cruz, a translation of *Niebla* (fog) by Miguel de Unamuno (2006)

The third translation of *Niebla* was the work of Juan Cruz, who kindly agreed to be interviewed by us about his career and his rendering of Unamuno's text. He was born in Palencia, Spain, but grew up in England, where he developed a career in arts. Nowadays, Cruz is the director of the Edinburgh College of Art of Edinburgh University, as well as a renowned scholar and artist. He is the author of numerous individual and collective expositions, papers, reviews, books, and catalogues. Although translation has always played an important role in Cruz's works, he only has translated two works in a "traditional way": *Niebla*, and a book written by his grandfather, *SEDA, an Interesting Story* included in the volume *The Alpine Fantasy of Victor B. and Other Stories* (2006).

Forma Arts and Media Ltd. published Cruz's translation of *Niebla* in 2006. This publishing house is a public organisation whose purpose is to support artists' careers. The project was first conceived as a piece of art that would be exposed orally to the public, but finally, it was decided to publish the translation in a book format. Apart from Juan Cruz's ideas about art and translation, he chose to work with this book due to different reasons. Firstly, because of the link between *Niebla* and *Don Quixote*, a work which he had already worked with. Also, Cruz considered that Unamuno was not very acknowledged in the United Kingdom, and he represented something special

to Cruz, given that his grandfather had met the author. The purpose of Cruz's work was to be a piece of art itself, not only a translation such as the ones that can be found in a bookshop. Juan Cruz has admitted that despite working with more people on this project, principally with Ian Hunt, an Art Critic and Editor, he was able to make his own decisions and the only modifications made by others had a grammatical character.

#### 2.4 Mist, by John Macklin (2014)

John Macklin published his translation of *Niebla* a few years later after Cruz's. Macklin was born in 1947 in Northern Ireland, where he started an outstanding academic career. He worked in numerous British universities until his death in 2014. He specialised in Spanish literature and studied many authors from the XIX and XX centuries, Unamuno included. Also, Macklin was responsible for the first Cervantes Institute in the United Kingdom in 1992, and he received the Order of Isabella the Catholic, a Spanish honour, because of his contributions to Hispanic Studies.

Macklin was co-author of a bilingual edition titled *¡Qué bien!* (1987) which collects three of the Miguel de Cervantes's *Novelas Ejemplares*. In addition, he is the author of two bilingual editions of Unamuno's works: *Abel Sánchez* (2009) and *Mist* (2014), both published by Liverpool University Press. Originally, these two books belonged to Aris & Philips Hispanic Classics, a collection within Oxbow Books, until Liverpool University Press acquired the firm in 2018.

*Mist* is a bilingual edition which includes the original novel in Spanish and its translation into English in a facing-page format. Moreover, it offers a thorough study of Miguel de Unamuno, his works, and his literary context, together with an analysis of the novel's plot, topics, and structure. In addition, Macklin included a bibliography and a list of all the translations of *Niebla* published to date, that is Fite's, Kerrigan's, and Cruz's.

John Macklin also added a translation note in which he commented on some of the translation problems that he found while translating. Macklin set the purpose of his version, which is "to retain that tone [Unamuno's] whilst adhering to the layers of meaning in the source text." He also commented on the edition and the target public:

The edition of *Mist* presented here is a bilingual one. It is likely that it will be used by readers with at least some knowledge of Spanish and will be used as a learning tool in colleges and universities. Well over half the text is dialogue, and for the most part translates easily, given the vocabulary, short sentences, and brief exchanges. It has been decided therefore to offer a translation as close as possible to the source text, whilst using normal and natural English. Names

have been retained in the original Spanish, as have the few references to places, in order to retain something of the Spanish context. This has meant in some cases translating the Spanish wording literally rather than choosing an obvious English idiom. (Macklin, 2014, p. 31)

In other words, Macklin's edition is oriented toward non-native Spanish literature students with a certain knowledge of Spanish. His translation tries to be as loyal to the original as possible, which means that sometimes it will favour Unamuno's tone and connotations over an English equivalent.

#### 2.5 Fog: A Novel, by Elena Barcia (2017)

The last translator of *Niebla* into English to date has been Elena Barcia. We also had the opportunity to talk to her and ask her some questions about her career and her translation, published as *Fog: A Novel* in 2017. Barcia is an active translator who has worked in film translation for thirty years. She has worked for many Hollywood Studios such as Disney Studios, Warner Bros. Studios, and Sony Pictures; and as a consultant for film directors such as Woody Allen, Stanley Kubrick, or Guillermo del Toro. This translation has been her only literary translation published, although she has other upcoming projects.

In the interview, Barcia told us that Spanish was her mother tongue despite being born in Los Angeles. That is because his father, José Rubia Barcia, was a Spaniard exiled after the Spanish Civil War. He was a well-known translator who received the National Book Award in 1979 for his translation of César Vallejo's posthumous poetry. Also, he worked teaching Spanish Literature at UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles), and it was in one of his lectures that Elena Barcia discovered *Niebla* and was fascinated by it.

Barcia considers Unamuno's novel a fundamental work in worldwide literature, therefore she decided to make a new translation into contemporary American English. She proposed it to Northwestern University Press, a publishing house founded in 1893 which aims to diffuse relevant literary and academic works. *Fog: A Novel* was included in the Northwestern World Classics collection, whose purpose is to gather worldwide literary masterpieces. The translation was preceded by an introduction written by Alberto Manguel, an internationally renowned writer, translator, and editor. In it, Manguel contextualises the publishing of *Niebla* in 1914. He describes this novel as an example of how Unamuno's texts differ from nineteenth-century literature given that, unlike it, they do not try to reproduce the external world but offer an introspective view.

