Chapter 1: On the Folly of First Impressions

A journey with Theo Hermans

Mona Baker, University of Oslo, Norway

Like most people of my generation, I first came across Theo Hermans’s work when I read *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, the widely celebrated and agenda setting volume he edited in 1985. Routledge’s reprint of the volume in 2014 seems to be based on a scan of the original, which was typed by his late wife Marion, probably on an electric typewriter, and probably on the kitchen table. Despite the publishers’ apology on the copyright page for the ‘imperfections’ of the volume, the unpolished look and the rather antiquated typeface of the old-fashioned typewriter are part of its charm and history. They provide a feel for the era, something of the sense of excitement and adventure that the group represented in the volume must have felt as they set out to articulate a bold new vision – a new paradigm as Hermans refers to it in his introduction – for a discipline that was only just beginning to emerge. Although Hermans insisted in the introduction to the volume that “this group is not a school, but a geographically scattered collection of individuals with widely varying interests” (1985a:10), it quickly became known as the ‘Manipulation School’, a designation that stuck and continues to have much currency today. In revisiting and reassessing the theoretical legacy of this ‘school’ some fourteen years later, Hermans tells us that the designation was coined by Armin Paul Frank in 1987 and given wider currency by Mary Snell-Hornby in her account of the approach a year later “as one of the two main schools of thought in translation studies in Europe in the 1980s” (Hermans 1999b:8), the other being the so-called Leipzig School in Germany (Snell-Hornby 1988:14).

According to Hermans (1985a:14-15), the ‘Manipulation’ group had been “meeting and publishing for close on a decade”; they had come together through “a series of symposia on literary translation” at the University of Louvain in 1976, the University of Tel Aviv in 1978, and the University of Antwerp in 1980. Being an outsider to the discipline and to the group myself at the time (in the early 1990s), and seeing this ‘school’ so idolized in the literature and at the conferences I was beginning to attend, I must admit that I wrongly took Hermans to be the cheer leader of an elite academic clan that dominated the field, that saw the world mostly through the privileged eyes of a jet-setting European, and that was only interested in literary translation – itself being the elite end of a discipline I envisioned as much broader in scope. It wasn’t long before I discovered that first impressions can be very misleading. In the years that followed, I came to realize that Hermans was one of the most fiercely independent, non-elitist, principled and culturally aware scholars in the field. Among other things, it was Hermans who pointed out as early as 1996 – long before Maria Tymoczko, Martha Cheung and others began to question the dominant Eurocentric conceptions of translation – that “when we translate into our own terms a concept of translation radically
different from ours, we inevitably do so by making use of our own categories of translation” (1996b:46-47). And it was he who first exhorted scholars of translation to be wary of a form of rashness that ignores its own ethnocentricity and translates all translation into ‘our’ translation, instead of patiently, repeatedly, laboriously negotiating the other’s terrain while trying to reconceptualize our own modes of representation and the commensurability of cultures.

Hermans (1997a:19)\(^1\)

In a two-volume collection he edited in 2006 that went beyond “prevailing disciplinary hegemonies” to feature contributions on translation in Asia, Africa and the Middle East (a revolutionary intervention at the time), Hermans reminded us again that however intercultural translation studies aspired to be, “its disciplinary history poorly prepared it for radical difference, the particularity of the local, the sheer variety of phenomena coming within its purview” (2006:9). A cornerstone of his vision for the discipline has thus been to “create a vocabulary at once more imaginative and self-critical” than what was available in the field at the time (2003a:380), and to “interrogate translation studies as currently constituted in a language such as English” in order to “make Western academia a province of a larger intellectual world, not its centre” (2009a:104). This was a vision I could identify with, and that inspired me and many others to follow his lead in conducting research that engaged with the world at large and required the analyst to reflect critically on their own position within it.