### 3. TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES

Now that we have presented the five translations of *Niebla*, we will continue with a comparative analysis between the original text and its English versions. We will focus on the title translation and a selection of passages which represent a translation problem. In doing so, we aim to identify the translation techniques employed in each case together with the translation method. Although both concepts are key to comprehend the translator's intention, it is essential to differentiate them:

Each solution the translator chooses when translating a text responds to the global option that affects the whole text (the translation method) and depends on the aim of the translation. The translation method affects the way micro-units of the text are translated: the translation techniques. Thus, we should distinguish between the method chosen by the translator, e.g., literal or adaptation, that affects the whole text, and the translation techniques, e.g., literal translation or adaptation, that affect micro-units of the text. (Molina and Hurtado Albir, 2002, p. 508)

Therefore, determining the translation techniques, defined as "the procedures to analyse and classify how translation equivalence works" (Molina and Hurtado Albir, 2002, p. 509), will help us to know the translation method, that is, the rendition purpose.

In this analysis, we will use Molina's techniques classification (2006), as we consider that it reflects the difference between translation technique and method. Moreover, we will employ the online version of *Diccionario de la Lengua Española* (DLE) and *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) to look for the meanings of the terms and expressions studied.

The results obtained will lead us to identify which of the translation methods defined by Hurtado Albir (1996, p. 48) has guided each edition: interpretative-communicative (translation of the sense), literal (linguistic transcodification), free (modification of semiotic and communicative categories) and philological (academic or critical translation).

#### 3.1 *Translation of Niebla's title*

When we gathered all *Niebla's* translations, what first caught our attention was the inconsistency among their titles: *Mist: A Tragicomic Novel*; *Mist; Juan Cruz, a translation of Niebla (fog) by Miguel de Unamuno*; and *Fog: A Novel*. In this section, we aim to study the implications of the title chosen in each case, and to do so, first, we will examine the connotations behind the two translations offered of the term *niebla*: "mist" and "fog". Next, we will analyse the subtitles added in some of the renderings of Unamuno's text.

We have decided to pay attention to the title because it constitutes a relevant element, “not only on a book cover or a title page, but also in the intentions and strategies of various parties” (Schaper, 2013, p. 103). Remarkably, the translators of *Niebla* do not agree on how this term should be translated. Whereas Fite, Kerrigan, and Macklin translated it as “mist”, Cruz and Barcia selected “fog”.

In the DLE, *niebla* is defined as “nube muy baja, que dificulta la visión según la concentración de las gotas que la forman” (Real Academia Española [RAE], n.d.-a). Fernández Turienzo (1998) states that, in *Niebla*, this word acquires a metaphoric nuance, and it is referred, on the one hand, “al discurso que no es discurso claro, ni latino, sino más bien ‘nebuloso’ y protestante” (p. 860), while on the other:

La niebla, fenómeno meteorológico, en primer lugar, se emplea también para decir que algo nos impide ver con «claridad», que nos fuerza a ver como en tiniebla, de una manera como «tenebrosa» y a ver «el mundo», las cosas, es decir, entender o comprender algo de manera confusa. Y finalmente, también se aplica al estado anímico de confusión y desorientación, en el que se encuentra quien no logra ver claro. (p. 862)

Regarding the translations of *niebla* into English, “mist”, and “fog”, we have examined the entries of both terms in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. As to *mist*, some entries interest us. This term is defined as:

A natural phenomenon consisting of a diffuse cloud of fine water droplets suspended in the atmosphere on or near the ground so as to limit visibility (but to a lesser extent than fog); such droplets viewed collectively as a substance or medium. (Oxford University Press [OUP], n.d.-e)

This definition refers to a meteorological phenomenon, although it is specified that this term can be used metaphorically. Another entry which connects with Fernández Turienzo’s definition is the following one: “Any of various immaterial things conceived as obscuring a person’s mental vision or outlook, or as veiling the real character or blurring the outlines of a thing” (OUP, n.d.-e). Lastly, the expression *in mist* is also included in the dictionary. It means ‘mistically’ (OUP, n.d.-e) and can be related to the novel’s main topic: “La niebla espiritual era demasiado densa” (Unamuno, 2021, p. 93).

In regard to “fog”, this is its definition:

A state of the weather in which thick clouds of water vapour or ice crystals suspended in the atmosphere form at or near the earth’s surface, obscuring or restricting visibility to a greater extent than

mist; this phenomenon viewed as a substance or medium. Also: an episode or occurrence of such weather. (OUP, n.d.-c)

It is quite similar to the first definition of “mist” we have commented on previously, even if there is a difference in the intensity of the phenomenon. Whereas mist is subtler, fog is more intense. Although this entry does not indicate a metaphoric use, there is an expression with “fog” which connects directly with one of the interpretations of *niebla* in the novel: “to be in a fog”, which means to be ‘in a state of confusion; confused, bewildered’ (OUP, n.d.-c). For example, in chapter XIII, the protagonist “sacudió la niebla de confusión que le envolviera” (Unamuno, 2021, p. 148).

Both Juan Cruz and Elena Barcia agree that the difference in intensity between mist and fog is crucial. In the interview with Elena Barcia, she assured us that the expression “to be in a fog” perfectly describes the emotional, mental and intellectual state of Augusto Pérez, the novel’s main character.

About the dictionary entries, we consider that both terms are established equivalences. This translation technique consists of using “a term or expression recognised (by dictionaries or language in use) as an equivalent in the TL” (Molina and Hurtado Albir, 2002, p. 510). Although there is a clear difference in the intensity, both refer to a climate phenomenon and also to the metaphorical references that *niebla* acquires in the novel. Nevertheless, a question comes up: is Unamuno’s *niebla* a thick and opaque fog, or is it a subtle mist?

Apart from the translation of the term *niebla*, there is another element in these titles that is worth studying. This is the presence of subtitles or genre indication, as it happens in *Mist: A Tragicomic Novel* and *Fog: A Novel*. The genre indication is defined as:

An appendage of the title, more or less optional and more or less autonomous, depending on the period or the genre; and it is rhematic by definition because its purpose is to announce the genre status decided on for the work that follows the title. (Genette, 1997, p. 94).

Both translations are classified as “novels”, although Fite specifies that it is “a tragicomic work”, a term that Unamuno (2021, p. 299) also used to describe his text. Now, why is this information added to the title? According to Genette (1997), titles can have four functions: design and identify, connote, describe, and tempt, though only the first one is obligatorily fulfilled. One of the reasons for modifying a title when translating it is due to “decisiones editoriales para garantizar el atractivo de la obra en la cultura receptora [y] acuerdos entre el autor y el editor para favorecer su posible traducción en

otras lenguas” (Jarilla Bravo, 2022, p. 134). Concerning this statement, Genette (1997) comments that, nowadays:

The triumph, as we know, of the autonomous indication of genre, especially for the genre ‘novel’, which today is rid of all its complexes and is universally said to be more of a ‘seller’ than any other genre. (p. 97)

Since the novel is the most successful genre in our times, one of the main reasons for adding this term to the title is to fulfil the function of tempting consumers and, consequently, increasing sales. In the case of Unamuno, another cause could be to clarify that it is a novel and not a philosophical treaty, a genre that Unamuno is well known for.

The case of *Juan Cruz*, a translation of *Niebla (fog)* by Miguel de Unamuno is more complicated because it was the translator himself who chose this title as he considered his work an artistic creation, besides a translation. In this title, the artist and translator play a central role and, because of that, neither the title nor the book’s cover corresponds with common publishing practices. As we mentioned before, Cruz declared that all the decisions made in this edition were his.

### 3.2 Translation problems

Now we have explored the title, it is time to investigate the body text. We have chosen a set of passages from the original Spanish text which contain a cultural element or *culturema*. *Culturemas* are defined as:

Those textually actualized items whose function and connotations in a source text involve a translation problem in their transference to a target text, whenever this problem is a product of the nonexistence of the referred item or of its different intertextual status in the cultural system of the readers of the target text. (Franco Aixelá, 1996, p. 58).

Molina (2006) classifies them into four cultural categories: natural environment, cultural heritage, social culture, and linguistic culture. The latter includes:

Los problemas de traducción derivados de transliteraciones [...], los escollos culturales provocados por refranes, frases hechas y nombres propios con significado adicional [...] y los desencuentros generados por metáforas generalizadas y por las asociaciones simbólicas (la simbología de colores, flores, plantas, animales...) (p.82).

Moreover, the linguistic culture category deals with the problems linked to interjections, insults and blasphemies, “cuyo grado de aceptación puede provocar una disfunción entre un texto y su traducción” (Molina, 2006, p. 82).

After an in-depth reading of *Niebla* and a previous selection of fragments that may pose major problems for the translator, we determined that the cultural elements belonging to the field of linguistic culture were the most abundant in Unamuno's text. In fact, "Unamuno se instala en la línea de la sabiduría tradicional, selecta y rica, plagada de expresiones parémicas" (Ríos Ruiz-Esquide, 2008, p. 181), hence his writings are characterised by the presence of proverbs, sayings, apophthegms, maxims, aphorisms, and other cultural elements typical of the Castilian language, which represent a challenge for his translators.

In the following, we will present a series of passages of the original novel that include a cultural element, which, as we have seen, always represents a translation problem. We will also compare the different translations and analyse the translation techniques employed in each case.

### 3.2.1 A recurrent image: *rana*

Firstly, we will explore the translation of the term *rana*. Moore (1977) is the author of the only article which explores an English translation of *Niebla*. He aims to determine if Anthony Kerrigan's translation is "an accurate rendering of the original Spanish text" (Moore, 1977, p. 159) and for that, he studies a selection of textual elements. Among them, he focuses on the term *rana*, which appears twelve times in the original text. In the novel, *rana* means principally a laboratory animal, a living being used for experimentation or other scientific purposes. Augusto, the protagonist, wants to conduct an experimental study about women and for that, takes Eugenia as a frog. However, all his plans fail, and he ends up being the *rana*.

Kerrigan translated *rana* as "guinea pig", an established equivalent (defined before), which means 'a person or thing used as the subject of an experiment' (OUP, n.d.-d). However, Moore (1977, p. 160) notes that this term lacks the meaning of "fool or idiot" present in the original term. This statement could be based on the expression *salir rana*, which means 'to disappoint' and can be used when something goes wrong, or a person has turned out to be bad or a traitor (Iribarren, 1996, p. 143). In the novel, Augusto becomes a *rana* when his plans fail, therefore Moore's interpretation is justified.