As I read more of Hermans’s work and interacted with him in a variety of contexts, it also became clear to me that far from being confined to what appeared to be his immediate areas of expertise (literary translation and European history), or to a particular theoretical school such as descriptivism or polysystem theory, his vision was much more ambitious, critical and wide ranging than that of any other scholar of his generation. In the years that followed the publication of *The Manipulation of Literature*, he engaged with a wide range of theories – from poststructuralism to relevance theory, and from Luhmann’s systems theory and Bourdieu’s field theory to Gadamer’s hermeneutics and Goffman’s symbolic interactionism. Each allowed him, in its own way, to address various limitations of descriptive studies and polysystem theory. Resorting to Bourdieu, for instance, allowed “a shift of emphasis from texts and repertoires to the more amenable concept of the individual translator’s agency” (Hermans 2011:14), a concept that is central to his own unique approach and is evoked repeatedly in his reorientation of the notion of norms to accommodate the complexity of individual and institutional dynamics (Hermans 1991, 1996b, 1999a, 2012a). Allowing “abstract actors” to become “human agents operating in institutional contexts” (2011:14) also supported historical studies of the type he has devoted much of his career to promoting (1997b, 2009b, 2012b, 2015).

Reflecting back on this early period in 2007, Hermans noted that *The Manipulation of Literature* “introduced the descriptive paradigm to Anglophone readers” and played an

\(^1\) Reiterated in Hermans (1998:28).
important role in the development of the discipline. Nevertheless, its limitations within the broader landscape of theoretical offerings of relevance to the study of translation at the time also had to be acknowledged, for while “descriptivism was cultivating its structuralist lineage, post-structuralism [had by then] passed it by” (2007c:89). Hermans had already written a detailed critical assessment of the paradigm he helped establish in 1985 (Hermans 1999b). Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-Oriented Approaches Explained, which quickly established itself as the definitive reference on this theoretical strand, gained much of its authority from being recognized as the account of “an informed insider”, and specifically one whose position as a key player in developing the field did not prevent him from acknowledging its limitations where he felt it necessary to do so (von Flotow 2001:2). It offered a critical, nuanced but fair assessment of descriptive translation studies and polysystem theory; while highlighting their strengths and achievements, it concluded that “[t]he structuralist-inspired model of empirical-descriptive translation studies as it was elaborated in the 1970s and ‘90s, new and exciting as it once was, is now a thing of the past” (1999b:160). But Translation in Systems also gained wide popularity because of the quality of Hermans’s writing. Unlike “the convoluted syntax and scientific jargon” typical of Gideon Toury’s writing in particular (Hermans 1995:215), it is highly accessible and engaging. In a review of the book published a year later, Candace Séguinot commented: “If there is a prize for the most literate of English-language writers on translation, there has never been any doubt in my mind that Theo Hermans would be a strong contender. ... His language is a delight” (2000:198). The ability to explain complex theoretical interventions through lively and varied examples of real life instances of translation and interpreting, and to do so in a language that skilfully balances intelligibility with terminological rigour, and with a bit of characteristic dry wit, is a hallmark of Hermans’s writing, and – as anyone who has listened to him speak will know – of his lecturing style.

Having started his career as a key member of a particular group of scholars with a distinctive approach to (literary) translation, Hermans never remained stuck in any ‘school’ or theoretical strand. He quickly moved on to articulating his own unique research agenda, continually working across groups, continents and sub-disciplines. While this rich research agenda clearly cannot be summarized in a few words, it would be fair to say that whatever lines it followed, it ultimately consisted of blowing apart the many illusions surrounding the concept of translation, of showcasing its “hybridity and plurality” and “its cultural force” (Hermans 1996a), irrespective of who undertook it, where and when it took place, and what domain or genre it fell within.

A web of interlocking concepts: Norms, voice, metaphor

It was only as I revisited some of Hermans’s many publications in the past few months that I began to appreciate the extent to which his work has influenced my own thinking and writing about translation. In what follows, I will acknowledge my debt to his work where I can as I attempt to trace the evolution of his thinking about translation after the 1985 phase and until the present, focusing on some of the key interventions that have come to define his approach to translation.

An important strand of Hermans’s work focuses on the translator’s voice and subject position, and highlights the active, pervasive presence of translators in the text. A second
strand details some of the ways in which translators can nevertheless be written out of the picture, spirited away to allow a text to function as an original; the focus here is on questions of authority and the phenomenon of authentication. The two strands do not, by any means, account for the wide range of themes addressed in Hermans’s prolific output, even without taking into consideration his many publications in languages I am unable to read, primarily Dutch. But they do allow me to group together diverse interventions into the debates about the translator in the text, and the processes by which translation functions within the wider social system. As will become clear, there is a productive tension in this body of work between, on the one hand, acknowledging the numerous ways in which translators’ subject positions are written into every text that is presented and received as a translation (2007a:59), and on the other, capturing some of the processes by which translators are made to disappear without a trace, as if by magic, in order to allow a text to function as an original. Both themes have their roots in Hermans’s sustained engagement with the concept of norms, which is central to the descriptive paradigm that constituted the bedrock of his early career. In order to trace their gradual articulation from the early 1990s to their most extended treatment in *The Conference of the Tongues* (Hermans 2007b), a good starting point might thus be to follow his various attempts to nuance and extend the concept of norms beyond the abstract, structural account offered by Gideon Toury.