Given that there was existing research which delves into this matter, we decided it was worth it to revise how *rana* has been translated along the five translations. We found that there is no consistency between the renditions and, most surprisingly, in some cases neither is there throughout the text. In the following example, we can see how, mostly, the term *rana* is translated as "frog" or "guinea pig":

Augusto pensaba: "¡Rana, rana completa! Y me han pescado entre todos". (Unamuno, 2021, p. 232)	Augusto kept thinking: "Frog! Frog! Absolutely the frog! Among them all, they have hooked me nicely." (Fite, 2000, p. 257)
	Augusto thought to himself: <i>Why, if I'm not the perfect guinea pig! They've landed me all right!</i> (Kerrigan, 1976, p. 193)
	Augusto thought: "Frog, complete frog! And between the lot they've caught me." (Cruz, 2006, p. 160)
	Augusto thought: "Guinea pig! A total guinea pig! Between them all, they have caught me." (Macklin, 2014, p. 317)
	Augusto thought: "A frog, a complete and utter frog! Together they've all fished me out of the water." (Barcia, 2017, p. 139)

**Table 1. Translations of *rana***  
Source. Elaborated by the author

Whereas Fite, Cruz and Barcia translate *rana* as "frog"; Kerrigan and Macklin do it as "guinea pig". Nevertheless, in other passages of the text, both Kerrigan and Macklin translate *rana* as "frog", for example: "You, the investigator who has become the investigated, you wished to use her like a frog in a laboratory, and she's the one who took you for a frog. So dive into your pool, and croak and live!" (Kerrigan, 1976, pp. 209 and 210).

After examining all the translations of the phrase, only Juan Cruz and Elena Barcia are consistent with their translation (*rana* as "frog"). Warner Fite does it also, except for one case: *pincha-ranas* (Unamunian neologism to designate biologists) (García Gallarín, 1998, p. 57), which is translated as "bug-stickers". As for Kerrigan and Macklin, the first one translated *rana* as "guinea pig" on most occasions, but also as "object of experimentation" and "frog". On the other hand, Macklin translated it as "laboratory rat" once, "guinea pig" four times, and "frog" six times.

We conclude that the repetition of *rana* throughout the text builds a recurrent image: Augusto as a frog, that is, as an idiot and an object of experimentation at the same time. This representation makes sense at the end of the novel when Unamuno reveals to the main character that he does not exist, he is a figment of the author's imagination. Therefore, although both "frog" and "guinea pig" are established equivalents, we think that the former option is preferable and, overall, that the term *rana* should be translated the same way along the text in order to conserve this recurrent image.

### 3.2.2 Insults: *panoli*

In *Niebla*, we found a great number of insults (*bruto, bestia, marica, bárbaro, tonto...*) overall aimed at characters that are not present in the scene. These textual elements are expressions that have evolved linguistically “from terms or expressions without an original insulting meaning through a connotative layer which added both insulting and non-insulting overtones to become fully insulting metaphors” (Mateo Martínez and Yus Ramos, 2000, p. 3). The translation of an insult should carry the original term’s explicit and implicit content together with all the connotations and emotional aspects of its meaning. Consequently, a literal translation often does not achieve the same effect in the target culture as in the source one (Mateo Martínez and Yus Ramos, 2000, p. 14).

Among all the insults of the novel, we have decided to analyse *panoli* given that it appears four times in the text. It means ‘dicho de una persona: Simple y fácil de engañar’ (RAE, n.d.-b) and comes from the Valencian expression *pa en oli*, bread with oil, a dish characterised by its simplicity (Jodar Sánchez, 2015, pp. 234 and 235). In the following example, we can see how this term is often with an adjective which emphasises it. In this case, it is *pobre* (“infeliz, desdichado y triste”) (RAE, n.d.-c):

—Pero ¿no dices — dijo el llamado Mauricio— que ese pretendiente es un pobre panoli que vive en Babia? (Unamuno, 2021, p. 126)	“But didn’t you say,” said the person addressed as Mauricio, “that this admirer of yours is a poor noodle who goes with his head in the clouds?” (Fite, 2000, p. 86)
	“But didn’t you tell me,” said the man addressed as Mauricio, “that the silly fellow is a dreamer, with his head in the clouds...?” (Kerrigan, 1976, p. 73)
	“But, didn’t you say” —said the one she had called Mauricio— that that pretender is a poor chump who lives in dreams? (Cruz, 2006, p. 53)
	“But didn’t you say,” said the aforementioned Mauricio, “that this suitor is a poor dimwit with his head in the clouds?” (Macklin, 2014, p. 136)
	“Didn’t you say this suitor is a poor sap with his head in the clouds?” Mauricio said. (Barcia, 2017, p. 48)

**Table 2. Translations of *pobre panoli***

Source. Elaborated by the author

In Fite's, Cruz's, Macklin's and Barcia's translations, we can see expressions that gather similar connotations to the original text: noodle, "stupid or silly person" (OUP, n.d.-f); chump, "a man as unintelligent as a chump of wood; a block, blockhead" (OUP, n.d.-a); dimwit, "a stupid or slow-witted person" (OUP, n.d.-b); and sap, "a simpleton, a fool" (OUP, n.d.-h). Regarding *pobre*, all of them have used poor "that provokes sympathy, or compassion; unfortunate, wretched" (OUP, n.d.-g). We think that these expressions convey the same meaning as the original, so we consider all of them established equivalents. On the other hand, Kerrigan uses "silly fellow", another established equivalent since "silly" gathers the meaning of poor and adds "lacking in judgement or common sense; foolish, empty-headed" (OUP, n.d.-i), which corresponds with *panoli*.