Toury’s work on norms revolutionized the discipline in the 1980s and early 1990s, but as Hermans explains, it theorized norms “mostly as constraints on the translator’s behaviour”, offering “only a brief indication of [their] broader, social function” (Hermans 1996b:25). By contrast, Hermans’s approach focuses on the social function of translation and its imbrication in networks of power and ideology, on norms as “part of every socialization process”, and as “mediat[ing] between the individual and collective sphere” (ibid.:26). What is interesting about norms is not that they allow us to compare source and target texts but that they “implicate values in translation”, and hence remind us that translation cannot be “value free, or neutral, or transparent”, nor can the translator’s subject position be totally erased (2002a:17). Throughout his sustained engagement with this concept, Hermans’s emphasis therefore remained on the agents involved in the translation process rather than on the relation between source and target texts (1996b:27).

For Hermans, unlike Toury, “[t]he operation of translational norms is ... not a matter of texts, or of textual relations, but of acting, thinking, feeling, calculating, sometimes desperate people, with certain personal or group interests at heart, with stakes to defend, with power structures to negotiate” (1997a:110). Translators are guided or constrained by norms, but “they are not so much hemmed in” by them “as actively negotiating their way through them and taking up a position in the process” (2009a:96). They have agency, a voice that can be traced in the text, and a subject position. At the same time, the fact that norms are an integral part of the socio-cultural system (1991:166) requires the analyst to engage with social relations that are both material (economic, legal, etc.) and symbolic. The latter “have to do with status, with legitimacy, and with what confers legitimacy” (1997a:9), and hence with the institutional setting of translation.

Norms are about the textual choices translators make, but “the relevance of these choices is ... that they are read as profiling a subject-position which is primarily ideological” (2009a:97). Picking up on a theme I highlighted earlier and that runs through much of his
work, Hermans goes on to suggest that this has implications for our own analysis of translation norms, that scholars too occupy a subject position in their writings. For “if translating is not an ideologically neutral activity, how can the study of translation be?” (ibid.:103). The study of translation is itself a social practice which is “always overdetermined” in the sense of being “shot through with interferences stemming from the concept of translation inscribed in our own language and culture, and from our ‘social persona’, our position and position-takings … in an institutional context” (1996b:48).

One of Hermans’s most widely cited and influential articles remains ‘The Translator’s Voice in Translated Narrative’ (Hermans 1996c). We can see the origins of his thinking about the positioning of the translator and the subject position he or she occupies clearly in the series of questions he poses early in the article (ibid.:26):

Does the translator, the manual labour done, disappear without textual trace, speaking entirely 'under erasure'? Can translators usurp the original voice and in the same move evacuate their own enunciatory space? Exactly whose voice comes to us when we read translated discourse?

These questions were revelatory for scholars of translation at the time, myself included. They inspired me to investigate the issue of translator style in an article that later spawned several studies by other scholars (Baker 2000), in direct response to Hermans’s questions. His examples were restricted to cases where the nature of the text is such that the translation “is caught blatantly contradicting its own performance” – as when a text declares that it is written in a language other than that of the translation (Hermans 1998:19) or a conference speaker says “This is me speaking and not the interpreter” (2002a:12). But he did point out that “we can and should postulate a translator’s voice, however indistinct, in all translations” (1998:19; emphasis added). He insisted in the 1996 paper and went on to assert a couple of years later that the translator’s voice is always “there in the text itself, every word of it” (1998:20). I therefore attempted to complement his focus on instances where the translator’s voice “breaks through the surface of the text speaking for itself, in its own name” (Hermans 1996c:27) with a methodology for capturing the translator’s largely subconscious linguistic habits and characteristic use of language.

Picking up this important thread from Hermans, then, my 2000 study focused on linguistic patterns, to unearth aspects of the translator’s voice that he insisted was always there. The study however failed to engage with the wider claims Hermans was articulating. For one thing, my exclusive focus on linguistic patterning in the translation of novels implied that style was an issue specific to literary translation, although Hermans had stressed that “there is nothing to prevent extending” the model he elaborated “from translated narrative to translated texts in general” (1996c:45). Referring to this study years later, Hermans (2009a) also makes an argument that I failed to articulate at the time but came to appreciate and pursue in later studies, in large part – as I have come to realize – as a result of reading more of his work. As he astutely observes, the relevance of patterns such as those I captured in my study “does not lie in the mere recognition of the translator’s linguistic tics being strewn around a text” but in demonstrating that “the translator’s own position and ideology are ineluctably written into the texts he or she translates”, and this in turn “brings on questions of responsibility and accountability, and hence ethics” (2009a:97).
For Hermans, moreover, raising the question of voice is intended to alert us to a much more important issue, “that of the standard perception of translation as transparency and as duplication” (1998:20). These pervasive metaphors reveal a set of societal expectations that require the translator to be completely self-effacing to ensure the original’s integrity and confirm its status as original. Ideologically, the “loyal self-abnegation” of the translator “guarantees the undisputed primacy” of the translation and the author (ibid.). The metaphors a society deploys in speaking about translation are not ideologically neutral, and throughout his extensive body of work on metaphors (1985b, 2004), Hermans reminds us that “translation has been hedged in by means of hierarchies strongly reminiscent of those employed to maintain sexual power relations” (1998:20-21). Drawing attention to the historical parallels between the way gender and translation are constructed in our societies, he explains that “[b]oth are cultural constructions” and “involve power differentials”, hence the importance of asking “whose interests are being served by these hierarchies, and why it is that translation apparently needs to be so tightly controlled and regulated” (Hermans 2001).

From voice to positioning: Translation as quotation

In his later work, Hermans replaced the concept of voice with that of positioning, to highlight the fact that “the translator’s subject position is continually being constructed as the discourse unfolds” (2014:286). Positioning is part of a dialogic, collaborative process that places both the translator and the reader in “jointly produced story lines, shared narratives that shape collectives, maintain distinctions and secure values” (2007b:81). The switch from voice to positioning allowed Hermans to argue that in making choices that “fall in or diverge from prevailing patterns and expectations” (i.e. from prevailing norms of translation), a translator necessarily adopts a position in relation to the existing body of translations in his or her society, and in so doing “marks not only a discursive presence but also a critical viewpoint” (ibid.:51; emphasis added). In this sense, “[a]ll translating is translating with an attitude. It could not be anything else, since all translations contain the translator’s subject-position” (ibid.:84-85).

It follows that translations are always self-referential, “they speak about themselves, with more or less emphasis” (2007b:51) because they both encode a subject position and respond, “whether in the form of compliance or defiance” (ibid.), to other translations that circulate in their social space. Each translation “invokes, not just another translation, but other translations, and, by extension, translation as a generic and historical category” (2007a:61). To be able to account for this aspect of translation and of the translator’s positioning, Hermans argued, it is necessary to view translation as a form of reported speech (2014:286). Asserting that “translation is second-order discourse, discourse that represents another discourse” (2007a:67), he concludes that it can be regarded as an interpretive utterance in relevance theory terms: an utterance that represents another utterance rather than one that makes direct statements about the world. But “just as quotations are more than verbatim repetitions of someone’s words”, translation too is

---

2 Hermans’s seminal article (1985b) initiated what was to become an enduring concern with metaphors of translation. As Guldin (this volume) demonstrates, Antoine Berman, among many others, drew very heavily on it. Practically all work on metaphors of translation is a direct response to this and later work on metaphors by Hermans.
“more than direct speech” (2007b:70). The model he goes on to elaborate theorizes translation as a mixture of direct and indirect speech and posits that the ambivalence resulting from the overlap “creates the space in which a translator’s critical attitude towards what is being translated can be profiled and the concept of irony comes into its own” (ibid.:65).