Consequently, we determine that despite the complexity of insults translation, and linguistic elements that are rooted in the source culture, the translators have achieved to solve this problem through different established equivalents.

### 3.2.3 Sayings: *como ir con un bacalao a Escocia*

Other cultural elements that represent a problem for translators are idioms and fixed expressions. In the next example, we will examine a fixed expression which is not very common in Spanish, namely, *como ir con un bacalao a Escocia*. In the text, it is used to describe a situation which is considered senseless.

¿A París y con mujer? ¡Eso es como ir con un bacalao a Escocia! (Unamuno, 2021, p. 187)	To Paris and with a woman? That is like taking along codfish to Scotland! (Fite, 2000, p. 183)
	You're taking a woman to Paris? That's like carrying codfish to Scotland or coals to Newcastle! (Kerrigan, 1976, p. 142)
	To Paris and with his wife? That's like going with a cod to Scotland! (Cruz, 2006, p. 114)
	Go to Paris with a woman? That is like going with cod to Scotland! (Macklin, 2014, p. 239)
	He's taking his wife to Paris? That's like taking beer to Germany! (Barcia, 2017, p. 100)

**Table 3. Translations of *como ir con un bacalao a Escocia***

Source. Elaborated by the author

We observe that Fite, Cruz, and Macklin have translated this expression as “like taking codfish to Scotland”, a literal translation, that is, a translation word for word (Molina and Hurtado Albir, 2002, p. 510). Macklin (2014) explained in his edition why he opted for this technique:

An example might be the use of “taking cod to Scotland”, a literal translation of which might easily have been replaced by “taking coals to Newcastle”. Whilst the English readership would have understood, this idiom is too highly embedded in the target text culture, and would have lost some of the freshness and wit contained in the Spanish phrase. (pp. 31 and 32)

In Kerrigan’s translation, we find several techniques. He translates it literally, as shown in the examples above, but he also employs an amplification. This technique consists of introducing details that are not formulated in the source text (Molina and Hurtado Albir, 2002, p. 510). In this case, he added the same established equivalent (defined previously) that Macklin dismissed: “like carrying coals to Newcastle” which means ‘to supply something to a place where it is already plentiful; to do something wholly superfluous or unnecessary’ (OUP, n.d.-j). Lastly, Elena Barcia’s translation consists of an established equivalent of her creation, “like taking beer to Germany”, which maintains the meaning of the source text.

Contrary to the example previously studied (*panoli*), this saying shows us how different techniques can be employed to successfully translate the original meaning to the target language. However, these choices are guided by the translation purpose, that is, the translation method.

#### 3.2.4 Translation method

After this brief analysis, we can conclude that the translation techniques used to resolve the translation problems of *Niebla* differ and coincide depending on the case. The established equivalent technique is prevalent and, at least in the examples studied, we have not found translating errors even if –as in *rana*– we prefer a translation over another. We can say that all of them achieved their purpose: to convey the original text to the English-speaking public. According to Hurtado Albir (1996), this corresponds with the interpretative-communicative method, which implies “procesos de comprensión y reexpresión del sentido del texto original manteniendo la misma función del original y produciendo el mismo efecto en el destinatario” (p. 48).

Nevertheless, to better understand the translators’ strategy while carrying Unamuno into English, we must remember what some of them expressed about this task. Fite (personal communication, 5 June 1928) defended that “it is more important that it should be Unamuno than it should

be orthodox English.” In the same way, Kerrigan confessed that, when translating Unamuno, “you have to get it pretty exact, and you can’t paraphrase it too well” (Doyle, 1987, p. 138). In the introduction of *Mist*, Macklin (2014) noted that “it has been decided therefore to offer a translation as close as possible to the source text, whilst using normal and natural English” (p. 31). For that reason, despite the fact these versions correspond with the interpretative-communicative method, we can find that some translation problems have been solved through literal translation, although this may not agree with Unamuno: “En general mi criterio es que al traducir se debe tender a conservar lo más posible al estilo del original, pero no de la lengua” (Unamuno, personal communication, 28 June 1927).

Besides, we need to point out that John Macklin’s *Mist* differs from the other renderings since it is a bilingual edition with an in-depth preliminary study and an academic purpose. Thus, we can say that it employs the philologic method:

Proceso a veces literal, otras interpretativo-comunicativo (o incluso libre), pero que se caracteriza porque se introducen en la traducción comentarios filológicos, históricos, etc. El original se convierte en objeto de estudio, dirigiéndose a un público erudito; suelen ser ediciones bilingües”. (Hurtado Albir, 1996, p. 48)

#### 4. RECEPTION

A fundamental aspect of this research is the reception of these translations among their target public. However, the study of reception is not easy. Here, we only try to approach it through some testimonies.