Adopting Sperber and Wilson’s approach to irony as “distinguished by the fact that the speaker distances himself from the opinion or words referred to” in what is being quoted, and hence as an “echoic utterance” (ibid.:76), Hermans then suggests that echoic translating is “translating with a dissociative attitude” (ibid.:83). Translations that are explicitly marked by this attitude – as when a translator signals his or her disapproval of the author’s views in a preface – are a special case. However, given that – as stressed earlier – all translation is translation with an attitude, and since it is neither possible nor productive to establish clear lines between the different types of attitude a translator might adopt in relation to a text (dissociative, neutral or associative), all translation is ultimately echoic. Importantly, Hermans argues (ibid.):

Approaching translation as a complex form of quoting makes it clear that translation matters, socially and historically, not only because it transmits cultural goods but because it transmits them under a certain angle, with evaluation attached.

Conceptualizing translation as quotation and as echoic thus reminds us that a translator’s subject position is inscribed in every word of the text, even when he or she is not aware of it, and that this has important ethical and ideological implications.

**Equivalence, authentication and the spiriting away of translators**

However perverse it may seem in the context of understanding translation as a social practice, I should like to sketch a sociological perspective on translation that chooses to write translators out of the picture

Hermans (2007a:57)

Equivalence has been central to both public and scholarly debates about translation since time immemorial. Hermans’s engagement with the concept does not follow the usual pattern of specifying conditions for attaining it, nor of attempting to define it or creating typologies of it as others have done. For him, “[s]peaking of translation in terms of equivalence means engaging in an elaborate – if perhaps a socially necessary – act of make-believe” (1998:18). He thus accepts Toury’s pragmatic approach to equivalence as “any target-language utterance which is presented or regarded as such within the target culture, on whatever grounds” (Toury 1985:20). Acknowledging the “bold, decisive and liberating” nature of this move on Toury’s part (Hermans 1999b:49), however, he goes well beyond it by theorizing equivalence, like norms, within a social context and constantly shifting, dynamic fields of power. Failure to live up to the ambition of attaining full equivalence is part of the social definition of translations; it is what allows us to recognize them as translations (2007a:59). Translations can only be recognized as such when they are not regarded as definitive (in the sense of being fully equivalent with their source). It is this
falling short of achieving equivalence that allows for the proliferation of retranslations. Recognizing a translation as a definitive version of a prototext thus “spell[s] the end of translation” (2007a:61), whereas the potential for retranslation “undermines any claim an individual translation may have to be the original’s sole representative” (ibid.). All translations are therefore “necessarily provisional and repeatable” (ibid.:59). And it is because translations are repeatable that they have their translators’ subject positions written into them (ibid.). There are always alternative ways “of representing the original in translation” (ibid.:61).

Equivalence, moreover, is not a textual feature; it is “primarily a matter of status and only secondarily a matter of semantics or use value” (2007b:9). The illusion of equivalence comes about through complex social processes that are firmly embedded within structures of power. Equivalence is thus to be understood as “equality of value and status” (ibid.:6), and can only be declared by an institution or an individual with a certain level of authority rather than “extrapolated on the basis of textual comparison” (ibid.). In other words, it is “proclaimed, not found” (ibid.). A proclamation of equivalence is subject to the same rules that govern performative speech acts: to effect a change in the world – in this case, the illusion of equivalence that allows a change in the status of a text – the conditions have to be right. Drawing on examples as varied as the story of the Septuagint, the Book of Mormon and the United Nations Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, Hermans focuses on cases where translations are authenticated, in the sense of being deemed equally authentic in two or more languages, “so that each version is on a par with the other version or versions” (ibid.:8). In the case of the Vienna Convention, “authentication is a pronouncement that carries legal force” (ibid.:9), whereas in the case of self translation or where “authors assist their translators, and in so doing control and authorise” the resulting translation (ibid.:22), the authentication process is weaker. It is “authentication in a minor key” (ibid.). The more strongly institutionalized the environment, the more effective the process of authentication. Literature is an example of a “weakly institutionalised field, in which pronouncements about the status of a text may be contested” (ibid:21) and authentication remains open to challenge. Authentication in a strongly institutionalized field like law, on the other hand, “makes equivalence a reality rather than an illusion”, albeit a reality that is “no more than a socially binding legal or institutional fiction” (ibid.:27).