Firstly, we will look into the reviews sent by Warner Fite to Miguel de Unamuno after the publication of *Mist: A Tragicomic Novel*. The communication between Fite and Unamuno continued some years after the translation of *Niebla*. In these letters, Fite sent Unamuno all the reviews published in the United States and the United Kingdom about the novel. Thanks to these reviews, we know that the reception of Warner Fite’s translation among the critics was heterogeneous. In England, Unamuno’s novel was not much acclaimed (Callahan, 2005, pp. 285 and 286), whereas, in the United States, the critics valued it more. After consulting all the letters sent by Fite to Unamuno in the Casa Museo Unamuno, we can confirm that most reviews were positive. An example of that is a review published in *The New York Times* on 2 December 1929 titled “A Playful Commentary”:

This is executed with the tenderest satire and the most consummate grace. It provides an appropriate ending for the whole brilliant commentary on humanity, which could only have been written by a philosopher who was also an artist and by a direct spiritual

descendant of the author of Don Quixote. (A Playful Commentary, 1929)

On the contrary, *The Argonaut* published on 1 December 1928 a review titled “Metaphysics in Fiction” which harshly criticised the novel:

This self-designated tragi-comic novel is translated from the Spanish by Warner Fite, who, one thinks, might better have employed his time. The only real points in the book occur in certain suggestively physical passages and in the “funeral oration by way of an epilogue,” supposedly spoken by Orfeo, a little dog. The name is a perfect one for a book, wherein the hero, if any, spends three hundred pages wondering if he is real, or only a character of fiction. As though anybody cared! (Metaphysics in Fiction, 1928)

As we can see, there was not a common opinion among the critics. While some of them were cruel to Unamuno’s novel, others praised the author’s intelligence and poetry. Respecting the translation itself, there were no comments made.

Regarding the following translations, we do not have many clues about his reception among the public and critics. The only study focused on any of these translations is the one mentioned by Moore (1977), which examines Kerrigan’s rendering. When we interviewed Juan Cruz and Elena Barcia, we asked them about the reception of their translations. Cruz told us that his work “disappeared”. He mentioned to us that he did not receive any comment from the publisher or the public, except for one email from a reader who harshly criticised his translation. Barcia also commented on the lack of repercussion of her work:

Lamentablemente, en EE. UU. no se le da mucha importancia a la traducción. Solo el 3% de los libros publicados son traducciones. No he recibido ningún comentario ni promoción por parte de la editorial ni se han publicado reseñas que yo sepa más que unas pocas en Amazon.com. (Barcia, personal communication, 7 July 2022)

## CONCLUSIONS

At this point, we have examined all five translations of *Niebla* into English, and we should be able to identify certain similarities and differences between them. About the translators, we have found that there are three Americans (Fite, Kerrigan, and Barcia) and two British (Macklin, and Cruz). This allows us to know in which variety of English the translations have been written. Moreover, it is remarkable that there are only two professional translators, Kerrigan and Barcia, whereas the other three stand out for their academic careers in different areas. In conclusion, we can say that although

the translators of *Niebla* come from different professional backgrounds, they all are great specialists in their respective fields.

About publishing houses, we must note that most of them are linked to a university. The first translation of *Niebla* published by Alfred A. Knopf was reprinted by the University of Illinois Press. Kerrigan's edition was published by Princeton University Press, Macklin's by Liverpool University Press, and Barcia's by Northwestern University Press. In addition, some of them are part of a collection. Kerrigan's is part of *Collected Works of Miguel de Unamuno*; Macklin's of *Aris and Philips Hispanic Classics* and Barcia's of *Northwestern World Classics*. This is something to consider given that belonging to a series or collection "amplifies the publisher's emblem, immediately indicating to the potential reader the type of work, if not the genre, he is dealing with" (Genette, 1997, p. 22). In consequence, *Niebla* is presented to the public as a classic due to being part of these collections. In the case of Fite and Cruz's translations, they do not belong to a collection, nevertheless, both publishers have described them as classics on their back covers.

Attending to these facts, we could say that there are more similarities than differences between these five works. Hence, we ask ourselves again why *Niebla* has been translated five times. We have seen the different causes for retranslation, for example, the lack of awareness of previous translations. In the retranslation of *Niebla*, this has not been the case, given that both Cruz and Barcia have affirmed to us that they know about some of them, if not all; and Macklin included in his edition a list of all the previous translations of *Niebla*.

In the analysis of the translation techniques employed in the translations of *Niebla*, we have shown that the presence of errors or the need for adapting the previous translations does not seem a cause for retranslation either. We have shown that despite using different techniques, all interpretations achieve the same purpose: communicate the original sense. This is supported by the fact that the two first translations, Fite's and Kerrigan's, were republished in 2000 and 2017 respectively, a practice that, according to Pym (2014, p. 83), tends to reinforce the validity of those particular versions.

Another reason for retranslation is the wish to include new paratexts and interpretations. We have seen how, except for Cruz's version, all of them add a preface that presents the author and the novel, although we do not consider this a reason enough to retranslate a work. Nevertheless, we believe that in all retranslations there is a will to provide a new interpretation of Unamuno's text. Chronologically, Kerrigan aimed to present to the English-speaking public a collection of Unamuno's works, where *Niebla* could not be

missed. Regarding the translation made by Cruz, he told us that his purpose was to present the translation as a piece of art itself. The case of Macklin is the clearest. We remember that this is a bilingual edition with an extensive previous study, which is explicitly oriented to non-native Spanish students. Lastly, Elena Barcia told us that she wanted to translate *Niebla* into contemporary North American English.

In addition, we cannot forget there are always personal motivations that intervene in the proliferation of new versions of a text. Both Juan Cruz and Elena Barcia have confessed that they were the ones who proposed the translation to the publishing house, and they did it because of personal taste.