An important consequence of the type of authentication that operates in strongly institutionalized environments like law is that it erases the memory of translation (2007b:10), and hence of the translator, for “where there is no translation, there cannot be a translator” (2007a:59). Once a translation has been authenticated, once it has been “successfully declared equivalent with its parent text“, it can no longer function as a translation (2007b:59). It “self destructs as translation and takes away the translator with it” (ibid.:27). This spiriting away of translators is accounted for in Hermans’s work on translation as a social system in which translators would merely be “presupposed as would be all sorts of material preconditions” (2007a:62). In Luhmann’s systems theory, on which Hermans draws heavily in several publications, “‘translator’ ... stands for a discursive identity, a point of reference, not a real person: physical bodies belong not to the social system but to its environment” (ibid.:69). As a discursive identity, rather than a physical presence, the translator can be spirited away through different types of institutional

Hermans’s interest in norms, equivalence, positioning and authentication connects directly with his vision for a broadly conceived, self-questioning discipline that is culturally and politically aware and cognizant of its own place in the world. The function of this discipline’s object of study (translation) is “meta-representational”; translations produce “representations of representations, ... verbal re-enactments for pre-existing discourses”, and hence partake of “society’s construction of reality” (2007a:57). Every concept he patiently dissects and exemplifies through numerous examples from very different genres is developed from this overarching perspective. The significance of highlighting agency by fleshing out the details of the translator’s voice and positioning is that it raises issues of ethics and accountability: demonstrating that a translator occupies a subject position in the text rather than acting merely as a mouthpiece for the author means that they are accountable for their textual and non-textual choices (2014:294-95) and “ultimately makes translation a socially relevant form of communication” (ibid.:299). Likewise, far from “an arcane legalistic procedure” (2003b:39), the relevance of authentication lies “in the conferral of authority” (2007b:11), with concrete, ethical consequences. The choice of language versions considered authentic in bilateral or multilateral agreements reflects the political power and prestige of the language communities in question rather than any inherent qualities of the authenticated texts (ibid.:14). Authenticating here privileges a specific version and the speakers of the language in question, alerting us to the imbrication of our object of study in broader questions of power and justice.

The real value of Hermans’s work is that it invites us to recognize “the social and cultural significance of translation” as “consist[ing] less in its instrumental role as a channel for the importation of foreign goods than in the value judgements attached to those goods as they are brought in and the ideological and other filters that subsequently affect the texts” that enter our social spaces as translations (2014:297-98).

**Postscript**

As I was struggling with various issues during a rather trying period in the early 2000s, I came across Hermans’s ‘Paradoxes and Aporias in Translation and Translation Studies’ (2002a) and was intrigued by a passing reference to narrativity. Hermans discusses narrativity briefly in this article as one of three suggestions for infusing our discourse about translation with critical self-reflexiveness, but even this brief reference was rich enough to inspire me to begin reading widely on narrative theory, and eventually write *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account* in 2006. The idea of narrative and the emphasis on critical self-reflexiveness spoke to me at a human level, beyond the scholarly context of Hermans’s argument. I acknowledged this particular debt in a footnote to Chapter 1 of the book (Baker 2006:173), as I acknowledged the source of my work on translator style earlier. However, having reread some of his prolific output more recently, I now realize that all along I have been merely picking the crumbs off Hermans’s table of rich and varied scholarly offerings over the years, and that my debt to him exceeds these specific, direct influences.
What I ultimately find inspiring in Hermans’s work is not this or that theoretical concept, this or that innovative line of research, but a vision that is inclusive, self-critical, human even in its most abstract arguments, conscious of the scholar’s position in a particular culture and in the world at large, and much wider in scope than the specifics of any genre or historical moment. Like many others (see, for instance, Guldin, this volume), I also find his openness and lack of defensiveness empowering. For rather than a streamlined, structured discipline dominated by a few themes and approaches, not to mention a particular clique or ‘school’ of thought, Hermans’s vision of translation studies is of a field that is mature enough to pursue many lines and models of investigation, “a splintered discipline, a de-centred and perhaps ex-centric field of study that must learn to speak several tongues, recognizes the contingency of theory and seeks to make its own uncertainties productive” (2006:9). More than anything else, it is this self-reflexive, critical and inclusive vision which constitutes the hallmark of his legacy as a scholar and mentor to all the contributors featured in this volume, and to numerous others not represented here.
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