That said, there is a fundamental fact that cannot be missed: *Niebla* is a classic. Accordingly, some publishing houses will be interested in printing it only to save the acquisition of royalties. This hypothesis makes sense when we look at the dates of publication: 1928, 1976, 2006, 2014, and 2017. Whereas there are almost 50 years between the first and the second and thirty years between the second and the third, the three last ones are quite near each other. Moreover, since 2006 not only have new translations appeared, but also Kerrigan's translation was reprinted again in 2017 by Princeton University Press. This can be explained because the Spanish Copyright Law (BOE, 1996) stipulates that 70 years after the author's death his works pass into the public domain. Miguel de Unamuno died in 1936, hence in 2006, when Juan Cruz published his translation, the right of exploitation was extinguished, and publishing houses could print his works free of charge.

Therefore, we conclude that the factors which more influenced the publication of five translations of *Niebla* into English are the ones linked to personal motivations as well as editorial-economic ones. Also, Miguel de Unamuno (2021) himself already predicted in 1935, when this novel had been already translated into ten languages, that it will be his most popular work abroad:

¿Por qué esta predilección? ¿Por qué han prendido en pueblos de otras lenguas antes que otras obras mías esta que el traductor Otto Buek llamó «novela fantástica» y el norteamericano Warner Fite «novela tragicómica»? Precisamente por la fantasía y la tragicomedia. Yo no me equivoqué, pues desde un principio supuse —y lo dije— que esta que bauticé de novela habría de ser mi obra más universalizada. (p. 299)

We agree with the fact that, in the end, "it is the permanence of the original [...] which gives impulse to the reiterative act of retranslation" (Diane-Cox, 2014, pp. 191 and 192) and we perfectly understand how this text and Unamuno continue to fascinate translators and readers.

As a final thought, we believe that the retranslations of *Niebla* must be considered as something positive since, as we have experienced, it can be difficult to have them and, hence, for the anglophone public to enter the Unamunian literature.

#### REFERENCES

- El País. (1991, 14 March). Anthony Kerrigan, traductor y poeta. [https://elpais.com/diario/1991/03/14/agenda/668905201\\_850215.html](https://elpais.com/diario/1991/03/14/agenda/668905201_850215.html)
- Callahan, D. (2005). The Early Reception of Miguel de Unamuno in England, 1907-1939. *The Modern Language Review*, 100, 235-245. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mlr.2005.0008>
- Deane-Cox, S. (2014). *Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Doyle, M. S. (1987). Anthony Kerrigan: The Attainment of Excellence in Translation. In M. Gaddis Rose (Ed.), *Translation Excellence: Assessment, Achievement, Maintenance* (pp. 135-141). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fernández Turienzo, F. (1998). La "niebla" de *Niebla* de Unamuno. In J. C. Torres Martínez, & C. García Antón (Coords.), *Estudios de Literatura Española de los Siglos XIX y XX: Homenaje a Juan María Díez Taboada* (pp. 860-868). Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, CSIC.
- Franco Aixelà, J. (1996). Culture-Specific Items in Translation. In R. Álvarez & C. A. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, Power, Subversion* (pp. 52-78). *Multilingual Matters*.
- García Gallarín, C. (1998). *Léxico del 98*. Editorial Complutense.
- Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (1996) La Cuestión del Método Traductor. *Método, Estrategia y Técnica de Traducción*. *Sendebarr*, 7, 39-57.
- Iribarren, J. M. (1996). El Porqué de los Dichos: Sentido, Origen y Anécdota de los Dichos, Modismos y Frases Proverbiales de España con otras Muchas Curiosidades. Gobierno de Navarra.
- Jarilla Bravo, S. M. (2022). La Variación Traductológica en el Título de una Novela Literaria. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas*, 16(32), 133-146. <https://doi.org/10.26378/rnlael1632485>

- Jodar Sánchez, J. A. (2015). Adjetival Cuco/Cuqui as "Cute" and "Astute". *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics*, 4(2), 234-235. <https://doi.org/10.7557/1.4.2.3459>
- Koskinen, K., & Paloposki, O. (2013). Retranslation. In Y. Gambier, & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (Vol.1, pp. 294-298). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Massor, J. (2019, 3 March). El Amigo Americano de las Letras Españolas. El País. [https://elpais.com/cultura/2019/03/02/actualidad/1551553205\\_810708.html](https://elpais.com/cultura/2019/03/02/actualidad/1551553205_810708.html)
- Mateo Martínez, J., & Yus Ramos, F. (2000). Insults: A Relevance Theoretic Taxonomical Approach to their Translation. *International Journal of Translation*, 12(1), 97-130. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258697847\\_Insults\\_a\\_Relevance-Theoretic\\_Taxonomical\\_Approach\\_to\\_Their\\_Translation#full-text](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258697847_Insults_a_Relevance-Theoretic_Taxonomical_Approach_to_Their_Translation#full-text)
- McGuire, W. (1982). *Bollingen: An Adventure in Collecting the Past*. Princeton University Press.
- Molina, L., & Hurtado Albir, A. (2002). Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta. Journal des Traducteurs = Translators' Journal*, 47(4), 498-512. <https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar>
- Molina, L. (2006). *El Otoño del Pingüino: Análisis Descriptivo de la Traducción de los Culturemas*. Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Moore, R. (1977). Translation and Re-Creation: Kerrigan's Version of Unamuno's *Niebla*. *International Fiction Review*, 4(2), 158-161. <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/IFR/article/view/13252/14335>
- Ortiz Gonzalo, M. (2004). La Retraducción de Literatura Contemporánea. *Vasos Comunicantes: Revista de ACE Traductores*, 29, 51-58. <https://vasoscomunicantes.ace-traductores.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/vasos-29.pdf>
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-a). Chump. In *Oxford English Dictionary*. [https://www.oed.com/dictionary/chump\\_n?tab=meaning\\_and\\_use#9395381](https://www.oed.com/dictionary/chump_n?tab=meaning_and_use#9395381)
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-b). Dimwit. In *Oxford English Dictionary*. [https://www.oed.com/dictionary/dimwit\\_n?tab=meaning\\_and\\_use#6822007](https://www.oed.com/dictionary/dimwit_n?tab=meaning_and_use#6822007)

- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-c). Fog. In Oxford English Dictionary. [https://www.oed.com/dictionary/fog\\_n2?tab=meaning\\_and\\_use#3918569](https://www.oed.com/dictionary/fog_n2?tab=meaning_and_use#3918569)
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-d). Guinea Pig. In Oxford English Dictionary. [https://www.oed.com/dictionary/guinea-pig\\_n?tab=meaning\\_and\\_use#2321485](https://www.oed.com/dictionary/guinea-pig_n?tab=meaning_and_use#2321485)
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-e). Mist. In Oxford English Dictionary. [https://www.oed.com/dictionary/mist\\_n1?tab=meaning\\_and\\_use#36384320](https://www.oed.com/dictionary/mist_n1?tab=meaning_and_use#36384320)
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-f). Noodle. In Oxford English Dictionary. [https://www.oed.com/dictionary/noodle\\_n1?tab=meaning\\_and\\_use#34153250](https://www.oed.com/dictionary/noodle_n1?tab=meaning_and_use#34153250)
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-g). Poor. In Oxford English Dictionary. [https://www.oed.com/dictionary/poor\\_adj?tab=meaning\\_and\\_use#29209673](https://www.oed.com/dictionary/poor_adj?tab=meaning_and_use#29209673)
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-h). Sap. In Oxford English Dictionary. [https://www.oed.com/dictionary/sap\\_n5?tab=meaning\\_and\\_use#24234825](https://www.oed.com/dictionary/sap_n5?tab=meaning_and_use#24234825)
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-i). Silly. In Oxford English Dictionary. [https://www.oed.com/dictionary/silly\\_adj?tab=meaning\\_and\\_use#22858496](https://www.oed.com/dictionary/silly_adj?tab=meaning_and_use#22858496)
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-j). To Carry Coals to Newcastle. In Oxford English Dictionary. [https://www.oed.com/dictionary/coal\\_n?tab=meaning\\_and\\_use#9223664](https://www.oed.com/dictionary/coal_n?tab=meaning_and_use#9223664)
- Pym, A. (2014). *Method in Translation History*. Routledge.
- Rabaté, J., & Rabaté C. (2014). *Miguel de Unamuno: Biografía*. Taurus.
- Real Academia Española. (n.d.-a). Niebla. In *Diccionario de la lengua española*. <https://dle.rae.es/niebla?m=form>
- Real Academia Española. (n.d.-b). Panoli. In *Diccionario de la lengua española*. <https://dle.rae.es/panoli?m=form>
- Real Academia Española. (n.d.-c). Pobre. In *Diccionario de la lengua española*. <https://dle.rae.es/pobre?m=form>
- Real Decreto Legislativo 1/1996, de 12 de abril, por el que se aprueba el texto refundido de la ley de propiedad intelectual, regularizando, aclarando y

- armonizando las disposiciones legales vigentes sobre la materia. *Boletín Oficial del Estado*, 97, de 22 de abril de 1996. <https://www.boe.es/eli/es/rdlg/1996/04/12/1/con>
- Ríos Ruiz-Esqvide, E. (2008). Florilegio Aforístico: El Pensamiento Aforístico de Unamuno. *Paremia*, 17, 179-187. [https://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/paremia/pdf/017/016\\_rios.pdf](https://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/paremia/pdf/017/016_rios.pdf)
- Robles, L. (1996). *Epistolario Americano: (1890-1936)*. Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Schaper, B. (2013). The Importance of the Literary Title and its Implications for Translation Theory. *Focus on German Studies*, 20, 101-112. <https://journals.uc.edu/index.php/fogs/article/view/42/29>
- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Ş. (2011). Retranslation. In M. Baker, & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd ed., pp. 233-236). Routledge.
- The Argonaut. (1928, 1 December). *Metaphysics in Fiction*.
- The New York Times. (1929, 2 December). *A playful Comentary*.
- Unamuno, M. (1976). *Novela/Nivola. Mist, Abel Sánchez, and How to Make a Novel* [Novela/Nivola: Niebla, Abel Sánchez y Cómo se hace una novela]. Princeton University Press.
- Unamuno, M. (2000). *Mist: A Tragicomic Novel* [Niebla: Una novela trágica]. University of Illinois Press.
- Unamuno, M. (2006). *Juan Cruz a Translation of Niebla (Fog) by Miguel de Unamuno* [Juan Cruz. Una traducción de Niebla, de Miguel de Unamuno]. Forma Arts And Media Ltd.
- Unamuno, M. (2014). *Mist* [Niebla]. Liverpool University Press.
- Unamuno, M. (2017). *Fog: A Novel* [Niebla: una novela]. Northwestern University Press.
- Unamuno, M. (2021). *Niebla*. Cátedra.
- Venuti, L. (2004). Retranslations: The Creation of Value. *Bucknell Review*, 47(1), 25-38.